



# Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD  
SEVENTH ASSEMBLY

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

6 MAY 2010

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

## Thursday, 6 May 2010

Duties Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1835
Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1835
Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2) .....	1836
Construction Occupations Legislation (Exemption Assessment) Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1839
Standing and temporary orders (Estimates 2010-2011—Select Committee) .....	1844
Privileges—Select Committee .....	1847
Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee .....	1847
Emergencies Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1857
Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1864
Crimes (Sentence Administration) Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1867
Visitors .....	1867
Questions without notice:	
Taxation—change of use .....	1867
Planning—sustainable use of building materials .....	1871
Budget—taxation levels .....	1872
Health—promotion grants .....	1878
Appropriation Bill 2010-2011 .....	1879
Standing order 156—advice .....	1943
Public Accounts—Standing Committee .....	1943
Planning and Environment—Standing Committee (Sixth Assembly) .....	1944
Financial Management Act—instruments .....	1948
Paper .....	1950
Legal Affairs—Standing Committee .....	1951
Papers .....	1951
Planning and Development Act 2007—schedule of leases .....	1951
Public Accounts—Standing Committee .....	1952
Women—equity of remuneration .....	1954
Public Accounts—Standing Committee .....	1955
Adjournment:	
ACT Planning and Land Authority—workplace injury .....	1956
Ms Anna Landon .....	1958
Ms Anna Landon .....	1959
National walk safely to school day .....	1959
Ms Anna Landon .....	1960
Tamil referendum .....	1960
Canberra Dragon Boat Association .....	1960
Fusion second-hand clothing store .....	1961
Catholic schools football .....	1961
VISACT blind cricket .....	1961
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Emergencies Amendment Bill 2010 .....	1964
Answers to questions:	
Public service—corporate credit cards (Question No 473 supplementary) .....	1965
Environment—abandoned shopping trolleys (Question No 554) .....	1965
Government—payment of invoices (Question No 593) .....	1966
Government—payment of invoices (Question No 594) .....	1967
Children—childcare centres (Question No 614) .....	1967

Emergency Services Agency—sheds (Question No 621) .....	1969
Legal Aid Office—staffing (Question No 622).....	1972
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 625) .....	1974
Environment—conservation measures (Question Nos 626, 629, 642, 643 and 644) .....	1974
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 627) .....	1975
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 628) .....	1976
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 632) .....	1976
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 634) .....	1978
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 637) .....	1978
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 638) .....	1979
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 639) .....	1979
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 640) .....	1980
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 641) .....	1981
Environment—conservation measures (Question No 645) .....	1981
Public service—staffing (Question No 647) .....	1982
Public service—staffing (Question No 649) .....	1983
Public service—staffing (Question No 660) .....	1984
Public service—staffing (Question No 662) .....	1986
Public service—staffing (Question No 663) .....	1987
Government—committees and working groups (Question No 669).....	1988
Government—committees and working groups (Question No 670).....	1989
Government—information technology services (Question No 673).....	1991
Government—information technology services (Question No 674).....	1992
Government—grants programs (Question No 677) .....	1992
Government—grants programs (Question No 678) .....	1993
Government—motor vehicles (Question No 681).....	1993
Government—motor vehicles (Question No 682).....	1996
Government—regulatory impact statements (Question No 685).....	1997
Government—regulatory impact statements (Question No 687).....	1998
Government—advertising (Question No 689) .....	1999
Government—advertising (Question No 690) .....	2000
Government—advertising (Question No 691) .....	2000
Government—training programs (Question No 693).....	2001
Government—training programs (Question No 694).....	2003
Capital works—projects (Question No 696) .....	2007
Planning—Molonglo (Question No 697) .....	2008
Planning—Deakin (Question No 698) .....	2009
Akron—collapse (Question No 699).....	2010
Land—rent scheme (Question No 700).....	2012
Taxation—stamp duty (Question No 701) .....	2013
Taxation—change of use charge (Question No 702) .....	2014
Business—statistics (Question No 703) .....	2014
Business—fake identifications (Question No 704) .....	2014
Business—licences (Question No 705) .....	2015
Roads—John Gorton Drive (Question No 706) .....	2016
Housing—energy ratings (Question No 707).....	2017
Housing ACT—complaints (Question No 708).....	2018
Sport—government support (Question No 711) .....	2019
Sport—grants (Question No 713).....	2020

Sport—programs (Question No 715) .....	2021
National Multicultural festival—cost (Question No 716) .....	2021
ACTION bus service—vehicles (Question No 718) .....	2022
Planning—Nicholls (Question No 720) .....	2027
Environment—street trees (Question No 721) .....	2027
Environment—firewood (Question No 722) .....	2028
Housing ACT—dwellings (Question No 724) .....	2029
Courts—Sentence Administration Board (Question No 727) .....	2031
Abengoa Solar (Question No 739) .....	2032
Commonwealth government—employees (Question No 740) .....	2033
Capital works—expenditure (Question No 741) .....	2033
Government—motor vehicles (Question Nos 791, 792 and 793) .....	2036
Disability services—individual support package program (Question No 814) .....	2037
Health—autism (Question No 815) .....	2038
Disability services—unmet need (Question No 816) .....	2039
Government—advisory bodies, statutory authorities and business enterprises (Question No 818) .....	2040
Education—Building the Education Revolution (BER)—projects (Question No 819) .....	2043
Government—websites (Question No 845) .....	2044
Government—websites (Question No 846) .....	2045
Government—websites (Question No 849) .....	2046
Government—websites (Question No 852) .....	2046
Government—websites (Question No 855) .....	2047
Government—websites (Question No 856) .....	2048
Government—websites (Question No 857) .....	2049
Government—websites (Question No 859) .....	2050
Government—websites (Question No 863) .....	2050
Calvary Hospital and Clare Holland House (Question No 870) .....	2051
Public service—staffing (Question No 872) .....	2052
Business—grants (Question No 873) .....	2053
Public service—staffing (Question No 875) .....	2053
Emergency services—training (Question No 878) .....	2055
Government—regional issues (Question No 884) .....	2057
Roads—Limestone Avenue and London Circuit (Question No 885) .....	2059
Roads—footpaths (Question No 886) .....	2060
Planning—Molonglo (Question No 888) .....	2060
Environment—noise pollution (Question No 891) .....	2062
Education—Building the Education Revolution (BER)—costs (Question No 892) .....	2063
Planning—Molonglo (Question No 893) .....	2064
Canberra Hospital—walk-in centre (Question No 895) .....	2065
Alexander Maconochie Centre—needle and syringe program (Question No 899) .....	2065
Canberra Hospital—patients (Question No 900) .....	2066
Hospitals—treatment interstate (Question No 904) .....	2066
ACT Health—litigation costs (Question No 905) .....	2068
Alexander Maconochie Centre—needle and syringe program (Question No 906) .....	2070

Alexander Maconochie Centre—rehabilitation programs (Question No 908) .....	2071
Alexander Maconochie Centre—population and costs (Question No 909) ..	2074
Government—motor vehicles (Question No 914).....	2076
Government—costs (Question No 917) .....	2076
Government—costs (Question No 920) .....	2078
Government—grants programs (Question No 935) .....	2078
<i>Our City, Our Community</i> brochure (Question No 940).....	2079
Roads—parking revenue (Question No 942) .....	2080
Territory and Municipal Services, Department—accounts (Question No 943) .....	2082
Government—departmental costs (Question No 946) .....	2083
Government—grants programs (Question No 959) .....	2083
Government—costs (Question No 963) .....	2083
Government—costs (Question No 964) .....	2084
Government—regulatory impact statements (Question No 965).....	2084
Government—advertising (Question No 970) .....	2085

**Thursday, 6 May 2010**

**MR SPEAKER** (Mr Rattenbury) took the chair at 10 am and asked members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

### **Duties Amendment Bill 2010**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MS GALLAGHER** (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Health and Minister for Industrial Relations) (10.01): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Duties Amendment Bill 2010 amends the Duties Act 1999 to abolish duty on applications to register caravans and camper trailers in the ACT. The ACT is one of the few remaining jurisdictions, together with Tasmania and Victoria, that still impose duty on an application to register or transfer the registration of a caravan or camper trailer. This bill will bring the ACT into line with other jurisdictions and, as a result, is likely to attract purchasers of caravans and camper trailers to register in the ACT.

By abolishing this duty, the bill will ensure that the ACT caravan industry is not disadvantaged compared to their New South Wales counterparts by our taxation laws. While the bill will abolish duty on caravans and camper trailers, trailers that are not camper trailers, such as goods carrying trailers, will continue to be liable in the current way. The relatively small amount of revenue forgone through this measure is expected to be offset by increased revenue from registration fees as more caravans transfer to the ACT.

The passage of this bill is necessary to give effect to revenue measures introduced in the 2010-11 ACT budget, and I commend the Duties Amendment Bill 2010 to the Assembly.

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

### **Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2010**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MS GALLAGHER** (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Health and Minister for Industrial Relations) (10.03): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 amends the Duties Act 1999, the Rates Act 2004 and the Payroll Tax Act 1987.

The bill contains four amendments, all of which provide a benefit to certain groups of taxpayers. Three of the amendments relate to special disability trusts under the Duties Act and the Rates Act. The fourth amendment, to the Payroll Tax Act, provides an exemption from payroll tax for wages that are paid or payable in relation to voluntary services performed under the Emergency Services Act 2004.

The amendment to the Duties Act provides an exemption from duty on the purchase of a residential property by a special disability trust where the beneficiary of the trust resides in the property as their principal place of residence. Special disability trusts were introduced by the Australian government to assist parents and immediate family members to make private financial provision for the current and future care and accommodation needs of a family member with a severe disability.

I believe it is important that all levels of government support and assist those parents and families who are caring for people with a disability. This exemption from duty will help ease some of the financial burden for those families who transfer a residential property into a special disability trust.

The amendments to the Rates Act will allow a trustee of a special disability trust to apply to the Commissioner for ACT Revenue for a deferral and/or rebate of rates. Currently, the owner of a parcel of land can apply to the commissioner to defer the payment of rates. However, where property is purchased by a special disability trust, the trustee is deemed to be the owner. The amendment to the Rates Act expands the definition of an “owner” and “eligible person” to allow a trustee of a special disability trust to apply for a deferral of rates on behalf of the beneficiary when the beneficiary is an eligible person. The amendments will also allow the commissioner to make a determination to defer rates without an application by the trustee of a special disability trust if there are exceptional circumstances to support such a deferral.

The final amendment introduces an exemption from payroll tax for wages paid or payable to an employee who takes part as a volunteer in emergency operations. This will include voluntary activities for the Rural Fire Service, SES, community fire units and bush fire-fighting, or assistance provided by the SES for emergencies in and around the ACT.

I commend the Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 to the Assembly.

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

## **Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2)**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MR CORBELL** (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.07): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2010 (No 2) is the 25th bill in a series of legislation that concerns the Justice and Community Safety portfolio. The bill I am introducing today will improve the quality of the ACT statute book.

Members would remember that the Assembly recently supported a motion calling on the government to, firstly, adhere to the generally accepted practice of using omnibus bills to deal only with amendments to legislation that are minor, technical and non-contentious in nature and, secondly, bring forward amendments of a more substantive nature in separate bills dealing specifically with those amendments.

I would like to take the opportunity now to reflect on the government's understanding of what is the generally accepted practice in relation to the content of omnibus bills. The omnibus bill program was developed in response to the need for greater flexibility in the drafting of amendments for revision purposes and to minimise costs associated with keeping ACT legislation up to date. Omnibus bills enable legislative amendments and repeals to be made that, taken alone, would generally be insufficiently important to justify separate legislation.

There are two major types of omnibus bills which the government uses to effect change to the ACT statute book—JACS bills and statute law amendment bills, or SLABs, as they are more commonly known. SLABs are designed to effect minor and technical amendments to legislation. They are an important part of maintaining and enhancing the standard of ACT law. The types of amendments that are typically included in SLABs are purely technical, involving the correction of grammatical issues, restructuring, omitting redundant words and updating language in line with current legislative drafting practice. SLABs are never used as a vehicle to enact substantive amendments.

JACS bills, on the other hand, have always been used to effect more substantive changes to the law than SLABs. While the amendments included may be substantive, the government has always striven to ensure that they do not involve a significant policy shift. JACS bills typically involve amendments which clarify or simplify procedures under the existing law, reinforce an existing policy intention or achieve national consistency through implementation of nationally agreed amendments.

In supporting the recent motion on the use of omnibus bills, I do not think that any member was suggesting that substantive amendments should not be made in JACS bills. However, the government is supportive of ensuring that the norm is that a majority of the substantive issues pursued through a JACS bill should not be controversial. The government is also supportive of ensuring that major new initiatives and major new policy are pursued through a distinct and separate bill.



I acknowledge that there will inevitably be debate at the margin about what is “substantive” and what is “controversial”. The characterisation is uncertain and can vary depending on individual perspectives. It can also change over time, sometimes even a short time, including between the introduction and debate on a bill. Some amendments have small transactional impact, but in the eyes of their proponents they are of considerable importance. Others may have high volume operational significance but be of very low impact to the community or meet with wide acclaim.

In any event, I am confident that the JACS bill I am introducing today will honour and uphold the generally accepted practice. The amendments involve a mixture of minor and technical amendments, as well as more substantive, yet uncontroversial, amendments. The technical amendments update the language and terminology used in ACT legislation, and the more substantive amendments ensure that the legislation operates effectively and in a manner consistent with government’s intention. While substantive in nature, the government maintains that these amendments are non-contentious.

Late last year, the Statute Law Amendment Act 2009 (No 2) inserted a definition into the Legislation Act 2001 of “bankrupt or personally insolvent”. The definition establishes a single term to cover the range of circumstances by which an individual may be considered bankrupt or insolvent under the commonwealth Bankruptcy Act 1966. Consequential amendments were made to 19 acts and regulations to apply the definition across the ACT statute book. This process was continued in the recently introduced Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010. Amendments are made to 16 acts and regulations in this bill to apply the definition to ensure that legislation within the Justice and Community Safety portfolio is consistent with the rest of the ACT statute book.

The bill also makes a number of amendments to the Prostitution Act 1992 to update the language used in the act. Specifically, amendments replace references to “sexually transmitted disease” with references to “sexually transmissible infection”. This change in terminology ensures consistency with terminology in Australian national policy. An amendment has also been made to the heading of section 25 of the act to ensure that it more appropriately reflects the content of the provision.

More substantive amendments are made to the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2008 and the Magistrates Act 1930 to ensure that the legislation operates effectively and in a manner consistent with the government’s intention.

The amendments to the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2008 will clarify an ambiguity in the act in relation to the appointment of temporary presidential and non-presidential members to the tribunal. The amendments will disaggregate the generic references to temporary appointment of tribunal members referred to in existing section 101 of the act by describing the way temporary appointments apply to each type of member. Temporary appointments will be permissible for a term of not longer than 12 months.

The amendments to the Magistrates Court Act will ensure that there is a consistent procedure for dealing with a failure to attend court in response to a summons.

Currently, the act authorises the court to issue an arrest warrant in the event of an accused person failing to attend court in response to a summons. The process for issuing the warrant, in this case, is simpler than issuing an arrest warrant in the first instance, because the summons has already been issued.

However, there is a gap in the law for how the court is to deal with an accused person who has attended court in response to a summons but has failed to attend any subsequent adjourned hearing on the same matter. Currently, where an accused person fails to attend a subsequent hearing, the court only has the option of issuing an arrest warrant in the first instance. The process involved in getting this warrant fails to take into account the fact that a summons has already been issued, and therefore results in a duplication of effort by the court. There is no justification for not applying the simplified arrest warrant procedure to this circumstance.

Accordingly, the amendments ensure that the process that applies in issuing an arrest warrant where an accused person fails to appear in the first instance also applies to the situation where the accused person appeared once, but failed to appear in a subsequent adjourned hearing.

The amendments will not remove any protections which currently apply to accused persons in relation to the issuing of an arrest warrant. The arrest warrant will continue to be issued only where the person is informed of the date and time of the adjourned hearing, and the information must continue to be substantiated by oath of the informant or witness. The amendments also ensure that where a lawyer has appeared on behalf of the accused person in the first instance, an arrest warrant can only be issued where the accused person has been given notice of the date and time of the adjourned proceeding.

JACS bills are invaluable in ensuring that legislation continues to give effect to the policy decisions that resulted in the enactment of the territory's laws. They allow the government to be responsive to community and stakeholder concerns, thereby delivering on the government's commitment to be alert to the territory's changing needs and attitudes. The bill I present today is no exception. It introduces amendments to the statute book of a relatively minor and generally uncontroversial nature, providing this Assembly with an opportunity to ensure, in a timely fashion, that the territory's laws continue to operate with minimal confusion or uncertainty, and address current challenges and issues.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

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

### **Construction Occupations Legislation (Exemption Assessment) Amendment Bill 2010**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing) (10.17): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

Mr Speaker, I present the Construction Occupations Legislation (Exemption Assessment) Amendment Bill 2010. This legislation continues reforms delivered earlier this year that provided industry and the community with a more effective process to unit title a development. The second stage of these reforms will introduce a new, but not mandatory, option for persons to apply for an “exemption assessment notice”. This option provides the homeowner with a way of knowing their development is lawfully exempt development. The construction occupation licensing legislation plays an important role in delivering these reforms.

In 2004, the government introduced the Construction Occupations (Licensing) Act or COLA. By interacting with other appropriate legislation, COLA established a framework to provide more effective regulation of the construction industry in the ACT. With proposed amendments, the Planning and Development Act will become an operational act and will provide the mechanism for a licensed person to be able to issue an exemption assessment notice for development under the act.

The newly created construction occupation of works assessor will be expanded. This means that a licensed works assessor can not only do unit title assessment work but also provide a notice that indicates a development is exempt from needing development approval.

The bill goes further in that it also expands the types of work a building surveyor can do. If passed, this bill will not only see surveyors providing exemption assessment notices under the Planning and Development Act but will also provide a totally new capacity to issue exemption assessment notices under the Building Act.

This bill is another example of a practical response to one of the issues raised through the Industry Monitoring Group. This bill introduces an exemption assessment certification service that, while not mandatory, will provide peace of mind to the community and a new business opportunity for industry.

COLA part 1 dealt with unit title reforms and was made in February this year. It inserted the construction occupation of works assessor. This bill seeks to expand that definition to include the work necessary to do an exemption assessment notice. In recent years the range and types of things that can be exempt from needing development approval and/or building approval has expanded.

The exemption now includes such things as a single dwelling, as long as it complies with the single dwelling housing development code in the territory plan. At the moment, a person can determine for themselves whether what they intend to build meets the exemption criteria. If the construction needs building approval but not development approval, the building certifier will confirm the “self-assessment” as part of the building approval application process.

However, for many other types of developments such as garages and carports there is not necessarily this informal “double-check” and no capacity to provide a formal written response. The reforms proposed by this bill put in place a non-mandatory process for people who would like to have their “self-assessment” confirmed by a licensed person and to have a record of this decision.

This record is then available for a variety of future uses. For instance, a prospective buyer would have “peace of mind” that the exempt single dwelling they are looking at buying is an exempt development or that the double garage is exempt development.

The bill also provides a mechanism so that an applicant for a building approval will now receive a written response. When appropriate this will confirm for the applicant why an approval could not be issued in instances where a building approval is declined.

Mr Speaker, the bill amends the Building Act, COLA and the Planning and Development Act. COLA is amended to expand what a works assessor and building surveyor can do. The Building Act and planning and development provisions relative to the application process are similar in both acts. They cover how to make an application to a licensed person; what materials need to be provided with the application; how, if the licensed person accepts the application, they will then manage its consideration; and, finally, how the applicant will be advised of the outcome of the application.

Mr Speaker, I will now turn to a more detailed discussion of the key provisions of the Building Act and the Planning and Development Act that will put in place the framework for these reforms to operate, and this, Mr Speaker, should come with a warning that this section is most definitely for planning nerds.

The application provisions are at clause 4 for the Building Act, inserting a new part 2, and clause 46 for the Planning and Development Act, inserting a new division 7.3.1A. New section 14E of the Building Act and new sections 138B to 138G of the Planning and Development Act provide for the more effective operation of the processes for an exemption assessment B and/or D notice.

New sections 14 and 138B set out the requirements of an application for an exemption assessment B or D notice including the need for the application to have a number of copies of the plan of the proposed development. New section 14A and section 136C are designed to ensure a proponent is not forced to have an exemption assessment B or D notice when applying for building approval or development approval.

Asking for an exemption assessment notice is not mandatory. A building surveyor is already, and will continue to be, required to assess whether a proposed development is exempt when deciding an application for a building approval. However, if a proponent has obtained and supplies an exemption assessment notice, the person making the decision must use it.

New section 14B of the Building Act and 138D of the Planning and Development Act provide that if an application has been made to the building surveyor or a works

assessor, and they agree to do the assessment, the building surveyor or works assessor must do the assessment and issue a notice. The notice must say what is exempt, what is not exempt, and why. A copy of the notice must be supplied to the ACT Planning and Land Authority.

New sections 14C to 14E and sections 138E to 138G set out the parameters for a building surveyor or works assessor to ask for further information. It also stipulates the form and time frames for requesting further information and what happens if the requested information is not provided. Because the building surveyor or works assessor carries responsibility for the decision, they need to have access to information that will help them determine the application. These provisions are designed to introduce a process for building surveyors, works assessors and applicants. The process is similar to that used in existing building and development approval application processes.

Mr Speaker, there are also defences provided in both the Building Act and Planning and Development Act for persons who use and act on certain approvals on the understanding that they are accurate and lawful. The provisions at clauses 16 to 21 and clause 47 amend existing provisions that deal with defences. A defence does not extend to prohibited development.

Clause 13 inserts new section 29(6A) for the Building Act to provide that an exemption assessment D notice, when used in the building approval process, has a lifespan of three months from the date it is issued.

**Mrs Dunne:** But wait; there's more!

**MR BARR:** This brings exemption assessment notices into line with building and development approvals. This means that an applicant can use the assessment notice for three months in other planning approvals processes. And, thank you, Mrs Dunne, for reinforcing that. The applicant can use the assessment notice for three months. If no other planning approvals are required then the lifespan is not relevant. A lifespan is considered necessary because other people will be relying on the information in the notice to determine planning approvals.

Mr Speaker, The bill also provides transitional provisions that will allow the respective acts to be modified by regulation if, in the executive's opinion, the matter had not been appropriately dealt with in this bill. This allows the government to modify the act by regulation for a period of two years from commencement. The use of transitional provisions like these provides an effective mechanism to modify the act in a timely manner.

The next provision I will speak on deals with the existing building approval process. The provision provides for applicants to get a written explanation where a building approval cannot be issued. This closes a gap in the existing process. New section 27A of the Building Act inserted by clause 9 requires that when a building application approval has been made to a certifier then the certifier must provide written notification where a building approval cannot be issued.

Existing provisions in the act require the building surveyor to issue building approval for those applications that they determine or assess as requiring building approval. However, there is no provision that requires the building surveyor to provide anything in writing if they determine that no building approval is required. This currently leaves the applicant with no written evidence of this decision or assessment.

Mr Speaker, there are many reasons why a building approval may not be issued. For example, a building approval may not be required because the building work is exempt under the Building Act or the act precludes a building approval being issued. For example, section 27 of the act provides that a building approval cannot be issued if an entity's advice was required and that advice has not been obtained. The provision in this bill ensures that a building certifier provides a written response for any building approval application they receive.

Part 3 amends the Construction Occupations (Licensing) Act. Clauses 27 to 30 amend the existing definition for building surveyor and works assessor so that these licensed persons can do work proposed by these reforms. Licensed categories are created in part 4 and I will speak on this shortly. Clause 34 amends existing section 104(3) to require that any codes of practice determined by the construction occupations registrar are notified. This provides industry and the community with access to the code through the legislation register.

Part 4 amends the Construction Occupations (Licensing) Regulation 2004. The amendments establish the licence classes for the new construction occupations and insurance requirements. As part of industry consultation, existing licensees indicated that any new persons working in the area should have the same insurance requirements as existing licensees. The amendments proposed ensure this. This is an important element of ensuring the industry is protected and all construction occupations are appropriately insured.

Clause 42 sets up the new licence classes for persons licensed to do exemption assessment D notices. A class A licence holder will be able to do exemption assessment D notices for the full scope of exemptions contained in schedule 1 of the Planning and Development Act. However a class B licence holder will only be able to work within exemptions or site work for either class 1 or class 10.

This means, for instance, that they can do an exemption assessment D notice for a swimming pool if the swimming pool is associated with a residential building or class 1. They will not be able to do an exemption assessment D notice for an exemption under schedule 1, 1.99C schools—new buildings or alterations. This is because this exemption applies to class 3 and class 9b buildings. Eligibility to apply for a class A or class B licence will be by qualification and relevant experience.

Lastly, part 6 deals with an amendment to the Unit Titles Act. The provisions strengthen the amendments introduced earlier this year so that when a land surveyor is engaged to do unit plans work they will know the precise detail that the plan needs to include. This will ensure that when the lessee uses that plan in an application for unit titling the plan will meet all legislative requirements. This will further assist the quick

processing of unit title applications. Additionally, this part also specifies limitations for the works assessor when requesting further information.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in closing, this bill is part of the government's ongoing efforts to improve our planning system to meet the needs of the economy, the industry, the environment and most importantly the community. I commend the bill to the Assembly. For the planning nerds, there will be an examination in due course. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

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

## **Standing and temporary orders**

### **Estimates 2010-2011—Select Committee**

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (10.32): I move:

That standing and temporary orders be amended to include a new temporary order 253A in the following terms:

253A. When presenting its report, the Chair of the Select Committee on Estimates will present to the Assembly a schedule listing questions on notice for which answers were not provided during the annual Estimates inquiry. Outstanding questions on notice will be provided to the Clerk within 30 days from the tabling of the estimates report. The Speaker will present to the Assembly the answers received after the report has been tabled and a schedule of questions on notice outstanding after the 30-day period.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as you would know, because you have been party to many of these discussions, the issue of the government's failure to answer questions on notice in the estimates process has been ongoing for probably four or five years in this place, and it has been getting worse over time. This year, in particular, various forums in this Assembly, including the meeting of committee chairs and the administration and procedure committee, have looked at this issue. It has also been, I understand, a live issue for discussion by the estimates committee after it was convened earlier this year.

This proposed motion came as a recommendation to the administration and procedure committee from the estimates committee for this year's budget. We have decided to adopt it and bring it to the Assembly in its present form. This is a two-edged sword, and we realise that. What we are trying to do as an Assembly is keep the government accountable and to ensure that questions taken during estimates are answered. There has been a constant stream of questions unanswered. We get to the end of the process and the government just says: "We don't have to answer that. That process is over, we don't have to answer it."

We want to find a process whereby it does not matter how long the process goes on, those questions will be answered. However, this is a double-edged sword; we recognise this, and it has been discussed in many places. If we provide a mechanism like this, the government may just say, "We've got another 30 days to answer after the estimates committee reports." That is unsatisfactory as well, and that is why this is a temporary order. We will be reviewing this in the administration and procedure committee after the estimates process this year.

This is not a get-out-of-jail-free ticket for the government. When the estimates committee sets up a process for answering questions, the government should be answering those questions to the estimates committee. The estimates committee needs that information before it can do its report. This is a backup mechanism; we do not want it to be a mechanism whereby the government just puts off answering the questions as long as possible, because that would be an abuse of the estimates process. I do not think that there is a member on the opposition or crossbench or a member who has been on the administration and procedure committee or the chairs committee where we have discussed this who thinks that the executive failing to answer questions in estimates is acceptable.

The message today to the executive is: this does not let you off the hook. We in this place expect the executive to answer the questions before the estimates committee concludes. If there is some reason why that does not happen—sometimes there might be something particularly technical—the small number of questions—not the hundreds of questions that we have seen in the past—that are outstanding must be answered within 30 days, and the Speaker has the capacity and the responsibility to come back and report after 30 days any outstanding questions. The Assembly will then have to take whatever steps it deems necessary if there are still outstanding questions 30 days later.

The intent of all the discussions is to require the executive to answer questions according to the timetable established by the estimates committee. I am not sure what that timetable is, but it does not matter. The estimates committee has made its decisions, and this is a backup mechanism. I am making those comments on behalf of the administration and procedure committee.

I have also been asked by my party room to make extra comments, and these are those extra comments: my colleagues who were in the estimates process said that they would prefer a different approach, because the approach here has risks associated with it. The approach they would like to see—it did not have the wholehearted support of the estimates committee and it probably would not have the wholehearted support of this Assembly, but it is the view of the Canberra Liberals—is that we should not finalise debate on the budget until all the questions outstanding are answered by the executive. That is the position that we as the opposition in this place will take. We expect the executive to answer every question before we conclude debate upon the budget by the end of June. That is the position that we will take. It is not exactly a position that is widely accepted here, but I am putting members on notice that that is the position that we will take.

Putting back on my hat as a member of administration and procedure, the overall position is that this is a system that we need to trial. We need to find a way of holding the executive to account. I recommend to members this amendment to temporary orders, which will be reviewed later this year and before the next estimates process. I commend the motion to members, and I look forward to their support.

**MR CORBELL** (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and



Emergency Services) (10.39): Madam Deputy Speaker, the government will be pleased to support this motion today. In doing so, I would like to make some brief observations about this process. I note the desire of non-executive members who constitute the estimates committee to ensure that answers to their questions are provided. I would say on the part of the executive that the executive makes every effort to answer all questions that are placed on notice during the estimates process.

However, this has been a process that has some frustration from the executive's perspective as well in that, firstly, often very large volumes of questions are lodged very late in the estimates process and government agencies are faced with the prospect of answering literally hundreds of questions on notice, often very detailed questions. As a result, it has simply been impracticable—in fact, not feasible—for those questions to have been answered in the time frame subsequently imposed by the estimates committee. I would encourage non-executive members to give consideration to ensuring that as many questions as possible are lodged as early as possible in the estimates process. That would facilitate timely answers from the government and assist the committee in its deliberations.

Secondly, I make the point that often it has been the practice of ministers to send answers to questions on notice to the Speaker following the expiry of the estimates committee process. I have signed numerous letters to the Speaker saying: "This question has been outstanding. I know that the select committee is dissolved, however, I need to be able to send this answer to someone." Therefore, I think this change is a good one in that it provides a clear mechanism for ministers to respond to questions once the select committee has been dissolved. It has been very unclear and ambiguous as to what the arrangement has been to date, and this gives us that clarity.

I simply reiterate that the government supports this approach. It gives some clarity to the operation of this important part of the Assembly's functions. However, I reiterate also the executive's preference for questions to be provided as early as possible to provide for timely answers. Questions arriving late in the process, even though perhaps within the time limit established, do present particular challenges for the executive in responding.

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Molonglo) (10.42): The Greens also support this proposed temporary standing order. I was on the estimates committee last year, and it is very frustrating to put in questions that are not answered in the time frame necessary for the estimates committee report. I do appreciate some of the statements that Mr Corbell made about the difficulty of answering them sometimes, but it is also very important that the questions be answered. No member is asking questions frivolously just to fill in time. All the questions are asked because the answers are required.

The other point I would like to make is that part of the reasons we are asking so many questions is that sometimes the budget papers can be impenetrable—that is the word that comes to mind. It is not always very easy to understand what is in them. The government could save itself an awful lot of work if the budget papers were improved. I know the estimates committee last time made comments along those lines. Without having any inside knowledge, of course, I suspect that the next estimates committee may have similar comments, because the papers are not very user friendly.

Most of the relevant comments have already been made by the previous speakers, so I will not take up more time, except to say that the budget is a very important process, and a very important part of the process is the estimates committee and the scrutiny that that brings. Answering questions is a very important part of that. I commend this motion to the Assembly.

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

### **Privileges—Select Committee Reporting date**

**MS BRESNAN** (Brindabella) (10.45): I move:

That the resolution of the Assembly of 23 February 2010, which established a Select Committee on Privileges, be amended by the addition of a paragraph 2A as follows:

“(2A) if the Assembly is not sitting when the Committee has completed its inquiry, the Committee may send its report to the Speaker, or in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, who is authorised to give directions for its printing, circulation and publication;”.

I will speak briefly to this to explain the reason behind this amendment. The committee had a public hearing a couple of weeks ago. The committee is very close to reporting on the matter. This amendment is to allow for the report to be, as it says, sent to the Speaker. The next sitting is not until June, and we thought it was best to be able to provide a resolution to the matter before that and not wait another month before we can provide advice to Mr Sullivan on the outcome of the committee before that June sitting date, and we are close to doing that.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

### **Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee Report 3**

**MS BRESNAN** (Brindabella) (10.46): I present the following report:

Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee—Report 3—*Inquiry into the Educational Achievement Gap in the ACT*, dated 14 April 2010, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

I will speak on this report and some of its recommendations and findings. The Greens were pleased to see this inquiry go ahead. It is an issue which has arisen in a number of public forums over recent years. In 2008, during the Sixth Assembly, Dr Deb Foskey MLA raised with the Minister for Education and Training concerns

about indicators of student performance, whether the relevance of socioeconomic status to the achievement of students was well understood within responses to the education system, and how these were being dealt with.

We recognise that, because of the make-up of the ACT population and the school system, with socioeconomic status not necessarily concentrated in particular areas but dispersed throughout the ACT, it is more difficult to address this particular issue. Nonetheless, it is one of the most important issues when we deal with the education system, how students are achieving and whether that is leading to a gap in the education achievement of these students.

I will read out some of the things from the report. The first is this:

The Government's submission stated clearly that socio-economic status could not be attached to individual schools and highlighted that:

there is no strong evidence or data from national or international measures to suggest there is a significant disparity between schools in the ACT similar to that observed in other jurisdictions. We do know, for example, that while a relationship between socioeconomic status and school performance is evident in other states, the character of the ACT population is different, and there is no evidence available to suggest that socioeconomic profile has a significant between-school influence on performance in the ACT.

I note, though, and this has been identified through the PISA results and other indicators, that, while the ACT is characterised as being a very high-quality school system—I think that is recognised by everyone—it is a low-equity education system. We see that the education achievement is more disparate in that low socioeconomic group.

I will refer to some of the conclusions from the report. Through the evidence from various groups that appeared, and from the evidence we gathered, it was quite clear that socioeconomic status was the leading factor when it came to the achievement gap and negative impacts on educational achievement. It was also clear from the evidence that the particular groups of students that require support to achieve educational outcomes included Indigenous students—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. That was again clear. We see that in a number of areas, but with education it was clear that they were a group that need additional assistance.

They also included students that came from non-English-speaking backgrounds, particularly refugees. We heard from a number of groups—this was a clear factor—that this is a group that is increasing in the education system as more refugees come in. Because they may not have been to school before, and also because of the very difficult circumstances they have been through, this is a group which is requiring additional assistance. This was clear.

It was also interesting that students with unrecognised gifts and talents and students which come from that talented group were a group that required some additional assistance to have that brought out and encouraged. The report says:

The social indicator identified as most likely to have a negative influence on ... educational experiences ... was socio-economic disadvantage. Low socio-economic status will increase the risks that students will not fully engage with the education system and that opportunities to reach their educational potential will be reduced.

The Committee concluded that there is an education achievement gap in the ACT evidenced by subgroup performance in standardised assessment tests as well as by the qualitative experiences of experts working in the field and who have provided evidence to the Inquiry.

During the inquiry we heard from a number of groups, and I thank all those people who participated. We heard some excellent evidence in particular from Dr Ainley from ACER. That was extremely informative and highlighted a number of the issues which I have mentioned. Let me read an extract from some of the evidence that he provided to the committee, again on socioeconomic background. Dr Ainley noted:

For kids of low socioeconomic background in relatively deprived areas the importance of the quality of the teaching is even greater because there is less opportunity for those children to pick up the skills, to learn the skills, from other experiences. If you have a lot of books at home and your parents are engaged in reading with you then it is less of an issue what happens in the classroom than if you do not have those resources.

This again picks up on quality teaching, which Dr Ainley said is one of the key factors in ensuring that students receive a quality education and for students that have issues when it comes to achieving and education. That was one of the big issues. We heard about quality teaching from the education department and the minister. It has been a focus of the ACT government, and we acknowledge that. It is good that that issue has been recognised, but Dr Ainley noted that that was a key issue.

We also heard from Professor McConaghy from the Centre for Research on Education, Poverty and Social Inclusion at the University of Canberra. That was also about the importance of getting students who may have learning difficulties or come from disadvantaged backgrounds at an early age. It is important to get that. If you do not do it by a particular age, you may have lost them all and the ability to reduce that education achievement gap is going to be more difficult. Let me go to another extract from the report and the research from Professor McConaghy. She noted:

We have done some preliminary analysis of the K-5 literacy data. We have found that the results in kindergarten are predictors of the results in year 5, and the results in kindergarten are negatively affected by low socioeconomic status. So there is a correlation between the low kindergarten results and low socioeconomic status, and those results do not pick up by year 5. So we need to look at the types of schooling interventions that will address the disparities in kindergarten right through.

That was a really important point about needing to address that achievement gap at an early age to make sure that it does not have a negative effect later on in a student's schooling years.

This report has identified some of the key strategies that are required in responding to the achievement gap. These include:

- Maximising opportunities for early childhood development and intervention;
- Increasing the opportunities for parental involvement, including by enhancing the communications and skills within school communities;
- Introducing and supporting a framework for the development of quality teaching practices within the teaching community;
- Ensuring the quality of schools so that teaching professionals have the resources and support to provide quality education; and
- Addressing the need for equitable funding by advocating for equitable funding models and providing school communities with the resources to meet identifiable need.

I will read a couple of the other things from the report. Again I go to a group I mentioned earlier, students coming from non-English-speaking backgrounds, in particular, refugee groups. This was again a consistent group that came up, along with Indigenous students. We heard from Galilee. They noted that they are increasingly offering education services to students from refugee backgrounds. Obviously, they have these, because Galilee provide support or education to students who come from those disadvantaged backgrounds and require greater assistance. They noted that, as well as students from low socioeconomic backgrounds and Indigenous students, they were seeing increasing numbers of these students.

Also, we heard from teachers that particularly provide services to non-English-speaking students. They were again noting that they are seeing an increase in the number of these students and also noting the increasing complexity and needs that the students have. This is something that we need to focus on much more here in the ACT, because we have a number of refugees in our community. It is extremely important that we are providing them with the same opportunities that other students have.

I will refer to some of the recommendations which it is important to highlight in the report, which pick up on some of the issues I have already raised. Recommendation 2 says:

... that the ACT Government ensure that teachers are aware and able to access expert advice and services to support them in adapting their pedagogical practice to suit the different educational needs of their students.

This again picks up on that complexity of students that teachers are finding they are now having to teach in the school system.

One of the things which we did not address to a great degree in this report, because there is a separate inquiry happening, is the needs of students with a disability. That is currently underway. This did come up in evidence as being a particular group in need, but that will be addressed fully in the other committee report.

Recommendation 6 says:

The Committee recommends that the Department of Education and Training establish cross-cultural awareness training options for ACT teachers and negotiate with the Faculty of Education at the University of Canberra for the inclusion of pre-service courses in Indigenous studies.

Again, this is about providing teachers, before they come into the school system, with the skills necessary to equip them to be able to deal with students that will have complex needs, particularly Indigenous students—that they are provided with the skills to be able to help them and help them achieve.

Recommendation 8 says:

The Committee recommends that any programs or initiatives developed should be undertaken in consultation with ESL teachers and Indigenous educators and community leaders and that these programs should be funded independently of the existing ESL funding model.

One of the things that came up about the way the model was set up was that sometimes students who had very high needs were not being included because of the way the program was structured. This is a recommendation about looking at how that is funded, because we are seeing an increasing number of these students in the system—so that they can be accommodated and so that they are given the assistance they need to be able to achieve.

Recommendation 10 says:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government investigate options for expanding the Gupan Gulwan program to include Years 11 and 12 students.

This picks up on one of the issues which were discussed in the committee with Indigenous students in terms of the rate of students going on to year 11 and 12. The Gupan Gulwan program goes up to year 10. It has been a very successful program. It was evident that those students do still need assistance when they get to years 11 and 12. We recommend that an expansion of the program be investigated so that we can pick up on the rate of Indigenous students leaving in year 12 and, hopefully, increase the number that go on to the final years of school.

There are a number of other recommendations which I will not mention here. The report picks up on issues such as social inclusion and building them into plans that the ACT already has so that we are providing opportunities for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. That came out as being the highest single factor. We do recognise that it is more difficult in the ACT because of the way our community is structured and also because of the structure of the school system, but nonetheless it is extremely important, given that this has come up as being one of the key factors, that it is addressed adequately and that we are providing opportunities for these students to achieve and to succeed in the school system.

I would like to thank Dr Sandra Lilburn. She did a fantastic job in putting this report together. We had a lot of evidence and a lot of research. It has been put together in an excellent way and provides some very good recommendations on how to approach this serious issue. I would also like to thank my fellow committee members: Jeremy Hanson; Mary Porter—who had a very difficult job, coming in towards the end of the reporting process and not having taken part in all the hearings; and I thank Mary for her contribution—and Joy Burch, who was part of the hearings. I thank everyone involved in this and again thank all the groups who came and gave their time in giving evidence to the inquiry.

**MR HANSON** (Molonglo) (11.00): I thank Ms Bresnan, for her words and for her stewardship of the committee, and the other members on the committee. My thanks also to Dr Sandra Lilburn, who again provided outstanding secretariat support, as she has many times before.

I also note the great array of people who made the effort to put in submissions to this inquiry. We received quite a few submissions. The hearings and the people that came before us in this committee were of a very high standard. I will just mention a few of them: Menslink; the AEU; Professor McConaghy; the Youth Coalition; the Gifted and Talented Support Group; the Principals Association; Trevor Cobbold from Save Our Schools, who always makes his time available; the members of the Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages; and of course the department officials who came and gave us their time. I would like to thank them.

It was a most informative inquiry. We found out about some of the problems that we are experiencing in terms of the achievement gap in education here in the ACT. What we found out quite clearly is that there is a gap in the ACT. We are blessed as a jurisdiction in that both economically and in terms of socioeconomic disadvantage, our numbers are few. But there is a gap for some people in our community, particularly those who have English as a second language, people with Indigenous heritage, refugees and migrants and people with a disadvantage such as a disability. Many people suffer from disabilities. Although we are conducting a separate inquiry at the moment, there is no doubt that they experience an achievement gap probably more profoundly than almost anyone else. And of course there are people with the disadvantage of coming from a low socioeconomic background. It was also interesting to note that there is an achievement gap among people who are gifted and talented—people who could achieve more and in some cases do not.

I will not go into great detail on the report, because the chair has already done that, but the point that is worth emphasising is that, although we in the ACT consider ourselves a lucky jurisdiction, we have to make sure that, when we compare ourselves with jurisdictions such as Victoria and New South Wales, we are comparing apples with apples. Although they may have, in raw numbers, greater numbers of people with disadvantage or people who are not achieving the standard that would be set, when we compare like people in the ACT and like students in New South Wales or Victoria, we see that we are not doing as well in some circumstances. I will just quote from the report:

This comparison confirmed the proposition that the ACT tends to be a low equity system. While the ACT ranked first on a number of band levels as having the highest proportion of students above the national minimum standard, this did not appear to translate into qualitatively different outcomes for underachieving students ...

Of particular concern is the poor ranking of the ACT in the percentage of students performing below the standard—

well below the standard—

in spelling across all year levels tested.

If you actually burrow down to the statistics, and I think NAPLAN provides some of this data as well, you will see that, when you compare people who are below the performance levels here in the ACT with like people in other jurisdictions, particularly Victoria and in some cases New South Wales, we are not doing as well. There is further work that can be done. The minister would also acknowledge that and I hope that he will take this in good faith. There has been a lot of work on and good contributions made to this report. I look forward to the government's response.

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

## **Report 4**

**MS BRESNAN** (Brindabella) (11.05): I present the following report:

Education, Training and Youth Affairs—Standing Committee—Report 4—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2008-2009*, dated 29 April 2010, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

I will speak briefly to the report. The committee had three public hearings, on 1, 14 and 15 December. We heard from ministers, departmental officials and agencies and also members of governing boards. I will go to some of the key issues which came up and also some of the key recommendations.

One of the big issues that have come up over recent years is class sizes. This was an issue that was discussed by the committee. An update was sought from the minister on the progress towards implementing the government's policy on reduced average class sizes for every year level in public schools. The minister advised that an additional 70 teaching positions had been filled for the commencement of the school year. There were a number of discussions around the fact that research had suggested that class size was not always the most significant factor when it came to providing quality education.



This was something that came out during the Assembly's achievement gap inquiry, particularly by Dr Ainley. It was noted that when you look at particular levels or numbers of class sizes, in some instances it does not have as much of an impact as quality teaching has. The minister agreed on this point. Obviously, there are several factors which affect teaching and achievement in schools.

One of the committee's recommendations was that the impact of reducing average class sizes on student learning outcomes be reported on in future Department of Education and Training annual reports. It will be interesting to see what impact reducing class sizes has on educational outcomes, given that we heard different evidence through the inquiry process about what impact it actually has.

The SMS notification system has been discussed, I think, in this chamber and in the media. The committee was interested in receiving feedback on what impact the introduction of the system has had on absenteeism. The minister advised that most parents have been positive about the system. Obviously, not all parents have mobile phones so not everyone will necessarily benefit from the system. The committee was interested in whether the system had resulted in a reduction of student absenteeism. We were advised that the statistics on this were not available but they would most likely be available on completion of the next annual report. The committee will be interested in getting an update and seeing what impact this has had.

The committee recommended that the department look at how parents without mobile phones can achieve the same level of prompt awareness of student absences as those parents with mobile phones. We recognise that this is a difficult thing to do, but it is worthwhile looking at because not everyone is going to benefit from the SMS system. The committee also recommended that the department provide the data, which they have indicated they will have, on the effectiveness of the notification system in the next annual report. We will look forward to seeing that, hopefully—if that data is available.

The University of Canberra appeared before the committee. This was the first time the UC had been invited to be part of annual reports hearings. It was very interesting to hear about some of the programs which they offer. One program in particular that we discussed was the gap year plus program, which gives students credit for experience gained during the gap year. Having a gap year has become more prevalent in the Australian university system and it was very interesting to see that they are offering a program where students can achieve credit for work that they do during the gap year. It is a really good example of using innovative ways to encourage students to return to tertiary education. I think it adds to the appeal of the ACT being a destination for international students and students from other parts of Australia. We commend the University of Canberra on that program which they offer.

One of the other areas that was looked at, and this was in relation to the children and youth portfolio, was the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre. There were a number of discussions about the new facility—what sorts of programs are offered to young people there. The committee made a recommendation that the Office for Children, Youth and Family Support investigate, in consultation with staff at the Bimberi Youth

Justice Centre, what forms of staff training are required to reduce the incidence of force required to manage the behaviour of detainees. This will look at de-escalation, the use of force-type training, how strategies can be used to de-escalate situations and, as the recommendation says, reducing the incidence of force needing to be used to manage behaviour.

There was a question around the number of young people who had been strip-searched or restrained during the year. This question was taken on notice and the response which we received back from the minister noted that there had been 139 strip searches conducted during 2009 and there were 44 incidents of force being used on 24 young detainees. I hope that in the next report we will see a reduction in that and that the recommendation from the committee is considered in reducing the number of these incidents.

In the same portfolio we also looked at some family support programs which are offered and, in particular, the adolescent day unit. This is a targeted intervention program. The day unit supports young people aged between 12 and 15. The committee was interested in why there have been fewer children supported through this program—421 received support in 2008-09 compared to 536 in 2007-08. The minister responded by noting that, due to the complexity of work that they had seen an increase in, this had had an impact on the throughput of numbers in the program. The committee has recommended that the government review the resourcing to the targeted intervention program, particularly to the adolescent day unit, to ensure that the quality of service can be provided to all vulnerable students needing support.

The last issue I want to raise is in relation to the arts portfolio. This is an issue which came up during the estimates process. It was about the arts community having concerns about a conflict of interest for people who are on boards. There was some discussion around this. The committee has recommended that the ACT government report to the Legislative Assembly on the outcome of the review of arts organisation governance and the requirements that will be made regarding membership of the boards of arts organisations. There have been some concerns about this in the arts community and I think it is a matter that deserves consideration.

Once again, I would like to thank the committee secretary, Dr Sandra Lilburn. She has been very busy putting this report together, and obviously the previous report which I spoke to. She has done an excellent job in putting both of these reports together. I also thank my fellow committee members, the deputy chair, Jeremy Hanson—I should have noted before that you are the deputy chair—and Mary Porter. I thank them for their contributions to these inquiries.

**MR HANSON** (Molonglo) (11.13): I think the chair has covered most of the issues. The only one I will turn to in particular is that of class sizes. The government has said that it is aiming towards an average class size of 21. I think that further investigation is required to see exactly how the government is calculating those figures. There is a big difference between an average class size of 21 and a maximum class size of 21.

The difference is, I think, that there is a concern—and this was expressed by the union the other day—that the government are, in a sense, cooking the books to make the

statistics basically say what they want. You might find that in a number of schools there are class sizes that are quite large, and inappropriately quite large, because they are balancing it from other areas where there is simply an insufficient number of students in a class. You have got to make sure that every class size is manageable and that you are not, basically, having classes which are either too small or too large, adding it all up and saying, “This all looks good because it is an average of 21,” when in fact in many classes you have got an inappropriate number of students, whether the number is too large or too small.

That is an issue that requires further attention when we look at the impact of class size. I think that class size does have an impact. The evidence that we have seen suggests that there are many other factors, most particularly the quality of the teacher, the quality of the principal and indeed the students themselves—what their socioeconomic make-up is, what disadvantage they may have. But class size is a factor and we need to keep a very close eye on the way the government is presenting the data.

I would like to again thank the chair for her stewardship, the other members of the committee and particularly, again, Dr Sandra Lilburn, who has been pretty busy of late.

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing) (11.15): I will take the opportunity to respond to the particular point that Mr Hanson raised and to note, of course, that it has some correlation with the report that was previously tabled by the chair of the committee. I will again put on the record the government’s commitment to average class sizes of 21 but stress that it is average for a reason. That relates to enabling decisions to be made at a local school level on the most appropriate class size within that overall average policy. It is important to have that flexibility. Schools and principals should be making those decisions rather than politicians seeking to mandate those particular outcomes. The flexibility that is provided by the government’s policy is critical—

*Mr Hanson interjecting—*

**MR BARR:** The application of the policy in terms of transparency—for the benefit of those opposite, who seem to struggle tremendously with this concept—is that the number of students divided by the number of teachers then gives you the capacity to determine the average across the system. This is a very clear policy distinction, Madam Assistant Speaker. It remains the government’s view that average class sizes give the flexibility that schools need and that the single most important factor in achieving improved outcomes in education is the quality of the teacher. I have said that consistently and I will continue to say it. It is the single most important factor. There are a number of other factors that contribute. Class sizes are one of them, but they are not the most important factor. They never have been and they never will be.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Emergencies Amendment Bill 2010**

Debate resumed from 4 May 2010, on motion by **Mr Stanhope**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Molonglo) (11.18): Members may recall I was in mid sentence the other day when the power surge stopped the Hansard recording. At the time, I was discussing the human rights implications of the bill that had been raised by the scrutiny committee. I had noted the minister's comments that the bill sought "intuitive simplicity". It certainly is intuitive that, in times of emergency, people will need to be ordered about. People will respond well to a clear direction from someone in a position of authority. It is also intuitive that, when an emergency is approaching, action will need to be taken to prepare.

The amendments in this bill remove any confusion that could have existed, and the Greens support them on that basis. The scrutiny of bills committee was correct to point out that the human rights implications, however, do not justify a delay or amendment to the government's legislation.

A second major amendment in this bill is the abolition of the existing Emergency Management Committee and their replacement with a senior officials group. The role of this group will remain the same, which is to provide strategic advice to cabinet on emergency management. Apart from the name change, the minister will no longer be required to "try and ensure" that the community and environment are represented on the group. This legislative wording was particularly weak and placed no real onus or requirement on the government to involve these groups in decisions. Nevertheless, the removal of the words did stand out to us, and we asked for some further explanation of the rationale behind this change.

Departmental staff were able to provide that further information in writing, and I would like to thank them for that assistance. With their assistance we were directed to the objectives of the act and how they are expanded by this bill. The expanded objectives will now include the need to prepare for, prevent, respond to and recover from emergencies. This is known as the comprehensive approach. The department advised that, implicit in this approach, is the need to consult with all affected community groups at each step of the way.

The departmental advice was clear that the bill does not preclude consultation with community groups or experts. This was an important point for us to clarify. The requirement to comply with the objectives applies to SEMSOG, the ESA commissioner and an emergency controller, if one is appointed. Each of these groups or individuals will need to follow the comprehensive approach and the associated consultation. This provides for a broader based consultation than currently set up in the legislation and provides the various officers with the opportunity to make the most of extensive community expertise. I believe it would be wise for them to do so, and I trust that this change in the law will offer that opportunity that will be taken up to harness that community expertise.

In conclusion, the Greens support this bill. It improves the ACT's ability to prepare for emergencies. It does this by allowing for preventive action to be undertaken which will ultimately assist in reducing loss of life and property.

**MR CORBELL** (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (11.21): I would like to thank members for their support of this bill. This bill refines the emergency governance arrangements within the territory, builds upon the existing framework and is aimed at streamlining and enhancing the way the territory responds in an emergency. During the preparation of the refresh of the ACT emergency plan in 2008, a number of issues came to light regarding the government's arrangements for emergency management. As a result, the ACT emergency management governance review made a number of recommendations on how these arrangements could be strengthened. The bill we are debating today is the government's response.

One of the changes this bill makes is, at first glance, innocuous but is one that has come about due to concerns from stakeholders consulted during the review. This change is the retitling of the "territory controller" to "emergency controller". During the review process, it was found that the title of "territory controller" can potentially lead to confusion as to the role and responsibilities of that position. This was due in part to the fact that, whilst the controller has overall responsibility for the operational requirements of an emergency incident, it is still the government that retains overall authority within the territory. As such, the review recommended the position be retitled to better reflect this distinction, hence the change from territory controller to emergency controller.

It is probably worth discussing this matter a little bit further. I note a similar concern has been raised in the Victorian bushfires royal commission where counsel assisting the commission has questioned and inquired into whether or not a state of emergency should have been declared in Victoria. I note that the point that has been made by the Victorian government is that there was no threat to the continuation of executive government, and, therefore, under their legislation they saw no need for the declaration of a state of emergency, and quite rightly. Those circumstances are relevant here in relation to this change of title.

The establishment of a territory controller does not mean that the executive government ceases to function; executive government continues to function. Indeed, even during the 2003 bushfire emergency here in the ACT where a state of emergency was declared and a territory controller appointed, executive government continued to function. It was essential that executive government continued to function for the range of recovery operations that were then on foot. This highlights that, whilst there will be potentially the need for an overall coordinating authority in the form of an emergency controller for significant emergencies, it is a different set of circumstances from those where the functions of executive government are under threat or have effectively collapsed.

A further change that this bill makes is the decoupling of the need to declare a state of emergency before an emergency controller can be appointed. This is a fundamental

change to the emergency management framework within the territory and will provide more flexibility in both how the territory plans for and responds to any given emergency event or situation.

The first benefit of this decoupling is that it will allow a controller to be appointed in those situations where strategic operational oversight is needed but where declaring a state of emergency would be impracticable or unwarranted. I refer to my earlier comments in this regard.

The second benefit is that it will allow a controller to be appointed in situations where it is likely that a state of emergency will need to be declared but the event is yet to fully impact upon the territory. The appointment of a controller in this situation will allow for the planning of both response and recovery in advance of the emergency occurring.

The appointment framework for the emergency controller also includes a mechanism that requires a review of an appointment by the Chief Minister no later than 48 hours after the appointment is made. The appointment of an emergency controller also ceases no later than seven days after it is made or if a state of emergency is declared. I must stress that this does not mean that the emergency controller cannot be reappointed should the emergency situation still be ongoing. These review and automatic cessation of appointment provisions have been included so that the need for an emergency controller is considered on a regular basis during an emergency.

I note that the scrutiny committee has provided comments in relation to this part of the bill. I thank the committee for its comments, and I would like to address those comments briefly. The first comment the committee has made is in relation to the human rights implications of the controller's powers when there is no declared state of emergency. I would point out that these same comments were made in relation to the existing powers when they were introduced into the Assembly back in 2004.

The Human Rights Act recognises that few rights are absolute and that limits may be placed on rights with the aim of balancing competing interests. The government's view is that the specialist powers that may be exercised by the emergency controller are reasonable and justifiable in the circumstances. The provisions strike a balance between the individual's rights and the public interest in ensuring the protection and preservation of life, property and the environment in emergency situations. Additionally, the bill provides for remedies to be sought if a person suffers loss as a result of these emergency powers being exercised.

The second comment the committee has made is in relation to the operation of proposed subsection 150C(3). In case members are not aware, this subsection states that subsection 150C(1) operates despite any other territory law. The committee stated that it believes that such a provision is an entrenchment provision and that the effect of such is to constrain the Assembly in its ability to make laws for the territory.

I do not agree with the comments the committee has made, and I would like to reiterate what I have said to the committee in my written response to the scrutiny comments. This provision does not have the effect—I repeat, does not have the

effect—of entrenching subsection 150C(2) against the operation of any other territory law. Subsection 150C(3) is an example of the type of provision used to make it clear that a section or subsection prevails over other territory laws in the event of any inconsistency.

This type of provision is used, for example, in emergency or law enforcement legislation where other territory laws could impede the operation of laws made for public protection, safety reasons or in the public interest. I would also draw to the attention of members that subsection 150C(3) is not restraining the power of the Assembly to make laws as the committee has contended. Indeed, this provision can be amended or repealed by the Assembly at any time just like any other piece of legislation. The Assembly could even make another law that overrides the effect of this law if necessary. The only effect of subsection 150C(3) is to allow the emergency controller to carry out the activities under subsection 150C(2) even if a competing interest exists under law.

Turning to the bill itself, another change it will make is to transfer the functions of the Emergency Management Committee to the Security and Emergency Management Senior Officials Group. With support from the Security and Emergency Management Planning Group, this officials group will provide whole-of-government policy advice on emergency and security management to the Security and Emergency Management Committee of the cabinet.

This amendment arose after the review into the ACT's emergency management governance framework, which found the previous model was ineffective in the way the community was engaged. The appointment of a single person to the EMC from the community was considered to not be the best way to represent the broad range of backgrounds and views that make up the ACT community.

The EMC's replacement—the Security and Emergency Management Senior Officials Group—will be the peak advisory body to cabinet on both security and emergency management matters. Because of this, this group will be required to handle and discuss material of a sensitive and potentially classified nature with both a local and national focus. It would not be appropriate to have uncleared community representatives in this group. This arrangement is consistent with similar arrangements in other jurisdictions.

The need to have effective community engagement was identified as an important element of emergency management by the review group. This is reflected in the bill by expanding the objects of the act to incorporate the need to prepare for, prevent, respond to and recover from emergencies, or what is referred to as the comprehensive approach to emergency management. Implicit in the comprehensive approach is the need to liaise and consult with the community at all phases of the process. By committing the government to this approach, all agencies undertaking emergency management activities need to consider and, if necessary, consult with the affected elements of the community.

The ESA commissioner's functions have also been amended to emphasise the importance of communicating information, advice and warnings to the community

during an emergency. Provisions exist within the act to ensure that the emergency plan includes the community and communication information plan for communicating information to the community during an emergency. This bill transfers responsibility for preparing, monitoring and recommending amendments through the ACT emergency plan from the EMC to the ESA commissioner.

I also note that Mr Smyth will propose an amendment to delete proposed subsection 150A(5), which outlines the circumstances or the criteria which the Chief Minister must use in being satisfied that an emergency is likely to happen. I appreciate that the language in this subsection is perhaps a little convoluted, but I also believe that it is there for a good reason in that it makes it clear that the Chief Minister has the broadest possible grounds upon which to determine whether or not he can be satisfied that an emergency is likely to happen and, therefore, exercise his powers under this act. I would characterise it as a belt-and-braces approach.

Although subsection 150A(1) allows the Chief Minister to appoint an emergency controller if he is satisfied that an emergency has happened, is happening or is likely to happen, subsection 150A(5) allows the Chief Minister to be satisfied that an emergency is likely to happen in the broadest possible circumstances, taking account of any factors or issues that he believes warrants them. I think this is necessary in emergency legislation of this type. It removes any potential for ambiguity and makes it clear that the broadest range of grounds are available to the Chief Minister to appoint an emergency controller in the circumstances outlined for that division. For those reasons, the government will not be supporting Mr Smyth's amendment. Nevertheless, I thank members opposite and the Greens for their support of this legislation.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

### **Detail stage**

Bill, by leave, taken as a whole.

**MR SMYTH** (Brindabella) (11.34): I move amendment No 1 circulated in my name [*see schedule No 1 at page 1964*].

I thank the minister for that attempted explanation. I think anybody that has actually read this section would agree with both me and the minister that it is convoluted. Just so that people know what we are talking about, the section reads:

The Chief Minister may be satisfied that an emergency is likely to happen if the Chief Minister is satisfied that an event that has happened or is happening, or a circumstance that exists, gives rise to the likelihood of an emergency.

If you wanted to interpret that in an emergency I think you would be in serious trouble. That is the point. What we should be doing is removing ambiguity to streamline the process to make sure that we do not have any indecisiveness in the case of an emergency. Hence, my move to delete section 150A(5).



On Tuesday I thanked the minister for the briefing that I had and I raised with the minister's advisers my concerns about what this paragraph means. I think it is extremely convoluted wording and I believe it duplicates what is covered in section 150A(5). If members have not read it, I will refresh their minds. It simply says:

This section applies if the Chief Minister is satisfied that—

(a) an emergency has happened, is happening or is likely to happen ...

They are the only options: it is happening, has happened or is likely to happen. I am not sure that the belt-and-braces explanation put forward by the minister is actually belt and braces or whether it is just dead weight legislation.

The officers giving the briefing took on notice my concerns and said that they would get an explanation as to what it meant. I thank the minister for replying. I note that the minister provided a response to my concern about the section. I am just not satisfied with his response because it does not provide any rationale for the wording that is used. I will read the response from the minister:

These sections mirror sections 156(4) and 156(1) in the act (see Attachment B). The difference between the two sections is that 150(A)(1) requires the Chief Minister to be satisfied that an emergency has happened etc but that a declaration of a state of emergency is not required and section 150A(5) sets out the circumstances in which the Chief Minister may be so satisfied.

There is no setting out of the circumstances. It does say that there may be circumstances but the answer given by the minister does not set out the circumstances. It just simply says "or a circumstance that exists". That is not setting out the circumstances. We have just heard from the minister where he said that he thought there was good reason because it covered every possible ground. Every possible ground is covered in subsection (1)—has happened, is happening, may happen. I think it is quite sad that we put clauses like this into legislation. If something really cannot be explained in quite a simple term, particularly in an act like this, then it quite simply should not be there.

If you want to follow through my logic, proposed subsection (1) provides that the Chief Minister is satisfied that "an emergency has happened, is happening or is likely to happen".

This is quite clear. The Chief Minister must be satisfied. There is no further advice on how the Chief Minister shall be satisfied. What we need to get to is what does this clause do? I appreciate that it is in the existing act but it does not lay out any of the things that the minister said that it did in the letter back to me. For those reasons, I believe it is a superfluous act. If you look at proposed subsection (1), it covers the three possibilities: is happening, has happened, will happen. There is no further need for this clause.

**MR CORBELL** (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and

Emergency Services) (11.38): As I have previously indicated in the in-principle debate, the government believes that excessive caution is appropriate in relation to these types of powers. These powers are wide ranging. These provisions of the bill and the act itself allow the executive government, in the Chief Minister, to appoint an emergency controller who will have broad-ranging powers to deal with the management of an emergency. They are extraordinary powers and the ground on which the grant of those powers is made should be broad and should allow significant discretion to allow the executive government to act to protect life, property and the environment.

The provisions of subsection 150A(5) are replicated, as Mr Smyth notes, in sections 156(5) and 151(4) of the Emergencies Act that deal with a declaration of a state of emergency itself. For no other reason it should be consistent. I think that consistency is important. The grounds should be same regardless of whether it is a declaration of a state of emergency or not.

Mr Smyth is not deleting those other provisions. Firstly, I would make the point that we should have consistency across the act. It should be in the same terms. Secondly and perhaps more importantly—going back to the point I made earlier—the clause provides for an explanation of the grounds on which the Chief Minister can be satisfied that an emergency is likely to happen. That is what it does. It interprets that power. It refers to the Chief Minister being satisfied that an emergency is likely to happen if, in his view, an event has happened or is happening or a circumstance exists that gives rise to the likelihood of that emergency.

This may involve circumstances or information that may not be readily apparent to others, may not be available to others. Therefore, a question could be raised as to why the Chief Minister is exercising those powers. So I think that on the grounds of excessive caution—and in these circumstances excessive caution is appropriate because you are talking about a bill, an act, that is designed to engage with a whole range of circumstances and we cannot always predict exactly what the nature of them will be—it is appropriate to retain the clause. If Mr Smyth was so concerned about it he could delete, and should be deleting, the other provisions of the act that do exactly the same thing, but he is not.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Molonglo) (11.41): The debate on this provision is an odd one, I must say. I think I do agree with Mr Smyth that the language of the provision is rather turgid. I think it probably warrants some amendment to improve its readability. But at this stage the Greens will not be supporting Mr Smyth's amendment. I do think that the provision is based on existing wording in the act. It also appears in section 156(4). It does require simplification and if we are to make some amendments, we should be doing that consistently throughout the act. I think it probably warrants a bit further consideration.

I am basically concerned that if we simply drop out this provision without addressing the provisions in section 156(4) and related provisions, there is the potential for some unintended consequences. On that basis we will not be able to support the amendment. But I am happy to flag that we are quite open to looking at further improvement to the act because I think, as this debate has illustrated—I think anybody listening to this

would be wondering, frankly, what we are debating—it clearly is the case that the act warrants some further improvement to make it readable and understandable in a more plain English way to those that are actually trying to do a job that is often done in rather stressful circumstances.

Question put:

That **Mr Smyth's** amendment be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 4

Mrs Dunne  
Mr Hanson  
Mr Seselja  
Mr Smyth

Noes 9

Mr Barr	Ms Hunter
Ms Bresnan	Ms Le Couteur
Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury
Mr Corbell	Mr Stanhope
Ms Gallagher	

Question so resolved in the negative.

Bill, as a whole, agreed to.

Bill agreed to.

## Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010

Debate resumed from 25 March 2010, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (11.48): The Canberra Liberals will be supporting this bill which amends a range of acts and regulations for statute law revision purposes. Typically, the substantive elements of statute law amendment bills, or SLAB bills as they are colloquially known, are contained in schedules.

Schedule 1 provides for minor, non-controversial amendments initiated by government agencies. In this bill eight acts are amended. Schedule 2 provides for minor, non-controversial amendments to the Legislation Act initiated by the parliamentary counsel office, but there are no such amendments in this bill. Schedule 3 provides for minor or technical amendments initiated by the parliamentary counsel and in this bill 26 acts and regulations are amended. Schedule 4 provides for routine repeals. There are no repeals in this bill.

Schedule 1 carries amendments to seven acts to centralise to the Legislation Act the definition of the term “bankrupt or personally insolvent”. You might recall that the second SLAB bill that passed through the Assembly last year added that definition to its dictionary, so the amendments to those seven acts simply cross-reference the term to that definition. There is also an amendment to the Building Act 2004 to clarify the meaning of insolvent in relation to builders that are corporations.

In the Education Act 2004, amendments will provide that copies of applications for various registrations of schools must be made available for inspection, free of charge, at a departmental office and not specifically the chief executive's office as it currently stands. They also provide that a person can be an authorised government person and an authorised non-government person at the same time. Finally, the Education Act is amended such that parents of a child whose home registration has been cancelled must enrol the child in an education provider's course within 14 days of cancellation.

One of the amendments to the Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Act 2008 clarifies that the Nominal Defendant will not be liable for personal injuries caused by an unregistered or uninsured motor vehicle that is used for recreational purposes on an area that is not a road or a road-related area. The bill gives the use of a quad bike as an example. This amendment would put more onus on the owners of such motor vehicles to at least carry appropriate public liability or third-party insurance, rather than relying on the government to prop them up. Another amendment will allow an injured person, in certain circumstances, to receive early payment for medical expenses.

Schedule 3 to this bill carries a range of minor technical amendments that are non-controversial. They involve the correction of minor errors, updating language, improving syntax, minor consequential amendments and other minor changes. In particular, a range of definitions common to the road transport legislation has been omitted from various acts and regulations and relocated in the Road Transport (General) Act 1999 dictionary, with relevant signposts provided in the dictionary to the amended acts.

Much of the work is on the initiative of the parliamentary counsel's office, and once again I am pleased to take the opportunity to congratulate the parliamentary counsel for their dedication to ensuring consistency and readability in our legislation in the ACT. In my experience, the ACT's statute book is the most accessible and user-friendly in the country. Nowhere else is it as easy to find what I am looking for, check the history and be able to navigate through it and read it with ease. I thank the parliamentary counsel's office for their good work; their service to members of this place and to the people of the ACT is much valued and appreciated.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Molonglo) (11.52): The Greens will be supporting this Statute Law Amendment Bill 2010. As has been touched on, statute law amendment bills represent the most appropriate way to keep the ACT statute book up to date and accurate. Each of the amendments contained would generally not warrant an amending piece of legislation in its own right. However, when added together they make for a bill worthy of scrutiny and debate by the Assembly.

The amendments in today's bill are indeed minor and technical, and I will not go through each specific proposal and make comment. It is enough to say that we have tracked through the changes and agree that they fit into the minor and technical category. In part, these types of bills can rectify past mistakes such as typographical and drafting errors.

Because of this, I was interested to see that this particular bill is shorter than previous bills. The last such bill debated in the Assembly amended over 100 separate pieces of

legislation. This time around we are to amend just over 30. It may be that through the ongoing process of SLAB bills we are eliminating mistakes in the statute book and, if that is the case, that is indeed a useful outcome. Irrespective of the reason for this relatively brief SLAB bill, I think its benefit in general is clear and well known.

I would like to provide one simple example of the amendments made today which I think demonstrates their worth. The amendment is to the Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Act 2008 and was initiated by the responsible department. The amendment clarifies a previously uncertain piece of the law. Following the passage of today's bill, someone injured in a car crash will be able to receive the compensation for medical expenses they are entitled to whether or not the police have submitted their paperwork on time. The only requirement on the injured party will be that they provide the name of the police officer who attended the scene.

This is a sensible amendment that will mean people are compensated for medical expenses they incur. The existing uncertainty has had the potential for compensation to be withheld because of delays in internal police processes. This is an unfortunate outcome, and the Greens are pleased to see it rectified. The amendment does not reflect a policy shift of government but it does improve the statute book and clarify a previously uncertain area of the law.

In conclusion, the changes in this bill make for a simpler and more consistent ACT statute book, and the Greens support the amendments made by this bill.

**MR CORBELL** (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, Minister for Energy and Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (11.54), in reply: I thank members for their support of this bill. The bill carries on the technical amendments program that continues to develop a simpler, more coherent and accessible statute book for the territory through minor legislation changes. It is an efficient mechanism to take care of non-controversial, minor or technical amendments to a range of territory legislation while conserving resources that would otherwise be needed if the amendments were dealt with individually.

Each individual amendment is minor, but when viewed collectively they are a significant contribution to improving the operation of the affected legislation and the statute book generally. For example, two minor amendments of the Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Act will be beneficial to the insurance industry and to claimants. First, the act is amended to clarify that the Nominal Defendant is not liable in relation to uninsured or unidentified vehicles that are designed to be used in off-road areas. Second, an injured person can receive early payment of medical expenses if the police report about the accident is delayed and the injured person can provide the insurer with certain information.

Equally, in relation to the Education Act, the amendments to improve the practical administration of the act provide that various applications must be made available, free of charge, at a departmental office and not specifically at the chief executive's office.

A number of other acts are amended to standardise the meaning of “bankruptcy”. As members would be aware, I have introduced a JACS bill this morning that provides for further technical amendments flowing from this definition. A range of acts and regulations comprising the road transport legislation have been amended to remove duplication of standard definitions. These amendments will make a significant improvement to the ease of reading and understanding of our laws.

I would like to express my ongoing appreciation for members’ continuing support for the technical amendments program and I would reiterate the comments of Mrs Dunne in relation to the excellent work of the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, for leading the way and striving for the best. In this case, that best is a modern, high quality, up-to-date and easily accessible statute book. 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.

## **Crimes (Sentence Administration) Amendment Bill 2010**

Debate resumed from 25 March 2010, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

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

**Sitting suspended from 11.58 am to 2 pm.**

## **Visitors**

**MR SPEAKER:** Members, before we commence question time, I would like to draw your attention to a number of visitors we have with us in the Assembly today. Firstly, I would like to welcome the delegation from the Beijing Municipal Committee of the Chinese People’s Consultative Conference. Mr Hargreaves and I have just hosted them for lunch in the Speaker’s hospitality room. I would also like to welcome members of National Seniors, the Canberra north branch, who are joining us through the education office today. Welcome to question time.

## **Questions without notice**

### **Taxation—change of use**

**MR SESELJA:** My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, in defence of your massive tax on homes, you constantly referred to advice you have received that you could not ignore. You further stated this would not impede housing affordability and development in the city centre. Treasurer, under your massive tax on homes, the new

added cost of a unit in Braddon, for a small unit complex, is likely to be \$52,500. Could you explain how this will not impede housing affordability and, further, how it provides an incentive for developers and owners alike to move closer to the city centre?

**MS GALLAGHER:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As I outlined yesterday, the government has not adopted a new system on change of use. We have not adopted the schedules outlined in the codification draft report. I have merely indicated that you should have a look at them. I did not say we had adopted them. There is further consultation—

**Mr Seselja:** You said that is how much it is going to cost.

**MS GALLAGHER:** No, I did not. I said there is further consultation underway. Indeed, we had extended the consultation based on some industry concerns. But I also draw Mr Seselja's attention to sections within the draft report, which I am sure he has read. In fact, there is a whole section in the draft report called "The levels of revenue leaking under the current system". In that report it clearly says:

... the ACT community has forgone revenue from its share of the increase in the value of public leasehold. The revenue base for the CUC is very broad (potentially every established residential and commercial block of land in the ACT) and the volume of DAs requiring a lease variation is significant and reasonably stable at around 200 to 300 ...

**Mr Hanson:** We can all read, Katy.

**MS GALLAGHER:** This is the important bit here, if you just listen for a second:

... while the underlying leasehold assets have appreciated in value significantly over the past few years the revenue from CUC—

the change of use charge—

has not risen proportionately.

It goes on to say that this is specifically the case in relation to dual occupancy developments where a fixed charge of \$3,750 applies. It states:

As a result, the 'windfall gain' has been made by all applicants. However, the windfall gain in some inner city suburbs have been significantly higher than for applications in other suburbs.

The government is simply looking to rectify the current system and allow site-by-site valuations, as set out in the Planning and Development Act, to apply.

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Seselja, a supplementary?

**MR SESELJA:** Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker. Treasurer, what effect will this new approach have on the affordability of units in the ACT?

**MS GALLAGHER:** In relation to housing affordability, which is I think an issue that the opposition seek to hide behind as they defend significant amounts of revenue not coming to the ACT community for the variation on leases—

**Mr Seselja:** Don't you care about homeowners, Katy?

**MS GALLAGHER:** This is what the opposition are hiding behind. To accept the proposition that the opposition are putting forward would imply that costs are being kept low because the change of use charge has been kept low, and I do not think that is something that we have seen.

We believe that the law, as passed by this place, setting out a process for collection of change of use charge, needs to be applied as intended—

**Mr Seselja:** I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**MS GALLAGHER:** and that involves extra revenue coming to the community.

**MR SPEAKER:** Order, Treasurer. Thank you.

**Mr Seselja:** My point of order is on relevance. The specific question was about the affordability of units. Again, the Treasurer is refusing to answer that question. What impact will this massive tax have on the affordability of units?

**MR SPEAKER:** Treasurer?

**MS GALLAGHER:** I have finished. I have answered the question.

**MR SPEAKER:** A supplementary, Mr Smyth?

**MR SMYTH:** Yes, Mr Speaker; thank you. Treasurer, how does this massive increase in the tax collected assist the government in increasing the density of population in the city, as is their desired outcome under the policies?

**MS GALLAGHER:** We believe that the activity that we are seeing, and indeed the activity we need to see in terms of intensification of urban redevelopment, particularly in our inner areas, and the profit that is being made from those developments will continue to make them extremely attractive for developers.

*Mr Seselja interjecting—*

**MS GALLAGHER:** If some developers choose not to realise those development opportunities, Mr Seselja, I am very sure that other developers will. There is money to be made.

**MR SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Mr Smyth?

**MR SMYTH:** Treasurer, do you have advice or a cost-benefit analysis or a business case that says that this policy, this change in the application that leads to such an



increase of a massive new tax, will not affect densification of the city, and will you table such advice?

**MS GALLAGHER:** As I have said a number of times—I am sure we will hear more of this from the opposition in the budget reply that we are all holding our breath for—it is not a new tax—

**Mr Smyth:** No, a tax increase, I said.

**MS GALLAGHER:** No, Mr Smyth, you and the opposition have been calling it a big new tax for the last two days.

**Mr Smyth:** A massive tax increase.

**MS GALLAGHER:** It is not.

**Mr Smyth:** A massive tax increase.

**MS GALLAGHER:** It is not.

**Mr Smyth:** Tony Abbott is talking about big new taxes.

**MS GALLAGHER:** Well, you Liberals all sound the same really. Here you are defending to the death the community being ripped off through the change-of-use charge. The windfall gains have not been flowing over—

**Mr Seselja:** And you're going to rip off homebuyers, are you? You're going to rip off homebuyers and renters.

**MS GALLAGHER:** Mr Speaker, it is clear that the windfall gains that have been received from paying extremely low change-of-use charges have not flowed on to property owners; they have not flowed on to families.

**Mr Smyth:** They have.

**MS GALLAGHER:** They have not flowed on to families, Mr Smyth, and it is not a big new tax. In relation to advice, yes, the government has got advice that revenue has been leaking and that we should seek to immediately rectify that. Yes, the government has got that. In relation to codification, in relation to a cost-benefit analysis, that work is not complete.

**Mr Seselja:** So you don't know what impact it will have.

**MS GALLAGHER:** What a surprise! You do understand—I have said it a number of times—that it is called a draft report into the review of the change-of-use system.

**Mr Smyth:** The tax isn't a draft.

**Mr Seselja:** It's in the budget.

**MS GALLAGHER:** This is where you cannot understand the difference between codification and actually applying the law as it exists at the moment. Yes, we have advice on that. In relation to a cost-benefit analysis about implementing change of use in codification, that is yet to come.

### **Planning—sustainable use of building materials**

**MS HUNTER:** My question is to the Minister for Planning and concerns the sustainable use of building materials. A provision of the Building Act 2004 requires the minister to make a disallowable instrument setting out guidelines for the sustainable use of materials for building, but the legislation register shows that there is no such instrument. Minister, why haven't you fulfilled this duty and created this instrument to ensure that the ACT uses best practice in building sustainability?

**MR BARR:** Whilst Ms Hunter has indicated that the government does take this matter seriously, and we would not have incorporated such a requirement into legislation if we did not, I will have to seek some advice from the Planning and Land Authority as to whether the instrument is just not linked to that website. As to whether it exists or not, I do not, of course, have a complete, encyclopedic memory of every regulation that is under my responsibility across all of my portfolios. I am sure that that does not surprise the leader of the Greens. I will find out from the Planning and Land Authority whether this is simply a case of it not being linked to a particular website or whether this particular instrument has not been made. If it has not been made, then I can give the Assembly the commitment to make it as soon as possible.

**MR SPEAKER:** Ms Hunter, a supplementary?

**MS HUNTER:** Given that this year's budget prominently lists encouraging the use of sustainable building products as a focus, can you detail the funding that is provided specifically for this item?

**MR BARR:** Thank you, Ms Hunter. That information will, of course, be in the section of the budget relating to the Planning and Land Authority. There was no special appropriation or additional amount allocated in this year's budget for that specific purpose. However, the government payment for outputs for the ACT Planning and Land Authority is a considerable amount, many tens of millions of dollars, and within that allocation it will be the responsibility of various officials within the department to ensure that that work is undertaken.

**MR SPEAKER:** Ms Le Couteur, a supplementary question?

**MS LE COUTEUR:** Yes. Minister, by what date will you create, or register if they have already been created, the sustainability guidelines we have been discussing?

**MR BARR:** I am sorry; I missed the first part.

**MS LE COUTEUR:** When will you either create or register, if in fact as you suggested they have already been created, the sustainability guidelines?

**MR BARR:** Thank you. If those guidelines are already in place and simply have not been put on the website, then I would hope the Planning and Land Authority could rectify that issue by close of business this week. If the guidelines have in fact not been made, then I will ask the authority to undertake that work as quickly as possible.

**Budget—taxation levels**

**MR HARGREAVES:** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer please explain the real facts behind taxation levels and growth contained in the ACT's 2010-11 budget—for the benefit of the young fellow over there?

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MS GALLAGHER:** I can hear already that the opposition is very interested in hearing this, so I imagine they will remain quiet and well behaved during my answer. Just remember that we do have visitors in the Assembly today, so if we can all keep it nice I think that will be lovely.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MR SPEAKER:** Order!

**MS GALLAGHER:** I do not mean to encourage them, Mr Speaker—

**MR SPEAKER:** You are encouraging them, Treasurer.

**MS GALLAGHER:** The facts need to be put on the table to address some of the inaccuracies that are being peddled around town, particularly by the opposition and the Leader of the Opposition. Yesterday many of us at the breakfast were very excited to see the three slides that the Liberals had put together overnight.

*Members interjecting—*

**MR SPEAKER:** Thank you, members.

**MS GALLAGHER:** It had been an all-night sitting of the Liberal staff in this place to come up with those three lines, those three graphs. I went to the issue around including the stimulus funding in the revenue lines that they outlined. I think the fact that that misinforms or certainly does not give an accurate picture of the base revenue—

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MS GALLAGHER:** Mr Seselja and Mr Smyth, I refer you to my overarching media release for the day—

**Mr Hargreaves:** Mr Speaker, on a point of order, I plead with you. I am trying to hear the answer.

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Hargreaves, your point of order is a fair one, but I think it is evident that the Treasurer is baiting the opposition, which is making my job rather more difficult.

**MS GALLAGHER:** Thank you. It is very unlike me to bait the opposition, Mr Speaker, but I feel compelled to address some of the inaccuracies that are being peddled. I am sure we will hear more of them in the budget reply this afternoon.

Yesterday I think Mr Seselja's line was that this is the highest taxing government since self-government and that we are getting more tax than ever—raising more tax than ever before. When you look at the graphs that Mr Seselja circulated yesterday, it is very important to note that these figures are nominal taxation and, from our appearance, have not been adjusted for inflation. They have not been adjusted to take into account the size of the growth in the economy. They have completely ignored things like the cost of delivering services that have grown—health, for example, which is growing at between eight and nine per cent.

From the year 2000-01 to the year 2010-11, the economy has grown, on average, 4.8 per cent in real terms. Total real taxation has grown by three per cent per annum. If you look at those two measures you will see that we have actually exercised taxation restraint. But if you look at the figures again and adjust them for inflation—if you look at those 10 years and adjust them for inflation—taxation per capita grew at a mere 1.7 per cent, despite economic growth in the community across the ACT of 4.8 per cent.

**Mr Seselja:** For every person that we get, you tax each of them more every year.

**MS GALLAGHER:** Mr Seselja, I am just having to outline the real story here, not the Liberal story—not the lazy Liberal story.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MS GALLAGHER:** Your use of nominal taxation per capita means that when you compare that decade your position is overstated by approximately \$660 per person per year.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MR SPEAKER:** Members of the opposition, we have talked about this before. The constant hectoring—

**Mr Hanson:** She does—

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Hanson! The constant hectoring and interjecting is not appropriate for the conduct of the chamber. You will get a chance to ask supplementary questions in a moment. Mr Hargreaves?

**MR HARGREAVES:** For the benefit of those opposite—the budget is for 2010-11—Treasurer, could you please let us know what the facts are for revenue growth in the context of the 2010-11 budget?

**MS GALLAGHER:** I can. If I could just complete around taxation, if you look at the decade again that Mr Seselja draws our attention to, taxation as a share of GDP has fallen from three per cent to 2.6 per cent and, compared to a 10-year average share, 2010-11 is 0.1 per cent lower. So I think that just debunks the myth that Mr Seselja is putting out that we are taxing greater than ever. When you look at what the facts are, when you accept the reality that the cost of delivering services has grown, the fact is that we have sought to keep taxation revenue as low as we can and we have exercised restraint in this area.

Again, I go back and look at the graphs that the Liberals have put out and actually look at the real picture. I think Mr Seselja tried to run a line yesterday that the GFC had had absolutely no impact on our revenue at all. The 2008-09 budget forecast revenue from 2009-10 to 2011-12 to be \$3.595 billion. In 2010-11, the budget, without stimulus, is \$3.598 billion, almost exactly the same, despite the extra expenditure that we have put in in delivering services and the cost of delivering services. They are the facts.

You cannot sit there and say that taxation revenue has grown faster than ever and that we have got deficits of this order when the facts simply do not support that. The extra investment in services and demand for government continues to grow.

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Smyth, one moment. Mr Seselja, you have been constantly shouting across the chamber today. You are now warned. Mr Smyth?

**MR SMYTH:** Treasurer, which of the figures presented in the Liberal documents yesterday are therefore incorrect?

**MS GALLAGHER:** As I said, when you actually look through the details of it, and indeed the revenue, I have not hidden behind the communist—commonwealth stimulus money—

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MS GALLAGHER:** Actually, I am perhaps the person most comfortable—

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MS GALLAGHER:** I am perhaps the person most comfortable with the communist—

**Mr Hargreaves:** Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MR SPEAKER:** Order, members!

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**MR SPEAKER:** Order! Thank you, members.

**MS GALLAGHER:** I actually think it is probably a good thing for a Treasurer to have some communist links.

**Mr Hargreaves:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**MS GALLAGHER:** You know, it evens out some of that economic rationalism that you just have to have as Treasurer.

*Mr Smyth interjecting—*

**MR SPEAKER:** Order! Mr Smyth!

**MS GALLAGHER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The government has not been hiding behind the commonwealth stimulus money. Indeed, I think what you have used—you have tried to use it for your advantage to include it in the base.

**Mr Smyth:** That's not the question. Which figures—

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Smyth!

**MS GALLAGHER:** That is what is wrong.

**Mr Smyth:** She's not answering the question.

**MS GALLAGHER:** No, you asked me what is wrong with your figures.

**Mr Smyth:** No, no. I asked which were incorrect.

**MS GALLAGHER:** You included the commonwealth stimulus money in the base—

**Mr Smyth:** Which figure's incorrect?

**Mr Stanhope:** I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker.

**MR SPEAKER:** Order, Treasurer. Stop the clocks, thank you.

**Mr Stanhope:** Mr Speaker, you have taken the step of formally warning the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that if they did not desist—

**Mr Smyth:** That is not true.

**Mr Stanhope:** You were just formally warned, I understand.

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Seselja was.

**Mr Smyth:** Yeah, not me.

**Mr Stanhope:** So Mr Smyth is free to continue to interject, is he?

**MR SPEAKER:** Not yet.

**Mr Stanhope:** Mr Speaker, I have to say—

**Mr Smyth:** Sit down, Jon. You're irrelevant. Sit down. Get your facts straight, mate.

**Mr Stanhope:** All right. Mr Speaker, I have to say that I fear that you are at risk of losing control of this chamber with your continuing ignoring—

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**Mr Stanhope:** with your propensity to continue to ignore the rabble that ministers are forced to deal with every day in question time.

**Mr Smyth:** To the point of order, Mr Speaker, the simple question was: which of the figures presented are incorrect? The minister has not even mentioned a single figure that might be vaguely incorrect and she needs to come back to the question.

**Mr Hargreaves:** On the point of order, Mr Speaker, Mr Smyth's question in fact was a supplementary to mine and I did not ask for particular figures. I did not address any figures. I asked for facts behind the budget—

*Opposition members interjecting—*

**Mr Hargreaves:** and so the minister has allowed that latitude and was attempting to answer the question. So I think, Mr Speaker, that you should rule Mr Smyth's point out of order.

**MR SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr Hargreaves.

**Mr Hargreaves:** And if the minister cannot tell the difference between the Liberal Party and the Communist Party, I am sorry about that.

**Mr Seselja:** Mr Speaker—

**MR SPEAKER:** Order!

**MS GALLAGHER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**MR SPEAKER:** Ms Gallagher, before you resume, on the points of order Mr Stanhope is correct: the noise in here is unacceptable today. I have tried to draw your attention to that. Mr Seselja is on a warning. The next member that intervenes will also be on a warning. Treasurer, you might come to the question.

**MS GALLAGHER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am just putting the context around the very simplistic slide show that we were inflicted with yesterday—that it does not tell the honest truth. You can use numbers, as you have in your three slides, to try to make a particular point. But the truth is, when you actually look at the different data, when

you adjust the taxation for inflation, you get a different picture. It is very convenient, Mr Smyth, to just ignore things such as inflation. But the government cannot and I think our budget indicates that. It is very convenient for your quick political shot—not so convenient for telling the honest truth. Again, I am happy to provide members with a more sophisticated slide show—

**Mr Smyth:** We kept it simple so you could understand it.

**MS GALLAGHER:** It took me a bit of time to work out what you were doing. But I am very happy to—

**MR SPEAKER:** Thank you, Treasurer.

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Smyth, a supplementary?

**MR SMYTH:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Treasurer, as you were just unable to find a single incorrect figure in the presentation, will you withdraw your comments?

**MS GALLAGHER:** No, I will not withdraw the comments. The figures require context. I will provide members with the estimated revenue as estimated in 2008-09 for the following forward estimates and then what actually happened in the 2009-10 budget when the global financial crisis hit and we lost \$1.1 billion across our forward estimates. As I said, it does not surprise us that a lazy opposition with no ideas that is going to stand up and go on, I imagine—

**Mr Smyth:** That was the estimate.

**MS GALLAGHER:** for 3½ hours this afternoon, about a budget—

**Mr Smyth:** Just one—one single incorrect figure.

**MR SPEAKER:** Order!

**MS GALLAGHER:** missed opportunity, high taxing, more revenue than ever before. We are all going to hear it.

**MR SPEAKER:** The clocks, thank you. Mr Smyth, you are now warned as well. I have said time and time again that we cannot have repeated interventions across the chamber. A few comments are okay, but the constant hectoring is not.

**Mr Smyth:** Point of order, Mr Speaker. I accept your direction, Mr Speaker. The minister again is failing to answer the question and point out a single incorrect figure. You might bring her back to the subject of the question and, if she does not have an answer, sit her down.

**MS GALLAGHER:** Mr Speaker, the opposition has been alleging that the global financial crisis had no impact on our budget. That is simply incorrect. It is a head in the sand approach, politically convenient for the 2½ hours that we are going to listen to them bleat on today. We are actually going to run a book on how many times they say “big new tax”, “great tax” or “massive tax”.



**Mr Hanson:** Massive new tax, Katy.

**MS GALLAGHER:** There you go. I have got a bit of inside running for that on the book now thanks to Mr Hanson. For example, if you look in the 2008-09 budget where we predicted revenue in the order of \$3.4 billion for the 2009-10 year, the actual budget—and yes, I am withdrawing the commonwealth stimulus out of it—3.231.

**Mr Hanson:** You cannot do that and declare that you have got a surplus this year.

**MS GALLAGHER:** It is not. It cannot be included in the base because it could not be used for anything. We were a letterbox for commonwealth money coming through to schools and housing. You cannot ignore that there are several hundred dollars off our base from what we were expecting and we have had to ride out that storm. Our economy—(*Time expired.*)

### **Health—promotion grants**

**MS LE COUTEUR:** My question is to the Minister for Health and concerns the government's health promotion grants. Minister, I understand that a strategic review of the health promotion grants was undertaken last year and that the consultancy body was required to provide a report to ACT Health by October 2009. Can you advise the Assembly what the results of the review were and when the review will be made public?

**MS GALLAGHER:** I will have to take that question on notice. I certainly have not that I can recall, and I will check, seen any recommendations around that report or any that would change the health promotion grants as they exist at this point in time. There are grants for about \$2.1 million from memory. I will certainly chase it up but I cannot recall seeing the report or the review.

**MR SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Ms Le Couteur?

**MS LE COUTEUR:** Minister, what consideration has the government given to increasing the amount dedicated to health promotion grants?

**MS GALLAGHER:** We do consider it; it is part of the budget process every year when we look around allocation of funds in health. I have to say that I think a \$2 million grants round is pretty generous. I think it is perhaps the most generous grants round that exists across the ACT government. It is always oversubscribed, I have to say, in terms of the applications coming in, but it is one part of the health promotion and prevention program within ACT Health.

We have a number of other programs, and they do receive budget funding. Some of the money in the mental health allocation will go to this area. In terms of some of the chronic disease management, again, some will go into promotion, raising awareness, education and looking at how we can support change for those who are already living with a chronic disease.

It is only one area, but I have to say that the pressures in health are so great and so difficult to meet every year that increasing a \$2 million grants round is on the list but it is not at the top of the list, Ms Le Couteur.

**MR SPEAKER:** Ms Bresnan, a supplementary question?

**MS BRESNAN:** Minister, given that a number of groups have stated they need long-term contracts to implement their health promotion programs effectively, is the government considering moving to three-year funding contracts under this grants scheme?

**MS GALLAGHER:** There are a number of organisations who do get long-term funding through the health promotion grants. I can certainly think of a few. It is a hard one, I think. I also get representations through a number of organisations that think that people should not get long-term funding under that, that they should only be used for one-off or short-term projects, because by moving people to three years, it reduces the pool available for those who have new ideas that want to come forward. So there is a balancing act.

It is similar to other grants rounds that we have been involved with. Indeed, when the community inclusion fund was a set period of time and when that finished, we were left with a range of programs that we needed to then go and find funding for in a longer term sense. It is a balancing act. There are a number that already get multi-year funding, I think they call it at the moment. I am not opposed, necessarily, to looking at that, but we have to acknowledge that, if we do more of that, we reduce the pool for everybody else.

*It being 2.30 pm, questions were interrupted pursuant to the order of the Assembly.*

## **Appropriation Bill 2010-2011**

Debate resumed from 4 May 2010, on motion by **Ms Gallagher**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MR SESELJA** (Molonglo—Leader of the Opposition) (2.30): Mr Speaker, welcome to the richest boom time the ACT budget has ever seen. The Australian economy is doing well. Commonwealth spending in the ACT means our economy is doing even better. Revenues have risen beyond anyone's expectations. Employment opportunities abound. Labour force participation rates are soaring and inflation remains tamed. These are not just good times, these are the best of times.

I should be rising to celebrate a balanced budget, exciting new initiatives and a new era of opportunity for better services and lower taxation, but I cannot. Instead I am here to lament a budget that gives us deficit after deficit, debt upon debt, a stagnation in services and a massive tax grab on homeowners and car drivers.

Mr Speaker, our job as an opposition is to scrutinise the budget line by line, while also examining and highlighting the poor policy that brought such a budget into being and

decry its defects. We are here to hold this government and this coalition—yes, I said coalition—to account for the budget they have presented to the people of the ACT, a budget founded not on misfortune or misadventure, but foundering from a lack of invention or intervention, of wasted time and lost opportunity.

Last year, we warned that the debts, deficits and lack of basic services in this budget would be unavoidable because the steps that needed to be taken in the last budget and the one before that and the one before that were steps left untaken. We have heard the Treasurer claim her budgets as responsible, as modest, as fair, and that this budget is one for growth. And it is: growth in debts and growth in deficits, and a growth in the poor discipline, lack of direction and determination that have typified the ACT Labor government since their re-election.

The Canberra Liberals have engaged with experts and have analysed the ACT economy with care. The ACT economy is inextricably linked to the Australian economy. It has similar growth rates, similar employment trends, similar inflationary pressures. It relies on growth in the national economy and particularly commonwealth spending for its growth. At a national level, it is fair to say that the outlook for the economy is positive, and so it is for the ACT. The world's demand for resources is driving the mining sector, driving jobs growth, and it is driving economic growth from which the ACT will benefit.

So what we have is actually a strong local economy amidst a national economy that has weathered the international crisis well. With this growth come challenges. Already this week we have seen the RBA lift the official cash rate 25 points to 4.5 per cent. CPI is pushing towards 2.9 per cent, just inside the RBA's target range. And workforce participation, especially in the ACT, is rising.

But this economic growth should also provide an opportunity for the ACT to bring its budget back into the black quicker than was originally anticipated. Our analysis shows that revenue has grown faster than predicted during last year's budget when the GFC was upon us. It has, in fact, grown higher, far higher, than the predictions of the budgets before the GFC had even earned its acronym. The bottom line in this budget is that this government has received more money than any other in the territory's history. It is the highest taxing budget in our history.

Mr Speaker, I am about to go through some figures, and I am pleased that the Treasurer, with her opportunity today in question time, was not able to debunk one of these numbers that we have put forward—not one. In the 2008-09 budget, when things were booming and the GFC had not yet occurred, the ACT government forecast that, in 2010-11, revenue would be \$3.591 billion. In the 2009-10 budget, after the potential impact of the GFC had become clear, the ACT government forecast that, in 2010-11, revenue would be \$3.518 billion. The government in this budget has said that revenue in 2010-11 will be \$3.668 billion. So we are already back above where we expected to be, even in the best of times.

Some people are doing it tough out there, but it certainly is not this government. In fact, revenue is forecast to grow to \$4.234 billion in 2013-14. How much stimulus money is there in 2013-14, Katy?

**Ms Gallagher:** Well, there is none by then, Mr Seselja.

**MR SESELJA:** Yes, indeed: \$4.234 billion but this Treasurer cries poor. It is the most ever collected by the territory, double what it was when Labor came to office, and they are still forecasting deficits. It is clear that no amount of revenue is ever enough for this Labor government.

**Mr Stanhope:** How many surplus budgets did the Liberal Party deliver in government?

**MR SESELJA:** No amount of taxation will sate their unquenchable addiction to reckless spending. The fact that there has been continued strong growth is undeniable. The budget papers say so in black and white.

**Mr Stanhope:** Not a single surplus in government, not one.

**MR SPEAKER:** Chief Minister!

**Mr Stanhope:** We have had eight.

**MR SESELJA:** Yet this budget predicts a \$470 million underlying deficit over the next four years—

**Mr Stanhope:** Not a single surplus in government. We have had eight.

**MR SPEAKER:** Chief Minister!

**MR SESELJA:** even though we have more income than ever. Why?

**Mr Stanhope:** Not one surplus in government.

**MR SPEAKER:** Chief Minister!

**MR SESELJA:** Because no matter how fast revenues grow, this government spends money even faster. He does not like it, does he? He does not like hearing about it.

**Mr Hanson:** Shame, Stanhope, shame!

**Mr Stanhope:** Not a single surplus in government.

**MR SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**MR SESELJA:** He does not like hearing about it. His record is on display.

**Mrs Dunne:** You don't like it, do you, Jon?

**MR SPEAKER:** Order, members! Mr Seselja, one moment please. Stop the clocks. Members, the Treasurer was heard essentially in silence on Tuesday when delivering the budget.

**Ms Gallagher:** Partial silence.

**MR SPEAKER:** Almost largely silence, and I expect you to show similar courtesy to Mr Seselja, and to Ms Hunter when she speaks. Mr Seselja.

**MR SESELJA:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the Chief Minister for displaying his sensitivity on this point. Just as revenue and taxes have increased, expenses will grow to \$4.395 billion under this budget. Until 2003-04, the expenditure and revenue graphs remained broadly in line. However, in 2008-09, those figures dramatically diverged and they are projected to move further apart as time goes by.

The rivers of revenue, the flood of finance, all trickle dry when you cannot control your spending. This is simply unsustainable. Growth in expenditure cannot continue to outstrip growth in revenue. Any kitchen table budget will show that continuing to spend more money than you receive will end in disaster. It is not a prediction or projection; it is a mathematical certainty.

So where has all this money come from and where has it all gone? It comes from property taxes, from GST, from a massive increase in rates and charges since Labor took power, and it has been wasted ever since. Since ACT Labor was first elected in 2001, taxation per capita has risen from \$1,794 to \$3,126.

As an example of this increase, an example that will ring true in many household budgets, we have conducted historical research into the rates bill that this government levies on householders in the ACT. Just to provide a few examples since 2001-02, rates have increased in Holder by 78 per cent, in Amaroo by 71 per cent, in Conder by 76.3 per cent and in Evatt by around 80 per cent. Across this territory, in every family home, they are the sorts of increases we have seen in the last nine years, with even more above-inflation rises to be levied again in this budget.

But in spite of this growth, ACT Labor have blown the budget again. ACT Labor spent more than they made again. We are not getting the services we paid for again. We are paying more, waiting longer and getting less. This is a budget that delivers a very small bang for very big bucks. And make no mistake: it is because of the policies and practices of this government that we get such poor results from such prodigious revenues.

Given the strong economy in the ACT and nationally, the ACT government budget should be in good shape. The streets should be paved with gold and we should all be enjoying platinum services. But we are not.

It is vital to remember that when we look at this budget we are not just looking at the document presented by the Treasurer only two days ago. We are looking at the story of this government over the last nine years, and it is a story of waste—wasted money, wasted time, wasted opportunity. Nine years of waste; nine years of ACT Labor.

The reality of this statement can be seen not only in the rows and columns of numbers in the budget papers but in the financial pain and frustration with services being felt in

the territory. Nine years that have seen our hospital waiting times go from average to the worst in the country. Nine years in which home prices have gone from average to amongst the most unaffordable for first homebuyers in the country. Nine years in which 23 schools have closed and dozens of GPs have closed shop. Nine years in which revenues and taxes have exceeded all expectations but which could still not keep pace with expenditure. That is the real result of this budget. That is the real legacy of this government.

The question that must be asked in all this is: why? Why do we have deficits during days that were, as Chris Uhlmann noted, not just good times, these were unprecedented times? Because this government cannot control spending, and they have a pathological aversion to responsibility. We have spoken before about the reluctance of this government to act responsibly for the future when times were good. Chris Uhlmann says the evidence available shows the government are largely the author of their own woes and suggests the government believe their own rhetoric when they claimed year after year to be in surplus. That is not just the opposition talking, that is respected commentators saying the same thing: you have run out of excuses.

This is a symptom of a lack of direction and discipline of this government. If you bounce from complete crisis to temporary respite as a simple spectator of events instead of a manager, if you fail to take the steps when times are good, if you put off the decisions for another day, that day will come all the sooner and you will not be prepared.

One of the hidden hits in this budget is the sleight of hand the government has tried to pull with the innocent-sounding change of use charge. This is nothing more than a massive tax on homes. And no matter how much Katy Gallagher tries to deny and distract, there is a bottom-line impact of \$89 million that this government intends to collect over four years from homebuyers, home renters and home investors. The fact that this will come on top of the already decreasingly affordable housing market, even worse for first homebuyers, just sinks the boot into these very people.

The Australian Property Monitors report last week showed the median house price in Canberra was around \$550,000. That is over half a million dollars to buy an average house, at a time when weekly earnings were growing much more slowly.

House prices in the ACT have more than doubled since March 2002, while total weekly earnings have risen by around 60 per cent in nominal terms. Prices grew much faster from March 2002 to November 2003, taking Canberra to new price heights through a reduction in the supply of land.

This was a deliberate policy decision, to squeeze land supply. It was a policy decision we have never recovered from and for which ordinary house owners are now paying an extraordinary price. The belated land release indicated in this budget is an acknowledgement of that failure, although we have yet to see the plan rolled out. And this government does not have a good record at delivering on land promises.

The government often quotes Real Estate Institute figures that suggest that, as a percentage of income, Canberra still has low housing costs. But contrast that with

the HIA-Commonwealth Bank figures that apply to first homebuyers and that provide a much more telling comparison that shows we are the second-least affordable jurisdiction for first homebuyers.

The Governor of the Reserve Bank has explicitly stated that one of the main drivers of housing affordability is land supply. In the ACT we are in the unique position of having direct control over this and the ability to make it happen; yet we have seen all manner of bizarre ideas come forth from this government and supply has still been strangled. Now a massive tax has been unveiled, an \$89 million slug to homebuyers.

Yesterday in the chamber the Treasurer admitted that the charges outlined in the government's papers would indeed be the guidelines that would apply to new units and dual occupancies in our suburbs.

**Ms Gallagher:** No, I didn't.

**MR SESELJA:** I will quote what the Treasurer said because she now denies it. She said:

... I ... refer Mr Seselja to the schedule and tables which indicated it is very clear from that that it would be a significant increase on what is currently being paid now under codification, and we expect it to be in that order under a site-by-site valuation process.

There it is. There it is in the Treasurer's own words. The tables that have been provided give us the indicator of how much tax they will be taking from ordinary homebuyers in the ACT.

**Ms Gallagher:** Read the first sentence. You didn't read the first sentence.

**MR SESELJA:** The quote speaks for itself. The Treasurer does not like it. She does not like it. But we can see from the table what people are going to pay under this government's regime. We can take it across the board. Let us have a look at it. In Braddon, on large unit complexes, it is over \$137,000 tax per unit; on smaller unit complexes, it is \$52½ thousand; on dual occupancies, it is \$75,000.

Let us choose some others. In Monash, it is \$33,750 tax per unit in small unit complexes; in Kambah, \$33,750; in Wanniasa, \$33,750; in Lyneham, \$41,250; in Holt, \$30,000; in Bonython, \$30,000. That, in anyone's language, is a massive tax on homes.

**Mr Corbell:** You are just a rent seeker, Mr Seselja, an absolute rent seeker.

**MR SPEAKER:** Mr Corbell, I have said what my expectations are on budget reply.

**MR SESELJA:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. They do not like it. They do not like this massive tax on homes being highlighted, a massive tax in Bonython and Bruce, a massive tax in Kambah and Curtin, a massive tax in Hall and Holt, a massive new tax on families in every suburb of this territory.

But it gets worse. Not only does the budget slug homebuyers, it slams car drivers as well. This budget announces increases in parking fees of 30 per cent. That means for those working in the city it will cost—

**Mr Stanhope:** What would you have done?

**MR SESELJA:** He really does not like hearing about this budget. It is perhaps because he does not have confidence in his Treasurer. For those working in the city, it will cost \$55 per week, every week, just to park. I know Katy Gallagher will tell them all to get on the bus, in a news flash, to force people out of their cars and into public transport but that shows just how out of date this government is. For all those families in the suburbs, that is simply not a viable option. I find it galling that it is always those individuals who live in inner suburbs and have free car parks who cry the loudest and who attack the families in Tuggeranong, Gungahlin, Belconnen and Weston Creek and tell them to catch the bus and tell them that their parking prices are going to be jacked up.

There are other examples of issues identified that have not been addressed in this budget, such as childcare. Due to our high participation rate in all sectors of the economy, we have an unusually high demand on the childcare sector; yet this sector is woefully supported. Ms Burch does not even know where the childcare needs are or what services are available to assist them. This is an appalling abrogation that must be addressed, and we have put forward an idea to do so, which I will speak to later in this speech.

But those three elements, a massive new tax on homes, a massive new slug on cars and a total ignorance of childcare issues, show just how out of touch this budget and the policies and priorities of this government are. Homes, cars, childcare are all taxed or ignored. This is not a budget for the times; it is not a budget for growth; it is a budget that attacks families in the suburbs.

The budget itself has many other examples of misguided priorities. Funding for business and industry development programs in 2010-11 will be reduced by \$4.8 million. Tourism, the biggest private sector industry in the ACT, has been virtually ignored. The only spending appears to be \$1.9 million for Floriade and Floriade's Nightfest.

The commitment to reform of ACTION is as late as some of the services. The timeliness and customer satisfaction of ACTION services have not only failed to meet the 2009-10 targets but have also been in decline from 2008-09 levels. The ACTION bus service is going backwards. Revenue from fares continues to provide only 20 per cent of operating costs, with more than \$77.3 million coming from the government subsidy.

The percentage of roads in good condition has slipped to 88 per cent. Despite the traffic bottlenecks at the moment, the government has failed to keep pace with its own targets for road resurfacing. Progress is occurring at just over half the target pace, and well short of previous years.



What we see in this budget, line after line, project after project, portfolio after portfolio, is that there might be spending but there is precious little in results. That is our assessment of this budget: big bucks, small bang.

At this time it is the common catchcry for the government to make puerile demands for an alternative budget. We have our own timetable and agenda and we will be sticking to it. But we have been doing the hard work to be an effective opposition. That role is twofold: first, to scrutinise government policy and performance, to support good policy and oppose bad policy; second, to provide alternatives and drive positive changes.

Over the past 18 months we have been performing both these roles. We have highlighted government failures: the debacle that is the prison, the serious and endemic problems in the health system, the failures in public transport and housing affordability, to name a few. We have also built an impressive list of policy achievements from opposition: the government advertising act, roadside drug testing, FOI reform, adoption changes, campaign finance reform and more.

However, Mr Speaker, I tell you what we would not do. We would not waste money on personal legacy projects, we would not waste time on red tape and we would not waste opportunities to do things right the first time.

In yesterday's debate, Mr Speaker, we saw just how defensive the Chief Minister was on the topic of the GDE—and he is right to be so. The figure that the government has finally owned up to—that it will cost at least \$20 million more, directly due to the decision to build it as a one-lane road instead of two—is an understatement—

**Mr Stanhope:** Name the roads you built in government.

**Mr Hanson:** Shame, Stanhope, shame!

**MR SESELJA:** not to mention the economic cost to the territory—

**Mr Stanhope:** Name a single road you built.

**MR SESELJA:** We see the sensitivity again, Mr Speaker.

**MR SPEAKER:** Stop the clocks, thank you, clerks. In the spirit of consistency, Mr Stanhope, you will be warned if you keep intervening.

**MR SESELJA:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. That is not to mention the economic cost to the territory and the frustration for motorists that the long, drawn-out and sorry saga has inflicted on the town.

We would not have wasted the time and money on a sham opening of the AMC as a pre-election stunt—or the millions every year running a half-empty facility. This facility was completed over budget with a reduced scope from 374 beds to 300 and no chapel.

*Mr Corbell interjecting—*

**MR SESELJA:** We hear from Mr Corbell again. Again he claims in this place that he delivered the prison on budget. It started off as \$110 million. It went to \$128 million. Then it went to \$131 million. Then they cut beds. Then they cut the chapel. Then they cut the gym. But Mr Corbell says, “It’s on budget, it’s on budget.” If you cut it enough and expand the budget enough, eventually it will be on budget. You could have dropped it to no beds; then you would have delivered it on budget. My goodness! Canberrans are now paying an extraordinary price for this prison: \$504 per prisoner per day. Yet, as we have seen with recent publicity, we are not getting what we paid for or what we were promised. We cannot keep prisoners safe inside the prison and we cannot stop people who are supposed to be there from just walking out the door.

We would not have wasted the chance to collect revenue owing to us. This is not a poor policy choice—just appalling management practice. They simply did not get around to collecting money. They forgot.

We would not be wasting up to \$7½ million on buses going nowhere every year. That is \$27,726 every single work day for the ACT taxpayers. It gets us absolutely nothing. We would not be wasting millions renting empty buildings, and more millions on busway plans that were doomed to fail.

We would not have spent \$5 million on FireLink, a communications facility which was never delivered. Mr Corbell’s woes continue. The legacy of waste is a fact for which all Canberra families will foot the bill.

The next question we are inevitably faced with is: where are the savings? Frankly, this budget is awash with waste, and here are just a few examples. Let us take the \$4.25 million for the planning, study and construction around Northbourne Avenue. I do not know how much it is for the study to tell you Northbourne Avenue does not work very well. But I will tell you right now, for free: it does not. How much have we saved just then?

You are spending \$100,000 for a feasibility study for one shopfront in Gungahlin. The centre of Gungahlin is nothing but shops. What about Gungahlin shops is unfeasible? Pick one and move in.

There is \$3.1 million in planning and documentation for the highly questionable government office projects—not building the offices or moving in; just planning and paper.

There is \$8 million for Treasury for land release—not for ACTPLA, not for LDA; for the Treasury department, presumably to count all the money raised by selling the land. Surely this is core business for all of these departments.

You finally realised that you can cut the Treasurer’s slush fund by 25 per cent. Well, why not make it 50 per cent? Based on historical measures, that could be up to \$21 million a year.

And \$26.3 million on the arboretum: I am sure some like the idea. But we are surrounded by the Brindabellas. And no-one could call it a core service. I am sure that ACTCOSS would love even a fraction of that amount for core community services.

We would not have hundreds of thousands on artwork on the side of the GDE instead of finishing the road. We would not have funded the Grassby statue, the prison artwork or spent the hundreds of thousands of dollars a year that the government spend on telling us just how good they are. That is what we would do differently.

Mr Speaker, if we from opposition can find savings of tens of millions of dollars just from the headlines provided by this government, how can anyone claim that there is no waste—worse still, absurd waste? I am sure when we drill down we will find more examples, just as we did in all the previous budgets this government has presented.

There are other areas I would like to address. There are places where we should be spending but which the government has ignored. Recently, I visited a number of homeless shelters in the region. Many of these shelters are regularly turning people away. The \$100,000-plus which the government waste every year on its propaganda newsletter would be a godsend, allowing them to give shelter to more people.

I met recently with the Women's Legal Centre, which gives legal advice to vulnerable women in our community. The centre does a fantastic job on a shoestring budget and receives very little support from the ACT government. I, along with many in the community, resent the wasting of money on twisted pieces of metal beside the GDE instead of providing more funding to vulnerable women.

These are questions that need to be answered and issues that must be addressed. We have put these issues on our agenda as a direct result of doing the hard work of alternative policy development. And we are doing it in a constructive way—not with this government, but with the people who really count: the community.

Our community consultations across a range of portfolio areas have started and the positive ideas we will be promoting are based on a sound understanding of the principles that actually drive communities and economies—ideas like the Infrastructure Canberra Bill that will give the territory the plan to move forward and the legislative authority to do so independently of the political cycle.

I announced in my budget reply last year that we would move forward with our territory master plan, called “concept Canberra”, and the hard work behind it is creating tangible proof of that concept being turned into a reality. This is just the first part of concept Canberra as an alternative vision for our city but an important one and one that should already be in place but which is once again another example of wasted opportunity for reform that this government has failed to address.

Another idea is Jeremy Hanson's health forums, which have had exceptional uptake and valuable input from a range of industry and community groups and which have provided a level of bilateral dialogue sorely missing in the management of public health under this government. You can see further hard work in the substantial and

scholarly paper presented by Mr Hanson that is bringing new thoughts and engagement in this debate.

And we would have a different policy agenda. I would like to point out some of those as announcements today.

**Ms Gallagher:** The cut and paste from all the ACT Health documents?

**MR SESELJA:** The health minister is constantly embarrassed by her opposite number, who continues to outshine her at every opportunity. These policies do exemplify the differences we will bring when we win government. They are policies based around the needs of the people in the community—not the needs of the people standing as candidates. They are responses to shortcomings identified by results in the real world and the rigour of our analysis.

For example, one of the aspects of our economy that we identified was the very high participation rate in the workforce, including both men and women. This is no doubt a positive for our economy; but it does bring with it the need to respond to the demands that this unusually high participation rate brings. It means, for example, that there are pressures on the childcare sector that are higher than those experienced around the country. This is exacerbated by the impending regulatory changes that will put increased pressures on this important sector.

The first element of the policy development is to get a true picture of what state the sector is in—a genuine deep look at the problems and opportunities. Frankly, we find it remarkable and disappointing that no in-depth study exists and that the government is developing policy blindly in this area. It should be no surprise then that this sector feels neglected when of course it ought to be supported. It is a fundamental aspect of our city's development that this sector be vibrant and supported and to be able to deliver this core service when our population clearly has a need for it.

According to the *Report on government services 2010*, 10,008 children aged five and under and 5,430 children aged between six and 12 attended Australian government approved childcare services in the ACT in 2008-09. This represents 37.1 per cent of children under five and 18.8 per cent of children aged six to 12. However, this only represents around half of all childcare in the ACT. The ABS data suggests that just as many children again are looked after by grandparents, other relatives and friends on an informal basis.

Families in the ACT are more heavily reliant on the not-for-profit community sector to provide childcare services. According to the report, the ACT has the highest median cost of centre-based long day care at \$325 per week and the highest median cost for family day care at \$312 per week. This compares to a median cost across Australia of \$285 and \$267 respectively. Despite the importance of the childcare sector to the Canberra community, government support is waning. In real terms, total recurrent expenditure has dropped from \$5 million in 2004-05 to \$4 million in 2008-09. Incorporating net capital expenditure, this translates to a total of \$5½ million in 2004-05 being reduced to \$4.5 million in 2008-09.

This lack of support by the government is linked to a lack of planning and forward thinking. Government documents reveal that the government is unsure of where vacancies are, other than anecdotally. The government is not investing time in planning for new centres. The government is working in silos.

Today the Canberra Liberals call on the government to immediately conduct an audit of childcare services in the ACT to determine where there is a need for additional services. ACT Labor promised two new childcare centres in the 2008 election and committed \$4 million to their construction, but has announced only one—and apparently decreed where it should be rather than consulting on where it is needed.

The audit should focus on the impact of the regulatory changes that will commence in 2012, including the impact on staffing, the impact on the community sector and the impact on overall numbers after the new ratios are implemented. After the results of the audit are known, the government should immediately develop a childcare master plan to help guide the sector through the changes that will take place in 2012. The master plan should consider and address the number of places that are needed into the future and where those places will be required; workforce issues and how to bring more staff into the sector in preparation for 2012; and the need for the creation of a capital funding pool to provide assistance for smaller centres to expand following the introduction of the new childcare ratios.

The Canberra Liberals would provide a centralised waiting list for the community-based childcare organisations in order to provide a one-stop shop for parents and allow the directors of childcare centres to spend more time in the childcare centre. The service would provide ongoing information on demand to parents as well as supporting the community sector. The service could be extended to for-profit centres. Families would not be required to pay a fee to join the list—which is often required by childcare centres.

The total cost of these proposals is quite modest. They would total \$683,000 over four years but would make a real, tangible improvement in this important sector.

This is just one example of looking at and listening to the community, researching and responding to the issue and preparing costed, achievable solutions. Of course, this is only possible if you keep your spending under control. You can invest in quality spending, not just quantity spending. You can get a bigger bang for your buck. But there are advantages to be brought to our city by just doing the job of government better.

As a Liberal government, we would also be focused on supporting small business in the ACT. Although, as we have seen, the federal public service is a major player in our economy, an equally vital component is the small businesses that make up the rest of our economic base. What is even worse, though, is that one of the poorest payers of small business is the ACT government itself. Not only is it not particularly supportive on a broader policy platform; it is actually an active impediment.

**Ms Gallagher:** I do not think we are. Bloody excellent, I think.

**MR SESELJA:** That is not what your figures say. From the tortuous procurement procedures to the ruinous payment policies, many small and even large businesses are thinking twice about working for the ACT government because it is simply bad business. Details of the recent payment history of invoices by the ACT government are quite revealing. In a number of answers to questions asked on notice, we discovered that the financial system operated by the ACT government or by agencies within the ACT government does not have the facility to identify invoices from small and medium enterprises. So how can they be serviced properly? We found that a number of agencies had a significant level of invoices that were considered to be overdue, including Disability, Housing and Community Services, Territory and Municipal Services, the Chief Minister's Department, Education and Training, Health, ACTPLA and Treasury.

As a matter of principle, all governments should pay their debts on time. This is particularly important in small jurisdictions such as the ACT, where the activities of the ACT government are relatively significant in the overall level of economic activity.

SMEs would benefit from receiving revenue on time. This would mean that these entities will have a reduced requirement to fund their operations from overdrafts. Ultimately the efficiency of government should be improved as the Shared Services agency and all other agencies work more effectively to ensure that all invoices are paid in a timely manner.

I know that other parties talk about this. It is in your coalition agreement. But Mr Smyth has concrete legislation ready to go to make it a reality. The fact that you cannot even identify small businesses, let alone service them properly, shows that your commitment to this sector is a sham. That is why we will take legislative action. If you will not do it, we will take the steps to make sure you do. Again, this is not an expensive policy announcement. It is simply better governance and an example of where simply doing business better will result in better business being done in the territory.

Our response to this budget says much about our response to this government, where we differ and where we would change priorities. Make no mistake: we support families. We believe governments must do all they can to support them and their needs, not give in to the urge to impose their ideals upon them. We understand what it is like to live in the suburbs, to put kids through school, and to save for a home and one day make it a better home. If a family needs two cars, they should not be punished or condemned by this coalition government. Instead, they should have roads that work and places to park. This budget does not support those people, but we will.

Homeowners moving into the market through an apartment or retirees downsizing and splitting their blocks are slugged in this budget. We will support them. If a family supports environmental action but cannot afford solar panels, they should not be forced to subsidise a major company to boost their bottom line. This government does not give them choice, but we will. If a family faces bullying at their school, they should be backed up by the strength of the department, not blocked by bureaucrats. This government does not stand up to bullies, but we will.

We stand for families; we stand for business; we stand for opportunity; and we stand for values. This is our calling as a party and as people. We will not back away from those values—not for political gain, not from personal pressure: not now, not ever.

This government has failed those families. You have failed to provide and protect our schools, closing 23 and conning many communities into believing there was hope. And as a parting slap in the face, you made it a joke yesterday, saying that it was easier to close a school than chop down a tree. You failed in our healthcare system, bullying your staff into silence and leaving sick people waiting at the door while you jetted around the world. You failed the basics of keeping our streets safe and our footpaths clean. All over this city, Canberrans are seeing the weeds grow unchecked, the parks lie unkempt, our city centre unsafe. For all the talk of the tiny programs listed in the budget, all the revenue raised and all the money spent, that is what the results are in our streets and our suburbs.

This budget is another wasted opportunity, another tax grab, another spending marathon and another kick in the teeth for Canberra families. This budget fails our finances, fails our families and fails this territory.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER** (Mr Hargreaves): Order, members! It is not appropriate behaviour to clap in the chamber, thank you. If you want to clap, please go outside and do it and have a love-in outside. This is not the place for a love-in, members.

**Ms Gallagher:** Yes, the boys are very excited.

**Mr Barr:** Watch out, Zed; your head might explode.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Order, members! Thank you.

**Ms Gallagher:** The boys are very excited. Go and get a big boy hug now.

**Mr Stanhope:** Kissy, kissy.

**Ms Gallagher:** Off for coffee.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Order! The government side will come to order!

**Mr Hanson:** Didn't anyone clap you, Jon?

**Mr Seselja:** I wanted to clap but no-one else would clap.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Mr Hanson! Mr Seselja, do not tempt me. You are on a warning already. Do not, please, tempt me. Mr Hanson, the same goes for you.

**MS HUNTER** (Ginninderra—Parliamentary Convenor, ACT Greens) (3.07): Every year at budget time we hear about getting the balance right, prioritising, and making choices. Indeed, there are only very limited resources and for years now the Greens

have been arguing that we need to reassess how we use those resources and make more strategic decisions about how we position ourselves for the future. We must all be very conscious that more than ever the choices we make now will have an enormous impact on our future prosperity. Business as usual will not provide long-term prosperity—in fact, quite the opposite.

The Greens' view is that the budget should deliver services for the community, protect the environment and ensure that we all have the opportunity to prosper. To do this we must start to address the challenges before us and recognise the structural changes to the economy that will happen as a result. Preparing our economy for the consequences of climate change, increased population and ageing must be the key aim of our fiscal policy.

We are pleased that the government has adopted some of the Greens' policies and initiatives, particularly the new focus on public transport that the Greens have pushed for so long now. There are also positive community programs and initiatives within this budget that the Greens strongly support.

However, as I said last year, we need to look into the longer term and consider how we will position ourselves for the challenges ahead of us. Well into the economic recovery, we now need to ensure that we take advantage of the recovery and better economic times so that we are insulated against the impacts of any future economic downturns. We also need clever, targeted investment in initiatives that will deliver positive environmental, social and economic outcomes for Canberra.

This budget includes a number of Green initiatives from the ALP-Greens parliamentary agreement that will now be implemented. The measures that we have pushed for represent value for money—small but efficient initiatives that will achieve results and make a practical difference to the people of Canberra: the continuation and extension of the Redex bus service, new park-and-ride facilities, money for swim schools, an increase in mental health funding, a small increase in the purchase of renewable energy, and a feasibility study for the Gungahlin shopfront. Also we are pleased to see a small increase in the energy concession rebate for low income earners and the protection of the community sector from the efficiency dividend—two initiatives we argued for here in the Assembly.

The ACT Treasury summary of economic indicators for March 2010 is quite positive. Everyone is in agreement that we are in a much better economic position than we thought we would be this time last year—consistent growth; low unemployment; a strong housing and construction industry; relatively strong business confidence; and, according to one assessment, currently the best performing economy in the country. All of this means that we are well placed and enjoying a good level of prosperity in what would have otherwise been difficult times.

In April, the Reserve Bank of Australia indicated strong growth in nominal incomes throughout the year and a return to trend levels in a number of indicators. Overall, the assessment was positive and the decision to raise interest rates reflected positive forecasts. However, the RBA did indicate in the March 2010 financial stability review that “Significant challenges and uncertainties for the global financial system remain.”



It should also be noted that the economic consensus now appears to be that the RBA will raise the official cash rate to around five per cent by the end of the year.

The global financial crisis demonstrated harshly that a reliance on traditional economic stabilisers, with little thought to the improvement of those traditional stabilisers, will leave us in a perilous position in future downturns. The default position must be to create fiscal space and ensure that positive economic times lead to improved fiscal positions. Economists have identified the need to create new automatic fiscal stabilisers to help ease economic cycles. The ACT is limited in what it can do in this regard; however, we should all apply ourselves to the task of building on measures such as the energy concession scheme, to ensure that we allocate and provide assistance and services to the more vulnerable in our community in the event of future economic downturns. We very much welcome the energy concessions scheme increase; however, this year we will still see a proportionate decline in the level of assistance provided to low income households.

The next decade will be rich with challenges and opportunities. Our challenge is to maintain our position as an economic leader as we move to a more sustainable economy, build in sufficient safeguards to ensure the prosperity of the ACT during future economic difficulties and have the foresight to take advantage of the opportunities rather than lagging behind and ending up as bystanders to the economic benefits reaped by those who acted earlier.

The GFC compels us to re-assess the aims behind, and the criteria used to evaluate, future fiscal policy decisions. Governments across Australia spent at record levels to combat the crisis. However, very little analysis was done to assess the broader impact of that spending and it appears that very little has been done to ensure that we are protected from such future events.

Economic results this year mean that we will return to the black sooner. This is of course a positive development, and the Greens are pleased to support the revised deficit strategy. We have consistently said that we support a strategy that takes a measured rather than a slash-and-burn approach. There are benefits in governments spending beyond their means to smooth out economic cycles, and deficit spending is appropriate provided it is suitable for the prevailing economic conditions. The Greens' view is that we should maintain a balanced budget over the economic cycle.

We must be very mindful of our underlying position and our ability to deliver services when the commonwealth stimulus money dries up. It is important that whilst we are in deficit we are using borrowed money wisely. Borrowing money for future prosperity is a good thing provided the gains are clear and identifiable. Two key examples that the Greens believe should be pursued, but unfortunately have not been, are preventive health spending and energy efficiency spending. These are areas where investment would reap long-term benefits for the whole community.

It is worth noting that the underlying deficit will peak in the 2010-11 financial year at \$172.7 million and the expectation for this financial year is a net operating surplus of \$54.2 million. This illustrates just how significant commonwealth money is to our economy.

In yesterday's debate on land release and the economy, I quoted an Access Economics report and I think it is worth repeating:

... a piece of good news of late is that the federal government has not been able to restrain itself thus far, still doling out dollars when bad publicity hits the front page. That is poor policy making but it is keeping the ACT's economy ticking over.

The report also states that the territory's medium-term prospects have hung in the balance ever since it became clear that federal government expenditure needed to be reined back in over the next few years. Trends in commonwealth spending and moves to restore the commonwealth budget were identified by the Treasurer as a key threat and as having a significant potential to reduce growth in state final demand. The answer to this is to develop our own sustainable industries, but there appears to be very little strategic investment in sectors that represent the best chance at long-term prosperity.

We must recognise that the four key forces affecting the Australian economy are climate change, the ageing population, the information and communications technology revolution and the re-emergence of China and India. As much as these are challenges, they are also opportunities. The information and communications revolution is not over and the low carbon economy is just beginning. The ACT's resources are not in the ground but in our heads. We are a knowledge-based economy and we should be investing in our strengths.

Other economies have recognised the environmental and economic imperative to shift to a low carbon, green economy. We have a great opportunity to build an economy that will not only help the ACT prosper but will ensure our fair contribution to a more sustainable world. The United Nations Environment Program green economy initiative describes the term "greening the economy" as the process of reconfiguring businesses and infrastructure to deliver better returns on natural, human and economic capital investments, while at the same time reducing greenhouse gas emissions, extracting and using less natural resources, creating less waste and reducing social disparities.

The ACT is well placed to become leaders in renewable energy, energy efficiency, sustainable water systems, biomaterials, green buildings, waste and recycling. The ACT has a small but dynamic manufacturing industry, a less than average proportion of industry share but nevertheless a valuable part of the ACT economy. Given that our education services are more than 50 per cent greater than the national average proportionate share, we should be linking these two sectors and creating a world-class and technology leading manufacturing sector that produces environmentally sustainable products that are also economically sustainable.

We know that public spending in renewable technologies and low carbon initiatives, rather than crowding out the private sector, actually encourages private sector expenditure and stimulates growth in industries that represent the best potential for long-term sustainability. The more we help businesses do the right thing and produce and develop sustainable products, the more businesses can invest in these industries confident of sustained support from government.

To properly address the skills shortage and promote productivity growth, we need to be providing relevant educational opportunities. Whilst we are pleased that there is a significant educational investment, no mention is made of new green skills in the additional \$12.5 million of funding for skilling the ACT. An investment of this magnitude to improve the skilled workforce within a “budget for our growing city” requires a commitment to green skills. Productivity growth is essential, but we need to recognise where the economy is going. I hope the government makes a targeted effort to give people tomorrow’s skills rather than yesterday’s.

A significant focus of the 2009-10 budget that will continue in 2010-11 is a large infrastructure spend. We are spending more than ever before and therefore it is critical that the investment is well targeted to provide benefits for many years to come and is designed to last. Clever infrastructure spending not only creates jobs now; if done well it can also deliver the city we will need in the future and drive change that will provide a lasting and sustainable return once government spending has finished. The welcome investment in the public transport system is a good example of this.

If we look at reporting and accountability, one of the Greens’ key priorities for the Seventh Assembly has been to reform and improve reporting and accountability mechanisms. The parliamentary agreement requires higher standards of accountability, transparency and responsibility in the conduct of all public business. There are still a number of measures in the parliamentary agreement that need to be adopted.

Triple-bottom-line accounting is one of those items. TBL means examining the economic, social and environmental impacts together. We know that the Chief Minister’s Department is undertaking a pilot TBL accounting project, but we need to see this implemented across all government agencies and incorporated in the budget as soon as possible. We need a better framework for government decision making. The Greens would like to see budgeting with a longer term view for the returns on investments and with better analysis of impacts before spending decisions are made.

It is important that triple-bottom-line accounting for each ACT government portfolio includes a detailed set of indicators which reflect the targets of key government strategy documents. The budget papers should contain measurements of progress towards these targets. Reporting against strategic and accountability indicators must be meaningful and measurable.

There seems to be a general lack of carry-through of key indicators from primary government plans into the budgeting and annual reports processes. Achieving these key indicators from already established government plans should be the spending priority. For example, where is the part of the budget that shows us how much funding has been put towards weathering the change, or the Canberra plan or its subsidiary plans?

This information is also not presented in the annual reports, which means that the government expends a lot of resources in developing these many government plans, but the one time each year when strategic decisions on expenditure are made, they do not seem to be made with these strategies and plans in mind. If they are, it is not clear

to anyone on the outside due to the lack of information in the budget papers and annual reports.

I know that the government is in the process of creating a climate change analysis tool and I hope that this will be in use before next year's budget. I also understand that a 2008 paper by the Community Inclusion Board stated that ACT Treasury had agreed to trial a poverty impact analysis in their examination of the management of debts to the ACT government. This was expected to occur in the near future, although I have not yet seen any evidence of this. I hope that this process is also underway.

We also have the unfortunate situation where we now have neither a women's budget statement nor the inclusion of gender impact statements and gender disaggregated data as provided for in the parliamentary agreement. There is a trial underway in ACT Health and I hope that by next year's budget we will have a comprehensive range of analysis tools that will have been applied to budget decisions.

There has also been a modest increase in the Auditor-General's budget attributable to revised wage parameters. I note also that no efficiency dividend will be applied. The Greens believe that the Auditor-General is an essential accountability mechanism. We were very pleased to see that the external performance auditor found that the Auditor-General is providing an important service in an efficient and effective manner and achieving good value from the office's use of the taxpayers' dollar.

In regards to the revenue items outlined in this year's budget, firstly, parking and bus fares are increasing, however, against a backdrop of increased investment in our public transport system, which needs to be paid for. We support encouraging a modal shift and providing people with other transport options that will help build a city where people can move around easily.

A significant revenue item change is the rectification of change of use charges. The Treasurer's assessment is that this comes about because the current law has been erroneously applied and, as a result, those developing properties have been paying less than the legislation requires. We support the proper implementation of the law and believe land should be attributed an appropriate value that provides a fair return for the community whilst not providing an overly burdensome disincentive for increasing urban density.

On land release, I would like to repeat my caution from yesterday, that land is a finite resource and that the significant environmental impacts must be addressed properly from the outset.

I turn now to expenditure and specific expenditure items in this year's budget on health and education. No doubt for most in the community, expenditure on health and education services is what most directly impacts on them. On education, it is a concern that the government's response to two major reviews into parts of the education system, the Shaddock review on special education in the ACT and the review of school-based management, were not tabled prior to this budget as both had resource implications.

The Shaddock review released in December 2009 identified a range of resource allocation issues, particularly around special education. We are pleased to see the government has made a start by allocating \$1.6 million over four years, but we would like to know exactly how the government is going to tackle the special education challenges in the short and long term. This is an area that requires significant investment from the government. While we recognise that investment has grown from \$44.6 million to \$51.4 million since 2004-05, the review shows that much more needs to be done. We are concerned that the funding does not extend to non-government schools given that they were covered by the terms of reference for the review.

The long-awaited review of school-based management in ACT public schools is the second review we have yet to have a government response to. The government's response to the review, combined with the funding of \$600,000 in this budget, must produce the efficiencies to address rising education costs.

While welcoming the establishment of the teacher quality institute overseeing teacher accreditation, registration and certification against nationally recognised standards, we are concerned that the call to support all teachers through more professional learning and relief teaching arrangements has been ignored. Investment in professional development was also a key issue in the Shaddock review.

The Greens welcome the additional funding of \$300,000 over four years allocated to ACT primary schools for the swim and survive program. For some time now the ACT Royal Life Saving Society has raised concerns that our students are slipping below the national benchmark on swimming ability and that there is a widening gap between ACT private school and public school students. Ensuring all primary school students have access to swimming and water survival skills is an important item in the ACT Labor-Greens parliamentary agreement and we are very pleased that it has been adopted.

On health, whilst there are a number of good initiatives and the provision for increased services and facilities to key areas of health care, the missed opportunity is the strategic investment in preventive health initiatives. It is better to keep people well and out of hospital rather than be able to treat them when they get there. The real answer, of course, is that we need to be doing both. I hope that we will see more of a commitment to preventive health measures very soon.

The budget allocates \$1 million a year for four years in new money to mental health services. Whilst it is, of course, welcome, it is inadequate and fails to recognise that mental illness is the leading cause of death and disability for Australians under the age of 44. We need at least twice that amount to ensure the current and growing mental health needs in the community are being addressed. Governments have not made mental illness the health priority that it should be, despite it affecting the lives of so many people. The ongoing inattention to mental health is something that will be attempted to be rectified through the Greens-ALP parliamentary agreement. I hope that the government will fulfil its obligations.

The ACT government has a commitment to making the ACT carbon neutral and the budget provides \$2.6 million over four years to fund the development of policies that

will get us set on that path. With all the work to do in the climate and energy department, we can only welcome this announcement, but let us also be clear about how little extra this is for such a mammoth task: \$2.6 million over four years—that is, \$650,000 per annum for the next four years.

The tasks at hand include developing and implementing policies on energy programs, feed-in tariff, the new action plan for climate change, emissions audits on all our government departments and the introduction into the ACT of electric vehicles. I hope that, as the size of the task becomes apparent to the government during the year, next year's budget might be able to respond to increased need.

A recurring issue as we move into a carbon constrained world is that of equity. Those who are most vulnerable in our society are more likely to be affected by rising electricity prices in a way that is not equitable. While we must make the changes to the electricity market that will drive the bulk of consumers to value electricity in a way that reflects the true cost, we can afford to protect those that we know are most affected by the impacts of climate change and rising energy prices. As I said, we welcome the extension to the energy concessions rebate but energy programs must also target as our very highest priority those vulnerable to energy poverty.

The Greens welcome the \$100,000 feasibility study for a Gungahlin shopfront. Again, this is a parliamentary agreement item and, whilst it is not being built yet, it is a step in the right direction and positive news for the people of Gungahlin.

Improved lighting for footpaths and cycle paths is also welcome as an important part of promoting active transport and giving people other transport options.

One particular disappointment is the government's waste expenditure. There is a real opportunity for us not only to do the right thing environmentally by reducing our waste but also economically. Recycling and waste recovery is an emerging market sector with significant potential for Canberra; so it is particularly disappointing that the government has not moved to address organic waste disposal and reuse and appears to be committing \$4.4 million to landfill rather than taking up cheap and easy initiatives such as battery and light globe recycling. This is a clear example of spending that does not save in the future.

On public transport, we welcome the recognition of the need for greater investment in public transport. Hopefully, this is just the first step in the creation of a world-class, affordable, safe, reliable and rapid transport system that creates a viable and effective alternative to cars. The retention and extension of the Redex bus route from Gungahlin through to Fyshwick as a first step in providing the transformation our public transport system needs is particularly welcome. For too long our public bus system has been seen as a cost burden. It is time to see it as a responsible investment. The consolidation of Redex and the investment in park-and-rides to serve our community will improve patronage, timeliness and efficiency across the entire network.

We encourage the government to build further upon the success of the Redex experiment. Gungahlin is not the only part of Canberra that needs and deserves

a frequent express service. Places like west Belconnen, Weston Creek and south Tuggeranong would benefit hugely from improved service and capacity of their public transport needs. We can and should learn the lessons of the Brisbane busways and Melbourne's tram frequency improvements: that courageous government investment in expanding supply and service quality provides investment returns above and beyond any other transport investment choices. I am sure the government will see that this investment in public transport would be very worth while.

In the community sector it is not such a great story. Investing comprehensively in the community sector and the work they do continues to be a missed opportunity. Community service providers report that they have not received any substantial funding increases to maintain their work, let alone meet the increasing demands that are being placed upon them. The impact of making the dollar stretch further is that a growing number of people are being turned away and are not receiving the services that they need.

We are still awaiting an outcome from the award modernisation process. This is likely to rule for an increase in community sector wages and our expectation is that these increases will be funded by the government.

The Greens welcome the additional \$2 million over four years for the prevention of violence against women and moves in this budget to improve funding of the Women's Legal Centre, particularly the Indigenous liaison officer at the centre. Confirmation by the government that the ILO will be maintained, I am sure, would be most welcome. And the Indigenous liaison officer position at the Women's Legal Centre as well as increased funding into prevention of violence against women were certainly things that my office lobbied the minister for during the budget process.

A considerable amount of effort went into the ACT young people's plan. That was a 2009 to 2014 plan. This plan was launched in December 2009 but this has not been identified as a priority for the 2010-11 financial year, indicative again that the government is writing plans that are not being resourced or implemented. And it just takes us back to the point that there are a number of community organisations who quite clearly said yesterday in the ACTCOSS forum that they really were finding it very tough to be able to deliver their services; they are turning more and more people away from their doors. And we really do need to look at the situation. We do need to properly fund the full cost of that service delivery, because those services provide such value for money and provide such vital services to so many in our community.

But back to the young people: we have the plan but unfortunately no identified money at all in this budget. Community-based youth services continue to experience significant challenges with regard to workforce development, recruitment and retention of workers, while also facing increased demand for service provision. A strong, community-based youth service is vital to address emerging issues and provide targeted support to young people.

The Greens are pleased to see additional funding allocated to the operating costs of Bimberi to ensure staffing ratios are adequate and that the intended rehabilitation and training programs can be run from the centre.

We also note that there was some money in the budget for the multicultural youth services. It was, we do agree, necessary but it was a very small amount. So we do need, as I said, to be looking at the true cost of delivering services and funding that true cost.

Growth for growth's sake in a business-as-usual model is not in our economic, social or environmental interests. The new investment in public transport does represent a significant change to the norm and the Greens are pleased to see this shift in government thinking that, over time, will start to provide a sustainable transport framework.

We are a growing city and the budget does address this. There are a range of initiatives that we welcome. However, while more of the same catch-up spending does provide some very welcome services, it alone does not position us to respond to future challenges or to prosper from future opportunities. What this budget does not do is address how we are growing, what the full extent of challenges of that growth will be and how we can best maximise the opportunities that will come.

In the Greens' assessment of this year's expenditure right across the portfolios, we see a pattern: places where the government can prioritise spending in the future that will deliver savings and long-term benefits, alternatives that build environmental, social and economic sustainability.

So what we have seen on many initiatives—and we do welcome them—is that it has been a modest budget, a lean budget, a budget for its times. It is a budget that does the job. But I guess what we would like to see is that longer term vision about where we need to be going as a city, as a society, as an economy. We need to be looking at how we can shift our economy.

Forty-four per cent of the ACT's revenue comes from the commonwealth and we need to be looking at how we might change the balance. Next week's federal budget will be critical for the ACT. Whatever is brought down in that budget can have a massive impact. And we have already seen through the year what a huge impact the changes to the relativities through the Grants Commission process had on our bottom line. And that was a cut of \$85 million from our GST income. So I also will be looking closely at next week's federal budget to see the impact.

But, with this year's budget, as I said, there are some small steps forward, there are some initiatives that have been funded from the parliamentary agreement. We do see, unfortunately, that there were some missed opportunities in the area of waste.

We would have liked to see some funding for preventive health, because that is good investment for the future. We would have liked to see more funding for mental health. We certainly have not seen money for the community sector but, as I have flagged, there is the wages case that will be coming down in the next several months; so it is our expectation, as I said, that government will come to the party on those wage increases.



So, at the end of the day, we have got a budget that does the job but we would like to see some more connection with the plans that have been developed and that longer term vision, that moving towards a sustainable economy, and we look forward to more investigation of the budget during the estimates process.

**Mr Stanhope:** We can't wait, either, Meredith.

**Ms Bresnan:** I'm sure you can't.

**Mr Stanhope:** We're in agreement on everything.

**Mr Hanson:** As per usual.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER** (Mr Hargreaves): Order, members! Mr Hanson, please.

**Mr Hanson:** The communist alliance.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Mr Hanson!

**Mr Stanhope:** Hear, hear!

**Ms Gallagher:** Poor Jeremy. Feeling unloved.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Chief Minister, Treasurer, please do not bait the unfortunate Mr Hanson.

**Mr Hanson:** Don't wind me up.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Yes. Mr Smyth, you have the floor, uninterrupted, I hope.

**MR SMYTH** (Brindabella) (3.41): Members, it is my melancholy duty to respond to the 2010 ACT budget. It is a melancholy duty because it is a budget that lacks vision and an appropriate response to the circumstances of this time. If you were looking for budget surpluses, you would be disappointed; they are not there. If you were looking for a fiscal policy strategy, you would be disappointed; it is not there. If you were looking for structural change, you would be disappointed; it is not there.

**Mr Stanhope:** You shouldn't be criticising your leader like that.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Chief Minister!

**Mr Stanhope:** He's talking about the statement—

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** I know, but sport is sport, Chief Minister.

**MR SMYTH:** If you were looking for diversification of the economic base, you would be disappointed; it is not there. If you were looking for tax relief in particular,

you would be disappointed; it is not there. If you were looking for smaller government, you would be disappointed; it is not there. If you were looking for a genuine investment in tourism, you would be disappointed; it is not there. If you were looking for bold and forward thinking action, you would be disappointed; it is not there, despite the claim. If you were looking for tough decisions, you would certainly be disappointed, because, despite the claims, there are no tough decisions in this budget.

The Treasurer is pleased that she has been able to report an apparent surplus of \$54 million for the financial year 2009-10. What she did not say is that this is a sham surplus. The only reason there is a surplus is because of the funds flowing from the federal government's various stimulus packages. Without \$158 million of federal government funds, the ACT would have been in deficit. I will say more about this in a moment.

The annual budget for a jurisdiction is meant to provide some vision for where the government of the day sees the jurisdiction evolving. Unfortunately, for the second budget from the Treasurer, this budget fails on all these counts. The Treasurer claims that this budget has a plan, as, indeed, she claimed that the 2009-10 ACT budget had a plan. In budget paper 3 at page 17, the Treasurer acknowledges that the need for a plan remains, and she is right. The sad thing is that we are yet to see a genuine plan for the future of the ACT budget. Sadly, the people of the ACT are still waiting for any plan to extract the territory from the fiscal mess of the recent years and the deficits that are to come.

We did not see a plan in May 2009, and we still do not have a plan today. While there obviously have been some impacts from the global economic and financial crisis flowing through to the ACT, this has not been the complete story. Many commentators are now calling it the North Atlantic crisis or, indeed, simply the North American financial crisis.

What we have seen over the past 12 months is frantic inaction by this government. The Treasurer told us in 2009 that all sorts of decisions would be made to bring the ACT back into surplus. There would be a razor gang, departments and agencies would bring proposals for savings, and these departments and agencies would have their own internal savings strategies. We really do not know what has happened, in fact, with these intentions. What we do know is that, after many months of failing to get a reasonable outcome, the Treasurer had to establish a panel of external advisers to try and find the savings that were sought, and additional funding of \$4.5 million was found to pay these advisers.

In simple terms, what seems to have happened between the 2009 budget and the 2010 budget is that the Treasurer has been sitting in her office a-wishin' and a-hopin' that something would happen and the territory's budgetary issues would be resolved. We are also gratified to read in budget paper 3 on page 20 that the razor gang will continue to meet to develop and assess savings measures. I await those outcomes with interest.

My take on this budget is that it is extremely mundane, even pedestrian in its character. An editorial in the *Canberra Times* noted:

What disappoints, as it so often does, is the failure of the budget—indeed of the whole budget process—to articulate a long-term vision of where Canberra is headed and of how—

the decisions in the budget—

fit in with the plan.

Amen to that! In regard to fiscal policy, let us turn to an overall perspective on the ACT and its economic and fiscal situation. We are well aware that CommSec, one of Australia's respected economic commentators, has rated the ACT's economy as performing extremely well. We understand and accept the basis on which CommSec reaches this conclusion. We welcome it. The concern that I and others have is that, while the ACT economy is performing so well, the budget is looking very dismal with deficits as far as the eye can see. The only conclusion I can come to is that the fiscal management of the Labor government leaves a lot to be desired.

We know that the Labor government budgeted for deficits at the height of the economic boom. This was not responsible economic and fiscal policy. All that happened is that this Labor government continued to spend the revenue boom at a time when this super profit, to use a contemporary concept, should have been put aside. This raises the whole notion of developing sovereign funds, whereby surplus funds can be collected, invested and used judiciously in economic development. Norway is an excellent example of the constructive use of sovereign funds. The Treasurer can talk all day about how strong the ACT's balance sheet is. It is not possible to get away from the fact that if more appropriate fiscal decisions had been made in recent years, the ACT would have been in an even more advantageous situation.

This leads me on to the extraordinary comments from the Chief Minister and former Treasurer when he said on Tuesday that the Labor government while he has been Chief Minister has had eight surplus budgets out of the nine budgets that have been presented. I do not know precisely what the Chief Minister was trying to say with this comment, as he seemed to be confusing concepts. Was he talking about the estimated outcome as presented when a budget is brought down? Was he talking about the actual outcome after the end of each financial year? Was he talking about AAS data or GFS data, or was he confusing both?

Notwithstanding these basic questions, the Chief Minister must be brought to account for this nonsense. According to the relevant budget papers, the Labor government budgeted for a deficit in 2003-04, 2005-06, 2006-07 and the financial year 2009-10. By my count, that is four deficits that were budgeted for out of nine budgets, meaning there were only five estimated surpluses.

On the other hand, if the Chief Minister is talking about actual outcomes for each year, the situation is a bit more complex, because of the changeover from the AAS regime to the GFS. On the basis of all the data that is available to me, using the AAS regime, the budget outcomes since 2001-02 were a surplus in each of the five years to 2006-07.

Using the GFS regime, there was a deficit in four years: 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2008-09. There is no way that the Chief Minister is correct in asserting that either there have been eight budgeted surpluses or that there have been eight surplus outcomes.

The Australian economy has shown good resilience following the global financial crisis as consumer and business confidence has returned, as financial institutions have gradually recommenced lending and as corporate activity such as mergers and takeover proposals have increased. Even though the Australian economy has recovered substantially from the global financial crisis, there is no room for complacency, and that is why this budget is such a disaster. This do-nothing approach from a do-nothing Treasurer leaves us exposed in the future, particularly when we know that the government continues to spend more than it earns.

I note that the Treasurer, although she tried, was not able to debunk any of the figures that the Liberal Party have tabled. That is the problem with this Treasurer; that is the problem with this party—we still have deficits and debts. We are going to have the potential of borrowing up to \$450 million as a consequence of this budget. We are still being taxed higher than ever before, and this government is still spending more than ever, all at a time when it cannot for the next four years deliver a single surplus. That is not a good sign, and it all comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers—in particular, those that live in outlying areas and drive cars.

This is not a budget rooted in reality. If you have a growing family, a young family, living in the outer fringes of this city—whether it be Banks or Conder or Charnwood or Amaroo—if you, on your way to work, have to drop children at childcare or at school or if you drop your spouse or your partner at their workplace, and if you want to do some shopping on the way home and take school-age children to their various activities, whether it be sport or drama or music or whatever it is that they do, you cannot do that on an ACTION bus. You cannot do that when you are being taxed again by this government. They are putting their hands in people's pockets for increased parking costs that are going up 30 per cent. It will be interesting to see the explanation of the fees—

**Ms Gallagher:** I take my children on the bus. They love it. When did you last catch a bus, Jeremy?

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER** (Mr Hargreaves): Order, members! Conversations across the chamber are disorderly.

**MR SMYTH:** We are told as a consequence of the parking fees going up that the revenue raised will increase by 30 per cent. Yet the fee in Civic, for instance, will go from \$9 to \$10.50 a day. That is one-sixth, call it 16 per cent. Perhaps the minister can explain where the increases are by area. I am sure we will explore this when we get to the relevant minister in the estimates. Are there new areas being put in for parking, or are there bigger increases further afield? If there is a 30 per cent increase in the overall take and the supposed increase in an area like Civic, the most expensive area currently, is only one-sixth, then there is some interesting maths being done here.

The other tax is the massive grab on homes. At a time when all parties in this place are committed to increasing the density of this city, we are having the anti-density tax put in place. If you are a young family trying to get into the property market, given that the median house price is about \$550,000 and the median apartment price is just over \$400,000, the only place you can go is to an apartment. Yet apartments are being sluggish by this government with their anti-density tax hike.

The change of use charge as it stands reaps the government some benefit. But what we have heard from the Treasurer today is that there is no analysis about the impact. It is about to be done, the work is about to be done. She could not tell us what the impact was on renters. She could not tell us what the impact was on first homebuyers trying to get into the market. She could not tell us what the impact was on those downsizing, which is also critical to the effective functioning of the housing market in the city because the work has not been done.

What she can tell us through the budget papers is that the massive tax hike is 185 per cent this year and it is \$89 million over the coming four years that the government will collect from change of use charge. She seems to think that it will not have any effect, so we will see what happens. Again, that shows how bereft of genuine policy reform this government is. Although I do note on pages 98 and 99 that the Treasurer's advance has now been put in as a reduction method. We are going to take 25 per cent off the one per cent. I have visions of Mr Stanhope last year standing up here and saying, "Mr Seselja's bizarre slash-and-burn plan that he took to the electorate last October included a reduction of the Treasurer's advance". So, last year it was bizarre and it was slash and burn; this year it is good fiscal policy.

**Ms Gallagher:** Yes, to pay for your stupid election promises. It was a 50 per cent reduction to pay for your reckless spending.

**MR SMYTH:** There you have it, Mr Assistant Speaker.

**MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER:** Order, members! I know it was a funny joke; I know it was amusing, but Mr Smyth has the floor, all by himself.

**MR SMYTH:** Last year it was bizarre, it was slash and burn, this year it is good fiscal policy. We are pleased you have seen the sense of it, but we are also pleased that you have been caught out and hoist on your own petard. It just shows how appalling this government is.

We are often criticised for not giving praise where praise is due. There are a few things here that I am very happy with—for instance, the film investment fund. Mr Hargreaves will remember in 2002 when I called for a film industry in the ACT. It is great to see a Liberal idea being funded; that is very good. I am sorry Mr Corbell is not here, because after hammering him for almost two years on a new fire shed for the Tidbinbilla Rural Fire Service, the shed has arrived. There is \$1.6 million for a new fire shed at Tidbinbilla. That is very welcome.

Of course, it is a shame Mr Barr, the automatic teller machine of the ACT Assembly, is not here. Members will remember in the debate on the racing industry earlier this

year that Mr Barr said: “I’m not here to fund industry. I’m not the automatic teller machine of the ACT Assembly, and they’re not getting the money.” Well, under pressure from the Assembly, under pressure from the Canberra Liberals, under pressure from the community and industry, he buckled, as he does so often. He has done the backflip, and the industry have got the money they deserve. That is a good thing, too. So, there you are, Treasurer—a few ticks, but a whole lot more work needs to be done. (*Time expired.*)

**MS BRESNAN** (Brindabella) (3.57): Budgets are a time when governments present to their community not only their plans for financial management but also their visions for the future. Given this budget is a tight one—possibly the tightest we will have in this Assembly—worthy of examination are what the government identifies as priority areas of spending and where the Greens differ in policy on these issues.

With regard to transport, the Greens welcome the shift in focus by the government from road construction towards a more balanced approach that accepts the importance of public transport as a means of building capacity and sustainability into the future. The announcements of improved bus stations at major employment and residential centres will go some way to improving the experience of public transport, and the bus priority measures will improve timeliness of services along Canberra and Northbourne avenues. These are measures that the Greens in the Assembly, as well as other transport groups, have been calling for over many years. The ACT Greens and the Queanbeyan Greens campaigned on the Canberra Avenue transit lane during the 2008 ACT election.

However, the Greens believe that this budget does only enough to maintain the status quo. It improves services for those who currently use public transport, and should encourage more people, particularly in the north of Canberra, to start using public transport, and it will cope with small projected increases in usage dictated by factors external to ACTION such as parking and fuel prices.

There is a wealth of research and evidence that shows that improving frequency and capacity provides a substantial return on investment, not only for a particular route but across the entire network. The Redex trial, which we welcome and acknowledge the government for establishing as a permanent part of the network—and it was a part of the Greens and Labor parliamentary agreement—demonstrated this. It is disappointing that the government has not identified any further high-frequency express routes within this budget. We acknowledge there is further work coming through the work undertaken by Jarret Walker. However, this would have been the chance, due to the great success of Redex, to introduce this service to another area of Canberra such as Belconnen or Woden.

The solution to reducing congestion has typically been to build more roads. It is true that in the short term wider roads can reduce travel time, but this is never a long-term solution as in the long term new lanes congest as passengers shift from public transport to roads until a new equilibrium is reached, little or no better than the old congestion problem.

The only effective long-term solution to congestion on roads is to improve non-congestible networks in terms of frequency, capacity and timeliness. Doing so

improves the standard of public transport, attracts drivers to the alternatives and reduces congestion. This is a fundamental and widely recognised precept of transport economics and one which we believe the government could be giving far greater consideration to if we want to avoid unnecessary expenses to government associated with road building and high emissions from congestion and to assist families who wish to save money while making responsible, sustainable transport choices.

It has been said in the media that the Health portfolio was a big winner through the budget. That statement is correct if you look at the amount of money going towards acute services. But the Greens question whether the health of our constituents will be better off in the long run. As our community ages and chronic disease and disability increase, we are expecting large increases in demand for health services.

Recent discussions between the state, territory and federal governments have essentially seen a shift of funding responsibility to the federal government. This move has been labelled as reform of our hospital system. But is it reform and is it what we really want? It appears governments are accepting of the levels of illness that will be presenting to hospitals. If we really want to achieve improvement in people's quality of life and health status, we should be trying to decrease the demand that will be presenting to our hospitals. And we can only do this if we assist people in making healthier choices and make primary health care available when it is needed.

It is disappointing that two-thirds of the new money coming from the commonwealth to the ACT Health budget is for acute measures, and it does appear that state and territory governments are accepting this without making a case for improving preventive and primary care.

Unfortunately, the case for good policy does not always make for good politics. Political parties in government tend to favour measures that are highly visible to the voter. This comes to the detriment of those people suffering an illness that is less visible in presentation, such as mental illness, who require services delivered by people as compared to buildings and machines. The Greens would argue that we should be looking to evidence-based policy in response to health policy challenges.

Studies have shown that investing in preventive health pays off in the long term. A recent US study, *Prevention for a healthier America*, shows that for every dollar invested in proven community-based disease prevention programs such as increasing physical activity, improving nutrition and reducing smoking levels the return on investment over and above the cost of the program would be \$5.60 within five years.

I note that last year a strategic review was conducted of the ACT health promotion grants program, but the review did not ask whether or not the government was investing the required amount in health promotion. The government needs to step back and take a look at the bigger picture if it is to provide vision and leadership to the community in addressing the health challenges our future population will present.

The Greens give significant priority to funding for mental health services and are disappointed that this budget does not provide a greater percentage of new health money to this area. I note there will be \$1 million per year in new funds for this area,

but we need at least twice this amount. If we are to address the ongoing and future needs of the community in this area, much greater investment is required to prevent the cycle of crisis that can occur in the lives of people with mental illness.

The AMA, Mental Health Community Coalition and Lifeline have also spoken out in concern. Mental illness still remains a taboo subject to many people, and I applaud Lifeline's current efforts to make the community and governments aware that mental illness is the greatest factor affecting the mortality and morbidity of Australians under the age of 44.

I would also like to note that HACC funding is not preventive funding and to include it as such is very disingenuous.

The budget for disability is fairly hit and miss. Groups are pleased to see additional funding for carers and support for autism and Asperger's. Some funds have been allocated to the provision of government disability services and planning for the replacement of centre-based respite houses. However, growth in unmet need and demand continues, especially, it seems, in the areas of housing and post-school options. It is disappointing that the ACT government is no longer allocating a reasonable proportion of the stimulus housing to people with a disability. In looking forward, I would like to see the government build into its budget an allocation for disability growth, similar to ACT Health. Each year, for example, we see about 12 students from Black Mountain finish school, but some are unable to gain financial assistance to enter a post-school option.

With regard to ageing, the ACT Greens are pleased that the 55 Plus Club facility in Tuggeranong is funded in this year's budget so that construction can begin. The Greens also welcome the positive ageing strategy released last year; but it is unclear how resource allocation will be prioritised in this budget.

The Greens are concerned that funding required for the increased number of people requiring community and palliative care nursing at home is not being met in this year's budget. The increased demand for at-home care is being funded from the HACC budget, putting too much pressure on the community care system, a system already stretched. Due to the ageing of the ACT population, the demand for ageing in place will only increase. I do acknowledge that housing for older people incorporates ageing in place principles and this should address some of the demand.

The Greens welcome the government's budget commitment to Multicultural Youth Services, although it does not go far enough. Since last year we have been working very hard to get the government to support this service. Since the social inclusion fund expired and new funding was not found in last year's budget, the ACT Greens have been disappointed with the cutting of essential services to MYS, including the highly successful drop-in centre in Civic. We are pleased the government has now recognised the valuable service MYS provides to migrants and refugees.

The ACT Greens welcome the multicultural strategy for 2010 to 2014 released last year. However, like some of the other plans, it is unclear what initiatives in this strategy are funded in this year's budget. Furthermore, we would like to see the



strategic indicator for multicultural affairs expanded to include more than the participation figures of the Multicultural Festival, as this is outdated and does not represent the success of the delivery of essential services on the ground.

With regard to the housing portfolio, I note that a large part of the stimulus package is to be delivered this year and that the ACT government has been able to manage the package in a way so that we can achieve more with the funding package that has been provided. This achievement is to be highly commended. But I am concerned that we are yet to see how the ACT government will maintain those stock numbers, both in public and in community housing, once they have been delivered.

A recent answer to a question on notice I put in shows that the ACT government plans to continue selling about 70 dwellings a year. While I expect some of them will be replaced elsewhere with the profits made, it is not clear that all will be replaced and the gains made by the stimulus package will be maintained.

The Greens must note with concern that there have been few significant new budgetary measures relating to corrections, specifically through-care and after-care. We recognise that resources for the escort of prisoners go some way to providing care for the duration of a prisoner's stay within corrections facilities, but we believe the government should be applying more resources to managing rehabilitation both within the walls of the AMC and beyond.

We made mention at the start of this week of the concept of cultural change within the corrections department. Corrections must manage prisoners with an eye to supporting rehabilitation from the moment they enter the system to when they fully integrate back into the community, and, while the development of the AMC goes some way to providing frameworks within the prison system itself to better support measures that reduce reoffending, we need to concentrate upon the post-prison environment.

It is understandable that, without assistance, it is difficult to re-engage with society, which is a significant factor in an individual's likelihood of reoffending. Whilst community support groups exist, the current transitional process is not coordinated, support services often overlap, and it would be greatly improved by better management as part of the discharge process. Appointment of a through-care and after-care manager for non-government services to manage the transition process and coordinate access to social and community services for prisoners would be a sensible investment decision in reducing reoffending and crime overall.

The ACT Greens support in principle the combination of WorkSafe and WorkCover into a single, integrated unit, and we trust that the more efficient use of these resources will translate into greater numbers of inspections and compliance checks. We have expressed concerns this year that the enforcement function of ORS conducts inspections too infrequently to be a credible deterrent to noncompliance. The ACT Greens expect the government to commit to improving the record of ORS in terms of compliance with regulations and safety checks.

Just in relation to my electorate of Brindabella, the ACT Greens welcome the government's commitment to the Erindale and Tuggeranong master plans, which we

have pushed for over the last year and through our motion on the Erindale master plan in the Assembly. These master plans will give local business and residents the opportunity to contribute to the development and growth of their area. The announcement of the feasibility study for a CIT learning centre in Tuggeranong is welcomed, especially for the young people living on the south side. We have worked hard to secure the provision of a park-and-ride facility on the south side, in this instance Erindale, and the ACT Greens included this as part of the parliamentary agreement. We would like to see more of these facilities included in future budgets for areas such as Calwell.

The Tuggeranong area has not received a significant amount of investment compared to other areas in past budgets, and I do think this budget has more for the Tuggeranong area than previously.

**MR HARGREAVES** (Brindabella) (4.11): Members, when I entered this place in 1998 it was to do my best to get the runs on the board for my electorate. It was really tough, actually, in those days because we had a Liberal government. It is not so tough now. While difficult decisions were made in previous budgets to enable the territory to steer a sound financial course, I am delighted that this government, a good Labor government, has enabled transport, health, education and the development of valuable community assets to be high priorities in the 2010-11 territory budget.

Members would be aware that I have maintained an active interest in all matters relating to service delivery in the electorate, and I am just delighted to see initiatives close to my heart find fruition in the 2010-11 budget. Let us have a good look at a number of these initiatives.

The standout is without a doubt the \$14 million committed to enhancing services provided at the Tuggeranong Health Centre. Indeed, when I was the manager of the south side health centres with Ian McNeill, who is in my office, we actually were part of the decision to build it at that particular site; so I am delighted to see its enhancement, as indeed will Mr McNeill.

For the benefit of any member for Brindabella that does not live in the electorate, the Tuggeranong Health Centre is located on the corner of Anketell Street and Pitman Street in the town centre. It is a three-storey building opposite the Tuggeranong bus interchange. For those people that do not know what a bus interchange looks like, it is adjacent to the Tuggeranong Health Centre. Both of them are adjacent to the park-and-ride. And for those who do not know what a park-and-ride is, it is where you can park your car, hop on a bus, but only pay once. Isn't that a good initiative? Isn't that a good initiative by the Labor government?

**Mr Hanson:** It is if you have lost your licence.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Mr Hanson is saying across the chamber: "Thank you for that, Mr Hargreaves. I had no idea what those facilities were." Now he does. Of course, the identification—for absent members that is—of these great government services for Tuggeranong provides a perfect segue into further initiatives contained in the budget.

Public transport is about reliability and amenity. And what does the budget provide? It provides \$3.15 million for a major bus station at Erindale. It provides \$4.1 million over four years to develop park-and-ride facilities, including one at Erindale, which will no doubt augment the major new bus station. And there is more. You did not have steak knives, did you? And there is more, as I say. There is \$700,000 for—

**Mr Hanson:** Trying to be funny, John?

**MR HARGREAVES:** Mate, I could not match you. Since Superman died there has never been a match for you. Madam Assistant Speaker, there is \$700,000 over four years for bike-and-ride facilities, including one at Erindale. The bike-and-ride facility is one of the most magic things that we have provided. I do not know if members are aware of why it took so long.

We had facilities in Civic for bike-and-ride. I do not know if you do recall this, Madam Assistant Speaker, because I know you are committed to that sort of stuff. The government was actually advised by the security experts at the time of the September 11 explosions thing in America—

**Mr Hanson:** Explosions thing?

**MR HARGREAVES:** that, in fact—we can be picky but Colonel Klink knows the difference between an explosion and something that goes bang in the night, and certainly he has not gone bang in the night for some time. What happened was that the security people said, “Do not put them in the city where there is mass transport because if we get a terrorist attack it will take out too many people.” So the government has always been reluctant to put the bike facilities elsewhere in Canberra. However, we did observe the success of that particular facility in Auckland; so we have overcome that fear, which is great.

We have also got \$2.75 million for new bus stops, shelters, signs, lights and bike racks on major bus routes, including Tuggeranong. This is just fabulous. Yes, those opposite have heard right: the government has made a massive investment in health and transport. It is a massive investment. I have heard that word “massive” before today.

**Mr Hanson:** Your massive tax on homes, John.

**MR HARGREAVES:** What is that about a massive fax? I do not know. Madam Assistant Speaker, is that the ghost of Steve Pratt that I heard moaning just then? It cannot be. But I know that he was a bit iffy about new on-road and off-road cycles and community paths, and now we have got \$1 million going into that too. This, of course, is dear to Mr Rattenbury’s heart. I reiterate what I said before. We went to the forum and advocated that to the opposition; so no wonder they are whinging about that \$1 million.

What does impress me is that this government, through this budget, continues to enhance and support this massive new investment of \$54 million in the Kambah P-10 school with a further \$240,000—

**Mr Hanson:** Don't choke, mate.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Nothing worse than the flu, Jeremy—except being in opposition. I take it back.

**Mr Hanson:** When you are in government, I agree with that.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Suck it up and get used to it.

**Mr Hanson:** It is a flu on Canberra. You made it sick.

**MR HARGREAVES:** You know what it is? Even God does not like you—

**Mr Hanson:** Not particularly religious, John.

**MR HARGREAVES:** because he maintains you in purgatory forever. We have to acknowledge the \$240,000 for the design of the pedestrian link across Drakeford Drive to improve the safety for students.

Just on that new school, I can report, particularly for the education of those opposite, that construction is going gangbusters. It is huge. This massive new building site—there is that word “massive” again—is a great reminder to my constituents of the government's genuine commitment to developing education not only across the territory but particularly in the valley.

You may ask, Madam Assistant Speaker, whether the government's spatial view of education stops there. It certainly does not. A further \$250,000 is slotted for a feasibility study into expanding the range of learning services provided by the CIT learning centre in Tuggeranong.

There is a further \$14.5 million over four years to support students and staff in three new schools, including the new Kambah P-10 school. But, of course, this government's investment in Brindabella does not stop there. Let us not forget the \$150,000 investment in road design for Ashley Drive between Erindale Drive and Johnson Drive.

This is another example of focusing on improving urban infrastructure and laying the groundwork for further improvement in road amenity for that part of Tuggeranong. Let us not forget that it was this government that duplicated Tharwa Drive and completed the duplication of Athllon Drive around the Tuggeranong town centre.

When I was sitting in the exact seat that Mr Hanson is sitting in, I was badgering the Liberal government to do that, and they did not do it. Now it is done. In addition, there will be a further \$615,000 for new bridge screens to prevent rock throwing at vehicles on ACT roads and \$200,000 for design work on Gudgenby bridge on the Naas Road to further assist those south of the Murrumbidgee River.

That commitment also extends to bushfire safety, as demonstrated by the \$1.6 million over four years for the Tidbinbilla Rural Fire Service shed. Mr Smyth's

congratulations to Mr Corbell on the provision of that facility are warmly welcomed—

**Mr Corbell:** Yes, I don't think he said a thing.

**MR HARGREAVES:** He said it with tongue firmly in cheek, I am sure.

**Mr Corbell:** Did he?

**MR HARGREAVES:** Well, there was something in his cheek. The list goes on. What is important is that the government's priorities are clear and unambiguous. There is nothing clear and there is nothing unambiguous about those opposite. But our priorities are clear and unambiguous. Urban planning and the design for Erindale and Tuggeranong town centres will get a boost of \$300,000. Traffic safety around schools across the territory gets a further \$1.3 million and the operation of the Lakeside Leisure Centre next to Lake Tuggeranong is supported with over half a million dollars.

Just as importantly, community safety was again at the forefront of this budget with an additional funding of \$9.175 million for the provision of 16 extra police officers. It would be an interesting number if the minister for police would actually work out how many police officers have been put on the beat by this government since we came to power.

**Mr Corbell:** 127.

**MR HARGREAVES:** I hear from the minister that it is 127. How about that? In percentage terms that would be significant. It would be awful—I would not want to be a shadow police minister, would you? No, not with those sorts of numbers.

**Mr Corbell:** It is just over 10 per cent.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Just over 10 per cent; well, what do you know? Mind you, I must say that they have been very quiet about their criticism of having extra police on the beat.

**Mrs Dunne:** Madam Assistant Speaker, this is not a conversation. This is a—

**Mr Corbell:** You just do not like it. You just do not like it.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Hello, Mrs Dunne's back from having a Bex and a good lie down. That is good. Welcome back. Welcome back, Mrs Dunne.

**Mrs Dunne:** No. I was trying to think of ways of doing you slowly, sunshine.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Oh, cranky-pants has had her cranky pill again.

**Mr Hanson:** Fifteen-minute speeches—it is a long time without a drink, isn't it, John?

**MR HARGREAVES:** It is. I shall have one. Thank you very much, Mr Hanson.

**Mr Hanson:** Probably the longest you go without a drink every day, isn't it?

**MR HARGREAVES:** You do try, don't you? You do try. It doesn't work. I have to say though that that sort of accusation coming across the chamber merely diminishes your standing across the rest of the place. It also occasionally diminishes the standing of this place, because most people expect more and better of their elected members than that sort of behaviour. However, if you want to try me out too, Mr Pratt, knock yourself out. If you want to go down in history about being the modern-day Steve Pratt, knock yourself out.

**Mr Hanson:** They're proud of you.

**MR HARGREAVES:** One of these days, you know, you will upset me, but you have got a long way to go yet. I have been insulted by experts. I have been upset by experts and, Madam Assistant Speaker, Mr Hanson is not an expert.

**Mr Hanson:** We could save what you earn—about 120 a year. We could make a saving right now.

**MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER** (Ms Le Couteur): Mr Hanson, please let Mr Hargreaves speak in silence.

**Mr Hanson:** He is enjoying it.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Members will be aware of my commitment to the development of the southern cemetery and I am delighted to see the government respond to that commitment with an investment of \$300,000 for advanced tree planting for the site.

I know, Madam Assistant Speaker, that you have an interest in the opinions of the territory's youngest citizens. I am sure that they will tell you that the \$1.2 million for playground safety upgrades is money well spent, and it is not good money after bad either. It is good money.

Importantly, the Murrumbidgee Country Club and the Yowani Country Club are being provided with combined funding of \$300,000 for non-potable water projects. They have been asking for this for some time. Heritage sites are not forgotten, with \$730,000 for upgrades and restoration. But like any narrative, it is important to leave the best until last. Here we go.

Can I say, members, that I am excited about the new breeding programs at Tidbinbilla for the Tasmanian bettongs and the grassland earless dragons. These will be established and, very importantly, the corroboree frog breeding program will be continued. That is good news. That really is good news.

**Mrs Dunne:** Are we going to have a safety switch this time?

**MR HARGREAVES:** Mrs Dunne displays her ignorance yet again. Finally, a measure that I have long believed necessary appears this year. It is the 12-month trial of a free annual collection of bulky waste for pensioners and concession cardholders.

**Mrs Dunne:** For some of your bulky waste collection.

**MR HARGREAVES:** Somebody certainly is involved with waste and it would have to be the Liberal Party. They are the experts in waste. Madam Assistant Speaker, this is a responsible budget in trying times. This is a responsible budget in uncertain times. I commend the budget to the Assembly.

**MR HANSON** (Molonglo) (4.25): What an honour it is to follow that fine speech! It is just as well, Mr Hargreaves, that the government is investing in Brindabella because they are certainly not getting value for money from you as their member.

In terms of speeches, though, I would like to commend the Leader of the Opposition, firstly, for the great speech that he gave today, that I thought was a very insightful analysis of the mistakes that have been made by this government not only in this budget but in the budgets prior, in the eight leading up to this one. It was a very fine speech. I commend Mr Smyth also for his insightful comments.

When we turn to speeches, if those of us that were at the budget breakfast reflect back—I do not think Mr Hargreaves was there; he was still in bed—it was a turning point in the community and certainly in the business community. If you saw what happened there, Jon Stanhope was largely irrelevant. He was sitting there; all he seemed to be concerned about was the arboretum, which is clearly a legacy project of his; attacking groups that had dared criticise his budget; making flippant remarks about closing schools being easier than cutting down trees. Quite clearly, the man has become irrelevant.

So what was left was for Katy Gallagher to deliver her “it’s not my fault” speech: “It is not my fault that the budget is so uninspired and it is not my fault that it is going into deficit because it is the GST or the GFC. They are both to blame.”

But when Zed Seselja spoke on the budget breakfast morning, he stripped away the spin. He stripped away the deceit of this government that has been saying it has not had enough money and crying poor and he proved quite clearly that this government has got more money coming in in revenue than it ever expected, than ever came in during the boom times. My expectation is that, by the end of this budget period, it will have twice as much money in revenue per annum than it had when it came into power.

So there was an actual shift in mood in the Press Club that morning. What actually occurred was that Katy Gallagher gave her speech and people were listening. I think that Katy Gallagher can deliver a sort of sense of reassurance and that is what she does.

But what happened was that, when Zed spoke, it stripped away the deceit; it stripped away the excuses; and she was left with nothing. The amount of people that have been contacting my office, and I imagine that of the other members of the ACT Liberals, to say that was a real turning point is significant. “We now understand where you are at and we are confident that you have got a good chance of being the next government and we are behind you.” The number of people who come into my office is significant.

So people in this community are starting to realise that this government fails to deliver on what it promises and it is more about spin and excuses than it is about delivering outcomes.

So it clearly is not a budget for the future. It is not a budget for today. What we are seeing from this government is what we have seen before, which is that we are paying more, we are waiting longer and we are getting less across so many different categories. It continues with the reckless spending, it continues with the high taxes but it contains no real investment in some important areas for the future.

I will go through my shadow portfolio, actually starting with health which is in many ways the most important category and portfolio for the whole of the ACT. This year, health funding exceeds \$1 billion, representing nearly 29 per cent of the ACT budget. However, when we look at the areas the government is focusing on in this budget, we see that funding is merely chasing expected growth in demand for services. It does not bode well for the community, considering that this government, since coming to office, has consistently failed to meet demand across a number of services in our health system.

This is demonstrated in the government's own statistics and is highlighted by me every time the ACT statistics place us at the bottom, or near the bottom, compared to any other jurisdiction in Australia on a range of health performance indicators. To put it bluntly, there is nothing in this budget to suggest that the waiting times for elective surgery, access block, beds per capita, emergency department waiting times, GPs, bulk-billing—and I could go on endlessly—will actually be addressed or improved in any significant or meaningful way.

I remind members in this place what the latest health figures show from this budget and from the recent Productivity Commission's report on government services. The latest comparable data show that emergency department waiting times for the ACT continue to remain unacceptable. The number of category 3 patients seen on time is still well below target levels. Although there has been a minor improvement, in category 4 it is still dismal and the lowest in the country, 56 per cent against a 75 per cent target.

The latest ACT Health quarterly performance report showed also that, for the six months to December last year, over 5,000 people, or nearly 10 per cent of all emergency department presentations, simply did not wait to be seen. They turned up and gave up. It is absolutely shocking.

For elective surgery, our waiting times are well and truly the worst in the nation. The latest comparable data shows that the median waiting time for elective surgery in the ACT was 72 days, against a national average of 34 days. And I remind you that that was 40 days when this government came to power. It has almost doubled. That length of time you wait for elective surgery has almost doubled in the time of the Stanhope-Gallagher government.

I also note that fewer people were removed from the waiting list last year than were added and the ACT recorded the highest proportion of patients waiting longer than a year for elective surgery, 10.3 per cent against a national average of three per cent.



GP numbers remain a significant cause for concern, with the ACT continuing to experience one of the worst shortages in the nation. We require about 140 doctors or GPs to achieve parity with the rest of the nation.

In terms of bulk-billing, the ACT continues to be well behind the rest of the nation on a number of services. The latest comparable data shows that only 51.1 per cent of services were bulk-billed, compared with an Australian average of 79.2 per cent. So addressing this should be a priority at all levels of government. But we see nothing in this budget to address that.

The number of hospital beds per 1,000 is 2.5. This is the lowest in the nation and in fact does not take account of the nearly 30 per cent of use that comes from New South Wales; so the stats are probably actually worse than presented. We also have the lowest number of public dentists per capita.

So I am putting the context of where this budget was delivered and I am very dismayed to be standing here saying all of this. I recall being in the same place last year and challenging the government to improve on those figures. But we have seen very little in terms of upward movement, in terms of improving people's access to our hospital system. So instead of congratulating the government, I find myself almost repeating those same criticisms.

The minister in her speech so explicitly said that this is a budget that is responding to the health needs of Canberrans now and not the future. So she has admitted that that is the case. This is a budget that is not aimed at the future, that has no vision in it. It is not going to make the changes that we need in our health system to adapt to an ageing and growing population.

We certainly recognise the funding that is in the budget for an additional 800 elective surgery procedures, and it is absolutely necessary to have that. And it is an acknowledgement from the government that there is a particular need, and this is a particular need where we actually require attention. We do hope to see more detail, however, on how the government will deliver the level of surgery that is required in these high-demand areas, particularly for specialties experiencing very long delays and capacity issues such as urology, orthopaedics, general surgery and neurosurgery. So I will be looking very closely at those capacity issues and seeing how the government is going to address the staffing shortfalls.

Although there is a lot of promise and there is money in the budget, it will mean nothing if the government cannot actually deliver. And what we do see from this government in terms of elective surgery and in terms of emergency departments, despite the amount of money that they throw at our health system—and we know that we are spending more per capita than anywhere else in Australia other than the Northern Territory—is that they simply do not have the ability to get the job done.

The extra funding for cancer services outlined in the budget is well overdue and this is an area which we know has been experiencing significant pressures in recent years. I think we all remember the case of the cancer patient just recently who had the very

traumatic experience of having to go to Sydney, and the many others who are in the same situation as she is.

When you look at the new spending initiatives, what you will see is that it is not born out of vision or an attempt to get ahead of the capacity issues that we are experiencing but is simply out of necessity. It is a reactive rather than a proactive approach. It is simply a matter of keeping pace with demand rather than any change, structurally or systemically, to make the changes that we need in our health system.

I note that there has been a review of outputs across the budget and over \$13 million has been transferred into early intervention and prevention from other areas. So there is a bit of movement around, but I think it is quite clear, when you look at the actual money that has been allocated in mental health services, in public health services, there is just no explanation of why it has been transferred. But it is certainly an inadequate amount, when you look at the outputs in the community that have a focus on prevention, on detection and early intervention as opposed to simply pouring more money in the acute end of the spectrum.

We have got to be able to do both. We have got to make sure that we are not simply neglecting the prevention, early intervention and detection; otherwise we will find that, budget after budget after budget, all we are going to be able to do is have to keep pouring more money time and again into the acute end.

There is no money for GPs in this budget. There is nothing there for probably one of the most critical areas in our community. So despite the fact that this government has had an Assembly inquiry that reported and had its own task force inquiry, we see nothing in response from this government to put additional money into the budget for GPs. And I think that is a great concern to the primary health community and it would be a great concern to the patients who are desperately trying to access a GP in the ACT.

On the issue of the national health and hospital reform, it is still unclear, I think, to many people how that is actually going to play out and how that funding mix is going to occur in the ACT, what the true impacts of that are, how the case-mix funding will be delivered, how it will be calculated, what the penalties will be if we do not actually meet our targets for elective surgery and our emergency departments. A lot of that is unclear, and the minister is at a loss to explain that.

She is also at a loss to explain quite what will happen with our regional hospital network. Will Queanbeyan, Cooma and Yass be included in that or not? The Prime Minister said that they were going to be and that is the way it was going to work, but Katy Gallagher on the radio then said, "No, we are a way off that actually occurring." So it is very difficult to know whether there is a need for that to occur or not.

If you recall, this was signed off before any due diligence was done on the impact of taking those hospitals and what it would actually mean for the ACT. So Jon Stanhope went into that agreement without having done any review, any due diligence to make sure that those hospitals would not have a significant negative impact if we took them as a region.

His approach, rather than fighting tooth and nail for everything he could for the ACT, as Victoria was doing, as New South Wales was doing, as WA was doing, was to actually say, "Let's go to the bar." I think that is an absolute abrogation of the Chief Minister's responsibilities and is yet again a demonstration that he is a man who has given up and does not really care about what is actually going on in the ACT unless it is to do with his arboretum.

In the capital works program, again, we are seeing about \$50 million of slippage this year, which is on the back of \$57 million of slippage from last year. So when the government talks about delivering in health, when it talks about the capital asset development plan, then I think we can rightly say it will not be delivered on budget, it will not be delivered on time and it will not be delivered on scope, because it never is.

In fact, I have a list of things that are slipping. They include the women's and children's hospital, the adult health inpatient facility, the secure adult mental health unit, the Gungahlin health centre, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander drug and alcohol unit and the TCH multistorey car park as examples. And most of those are not just delayed in this budget but from others.

In terms of other portfolio areas, I notice that there are additional police officers. And I welcome those. But they are not front-line police in terms of addressing the violence that we have in our community, the assaults, the break and enters, the car thefts. They are not actually front-line police officers. Although they are in there and are going to be getting lots of revenue so that they are cost neutral, it is yet another way this government is grabbing revenue from the community. But what I do note is that there are no additional police, essentially, on the beat.

In terms of corrections, there is a slight increase in corrections funding but there is nothing that we can see that is actually going to address the issue, and that is that we are paying more for corrections in the ACT than anybody else and each prisoner is costing us in the order of \$504 a day.

In the time that I have left, I really reiterate the point that this is not a budget for today, it is not a budget for the future. Again, we are going to pay more, we are going to wait longer and we are going to get less.

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (4.40): Madam Assistant Speaker, today we have heard in this debate the Canberra Liberals' acknowledgement that the economy is strong.

**Mr Hanson:** The economy is strong.

**MRS DUNNE:** The economy is strong; it is a shame about the budget. That is the message. We have heard that the woes of the global financial crisis are largely behind us. We have heard that employment in the ACT is strong, with high participation rates and low unemployment rates. We have heard that inflation is pretty much under control. We have heard that ACT revenues are stronger than ever before. Indeed, they are so strong that by 2013-14 they will be the most ever collected by the territory. And we have heard that territory expenses are to grow even higher, such that deficits are to continue and borrowings are to increase.

It was interesting that Mr Hanson made the comment that, when going back to his notes on what he said last year, he found that he had to say the same things again—the challenges were still there. If the ministers who attended the ACTCOSS forum yesterday had been courteous enough to turn up and listen to what ACTCOSS had to say about the budget, rather than just fly in and give their piece and leave, they would have heard that every one of the speakers from ACTCOSS had basically the same thing to say. They had looked at what they said last year and they felt that that would be the same analysis for this year because nothing had changed for the community sector.

The ministers were late and they were discourteous to the community sector. Therefore, they did not hear what ACTCOSS had to say about the problems in the budget. It was interesting to listen to what ACTCOSS had to say about the budget and to hear the message, yet again, that there is nothing left to give in the community sector budget, yet they are always asked to give more. We have to ask where the expenditure is going.

I looked at some people in the community sector and how they are doing. I looked, for example, at the plight of grandparents and other carers who look after the children of their children or other relatives. This is not a foster care situation that we are talking about. In saying that, I do not in any way downplay the critical importance of foster care in our community. The difficulties those incredibly generous foster parents face in taking on the care of other children can never be underestimated.

But the people who look after their grandchildren and others who look after their nephews and nieces, or their brothers and sisters—people who look after their kin—face special challenges. They face special challenges because the parties are related. They face special challenges because the care arrangements are often permanent. They face special challenges because this ACT Labor government has been slow to recognise those challenges.

Just one challenge, for example, is a grandparent who might be 65 or 70 who takes on the care of a grandchild at risk who might only be five or six years old. Imagine the plight of that 65 or 70-year-old thinking that their job as a parent should be over by now but facing the reality that, once again, it is just beginning. Imagine that 65 or 70-year-old grandparent taking on a grandchild aged five or six and facing the prospect that the child will still be in their care when they are 80 or more. What has this government done to help these people? This government so far has done nothing, except be long on rhetoric.

In the lead-up to the 2008 election, ACT Labor promised \$800,000 to—and I quote from their policy document—“create a dedicated service run by a non-government organisation to provide information, advice and support to grandparents and kinship carers who are caring for children”. Almost two years of the term of that government has gone and the emptiness of that promise is evident. There has been no money, no dedicated service and no information. I am sure the minister is upstairs squirming and would want to come down here and say that the moneys have been provided in the budget and they have called a tender. But it is almost two years since that

commitment was made, almost a year since that money was first appropriated, and not a cent of it has been spent.

Once again, the ACT Labor government has done too little, too late. So much so that, when the tender was advertised this week, the potential tenderers were told that they could not download documents because they were not available and that only an interim officer had been allocated to manage this process. Meanwhile, there are, to my knowledge, 150 children out there who do not even have a case worker, who are looked after by grandparents and kinship carers. That is what we think—150 children who have little or no government support and who do not know what the future holds.

There are grandparents and other kin out there who tell me that the support and information they get from the government is inconsistent and dependent on how good your case manager is. They do not know what their rights are. They get buried in red tape. They are not even allowed to take their grandchildren shopping or on a picnic or to the circus in Queanbeyan unless they get the permission of the chief executive. They are not allowed to make decisions about what medical services their grandchildren might need. They are not allowed to leave their grandchildren in the care of someone else, even for an afternoon to go to a movie or sit down at a coffee shop. For years now, a group of people—they have now formed an incorporated body, Grandparents and Kinship Carers Inc—have been bashing their heads against a brick wall, trying to get the government to listen.

I draw members' attention to this document: *The grandparents' story*, by the Grandparents Stories Group—a gathering of grandparents parenting grandchildren because of alcohol and other drugs. This document was published in 2005 by the mothercraft association in the ACT. It is my only copy, otherwise I would table it. I recommend that members go away and read the stories in this document and ask themselves—and this was published in 2005—in 2010, is there one thing that is better for these families? I think that the answer is no. That is a disgrace. It is a disgrace that lies fairly and squarely at the feet of this Labor government. Successive ministers—Ms Gallagher, Mr Barr and Ms Burch—have failed to deliver in this area.

Moving on to other areas in relation to children, Mr Seselja today announced—and I am pleased that he announced—the beginning of the Canberra Liberals' approach to improving childcare in the ACT. We have the highest fees for childcare in the nation. We have long and growing waiting lists. We have a unique service delivery model in the ACT in that there are no government-run childcare centres and 80 per cent of them are run by community-based organisations. A large proportion of those are run by parents who use the centres. Mums and dads of this city are running our childcare system, and it is a great system, but the government is not doing anything to support them.

There is in the budget \$4 million for a childcare centre in Flynn, but we have to remember that in the 2008 policy document the government committed \$4 million to two new childcare centres. In recent months we have been told by the government, through documents obtained under FOI, that they did not know where they were going to put those childcare centres because there was not enough information available to them. Now some work has obviously been done because the government

have committed to one of those childcare centres and have already committed the \$4 million that they promised in 2008. So my question is: is there not going to be another childcare centre or are they going to blow their election commitment budget and go beyond \$4 million? These are things that have to be answered.

One of the clear messages that have come from looking into childcare planning in the ACT is that the government simply do not have any idea what is going on. They do not have any kind of audit. They do not know where the demand is. The waiting lists are hotchpotch and there is no coordination. They are difficult to keep up to date.

Showing a further lack of understanding of how childcare works, the ACT Labor government introduced portable long service leave, which will put cash flow pressures on centres and affect their viability. It has signed up, as has everybody else, to changes in 2010 that will mean lower child-carer ratios. This will cause childcare centres to completely review how they do business. They will need to make decisions that go to business viability. Should they reduce their numbers, the numbers of the children in care, or should they test the already tight employment market and see if they can get more carers? Should they extend their facilities to allow for more children to be accommodated? What impact will all of this have on childcare fees?

The government simply does not know. We saw the minister in here yesterday unable to answer questions. She just does not think it is going to have any impact. If she thinks that, she is kidding herself. This is why the Canberra Liberals today have announced the policy that we have. We will see an audit of childcare and a master plan which will help people and organisations get through the change in priorities in 2012 and beyond. That is absolutely essential. In addition to that, we think that the ACT government should provide a centralised waiting list service so that there can be some ongoing certainty as to where the demand is and what the nature of the demand is. At the moment the government does not know.

There are other issues in other portfolios that I need to attend to. In the justice portfolio, for instance, the attorney has announced a somewhat quirky proposal—an Australian-first—a virtual district court jurisdiction. It left all of those that I spoke to somewhat perplexed about what it meant, mainly because the attorney had not consulted with anyone before making the proposal public and committing \$1.6 million over four years. The attorney says that this will improve efficiencies in the courts in the ACT.

I think no-one would dispute that we need to do something about efficiencies in the courts, but in my discussions with the legal fraternity since this was announced on Tuesday, after being told that they were not consulted, the universal opinion is that it probably will not work because there are not enough resources behind it. The proposal is to take the workload out of an already pressed Supreme Court and put it into an already pressed Magistrates Court, to take two magistrates offline for up to 50 per cent of the time, give them a dual commission, give them a pay rise for that dual commission—which I suppose is fair enough—and then ask them to do more work than they are already doing, with the generous admix of two extra registry staff for two years. The overall impact is that there will be two extra registry staff for two years and this is going to create a more efficient system.

One of the great problems we have in the court system in the ACT at the moment is forum shopping. We are going to create another tier which will only exacerbate forum shopping. Some people in the legal fraternity think that, with the right sort of consultation and the right resources, which are not there now, it may possibly work. But it is interesting that the attorney put out a discussion paper about access to justice. He is prepared to discuss everything in the discussion paper except this major initiative. It is typical of the Stanhope government and its incapacity to take the community with it.

As a member for Ginninderra, I cannot let my time go by without commenting on the provision of services in my electorate. I do not know what it is but Belconnen is always the poor cousin, the ugly sister, in a Stanhope government budget. You have to really scratch around to find if there is anything in there for Belconnen. It is the same this year. We have talked about the Flynn preschool. There is some good in that because we now know that the Stanhope government will not be bulldozing the Flynn school. So we do have some certainty there. That is about it. We do not know what is going to happen with the rest of the Flynn school or the relationship with the John Flynn Community Group in implementing any changes that may happen there.

There is nothing in the budget for the Belconnen Arts Centre. There is no stage 2. There is nothing in the budget for the upgrading of the existing Belconnen theatre, which is left languishing. We do have the beginning of a transit way, which means that Mr Stanhope has started now to channel Mr Corbell on transport matters. There are some park benches and some seats at Lake Ginninderra and a little bit of money that will be welcomed by the Strathnairn homestead art centre. That is about it. Belconnen, as usual, gets very little indeed. One of the questions that we have to ask is: now that the government has changed the reporting on the land release program, are the blocks and the Hawker shops in the commercial release? It is unclear from the land release program whether or not they are. There are many problems with this budget which will be further explored by the Liberal opposition in coming days.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Molonglo) (4.55): I would like to start today by discussing the implications of this budget on the issue of climate change in the ACT over the next financial year. It has been interesting to note that the media narrative has been that climate change has taken a back seat in this budget, and it is true that this budget does not give a clear indication of how the ACT plans to turn around the ACT's growing greenhouse emissions.

While it is blatantly obvious that I do not think that there should be any de-prioritisation of climate change and energy issues, I find it hard to believe that the government could justify this either. The Greens will be expecting the government to deliver on a number of climate, energy and sustainability initiatives in the next 12 to 18 months. These must be initiatives that will drive the ACT to substantially reducing its emissions by 2020. By definition, then, they must be substantial, and some of them are going to require government resourcing. I look forward to seeing that reflected in next year's budget.

Only \$2.6 million of new spending has been allocated to the climate change department over four years. Just to break that down, that is around \$650,000 per year

for the next four years, which I must acknowledge, in a year when the public service has been asked to find an efficiency dividend, is some acknowledgement of the work that needs to be done by the department.

Let us look at what is on the agenda. Firstly, the government is yet to deliver its final energy policy for the ACT. We waited quite some time for the draft policy, which was released just before Christmas last year, so we hope that the final version is progressing well and we look forward to its release. There will be the development of the greenhouse gas targets legislation, and the minister has also mooted that he will be tabling legislation to establish a white certificate trading system for electricity retailers to systematically implement energy efficiency measures right across the Canberra community—at least, that is what I hope it achieves. Then there is the extension to the feed-in tariff that will see the scheme enable medium to large-scale installations and, hopefully, open up the scheme to new investors, in both the commercial and the community sector. On top of that we must see action plan 2 of weathering the change, which will put the concrete actions on the table. There is no doubt that there will be initiatives in this plan which will inevitably require substantial government funding in next year's budget.

It is clear that, with the work that DECCEW has on its plate, \$2.6 million over four years is not a large amount of money. When you add to that the government's ambition to undertake audits for all government departments and the intention to facilitate the introduction of electric cars into the ACT, it starts to look like a shrinking pot of money. I will be keen to find out during the estimates process how that money will be spread around, because \$650,000 a year is not much to do all of that work.

Obviously, DECCEW has some staff already working on the development of the energy policy and the feed-in tariff, but the budget papers reveal that the department has struggled to meet its anticipated outcomes this year. Progress on the energy policy has been slow and the department's policy branch failed to deliver 50 per cent of its strategic objectives in the 2009-10 financial year—including not completing the energy policy, not reviewing the Nature Conservation Act and not completing the "Think water, act water" review. But let us face it: no matter how hard people are working, fewer departmental resources mean less progress. So this extra funding is certainly a step in the right direction.

The Greens were pleased to see the increase in the energy concession rebate in the budget, though once again it was not as much as was hoped for—only \$20 a year for households, when prices rose by \$30 in the last year for the average household energy bill, and nothing to make up for years gone by. Still, it is a step in the right direction. But it would be encouraging if the government, firstly, acknowledged that the rate was still lower as a proportion of the average electricity bill than what it was five years ago and, secondly, made a firm commitment to put low income families and others at risk of energy poverty at the core of their programs for energy efficiency. So far, we have not seen many encouraging signs, and the current programs do not specifically target those groups. Aside from the successful but small WEST program, there is little on offer for this group. As the Greens outlined in the chamber when we debated our motion on this last month, we must not leave behind those most vulnerable.



Of course, another task for that \$2.6 million is to undertake audits of all government departments in regard to their energy use, and therefore greenhouse emissions, which we of course welcome. It has certainly been clear in the last couple of years, when Ms Le Couteur has consistently asked questions in both estimates and annual report hearings, that departments currently do not know what their energy profiles or emissions profiles are. We have not been able to get any sort of consistent answers. However, once these audits have been done, I sincerely hope that this is accompanied by a requirement for all ACT government departments to meet efficiency targets for energy consumption. I say this in part because I believe that, once this happens, there can be no excuse for the government dropping the ball on their use of green power for all ACT government operations.

This year, the ACT government failed to deliver on their commitment to increase the purchase of renewable energy by 10 per cent, an annual target, delivering just a 2.5 per cent increase in this year's budget. Yet if they had implemented energy efficiency targets and programs in their departments, such a commitment to increase the purchase of green power by 10 per cent could actually have been cost neutral.

With regard to water, an ongoing area of disappointment for us is the government's failure to expand the ToiletSmart program to include a visit by a plumber to offer a home tune-up. This is a program that has been running in Queanbeyan. While we understand the government's reluctance to have all the same terms and conditions as the Queanbeyan program, it is a real shame that the service of providing a tune-up for those who access the dual-flush toilet rebates has not yet been included.

An update from the National Water Commission indicates that the ACT, per household, uses more water than Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide or Brisbane. While we have done a good job in cutting our water use by 20 per cent since 2003, we clearly still have some work to do. This, along with setting high standards for water efficiency for new developments, is another example of investing small amounts that will continue to save money and water in the future. Too often we have been focusing on big-ticket, expensive items such as the \$363 million Cotter Dam upgrade, yet forgetting to implement the smaller, cheaper options that will lead to better water saving in the years ahead.

On the management of national parks and reserves, the Greens welcome the announcement by the government of funds for weed management for Jerrabomberra wetlands of \$200,000 as well as the \$150,000 for Mount Painter, which will support the very active community that has been working there for a number of years now. Jerrabomberra wetlands in particular I have visited quite regularly over the last few months, and I know from firsthand experience what a job there is to do down there. It is somewhat heartening that, with a new interim board and, hopefully, a new management plan, the government has allocated \$2.3 million for upgrades to the site. It certainly needs some attention. With the development at East Lake on the cards, it will be important to ensure that the protection of the wetlands is paramount in the process of that development. They are a truly world-class asset right here almost in the heart of our city. It is extraordinary on any kind of global consideration to have such a natural wonder right in the middle of our city.

More broadly, though, we are concerned about the lack of systematic funding for our parks and reserves. We are hearing anecdotally that parks are increasingly under-resourced in terms of ranger support being stretched and delays on management plans. This is an area that I will be hoping we can get some clarity on in estimates, as it appears that we have not quite got a clear handle on how ranger services are allocated across our parks or how resources are allocated.

We need to be clear that we cannot create new park areas without allocating extra resources to their management; nor can we proceed on the path of urban development without giving consideration to maintaining the biodiversity values in the regions we are developing in. Specifically, the new development in Molonglo valley will drive the need for increased resources to manage at-risk species and habitats. The impact of humans on our environment generally requires more management, not less, as my colleague Meredith Hunter outlined yesterday. Recreational activities, feral animals and weeds all present a huge challenge to the protection of biodiversity in our parks.

Turning to the Justice and Community Safety sections of this budget, there are welcome increases in funding for some key areas. We are pleased to see those investments and will scrutinise them in the coming weeks to ensure that the detailed implementation plans attached to each program represent the very best approach to achieving the stated goals. The government have stated goals such as reducing court waiting times and increasing public safety late at night. The detail on the implementation where we can ensure we really are getting the best bang for buck with those programs will be the important consideration that we will be seeking to pursue in estimates.

There are, however, missed opportunities in the budget. The Greens have identified some actions that should have occurred now to close gaps in the legal system. Securing better office accommodation for the five community legal centres would have given volunteer lawyers somewhere to work from. Because the government has not acted on this, the community legal centres will continue to turn away lawyers who want to provide pro bono assistance. That is a stark example of a missed opportunity. The Greens will continue to advocate for action on this issue.

Let me turn to some areas where we have seen action. The Women's Legal Centre looks to have received recurrent funding, which is a welcome improvement on the current situation, where they receive only one-off, year-by-year funding. I will say that the budget papers are not absolutely clear about how the total allocated figure of \$162,000 will be split between the Women's Legal Centre and other "community sector" groups mentioned in the budget description. This is something we will be pursuing closely in estimates. We are particularly keen to ensure that the centre has received funding for its Indigenous liaison officer. Funding for that current position runs out at the end of the next month. The position has been a success. The Indigenous liaison officer is responsible for linking Indigenous women out in the community with the help available at the Women's Legal Centre. Since the position started five years ago, the number of Indigenous women accessing the centre has increased seven times.

I was also interested to see that dedicated funding has been provided for an Indigenous liaison officer at Legal Aid. I note that the funding for that officer at Legal Aid amounts to \$48,000 per year. At estimates, we will look to get the details on what type of position can be funded with that sum of money.

The Greens were interested to see the release of the government's 2010 access to justice initiative in conjunction with the budget. The government's proposal is to create a third tier in the court system with the creation of a virtual court. The Greens welcome the government's contribution to the ongoing debate around unmet legal need and access to justice. We want the 2010 financial year to be a year of action on this issue. However, any actions taken must go directly towards reducing the time people wait to have their cases heard or reducing the numbers of people falling through the gaps and going without assistance when they need it most. The Greens remain to be convinced that a third tier in the courts will actually achieve either of these key outcomes. We acknowledge that a virtual court is an innovative idea brought forward by the government and look forward to participating in the consultation and debate that is to take place.

I would like to turn now to two key staffing issues raised in this budget: police and ambulance staff. The Greens welcome the 10 extra late-night police included in the budget. These police will need to take the lead role in enforcing the new liquor laws which we hope will be in place for next summer. The 10 new positions will, in part, be funded from the revamped licensing system for pubs and clubs. The Greens support this approach to raising funds for the dedicated police team. It guarantees the funding for the positions, and should the number of venues increase in the future the funding will also increase.

For those 10 police officers to have the best impact on a safe and vibrant Canberra nightlife, they need to be actually entering pubs and clubs and observing the service of alcohol. This is where we can get the most positive impact on behaviour. The alternative is to wait until patrons are drunk later in the night and enforce the laws from the kerbside. This is a reactive approach that does little to tackle root causes of the problem. The exact role and responsibilities of the police need to be made clearer, and the Greens will be pursuing this during estimates.

The Greens welcome the new funding and staffing for the Ambulance Service. The government have been told in the Lennox review that they should consider increasing the capacity of the communications centre. The centre can help to relieve demand on the front-line ambulance service by delivering medical advice and diverting non-urgent calls. The government have acted on this recommendation in the budget. However, the government were told in the same review to consider increasing the numbers of front-line ambulance staff. The Greens see this as an equally valid and necessary step. Front-line staff must be resourced well enough to attend those calls they are directed to by the call centre. The Greens are concerned to ensure that the government keep this option open during the next 12 months and at the next budget.

To conclude, there are some good moves made in this budget on justice and community safety. There are, however, key unanswered questions, some of which I

have outlined today. These questions need to be resolved before the Greens can be sure that the funding in the budget really is being best directed towards achieving a safer and more just Canberra community. I hope that when it comes to the estimates process we do not see some of the repeats we saw last year, when many of the questions about simple program funding could not be answered in the estimates process and had to be taken on notice.

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Molonglo) (5.10): I am pleased to see that the government has agreed to fund a number of areas that the Greens have lobbied for over the years. But I am also very disappointed that there are a number of key areas for the government's future that simply have not been funded.

The lack of general direction and long-term priority shown by the budget is frustrating for everyone involved. It is particularly frustrating where the community has worked with the government to develop long-term strategies and believes that there are agreed priorities and plans, and then the budget comes down and the community simply cannot find out what has happened. The problem is that the indicators from the plans do not follow through to the budget, so it is incredibly hard for anybody—the community in particular, but even us here in the Assembly—to find out what exactly is happening as the focus of spending activity.

How can we find out how much the government is spending on climate change? What is the expenditure on weathering the change? These are excellent questions which you cannot with any degree of ease answer from these budget papers. That is why there are so many questions taken on notice in the estimates process. I have said before and I will say again—I said it again this morning—that we need to improve the budget papers so that the Assembly and the community do not have to waste their time trying to find information which we know the government has, which we know is in the budget papers. This would reduce work for the government as well as for the community and the members.

Let me give an example of how impenetrable some of this is. Waste and recycling in TAMS is stated to be \$28.7 million, yet I can account for only \$3.7 million in the line items shown in the budget paper. And again we have things misclassified. We have got bulky waste pick-up labelled under climate change spending; it is basically a much-needed social initiative, not about climate change.

I will now come to talk to the TAMS budget. TAMS is, of course, one of the biggest areas of government spending. There are a few positives there. Specifically, I mention the \$100,000 for a feasibility study for a Gungahlin shopfront. I have to agree with Mr Seselja's comments that we hardly need \$100,000 for that study, but it is an item in the parliamentary agreement, so I am very pleased that the government has started on it.

In general, I am disappointed to say that TAMS spending remains basically business as usual. The Greens see some good opportunities for cheap and smart initiatives to improve Canberra for the future. The most disappointing area is that of waste and resource recovery. Despite the persistent effort of the Greens, including having waste initiatives in our parliamentary agreement, the government still ignores the solutions

we need for the future. These solutions include things like organic and commercial waste recycling. It is ironic that the government has ignored these recycling options and is now having to commit \$4.4 million to committing a new landfill cell so that more waste can simply be buried. The percentage of waste recovered in the ACT has sunk a few per cent and stalled. This continues; it projects to be the same next year. We need our targets and our actualities to rise.

Probably the biggest waste issue affecting Canberra at the moment is the tens of thousands of tonnes of organic waste which are still going to landfill—where, of course, it breaks down into the highly potent greenhouse gas of methane. For years the Greens have been calling on the government to act on this. We still ask the government to honour the parliamentary agreement; the parliamentary agreement talked about a trial in organic waste collection. We would also like the government to invest in infrastructure for large-scale recycling of organic waste so that it can target the big producers of organic waste like the commercial sector.

I am also very frustrated that the government has ignored the Greens' calls for battery and light globe recycling. These are both items which become toxic waste. They are both items which are for sale in Canberra now. They are items which can be recycled, but there is no easy way for the community to recycle them. A cheap and easy initiative which is carried out in other jurisdictions is for the government to provide drop-off points like shopfronts and libraries.

Another cheap and easy initiative which is being carried out elsewhere in Australia is new drinking fountains. If we had these, people would purchase less bottled water and there would be fewer bottles to be disposed of. This would lead to less waste.

Another area of waste that the government has not worked on is street-level recycling bins. Again, this was part of the agreement which has not yet been implemented. I guess what is going to happen is that all the additional waste is going to go into the landfill cell that the government has decided to build.

Another area I am very concerned about is the urban tree management program funding which has been taken out of the budget. While I understand that the government is waiting for the commissioner for the environment's report on tree management, and I am very pleased that the government is waiting for this before taking significant on-ground action, I do not understand why there is no funding for it going forward in the next year. The report is due in July, the first month of the next financial year. Why can't the government respond to this report and start work in the coming financial year? It is an important program; it needs to start. The consultation work should be done in time for it to start in this financial year.

When we are talking about trees, it would not be right for the Greens not to comment on funding for the arboretum. \$22.6 million is a princely sum; it would fund an organic waste system for the entire ACT, make good inroads into preventive health, fully fund our mental health needs, provide for infrastructure to ensure that Molonglo is a zero emissions neighbourhood and also do an awful lot in terms of preserving and maintaining our urban forest which we all love. I guess we should at least be pleased that the arboretum funding was not listed as a climate change initiative this year; at least that amount of greenwashing has been reduced.

The Greens welcome this year's budget announcements towards a more sustainable Molonglo valley development. Ensuring that Molonglo incorporates excellence in sustainable design is a high priority for the Greens. While funding for roads and land release infrastructure in Molonglo is very clear, the budget commitment to these sustainability initiatives is very unclear. We will be looking to get further information through the estimates hearings.

I was interested in claims that this budget commits to a sustainability strategy for Wright and Coombs, requiring water saving measures for new homes; maximum solar access requirements; a riparian management strategy for the Molonglo River corridor; and provisions for sustainable transport. We are very pleased that the government has allocated over \$24 million for stormwater ponds, pipes and pumps in north Weston and Coombs. We would like to see that Molonglo households have access to non-potable water to enable them to reduce their potable water use. We look forward to seeing that Molonglo is going to have improved water saving design standards and that we are not simply repeating the current water saving urban design standards of the rest of the ACT.

Planning wise, we are pleased to see funding go towards master planning for some specific areas: Tuggeranong, \$300,000; Erindale, also \$300,000; and Pialligo, \$100,000. These are things which we have worked very closely with the government to achieve. We believe that through the locality planning processes—master planning or precinct planning—the government is much better equipped to resolve issues for most stakeholders and the plans will better reflect the needs of local communities. There are still a lot of areas throughout Canberra which require this more detailed planning. Civic is one of those. Others are the villages of Hall and Tharwa, along with Pialligo.

We were quite surprised in this context to see \$130,000 in this budget for the study into the potential eastern broadacre employment corridor, despite the fact that the eastern broadacre study is yet to be released. I hope that this study includes substantial consultation with the residents of the areas in question, as thus far they feel that they have been excluded by the closed doors in this process.

I was very pleased to see that Lawson south has been touted as another sustainable showcase. It is on a transport corridor and it is close to places such as Canberra uni, Belconnen town centre, Calvary hospital and Bruce CIT, so it is an ideal place for such a development.

In relation to the increased funding that the government will gain from increased change of use charges, the Greens are broadly supportive. The Treasurer has told us that this increase is due to the current law being erroneously applied and developers not paying the amount for properties that legislation requires. However, with the Liberal opposition, we are still unsure whether this will have negative consequences for infill and urban development. There does not appear to be any modelling done by Treasury—or by Macroeconomics, the consultants who are reviewing the change of use charge system. I should say that I mean no modelling on the impacts on urban development; obviously there has been modelling on the potential revenue impacts,

but we do not know about the sensitivity of the urban development. We do know that last year's waiver of change of use charges to encourage development was a success, so it is difficult to believe that an increase in the change of use charge will not impact on developments.

I will briefly comment on transport initiatives. As the government knows, we have been pushing strongly for active transport, and sustainable transport and public transport are part of that. We are very pleased that public transport has been a focus of this year's budget. We are very pleased that our requests for work on inner north and Northbourne traffic issues have been picked up. We are very pleased that there will be feasibility studies for Northbourne Avenue and how this can be reworked, particularly for buses, pedestrians and cycle commuters. I look forward to talking further with Mr Stanhope about this.

Another thing we asked for was the redesign of some areas into shared spaces, particularly the town centre of Gungahlin. There is nothing in the budget which supports that, although I note that, following my motion yesterday, Mr Stanhope agreed to look into it.

I point out also that a number of the transport initiatives being funded in the 2010-11 budget are leftover items from the government's 2004 sustainable transport plan. I guess we could say that it is better late than never, because we do support those.

Pedestrian and cycling funding did not fare as well as public transport. There is \$1 million for each of the pedestrian and cycle infrastructure—welcome, of course. But I note that, because of the parliamentary agreement, recurrent funding for cycling infrastructure is to be increased to \$3.6 million per annum—and the same for footpath funding, which was boosted by another half million. These are areas which need increased funding, particularly when you remember that there is \$185 million in funding out for road contracts right now. The paybacks from active transport are great.

We also applaud the increased expenditure on lighting for pedestrian and cycling networks, particularly in the inner north. Where I live, that has been one of the problems.

I go to heritage. We very much welcome the capital works projects on heritage such as Cargill's dairy and additional heritage signing. But it appears that there are no additional operational funds for the Heritage Council; considering that the council currently has a 10-year backlog to clear, this is disappointing.

I go briefly to arts. I am very pleased that some of the infrastructure spending will help house some of ACT's arts groups. There is money for the Canberra Potters Society and the Street Theatre, for example. I am also optimistic about the outcomes from the \$1.8 million for film projects; Canberra has some good opportunities with its film industry and we can see lots of projects coming from our local talents. I am pleased, also, that there is positive movement on the Kingston arts precinct plan; I would like to get some more information about how that is developing.

Last, I go to business and industry development. I am running out of time, so I will just note that Ms Hunter spoke at greater length about the need for Canberra to move to a green knowledge-based economy. It is important that we provide more support than we are currently doing for this. I very much look forward to the green economy paper which, as a result of the Greens-Labor agreement, I understand the government has funded the University of Canberra to produce.

Overall, it is a budget that is steady as she goes. I would have liked to see a budget that had a more visionary grasp of the needs of a future Canberra, and from what I have heard I think that these sentiments are echoed throughout the community.

**MR DOSZPOT** (Brindabella) (5.25): For a mid-term government, the Stanhope-Gallagher government has delivered what many have characterised as a boring budget.

In the face of healthy economic indicators, the ACT Labor Party never ceases to trumpet the doom and gloom scenario of the economy. Last year's budget was tinted by talks of the efficiency dividend and the global financial crisis. And this year it is the GST.

The facts are simple and plain to see. The ACT economy is keeping pace with the Australian economy. The economy is returning to pre-GFC levels. Employment and participation rates are strong. Hence, as much as the Treasurer would like to explain it away, this is a budget of opportunities lost. But the fact still remains that the ACT economy is sounder than the government would want us to think. And the fact is that the Stanhope-Gallagher budget has once again failed the community and the people of Canberra. Simply put, this budget focuses too much on short-term wins and not on preparing the present for the future.

The ACT Labor government has touted our economy as a knowledge economy, yet this budget has focused on marquee capital projects. It should be investing in Canberrans, in people, in knowledge. Instead, as Mr Seselja has said, we are here to lament a budget that gives us deficit after deficit, debt upon debt, a stagnation in services and a massive tax grab on homeowners and car drivers.

Turning to my portfolio of education, as much as we acknowledge the \$14.4 million to be invested in new schools over four years, the government has consistently rejected the idea of reopening schools in Flynn, Cook, Hall and Tharwa. The new \$4 million children's centre in Flynn is not a school—and it is at twice the cost of what the government said it would cost to reopen the Flynn primary school, and completely at odds with the Flynn community group's proposal.

On 27 April 2010 the Flynn community group issued the following press release, headlined "Flynn seeks urgent meeting after Anzac Day shock":

Flynn community groups are seeking an urgent meeting with ACT Government ministers following the shock Anzac Day announcement for Flynn Primary School that appears to leave the Flynn community out in the cold again.



“We were shocked to learn over the Anzac weekend that the Government appears to have turned its back on Flynn again and ignored the detailed plan for a sustainable community centre that has been worked up by our community over the past four years,” according to Flynn community spokesperson, Roger Nicoll.

The community is bewildered by the Government’s announcement because we thought that we were in a consultation process over the past eight months, as part of a joint working group, to determine the future use of the Flynn Primary School.

The announcement of a large childcare centre occupying half the building and the lack of detail about plans for further use of the site is at odds with what the community understood was agreed at working groups meetings with government officials over the past eight months.

“Now the government has announced the very thing that we said wouldn’t work and wouldn’t meet the needs of the Flynn community. It seems like school closures all over again,” said Mr Nicoll.

This government has failed those families time and time again, firstly, by closing their schools in 2006, then, again, when it was indicated that there may yet be hope, and then, even after the education and standing committee inquiry into school closures and its recommendation to reopen the four schools in Flynn, Cook, Hall and Tharwa, this government failed them again.

Mr Barr hammered the final nails into the coffin of the hope of these communities, yet there was still further hope dangled out to the Flynn community over eight months of consultation. Imagine their surprise when, as I just said, on Anzac Day, of all days, came the announcement of the \$4 million to be spent at Flynn on a large childcare centre—the very thing that the Flynn community told the government would not work and would not meet the needs of the Flynn community.

The Chief Minister and this government have failed to protect our schools, closing 23, and conned many communities into believing there was hope. And the cruellest cut of all to the community came yesterday when the Chief Minister stated during the budget speech breakfast, in a most tasteless joke, that it was easier to close a school than chop down a tree. This last statement just beggars belief—for the Flynn community, after all it has been through, to be facing a comment like that from our Chief Minister.

As the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Seselja, stated earlier, we have had nine years of Labor—nine years of wasted money, wasted time and wasted opportunity; nine years of waste; nine years of ACT Labor; nine years in which 23 schools have closed and dozens of GPs have closed shop; nine years in which revenues and taxes have exceeded all expectations but could still not keep pace with the expenditure.

Take also the \$1.6 million committed to support students with disabilities over four years in ACT public schools. At those levels, each year of funding each school will receive approximately \$4,650. Equally pertinent, if the government is committed to providing assistance to students with disabilities, why is this funding only available to students at ACT public schools? The Treasurer said in the budget speech:

Students with disabilities will receive additional support, with \$1.6 million over four years to address a number of the recommendations contained in the Shaddock Review of Special Education.

As I understand it, the Shaddock review of special education was over both government and non-government schools. Yet here we have \$1.6 million being given, as part of the Shaddock review into special education, to only part of our school community. I pose the question to the Treasurer and to the minister for education: correct this oversight and let us know how this situation has come into place.

I note also the \$3.9 million committed over four years to establish an ACT Teacher Quality Institute. This institute will be responsible for teacher registration and accreditation against national standards. Whilst we note the establishment of this institute and understand that standardised accreditation is important, there are additional urgent priorities for the education sector and for the teachers. For example, according to the ACT branch of the Australian Education Union, deputy principal pay levels are 16.1 per cent below those of their counterparts across the border in New South Wales. Equally, a casual relief teacher's pay can be as much as 11.8 per cent below the going rate in New South Wales. In fact, the ACT comes out at the losing end, in comparison to New South Wales, in every teacher salary step comparison except one.

This is a matter of attracting and retaining teachers in the ACT and as such it would have been good to hear the government in this budget consider the issue of teacher pay parity and workload. Minister Barr talks about wanting to attract "the best teachers in the country". Yet our teachers here in the ACT are underpaid and overworked. In a recent discussion with a constituent it was noted that, on average, it takes a teacher 10 years to earn a salary equivalent to the shorter time frame it would take a graduate—three years, I understand—to attain EL1 level in the commonwealth government or SOGC level within the ACT government.

Teachers also need better provisions for professional training. They need reasonable workloads to allow them to apply what they have learnt. They need more quality support teachers. This list is merely indicative and it would have been good to hear the government articulate this within the budget. Again, this budget should be about the people, not marquee projects. Minister Barr, it is not that teachers should be recognised as professionals; they are professionals and should be treated as such and should be paid as such and should get the considerations that all the teaching profession deserves.

The government have had since 2001 to get this right, but here we are, nine years later, with the government still referring back to what the Liberal government did nine years ago—not looking at their responsibilities to our community, and in this instance I am talking about the education community.

I note also the \$12.6 million designated for environmentally sustainable initiatives and infrastructure upgrades. In tandem with the \$12.5 million set aside for skilling in the ACT, it would have been good to see some commitment to developing green skills.

After all, with the government's initiatives around the ACT solar facility and electric cars, one would think that Canberrans should be properly skilled and able to compete for the jobs that these investments generate.

Turning now to my portfolio of disability, it was already apparent that the government's education and disability agencies need to work better together on the issue of student disabilities. The recent inability of Minister Burch to articulate relevant aspects of the Department of Education and Training's commissioned Shaddock review was telling.

Deny the importance of disability needs as you may; the truth remains that we need to ensure quality of life for people with disabilities. According to figures released by National Disability Services, 45,000 or approximately 14.2 per cent of Canberra residents have a disability. Looking at this in greater detail, 24,000 people report a disability requiring assistance, 13,000 people have profound or severe activity limitations, 12,400 people over the age of 65 have a disability and 4,284 people access the accommodation, respite, community access and support services funded by government and community organisations. My question to the government is: are you aware of the gravity of this portfolio?

I have no doubt that the Labor spin machine was hard at work selling Minister Burch's piecemeal initiatives—for example, \$425,000 over four years to help families having to care for a child with autism. Well, that sounds well and good on the surface. But this money is salary to employ a coordinator to provide an information service. This is another example of Labor not properly consulting the community. Autism Asperger ACT had provided the Treasury a submission with a minimum budget request—a minimum budget request that they felt would do some justice to their requirements—of \$2.16 million. It is there for all to see on the website. The amount announced by Ms Burch of \$425,000, which does not give any direct cash to Autism Asperger ACT, is over four years and less than five per cent of what was requested by Autism Asperger ACT.

The needs are huge and there are obviously competing requirements, but this is one of the aspects of the anger that is rapidly becoming more and more apparent against this government, when we cannot give \$424,000 directly to a community need, but we can give 22—26—\$28 million for an arboretum. We can give money of that scope and that generosity to something that is basically the Chief Minister's legacy, his version of the pyramids of Egypt, a legacy to Jon Stanhope.

The model of support is probably replicated with the \$424,000 for the Carers Advocacy Service. My question is: will we end up with a situation similar to that with Therapy ACT, where we are faced with a mammoth waiting list for too few services?

Minister Burch, you noted in one of your media releases that the government is investing in our disability community. The fact is that salaries are not investments. Your government intends to lower the school leaving age of students with disabilities to 18. When this happens, if this happens, how will you handle this two-year pipeline of school leavers transitioning to the next stage of their lives? How will you handle this when these students and others with disabilities show up at—to use your words—the government's "front door".

We stand for families, we stand for business, we stand for opportunity and we stand for values. This is our calling as a party and as people, and we will not back away from those values—not for political gain, not from personal pressure, not now, not ever. We would like to see some of the issues that we have discussed here addressed. Unfortunately, my time has run out. There are still quite a few other issues to talk about in sport and recreation, but no doubt we will get the opportunity to do that during estimates, Mr Barr. I am glad to see you have finally joined us.

**MS PORTER** (Ginninderra) (5.40): I rise today as a member for Ginninderra to draw members' attention to aspects of this budget that will greatly benefit the constituents in my electorate. This budget responds to the needs of a growing city, and I am delighted to stand in this place to talk about it, especially the contribution that it makes to the people of my electorate.

The 2010-11 budget demonstrates this government's determination to invest in essential services and community infrastructure across the ACT. I would like to draw people's attention to some of the ways in which my constituents will benefit from this responsible budget. I am pleased to see the measures in this budget for people in my electorate in many ways. Over \$4 million has been allocated to develop park-and-ride facilities across Canberra, including Belconnen. This is an important initiative, and it speaks for this government's determination to encourage Canberrans to use the public transport system. Additionally, the government has made provision for bike shelters in Belconnen, as part of the bike-and-ride initiative, to accommodate between 20 and 25 bikes.

My constituents will also benefit from other environmentally focused initiatives. Over \$7 million has been assigned for stage 1 of the Belconnen-to-city transit way, which will develop the Barry Drive and College Street sections. Additionally, \$200,000 has been assigned for a feasibility study for options for a transit way between Macarthur Avenue and Haydon Drive. These initiatives acknowledge the growth in my electorate and demonstrate a desire to build structures to a level commensurate with this growth.

A strong public transport service is critical to an environmentally sustainable city, so I am pleased that the government has put money aside in this budget to encourage the people of Ginninderra to use the public transport system whenever possible. I already mentioned briefly the initiative to help encourage people to ride their bicycles to work as well. These two initiatives have several benefits, of course. The push to get us either riding our bikes to work or commuting in buses promotes more environmentally friendly attitudes and behaviour as well as improving our health. We all know that rising obesity is a problem for our society.

As we know, the provision of childcare—members have been talking about that just now—is a critical resource to contemporary Australian families. I am pleased to see that this budget has allocated \$4 million to refurbish the old school site in Flynn to be used as a dedicated childcare centre that will offer 100 to 120 places to families in Ginninderra.

I am also very pleased to see that over \$300,000 has been allocated for the design of a storage and water control pond adjacent to Lake Ginninderra as well as a series of

mini wetlands along College Creek. Such features of this budget demonstrate the government's concern about climate change and the practical measures that need to be implemented at several levels to meet this challenge.

My government is not merely concerned with providing opportunities for the people in Canberra to participate in a strong economy; it also realises that art and culture are important aspects of our lives. In this budget for Ginninderra, \$200,000 has been allocated to improvements at Strathnairn homestead, including provision for extra studio space. Set in a converted 1920s homestead on the north-western outskirts of my electorate, the Strathnairn homestead features regular exhibitions as examples of woodwork, photography, sculpture, glass, textiles, ceramics and mixed media. I am a very frequent visitor to Strathnairn and I have purchased more than one of the wonderful artworks that can be bought that are designed or executed by our local artists. Expenditure to improve access to these local artists and help them in their creative expression is very important. The quality of our lives is greatly enriched by artistic endeavour.

Art is very popular, as we have recently seen with the large crowds at our recent exhibition at the National Gallery. However, our Raiders, as most of us would call them, have been allocated \$65,000 for an upgrade of their training facilities, which I am also pleased to see.

Young people, of course, have not been forgotten in this budget. Some \$200,000 has been allocated for the design of the Belconnen skate park. When constructed, this will provide another avenue for young people in my electorate to participate in this exciting activity, although I find it a bit hair-raising to watch them, I must say. I know how much young people in this area have been looking forward to this.

I am also pleased to see the allocation of money in the budget for upgrades to Lake Ginninderra parks and playgrounds. These parks are very popular and any weekend, or any morning or evening in fact, that you would like to go down to the paths and the parks around Lake Ginninderra you will see many people riding their bikes, walking and enjoying picnics with their families. That is maybe not so much the case now with the colder weather, but certainly I can attest to the popularity of that area as a result of walking Lola, whom everybody knows about, around the lake and visiting the playgrounds with my grandchildren.

This government has introduced a responsible budget that addresses key areas such as health and education, provides for valuable infrastructure for the ACT and promotes positive action on climate change. The people in my electorate will benefit greatly, as I said, from aspects of this budget. The Treasurer has said that this budget is one about which some people may say we should have made different choices. I am pleased, though, to see all the measures that are in this budget, not only for my electorate but ACT-wide. There are many important initiatives, some of which will meet the immediate needs of our growing and ageing population. However, importantly, it is also one for the future with funds allocated to important infrastructure.

Funds are allocated to a jewel that many Canberrans and Australians—in fact, people from all around the world, I believe—will appreciate for decades to come. Of course I

am talking about the arboretum. Ms Le Couteur has said that the money that has been put aside for the arboretum could purchase many things. However, this is an investment for our city; it is an investment for our future; it is an investment that will pay dividends several times over far into the future. I welcome the funds in this budget put aside for the arboretum. I am glad the government continues to be both responsible and also visionary.

**MR COE** (Ginninderra) (5.47): The budget the Treasurer presented on Tuesday is one that unfairly hurts families and makes hardworking Canberrans pay the price for Labor's mismanagement of public finances. The situation was well described by the leader of the Canberra Liberals, Zed Seselja, at the Canberra Business Council's breakfast yesterday. At the event, he described the state of play as being the least bang for the most buck. Indeed, this government has disregard for public money. The ALP and Greens share the philosophy that governments are better at making decisions about individuals' finances than the individuals themselves. We on this side of the chamber believe that what makes our community great are the people that comprise it. I have the utmost confidence in Canberrans' ability to invest in their future and that of and their families. We do not need a government that over-reaches into our pockets.

We all know that there is a need for limited taxation to deliver efficient services to Canberrans. However, what we have seen from this government is excessive taxation for the delivery of poor services. It is the average Canberra family that is subsidising this government's poor decision making and the pet projects of the Chief Minister and the Greens. Next year, the average person will pay \$3,127 to the ACT government in taxes—that is, every man, woman and child is paying in excess of \$3,100 to the ACT government, and it is on the rise. That is in addition to our federal taxes, including GST. Does anyone in Canberra think we are getting good value for money? I argue no. This government is a poor custodian of our money. Often, it is families in the suburbs, like the suburbs I represent in Ginninderra, that are paying above and beyond their fair share for substandard services and infrastructure.

The government's mismanagement of our territory is clearly depicted through the increased revenue measures to be introduced from 1 July this year. The changes to the betterment tax are a massive tax on families and are in addition to all the other increases to fees and charges. I look forward to scrutinising the government ministers in estimates to find out where some of the wastage is so that we can try to bring reforms to this government.

As a shadow minister in the Liberal opposition, I have responsibilities for urban services, transport services, housing, heritage and youth. Today, I will briefly address how the budget impacts on these areas. It is in the Department of Territory and Municipal Services that we see so many missed opportunities when it comes to the delivery of core services and basic infrastructure for Canberrans. The Ernst & Young report that was reluctantly released by the ACT government last year contains findings such as:

... less priority is afforded to financial discipline both organisationally and individually and the consequences of overspending are not evident.

And:

Senior management and Strategic Finance have limited visibility of the activities performed within the Department and the costs of undertaking them.

Further:

TAMS has yet to clearly articulate the alignment between its core business activities, government's policy priorities, its service delivery objectives, the indicators needed to monitor service delivery performance against these objectives and the supporting financial budgeting.

And:

In order to manage the risk of developing services at financial expenditure which exceeds budget, TAMS needs to institutionalise a culture of fiscal restraint.

These problems point to poor leadership and no desire to improve.

The ACTION authority is a prime example of a part of the ACT government failing to meet its targets despite large sums of money being spent. Page 113 of budget paper 4 of the 2010-11 documents paints a sorry tale of the state of play within the bus network. We saw the timeliness of ACTION services slip again to 82 per cent. Of course, as was discussed in committees here at the Assembly last year, this figure only represents what time the buses leave the depot, not the timeliness of their services en route. We also see in the budget that the customer satisfaction indicator has fallen to 80 per cent.

Perhaps most disappointing of all for this government that prides itself on environmental sustainability, with public transport being an important pillar of that platform, is the fact that, rather than the modal share increasing, it has decreased by 5 per cent and ACTION patronage has fallen by 801,000. In fact, there were 1.33 million fewer customers boarding ACTION buses than was the target. We also saw the cost per vehicle kilometre increase to \$4.13, and the total cost per passenger boarding increased significantly to \$6.30.

The percentage of operations ACTION receives from fares is now just 20.1 per cent. There is little which is sustainable about that. Yet, in spite of these poor figures, ACTION employed around 60 more full-time equivalent staff than targeted. The question has to be asked: are Canberrans happy with the bus service they are getting for the fares and the \$76 million subsidy?

The budget for the rest of TAMS does not describe a rosy affair. Canberrans are suffering from years of neglected infrastructure and failure to properly invest in our future. Only the Canberra Liberals have a plan to get Canberra's infrastructure and infrastructure delivery back on track.

The percentage of roads in good condition has slipped to 88 per cent. Furthermore, the government only managed to resurface about half of the roads they were meant to in 2009-10. This year, Canberrans sent more waste per capita to landfill. While the ACT government claim to be committed to a no-waste city, their predictions are for a

further rise in waste over the coming year. This stands in contrast to the government's original target of no waste by 2010. Of late, we have seen a tangible objective morph into an unlikely aspirational target. We have witnessed a marginal increase in the cost of kerbside collection over the past year, and the government has also committed \$327,000 this year to the expansion of landfill at the Mugga Lane tip.

In another appalling display, Canberrans will be paying even more for parking their cars. I understand the cost will increase by \$1.50 in the city, taking the all-day rate to \$10 or more. This is an unfair slug on Canberra families. In the Treasurer's speech on Tuesday, she said:

We are introducing some limited increases to fees and charges in this Budget. Parking fees will increase, in line with our objectives to encourage a shift to alternative modes of transport.

If that is true, why was such a hefty increase for bus tickets introduced on 1 July last year? Surely, if the government is in the business of using price levers to alter transport preferences, it would not have increased bus fares by so much as 49 per cent. I think a more sustainable measure to get people on to buses would be to make the buses run more efficiently. This would mean more services and more direct services for the same money. That would be a better service. Surely this would be a more sustainable way of getting people onto buses than driving up the price of parking.

We know there is relatively low elasticity of demand for parking, meaning that even when prices increase, the level of demand will not decrease by as much as it would if it were another product. The government know this and know that they can increase the cost of parking and people will still pay it. It is a cash grab. Tell the families in Dunlop who go to work in Woden, drop off the kids on the way and come home via the shops or picking up a child from soccer training that they should be using a bus. This government is out of touch.

I note also that the government is deferring the street tree planting program. Surely the tree removal program will continue according to need. So does this mean that as trees are removed from our urban environment they will not be replaced? Again, the government should be able to manage this situation better.

In housing, the average cost per dwelling has risen by 3.75 per cent to \$10,073. The overall satisfaction of tenants with the provision of public housing has also fallen by one per cent. Furthermore, the percentage of tenants owing more than four weeks rent and with debts greater than \$500 sits at 15 per cent, exceeding the 2009-10 target by five per cent. This area of government is a policy vacuum, and we all expect better.

Within the heritage portfolio, the budget has allocated funding of almost \$1 million for a number of projects aimed at preserving the heritage of the ACT, including the restoration and interpretation of Robertson house at Oaks Estate, Tralee homestead and Cargill's dairy cottage. The installation of heritage signage at various sites and improvements to the Ginninderra blacksmith workshop are also on the agenda. We should be proud of the history of Canberra. The history of Canberra, and Australia more generally, is not one of wars and revolutions. Instead, it is a history of quiet



achievers determined to better their lives and the lives of their families and future generations. The history of Canberra and the region is very much consistent with this. I hope the government gives due attention to promoting and sharing this heritage of ours.

There are a number of initiatives in this year's budget that have been marketed as being beneficial for young people. However, again we see very little in the way of a forward plan for service delivery specifically for the youth of the territory. While the ACT has a significant ageing population, we continue to have a higher proportion of young people than the national average. Where is the forward planning for the implementation of the ACT young people's plan in this budget? The government has waxed lyrical about the whole-of-government policy framework for all young people in the ACT, but where is the foundation to implement this?

Infrastructure funding for items such as CIT vocational education in Gungahlin, a new Gungahlin library within the Gungahlin college, and a Gungahlin health centre is welcome, but, again, we eagerly await the successful delivery of this infrastructure. I also note that the average cost per custody day at the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre is extremely high at \$1,340.

Within my electorate of Ginninderra, encompassing all of Belconnen, Nicholls and Hall, there are a number of capital projects that will be taking place. The Lake Ginninderra foreshore upgrade has been going on for a number of years and has been rescoped on a number of occasions. I do not think anybody is completely sure as to what is being done, when it is going to be done and how much it is actually going to cost. I know that \$200,000 has been allocated to the design of a skate park in Belconnen. However, there is no date proposed for the commencement of construction. It is also not clear exactly where it will be constructed.

I note a major bus stops program will be implemented in Kippax with new park-and-ride and bike-and-ride facilities provided for Belconnen residents along with a program to install bus shelters in Belconnen. However, the question remains whether the government is actually able to deliver on these promises.

The suburb of Flynn has been allocated \$4 million for a community childcare centre. However, once again, the views put forward by the Flynn community have been ignored by the government. The Flynn community believe that the proposal put forward by the government does not allow for a sustainable community hub. The John Flynn Community Group and the Flynn primary school parents and citizens association have gone to extraordinary lengths to find a workable and amicable solution based on a multi-use hub with a wide range of services managed through a community consortium. In the words of Roger Nicoll:

We were shocked to learn over the Anzac weekend that the Government appears to have turned its back on Flynn again and ignored the detailed plan for a sustainable community centre that has been worked up by our community over the past four years.

The people of Flynn have had a very tough time under this government, and it does not seem to be getting any better in the future.

This government has record revenue and expenditure to match. However, we do not have the unprecedented services that should go hand in hand with this. I am sick of this government measuring everything by how much it spends. I want to be part of a Liberal government that prides itself on how little money we take from taxpayers. It is not good enough for higher expenditure to be the mechanism by which success is measured. We need to shift the focus to outputs and not inputs.

We should be looking at all our services in deciding whether the government should be delivering them or whether business or community groups are better placed to serve our community. Canberrans pay too much and get very little in return. This culture of big spending and bad services must end. This budget fails our finances, fails our families and fails the territory.

*At 6.00 pm, in accordance with standing order 34, the debate was interrupted. The motion for the adjournment of the Assembly having been put and negatived, the debate was resumed.*

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

### **Reference to Select Committee on Estimates 2010-2011**

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

That the Appropriation Bill 2010-2011 be referred to the Select Committee on Estimates 2010-2011.

### **Standing order 156—advice Paper and statement by Speaker**

**MR SPEAKER:** Pursuant to a resolution of the Assembly on 25 March 2010, I present the following paper:

Standing order 156—Advice from the Ethics and Integrity Adviser, dated 5 May 2010.

Members, I make a brief comment. The report from the ethics and integrity adviser raises some substantive questions regarding both the Assembly's standing orders and the self-government act. I would like to foreshadow that I will be raising these questions in the Administration and Procedure Committee and would welcome views from all members on steps that may be taken in response to the advice of the ethics and integrity adviser.

### **Public Accounts—Standing Committee Report 6—government response**

**MS GALLAGHER** (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Health and Minister for Industrial Relations) (6.02): On behalf of the Chief Minister

and for the information of members, I present the following paper:

Public Accounts—Standing Committee—Report 6—Review of Auditor-General's Report No 7 of 2008: Proposal for a gas-fired power station and data centre—Site selection process—Government response.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

The Auditor-General's report No 7 of 2008 *Proposal for a gas-fired power station and data centre—Site selection process* was presented to the ACT Assembly on 10 December 2008. On 22 April 2009, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts resolved to inquire further into the audit report. It delivered its report on 9 February 2010. The committee's review and recommendations ranged across strategic project facilitation criteria, the purposes for use of broadacre land, direct land sale procedures, community consultation and probity in dealing with territory-owned corporations.

In this response to those recommendations, the government agrees to nine recommendations, agrees in part with two recommendations, notes four recommendations and does not agree with three recommendations. A number of the recommendations relate to ensuring sound and open administrative practices. I am pleased to be able to say that the ACT government already has effective procedures in place that address these recommendations.

Engaging and empowering the community in the decisions that affect it is an essential part of contemporary government, particularly in a jurisdiction the size of the ACT. The ACT government continues to work hard to maintain and improve its community engagement approaches. The community engagement website has been enhanced and the Chief Minister's Department is reviewing community engagement guidelines. The Department of Land and Property Services is also preparing a comprehensive communications plan and this will be placed on the department's website.

The government will also engage with the community in a conversation about how best to integrate land use, environmental, transport, economic and social policy directions in pursuing a sustainable long-term future for Canberra. In this regard the government's response makes clear that, while the Public Accounts Committee report calls for a new ACT planning strategy, the government adopted the Canberra spatial plan and companion sustainable transport plan for this purpose.

On behalf of the Chief Minister, I would like to thank the Public Accounts Committee for its work in reviewing the Auditor-General's report and in developing the 18 recommendations.

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

## **Planning and Environment—Standing Committee (Sixth Assembly)**

### **Report 34—government response**

**MR STANHOPE** (Ginninderra—Chief Minister, Minister for Transport, Minister for

Territory and Municipal Services, Minister for Business and Economic Development, Minister for Land and Property Services, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs and Minister for the Arts and Heritage) (6:06): I thank the Treasurer for standing in for me. For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Planning and Environment—Standing Committee (Sixth Assembly)—Report 34—*Inquiry into the Namadgi National Park Draft Plan of Management*—Government response.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

I table the government response to the Standing Committee on Planning and Environment inquiry into the Namadgi national park revised draft plan of management. In accordance with the then Land (Planning and Environment) Act, in December 2007 the Minister for Planning referred the Namadgi national park revised draft plan of management to the Legislative Assembly Standing Committee on Planning and Environment. The standing committee subsequently handed down its report in July 2008. On behalf of the government, I thank the committee for their contribution to this important document and to the planning process.

The Namadgi national park plan of management is a significant and important document for the ACT. It sets out the principles and policies for managing Namadgi, which encompasses 46 per cent of the ACT, contains our most important and pristine water catchment, the Cotter catchment, provides habitat for a tremendous diversity of plants and animals and is an important recreation area for people living in the ACT region and for interstate and international visitors.

The committee investigated the administration and effectiveness of the stakeholder consultation process during the development of the draft plan of management, the nature and level of participation of the Namadgi advisory board in developing the plan, Namadgi national park's value as a biodiversity conservation area and as part of a greater regional conservation corridor.

The government has given careful consideration to the recommendations made in the standing committee report. The government agrees fully with 13 of the recommendations, agrees in principle with one of the recommendations, notes four of the recommendations and does not agree with three of the recommendations.

I am pleased to report to the Assembly that the standing committee was favourable in its finding on community consultation and commended the considerable effort made by TAMS to consult openly and fairly with a wide audience. Participation by all key stakeholders was facilitated through a variety of methods for engaging the community. The committee reported that the interim Namadgi advisory board operated effectively and made a significant contribution to the development of the Namadgi plan of management, while acknowledging that at times there were some difficult dynamics between board members. The report notes that TAMS personnel provided a consistently high level of administrative assistance and information to the advisory board.

Those recommendations that the government disagrees are relatively minor in nature. Recommendation 9 is:

that the Department of Territory and Municipal Services evaluate the cost and environmental impact of creating a horse riding track parallel to Boboyan Road as an alternative to the realigned Grassy Creek fire trail, prior to allowing access to the Grassy Creek trail for a trial period.

It has been superseded by other fire trail construction in the park. Since the committee handed down its report, other fire trails, the Burnt Hill and Potter fire trails which are in the vicinity of the area referred to by the committee, have been constructed to meet the requirements of the strategic bushfire management plan. These trails are accessible to horse riders and provide a safe and pleasant alternative route to Boboyan Road. An evaluation of constructing another trail adjacent to Boboyan Road is therefore considered unnecessary. In other words, the passage of time has essentially rendered that particular recommendation unnecessary.

The government disagrees with recommendation 15:

that the plan of management should include details of the monitoring and reporting arrangements that will be implemented to assess the trial use of the realigned Grassy Creek fire trail by recreational horse riders as an alternative to Boboyan Road and the Bicentennial National Trail.

It is the government's view that this level of detail is not appropriate for a plan of management. The plan proposes a range of monitoring programs and it would be inappropriate to include their design and methodology in a strategic planning document. The government, however, has agreed to make publicly available on the TAMS website the methodology and reporting of the monitoring program on the Grassy Creek fire trail.

The government also disagrees with recommendation 21:

that resources already allocated for widening fire trails and access roads be redirected to support the use of remote area fire teams, small machinery and air support.

TAMS has an obligation to undertake bushfire preparation for both fire protection and fire suppression purposes. Access to the park is an important strategy for fuel reduction programs and for fighting wildfires when they occur. Upgrading the standard of fire trails, the establishment of helipads and training for staff for remote area fire teams are all considered to be an important strategy for preparing the ACT for fire events.

The recommendations to which the government's response has been noted, recommendations 2, 4, 5 and 6, are largely outside the scope of the management plan. Broadly, they relate to matters of process and governance arrangements for management of the park.

The government notes recommendation 2:

that the Department of Territory and Municipal Services comply with the ACT Government Community Engagement Manual.

The government acknowledges that providing feedback to the public when submissions are made to a draft plan is required.

The government notes matters concerning the interim Namadgi advisory board. These matters, included in recommendations 4, 5 and 6, relating to updating members of the interim Namadgi advisory board, establishing a permanent board and ensuring that any future advisory board is appropriately resourced and supported, are matters of process and governance beyond the scope of the plan of management.

The government agrees with recommendation 3:

that the Department of Territory and Municipal Services finalise the future role, if any, of the interim Namadgi Advisory Board.

The government is committed to fostering Aboriginal involvement in land management. For example, the forthcoming review of the Nature Conservation Act, a process which is being progressed by the Department of the Environment, Climate Change, Energy and Water, will canvass community views on this matter. Separately I have requested that, following individual discussions with signatories to the 2001 agreement between the territory and ACT native title claimants, a meeting of former members of the interim board of management is convened by TAMS to discuss progression towards a permanent board of management for the park.

The government also agrees in principle with recommendation 8:

that Schedule 3 from the 2005 Namadgi National Park draft plan, 'indicative guide to events in Namadgi' be reinstated in the final plan of management.

The government fully agrees with recommendations 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. The majority of these recommendations have led to amendments to the revised plan and strengthen protection measures for the park, particularly in relation to horse riding and recreational use. These include reference to the distance horses are to be tethered from historic huts and water courses and detail on the requirements for horse-feed both prior to and during travel through the national park.

The plan has also been amended so that more stringent measures will be applied to commercial recreational providers. They will need to prepare environmental management plans for their operations within Namadgi and new operators will have a one-year trial period to ensure satisfactory performance.

It is important that the Assembly notes the considerable efforts made by the Department of Territory and Municipal Services to consult the ACT and wider community to ensure that the plan of management will reflect fairly the views of those who have an interest in and care about the protection and management of Namadgi national park.

The standing committee also notes the professional support and high level of administrative assistance and information that was provided to the interim Namadgi advisory board to enable all members of the board to fulfil their function of providing advice to the Conservator of Flora and Fauna and for the Namadgi national park draft plan of management.

In relation to the interim Namadgi advisory board members, I would like to take this opportunity to personally and publicly thank them for their most valued and valuable contribution. I recognise that it may not be easy for community members to participate in a strategic planning process such as the formulation of a plan of management when their experience with such matters may be limited. It is a credit to each of the individual board members that they persisted with the lengthy planning process required to produce this revised draft plan of management and see it through to completion. And for that I thank them very much.

I would also like to thank the National Parks Association for their ongoing advocacy for the preservation and management of the park. For the record, I would like to also assure the Assembly that the government will continue to manage Namadgi professionally, to resource the park to a level that it requires. The government will continue to ensure Namadgi's conservation values are protected and the park is accessible to the ACT community.

But I have to say there have been recent assertions by the association that the 2010-11 budget papers would include a 20 per cent cut in ranger positions in the budget. I have to say I regret raising that in the context of this, but it is a claim or an assertion made by the association this week which I refute categorically.

It should be noted by the Assembly that the final Namadgi national park plan of management will be tabled in the Assembly by my colleague the Minister for Planning, Mr Andrew Barr.

Finally, I thank all members of the committee for the considerable effort that they have put into reviewing this draft plan.

Debate (on motion by **Ms Bresnan**) adjourned.

## **Financial Management Act—instruments Papers and statement by minister**

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

Financial Management Act—

Pursuant to section 14—Instrument directing a transfer of funds within ACT Health, including a statement of reasons, dated 21 April and 3 May 2010.

Pursuant to section 16—

Instrument directing a transfer of appropriations from the Chief Minister's Department to the Department of Land and Property Services, including a statement of reasons, dated 12 April 2010.

Instrument directing a transfer of appropriations from the Department of Justice and Community Safety to Housing ACT, including a statement of reasons, dated 12 April 2010.

Instrument directing a transfer of appropriations from the Department of Territory and Municipal Services to the Chief Minister's Department, including a statement of reasons, dated 21 April 2010.

Instrument directing a transfer of appropriations within the Legislative Assembly Secretariat, including a statement of reasons, dated 30 April 2010.

Pursuant to section 17—

Instrument varying appropriations relating to Commonwealth funding to the Department of Education and Training, including a statement of reasons, dated 12 April 2010.

Instrument varying appropriations relating to Commonwealth funding to the Department of Treasury, including a statement of reasons, dated 12 April 2010.

Instrument varying appropriations relating to Commonwealth funding to the Legal Aid Commission (ACT), including a statement of reasons, dated 21 April 2010.

Pursuant to section 18A—Authorisation of Expenditure from the Treasurer's Advance to the Department of Treasury, including a statement of reasons, dated 8 April 2010

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

Leave granted.

**MS GALLAGHER:** As required by the Financial Management Act 1996, I table a number of instruments issued under sections 14, 16, 17 and 18 of the act. Advice on each instrument's direction and a statement of reasons must be tabled in the Assembly within three sitting days after it is given. Section 14 of the act allows for existing appropriations to be varied by a transfer of funds between appropriations. This variation must be authorised by the Treasurer and signed by another minister. The transfer must also not reduce the appropriation of the losing agency by more than three per cent.

This package includes one instrument signed under section 14. An amount of \$9.4 million was provided in the 2008-09 budget for the construction of the intensive care unit at Calvary Public Hospital. A subsequent value management study has determined that the final cost for the project will be around \$11.4 million. This instrument transfers \$2 million of ACT Health's departmental capital injection to expenses on behalf of the territory to fund this shortfall and complete the project by the scheduled date of October 2010.

Sections 16(1) and (2) of the act allow the Treasurer to authorise the transfer of appropriation for a service or a function to another entity, following a change in responsibility for that service or function. This package includes four instruments signed under section 16. An amount of \$5.931 million of appropriation has been transferred from the Chief Minister's Department to the Department of Land and Property Services, consistent with the administrative arrangements announced on 1 December 2009. This transfer of appropriation is budget neutral and will enable



functions previously undertaken by CMD to be undertaken by LAPS. Also, consistent with the administrative arrangements effective from 10 November 2009, \$9.959 million in appropriation associated with Australian Capital Tourism has been transferred from the Department of Territory and Municipal Services to CMD.

An amount of \$715,000 has also been transferred from the Department of Justice and Community Safety to Housing ACT for the managed accommodation program for people exiting the Alexander Maconochie Centre. The program is complementary to the men's accommodation support service and the outreach support service currently administered by Housing ACT.

In addition, the ACT Government and Assembly Library appropriation has been transferred from the territorial accounts of the Legislative Assembly Secretariat to its departmental accounts. The operating budget for the library was originally transferred to the Legislative Assembly Secretariat's territorial accounts. However, after a review of this arrangement, it is now considered more appropriate that the library, including its staff and the library collection, be recognised in the Legislative Assembly Secretariat's departmental accounts.

Section 17 of the act enables appropriations to be varied for any increase in existing commonwealth payments by direction of the Treasurer. This package includes three instruments authorised under section 17 of the act. An additional \$700,000 has been received from the commonwealth for the digital education revolution program and the Department of Education and Training's appropriation has been increased to deliver this program. An amount of \$360,000 in additional funding has been received from the commonwealth for the provision of legal assistance services under the legal aid national partnership. Accordingly, the Legal Aid Commission's appropriation has been increased. An amount of \$1.526 million of additional funding has also been received from the commonwealth for the first homeowners boost.

This increase in funding is due to the extension of the scheme by the commonwealth to 31 December 2009. This extension was announced after the release of the ACT budget. The increase in appropriation is required to fund the additional first home owners boost payments being made by the Department of Treasury.

Section 18 of the act allows the Treasurer to authorise expenditure from the Treasurer's advance. The amount of \$2.5 million has been provided to Treasury to make first-home owner grant payments and to facilitate the payment of the first home owner boost, as Treasury receives this funding from the commonwealth in arrears. Additional detail regarding all instruments is provided in the statement of reasons accompanying each instrument. I commend these instruments to the Assembly.

## **Paper**

**Ms Gallagher** presented the following paper:

Gene Technology Act, pursuant to subsection 136A(3)—Operations of the Gene Technology Regulator—Quarterly report—1 October to 31 December 2009, dated 16 February 2010.

## **Legal Affairs—Standing Committee Report 7—government response**

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing): On behalf of the Attorney-General and for the information of members, I present the following paper:

Legal Affairs—Standing Committee (Sixth Assembly)—Report 7—*Strict and Absolute Liability Offences*—Government response.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

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

## **Papers**

**Mr Barr**, on behalf of **Mr Corbell**, presented the following paper:

Work Safety Act, pursuant to subsection 209(2)—Work Safety Matters Report—1 July to 31 December 2009.

**Mr Barr** presented the following paper:

University of Canberra Act, pursuant to section 36—University of Canberra—Annual Report 2009, including financial statements, dated April 2010.

## **Planning and Development Act 2007—schedule of leases Paper and statement by minister**

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Planning and Development Act, pursuant to subsection 242(2)—Schedule of leases granted for the period 1 January to 31 March 2010.

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

Leave granted.

**MR BARR**: Section 242 of the Planning and Development Act 2007 requires that a statement be tabled in the Assembly each quarter outlining details of leases granted by direct sale. Section 458 of the P&D act, as amended, also provides transitional arrangements for all direct grant applications made under the Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991, now repealed, to be decided under the repealed act. The

schedule I have just tabled covers six leases granted for the period 1 January 2010 to 31 March 2010. In addition, 82 single dwelling house leases, 15 of which were land rent leases, were granted by direct sale during the quarter.

## **Public Accounts—Standing Committee Report 5—government response**

**MS BURCH** (Brindabella—Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, Minister for Children and Young People, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Women)(6.24): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

Public Accounts—Standing Committee—Report 5—Review of  
Auditor-General's Report No 4 of 2008: Maintenance of Public Housing—  
Government response.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

I am pleased today to table the government's response to the standing committee's review of the Auditor-General's report on the maintenance of public housing. In tabling the government's response to the standing committee, I would like to make comments on the background of the maintenance of public housing. As members would know, the provision of public housing in the ACT dates from the early days of Canberra's development where, over time, housing was provided to attract workers to meet major construction programs. This resulted in a legacy of a large proportion of government housing. This same legacy means that housing stock, comprising around 11,500 dwellings, has an average age of 30 years and is the oldest public housing stock in Australia. The age and structure of the public housing portfolio presents considerable challenges for the maintenance and rejuvenation of the stock. Our priority is to ensure that this portfolio is responsive to tenant needs, is affordable, safe, secure and appropriate.

Housing ACT tenants quite rightly expect and demand prompt and efficient maintenance and repairs to their home. Housing ACT applies best practice asset management principles in planning the delivery of maintenance services and this is achieved through a total facilities management model. This model enables Housing ACT to manage repairs and maintenance effectively within a fixed budget; provide a single point of contact; provide specialist assistance and high level technical advice; provide coordinated management; value for money; and delivery of services from an owner's perspective.

Since 2005, Housing ACT's total facilities management has been delivered by Spotless Pty Ltd, following an extensive tender process. The contract has two options for extension for two years, one in July 2008, which has been implemented, and one in July 2010, which Housing ACT has recently negotiated with Spotless. The contract is worth over \$200 million for the potential seven years of duration.

This government welcomes the standing committee's report. As noted by the standing committee, the objective of the Auditor-General's report was to provide an independent opinion on whether the maintenance for public housing is being managed efficiently and effectively. While the Auditor-General found there were some difficulties and delays in implementing the total facilities management contract during the early period, leading to some deficiencies in its management, she also stated that Housing ACT has taken action in recent years to improve the performance of the maintenance of public housing through change management initiatives.

Housing ACT has already responded to the recommendations of the Auditor-General's report and has implemented all of the agreed recommendations. In all, the standing committee has made five recommendations in its report. The government agrees with two of these recommendations, agrees with one recommendation in part and has noted two recommendations.

In addition to the standing committee's recommendation relating to the Auditor-General's report, the committee also seeks that another audit be undertaken prior to the letting of the next contract and that there be consultation with tenants as part of this process. This recommendation can only be agreed in part as only the Auditor-General can determine whether such an audit will occur. However, the government would welcome a further audit.

The government would be pleased to seek the views of tenants. Perhaps the appropriate mechanism for doing this would be through our Joint Champions Group. The issues around the extension or retendering of the maintenance contract is a recommendation raised by both the Auditor-General and the standing committee—specifically that there be sufficient time before the expiry of the existing contract to undertake negotiations or the tender process.

I am pleased to advise that negotiations with Spotless have been concluded and a deed of variation extending the Spotless contract to July 2012 was executed in early March. A copy of both the deed of variation and a statement of reasons for the extension of the contract are included in the government's response.

The considerations taken into account in extending the contract include Spotless's overall performance in delivering maintenance services, value for money, employment initiatives and the reinvestigation and refining of performance indicators. The standing committee's final recommendation seeks information on the funding of maintenance of public housing dwellings.

I welcome the opportunity to address this issue. As I have already said, we face considerable challenges in maintaining our public housing stock given the size and the age of the portfolio. In managing the maintenance of public housing properties, expenditures need to be channelled to those properties that are in the greatest need of maintenance and in areas that are sustainable in the long term.

We are currently undertaking a condition audit of all our properties. We have developed standards to ensure there is appropriate amenity and safety for tenants, and

the preservation of the assets. Increasingly, we are structuring the maintenance program to focus on planned rather than responsive maintenance.

In 2009-10, \$35 million was allocated to the Housing ACT capital program to maintain the public housing portfolio which is currently valued at approximately \$3.8 billion. This allocation of maintenance funding includes an appropriation of \$2 million to improve energy efficiency in public housing dwellings. Over the past four years, Housing ACT has spent around \$30 million per annum, on average, on maintaining its public housing dwellings. This equates to an average expenditure of over \$2,600 per dwelling each year.

The challenges of maintaining public housing stock are not limited to the ACT. It should be noted that it is not limited to the ACT. The maintenance costs per dwelling across all states and territories, excluding the capital upgrade or refurbishment costs, have been reported in the 2006-07 Housing Assistance Act annual report issued by the commonwealth Department of Family, Housing and Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. These costs range from as low as \$1,357 per dwelling in Victoria to \$3,076 per dwelling in the Northern Territory. The Australian average was \$1,690 per dwelling, with the ACT costs being above this national average.

In closing, public housing is a significant government asset and more managed maintenance is critical in managing this asset. It is also important that we provide good service to our tenants. The Auditor-General's report and now the report of the standing committee have helped us to focus on the efficiency in the delivery of our services.

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

## **Women—equity of remuneration**

**MS BURCH** (Brindabella—Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, Minister for Children and Young People, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Women): I seek leave to make a 30-second comment and to table a letter.

Leave granted.

**MS BURCH**: I table the following paper:

Pay equity audit—Copy of letter to Ms Hunter from Ms Burch, dated 6 May 2010.

On 24 February the Assembly passed a resolution requiring the government to report back to the Assembly during this sitting week on the government's progress on investigating a gender pay equity audit of the ACT public service. This motion was originally from Ms Hunter and I have provided interim advice to her in writing and have now tabled that advice.

**MS HUNTER** (Ginninderra—Parliamentary Convenor, ACT Greens), by leave: I note that this correspondence from the minister, Minister Burch, to me is in regard to

the motion. The motion called for the minister to come back in this sitting to let the Assembly know where we were up to in investigating ways that there could be a gender equity audit of workers in the ACT public service.

While I am disappointed that that work has not been able to be tabled or progressed or reported on here in the Assembly this week, I have had a number of fruitful meetings with the minister. She has assured me that she is committed to this work and that it is just going to take a little more time. Therefore, this letter was sent to me to inform me that she would be coming back with progress on that work in the June sitting week.

## **Public Accounts—Standing Committee Report 7—statement by minister**

**MS GALLAGHER** (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Health and Minister for Industrial Relations): I seek to leave to make what would constitute a fairly brief statement concerning recommendation 25 of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts *Report on annual and financial reports 2008-2009*.

**Mr Smyth**: I like leave. It is a good thing.

**MS GALLAGHER**: I note the enthusiasm from Mr Smyth.

**Mr Smyth**: I like a good PAC report recommendation being adhered to.

Leave granted.

**MS GALLAGHER**: Then you will like this one too. I am responding to recommendation No 25 of the *Report on annual and financial reports 2008-2009* by the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. I am sure Mr Smyth, as he memorises everything, will remember what recommendation 25 is about.

**Mr Smyth**: It is about executive salaries and open and accountable government, referring it back to the Assembly—

**MS GALLAGHER**: That is right. The recommendation calls on me to report on the outcome of correspondence with territory-owned corporations regarding greater transparency of executive remuneration. I have got to check the date—

**Mr Smyth**: Last sitting day in May.

**MS GALLAGHER**: but I am hoping that the daily program may have given some insight into that—or you really do have some rather exceptional skills.

I can advise that Actew and ACTTAB have both indicated that they are receptive to changing the prevailing reporting requirements in order to provide added disclosure of executive remuneration. Rhodium was not invited to comment about this matter, as it is in the final stages of winding down its operations.

In responding to previous questions about the disclosure of Actew's executive remuneration, I have informed the Assembly that the current level of disclosure is in

accordance with current accounting and legal requirements. It is also evident that, in the absence of any specific legal requirement, the commonwealth's Privacy Act prevents the disclosure of the remuneration for an individual without their prior consent.

It is interesting to note that virtually every government-owned business in Australia is currently adhering to similar levels of disclosure. In the ACT, commonwealth, New South Wales, Northern Territory, Queensland and Tasmania the remuneration of key management personnel of government companies is reported as an aggregate amount under various categories of benefits. Names of personnel are not matched to any income.

This reporting practice satisfies the Australian accounting standard AASB124 and the Corporations Act 2001, chapter 2M, part 2M.3, financial reporting, and part 2M.5, accounting and auditing standards.

In South Australia and Victoria, the remuneration of key management personnel of government companies is reported in income bands. Names are not provided. Each income band only identifies the number of personnel falling within the relevant income band.

It has, however, been drawn to my attention that there is one notable exception to the general level of remuneration disclosure by most government businesses, and this concerns the Water Corporation of Western Australia that is required by its enabling legislation to report on a similar basis to publicly listed companies under the Corporations Act. The Water Corporation Act 1995 stipulates that the Water Corporation must disclose the remuneration of each director and each of the five named officers receiving the highest remuneration.

I accept that it seems to be an anomaly that government businesses are not obliged to provide the same level of disclosure as publicly listed companies, given that they are in essence dealing with public monies. There is also a general premise that government businesses are expected to operate on a similar basis to their private sector counterparts. Therefore, I undertake to bring to the Assembly draft legislation to facilitate improved disclosure of executive remuneration relating to territory-owned corporations.

## **Adjournment**

Motion by **Ms Gallagher** proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

## **ACT Planning and Land Authority—workplace injury**

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Planning, Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Gaming and Racing) (6.38): In question time on 18 March 2010, Mr Doszpot asked me a question in relation to an incident in Scullin. Members will be aware that I undertook to come

back to the Assembly with further information when that was available. I now have that information.

On 8 March 2010, ACTPLA's on-call electrical inspector investigated an incident reported to him by ActewAGL that a person inspecting retrofitted thermal insulation at a premises in Scullin had received an electrical shock.

ACTPLA and the ORS-appointed inspectors both attended the incident within half an hour of the report. At the Scullin residence they interviewed the lessee/occupant, who advised them of the following details:

- The worker inspecting the thermal insulation under the federal government program entered the roof space of the house via the ceiling access entranceway.
- He was only in the roof space for a short time before he came down.
- He stated that he had stepped in a pool of water and received an electric shock and requested that the leaseholder call an ambulance.
- The shock recipient was then conveyed by ambulance to hospital.

Following electrical inspection and instrument testing onsite, the electrical inspector found that the likely cause of the shock incident was electrical current tracking from the 240-volt smoke detector through the wet ceiling plasterboard, thermal insulation and wet timbers in the roof to an earth situation.

Internal roof structure was wet due to leaks occurring in the ridge capping from above. A follow-up interview with the shock recipient would be conducted by the ORS inspector as part of the ORS investigation.

It should be noted that ACTPLA's electrical inspectorate was working as technical adviser to ORS and does not have a final report since that is an ORS responsibility to produce. ACTPLA's recommendations to the lessee included:

- The lessee was advised to make the ridge capping weatherproof to stop it leaking onto the electrical installation.
- The lessee was advised to have a safety switch protection added to the light circuit.

I am advised this was completed on 9 March.

- No persons were to enter the roof space to conduct repairs unless the house's electrical installation was disconnected from the electricity network.
- The lessee was to engage a licensed electrician to certify that any electrical faults had been cleared by repairs effected prior to the house being reconnected to the electricity network.

For the information of members I can now table the following paper:



Electric shock incident—Section 45 Block 44 Scullin ACT—Report prepared by the Electrical Inspector, ACT Planning and Land Authority, dated 17 March 2010.

### **Ms Anna Landon**

**MR RATTENBURY** (Molonglo) (6.41): I rise tonight to say thank you to a member of my staff, Anna Landon, as today is her last sitting day before her retirement on 20 May.

Anna has had a long history working in this place. She first worked here in the executive in Wayne Berry's office in Rosemary Follett's government. But, even before then, Anna Robieson, as she was at that time, ran in the very first election for the ACT government in 1989. If you go up to the Speaker's office or the Speaker's hospitality room, you can see her name on that infamous 1989 ballot paper. I believe she is about halfway along what is quite an extraordinary piece of ACT electoral history.

Since that time, Anna has also worked in Housing ACT and with the disability department here in the ACT. More recently, in 2005, she returned to the Assembly to work with my predecessor, Wayne Berry, in the Speaker's office. It was my very great fortune, and a testament to Anna's commitment to the role of the Speaker and to the running of this Assembly, that she joined me again in the Speaker's office after the 2008 election.

She brought with her a wealth of experience that was of immense value to me in those first few months after the election. Not only was I new to the Assembly but, as members know, I was also new to the role of the Speaker. Anna's experience and knowledge of the office of the Speaker and her wise counsel were invaluable to me both personally and professionally.

Being a card-carrying member of the Labor Party, Anna was a brave lady to take on working for a Greens member in the Assembly, but I know, Anna, that the Greens team have very much taken you into their hearts and they are going to miss you very much.

From talking to some of my Greens colleagues, and from my own experience, it has become clear that Anna brings much more than just experience to our team. I would like to offer a few of the phrases that people put forward when we asked them what they thought when they thought about Anna, and it is a varied bunch: "a fantastic cook", "a great hostess", "feeds you up", "loves flowers"—and brings them to the office, "a wedding celebrant", "a wordsmith", and, I think most complimentary amongst this list, "a wicked sense of humour".

So Anna has been a tremendous asset. From my own office, from Helen and Richard and me, a very special thankyou. We loved having you in our office—your warmth, your wit, your sage advice, cups of tea when needed, and flowers—and we really are going to miss you.

That said, Anna is not going quietly. While she is formally retiring from the workforce, she is no doubt going to be a very busy lady, pouring energy into those activities and beliefs that she is passionate about, and I think the looming federal election is undoubtedly one of those things that she will be putting a lot of energy into with her colleagues in the Labor Party.

Anna, I simply say thank you and good luck.

**Ms Anna Landon**  
**National walk safely to school day**

**MS HUNTER** (Ginninderra—Parliamentary Convenor, ACT Greens) (6.44): I would also like to echo Mr Rattenbury's comments. Anna has certainly been a fantastic part of the Greens team. She really did help in those early days when we were taking our baby steps when we first arrived, and I know how much assistance and support she has been to Shane in his role as Speaker.

She certainly does have a dry and wicked sense of humour. She is fantastic at crosswords. For that little bit of downtime at lunchtime when you want to do a crossword, Anna is a great companion. She is a true believer, a Labor Party true believer, but she fitted into our team and we are going to miss her. We, I think, have formed those sorts of ties and, hopefully, friendship that will continue after she retires from her position in the Speaker's office.

I would also like in the adjournment debate to draw attention to the fact that tomorrow is national walk safely to school day. It is the 11th year that the walk has been held and it is really encouraging kids to be healthy kids. It is about promoting the health benefits of walking. It is about also making it safer because they are learning their road safety skills as they walk to school.

It is about, I guess, turning back the clock a bit. Many years ago it was most unusual for children to be driven to school. You usually walked to school, you rode your bike. In the case of Brian Quade, one of my advisers, you rode a horse. That is growing up in the country for you. It was not in downtown Canberra, I can assure you. But it really is important that we provide those opportunities for children to be able to have those health benefits and, as I said, turn back the clock a bit so that we are not putting children in cars every morning.

Yesterday Ms Le Couteur moved her active transport motion and as part of that motion I spoke about the important benefits for children to be able to walk to school. It is part of making our city friendly and is certainly, as I said, looking at how we can make it a safe and fun, happy and healthy way for children to get to and from school.

I am sure that all members received the information pack in their offices along with a poster and some stickers. I sent the stickers and the posters off with my youngest son to his class at Turner primary, where his teacher was very happy to receive those stickers and hand them out to all of the children. I am hoping that a number of them will participate and walk to school tomorrow. Certainly Turner is also one of many

schools in the ACT that benefit from the YWCA's program the walking school bus, which is a fantastic initiative that I believe is funded by the ACT government. I just alert people that tomorrow is national walk safely to school day and I hope that a lot of children are able to participate.

**Ms Anna Landon**  
**Tamil referendum**

**MS BRESNAN** (Brindabella) (6.48): I too would like to thank Anna for the great contribution she has made since she has been here. As Shane said, she is a fantastic cook. She is also extremely fashionable and, as everyone has also said, has a wicked sense of humour. She loves pink. That is right. Her presence is going to be greatly missed.

I would like to briefly mention that on Sunday, 18 April, I attended, as an observer, the ACT booth for the Tamil referendum, where Tamils living in Australia were asked to vote on whether they aspire for the formation of an independent Tamil homeland in the north and east of Sri Lanka. At least 10,000 Tamils turned out for this vote. Dr Sam Pari from the Australian Tamil Congress said that, whilst the result will have little political significance, it will serve as a tool to show the world that Tamils living overseas support the cause of Tamil independence.

The provisional results from Australia were that 99.4 per cent voted yes to the referendum. The referendum has been held successfully in other countries, including Norway, France, Canada, Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany and the United Kingdom. Again, in these countries more than 99 per cent voted yes and a further five countries will be conducting a referendum in the next few months. The UK government has formally recognised the result of the referendum for the UK; so it would be good to see the Australian government do the same thing for the Tamil people living in Australia.

The referendum this year is based on the Vadukkoddai resolution, which was a landmark decision made by Tamil political parties in 1976 to reclaim their traditional homeland and exercise their right to sovereignty. What they hope to achieve through the referendum this year, obviously by showing that there is the vast majority of support amongst Tamils living overseas or independents, is to reaffirm the political aspirations of the Tamils in the isle of Sri Lanka, that the opinion of Tamils living overseas can be used to determine the political solution to ethnic conflict, that the results be taken to governments and international bodies and that this bring about national and global solidarity amongst Tamils and bring consensus on the national question.

As I noted, I do hope that the Australian government follows in the footsteps of the UK government and officially recognises and supports the results of the referendum in Australia. I wish all the Tamil community success with further referendums that they run across the world.

**Canberra Dragon Boat Association**

**MR COE** (Ginninderra) (6.51): I rise today to speak about a particularly active, sometimes in the unearthly hours of the day, group in Canberra and that is the dragon

boat race community. Dragon boating is a sport which is growing in popularity and one that I have participated in on occasion and one that I have found particularly gruelling, I must admit, but one that I found very enjoyable as well. The Canberra Dragon Boat Association does a great job in facilitating the events in the capital and in sending people around Australia and abroad to compete in competitions.

In the ACT there are a number of different teams and those teams are: ADFA, the dragon flyers, the Canberra griffins, the ice dragons, the navmat dragons, the diamond phoenix, the uni dragons, the Canberra titans and the dragons abreast. And there are junior teams. They are the Canberra sparks, the Blue Gum community school, Canberra girls grammar school, Canberra grammar school, St Clare's college and St Edmunds.

The Canberra Dragon Boat Association committee is made up of the president, Kel Watt; the vice president, Michele Moroney; the secretary, Andrew Churches; the treasurer, Ming Tan; the membership officer, Natalie MacLean; the equipment officer, Robyn Whytcross; the training coordinator, Robyne Kellett; the events coordinator, Fiona Coughtrie; and the development officer, Fiona Tinning. I congratulate them all for the very good that they do. The life members of the association are Anna Wellings-Booth, Jennie Holbrook, Robyn Kellett, Michele Moroney, Alf Pawlicki and Les Williams.

Next month a number of people from the ACT will be going to China from the 10th to the 27th to compete in some competitions in a few different cities there. I wish those people that will be travelling all the best. I understand it is just an interim list but I do wish them and any newcomers that may be signing up in the coming few weeks all the best. I wish the following well in their trip abroad: Peter Alchin, Mark Carson, Kristy Carswell, Fiona Coughtrie, Annie Forestier, Rebecca Green, Sarah Hanley, Lachlan Henderson, Matthew Jones, Min-Chul Kim, Anna Lawrence, Sam Lawrence, Sophia Marmotta, Duncan McDonald, Vanessa Mercer, Faye Pearse, Michael Prendergast, Sharon Prendergast, Graham Reardon, Rebecca Snape, Nick Tongue, Kim Toussai, Ian Vivian, Michael Wilson, Margaret Wolf, Natalie Woods and Matt Zaharias

In a couple of weeks the Canberra Dragon Boat Association will have their annual presentation night. That is happening on 22 May. I wish all participants and all people who attend that evening the very best of fortune for the night and I do congratulate the winners in advance for what has been a very good season.

**Fusion second-hand clothing store**  
**Catholic schools football**  
**VISACT blind cricket**

**MR DOSZPOT** (Brindabella) (6.55): I had the pleasure to attend a number of events over the last weekend. On Saturday morning I attended the opening of the first wombat wardrobe quality second-hand clothing store for Fusion in Canberra. Senator Gary Humphries and Miss Sam Garcia cut the ribbon. Ms Garcia had recently returned as a pilgrim from Uluru with Fusion. A crowd of around 30 people were at the opening and over the first hour of the shop being open for business goods to the

value of \$191 were sold. I congratulate Brenton Reimann and the committee of Fusion Canberra for their ongoing commitment to the Canberra community.

On Sunday morning, 2 May, I attended the Catholic schools football carnival held at the University of Canberra. The tournament was hosted by St Thomas More's primary school from Campbell and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate school principal Margaret Pollard for organising such an amazing and wonderful event for not only the participants but for the spectators as well.

There were some 1,035 registered players in 108 teams. They played 216 games over 18 pitches on 12 games per pitch, thus the importance of keeping these pitches viable, Minister Barr. Each team played four games; so each player obviously had value for their participation. There were nine fields set aside for years 3 and 4 and nine fields were set aside for years 5 and 6. Including the 1,000 players and around 2,000 parents and onlookers, it made for a crowd in excess of 3,000 and provided a great carnival atmosphere.

At least six new referees were thrown in headfirst and Capital Football have to be thanked as well for their contribution to the event. I know Mr Coe, as a former referee, would appreciate the opportunity—

**Mr Coe:** And player.

**MR DOSZPOT:** And player—that these young referees will have had from such an experience. And obviously these referees will be very valuable referees at their local clubs and to Capital Football as a result of that experience.

I am not going to name all 108 teams in the speech but, in addition to St Thomas More's school, I would like to acknowledge St Francis of Assisi primary school, St Jude's primary school, St Thomas the Apostle primary—these are all primary schools—Rosary primary, St Francis Xavier, St Bede's, St Benedict's, St Joseph's, St Monica's and St Clare of Assisi. And that is some of the schools. There were, I think, 28 schools.

I do have to admit to a certain amount of personal bias and interest in this event, as I had my son, Adam, coaching and daughter-in-law, Neti, an assistant referee and granddaughter, Isabella, and grandson, Noah, playing for two separate teams.

**Mr Barr:** Who won?

**MR DOSZPOT:** They all won. In fact, the St Jude's under-11 team that my son coached, I think, won one of the tournaments.

In the afternoon I attended the VISACT blind cricket presentation day at the Lions Club youth haven fields in Kambah. I would like to congratulate Robert Altimore and Stephen Fagg, the organisers, for their fantastic effort in promoting visually impaired sport. And they are excellent organisers. Robert Altimore is also very heavily involved with Radio 1RPH. I really appreciate their contribution to the community.

Apart from the organisers, I would also like to thank Lord's Taverners for their contribution. I think a \$5,000 prize was given by Lord's Taverners and I congratulate them for their involvement. I also thank the Canberra City Lions Club for their support of VISACT over a number of years.

There were a couple of other events but I do not have time to cover those. And yes, Mr Barr, my social calendar is pretty full on the weekends.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

**The Assembly adjourned at 7 pm until Tuesday, 22 June 2010, at 10 am.**

## **Schedule of amendments**

### **Schedule 1**

#### **Emergencies Amendment Bill 2010**

Amendment moved by Mr Smyth

1

Clause 24

Proposed new division 7.3.1A

Page 7, line 22—

*omit 150A(5)*

---

## Answers to questions

### Public service—corporate credit cards (Question No 473 supplementary)

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Health, on 10 December 2009:

- (1) How many corporate credit cards are used by employees of each department or agency in the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) For what purpose is each card issued.
- (3) What is the average amount spent each month on each credit card.
- (4) What was the total amount spent on each credit card in (a) 2006-07, (b) 2007-08 (c) 2008-09 and (d) 2009-10 to date.
- (5) What is the limit on each credit card.
- (6) How much has been spent on any form of catering, including official meals, at restaurants.

**Ms Gallagher:** Further to my answer of 14 January 2010, I am now advised that the answer to question 6 is:

- (6) In 2008-09 there was \$22,755.99 spent and in July to November 2009 there was \$4,928.97 spent on corporate credit cards.

---

### Environment—abandoned shopping trolleys (Question No 554)

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 11 February 2010:

- (1) What approach does the Government take to managing/collecting shopping trolleys that are abandoned on public land and what process is followed once they are collected.
- (2) How many trolleys has the Government collected in each of the years from 2005 to 2010 to date.
- (3) What is the cost to the Territory of collecting abandoned trolleys.
- (4) What legislation currently governs the collection of abandoned trolleys.
- (5) What avenues currently exist for penalising individuals who take/abandon shopping trolleys and how many times have these been used against individuals in the last five years, for example, were there any prosecutions/fines of individuals for taking or abandoning a trolley.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:



- (1) Abandoned shopping trolleys in the ACT are primarily managed by the supermarkets themselves who have engaged trolley collectors to patrol the areas surrounding supermarkets to recover their trolleys. In addition there is a national organisation, Trolley Tracker, who is contracted by the larger supermarkets whom the public can call to report abandoned trolleys and they will arrange for collection. When this approach fails or is inadequate the *Roads and Public Places Act 1937* provides a Roads and Public Places Officer with powers to seize an abandoned trolley and remove it the Territory Impound Yard should it create a hazard. In circumstances where the abandoned trolley does not meet the hazard or restriction of movement criterion, a Roads and Public Places Officer may only give the owner of the abandoned trolley a direction in writing to remove the trolley from the public place within 7 days of the written direction.

The Government has separately developed a proposal to legislate in this area which will be discussed with your office shortly.

- (2) City Rangers do not have records of trolleys collected in the years 2005 until 2010. The ranger's remove trolleys to the Territory Impound Yard where they are later sent for recycling. No trolleys have been claimed by an owner under the provisions of the *Uncollected Goods Act 1996* thus not generating a financial or numeric record.
- (3) Shopping trolleys collected by the Territory are primarily collected by personnel during their rostered hours of duty. The Territory does not maintain an individual accounting process associated with the collection of abandoned shopping trolleys.
- (4) *Roads and Public Places Act 1937*, the *Uncollected Goods Act 1996* and the *Litter Act 2004*.
- (5) The Litter Act is the only Act with provisions that would allow for penalising individuals who take/abandon shopping trolleys. There have been no prosecutions or fines issued for abandoning a shopping trolley issued by the Department of Territory and Municipal Services in the last five years. The issuing of fines for the abandonment of a shopping trolley under current legislation requires a ranger to actually witness the abandonment and then prove the intent of an individual not returning the trolley to its owner.

### **Government—payment of invoices (Question No 593)**

**Mr Seselja** asked Attorney-General and the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 February 2010:

How many invoices were received by each department or agency in the Minister's portfolio in (a) July, (b) August, (c) September, (d) October, (e) November and (f) December 2009, what was the average value of these invoices and how many of these invoices were fully paid by their due date.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- Information associated with the number of invoices received by the Department each month is not available. The response is therefore based on the invoices paid by the Department.

- In line with how Shared Services provided the required information to the Department, the below response reflects the total number of invoices paid during the period July to December 2009, rather than each month individually.

Agency	Number of Invoices Paid			% of All Invoices Paid			Average Value of Invoices Paid
	On Time	Overdue	Grand Total	On Time	Overdue	Grand Total	\$
<b>Department of Justice and Community Safety</b> (including Emergency Services Agency)	11, 099	2,333	13,432	83%	17% <i>Notes 1-2</i>	100%	\$4,030.51

*Notes:*

1. The information has been extracted by Shared Services based on 35 days from the invoice date. Due to how the 'due date' field is used in the system, this methodology provides the most accurate payment data possible. A parameter of 35 days has been used instead of 30 days to allow for the normal time lag that occurs before a department receives invoices from suppliers.
2. Invoices can remain unpaid past the due date for a variety of valid reasons, including:
  - the invoice is being disputed by the agency with the vendor or further documentation is required;
  - the invoice received is an invalid tax invoice;
  - the invoice details are incorrect resulting in the invoice not being received by the correct agency or area within the agency; or
  - the invoice is issued by the vendor well after the date specified on the invoice.

---

### **Government—payment of invoices (Question No 594)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 February 2010:

How many invoices were received by each department or agency in the Minister's portfolio in (a) July, (b) August, (c) September, (d) October, (e) November and (f) December 2009, what was the average value of these invoices and how many of these invoices were fully paid by their due date.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. My response to question on notice 593 includes information relating to the Emergency Services Agency.

---

### **Children—childcare centres (Question No 614)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Children and Young People, upon notice, on 25 February 2010:

- (1) How many (a) long and (b) family day care positions are there in (i) Belconnen, (ii) Gungahlin, (iii) North Canberra, (iv) South Canberra, (v) Weston Creek, (vi) Woden and (vii) Tuggeranong.
- (2) How many of the positions referred to in part (1), in each area, are vacant as of 24 February 2010;
- (3) How many of the positions referred to in part (1), in each area, are provided by (a) non-profit community-based and (b) for-profit organisations.
- (4) How many non-profit childcare centres in the ACT are run by parent management committees and in which suburbs are these centres.
- (5) What communication strategy is being used to ensure that centres are prepared for regulation changes that will take place in 2012.
- (6) How many childcare centres in the ACT already have a ratio of one staff member for every four children under the age of two and how many have a ratio of one staff member to every five children.
- (7) How many visits to community-based childcare centres did the Minister make between November 2009 and 24 February 2010 and when were those visits.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. a. Long day care places –
  - (i) Belconnen, 1291 places;
  - (ii) Gungahlin, 681 places;
  - (iii) North Canberra, 1460 places;
  - (iv) South Canberra, 1716 places;
  - (v) Weston Creek, 241 places;
  - (vi) Woden, 664 places; and
  - (vii) Tuggeranong, 1226 places.
- b. There are five family day care schemes in the ACT that offer approximately 1126 full time effective child care places. There are no regional boundaries that limit which scheme carers can register with. The Department does not have data about how many places are available in each region.
2. I do not have data on the vacancies in individual centres. Vacancy information is available on the mychild website.
3. a. Non Profit Community Based services –
  - i) Belconnen, 1056 places;
  - ii) Gungahlin, 276 places;
  - iii) North Canberra, 789 places;
  - iv) South Canberra, 683 places;
  - v) Weston Creek, 241 places;
  - vi) Woden, 331 places; and
  - vii) Tuggeranong, 818 places.

- b. For profit organisations –
      - i) Belconnen, 235 places;
      - ii) Gungahlin, 405 places;
      - iii) North Canberra, 671 places;
      - iv) South Canberra, 1033 places;
      - v) Weston Creek there are 0 places;
      - vi) Woden, 333 places; and
      - vii) Tuggeranong, 408 places.
  - 4. There are 22 non-profit child care centres which are managed by parent committees. 9 of these are located in Belconnen, 6 in North Canberra, 2 in South Canberra, 3 in Woden and 1 each in Weston Creek and Tuggeranong.
  - 5. The Australian government with states and territories have developed a communication strategy which will provide ongoing information and updates to service providers and families about the National Quality Framework. An initial communiqué was provided to all child care services through the Child Care Management System in early March.
- Regular updates are posted on Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Early Childhood website (<http://www.deewr.gov.au/EarlyChildhood/Pages/default.aspx>) and also on the Australian Government's My Child website <http://www.mychild.gov.au/>
- Links to these websites are provided on the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services, Children's Policy and Regulation Unit's website.
- The Children's Policy and Regulation Unit within the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services regularly provides information to the child care sector on the National Quality Framework at the ACT Children's Services Forum, the most recent of which was held on 26 March 2010. Information was also provided at the child care directors meeting on 17 March 2010 and in a quarterly newsletter. Information is being provided to existing proprietors with all new licences and renewals issued and to prospective proprietors who are planning on developing new services.
- 6. 110 child care centres in the ACT cater to children aged under two. Approximately 20% of these child care centres are operating with ratios of 1:4 for children under two. The remaining 80% currently have a ratio of one staff member to every five children aged under two.
  - 7. During the period of November 2009 and 24 February 2010 I visited one community-based child care centre. This was on 13 November 2009 where I visited the Narrabundah Early Childhood School.

### **Emergency Services Agency—sheds (Question No 621)**

**Mr Rattenbury** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 25 February 2010:

- (1) In relation to the \$2 270 000 allocated in the 2009-10 budget for the refurbishment of the Emergency Services Agency (ESA) sheds at Jerrabomberra and Rivers, what is the current status of each project.

- (2) What is the current expected cost for design and construction of each project outlined in part (1).
- (3) Have tenders for the design and construction been issued for each project; if so, (a) when were they issued, (b) when did they close and (c) who has been appointed to undertake the design and construction work for each project.
- (4) What is the current expected completion date for each project.
- (5) What are the current architectural plans for each project.
- (6) Does the ESA retain intellectual property in each project's architectural plan.
- (7) At what stage in each project were the architectural plans first finalised and have those plans been subsequently revised; if so, have those revisions been completed and what are the reasons for each revision.
- (8) What sign off process within ESA was used for the plans and are there any remaining internal and external approval processes each design needs to go through; if so, (a) what are they, (b) who are they with and (c) how long is each expected to take.
- (9) What consultation was undertaken with the ACT Rural Fire Service (ACTRFS) and ACT Emergency Service (ACTES) regarding the design of the proposed refurbishments.
- (10) If consultation, referred to in part (9), was undertaken (a) when did that consultation occur, (b) who was it with, (c) has that consultation finished and (d) what were the results of that consultation.
- (11) What consultation was undertaken with members of the Jerrabomberra and Rivers ACTRFS brigades and ACTES units regarding the design of the proposed refurbishments.
- (12) If consultation, referred to in part (11), was undertaken (a) when did that consultation occur, (b) who was it with, (c) has that consultation finished and (d) what were the results of that consultation.
- (13) How many consultants have worked or are working on each project, where are they from, when were they engaged and at what cost as at 24 February 2010.
- (14) How much has been spent on the two projects as at 24 February 2010 and on what specific activities has that money been spent.
- (15) What are the current costings for the design and construction of each project and how has the Government ensured that works undertaken are cost effective and reflect value for money.
- (16) What contingency plans does the Government have to ensure the projects are completed should they run over-time and/or over-budget given the expected completion date for the two projects listed in Budget Paper 4 is June 2010.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Both sets of final sketch plans are complete and development applications have been submitted to the ACT Planning and Land Authority.
- (2) Both the Jerrabomberra and Rivers station upgrades are being run as one project. The current expected cost for the design and construction of the project is the \$2.27m allocated.
- (3) David Epstein, Architect, was originally engaged in early 2009 to undertake work on the Jerrabomberra and Rivers Stations. However, due to illness alternative project manager/architects were sought in mid 2009.

Boss Constructions were engaged by Procurement Solutions on 31 July 2009 to undertake the Jerrabomberra and Rivers Upgrades from a panel of project managers established by the Department of Treasury following a public tender.

Boss Constructions engaged Architects Daryl Jackson, Alistair Swayn (DJAS) on 23 September 2009 to undertake the design work.

- (4) Both Jerrabomberra and Rivers shed upgrades are expected to be completed in mid to late September 2010.
- (5) The current architectural plans have been provided separately to the Secretariat.
- (6) The ESA will retain the intellectual property in each project's architectural plan, once document readiness has been completed.
- (7) Preliminary Sketch Plans were achieved in October 2009 for both the Jerrabomberra and Rivers sites. Various iterations of the plans have been made following further consultation with stakeholders, based on cost plans that exceeded the allocated funding. Following a value management review, final sketch plans were brought within the allocated budget in February 2010.
- (8) The nominated representative for each brigade provided written advice that the plans met their respective needs prior to the value management exercise being undertaken.
  - (a) Development Applications (DA) for each site have been submitted;
  - (b) Within any DA National Capital Authority requirements must be met prior to meeting completeness checks from the ACT Planning and Land Authority;
  - (c) The DA process takes 30 working days if no queries are forthcoming. If other parties or groups query the DA another 15 working days may be added to assess the application.
- (9) The ACT Rural Fire Service (ACTRFS) and ACT State Emergency Service (ACTSES) nominated both staff and volunteer representatives from the respective brigades/units to participate in the consultation process over the entire project. As the end users, the ACTRFS and ACTSES volunteers have been the main point of contact throughout the project and have been consulted on the design for their respective sheds.
- (10)
  - (a) Consultation commenced early 2009 and has continued throughout the project;
  - (b) Consultation has been with nominated ACTRFS and ACTSES staff and volunteer representatives;
  - (c) No. Consultation will continue until completion of the project;

- (d) The results of the consultation are the final plans which have been prepared for the development approval.
- (11) See answer to Question 9.
- (12) See answer to Question 10.
- (13) See answer to (3). Other sub-contractors utilised during the project under Boss Constructions include geotechnical surveyors, electrical engineers, structural engineers, quantity surveyors etc. ACT Procurement Solutions has advised that the total costs of consultants to date is \$121,323.92 which includes design, construction management, engineering, surveys and cost surveys.
- (14) ACT Procurement Solutions has advised that the funding spent to date on the Jerrabomberra/Rivers project as at 24 February 2010 is \$123,566.26. Primarily, the specific activities that funding has been utilised for are architectural design, cost planning and project management, as well as the ACT Procurement Solutions fee.
- (15) The current cost for the design and construction of the project is \$2.27m. The Government has ensured that works undertaken are cost effective and reflect value for money by utilising ACT Procurement Solutions to add value or enhance design and construction aspects of the project, via a competitive design and construct tender process.
- (16) ESA has been advised that the projects will now run over the original scheduled completion date and be completed by late September 2010. RFS and SES brigades can continue to operate from existing sheds in the meantime. The re-profiling of project cashflows between 2009-10 and 2010-11 will be subject to the 2010-11 Budget process. The risk of the project running over budget has been mitigated via a value management process. The residual risk is assessed as low.
- 

### **Legal Aid Office—staffing (Question No 622)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 16 March 2010:

- (1) What was the head-count and the full-time equivalent (FTE) count for staff employed in the Legal Aid Office as at 31 December 2009.
- (2) How many of those staff, both head-count and FTEs, are (a) legal professionals providing legal advice and service to clients, (b) support staff and (c) other staff.
- (3) What are the roles and classifications of other staff as referred to in part (2).
- (4) What were the staffing costs for each category referred to in part 2 for the period 1 July to 31 December 2009.
- (5) What is the projected head-count and the FTE count as at 30 June 2010.
- (6) What is the projected head-count and FTE count as at 30 June 2010 for (a) legal professionals providing legal advice and service to clients, (b) support staff and (c) other staff.

(7) What are the projected staffing costs for each category referred to in part (6) for the period 1 January to 30 June 2010.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The answers to (1), (2) and (4) to (7) are in Table A and the answer to (3) is in Table B.

**Table A**

	<b>Headcount as at 31/12/09 Q1.</b>	<b>FTE as at 31/12/09 Q2.</b>	<b>Staffing costs 01/07/09- 31/12/09 Q4.</b>	<b>Projected headcount as at 30/06/10 Q5.</b>	<b>Projected FTE as at 30/06/10 Q6.</b>	<b>Projected staffing costs 01/01/10 – 30/06/10 Q7.</b>
Legal professionals	22	20.85	\$1,217,345	25	23.45	\$1,280,365
Support staff	14	11.74	\$ 307,701	13	11.14	\$ 331,765
Other staff	24	21.42	\$ 974,372	24	21.62	\$ 961,293
Total	60	54.02	\$2,499,418	63	56.21	\$2,573,422

**Table B**

<b>Other staff</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Classification</b>
<b>Directorate</b>	Chief Executive Officer <sup>1</sup>	2.5
	Deputy Chief Executive Officer	1.3
	Personal Assistant to CEO and DCEO	ASO4
	Community Legal Education Officer	ASO4
<b>Corporate</b>	Business Manager	SOGA
Finance	Finance Manager	SOGC/B (broadband)
	Accountant (12 month position)	ASO6
	Finance Officer	ASO4
	Administrative Assistant	ASO1
Human Resources	HR Manager	SOGC/B (broadband)
Information Technology	IT Manager	SOGC
<b>Client Services</b> <sup>2</sup>	Supervisor	ASO4
	Grants Officer	ASO4 (Legal 1 from 2010)
	Receptionist	ASO3
	Client Services Officers (X4)	ASO2/3 (broadband)
<b>New Directions Program</b>	Program Manager (Temporary)	SOGA
<b>Unattached (long term leave)</b>	Client Services Officers (X2)	ASO2/3
	Corporate Services Officer	SOGC
<b>Commonwealth Funded Programs</b>	Family Dispute Resolution Officer	ASO4
	Family Pathways Program Officer	ASO5



<sup>1</sup> CEO and DCEO are also legal professionals and deemed by the *Legal Aid Act 1977* to be a firm of solicitors practising in partnership in the ACT. When other duties permit, the DCEO appears as counsel in legally assisted cases.

<sup>2</sup> Client Services administers grants of legal assistance, the Family Dispute Resolution Program and provides reception and information services. The Client Services Manager, a Legal 2, is counted in the Legal professional data.

---

### **Environment—conservation measures (Question No 625)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The information requested in this Question on Notice is not collected separately by ACTPLA. Most of the available information that is collected will be reported in ACTPLA's 2009-10 Annual Report. Information relating to the financial year to date will require detailed research of financial and other records, for which the Government is not prepared to invest the significant time required to address as it would be too resource intensive and time consuming.

---

### **Environment—conservation measures (Question Nos 626, 629, 642, 643 and 644)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.

- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

*The member should note that the response covers the entire Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services*

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services 2009-10 Annual Report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 627)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecological Sustainable Development section of the Chief Minister's Department's 2009-10 Annual Report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 628)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of the Department's 2009-10 Annual Report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 632)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answers to the member's questions are as follows:

- (1) As part of its Capital Upgrades Program, ACT Health has allocated funds for works associated with reducing energy usage and environmental sustainability. These include:
    - (a) the installation of more energy efficient hot water systems in community facilities;
    - (b) improved metering systems;
    - (c) window-tinting to buildings 5 and 12 at the Canberra Hospital; and
    - (d) upgrade to the building 6 heating and cooling control system at the Canberra Hospital.

Additionally, as a component of its cyclical maintenance program, ACT Health typically upgrades electrical and plumbing fittings to latest energy or water efficient standards, wherever replacement is assessed as being necessary.
  - (2) The cost of each individual sustainability measure is not tracked separately, but is a component of overall capital upgrades project costs or the agency's recurrent maintenance budget, as applicable.
  - (3) ACT Health supports and participates in the Australian Government Department of Climate Change benchmarking through the Online System for Comprehensive Activity Reporting (OSCAR) database. OSCAR standardises the calculation of greenhouse gas emissions to produce comparable datasets regarding environmental performance. Data is gathered on a whole of agency basis and not tracked to individual efficiency measures.
  - (4) A range of water saving strategies has been implemented, such as:
    - (a) the installation of flow restrictors and six-star energy-rating plumbing fixtures;
    - (b) progressively implementing drought-tolerant landscapes at all ACT Health facilities;
    - (c) installation of water meters on cooling towers;
    - (d) transition to microfiber floor mopping;
    - (e) the equipment and assets replaced under the agency's cyclical assets replacement program includes assessment for water-efficiency and environmental impact; and
    - (f) Regular all-staff reminders to think of the environment and to actively participate in energy and water saving strategies in the workplace and at home.
  - (5) The cost of each individual water efficiency measure is not tracked separately, but is a component of overall capital upgrade project costs or the agency's recurrent maintenance budget, as applicable.
  - (6) Water savings are not tracked on an individual efficiency measure basis, rather on a whole of agency level only. It is not possible to accurately track each efficiency measure due to increasing activity levels and associated increase of floor space, assets, bed numbers, theatres and patient throughput.
-

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 634)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of the Department's 2009-10 Annual Report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 637)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of the Department's 2009-10 Annual Report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 638)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) – (6) Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of the *Department of Education and Training Annual Report 2009-10 and the Canberra Institute of Technology Annual Report 2009*.
- 

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 639)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.

- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of each Department's 2009-10 Annual Report.
  - (2) As above.
  - (3) As above.
  - (4) As above.
  - (5) As above.
  - (6) As above.
- 

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 640)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of each Department section of each Department's 2009-10 Annual Report.

For Sport and Recreation refer to the Territory and Municipal Services Annual Report.

For Australian Capital Tourism refer to the Chief Minister's Department Annual Report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 641)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.
- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) - (6) In relation to the Gambling and Racing Commission, comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of Commission resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of the Commission's 2009-10 Annual report.

---

**Environment—conservation measures  
(Question No 645)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What measures, in the Minister's portfolio, are being undertaken in 2009-10 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- (2) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many tonnes of greenhouse gases have been abated by the implementation of each measure in 2009-10 to date.



- (4) What measures are the Government taking in each portfolio to reduce water consumption.
- (5) What is the (a) budgeted cost of each measure in 2009-10 and (b) actual cost to date in 2009-10 of each measure referred to in part (4).
- (6) How much water has each measure saved to date in 2009-10.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Comparative information of greenhouse emissions, water consumption and other aspects of departmental resource usage will be reported in the Ecologically Sustainable Development section of each Department's 2009-10 Annual report.

### **Public service—staffing (Question No 647)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many staff are currently receiving higher duties allowance (HDA) in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) At which levels are staff receiving this allowance.
- (3) What is the total value of HDA that has been paid to staff in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (4) How long, on average, has each staff member currently on HDA been receiving HDA.
- (5) How many of the positions that are filled by staff members on HDA have been advertised and are waiting for recruitment processes to be completed.
- (6) How long, on average, is each recruitment process in the agency or department, from date of first advertisement to the employee commencing in the position.
- (7) What is the average cost of each recruitment process.
- (8) How much is spent on advertising and the engagement of agency hire firms and contractors to assist with recruitment on each recruitment process.
- (9) How many agency hire firms or contractors are currently contracted to each agency and/or the department and what are the terms of their contract.
- (10) Will any contracts with agency hire firms need to be broken to enforce the ACT Government's policy to freeze recruitment of non-essential staff.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) and (2) Refer to the following table:

TABLE: ACTPLA staff on Higher Duties as at 12 April 2010

Level	Number
ASO3	2
ASO4	2
ASO5	5
ASO6	7
SOGC	7
SOGB	6
SOGA	2
SPA01	1
<b>Total Staff on HDA</b>	<b>32</b>

- (3) (a) \$333,847.75  
 (b) \$310,330.72  
 (c) \$158,146.32

(4) Approximately 130 days

(5) Eight

(6) On average, it takes approximately ten weeks to fill a position from advertisement to commencement of the successful candidate. However, it must be noted that there is significant variation between individual recruitment processes, depending on the nature of the attributes required, classification level, whether it is necessary to undertake a local or wider process, whether the position is temporary or permanent, whether the successful applicant requires to relocate from elsewhere and so on.

(7) Individual processes can vary substantially (refer (6) above) but cost on average of each recruitment process is approximately \$4,500.

- (8) Recruitment advertising: \$23,708.18  
 Recruitment agency charges: \$29,702.50

(9) None

(10) No (see (9) above)

### **Public service—staffing (Question No 649)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many staff are currently receiving higher duties allowance (HDA) in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) At which levels are staff receiving this allowance.
- (3) What is the total value of HDA that has been paid to staff in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (4) How long, on average, has each staff member currently on HDA been receiving HDA.

- (5) How many of the positions that are filled by staff members on HDA have been advertised and are waiting for recruitment processes to be completed.
- (6) How long, on average, is each recruitment process in the agency or department, from date of first advertisement to the employee commencing in the position.
- (7) What is the average cost of each recruitment process.
- (8) How much is spent on advertising and the engagement of agency hire firms and contractors to assist with recruitment on each recruitment process.
- (9) How many agency hire firms or contractors are currently contracted to each agency and/or the department and what are the terms of their contract.
- (10) Will any contracts with agency hire firms need to be broken to enforce the ACT Government's policy to freeze recruitment of non-essential staff.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The response for Business and Economic Development is included in QON 646 asked of the Chief Minister.

---

**Public service—staffing  
(Question No 660)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many staff are currently receiving higher duties allowance (HDA) in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) At which levels are staff receiving this allowance.
- (3) What is the total value of HDA that has been paid to staff in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (4) How long, on average, has each staff member currently on HDA been receiving HDA.
- (5) How many of the positions that are filled by staff members on HDA have been advertised and are waiting for recruitment processes to be completed.
- (6) How long, on average, is each recruitment process in the agency or department, from date of first advertisement to the employee commencing in the position.
- (7) What is the average cost of each recruitment process.
- (8) How much is spent on advertising and the engagement of agency hire firms and contractors to assist with recruitment on each recruitment process.
- (9) How many agency hire firms or contractors are currently contracted to each agency and/or the department and what are the terms of their contract.

- (10) Will any contracts with agency hire firms need to be broken to enforce the ACT Government's policy to freeze recruitment of non-essential staff.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 205 DET staff are currently receiving higher duties allowance.

108 CIT staff were receiving higher duties allowance as at 17/3/2010.

- (2) The level at which staff receive HDA is outlined in the table below:

DET		CIT	
ASO3	1	ASO3	5
ASO4	14	ASO4	19
ASO5	11	ASO5	11
ASO6	15	ASO6	12
CE	2	CE	2
CT	1	PAO2	2
GSO5	1	SOA	3
GSO6	1	SOB	4
SA2	1	SOC	9
SLA	10	STP	20
SLB	30	TB1	2
SLC	100	TB2	12
SOA	1	TB3	2
SOB	7	TB4	3
SOC	10	TO3	1
		TO4	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>108</b>

- (3) Total HDA paid to staff is outlined in the table below:

	DET	CIT
HDA paid 2007-08	\$2 816 606.30	\$982 521.01
HDA paid 2008-09	\$2 909 163.01	\$1 163 842.66
HDA paid 2009-10 FYTD (17 March 2010)	\$2 101 950.95	\$877 537.95

- (4) On average, each staff member at DET currently on HDA has been receiving HDA for 6.92 months.

On average, each staff member at CIT currently on HDA has been receiving HDA for 9.26 months.

- (5) DET has 35 positions currently filled by staff members on HDA that are waiting for recruitment processes to be completed (31 March 2010).

CIT has 14 staff members currently on HDA awaiting the finalisation of recruitment processes.

- (6) The average length of DET recruitment processes from the date of recruitment request until the date of offer to a successful candidate is 48.8 days. Information on the time

between dates of offer and commencement is not recorded. (Source: Shared Services report 1 July to 31 December 2009).

According to Shared Services reporting (July to December 2009), the average time frame for CIT recruitment processes from advertising to employee starting is 41.7 days.

- (7) The information is not collected separately and therefore is not available.
- (8) DET has spent \$162 769 on recruitment for the financial year 2009-10 to date. Costs include advertising, scribing services and executive recruitment.
- In 2009 the CIT spent \$49 905 on recruitment advertising and \$7 000 with a recruitment agency for one director's position.

- (9) DET does not enter into long term contracts with agency hire firms or contracts for assistance with recruitment processes. Firms are engaged on an ad hoc basis to provide a specific service – for example scribing for a particular position or executive recruitment for a specific vacancy.

CIT has no exclusive contract with any agency hire firms, however CIT has utilised two specialist recruitment companies to fill two temporary positions pending the finalisation of recruitment processes.

- (10) No.

---

### **Public service—staffing (Question No 662)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many staff are currently receiving higher duties allowance (HDA) in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) At which levels are staff receiving this allowance.
- (3) What is the total value of HDA that has been paid to staff in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (4) How long, on average, has each staff member currently on HDA been receiving HDA.
- (5) How many of the positions that are filled by staff members on HDA have been advertised and are waiting for recruitment processes to be completed.
- (6) How long, on average, is each recruitment process in the agency or department, from date of first advertisement to the employee commencing in the position.
- (7) What is the average cost of each recruitment process.
- (8) How much is spent on advertising and the engagement of agency hire firms and contractors to assist with recruitment on each recruitment process.

- (9) How many agency hire firms or contractors are currently contracted to each agency and/or the department and what are the terms of their contract.
- (10) Will any contracts with agency hire firms need to be broken to enforce the ACT Government's policy to freeze recruitment of non-essential staff.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The response for Tourism is included in QON 646 asked of the Chief Minister.

The response for Sport & Recreation is included in QON 667 asked of the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services.

---

**Public service—staffing  
(Question No 663)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many staff are currently receiving higher duties allowance (HDA) in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) At which levels are staff receiving this allowance.
- (3) What is the total value of HDA that has been paid to staff in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (4) How long, on average, has each staff member currently on HDA been receiving HDA.
- (5) How many of the positions that are filled by staff members on HDA have been advertised and are waiting for recruitment processes to be completed.
- (6) How long, on average, is each recruitment process in the agency or department, from date of first advertisement to the employee commencing in the position.
- (7) What is the average cost of each recruitment process.
- (8) How much is spent on advertising and the engagement of agency hire firms and contractors to assist with recruitment on each recruitment process.
- (9) How many agency hire firms or contractors are currently contracted to each agency and/or the department and what are the terms of their contract.
- (10) Will any contracts with agency hire firms need to be broken to enforce the ACT Government's policy to freeze recruitment of non-essential staff.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The following answers relate to the ACT Gambling and Racing Commission.  
Answers for questions 1-6 are based on information as at 17 March 2010.

- (1) 8

(2) ASO5, ASO6, SOGC, SOGB.

(3)

	Period	Amount
(a)	2007-08	\$107,445.35
(b)	2008-09	\$121,758.80
(c)	2009-10	\$59,591.68

(4) 18 months.

(5) No relevant positions currently advertised, however 5 positions have recruitment action pending.

(6) The average length of recruitment processes from the date of a recruitment request until the date of offer to a successful candidate is 45 days. Information on the time between dates of offer and commencements in positions are not recorded.

(7) This information is not collected separately and therefore is not available.

(8) Nil.

(9) Nil.

(10) Not Applicable.

### **Government—committees and working groups (Question No 669)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many working groups, consultation groups, inter-departmental committees, roundtables or other intra-government committees are chaired or organised by the Minister's department and agencies in their portfolio.
- (2) What is the cost of administering each group referred to in part (1).
- (3) What is the purpose of each group.
- (4) How often does each group meet and what costs are associated with each meeting.
- (5) Which other ACT Government departments or agencies are represented.
- (6) How many community consultation groups, roundtables or committees are chaired or organised by the Minister's department and agencies in their portfolio.
- (7) What is the cost of administering each group referred to in part (6).
- (8) What is the purpose of each group referred to in part (6).
- (9) How often does each group referred to in part (6) meet.
- (10) Who is represented on each group referred to in part (6).

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

In relation to the ACT Planning and Land Authority, the information requested in this Question on Notice requires detailed research of financial and other records.

The Government is not prepared to invest the significant time required to address such questions as it would be too resource intensive and time consuming.

---

**Government—committees and working groups  
(Question No 670)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many working groups, consultation groups, inter-departmental committees, roundtables or other intra-government committees are chaired or organised by the Minister's department and agencies in their portfolio.
- (2) What is the cost of administering each group referred to in part (1).
- (3) What is the purpose of each group.
- (4) How often does each group meet and what costs are associated with each meeting.
- (5) Which other ACT Government departments or agencies are represented.
- (6) How many community consultation groups, roundtables or committees are chaired or organised by the Minister's department and agencies in their portfolio.
- (7) What is the cost of administering each group referred to in part (6).
- (8) What is the purpose of each group referred to in part (6).
- (9) How often does each group referred to in part (6) meet.
- (10) Who is represented on each group referred to in part (6).

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Department currently administers five interdepartmental committees, namely:
  - Climate Change Interdepartmental Committee;
  - Feed-in Tariff Stage 2 Interdepartmental Committee;
  - Electric Vehicles Interdepartmental Committee;
  - Vertebrate Pest Working Group; and
  - Canberra Integrated Urban Waterways Committee.
- (2) This information is not collected separately and therefore is not available.
- (3)
  - Climate Change Interdepartmental Committee coordinates a whole of government approach to climate change.



- Feed-in Tariff Stage 2 Interdepartmental Committee advises Government on the implications of an expanded Feed-in Tariff Scheme.
- Electric Vehicles Interdepartmental Committee to implement the commitment under the ACT Government's Memorandum of Understanding with Nissan Australia.
- Vertebrate Pest Working Group reviews the *ACT Vertebrate Pest Management Strategy 2002* and develop the *ACT Pest Animal Management Strategy 2010-2020*.
- Canberra Integrated Urban Waterways Committee provides advice on addressing urban water issues (e.g. wetlands).

(4)

- Climate Change Interdepartmental Committee – as required.
- Feed-in Tariff Stage 2 Interdepartmental Committee – as required.
- Electric Vehicles Interdepartmental Committee – as required.
- Vertebrate Pest Working Group – as required.
- Canberra Integrated Urban Waterways Committee – as required.

(5)

- Climate Change Interdepartmental Committee – all agencies.
- Feed-in Tariff Stage 2 Interdepartmental Committee – Chief Minister's Department (CMD), ACT Treasury, Department of Housing and Community Services, ACT Planning and Land Authority (ACTPLA) and the Department of Territory and Municipal Services (TAMS).
- Electric Vehicles Interdepartmental Committee – CMD, ACTPLA, and TAMS.
- Vertebrate Pest Working Group – TAMS.
- Canberra Integrated Urban Waterways Committee – ACTPLA and TAMS.

(6) The Department supports the ongoing work of the ACT Flora and Fauna Committee, the ACT Natural Resource Management Council, and the ACT Natural Resource Management Advisory Committee.

(7) The members are remunerated in accordance with the decisions of the Remuneration Tribunal. Additional costs of the committees are not collected separately and therefore are not available.

(8)

- The purpose and function of the Flora and Fauna Committee is outlined in Division 2.2 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1980*.
- The Natural Resource Management Council provides community leadership and guidance on ACT and Australian Government investments in natural resource management in the Territory.
- The Natural Resource Management Advisory Council provides high-level advice and responds to matters as requested by the Minister. It also provides advice to the Department of the Environment, Climate Change, Energy and Water.

(9)

- The Flora and Fauna Committee has scheduled meetings every three months for approximately three hours.
- The Natural Resource Management Council has scheduled meetings every two months for approximately three hours.
- The Natural Resource Management Advisory Council has scheduled meetings every two months for approximately five hours.

(10) The current members are:

- Flora and Fauna Committee
  - o Prof. Arthur Georges;
  - o Dr Penny Olsen;
  - o Dr Margaret Kitchin;
  - o Dr Richard Norris;
  - o Dr Barry Richardson;
  - o Mr Paul Stevenson; and
  - o Dr Richard Schodde.
- Natural Resource Management Council
  - o Dr Sarah Ryan;
  - o Mr Bill McCormick;
  - o Mr Peter Davey;
  - o Ms Kirstin Ross; and
  - o Dr David Shorthouse.
- Natural Resource Management Advisory Committee
  - o Mr Ian Fraser;
  - o Dr Lyn Hinds;
  - o Dr Greg Richards;
  - o Dr Rosemary Purdie;
  - o Ms Anne Duncan; and
  - o Mr Paul Davies.

---

**Government—information technology services  
(Question No 673)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What was the cost of the provision of information technology (IT) services per employee on average for (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) What is the marginal cost of the provision of IT services for an additional employee at the current staffing levels.
- (3) What specialist IT services are required, or have been custom-built, for the agency or department and what is the (a) cost of each and (b) depreciation cost of each.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

In relation to the ACT Planning and Land Authority the information requested requires detailed research of financial and other records. It would be a very expensive and resource intensive process to extract the information requested and I am not prepared to request this information given ACTPLA's current work program.

---

**Government—information technology services  
(Question No 674)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What was the cost of the provision of information technology (IT) services per employee on average for (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) What is the marginal cost of the provision of IT services for an additional employee at the current staffing levels.
- (3) What specialist IT services are required, or have been custom-built, for the agency or department and what is the (a) cost of each and (b) depreciation cost of each.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The cost per employee for the provision of IT services is as follows:
  - (a) For 2008-09 the average cost per employee was \$2,915. This represents costs from 11 November 2008 to June 2009.
  - (b) For 2009-10 the average cost per employee is \$3,255. This represents costs from 1 July 2009 to 28 February 2010.
- (2) The marginal cost of the provision of IT services for each additional employee is \$4,064 per annum.
- (3) The Department utilises the following specialist IT Services:
  - remote access tokens at a cost of \$3,450 per annum; and
  - web hosting costs at a cost of \$21,343 per annum.

No depreciation is applicable for these specialist IT Services.

---

**Government—grants programs  
(Question No 677)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many grants programs are administered in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio and what is the cost of administering each program.
- (2) What is the total value of grants paid in 2009-10 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Grants administered by the ACT Planning and Land Authority (ACTPLA):
  - (a) Annual grants to the six community councils to support participation by the community in community council activities and to communicate to ACTPLA the views, expectations and concerns of community members.

- (b) Bushfire rebuilding grants. The grants are rebuilding grants that provide up to \$5,000 for households rebuilding on original blocks
- (c) Tune Up Canberra. This program provides grants to encourage owners of commercial office buildings to make their buildings more energy and water efficient. The program is jointly funded with ACT businesses.

It is not possible to quantify the cost of administering the grants. These functions are included in respective officers' overall duties.

(2) (a) The total value of grants paid to community councils to date in 2009-10 is \$20,000.

(b) The total of bushfire rebuilding grants to date in 2009-10 is \$10,000 (two payments).

(c) Tune Up Canberra - nil paid to date in 2009-10.

---

**Government—grants programs  
(Question No 678)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many grants programs are administered in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio and what is the cost of administering each program.
- (2) What is the total value of grants paid in 2009-10 to date.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Department administered the following grant programs during the year:
  - (a) Community Energy Grants – the cost of administering this program is approximately \$69 000.
  - (b) Environment Grants – the cost of administering this program is approximately \$26 000.
  - (c) Community Partnerships for Sustainability and the Environment – the cost of administering this program is approximately \$12 000.
- (2) As at 28 February 2010, the Department has paid \$503 000 in grants.

---

**Government—motor vehicles  
(Question No 681)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many vehicles are currently used by the Minister's department or each agency, what are their types and sizes and how many are privately garaged.
- (2) How many kilometres are travelled each year by the vehicles referred to in part (1).

- (3) What are the insurance costs for the department and each agency, including third party insurance for vehicles.
- (4) What output costing methodology is used to allocate costs across the department and each agency.
- (5) What are the top ten individual depreciation costs for the department and each agency.
- (6) Which assets do the costs referred to in part (5) refer to and what was the initial cost of the asset.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) and (2)

ACTPLA had 29 vehicles in use at 31 March 2010.

The information sought in the questions is consolidated annually at the end of the FBT year (ie 31 March). The information for the FBT Year ending 31 March 2010 is currently being compiled but will not be available for some weeks yet.

Relevant information from the consolidated report for the 2008-09 FBT year is provided in the following table in order to respond to the spirit of the question. The make-up of ACTPLA's fleet and distances travelled remains similar in 2009-10 with an increase of two vehicles over the 2009 figures reported below reflecting increased trades inspectors.

Other than those marked with an asterix, all vehicles were home garaged in accordance with the *ACTPS Non-Executive Passenger and Light Commercial Vehicle Management Policy*.

**TABLE: ACTPLA MOTOR VEHICLES – FBT YEAR 2008-09**

Make	Model	Body Type	Start Date (Note 1)	End Date (Note 2)	Kms Travelled (Note 3)
Toyota	Camry Altise	Sedan	01/04/2008	02/04/2008	0
Nissan	Tiida Stl	Hatchback 5dr	01/04/2008	17/04/2008	0
Holden*	Astra Cd	Hatchback 5dr	01/04/2008	02/05/2008	1317
Toyota	Camry Altise	Sedan	01/04/2008	02/05/2008	1312
Holden	Astra Cd	Hatchback 5dr	01/04/2008	27/05/2008	1635
Toyota	Rav4 Cruiser	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	27/05/2008	901
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	12/06/2008	4028
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	12/06/2008	4042
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	12/06/2008	5348
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	12/06/2008	4480
Toyota	Corolla Ascent	Wagon	01/04/2008	24/07/2008	8575
Toyota*	Hilux Sr	Dual Cab	01/04/2008	13/11/2008	5948
Nissan	Tiida St	Hatchback 5dr	01/04/2008	17/12/2008	10273
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	21/11/2008	16713
Toyota	Prius Hybrid	Hatchback	01/04/2008	27/11/2008	9953
Nissan	Tiida St	Hatchback 5dr	01/04/2008	27/11/2008	10283
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	17915
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	17740
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	21056

Make	Model	Body Type	Start Date (Note 1)	End Date (Note 2)	Kms Travelled (Note 3)
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	19180
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	17992
Holden	Commodore SV6	Utility	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	17731
Citroen (Note 4)	C4 Picasso Exclusive	Wagon	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	28707
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	24073
Toyota	Camry Altise	Sedan	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	22140
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	01/04/2008	31/03/2009	24474
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	18/04/2008	31/03/2009	27901
Toyota	Camry Altise	Sedan	28/04/2008	31/03/2009	15980
Subaru (Note 4)	Forester Xs Premium	Wagon Awd	07/05/2008	27/02/2009	22641
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	22/05/2008	31/03/2009	24325
Smart	Fortwo	Coupe	02/05/2008	31/03/2009	9148
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	04/06/2008	31/03/2009	23367
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	04/06/2008	31/03/2009	15849
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	04/06/2008	31/03/2009	21680
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	04/06/2008	31/03/2009	13576
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	14/07/2008	31/03/2009	18144
Toyota*	Hilux 4wd Sr	Dual Cab Utility	03/11/2008	31/03/2009	3889
Toyota	Prius Hybrid	Hatchback	07/11/2008	31/03/2009	6254
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	14/11/2008	31/03/2009	7659
Toyota	Prius Hybrid	Hatchback	24/11/2008	31/03/2009	4474
Smart	Fortwo Pulse	Coupe	16/12/2008	31/03/2009	2660
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	12/02/2009	31/03/2009	1964
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	12/02/2009	31/03/2009	1954
Toyota	Rav4 Cv	Wagon 4x4	19/02/2009	31/03/2009	1803

**Notes:**

1. Where date shown is 1 April 2008, the vehicle was in service at the start of the FBT year. Where another date is shown, this is the date that the vehicle entered service with ACTPLA.
  2. Where date shown is 31 March 2009, the vehicle was in service at the end of the FBT year. Where another date is shown, this is the date that the vehicle was retired from service with ACTPLA.
  3. This is the distance in kilometres travelled by each vehicle between the dates shown in the "Start Date" and "End date" Columns.
  4. These vehicles are provided to SES members under the provisions of the relevant Remuneration Tribunal Determination.
- (3) Insurance costs for the year ending 30 June 2009 totalled \$306,430.72. This figure does not include third party insurance costs for motor vehicles which are included in vehicle lease costs and are not separately available.
- (4) As described in the Budget Papers, ACTPLA has a single "Output Class" and "Output" and this question is not therefore relevant.
- (5) The top three depreciation costs for ACTPLA as at 31 March 2010 are:
- |                        |              |
|------------------------|--------------|
| Computer Software      | \$125,240.00 |
| Leasehold Improvements | \$ 34,601.47 |
| GPS Glonass System     | \$ 12,623.18 |

The seven other top depreciation costs are all motor vehicles ranging in amount from approximately \$3,500 to \$4,500 each.

(6) The initial cost of each of the three assets identified at (5) above was:

Computer Software	\$ 836,132.63
Leasehold Improvements	\$ 5,957, 979.90
GPS Glonass System	\$ 84,085.00

The initial cost of the seven individual vehicles, which are each subject to Finance Leases, is not collected separately. Collection of the information would require detailed research of relevant records. The Government is not prepared to invest the significant time required.

### **Government—motor vehicles (Question No 682)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many vehicles are currently used by the Minister's department or each agency, what are their types and sizes and how many are privately garaged.
- (2) How many kilometres are travelled each year by the vehicles referred to in part (1).
- (3) What are the insurance costs for the department and each agency, including third party insurance for vehicles.
- (4) What output costing methodology is used to allocate costs across the department and each agency.
- (5) What are the top ten individual depreciation costs for the department and each agency.
- (6) Which assets do the costs referred to in part (5) refer to and what was the initial cost of the asset.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Department has 10 vehicles. The following table provides details of these vehicles:

<b>Type</b>	<b>Size</b>
Toyota Yaris	Small
Mazda 2	Small
Honda Civic	Small-Hybrid
Mitsubishi Colt	Small
Toyota Hilux	Medium Commercial
Toyota Hilux	Medium Commercial
Ford Ranger	Medium Commercial
Ford Ranger	Medium Commercial
Mitsubishi Triton	Medium Commercial
Mitsubishi Triton	Medium Commercial

Note: The six medium commercial cars are home garaged. Two other vehicles are periodically home garaged for on call officers. This does not include executive vehicles which are provided as part of executive's remuneration and are privately used.

(2) The following table provides details of the kilometres travelled by each vehicle:

Type	Kilometres travelled 2009-10
Toyota Yaris	11,837
Mazda 2	10,941
Honda Civic	13,295
Mitsubishi Colt	11,833
Toyota Hilux	19,059
Toyota Hilux	12,425
Ford Ranger	10,040
Ford Ranger	21,443
Mitsubishi Triton	18,620
Mitsubishi Triton	17,973

(3) The total insurance costs for the Department are \$83 000.

(4) The Department uses the 'actual costing' methodology.

(5) The Department has 3 classes of assets. The Department's top depreciation costs are associated with:

1. Finance Leased Motor vehicles;
2. Leasehold Improvements; and
3. Plant and Equipment.

(6)

- Finance Leased Motor Vehicles – cost \$378 000 for 13 vehicles;
- Leasehold Improvement – Macarthur House fitout (\$250 000); and
- Plant and Equipment – sound level meter (\$16 000), and filing carousel (\$50 000).

---

## **Government—regulatory impact statements (Question No 685)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many regulatory impact statements have been prepared by the Minister's department or each agency in their portfolio to date in 2009-10.
- (2) How many hours were spent on the preparation of each statement referred to in part (1).
- (3) Which areas of the department or each agency were responsible for drafting each statement.



- (4) What economic analysis, if any, has been performed by the department or each agency in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date.
- (5) What was the cost of undertaking the analysis referred to in part (4).

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The following information relates to the ACT Planning and Land Authority:

- (1) Four regulatory impact statements.
  - (2) This information was not collected separately, and is therefore not available.
  - (3) Legislation Section, ACTPLA.
  - (4) It is unclear as to what this relates to.
  - (5) As above.
- 

**Government—regulatory impact statements  
(Question No 687)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on, 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many regulatory impact statements have been prepared by the Minister's department or each agency in their portfolio to date in 2009-10.
- (2) How many hours were spent on the preparation of each statement referred to in part (1).
- (3) Which areas of the department or each agency were responsible for drafting each statement.
- (4) What economic analysis, if any, has been performed by the department or each agency in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date.
- (5) What was the cost of undertaking the analysis referred to in part (4).

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Nil.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) (i) The direct sales eligibility process - managed by the Department of Land and Property Services - requires, during the assessment of the application for eligibility, a financial analysis of each proponent. The direct sale offer process - managed by the Land Development Agency - requires a detailed due diligence financial analysis.

- (ii) A comprehensive economic and financial analysis was undertaken for the proposed new ACT Government office building. This took place in 2008-09 and 2009-10. The analysis compared five scenarios ranging from the new building, leasing comparable space from the market, and three business as usual cases. In addition, analysis of available funding options was undertaken.
- (5) (i) The direct sale process above is a part of core departmental business, and the specific information is not collected separately and is therefore not available.
- (ii) The economic and financial analysis, for the proposed new ACT Government office building, is part of the Start Up Consultancy being managed by Cox Humphries Moss. The total cost of the financial analysis was \$195,725 with specific costs as follows:

CBRE (including valuations)	08/09	\$105,880	09/10	\$5,640	\$111,520
Prime AG (David Trebeck)	08/09	\$47,520	09/10	\$10,560	\$58,080
Fife Capital			09/10	\$26,125	\$26,125
<b>Total</b>	08/09	\$153,400	09/10	\$42,325	<b>\$195,725</b>

---

### **Government—advertising (Question No 689)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How much has been spent on advertising to date in 2009-10 for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) On what campaigns was this money spent
- (3) What form of media was employed to undertake this advertising.
- (4) Which businesses were employed to undertake, or consult on, each campaign and how many of these are small businesses from the ACT.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question (in relation to the ACT Planning and Land Authority) is as follows:

- (1) Total advertising expenditure to 31 March was \$269,779.74
- (2) Most of ACTPLA's advertising expenditure is on public notices that are a statutory requirement under the *Planning and Development Act 2007*.

This includes development application notification (including expenditure on signs placed on development sites) and notification of environmental impact statements, proposed road closures and Territory Plan variations.

Some further print advertising is undertaken to inform the community about major planning projects or initiatives.

- (3) Print media, signs on development sites. (Chronicle and Canberra Times)
- (4) Nil.

### **Government—advertising (Question No 690)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How much has been spent on advertising to date in 2009-10 for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) On what campaigns was this money spent
- (3) What form of media was employed to undertake this advertising.
- (4) Which businesses were employed to undertake, or consult on, each campaign and how many of these are small businesses from the ACT.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Department has, to date, spent \$170 000 on advertising in 2009-10.

(2)

<b>Campaign</b>	<b>Business used</b>
Greenpower	Couch Creative
Noise Awareness	Zoo Communication
ToiletSmart	2B
Monergy	Zoo Communication

- (3) The Department utilised radio, print and cinema.
- (4) The table above provides information on the businesses used for each campaign. The Department is not aware of whether these businesses fall within the definition of a 'small business'. The businesses are ACT based and were selected on the basis of creativity/value for money.

### **Government—advertising (Question No 691)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How much has been spent on advertising to date in 2009-10 for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) On what campaigns was this money spent
- (3) What form of media was employed to undertake this advertising.

- (4) Which businesses were employed to undertake, or consult on, each campaign and how many of these are small businesses from the ACT.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Department of Land and Property Services: \$6,859 as at 21 March 2010

Land Development Agency: \$170,763.58 as at 21 March 2010

- (2) Department of Land and Property Services: National Arboretum Canberra (Festival of the Forests)

Land Development Agency:

- Land sales at Kingston Foreshore, Bonner, EpiCentre Fyshwick, Flemington Road, Forrest, Belconnen, Griffith, Calwell and Dunlop
- Community Consultation (Molonglo, Nicholls, Harrison 4, Wanniasa, Hume, Hawker, Kingston Foreshore)
- Affordable Housing / Land Rent

- (3) Department of Land and Property Services: Flyers, Newspaper advertisement, Tree booklets.

Land Development Agency: Press advertising, Website advertising, Radio advertising.

- (4) Department of Land and Property Services engaged ACT Publishing Services, Canberra Times and David Lancashire Design which is a Melbourne based small business.

Land Development Agency employs Cre8tive, Grey Advertising and Martins Integrated for its advertising and Cre8tive is a small business in the ACT.

---

### **Government—training programs (Question No 693)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What are the overhead fixed costs for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) How much has the department and each agency spent on training programs in 2009-10 to date.
- (3) What was the purpose of each training program and how many staff participated.
- (4) What in-house training programs were undertaken in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date which resulted in no marginal cost to the Government.
- (5) What in-house training programs were undertaken in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date which resulted in a cost to the Government and what was this cost.
- (6) What is the average oncost for each officer in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio in 2009-10 and what is included in this oncost.

- (7) What is the marginal oncost of an additional worker at the current staffing levels.
- (8) What specialist qualifications are required by staff for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio to undertake its roles and responsibilities and what skills are currently lacking in department and each agency.
- (9) How many employees are currently employed and what level is each.
- (10) What is the average salary for each employee with a specialist skill that is required for the Minister's department and each agency to undertake its roles and responsibilities.
- (11) What training must employees undertake on a regular basis to maintain their specialist skills and what is the cost of this training.
- (12) What specialist equipment is required for officers to undertake their jobs.
- (13) For each piece of equipment referred to in part (12), (a) how many are required, (b) what is the capital cost of each and (c) what is the running cost.
- (14) Over what period is each piece of equipment, referred to in part (12), depreciated.
- (15) How many graduates are employed in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (16) What was the cost of employing each graduate referred to in part (15) and how many have been employed on average each year since 2001.
- (17) How many staff have been recruited in 2009-10 to date and how much has been spent on recruitment in 2009-10 to date.
- (18) How much space is currently leased as at 28 February 2010 by the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (19) What is the cost of the leases referred to in part (18) and what is the make-good provision.
- (20) When will the leases be complete.
- (21) How many staff have left the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio in 2009-10 to date.
- (22) What is the average amount of (a) recreation and (b) long service leave currently held by staff members.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

In relation to the ACT Planning and Land Authority, the information requested in this Question on Notice requires detailed research of financial and other records (note advice in relation to parts 18 – 20 below). The information requested is not collected separately and therefore not available.

The Government is not prepared to invest the significant time required to address such questions as it would be too resource intensive and time consuming.

In relation to parts 18 – 20 of the question this matters comes under the responsibility of the minister for Land and Planning Services and not the Minister for Planning.

---

**Government—training programs  
(Question No 694)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What are the overhead fixed costs for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (2) How much has the department and each agency spent on training programs in 2009-10 to date.
- (3) What was the purpose of each training program and how many staff participated.
- (4) What in-house training programs were undertaken in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date which resulted in no marginal cost to the Government.
- (5) What in-house training programs were undertaken in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date which resulted in a cost to the Government and what was this cost.
- (6) What is the average oncost for each officer in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio in 2009-10 and what is included in this oncost.
- (7) What is the marginal oncost of an additional worker at the current staffing levels.
- (8) What specialist qualifications are required by staff for the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio to undertake its roles and responsibilities and what skills are currently lacking in department and each agency.
- (9) How many employees are currently employed and what level is each.
- (10) What is the average salary for each employee with a specialist skill that is required for the Minister's department and each agency to undertake its roles and responsibilities.
- (11) What training must employees undertake on a regular basis to maintain their specialist skills and what is the cost of this training.
- (12) What specialist equipment is required for officers to undertake their jobs.
- (13) For each piece of equipment referred to in part (12), (a) how many are required, (b) what is the capital cost of each and (c) what is the running cost.
- (14) Over what period is each piece of equipment, referred to in part (12), depreciated.
- (15) How many graduates are employed in the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.

- (16) What was the cost of employing each graduate referred to in part (15) and how many have been employed on average each year since 2001.
- (17) How many staff have been recruited in 2009-10 to date and how much has been spent on recruitment in 2009-10 to date.
- (18) How much space is currently leased as at 28 February 2010 by the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio.
- (19) What is the cost of the leases referred to in part (18) and what is the make-good provision.
- (20) When will the leases be complete.
- (21) How many staff have left the Minister's department and each agency in their portfolio in 2009-10 to date.
- (22) What is the average amount of (a) recreation and (b) long service leave currently held by staff members.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Department's overhead fixed costs (that are not dependant on the activities of the Department) include office rental, utility costs, finance and human resources, and other corporate and management functions.
- (2) \$58,070
- (3) Training programs are undertaken by employees to maintain and enhance their skills in performing their duties. Data regarding staff participation in individual training programs is not collected separately and is therefore not available.
- (4)
  - (a) 2008-09:
    - Appropriate Workplace Behaviour;
    - Budget information session;
    - Overview of ACT Government and financial delegations;
    - Oracle;
    - Human Rights training; and
    - DECCEW Seminar series.
  - (b) 2009-10 to date (as at 31 March 2010)
    - Budget Business Cases;
    - Procurement;
    - Finance Essentials;
    - Workplace Health and Safety;
    - Staff Induction;
    - Cabinet Processes; and
    - DECCEW Seminar Series.
- (5)
  - (a) 2008-09
    - Information Technology: \$1,990

(b) 2009-10 to date (as at 31 March 2010)

- Time Management: \$8,023; and
- Training for the bicycle fleet: \$800.

(6) The Department uses the *Department of Treasury Salary and Admin On-Cost Model* (October 2008) to determine salary on-cost estimates for each generic classification based on an average salary cost of each classification, and a standard figure for administrative on-costs.

The salary on-costs include estimates for superannuation; employer productivity superannuation contribution; long service leave provision; annual leave loading; workers' compensation premium, and other issues as necessary on a case-by-case basis. The salary on-cost total is 16.41% of the average salary.

The administrative on-cost model is based on average estimates for IT and communications related costs; accommodation; insurance; training; fleet; other administrative items including OH&S expenses, office machines and equipments, stationery and postage; and a corporate component covering payroll and human resources costs per FTE across Government. The total standard figure for administrative on-costs (in the October 2008 Guideline) was \$15,790.

The Salary and Administration On-Cost Model is updated annually to assist with budget preparation.

- (7) The marginal oncost of an additional worker is dependant on the level/classification of the employee.
- (8) All Departmental staff are recruited against job specific criteria. All selection processes for Departmental positions are merit based and the best people are appointed to the positions.
- (9) The Department (including the Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment) currently employs 108 staff. The break down of classification is as follows:

<b>Classification</b>	<b>No. of staff</b>
ASO4	2
ASO5	14
ASO6	22
SES	8
GAA	1
PO 2	7
SOGC	20
SOGB	12
SOGA	7
SPOC	4
STOC	1
SPOA	2
TO3	5
TO4	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>



- (10) All staff have specialist skills relevant to their position; the average employee salary is \$80,629.21 per annum.
- (11) All employees undertake training regularly to maintain and enhance their skills. Environment Protection officers are required to have accredited training in environmental noise measurement. The training cost is approximately \$6,600 per officer.
- (12) Environment Protection officers require the following equipment for environmental noise measurement: sound level meter; sound level meter calibrator; and anemometer.
- (13) Sound level meter: five required, average cost is \$13,000.  
Sound level meter calibrator, five required, average cost \$1,800.  
Anemometer: five required, average cost \$100.
- The running costs of these pieces of equipment are negligible.
- (14) Sound level meters are depreciated over a period of 5 years. The sound level meter calibrators and anemometers do not depreciate.
- (15) Under the Graduate Administrative Assistant program, the Department employs one graduate.
- (16) The cost for employing our current graduate is \$76,085.53.  
(Rate of pay: \$55,317, plus 9% superannuation and \$15,790 oncost)

The Department has employed two graduates since it was created in November 2008.

- (17) Based on Shared Services Bi Annual Report for the period 1 July - 31 December 2009, the Department's recruitment statistics are as follows:

Appointments	6
Promotions	3
New Temporary Contracts	25

The financial year to date expense on recruitment activity is \$54,395.25.

- (18) The Department leases 1,525 square metres at Macarthur House from ACT Property Group.

The Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment leases 155 square metres at Dickson Motor Vehicle Registry Building.

- (19) Rental costs for the Department are \$42,432.37 per month.  
Rental costs for the Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment are \$2780.10 per month
- (20) There is no end date.
- (21) To date, Shared Services reports show 16 separations during 2009-2010 for the Department, including the Office of the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment.

(22)

- (a) As at 30 March 2010, the average amount of recreation leave held by staff is 22.12 days.
- (b) As at December 2009, of staff eligible to take long services leave (LSL) the average amount of LSL held by staff is 2.9 months.

### Capital works—projects (Question No 696)

**Mr Seselja** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 18 March 2010 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) Which capital works projects were completed by the ACT Government in (a) January and (b) February 2010.
- (2) What was the (a) initial budgeted cost, (b) the final cost, (c) the initial completion date and (d) the actual completion date for each capital work completed by the ACT Government in (i) January and (ii) February 2010.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Responses to the above questions are contained in the attached spreadsheet.

Project	Original Project Value (\$'000)	Actual Cost (\$'000)	Initial Completion Date	Actual Physical Completion date
<b>DHCS</b>				
Community Facilities	757	Note 1	Jun-09	Jan-10
Youth and Child Care Facilities	1,080	Note 1	Jun-09	Jan-10
Child and Family Centre - Belconnen - Design	250	Note 1	Dec-08	Feb-10
<b>JACS</b>				
Supreme Court Roof Replacement and Air-conditioning Systems Upgrade	2,033	Note 1	Dec-08	Jan-10
Sexual Assault Reform Program	625	Note 1, 2	Dec-08	Jan-10
<b>Health</b>				
TCH Bldg 12 Building works	370	Note 1	Jun-09	Feb-10
<b>LAPS</b>				
Government Offices Air-Conditioning Upgrade	1,410	1,410	Jun-08	Jan-10
<b>TAMS</b>				
Barton - Intersection Upgrade - Feasibility	100	Note 1	Nov-09	Jan-10
Fyshwick - Canberra Avenue/Hindmarsh Drive - Intersection Upgrade - Feasibility	50	Note 1	Nov-09	Jan-10
Macgregor West - Intersections and Residential Street Improvements (Feasibility Study)	100	Note 1	Dec-09	Jan-10
Gungahlin - Gundaroo Drive/Mirrabeil Drive - Intersection Upgrade - Design	150	Note 1	Nov-09	Jan-10
Fyshwick - Additional Road Works and Intersection Upgrades - Design	200	Note 1	Nov-09	Jan-10

Project	Original Project Value (\$'000)	Actual Cost (\$'000)	Initial Completion Date	Actual Physical Completion date
CCTV Upgrade - Upgrade Existing on-bus CCTV on 54 Scania CNG Buses with ACTGS Standard CCTV	450	Note 1	Jun-10	Jan-10
Canberra City Central	755	Note 1	Jun-08	Feb-10
Macgregor West - Parkwood Road Infrastructure	1,200	Note 1	Jun-09	Jan-10
Stromlo Forest Park - Operations and Access Upgrade	1,840	Note 1	Jun-10	Feb-10

Notes:

1) These projects have not yet reached financial completion.

2) Project value reduced by \$0.080 million as the ICT component of this project is now reported separately

---

### Planning—Molonglo (Question No 697)

**Mr Seselja** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 18 March 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Land and Property Services*):

- (1) How many contracts have been signed for any construction work for the Molonglo development.
- (2) For each contract referred to in part (1), (a) what is the value of the contract, (b) who is the contract with, (d) when was the contract signed, (d) how long will the contract run for and (e) what are the costs to amend or cancel the contract.
- (3) How much has the ACT Government spent to date on preparation and planning for the Molonglo development.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Government Contracts Register is an online publication of ACT Government Contracts with suppliers of goods, services and works. It registers contracts with a value of \$20,000.00 and above and can be found at <http://www.procurement.act.gov.au/contracts>.
- (2) As above.
- (3) The cost of public servants working for the Molonglo development not separately identified.

The Land Development Agency has spent \$749,493.74 to date, principally on planning, engineering and marketing consultants.

---

**Planning—Deakin  
(Question No 698)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What is the current estimated cost of the refurbishment of the Deakin shops.
- (2) When will the refurbishment of the Deakin shops be complete.
- (3) What was the expected completion date when the Government approved the expenditure.
- (4) What impact has the refurbishment had on businesses at Deakin shops to date.
- (5) Why was the Government unable to undertake the refurbishment in winter months of the year when the impact on businesses at Deakin shops would have been lessened.
- (6) What further refurbishments of shopping centres are planned for (a) 2009-10, (b) 2010-11, (c) 2011-12 and (d) 2012-13.
- (7) What is the estimated cost and completion date of these refurbishments.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Total cost of the project is \$1,150,000. This includes procurement, construction, design and approvals costs and public artwork.
- (2) Completion of construction is programmed for May 2010.
- (3) Completion date was originally expected to be June 2009, but was adjusted as a result of further consultation with Deakin business owners when agreement could not be reached on a design.
- (4) Parks, Conservation and Lands (PCL), along with ACT Procurement Solutions and the construction contractor, has worked with business owners at Deakin shops to keep the impact of construction works on trade to a minimum. The refurbishment works have been undertaken in stages to minimise impacts on traders and customers at Deakin.
- (5) Construction tenders for the project closed on 23 April 2009. A number of important design issues had to be resolved after close of tenders, before construction could commence.

The significant changes were:

- To achieve the best outcomes across public open space at Deakin shops the designer proposed works on an area within leasehold. Despite extensive negotiations and design revision the leaseholder refused to give approval for works on leased land. This led to further design revisions and consultation. (Development Application was Conditionally Approved on 23 June 2009. Further design revisions occurred in July-August 2009).
- Due to these design changes and delays, the construction contractor was required to submit a revised price and program for the modified scope of works (October 2009).

The construction contract was finalised for the modified scope of works and program in mid-November 2009.

Rather than commence works in December 2009, which is the peak period for traders, the start of works was postponed until January 2010, to take advantage of the quieter holiday period.

- (6) The following shopping centres are currently programmed to undergo various levels of upgrade or refurbishment and/or Forward Design: Lyons, Red Hill, Sculling, Waramanga, Farrer in the future.
- (7) The current shopping centre upgrade program is \$8 million.

---

### **Akron—collapse (Question No 699)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many contractors have been affected by the collapse of Akron.
- (2) How many tenders for construction or development work have been called for within new suburbs before the relevant development application has been approved in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (3) What risks did the ACT Government identify with the engagement of Akron when it considered Akron's bid(s) for contracts.
- (4) How many statutory declarations did the ACT Government receive from Akron throughout its contracts relating to the completion of work and payment of contractors.
- (5) What did the ACT Government do with these statutory declarations.
- (6) When did the ACT first become aware of the financial difficulties faced by Akron and when did the ACT Government first become aware of the difficulties Akron had in paying sub contractors.
- (7) What action did the Government take when it became aware of these difficulties.
- (8) How much money will the ACT Government lose as a result of the Akron collapse and why will it lose this amount.
- (9) Given that the Directors of Akron stated that the company failed due to losses incurred on projects in unfamiliar regions, what experience did Akron have in projects in the ACT and is the Government aware of any projects that Akron incurred a loss on.
- (10) Given that the Administrators stated that a contributing factor to the collapse of Akron was that the company outgrew its systems and capabilities, was the ACT Government aware that Akron was growing strongly to the point that it was outgrowing its systems and capabilities when it engaged Akron.

- (11) Given that the Administrators stated that a contributing factor to the collapse of Akron was Akron was incorrect costing/estimating of projects, was Akron selected by the Government because it was the cheapest option.
- (12) Given that the Administrators stated that a contributing factor to the collapse of Akron was Akron pursuing contracts at low margins to buy work, including contracts that ultimately were loss making, did Akron pursue a contract with the ACT Government to buy work at a low margin on which it ultimately made a loss.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The Land Development Agency (LDA) is not aware of the exact number of contractors affected by the collapse of Akron. However, the most recent update on the "current status of administration" indicates that at the time of entering into administration, Akron had 138 projects on foot across Australia for 52 principals.
2. The number of LDA tenders for development work called prior to receipt of development approval:
  - 2007-08 = 3
  - 2008-09 = 0
  - 2009-10 = 1

It should be noted that whilst the LDA called for tender following Estate Development Plan Approval, no construction has started prior to DA approval.

3. Akron was selected because its tender offered the best value for money at an acceptable risk as assessed against the mandatory and assessable evaluation criteria and compared with the tender responses from all other respondents. The Assessment Criteria were as set out in the Government Procurement Board endorsed Procurement Plan and Request for Tender.

The criteria included appropriate pre-qualification, past performance, financial capacity and relevant projects; technical and managerial skills and a demonstrated capacity to carry out tasks; and project delivery and timing.

4. 16 statutory declarations.
5. Sighted as part of the LDA payment process and then filed on project files.
6. In late September 2009, LDA staff became aware that Akron was experiencing some difficulties in Victoria. Then, in late October 2009, the LDA became aware of concerns that some Canberra based sub-contractors had not received amounts due in mid-October 2009.
7. The LDA has been working (including with the CFMEU) to ensure that local sub-contractors have been paid relevant amounts for work on the local projects as the amounts fell due by:
  - Arranging additional security in the form of a bank guarantee from Akron to protect the ACT Government's financial position and to enable LDA to make a payment to Akron and payments to sub-contractors;
  - Seeking agreement from Akron that prior to LDA payment all outstanding debts to sub contractors would be paid; and

- The LDA then monitored payments by Akron to its sub-contractors and continued discussions with Akron staff to help ensure local subcontractors were paid amounts as and when they fell due.
8. The LDA is unable to provide accurate advice on the extent of any actual loss that may arise. The final outcome will be dependent on the result of the liquidation of Akron which is currently underway. In this context the majority of the LDA's claim which was lodged with the Administrator in February 2010 relates to liquidated damages for the delays in completion of the Bonner contracts.
  9. Akron, a Victorian based company, met all relevant ACT Government Procurement Board requirements that enabled it to operate in the ACT. At the time it entered into Voluntary Administration, Akron had reached practical completion of the Bonner 1A project and substantially completed the work on Bonner 1B2. Substantial work had also been undertaken on a contract at Crace. The ACT Government is not privy to the detailed financial performance of any Akron projects.
  10. There was no evidence available to the LDA or ACT Government that this was the situation when Akron was engaged to undertake works at Bonner in early 2008.
  11. Akron was selected in accordance with the Government Procurement Board approved evaluation criteria.
  12. The LDA and the ACT Government have no knowledge of Akron's specific motivations for tendering for ACT work.
- 

### **Land—rent scheme (Question No 700)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many blocks have been sold under the land rent scheme in February 2009.
- (2) How many of the blocks referred to in part (1) have been sold to (a) builders and (b) non-builders.
- (3) How many blocks are leased under the (a) discount rate of two per cent and (b) standard rate of four per cent of the unimproved value of the block.
- (4) What is the total value of blocks sold under the land rent scheme as at 28 February 2010.
- (5) What is the total revenue the ACT Government has received from rent on blocks sold under the land rent scheme to 28 February 2010.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No blocks were sold under the land rent scheme in February 2009.
- (2) No blocks were sold (a) builders and (b) non-builders.

- (3) As at 28 February 2010, 9 blocks were leased at the discount rate and none at the standard rate.
  - (4) As at 28 February 2010, the total value of blocks settled, exchanged, or pending exchange was around \$46 million.
  - (5) To 28 February 2010, the ACT Government received \$31,384 in revenue under the scheme.
- 

**Taxation—stamp duty  
(Question No 701)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What is the value of rates and land tax paid by small businesses in the ACT.
- (2) What is the total value of stamp duty paid in the ACT by homebuyers who purchased (a) existing housing stock and (b) new homes, by homes, units and townhouses in each month of the 2009-10 financial year.
- (3) What is the average value of stamp duty paid in the ACT by each homebuyer who purchased (a) existing housing stock and (b) new homes, by homes, units and townhouses in each month of the 2009-10 financial year.
- (4) What is the total value of stamp duty paid in the ACT by first homebuyers who purchased (a) existing housing stock and (b) new homes, by homes, units and townhouses in each month of the 2009-10 financial year.
- (5) What is the average value of stamp duty paid in the ACT by each first homebuyer who purchased (a) existing housing stock and (b) new homes, by homes, units and townhouses in each month of the 2009-10 financial year.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The size of a business is not relevant to the assessment of these taxes and this data is therefore not recorded in the rates and land tax system. Information on the value of rates and land tax paid by small businesses in the ACT is not able to be provided.
  2. Whether the transfer is for existing housing stock or new homes (homes, units and townhouses) is not relevant to the assessment of duty and therefore this level of detail is not recorded in the duty system. A breakdown of the total value of stamp duty paid on existing housing stock and new homes (homes, units and townhouses) is not available from the duty system.
  3. See answer 2. above.
  4. See answer 2. above.
  5. See answer 2. above.
-



**Taxation—change of use charge  
(Question No 702)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 18 March 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Planning*):

- (1) How much has the ACT Government collected under the Change of Use Charge to date in 2009-10.
- (2) How many individuals or businesses paid the Change of Use Charge in 2009-10 and what was the average payment made by (a) individuals and (b) businesses.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Government has collected \$5,925,325 in Change of Use Charge from 1 July 2009 to 17 March 2010.
  - (2) A total of 147 payments have been received. There have been 51 payments received from individuals and 96 payments from businesses. The average payment by individuals was \$3,578 and the average payment by businesses was \$61,722.
- 

**Business—statistics  
(Question No 703)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many small businesses provided goods or services to the ACT Government in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date.
- (2) How many of these businesses were from (a) the ACT and (b) interstate.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. Currently suppliers of goods and services to the ACT Government, be it via contract or otherwise, are not requested to nominate if they are a small business. The ACT procurement policy is based on the pursuit of value for money and does not discriminate on the basis of turnover, staff or assets of a business.
  2. See response to Part 1.
- 

**Business—fake identifications  
(Question No 704)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many fake identifications (IDs) have been handed in to the Government's regulatory authorities in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.
- (2) What is the Government's policy on fake IDs and what action has the Government taken to reduce the number of fake IDs in circulation since 2008.

- (3) From which parts of Canberra have fake IDs been handed in.
- (4) What education programs does the Government undertake to alert businesses to the types and nature of fake IDs that are used and how to identify them.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The number of fake IDs handed to the Office of Regulatory Services (ORS) for the following financial years were:  
2007-08 = 198  
2008-09 = 259  
1 July 2009 to date = 238
- (2) Under section 158 (1)(a) of the *Liquor Act 1975*, it is an offence for a person to use someone else's identification, or a form of identification that is forged or fraudulently altered to obtain entry to a bar-room on licensed premises. Any fraudulent ID identified by ORS inspectors will be seized immediately and the person will also be apprehended and delivered to the police as soon as practical.

To reduce the number of fraudulent IDs being circulated in the ACT, the ORS liaises regularly with schools (colleges) and has also undertaken a number of presentations to raise awareness of the potential consequences if caught with fake IDs.

- (3) Predominately from Civic.
- (4) An 'ID Checking Guide' has been developed and is provided to all licensed premises. This provides the premises with the tools to identify the difference between a legitimate ID and a fake. The ORS, in late 2009, engaged in a joint education activity with ACT Policing Crime Prevention. This campaign provided copies of the guide to licensed premises and discussed what to look for when trying to determine if an ID is legitimate or not ( i.e. look at the hologram etc).

---

### **Business—licences (Question No 705)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many applications were received by the Government for (a) liquor licences and (b) outdoor café licences in February 2010.
- (2) How many of the applications referred to in part (1) have been approved to date.
- (3) What was the average wait time for each application approved.
- (4) What is the average seating capacity for applications received in February 2010.
- (5) In which suburbs did businesses apply for a (a) liquor licence and (b) outdoor café licence in February 2010.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) a) Liquor licences - 2 new licence applications  
b) Outdoor cafe permits - 2 new permit applications
  - (2) Liquor licences - 1 liquor licence approved (1 still pending).  
Outdoor cafe permits – 2 permits approved.
  - (3) Liquor licences – one took 8 days, one not yet decided as the applicant has failed to appear for suitability interview on two separate occasions.  
Outdoor cafe permit – one took 5 days, the other took 12 days.
  - (4) Liquor licences – one application for an OFF licence so not applicable, one ON licence not yet determined.  
Outdoor cafe permits – one for 18 seats, the other for 28 seats
  - (5) a) Liquor licences – Isaacs and Dickson  
b) Outdoor cafe permits – Mawson and Kingston
- 

**Roads—John Gorton Drive  
(Question No 706)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010  
(*redirected to the Minister for Transport*):

- (1) How much has the Government spent to date on the planning and design of John Gorton Drive.
- (2) Will John Gorton Drive be duplicated when it is initially constructed or will it be a single lane in each direction.
- (3) What changes will be required to (a) Glenloch Interchange and (b) the Tuggeranong Parkway to accommodate additional vehicle traffic generated in Molonglo.
- (4) What assessment has the Government made of the economic cost of traffic delays associated with these changes.
- (5) If the assessment referred to in part (4) has not been made, when will the Government undertake this assessment and what methodology will the Government use.
- (6) What is the Government's policy on the number of car parking spaces that should be available for each private residence in Molonglo.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) John Gorton Drive is an integral part of the Molonglo development and has been planned and designed on that basis. A number of studies have looked at the planning and design of this road as part of the overall development. A specific design consultancy has been underway over the last year by GHD and has a value of approximately \$1.1 million including construction supervision.
- (2) Yes. John Gorton Drive will be constructed with two lanes in each direction from the outset.

- (3) (a) In the shorter term there will be no changes to the Glenloch Interchange; in the longer term as North Molonglo is developed, there may be need to provide a connection between Caswell Drive and William Hovell Drive.
- (b) In the longer term as Molonglo develops the Tuggeranong Parkway will need to be upgraded to include a third lane in each direction.
- (4) The Department of Territory and Municipal Services completed an economic and technical assessment in October 2009 of the impact of Molonglo and other developments on existing road infrastructure such as Glenloch Interchange. This assessment also considered future traffic conditions and infrastructure requirements.
- (5) This assessment has already been undertaken.
- (6) The current Government policy on car parking provision is explained in the Territory Plan. In general a parking provision rate of 2 spaces per single dwelling housing is required while for multi-unit housing there is a schedule of provision rates that adapt to the context of development. This provision may be further considered when the Government consults on the revised Estate Development, Residential and Multi-Unit Development codes in the near future.

---

### **Housing—energy ratings (Question No 707)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What changes would be required for existing homes to reach a seven star energy rating.
- (2) What design features are essential for new homes to achieve a seven star energy rating.
- (3) What consideration has the Government given to seven star ratings and what consultation has been undertaken by the Government with stakeholders.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Changes required for individual homes to reach a 7 star rating would be dependent on each home's current efficiency and design.
- (2) Ratings are not based on a simple addition of individual elements. Consequently, there is no single set of essential criteria that will guarantee a 7 star rating for all designs.

Designs that promote energy efficiency typically use features that significantly limit heat loss and maximise heat gain in winter, and resist heat gain in summer. These include the use of passive solar design and solar orientation, glazing and thermal mass and insulative properties of building materials in walls, ceiling, roof and floors.

- (3) The ACT Government is participating in the National Strategy on Energy Efficiency, which is a Council of Australian Governments-endorsed strategy that includes a project to develop a new national framework for building energy standards and assessments.

Part of this project is to plan for increasing the stringency of building energy efficiency standards leading to 2020. It is expected that new standards for houses will move beyond rating focused on the building fabric and the current narrow focus on the star rating system.

ACTPLA is coordinating the ACT's involvement in the project, and will submit the Government's proposals for the level of stringency and timing of future standards for buildings and their services based on research, experience and consultation with ACT Government agencies, local industry and community groups. This is the most appropriate process for setting new standards that will gain acceptance across all jurisdictions and for reviewing the impact of previous standards on household energy use.

---

### **Housing ACT—complaints (Question No 708)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) How many complaints have been received by the Minister's department from public housing tenants that relate to (a) maintenance issues, (b) noise issues, (c) pest issues, including, but not limited to, rodents, possums, or spiders and (d) the quality of public housing in (i) 2007-08, (ii) 2008-09 and (iii) 2009-10 to date.
- (2) How long, on average, did each complainant wait for a response from the department and how many complaints took longer than 30 days to resolve.
- (3) How many complaints remain outstanding to date.
- (4) What was the cost of action taken to resolve these complaints in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As at Wednesday 24 March 2010 the number of complaints received were:

(a)	2009-10 to date	2008-09	2007-08
Maintenance issues	235	419	380
(b)	2009-10 to date	2008-09	2007-08
Noise issues	126	185	161

- (c) Complaints regarding pest issues are not separately recorded.

- (d) Complaints regarding the quality of public housing are not separately recorded. However levels of tenant satisfaction with the overall provision of public housing in the ACT as determined by client satisfaction surveys undertaken in the following years are as follows:

2008-09	2007-08	2006-07
69%	65%	67%

2009-2010 results are not yet available as this survey process is currently underway.

- (2) Complainants waited, on average, the following number of days for a response from the Department in relation to maintenance issues:

2009-10 to date	2008-09	2007-08
25.79	24.82	25.24

Complainants waited, on average, the following number of days for a response from the Department in relation to noise issues:

2009-10 to date	2008-09	2007-08
20.08	27.32	40.63

Complaints relating to maintenance issues which took longer than 30 days to resolve:

2009-10 to date	2008-09	2007-08
80	99	71

Complaints relating to noise issues which took longer than 30 days to resolve:

2009-10 to date	2008-09	2007-08
28	55	80

- (3) The number of complaints which remain outstanding to Wednesday 24 March 2010:

Maintenance issues	15
Noise issues	17

- (4) After careful consideration of the question, and advice provided by my Department, I have determined that the information sought is not in an easily retrievable form, and that to collect and assemble the information sought solely for the purpose of answering the question would be a major task, requiring a considerable diversion of resources. In this instance, I do not believe that it would be appropriate to divert resources from the provision of direct services to clients, for the purposes of answering the Member's question.

However, Housing ACT can advise that \$34.4m was spent on repairing, maintaining and improving public housing properties in 2007-08. In 2008-09, Housing ACT spent \$43.7m and has budgeted \$42.2m in 2009-10 for similar works. The figures in 2008-09 and 2009-10 include \$2.3m in ACT Government funding to improve the energy efficiency of public housing properties. These two years also include \$3.2m in funding from the Australian Government Economic Stimulus Plan which ceases in 2009-10.

---

### **Sport—government support (Question No 711)**

**Mr Doszpot** asked the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

How many sporting events did the Government contribute resources to, in cash and in kind and what was the value and nature of each contribution.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

In 2008/09 Territory Venues and Events contributed resources to six events as follows:

<b>Value of Contribution</b>	<b>Nature</b>
\$670,000	Event Management
\$50,000	Facility Improvements
\$138,000	Cash Incentive

In 2008/09 Sport and Recreation Services contributed resources to two events as follows:

<b>Value of Contribution</b>	<b>Nature</b>
\$3,000	Event Support

While not specifically targeted "at events", operational funding provided to peak sporting bodies through the Sport and Recreation Grants Program also increases their capacity to host events such as national or local championships.

In 2008/09 Australian Capital Tourism, under its Events Assistance Program (EAP) contributed resources to 14 events to the value of \$189,000.

### **Sport—grants (Question No 713)**

**Mr Doszpot** asked the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

What sport grants programs are administered by the ACT government and what is the cost for administering each program.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The ACT Government has administered two designated sports grants programs in 2009/10: Sport and Recreation Grants Program (SRGP) and the National League Team Funding Program (NLTP).

The SRGP is coordinated from within the Client Services area of Sport and Recreation Services (SRS). An ASO5 FTE (\$63,409) is responsible for program administration (among other duties). The system is supported by an on-line database/application system – service of this system cost \$19,043 in 2009/10, with an additional one-off cost of \$17,057 to migrate the database from an obsolete external provider onto the InTACT network.

The NLTP is also coordinated from within the Client Services area of SRS. An ASO6 FTE (\$71,423) is responsible for program administration. It is estimated that administration of this program is approximately 20% of the duties of this role.

**Sport—programs  
(Question No 715)**

**Mr Doszpot** asked the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) What is the cost for each sporting program administered by the ACT Government and how many staff are involved in the administration of these programs.
- (2) What equipment and facilities are provided for each program.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Sport and Recreation Services (SRS) delivers a range of programs to improve the sport and recreation opportunities available to the Canberra community. Many of these programs are delivered in partnership with the Federal Government, through the Australian Sports Commission (ASC), under an annual Funding Level Service Agreement (FLSA).

The 2009-10 FLSA between SRS and the ASC is valued at \$157,641.75 and requires the delivery of the following national programs in the ACT:

- Indigenous Sport
- Disability Sport
- Sport Programs and Organisational Development (includes Governance, Club Development, Ethics, Coaching and Officiating, Women in Sport and Junior Sport).

Further targeted programs delivered directly by SRS are:

- Kids at Play
- Actively Ageing

In 2008-09 SRS received a four year budget appropriation totalling \$612,000 to support implementation of the Actively Ageing and Disability Sport programs.

SRS employs the equivalent of 5.5 full time employees to administer the above mentioned programs.

- (2) To cater for the specialised needs of the target audience, equipment is provided for SRS programs as follows:
  - Disability Sport program - modified sporting equipment (sports ability kits) provided for use by people with a disability to engage in sport and/or recreation activities.
  - Kids at Play – two custom fitted Ford Transit vehicles containing a range of modified equipment catering for children aged 2-5 years

Sporting facilities are not required by SRS for the delivery of its programs.

---

**National Multicultural festival—cost  
(Question No 716)**

**Mr Doszpot** asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:



What was the total cost of the 2010 Multicultural Festival.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The receipt of revenues and payment of invoices from suppliers for the 2010 National Multicultural Festival is not complete, and it is not expected that it will be finalised for at least another month.

This information will be provided to you once it is completed.

---

**ACTION bus service—vehicles  
(Question No 718)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to vehicles to be delivered to ACTION Buses as part of Contract C09139, Supply of 26, 14.5M Low-Floor Steer Tag Axle Diesel Powered Buses, for each vehicle, Body No ACTS001 to ACTS026, (a) which have been delivered to ACTION and when, (b) which have been accepted by ACTION and when, (c) which vehicles passed (i) Item 1, (ii) Item 2, (iii) Item 3, (iv) Item 4, (v) Item 5 and (vi) Item 6 of the acceptance test (Schedule 5).
- (2) What portion of the contract price has been paid, as per Schedule 1, Item 3.
- (3) For each vehicle not delivered or accepted, when does ACTION expect them to be delivered and accepted.
- (4) How much money has been paid to the supplier and how much is outstanding.
- (5) Of the accepted vehicles, how many (a) have undertaken passenger services and (b) kilometres has each vehicle travelled since being accepted.
- (6) In relation to vehicles to be delivered to ACTION as part of Contract C09140, Supply of 74 Rigid Diesel Powered Buses, for each vehicle, Body No. ACTM001 to ACTM072 and ACTME41 to ACTME42, (a) which have been delivered to ACTION and when, (b) which have been accepted by ACTION and when, (c) which of the accepted buses have been used on passenger services, (d) how many kilometres has each bus travelled since being accepted, (e) which vehicles passed (i) Item 1, (ii) Item 2, (iii) Item 3, (iv) Item 4, (v) Item 5 and (vi) Item 6 of the acceptance test (Schedule 5) and (f) what portion of the contract price has been paid, as per Schedule 1, Item 3.
- (7) For each vehicle not delivered or accepted, when does ACTION expect them to be delivered and accepted.
- (8) How much money has been paid to the supplier and how much is outstanding.
- (9) Of the accepted vehicles, how many (a) have undertaken passenger services and (b) kilometres has each vehicle travelled since being accepted.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1)

	(a)	(b)	(c)
<b>Body No.</b>	<b>ACTION Delivery date</b>	<b>ACTION Acceptance date</b>	<b>ACTION Acceptance</b>
ACTM001	14-Feb-10	19-Mar-10	Passed
ACTS002	20-Mar-10	30-Mar-10	Passed
ACTS003	26-Mar-10	13-Apr-10	

(2) 23.7% of the contract price has been paid to date.

(3) The projected delivery date is dependant on the production capability of the Adelaide Bus Factory of Custom Coaches and the Scania Pre Delivery facility. The expected dates are as indicated in the table below.

<b>Body No.</b>	<b>Projected Delivery date to ACTION</b>	<b>Projected Acceptance date by ACTION</b>
ACTS004	09-Apr-10	22-Apr-10
ACTS005	18-Apr-10	02-May-10
ACTS006	24-Apr-10	08-May-10
ACTS007	24-May-10	07-Jun-10
ACTS008	03-Jun-10	17-Jun-10
ACTS009	12-Sep-10	26-Sep-10
ACTS010	03-Oct-10	17-Oct-10
ACTS011	03-Nov-10	17-Nov-10
ACTS012	22-Nov-10	06-Dec-10
ACTS013	24-Dec-10	07-Jan-11
ACTS014	01-Mar-11	15-Mar-11
ACTS015	25-Apr-11	09-May-11
ACTS016	01-Jun-11	15-Jun-11
ACTS017	24-Jul-11	07-Aug-11
ACTS018	20-Aug-11	03-Sep-11
ACTS019	24-Sep-11	08-Oct-11
ACTS020	22-Oct-11	05-Nov-11
ACTS021	27-Nov-11	11-Dec-11
ACTS022	24-Dec-11	07-Jan-12
ACTS023	28-Jan-12	11-Feb-12
ACTS024	25-Feb-12	10-Mar-12
ACTS025	25-Mar-12	08-Apr-12
ACTS026	22-Apr-12	06-May-12

(4) Excluding GST

\$3.125 Million has been paid to the supplier with a further \$10.063 Million outstanding

(5) a) ACTS001 was launched on March 16<sup>th</sup> this vehicle being the first of the series will be utilised over the next 3 weeks by the ACTION Driver Training Section to familiarise ACTION Drivers with this new vehicle type. ACTS001 is projected to enter passenger services on Tuesday April 27<sup>th</sup> 2010.

b) As at Thursday April 8th 2010

ACTS001 has 2,385 Kms on the odometer

ACTS002 has 1,250 Kms on the odometer

ACTS003 has 1,235 Kms on the odometer

The first 1,200 km of each bus is the journey from the Adelaide factory to Canberra

Once a bus is accepted there is a commissioning process that involves the installation of the Radio Communication System, Ticketing Equipment, a Fuel Monitoring appliance and the final pre service check by Belconnen and MUO Workshops. This process is being delivered over and above the Workshops primary role of servicing and maintaining fleet to the network and with the volume of vehicles coming through the process can take between 10 to 14 working days per bus to complete.

(6)

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
<b>Body No.</b>	<b>ACTION Delivery date</b>	<b>ACTION Acceptance date</b>	<b>ACTION In Service date</b>	<b>KM's AS at 8/04/10</b>	<b>ACTION Acceptance</b>
ACTM001	24-Aug-09	28-Aug-09	15-Sep-09	25,274	Passed
ACTM002	24-Sep-09	29-Sep-09	06-Oct-09	21,861	Passed
ACTME41	25-Sep-09	30-Sep-09	07-Oct-09	18,166	Passed
ACTME42	28-Sep-09	03-Oct-09	10-Oct-09	20,018	Passed
ACTM003	30-Sep-09	05-Oct-09	12-Oct-09	20,899	Passed
ACTM004	02-Oct-09	07-Oct-09	14-Oct-09	19,556	Passed
ACTM005	02-Oct-09	07-Oct-09	14-Oct-09	21,966	Passed
ACTM006	07-Oct-09	12-Oct-09	19-Oct-09	24,335	Passed
ACTM007	15-Oct-09	20-Oct-09	27-Oct-09	16,564	Passed
ACTM008	16-Oct-09	21-Oct-09	28-Oct-09	26,776	Passed
ACTM009	27-Oct-09	01-Nov-09	08-Nov-09	19,389	Passed
ACTM010	29-Oct-09	03-Nov-09	10-Nov-09	4,623	Passed
ACTM011	08-Nov-09	13-Nov-09	20-Nov-09	14,145	Passed
ACTM012	08-Nov-09	13-Nov-09	20-Nov-09	13,508	Passed
ACTM013	24-Jan-10	29-Jan-10	05-Feb-10	5,791	Passed
ACTM014	10-Feb-10	15-Mar-10	22-Mar-10	2,920	Passed
ACTM015	10-Feb-10	15-Mar-10	22-Mar-10	3,282	Passed
ACTM016	16-Feb-10	21-Feb-10	6-Apr-10	1,675	Passed
ACTM017	16-Feb-10	21-Feb-10	7-Apr-10	1,482	Passed
ACTM018	28-Feb-10	05-Mar-10		1,231	Passed
ACTM019	12-Mar-10	17-Mar-10		1,236	Passed
ACTM021	14-Mar-10	19-Mar-10		1,239	Passed
ACTM023	15-Mar-10	20-Mar-10		1,228	Passed
ACTM025	20-Mar-10	30-Mar-10		1,226	Passed
ACTM022	23-Mar-10	30-Mar-10		1,233	Passed
ACTM026	25-Mar-10	06-Apr-10		1,229	Passed
ACTM027	26-Mar-10	07-Apr-10		1,230	Passed
ACTM020	30-Mar-10	09-Apr-10		1,228	
ACTM028	30-Mar-10	12-Apr-10		1,235	

The first 1,200 km of each bus is the journey from the Adelaide factory to Canberra

Once a bus is accepted there is a commissioning process that involves the installation of the Radio Communication System, Ticketing Equipment, a Fuel Monitoring appliance and the final pre service check by Belconnen and MUO Workshops. This process is being delivered over and above the Workshops primary role of servicing and maintaining fleet to the network and with the volume of vehicles coming through the process can take between 10 to 14 working days per bus to complete. Some buses are out of sequence due to production issues at the Factory.

f) 50% of the contract price has been paid to date.

(7) The projected delivery date is dependant on the production capability of the Adelaide Bus Factory of Custom Coaches and the MAN Pre Delivery facility. The expected dates are as indicated in the table below.

<b>Body No.</b>	<b>Projected ACTION Delivery date</b>	<b>Projected ACTION Acceptance date</b>
ACTM029	09-Apr-10	15-Apr-10
ACTM024	14-Apr-10	21-Apr-10
ACTM030	15-Apr-10	22-Apr-10
ACTM031	28-Apr-10	03-May-10
ACTM032	07-May-10	12-May-10
ACTM033	27-May-10	01-Jun-10
ACTM034	09-Jun-10	14-Jun-10
ACTM035	18-Jun-10	23-Jun-10
ACTM036	01-Jul-10	06-Jul-10
ACTM037	15-Jul-10	20-Jul-10
ACTM038	23-Jul-10	28-Jul-10
ACTM039	04-Aug-10	09-Aug-10
ACTM040	16-Aug-10	21-Aug-10
ACTM041	27-Aug-10	01-Sep-10
ACTM042	08-Sep-10	13-Sep-10
ACTM043	17-Sep-10	22-Sep-10
ACTM044	30-Sep-10	05-Oct-10
ACTM045	11-Oct-10	16-Oct-10
ACTM046	21-Oct-10	26-Oct-10
ACTM047	29-Oct-10	03-Nov-10
ACTM048	10-Nov-10	15-Nov-10
ACTM049	25-Nov-10	30-Nov-10
ACTM050	03-Dec-10	08-Dec-10
ACTM051	16-Dec-10	21-Dec-10
ACTM052	29-Dec-10	03-Jan-11
ACTM053	07-Jan-11	12-Jan-11
ACTM054	24-Jan-11	29-Jan-11
ACTM055	31-Jan-11	05-Feb-11
ACTM056	10-Feb-11	15-Feb-11
ACTM057	21-Feb-11	26-Feb-11
ACTM058	02-Mar-11	07-Mar-11
ACTM059	14-Mar-11	19-Mar-11

<b>Body No.</b>	<b>Projected ACTION Delivery date</b>	<b>Projected ACTION Acceptance date</b>
ACTM060	23-Mar-11	28-Mar-11
ACTM061	01-Apr-11	06-Apr-11
ACTM062	11-Apr-11	16-Apr-11
ACTM063	20-Apr-11	25-Apr-11
ACTM064	29-Apr-11	04-May-11
ACTM065	13-May-11	18-May-11
ACTM066	24-May-11	29-May-11
ACTM067	09-Jun-11	14-Jun-11
ACTM068	14-Jun-11	19-Jun-11
ACTM069	16-Jun-11	21-Jun-11
ACTM070	23-Jun-11	28-Jun-11
ACTM071	27-Jun-11	02-Jul-11
ACTM072	01-Jul-11	06-Jul-11

(8) Excluding GST

\$16.748 million has been paid to the supplier with a further \$16.800 million outstanding.

(9)

a) 19 vehicles have entered passenger service

b) Kilometres travelled per vehicle as per table below

<b>Body No.</b>	<b>KM's AS at 8/04/10</b>
ACTM001	25,274
ACTM002	21,861
ACTME41	18,166
ACTME42	20,018
ACTM003	20,899
ACTM004	19,556
ACTM005	21,966
ACTM006	24,335
ACTM007	16,564
ACTM008	26,776
ACTM009	19,389
ACTM010	4,623
ACTM011	14,145
ACTM012	13,508
ACTM013	5,791
ACTM014	2,920
ACTM015	3,282
ACTM016	1,675
ACTM017	1,482

The first 1,200 km of each bus is the journey from the Adelaide factory to Canberra.

**Planning—Nicholls  
(Question No 720)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport*):

- (1) When will work on widening the Nicholls shops car park (a) commence and (b) completed.
- (2) Has the contract for the upgrade been awarded; if not, when will the decision be made and announced.
- (3) What is the actual, or estimated, cost of the work.
- (4) For the current situation and under the proposed changes, how many parking bays are and/or will be available for (a) general parking, (b) parking for goods carrying vehicles and (c) mobility parking scheme permits.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Work on the Nicholls Shops car park widening has:
  - (a) commenced on Monday, 22 March 2010;
  - (b) and will be completed in early May 2010.
- (2) The contract has been awarded to Acclaim Contractors.
- (3) The contract value is for \$103,039.70
- (4) a) parking bays - 50  
b) parking for goods carrying vehicles – 0  
c) mobility parking scheme permits - 2

---

**Environment—street trees  
(Question No 721)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

How many dead or dangerous trees were removed from suburban streets and how many of the trees were replanted, broken down by suburb and for each year between 2005 and 2009, inclusive.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

**Attachment A** provides data from the Department of Territory and Municipal Services dead and hazardous tree removal program for the number of trees removed from suburban streets, broken down by suburb for each year between 2005 and 2009. The total number of trees removed from suburban streets under this program during the period 2005-2009 is 3,921. Data is not available for trees removed by TAMS staff under routine tree maintenance programs.

TAMS manages a range of programs that involve new planting and the replacement planting of trees in Canberra's streets. The total number of trees planted over this period greatly exceeds tree removal.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

---

### **Environment—firewood (Question No 722)**

**Ms Bresnan** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) Given that in the ACT Firewood Strategy 1999 the objective of ACT Firewood Industry Code of Practice is that merchants agreed to abide by a number of conditions, including supplying the choice of mixed fuel wood loads, selling by mass, (weight) only, stocking only seasoned wood, providing information pamphlets on correct wood burning practices to their customers and to provide where possible the source and type of firewood in a fuel wood load, does the Government have a record of how many wood merchants are compliant and non-compliant with the ACT Industry Code of Practice and can these figures be provided for each of the past five years.
- (2) What steps has the ACT Government taken over the past five years to ensure that business is compliant with the ACT Industry Code of Practice.
- (3) Are there incentives for businesses to sign up to the ACT Industry Code of Practice.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The voluntary ACT Firewood Industry Code of Practice (COP) became obsolete when the *Environment Protection Legislation Amendment Bill 2000* (EPLA Bill) came into effect on 5 April 2001.

The EPLA Bill was presented by Ms Kerrie Tucker MLA on 28 June 2000, the then ACT Greens MLA. The Bill was passed by the Assembly on 30 August 2000.

The EPLA Bill amended the *Environment Protection Act 1997* to make the sale and supply of firewood a Class A activity requiring an environmental authorisation issued by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and the Environment Protection Regulation to set minimum standards for such an authorisation. The prescribed conditions are contained in the Regulation.

In addition to the prescribed conditions, the EPA requires each authorisation holder to produce an annual report by 31 January for the amount of firewood sold in the previous calendar year.

As the COP became obsolete in 2001, no compliance records exist.

- (2) As noted, the voluntary COP has been replaced by the requirement that wood merchants to hold an environmental authorisation under the *Environment Protection Act 1997*.

Currently there are 21 authorised firewood merchants operating in the ACT, of which three are wholesale merchants.

The EPA reviews all environmental authorisations annually. These reviews show a very high level of compliance, with any non-compliance addressed through the review process.

The following identifies the number of non –complaint merchants over the last five years:

- 2005 - 1;
- 2006 - 2;
- 2007 – 1;
- 2008 – 3; and
- 2009 – 2.

Non-compliance related to merchants not providing a ‘burning tips’ pamphlet with sales transactions. In these instances, the EPA wrote to the merchant reiterating that, as a condition of their authorisation they are required to supply a pamphlet with every sale. Additional copies of the pamphlet were also provided to the merchants.

- (3) As noted, the voluntary COP has been replaced by the requirement that wood merchants are required to hold an environmental authorisation under the *Environment Protection Act 1997*.

---

### **Housing ACT—dwellings (Question No 724)**

**Ms Bresnan** asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 18 March 2010:

- (1) For (a) 2004-05, (b) 2005-06, (c) 2006-07, (d) 2007-08 and (e) 2008-09, (i) how many dwellings did ACT Housing dispose of, (ii) what was the total value of the dwellings ACT Housing disposed of, (iii) how many of these dwellings were sold to ACT Housing tenants and (iv) how many of these dwellings were sold to ACT Housing tenants under a shared equity scheme.
- (2) For (a) 2009-10, (b) 2010-11, (c) 2011-12, (d) 2012-13 and (e) 2013-14, (i) how many dwellings does ACT Housing plan to dispose of, (ii) what is the anticipated total value of the dwellings ACT Housing plans to dispose of, (iii) how many of these dwellings does ACT Housing plan on selling to tenants and (iv) how many of these dwellings does ACT Housing plan on selling to tenants under a shared equity scheme.
- (3) If the number or total financial value of dwellings disposed of has changed from year to year, can the Minister explain why.

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

- (1) (i) The number of dwellings disposed of by Housing ACT was
  - (a) 2004-05 – 76
  - (b) 2005-06 – 92



- (c) 2006-07 – 76
- (d) 2007-08 – 69
- (e) 2008-09 – 150

(ii) The total values of the dwellings disposed of by Housing ACT was

- (a) 2004-05 – \$26.6 million
- (b) 2005-06 – \$33.64 million
- (c) 2006-07 – \$27.18 million
- (d) 2007-08 – \$26.39 million
- (e) 2008-09 – \$44.30 million

\* (iii) The number of dwellings sold to Housing ACT tenants was

- (a) 2004-05 – 16
- (b) 2005-06 – 24
- (c) 2006-07 – 41
- (d) 2007-08 – 47
- (e) 2008-09 – 12

\* The number of dwellings specified under (iii) are included in (1).

(iv) None of these dwellings were sold to Housing ACT tenants under a shared equity scheme as the scheme was not in existence.

(2) (i) The number of dwellings that Housing ACT anticipates selling is:

- 2009-10 - 60
- 2010-11 - 78
- 2011-12 - 70
- 2012-13 - 70
- 2013-14 - 70

(ii) The anticipated total value of the dwellings that Housing ACT plans to dispose of is

- 2009-10 - \$26.36 million
- 2010-11 - \$34.67 million
- 2011-12 - \$33.22 million
- 2012-13 - \$35.24 million
- 2013-14 - \$37.38 million

(iii) The number of dwellings that Housing ACT anticipates selling to tenants is

- 2009-10 - 29
- 2010-11 - 40
- 2011-12 - 35
- 2012-13 - 35
- 2013-14 - 35

\*\* (iv) The number of dwellings that Housing ACT plan selling to tenants under a shared equity scheme is

- 2009-10 - 0
- 2010-11 - 25
- 2011-12 - 20
- 2012-13 - 20
- 2013-14 - 20

\*\* The number of dwellings specified under (iv) is included in (iii) as the shared equity scheme is part of the sale to tenant program. While contracts may have been

exchanged before 30 June 2010, it is not expected that the sale would have been finalised by that time.

- (3) The number of properties sold varies from year to year depending upon the nature of the Housing ACT Capital Budget. The value of properties sold each year is dependent upon the nature, location and size of the dwellings sold. For example, the sale proceeds in 2008-09 included just over \$25 million from the sale of Fraser Court. The number of dwellings sold also increased in that year as the sale of Fraser Court resulted in the sale of 104 dwellings.

---

### **Courts—Sentence Administration Board (Question No 727)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 23 March 2010:

- (1) What was the quantum of each of the legal costs and compensation paid out by the ACT in relation to successful challenges to decisions of the Sentence Administration Board during (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09, and (c) 1 July to 31 December 2009.
- (2) For each of the matters referred to in part (1), what was the nature of the decisions of the Board that were successfully challenged.
- (3) In relation to the legal advice received by the Sentence Administration Board from the Government Solicitor, referred to in the Hansard of 25 November 2009, page 104, Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety inquiry into annual and financial reports 2008-2009, (a) what changes did the Board make to its decision-making processes as a result of that advice and (b) when did the Board make the changes.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The quantum of legal costs and compensation paid out by the ACT in relation to successful challenges to decisions of the Sentence Administration Board is as follows:
  - (a) during 2007-08, the ACT did not pay out any compensation or costs to plaintiffs, however the Territory incurred \$26,648.45 in legal costs (by way of services provided by the ACT Government Solicitor (**ACTGS**) and counsel). Approximately two thirds of these costs were met by the Territory's insurance arrangements.
  - (b) during 2008-09, the ACT did not pay out any compensation but paid out \$10,000.00 in plaintiff legal costs. The Territory incurred \$83,588.68 in legal costs (by way of services provided by ACTGS and counsel). Approximately 80% of these costs were met by the Territory's insurance arrangements.
  - (c) during the period 1 July 2009-31 March 2010, the ACT paid out \$203,216.89 in compensation (which included a costs component), as well as \$22,000.00 in plaintiff legal costs. The Territory incurred \$7,538.30 in legal costs (by way of services provided by ACTGS and counsel). These costs and compensation were met by the Territory's insurance arrangements.
- (2) Details of decisions of the Board which have been successfully challenged are as follows:

- (a) *Morro, Ahadizad & N*: in each of these matters, the Territory admitted liability for unlawfully detaining the plaintiffs and quantum was the only issue in dispute. In Mr Ahadizad's case, the Territory's liability ultimately stemmed from a failure of the Board to afford the plaintiff adequate procedural fairness before cancelling his periodic detention order and committing him to full-time custody. In Mr Morro's and N's cases, the Board incorrectly interpreted a provision of the *Crimes (Sentence Administration) Act 2005* which resulted in the unlawful cancellation of each plaintiff's periodic detention order and committal to full-time incarceration.
- (b) *Jackson*: the plaintiff successfully challenged the decision of the Board to delay its decision in relation to the plaintiff's application for parole.
- (c) *Alzaabi*: the plaintiff successfully challenged the decision of the Board to delay its decision in relation to the plaintiff's application for parole.
- (3) The Board conducted a review in relation to the way breach matters were conducted. As a result of the review, it was determined that if there was a possibility that a parole or periodic detention order would be cancelled, no action would be taken in that regard until the offender had the opportunity to appear before the Board in person.

These changes were made in early 2007.

### **Abengoa Solar (Question No 739)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 23 March 2010:

- (1) Is the ACT Government aware of a Spanish company, Abengoa Solar, which specialises in solar panel technology.
- (2) Was the ACT Government approached by Abengoa Solar concerning the possibility of establishing a presence in the ACT; if so, what was the (a) advice that was provided to the company and (b) response from Abengoa Solar to the ACT Government following the provision of this advice.

**Mr Stanhope**: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1. Yes
- 2. Representatives from the Chief Minister's Department met with Abengoa Solar on 29 April 2009.
  - a. Government representatives provided general inward investment information on the ACT and Abengoa was directed to information pertaining to the ACT Solar Power Facility Project and climate change policy at the DECCEW and Procurement Solutions websites.
  - b. Abengoa advised that they were intending to respond to the EOI when it was released in May 2009.

**Commonwealth government—employees  
(Question No 740)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 March 2010:

- (1) What was the (a) total number of employed people in the ACT and (b) number of people who were employed in the ACT by the Commonwealth Government for each of the past 25 years including 2008-09.
- (2) How many people were employed by the ACT Government for each year since self government was implemented in the ACT including 2008-09.
- (3) What were the sources for the data for each of the categories of employment referred to in parts (1) and (2).

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) The information is publicly available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) website. Link:  
<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/mf/6202.0>
- (b) Information for recent years is publicly available from the Australian Public Service Commission's State of the Service Reports. Link:  
<http://www.apsc.gov.au/stateoftheservice/>
- (2) The number of people employed by the ACT Government for each year since self-government (including 2008-09) can be found in the ACT Government Workforce Statistical Report from 1989-1999\*, the State of the Service Report from 2000-2005 and the Workforce Profile from 2005-2009.

These reports can be found in the ACT Government & Assembly Library.

- (3) Parts (1) and (2): as above.

\* From 1989 – 1994, the figures in the ACT Government Workforce Statistical Report included all employees on the payroll (ie paid and unpaid). From July 1994, the methodology was changed to include paid employees only which is a more accurate and consistent way of reporting.

---

**Capital works—expenditure  
(Question No 741)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to Appendix 2 in the 2009-10 Budget Review on Re-Profiled Capital Works Projects, what are the reasons for the changed patterns of proposed spending on the capital works projects of (a) Kings Highway Upgrade, (b) Roads to Recovery Program, (c) Upgrade of Airport Roads, (d) North-South Arterial Road for Molonglo Suburbs, (e) North Weston Pond and Bridge, (f) Cohen Street Extension, (g) Establishment of Regional Community Facilities and Neighbourhood Halls, (h) Belconnen Enhanced Community Health Centre, (i) Secure Adult Mental Health Unit, (j) Women and Children Hospital, (k) New Forensic Medical Centre and (l) New Belconnen Police Station.

- (2) Why has the value of the Phase 1 CSR been reduced again to \$28.630 million and what are the reasons for the changed pattern of spending on this project.
- (3) What is involved in the Helicopter Base component of the Emergency Services Agency project
- (4) What funding is required for the Helicopter Base activity.
- (5) Was the Helicopter Base activity originally part of the new headquarters project.
- (6) What is the reason for the increase of \$3.1 million in the estimated value of Emergency Services Agency New Headquarters project and why has the pattern of spending on this project changed.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The reasons for the changed patterns of proposed spending on the capital works projects are
  - (a) **Kings Highway Upgrade:** The project cash profile was modified to take into consideration the duration of a full environmental impact assessment which is currently taking place.
  - (b) **Roads to Recovery Program:** The balance of the Roads to Recovery program consisted of projects that were well advanced in terms of forward design and were able to be brought forward to the current year.

Approval was obtained from the Commonwealth Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government to bring five projects forward - Tharwa Bridge foundation works, Barry Drive Bus lane, Flemington Road Bus lane and London Circuit/Northbourne Avenue pavement resurfacing works. These projects were brought forward and the cash profile was adjusted accordingly.

  - (c) **Upgrade of Airport Roads:** This project, which included the first stage of the Majura Parkway project, required a full environmental impact assessment. This assessment is currently underway but the cash requirement for 2009 10 was modified to reflect the statutory planning process requirements.
  - (d) **North-South Arterial Road for Molonglo Suburbs** and (e) **North Weston Pond and Bridge:** Both of these projects were delayed while the statutory planning approvals were obtained, the scope of work was also modified during the design process and additional funding was sought in the 2009 10 Budget process. The tender process for these works also had a number of issues to resolve and took longer than originally planned. The cash profile was adjusted accordingly as it became clearer what could actually be achieved in 2009 10.
  - (f) **Cohen Street Extension:** This project provided some opportunities to bring forward works associated with the Belconnen Town Centre improvements. The cash flow was adjusted accordingly to enable this to happen.
  - (g) **Establishment of Regional Community Facilities and Neighbourhood Halls:** This project has multiple components, with works well underway and the June 2010 completion date still on target. The rollover reflects differences between the expected physical and financial completion of the project, which will not occur until 2010-11.

- (h) **Belconnen Enhanced Community Health Centre:** This project has been delayed due to an unexpected issue with the original site that was selected. Investigation of an alternative site is underway and this has impacted on the timing of the cash flow for the project.
- (i) **Secure Adult Mental Health Unit:** This project has been delayed as a result of the need to seek an alternative site away from The Canberra Hospital campus.
- (j) **Women and Children Hospital:** The scope of this project was revised during the first half of the financial year as a result of the modification to the scope following site visits in Europe. This required a revision to the Preliminary Sketch Plans and subsequently delayed progression of the design and therefore construction commencement.
- (k) **Forensic Medical Centre:** Cash flows have been revised to align with the estimated construction schedule. However, the expected completion date of June 2011 is still expected to be achieved.
- (l) **Belconnen Police Station:** Cash flows have been revised to align with the estimated construction schedule. The rollover also reflects an expected delay in the project completion from December 2010 to June 2011, with financial completion expected in early 2011 12.
- (2) The further reduction of \$7.370 million to \$28.630 million in Phase 1 CSR corresponds with an increase in funding for the Women's and Children's Hospital. The change in planned cash flow relates to 'Northern Precinct Enabling and Infrastructure Works' which were identified and approved during 2009 10.
- (3) The Snowy Hydro Aero-Medical base upgrade aims to include appropriate medical and helicopter facilities for physicians and intensive care paramedics. The new Rural Fire Service Hangar and facilities will allow the ESA to move from the Canberra Airport and provide appropriate operational facilities for National Aerial Fire fighting Centre helicopters and pilots.
- (4) The Helicopter Base project construction budget is \$2.2 million.
- (5) The Helicopter Base project was not part of the project announced in 2006-07. Funding for the Base was provided as part of the 2009 10 Budget funding for "ESA Specialist Outdoor Training Centre and Helicopter Base".
- (6) The additional funding provides for the construction of a secure compound and associated facilities between Building 183 and the new HQ; building code and safety remediation works on Building 183 in conjunction with Capital Airport Group; changes to final plans; project management; and site environmental requirements at Hume. Cash flows have been revised to align with the estimated construction program. However, the expected completion date of December 2010 is still likely to be achieved.
-

**Government—motor vehicles  
(Question Nos 791, 792 and 793)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Women, the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services and the Minister for Children and Young People upon notice, on 24 March 2010:

- (1) How many vehicles are currently used by the Minister's department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) What are the types and sizes each the vehicles referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many of the vehicles referred to in part (1) are privately garaged.
- (4) How many kilometres are travelled by each vehicle.
- (5) What are the insurance costs, including third party insurance for each vehicle.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

*The member should note that the response covers the entire Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services*

- (1) The department has 176 vehicles. Where possible vehicle pools have been created and are available for use across business units to maximise vehicle use.
  - (2) The types and sizes of the vehicles are;
    - (a) 112 - 4 cylinder sedans and hatchbacks
    - (b) 11 - 4 cylinder station wagons
    - (c) 31 - 4 cylinder multi passenger vehicle (MPV)
    - (d) 3 - 5 cylinder MPV
    - (e) 2 - 6 cylinder MPV
    - (f) 2 - 4 cylinder van (small)
    - (g) 2 - 4 cylinder van (medium)
    - (h) 7 - 4 cylinder van (large - modified for clients)
    - (i) 3 - 4 cylinder 12 seat bus (modified for clients)
    - (j) 3 - 4 cylinder duel cab utility.
  - (3) 28 vehicles are privately garaged. The majority of these vehicles are privately garaged due to lack of secure parking.
  - (4) DHCS vehicles travelled a total of 1,986,000 km in the 09/10 Fringe Benefit Tax period, an average of 11,300 km per vehicle.
  - (5) All DHCS vehicles are leased under the government's vehicle leasing contract. Insurance is included under this arrangement.
-

### **Disability services—individual support package program (Question No 814)**

**Ms Bresnan** asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 24 March 2010:

- (1) What was the total ACT Government funding allocated to Individual Support Package Program in (a) 2004-05, (b) 2005-06, (c) 2006-07, (d) 2008-09 and (e) 2009-10 and how many people received funding each year under this program.
- (2) What is the total ACT Government funding allocated to Individual Support Package Programs in (a) 2010-11, (b) 2011-12, (c) 2012-13 and (d) 2013-14 and how many people are expected to receive funding each year under this program.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1)

Year	Number of ISPs	Expenditure in \$m	Comment
2004-05	151	7.3	
2005-06	160	8.5	
2006-07	99	6.0	
2007-08	124	6.6	Not requested
2008-09	124	7.8	
2009-10	122	8.1	

In 2006/07:

- Disability ACT assessed the arrangements for a number of people with small, non-recurrently allocated packages generally between \$5 000-\$10 000 per annum. Many of these were adapted to ongoing block funded arrangements; and
- Individual Support Packages which had been allocated to a number of people in the ACT Government accommodation support service were converted into the agency's base funding.

These changes to the way the funds for services were allocated had no impact on the level of service provided to each individual.

- (2) There are a range of funding arrangements available to an individual - Individual Support Package (ISP) funding is only one of them.

Therefore it is not possible to determine the number of ISPs that may be allocated in a given year.

The method of purchasing services (i.e. whether Individual Support Package or block funding or grants) is determined by prioritised need, individual circumstances and preference.

On the basis of the 2009/10 average ISP allocation being \$66 000 per person, Disability ACT projects that it may have the potential financial capacity to allocate resources to an additional 20 people in 2010/11. Some of these individuals may receive their resource in the form of an ISP.



Year	Number of ISPs	Expenditure in \$m
Actual 2009-10	122	8.1
Estimated 2010-11	142	9.7

Since 2007, with the exception of the response to school leavers and recipients of Quality of Life grants, the people prioritised for formal support (including Individual Support Packages) have been those with high and complex needs. They have generally received maximum allocations above \$100 000 per annum. The number of people supported in 2010/11 may be less than the projected 20 if the majority of prioritised individuals have high and complex needs and need a higher than average allocation.

---

### Health—autism (Question No 815)

**Ms Bresnan** asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 24 March 2010:

What specialist services or programs are funded or provided by the ACT Government to assist people who have autism or aspergers.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The ACT Government Social Plan sets out a commitment to the principles of inclusion. As far as possible, services to people with a disability are provided as part of the services available to all ACT residents.

The additional support services required by people with a disability are not generally classified by diagnostic category, but by need. People with autism and a co-morbid intellectual disability are usually assessed as having a severe or profound disability and high support needs. Therefore they are eligible for the range of disability support services provided or funded by the ACT Government – including respite services, community access services, community support and accommodation support services.

In addition to the services provided for all people with a disability, which are available to people with autism, the following autism specific services are provided.

- **Assessment of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD):** Therapy ACT conducts multi-disciplinary assessments which aid in diagnosis.
- Community Paediatricians at ACT Health work in partnership with Therapy ACT in the assessment and diagnostic process.
- **Family Support**  
Therapy ACT provides a family group program for families in the ACT who have a child diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder. The program includes information, parent education, support and short-term targeted intervention.
- **Therapeutic Intervention**  
Therapy ACT provides therapeutic intervention (occupational therapy, physiotherapy, psychology, speech pathology, and social work).

- **Development and Education**

The Department of Education and Training provides a range of specialist developmental and educational programs including:

- communication and social awareness group for children aged between 18 months and three years. A diagnosis is not required for this group, but many of the children are considered likely to be diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder;
- children with a diagnosis of an autism spectrum disorder between the ages of three and four years are eligible for eight hours of early intervention education services per week;
- preschool-aged children are able to access up to 12 hours of mainstream preschool per week, in addition to their early intervention education hours;
- Autism specific Learning Support Units in primary and high schools provide supported educational placements;
- Inclusion Support for students in mainstream settings. This is a combination of direct resources allocated to schools (often resulting in the employment of Learning Support Assistant) and the support of consultant teachers;
- Special school placements;
- Students with ASD are also eligible for placements in general Learning Support Units and Learning Support Centres;
- Technology support from the Inclusive Technology team; and
- Ongoing professional development programs for school staff focussing on ASD – this includes the Positive Partnerships program in 2009 and 2010.

---

**Disability services—unmet need  
(Question No 816)**

**Ms Bresnan** asked the Minister for Disability, Housing and Community Services, upon notice, on 24 March 2010:

- (1) What is the financial value of the current level of known unmet need for disability services per annum.
- (2) How much of this reflects unmet need for (a) the Individual Support Package Program, (b) accommodation places and (c) respite services.
- (3) What other types of services are reflected in the calculation of unmet need.

**Ms Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Current assessments by Disability ACT put the known unmet need at approximately \$8.3 million.

- (2) Unmet need is recorded on the basis of what service is required rather than what type of funding program (Individual Support Program for example) is requested.
- (3) The breakdown of the data for known unmet needs indicates:
  - 64% accommodation support services;
  - 10% respite services;
  - 25% community access services; and
  - 1% community support services.

Disability ACT is aware however, that the level of known unmet need in these categories is not an accurate reflection of what individuals and families choose to access. Needs and expectations are regularly re-negotiated with Disability ACT and other service providers in part due to changing circumstance, greater awareness of programs and a desire for security.

**Government—advisory bodies, statutory authorities and business enterprises  
(Question No 818)**

**Mr Doszpot** asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to each board, committee, advisory council or committee, or similar within the Minister's portfolio, including statutory authorities, government owned corporations and government business enterprises, what is the (a) name of each body and (b) each body's function or role.
- (2) What are the names, positions and qualifications of the members of each body referred to in part (1) and when do their terms expire.
- (3) How many vacancies are currently carried on each body and how long have those vacancies remained unfilled.
- (4) When will the vacancies referred to in part (3) be filled.
- (5) What is the remuneration of each member of each body, annual or per diem as appropriate.
- (6) What are the allowances of each member of each body.
- (7) Which members of each body are required to travel to Canberra in order to participate in meetings.
- (8) What is the cost, on average, per body meeting for those members to travel to Canberra to attend body meetings.
- (9) Why was each member referred to in part (7) appointed to the body in preference to seeking local members.
- (10) What was the total remuneration, allowances and travel costs paid to body members in (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09 and (c) 2009-10 to date.

- (11) Do any members of each body have the use of a government vehicle; if so, (a) on what basis, (b) at what cost, and (c) did the member privately garage the vehicle.
- (12) Is the use of a government vehicle included as part of a remuneration determination by the Remuneration Tribunal; if not, who authorised it.
- (13) How often does each body meet and what is the average length of meetings.
- (14) Does each body ever meet outside Canberra; if so, (a) why, (b) how often and (c) at what cost.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) This information can be found in the following publications:
- *Annual Report 2008-2009 Department of Education and Training*
  - *ACT Building and Construction Industry Training Fund Authority Annual Report 2008-2009*
  - *University of Canberra Annual Report 2008*
  - *Canberra Institute of Technology Annual Report 2009;*
- and on the Department of Education and Training website: [www.det.act.gov.au](http://www.det.act.gov.au).
- (2) The ACT Legislation Register provides information about names, positions, qualifications for membership and expiry dates of members of many of these boards and councils. Further information can also be found in the:
- *Annual Report 2008-2009 Department of Education and Training*
  - *Canberra Institute of Technology Annual Report 2009;*
- and on the Department of Education and Training website: [www.det.act.gov.au](http://www.det.act.gov.au).

The Department of Education and Training Audit Committee Chair's term of office expires on 15 August 2010. The other independent member's term of office expires on 11 May 2011.

Table 1 provides information about the names, positions, qualifications for membership and expiry dates of members of the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Consultative Body and the names, positions and qualifications for membership of Safe Schools Taskforce members. There are no expiry dates for the Safe Schools Taskforce members' terms of office.

Table 1

	Member	Qualification	Expiry
ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Consultative Body	Mr Bradley Bell	Parent Member	01-Jun-11
	Ms Deborah Eades	Parent Member	01-Jun-11
	Ms Michele-Charee Abel	Parent Member	01-Jun-11
	Mr Jozef Belopotoszky	Community Member	01-Jun-11
	Ms Delma Brennan	Community Member	01-Jun-11
	Ms Margaret Huddleston	Community Member	01-Jun-11
	Mr Dean Jard	Parent Member	01-Jun-11
	Mr Terry Williams	Parent Member	01-Jun-11
	Mr Dion Devow	Parent Member	01-Jun-11

	Member	Qualification	Expiry
Safe Schools Taskforce	Dr Jim Watterston	Chief Executive, Department of Education and Training	NA
	Dr Mark Collis	Director, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education and Student Services, Department of Education and Training	NA
	Ms Jayne Johnston	Executive Director, School Improvement, Department of Education and Training	NA
	Mr Paul Whittaker	ACT Policing	NA
	Ms Penny Gilmour	ACT Branch Secretary, Australian Education Union	NA
	Ms Cathy Smith	Australian Education Union	NA
	Ms Elizabeth Singer	President, ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association	NA
	Ms Kelly Lokan	Youth Advisory Council	NA
	Ms Matilda Dickman	Youth Advisory Council	NA
	Ms Louise Stokes	Catholic Education Office	NA
	Ms Lyn Renno	Independent Education Union	NA
	Ms Kate Lyttle	Association of Parents and Friends of ACT Schools (APFACTS)	NA
	Ms Jeanette Widmer	Association of Independent Schools	NA
	Mr Michael Battenally	ACT Principals' Association	NA
	Mr Dennis Yarrington	ACT Principals' Association	NA
	Ms Christine Kallir Preece	ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association	NA

(3) Three positions have been vacant since February/March 2010.

(4) All positions will be filled as soon as possible.

(5) The ACT Remuneration Tribunal website provides information about remuneration.

The Chair of the ACT Accreditation and Registration Council is provided with an annual payment of \$12 000 to cover expenses as the statutory office holder, and as a support payment in lieu of an actual remuneration or stipend.

The Department of Education and Training Audit Committee chair is remunerated at the rate of \$2200 per meeting and \$294 per hour for special meetings. The other independent member on the Audit Committee is remunerated at the rate of \$1980 per meeting and \$264 per hour for special meetings.

The CIT Audit Committee chair is remunerated at the rate of \$1100 per meeting. Independent paid members are remunerated at the rate of \$750 per meeting. ACT public servants appointed as independent members receive no remuneration for their role on the committee.

(6) Canberra Institute of Technology Advisory and CIT Audit Committee members do not receive any allowances. Members of the other committees may claim reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred in the exercise of functions.

(7) Nil.

(8) Nil.

(9) N/A.

(10) For information about remuneration, please refer to the response to Q 5. For information about allowances, please refer to the response to Q 6. Travel costs paid to members of the Accreditation and Registration Council are as follows:

- (a) 2007-08 - \$1085
- (b) 2008-09 - \$913
- (c) 2009-10 - \$800

The remuneration to the CIT Audit Committee is as follows (these figures are provided as yearly figures as CIT financial reporting is done on a calendar year basis):

- (a) 2007 - \$5500
- (b) 2008 - \$9950
- (c) 2009 - \$14 400
- (d) 2010 - \$3700

The remuneration to the Department of Education and Training Audit Committee is as follows:

- (a) 2007-08 - \$23 000
- (b) 2008-09 - \$18 920
- (c) 2009-10 - \$16 720

(11) No.

(12) N/A.

(13) The *Annual Report 2008-2009 Department of Education and Training and the University of Canberra Annual Report 2008* provide information about the frequency of meetings.

Meetings range in frequency from three times per year to monthly. The length of meetings ranges from 1.5 hours to six hours.

(14) No.

---

### **Education—Building the Education Revolution (BER)—projects (Question No 819)**

**Mr Doszpot** asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What structures were built for each ACT school, by school name, as a result of Building the Education Revolution (BER) funding.
- (2) What was the total cost of each structure referred to in part (1) for (a) design, (b) construction, (c) site management and (d) other admin or miscellaneous costs.
- (3) Were all projects referred to in part (1) completed within the time frame required by the Federal Government; if not, why not.
- (4) How many of the contractors engaged in the construction of BER projects for ACT schools were ACT based businesses.
- (5) Are there any ongoing issues relating to the quality of any construction built with BER funding.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) The list of projects by school is available at <http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/BuildingTheEducationRevolution/Pages/NationalSchoolPrideProgramResults.aspx> for National School Pride projects and <http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/BuildingTheEducationRevolution/Pages/P21.aspx> for Primary Schools for the 21st Century projects. All National School Pride projects have been completed and as at 18 April 2010, seven Primary Schools of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century were completed.
- 2) As I stated to the Assembly on 24 March 2010, I undertook to provide information on the costings at the completion of the projects.
- 3) Extensions of time were approved by the Australian Government for a small number of projects.
- 4) Six of the seven construction managers are local ACT companies, and the seventh is a national company with an office in the ACT.
- 5) No. Any identified rectification work is addressed in the defects liability period.

---

**Government—websites  
(Question No 845)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,  
(a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and  
(c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.

- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in “act.gov.au”.
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

The response for Business and Economic Development to part 1 is included in QON 672 asked of the Chief Minister.

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the other parts of the Member’s question.

---

### **Government—websites (Question No 846)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister’s department and each agency in the Minister’s portfolio,  
(a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and  
(c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in “act.gov.au”.
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.



- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the Member's Question.

---

**Government—websites  
(Question No 849)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,  
(a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and  
(c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the Member's question.

---

**Government—websites  
(Question No 852)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,
  - (a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and (c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the Member's question.

---

### **Government—websites (Question No 855)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,
  - (a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and (c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".

- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the Member's question.

---

**Government—websites  
(Question No 856)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,
  - (a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and (c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) – (9) I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information to answer the Member's question.
-

**Government—websites  
(Question No 857)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,  
(a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and  
(c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the Member's question.
  - (2) As above.
  - (3) As above.
  - (4) As above.
  - (5) As above.
  - (6) As above.
  - (7) As above.
  - (8) As above.
  - (9) As above.
-

**Government—websites  
(Question No 859)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Gaming and Racing, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,  
(a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and  
(c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.
- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detail information required to answer the Member's question.

---

**Government—websites  
(Question No 863)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to the Minister's department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio,  
(a) how many websites are managed and maintained, (b) which websites are they and  
(c) what is the purpose of each.
- (2) Who manages and maintains the websites referred to in part (1) and is this in-house responsibility or the responsibility of contractors.
- (3) What is the current annual cost of maintaining and managing the websites.

- (4) If contractors are engaged to perform some of this work, how much is the annual cost of engaging the contractors.
- (5) Does each website allow people to subscribe to a mailing list; if so, (a) what is the purpose of the mailing list, (b) how many subscribers does it have and (c) how many subscribers have an email address that end in "act.gov.au".
- (6) When did each website go live.
- (7) What was the initial development cost of each website.
- (8) Is the website considered an asset which is depreciated; if so, what is the (a) depreciation rate and (b) annual depreciation cost of the site.
- (9) How many individual visitors does each website receive on average per week.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am not prepared to authorise the use of considerable resources that would be involved in providing the detailed information required to answer the Member's question.

---

### **Calvary Hospital and Clare Holland House (Question No 870)**

**Mr Seselja** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How much has the ACT Government spent to date on its bid to purchase Calvary Hospital and which departments or agencies have incurred this cost.
- (2) How much has the ACT Government spent to date on its attempt to sell Clare Holland House.
- (3) How much of this has been spent on (a) consultants, (b) legal advice and (c) any other specialist advice.
- (4) What specialists has the Government engaged to assist it with aspects of the Calvary Hospital and Clare Holland House proposals.
- (5) What costings have been undertaken by Treasury in relation to the proposals.
- (6) How many staff have worked on the proposals and in which government department or agency are these staff employed.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Treasury has spent \$30,000 (GST exclusive) in relation to the proposal, including a peer review of the financial analysis of the Calvary options and accounting advice.

ACT Health has spent \$106,015 (GST exclusive) in relation to the proposal, including external valuations and consultation.

- (2) As above for Treasury.

ACT Health has spent \$20,650 (GST exclusive) including external valuations and survey work.

- (3) (a) \$30,000 (GST exclusive). The majority of the costs incurred by ACT Health (\$126,665) were for contractors (\$122,745) engaged for specific tasks. (b) Nil. (c) Nil.
- (4) Treasury engaged Ernst & Young to undertake a peer review of the financial analysis of the Calvary options and PricewaterhouseCoopers to provide accounting advice.
- (5) Treasury has prepared a financial analysis of the Calvary options, a copy of the report is available on the ACT Health website.
- (6) A range of staff from Treasury and ACT Health have worked on the proposal to purchase Calvary Public Hospital and the sale of Clare Holland House for, at various times and in various capacities.

---

**Public service—staffing  
(Question No 872)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What specialist qualifications are required by staff employed in Business and Industry Development to undertake their roles and responsibilities and what skills are currently lacking in this area of the Minister's department.
- (2) What is the average salary for each employee who has a specialist skill that is required for this area of the department to perform their roles and responsibilities.
- (3) What is the average oncost for each officer in this area of the department in 2009-10 and what components comprise these oncosts.
- (4) What training must employees undertake on a regular basis to maintain their specialist skills and what is the cost of this training.
- (5) How many graduates were employed in this area of the department each year since 2001.
- (6) What is the cost of employing each graduate referred to in part (5).
- (7) How many staff have (a) left and (b) been recruited to this area of the department during 2009-10.
- (8) What is the average amount of recreation and long service leave currently held by officers in this area of the department.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The response for Business and Economic Development is included in QON 692 asked of the Chief Minister.

---

**Business—grants  
(Question No 873)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Minister for Business and Economic Development, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many grants program are administered by the Business and Industry Development area of the Minister's department and what is the cost of administering each of these grants.
- (2) What is the total value of grants made by this area of the department.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The response for Business and Economic Development is included in QON 676 asked of the Chief Minister.

---

**Public service—staffing  
(Question No 875)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What specialist qualifications are required by staff in the department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio to undertake their roles and responsibilities and what skills are currently lacking in the department and in any of the agencies.
- (2) What is the average salary for each employee who has a specialist skill that is required for the department and each agency to perform their roles and responsibilities.
- (3) What is the average oncost for each officer in the department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio in 2009-10 and what components comprise these oncosts.
- (4) What training must employees undertake on a regular basis to maintain their specialist skills and what is the cost of this training.
- (5) How many graduates were employed in the department and in its agencies each year since 2001.
- (6) What is the cost of employing each graduate referred to in part (5).
- (7) How many staff have (a) left and (b) been recruited to the department and each agency during 2009-10.
- (8) What is the average amount of recreation and long service leave currently held by officers in the department and each agency.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:



- (1) Treasury has one position in which qualifications are stated as mandatory. The Director Accounting, incorporating the role of the Chief Finance Officer requires appropriate tertiary qualifications in Accounting, Commerce, Finance or a related field and CPA or CA qualifications.

There are no skills lacking in any specialist position in Treasury.

- (2) The CFO is paid at the SES 1.3 level. Remuneration for this position can be found at <http://www.cmd.act.gov.au/governance/remtrib/home>.
- (3) The Department uses the Department of Treasury Salary and Admin On-Cost Model (October 2008) to determine salary on-costs estimates for each generic classification based on an average salary cost for each classification, and a standard figure for administrative on-costs.

The salary on-costs include estimates for Superannuation; Employer Productivity Superannuation Contribution; Long Service Leave Provision; Annual leave Loading; Workers' Compensation premium, and other issues as necessary on a case-by-case basis. The salary on-cost total is 16.41% of the average salary.

The administrative on-cost model is based on average estimates for IT and communications related costs; accommodation; insurance; training; fleet; other administrative items including OH&S expenses, office machines and equipment, stationery and postage; and a corporate component covering payroll and human resources costs per FTE across Government. The total standard figure for administrative on-costs (in the October 2008 Guideline) was \$15,790.

- (4) The CFO position is required to undertake a set number of professional development hours and maintain membership of relevant professional bodies. An estimate for ongoing training is \$1,500 per annum.
- (5) The number of graduates employed by Treasury since 2001 is shown in the table below.

2010	6
2009	7
2008	9 (incl 2 for Shared Services)
2007	11 (incl 1 for Shared Services)
2006	6
2005	7
2004	8
2003	2
2002	3
2001	2

- (6) Graduates are employed as Graduate Administrative Assistants (GAA) under the collective agreements.
- (7) There have been 7 permanent commencements and 8 permanent separations as at February 2010 for Treasury.

- (8) The average amount of long service leave per person currently held within Treasury is \$15,836. These are calculated in accordance with the accounting standards which require a projection of future salary increases, the use of a discount rate to reflect the likelihood of when the leave will be taken and the inclusion of on-costs when leave is taken in service.

The average amount of recreation leave per person currently held within Treasury is \$11,589.

---

### **Emergency services—training (Question No 878)**

**Mr Smyth** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How much has the Emergency Services Agency spent on training programs in 2009-10 to date.
- (2) What was the purpose of the training programs referred to in part (1) and how many staff participated.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) During the period 1 July 2009 to 28 February 2010, the ESA expended \$341,028 on training. This amount represents only specific training costs and venue hire. However it does not include any costs associated with backfilling positions e.g. Overtime or Higher Duties Allowance.

- (2) Business Unit Training figures for 1 July 2009 – 30 March 2010:

<b>Program</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>No. of Participants</b>
ACTFB RFS Comcen Operator	Operate RFS radio equipment	3
Advanced CPR	Advanced CPR	2
Aerial appliance Instructor	Instruct others to use aerial appliance	1
Assess competence	Assess CBT	2
BA Van driver	Drive ACTFB BA van	8
Drive aerial appliance	Drive ACTFB aerial appliance	20
Defibrillator operators	Use and ACTFB defibrillator	8
Drive under operational conditions	Drive an ACTFB appliance to an incident safely	8
Chainsaw operations	Operate chainsaws and fell trees	7
ACTFB Comcen operator	Operate safely in the ESA Comcen	3
Manage projects	Required for FB 8 promotion	4
Qrae operation	Operate specialist CBR equipment	10
Road accident rescue level 3	Operate safely at a road accident rescue	8
Road accident rescue refresher	Operate safety at a road accident rescue	3
Senior first aid certificate - ACTFB	Job requirement	22

<b>Program</b>	<b>Program Objectives</b>	<b>No. of Participants</b>
Undertake vertical rescue - ACTFB	Job requirement	20
Diploma in Project Management	Job requirement	2
Wildfire refresher	Prepare for bushfire season	73
AFP command and control course	To train Police, Fire and Ambulance staff to work cohesively at major incidents	4
AFP command and control refresher	To test Police, Fire and Ambulance staff ability to work cohesively at major incidents	4
Community awareness program	Course required for ACT fire-fighters career progression	8
ACTAS Clinical Update programme	To keep Intensive Care Paramedic up to date with the latest in patient care	88
ACTAS Clinical Update programme	To keep Intensive Care Paramedic up to date with the latest in patient care	21
ACTAS Orientation	New staff orientation	5
Advanced Diploma of Paramedical Science	Base level qualification for intensive Care Paramedics	4
Certificate IV in Health Care (Ambulance)	Pathway qualification to Ad Dip for ICPs	7
Certificate III in Non Emergency Client Transport	Base level qualification for Patient Transport Service officers	2
Leadership at the Peak program	Leadership program for senior ESA Managers	17
Ergogym Manual Handling Course	OHS program for ESA workshops and resource centre staff	8
Business Writing	Improve business writing of senior managers	10
Negotiating with Emotional Intelligence	Improve negotiating skills	1
Testing and Tagging Course	Job requirement	1
AIIMS 2 day short course	Job requirement	12
AIIMS Incident Controller	Train staff to perform the functions of an Incident Controller at a major incident	5
AIIMS Information Officer	Train staff to perform the functions of an Information Officer at a major incident.	6
AIIMS Planning Officer	To train staff to perform the functions of a planning officer at a major incident	6
AIIMS Management Support Unit	Job requirement	4
Basic Wildfire Awareness	Job requirement	9
Certificate IV in Frontline Management	Job requirement	7
Resilience and Conflict Resolution	Development program for ACTAS comms operators	23
Work safely around aircraft	Safety induction unit for staff working around aircraft	5

Program	Program Objectives	No. of Participants
Senior First Aid	Job requirement	2
Australasian Inter-Service Incident Management System (AIIMS 22022VIC)	Job Requirement	11
ACTAS Clinical Update Program	Job Requirement	27
Certificate IV Frontline Management	Job Requirement	5
Senior Fire fighter Development	Job Requirement	10
Stage III Road Accident Rescue	Job Requirement	7
Station Officers Development	Job Requirement	10
Writing a Business Plan	Job Requirement	8
AEMI, ACT Extension Design and manage activities which exercise elements of emergency management	Job Requirement	8

### **Government—regional issues (Question No 884)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) Is there a department or division with responsibility for regional issues; if so, (a) what is it called, (b) where is it located and (c) who does it report to.
- (2) What emphasis does the unit have in terms of economic, environmental, community development.
- (3) How many full-time equivalent positions are involved in this unit.
- (4) What are the objectives of the unit.
- (5) What engagement does the unit have with regional communities, other local governments and their agencies, and other relevant organisations in the region.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Two units within my portfolios address regional issues as part of their wider responsibilities.
  - The Economic, Regional and Planning Branch (ERP), which is part of the Policy Division within Chief Minister's Department (CMD). The team reports to the Deputy Chief Executive, Policy Division.
  - The Intergovernmental and Regional Development Unit, which sits within Business and Industry Development (BID) in CMD, provides support on regional issues, in particular Regional Development Australia ACT (RDA ACT). This team reports to the General Manager, Business and Industry Development.

- (2) ERP develops policy and strategy on, and coordinates responses to, cross border and regional issues. Economic, environmental and community development considerations are factored into this work as required.

BID's regional work focuses around the RDA ACT Priority Areas. These are:

- supporting and encouraging innovation at all levels;
  - promoting regional relationships through economic development;
  - supporting community infrastructure; and
  - promoting social inclusion.
- (3) It is estimated that regional issues involve the equivalent of one full-time equivalent position within ERP, although given the location of the ACT within the region, cross border and regional issues are often relevant across a wider spectrum of policies and initiatives.

It is estimated that servicing the Deed of Grant between RDA ACT and the ACT Government and managing other regional issues requires one full-time equivalent position within BID.

- (4) With respect to regional issues, ERP carries out a range of activities including:

- coordinating relations between NSW and the ACT on regional and cross border issues;
- providing secretariat support to the Regional Leaders' Forum;
- providing advice on regional strategy and policy, including supporting my participation in the Regional Development Council and agency involvement in its sub committees; and
- supporting me, as Chief Minister, and the Chief Executive in discussions with the NSW Government and local governments in the region.

With respect to regional issues, BID has responsibility for servicing the Deed of Grant between the ACT Government and RDA ACT under which the funding is provided. This involves:

- attending monthly RDA ACT Committee meetings;
- delivering on action items and responsibilities delegated to the ACT Government from Committee meetings;
- coordinating EOI and selection process for the RDA ACT Committee and engaging with the Federal Government to ensure proper Corporate Governance.

Other relevant activities include:

- communicating with the NSW State Government to coordinate regional development activities; and
- promoting the ACT and surrounding region as a centre of excellence for Green Economic development.

- (5) ERP has responsibility for:

- RLF Secretariat - the RLF brings together the Mayors and General Managers of the 17 local councils in the Capital Region; State and Federal members with seats in the region; and representatives of the Regional Development Australia boards in the region.;
- liaising with the Regional Coordinator, NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet on regional and cross-border issues;
- supporting meetings between the Chief Executive, CMD and the Director General, NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet;
- supporting regular meetings between myself and the Mayor of Queanbeyan; and
- supporting ACT participation in the Regional Development Council (RDC) and the Standing Committee on Regional Development (SCORD), the RDC's permanent standing committee.

BID's engagement in the region is primarily delivered through the RDA ACT. The RDA network is being established throughout Australia to provide a strategic framework for economic growth in each region. There are four key functions that underpin the role of the national network of RDA committees:

- providing advice through consultation and community engagement;
- promoting regional approaches to planning and infrastructure;
- promoting whole-of-Government program approaches, policies and initiatives; and
- community and economic development.

---

### **Roads—Limestone Avenue and London Circuit (Question No 885)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide details of the \$7.6 million upgrade work being undertaken on Northbourne Avenue and London Circuit, including a breakdown of the spending and the timelines for each of these items.
- (2) Is there any work planned regarding the on-road cycle lanes down Northbourne Avenue, such as widening them, converting them into separated cycle lanes or taking measures to avoid overlaps between buses and cyclists.
- (3) Has any consideration been given to converting one traffic lane on each side of Northbourne Avenue into a bus only lane and what is the Government's position on this.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The estimated cost for Northbourne Avenue is \$3.8M. The estimated cost for London Circuit is \$3.8M. Both projects are expected to be completed by mid June 2010.
- (2) This is a pavement rehabilitation project and all traffic and road cycle lanes are to be reinstated to the existing configurations.

- (3) Not as part of this project. The Government is currently developing the Sustainable Transport Action Plan which will inform its view on such measures as bus only lanes and cycle lanes on Northbourne Avenue.

---

**Roads—footpaths  
(Question No 886)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport*):

- (1) How many reported accidents involving pedestrians occur on footpaths, each year in the ACT, including falls and collisions.
- (2) How many complaints are received by Canberra Connect each year about footpaths.
- (3) Given that the walking school bus has stopped due to difficulties with traffic on Knox Street, Watson, what steps is the Government taking to make sure the project can continue.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The number of claims for compensation in relation to footpath accidents involving pedestrians received by Roads ACT are as follows:  
  
2006 – 35; 2007 – 35; 2008 – 17; 2009 - 25
- (2) In 2006, Canberra Connect received 14 complaints about footpaths and 13 requests for servicing or installing footpaths.  
  
In 2007, Canberra Connect received 32 complaints about footpaths and 64 requests for servicing or installing footpaths.  
  
In 2008- Canberra Connect received 41 complaints about footpaths and 66 requests for servicing or installing footpaths.  
  
In 2009, Canberra Connect received 59 complaints about footpaths and 116 requests for servicing or installing footpaths.
- (3) The Government, through Roads ACT, has liaised with the Co-ordinator of the Walking School Bus route from Hackett to Majura Primary School. These discussions clarified concerns regarding Antill Street (not Knox Street). As a result of this, Roads ACT has recently enhanced the linemarking around the existing pedestrian refuge islands as well as installing additional warning signs to further assist the walking school bus safely cross Antill Street.

---

**Planning—Molonglo  
(Question No 888)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Land and Property Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to Molonglo building rules, why has the Land Development Agency (LDA) decided to use a rule, six square metres of north facing glass, to improve house thermal performance, rather than use performance measures such as an energy efficiency rating (EER).
- (2) How does the Minister define northern for the purposes of the rule referred to in part (1).
- (3) What impact does the LDA expect that requiring six square metres of north facing glass have on house thermal performance
- (4) What will the impact of requiring six square metres of north facing glass be on summer performance.
- (5) Will the amount of glass vary with the size of the house.
- (6) Will the requirement referred to in part (3) apply to multi unit developments.
- (7) Is the ACT Government moving away from use of performance measures to rules.
- (8) Will the six square metres of northern glass be required if a house is built to a rating of EER 7.
- (9) Will the rule referred to in part (1) be extended to other parts of Canberra; if not, why not.
- (10) How does the LDA plan to implement this.
- (11) Will it be (a) a Territory Plan variation, (b) a precinct code, or (c) other.
- (12) When does LDA plan to release (a) medium and (b) high density land in Molonglo.
- (13) What impact on social development will there be from not releasing medium and high density areas early and therefore leaving a big gap along the main road in the middle of Wright and Coombs.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Under the Building Code of Australia dwellings are required to achieve a 5 Star energy efficiency rating (EER), and ACT Planning and Land Authority (ACTPLA) is presently examining options to improve solar access, irrespective of the dwelling's energy rating. One option is to specify a minimum area of north facing glass to living areas.
- (2) Windows are considered to be north facing when they are within the arc 40 degrees west of north to 50 degrees east of north.
- (3) North facing windows can be readily shaded in the summer months without affecting solar gain in winter.
- (4) See answer (3).
- (5) This matter has not yet been determined.



- (6) Yes, but not necessarily to all dwellings. It is very difficult to achieve direct solar access to all dwellings in an apartment building.
- (7) The use of rules in codes is a key part of performance based planning. In some cases a rule is mandatory, but in many others departures from a rule are allowed provided the applicant can properly justify those departures by reference to criteria.
- (8) If this measure is ultimately adopted, yes.
- (9) Yes.
- (10) LDA will implement by ensuring the estate planning is capable of accommodating housing that can comply. However, ultimately the enforcement of planning policy is the responsibility of ACTPLA.
- (11) Overshadowing and solar access provisions are proposed to be incorporated into a number of codes, including a new Estate Development Code, as part of the first stage of a continuing review of the Territory Plan by ACTPLA. Due to the significant nature of these and other changes, the new codes will be the subject of full variations to the Territory Plan, rather than technical variations. The new codes will become effective only after consideration by the Minister for Planning and the Legislative Assembly.
- (12) It is proposed that medium and higher density sites will form part of each release including the release proposed for June 2010.
- (13) The release of medium and higher density sites will occur as quickly as market demand warrants. LDA's estimation is that it will take some time before there is sufficient demand for this type of housing in Molonglo to enable all of these sites to be released.

Medium and higher density sites differ from 'suburban' residential sites in that the construction cost is much higher than the price of the land and if the sites are released before the market is ready, the land value can decrease.

---

### **Environment—noise pollution (Question No 891)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for the Environment, Climate Change and Water, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) In relation to noise issues at the Transit Bar building and the Waldorf building, has the Environment Protection Authority done any noise measurements, both inside or outside, for each of these buildings; if so, what were the results.
- (2) How many noise complaints have been received from the Waldorf, since the start of its residential use and when were they received.
- (3) What did the noise complaints referred to in part (2) relate to.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes. In August 2006 the Environment Protection Authority received a complaint regarding amplified music from the Transit Bar. A noise measurement was taken at the Waldorf on the balcony of the affected unit. The noise was 12dB(A) above the noise zone standard for Civic. As this measurement exceeded the noise standard, it was not necessary to take a measurement at Transit Bar's lease boundary. Officers from the Environment Protection Unit attended the Transit Bar and issued a verbal warning.
- (2) There have been a total of 32 noise complaints received from the Waldorf Apartments. The table below summarises when these complaints were received.

Number of complaints	Activity	Type of Noise	Year
Two	Transit Bar	Amplified Music Patron Noise	2006 - 1 Complaint 2008 - 1 Complaint
30	Toast Café and Bar	Amplified Music Amplified Music Amplified Music Amplified Music Amplified Music Amplified Music	2002 – 1 Complaint 2003 – 3 Complaints 2004 – 2 Complaints 2005 – 8 Complaints 2006 – 13 Complaints 2007 – 1 Complaint

In relation to the Transit Bar, there have been two complaints received by the Environment Protection Authority. The first was in August 2006 as detailed in question one. The second was in April 2008 and related to noise from patrons. Under the *Environment Protection Act 1997* noise from a person using his or her body is exempt and is dealt with by the ACT Police.

- (3) Information on complaints referred to in Part 2 of your question are detailed in the table on page one.

---

### **Education—Building the Education Revolution (BER)—costs (Question No 892)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Education and Training, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What is the average cost of buildings, per square metre, under the Building the Education Revolution (BER).
- (2) What was the average per square metre cost of buildings constructed by the Department of Education and Training in the previous year before the BER program.
- (3) Why is there a difference in price if the two average costs referred to in parts (1) and (2) are not the same.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) It is not feasible to provide an average cost per square metre for each building and project under the Building the Education Revolution (BER) initiative. Individual

project scopes and associated cost vary, including shade sails, shade structures, the refurbishment of classrooms, libraries, school front entries and assembly halls, and the construction of new libraries, assembly halls, multi-purpose buildings and environmental centres. The cost will also vary with the extent of furniture fitout which may include, for example, interactive white boards, audio visual systems, and desks and chairs. The cost for these elements differ significantly and it would therefore be meaningless to aggregate as an average per metre figure.

At the start of the BER initiative's implementation, it was decided that all projects would be custom designed and built on site, in consultation with school communities. The size of buildings, design features, environmental design initiatives, the level of fitout and other inclusions such as covered walkways was agreed on a school-by-school basis and therefore differ from one project to another. The project scope was however contained within the funding allocated for each school.

- (2) Prior to the commencement of the BER initiative in February 2009, the ACT Government funded a range of capital improvements, new schools and new facilities across ACT public schools. This included the construction of Kingsford Smith School, new gymnasiums at Belconnen and Stromlo High Schools, the performing arts centre at Lyneham High School, and school refurbishments at older schools such as Alfred Deakin High School, Telopea Park School and Narrabundah College.

Similarly, the cost of these projects would be meaningless if aggregated and averaged. In addition, each project is managed and delivered through different construction methods and therefore each project cannot be compared on a cost per square metre basis.

With the assistance of ACT Procurement Solutions, the Department of Education and Training delivers capital infrastructure projects on a competitive and value for money tender basis.

- (3) As explained above, cost comparisons are not feasible when such a wide range of project scopes is being undertaken.

### **Planning—Molonglo (Question No 893)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Planning, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What work has the ACT Planning and Land Authority done to meet the Government's Children's Plan commitments for Molonglo.
- (2) Have any children been consulted at any stage through the planning processes.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Planning and Land Authority participated on a Child Friendly City Sub Committee of a cross-Government interdepartmental committee that was established by the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services in 2009.

During 2009, a process to revisit and refresh the ACT Children's Plan was undertaken. This process involved consulting with children, families and people who

work with children to find out how to make Canberra a more child friendly city. The refreshed ACT Children's Plan will be launched later this year.

The Coombs and Wright concept plans (precinct code) prepared by ACTPLA for the first suburbs of Molonglo Valley will ensure that these suburbs adhere to the principles of a child friendly city promoted by UNICEF, and will set the standard for future concept plans for Molonglo.

(2) See above.

---

**Canberra Hospital—walk-in centre  
(Question No 895)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) When will The Canberra Hospital nurse-led Walk-in Centre be established.
- (2) Has the model and protocols for the operation of the centre been finalised; if not, what aspects are yet to be finalised and when is it expected to be finalised.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The centre is expected to open in May 2010.
- (2) The operational Model of Care containing policies, protocols and medication guidelines for the scope of service of the Walk-in Centre are progressing through the endorsement process with key stakeholders. All operational policies, protocols and guidelines will be finalised prior to opening.

---

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—needle and syringe program  
(Question No 899)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What work has been conducted by ACT Health to date in relation to the need for a Needle Syringe Program (NSP) at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC).
- (2) What is the progress or status of any such reviews into the need for such a program and are any preliminary findings of the review supportive of the introduction of an NSP at the AMC.
- (3) What are the preliminary findings or any available findings of the review and where can they be accessed.
- (4) What date will the review be completed and will it be publicly available.
- (5) What date will the ACT Government decide on the need to introduce an NSP.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The Government has committed to undertaking an evaluation of drug policies and services and their subsequent effects on prisoners and staff within AMC in accordance with ACT Health's Adult Corrections Health Services Plan 2008-2012. This evaluation has commenced.
  2. The evaluation is a joint initiative of the ACT Department of Justice and Community Safety and ACT Health. An evaluation protocol has been developed and an advisory group has been established. Data collection has commenced. There are no preliminary findings. The evaluation is expected to be completed in December 2010.
  3. There are no preliminary findings from the evaluation.
  4. The evaluation is expected to be completed in December 2010. At this stage no decision has been made as to if the report will be made publicly available.
  5. A date has not been established for when the ACT Government will respond to the findings from the evaluation. At this stage it would be unhelpful for me to speculate on the outcome of the evaluation.
- 

### **Canberra Hospital—patients (Question No 900)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What was the daily average number of patients admitted at The Canberra Hospital (TCH) for this financial year to date.
- (2) What was the daily average number of patients admitted at TCH in the 2000-01 financial year.
- (3) What was the average daily number of patient admissions, referred to in part (1), in terms of (a) planned and (b) unplanned.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 193
  - (2) 140
  - (3) (a) 117 for planned admissions; and  
(b) 76 for unplanned admissions.
- 

### **Hospitals—treatment interstate (Question No 904)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many patients have been required to travel interstate this financial year to date and what is the breakdown by type of service.

- (2) How many of the services referred to in part (1) are already provided in Canberra and how many are not and what services are they.
- (3) In relation to part (1), which other states and cities do ACT patients go to seek treatment and what is the number by type of service to each city.
- (4) In relation to part (2), what were the actual reasons for patients leaving the ACT to seek treatment for each type of service, such as (a) the required service was not offered in the ACT, (b) the required service was running at capacity in the ACT and it was not safe for the patient to face a delay, (c) the required service would have been provided quicker in another jurisdiction and (d) any other reason.
- (5) What is the number of patients for each reason referred to in part (4).

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the member's question is:

- (1) ACT Health does not collect data on **all** patients who travel interstate for health care. However ACT Health can provide data on those patients who claimed for interstate travel through the Interstate Patient Transport and Assistance Scheme (IPTAS).

From 01 July 2009 – 28 February 2010 inclusive the total number of claims through IPTAS for patients required to travel interstate is 597.

A breakdown of data is unavailable for the proportion of clients by type of service. Services include the following:

<b>Adult</b>	<b>Paediatric</b>
Allergy	Allergy
Cardiology	Cardiology
Clinical Genetics	Clinical Genetics
Craniofacial	Craniofacial
Dental	Dental
Dermatology	Dermatology
Endocrinology	Endocrinology
ENT	ENT
Gastroenterology	Gastroenterology
General	General
General Surgery	General Surgery
Gynaecology	Gynaecology
Haematology	Haematology
Immunology	Immunology
Infectious Diseases	Infectious Diseases
Medical Imaging	Medical Imaging
Neurology	Neonatal Surgery
Neurosurgery	Neurology
Obstetrics	Neurosurgery
Oncology	Oncology
Ophthalmology	Ophthalmology
Orthopaedics	Orthopaedics
Pain Management	Pain Management
Perinatal Surgery	Plastic Surgery
Plastic Surgery	Psychiatry

<b>Adult</b>	<b>Paediatric</b>
Psychiatry	Radiation Oncology
Radiation Oncology	Rehabilitation
Rehabilitation	Renal Medicine
Renal Medicine	Rheumatology
Rheumatology	Spinal
Spinal	Thoracic Medicine
Thoracic Medicine	Urology
Urology	Vascular Surgery
Vascular Surgery	

- (2) The current ACT IPTAS guidelines state that to be eligible for financial assistance the service must either not be available in the ACT or the service must be accessed for clinical continuity. The patient's General Practitioner/Specialist determines this status based on individual clinical need before signing the claim form.
- (3) Other States/Territories utilised for services include:  
The overwhelming majority processed are for services in Sydney.  
NSW – Sydney & Wagga Wagga  
Victoria – Melbourne  
South Australia – Adelaide  
Queensland – Brisbane.
- A breakdown of data is unavailable for the proportion of clients accessing other states and cities.
- (4) A breakdown of data is unavailable for the proportion of clients accessing services outside the ACT either because the service is not available in the ACT, or for continuity of care reasons. All 597 patients YTD who have claimed through IPTAS have travelled interstate fall into one of these two categories.
- (5) See above

---

### **ACT Health—litigation costs (Question No 905)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How much money has been spent by, for or on behalf of ACT Health in relation to any litigation (a) in the last financial year, and (b) this financial year to date.
- (2) How much money has been spent by, for or on behalf ACT Health for the purposes of (a) damages arising out of medical negligence or (b) meeting the cost of parties engaged in litigation with ACT Health (i) in the previous financial year and (ii) this financial year to date.
- (3) In the previous five financial years what were the three most expensive cases of litigation, for example, a case being all litigation involving a single party, involving ACT Health.

- (4) In relation to the cases referred to in part (3), what is the (a) case title or titles and in which tribunals or courts was the litigation heard and the outcome of the cases, (b) how much money was spent for ACT Health's legal representation, (c) how much was paid in damages for each case if damages were awarded, (d) how much was spent in relation to meeting court costs and litigation costs if so ordered and if not included in part (4)(c).
- (5) How much was spent in (a) the last five financial years and (b) this financial year to date by, for or on behalf of ACT Health in relation to investigations for matters that either do or do not eventuate in a claim.
- (6) What have the investigations referred to in part (5) related to.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the member's question is:

(1)

Year	Costs
2008-09	\$8,243,191
2009-10 Mar YTD	\$5,272,438

These amounts reflect payments made by ACT Health, and on behalf of ACT Health, by the ACT Insurance Authority (ACTIA), for litigated matters only. They do not include costs incurred in investigating matters which do not eventuate in a claim and are shown gross of reinsurance recoveries and agency insurance excess payments. The amounts include medical negligence, public liability, professional indemnity and directors and officers claims.

(2)

Year	Costs
2008-09	\$6,120,868
2009-10 Mar YTD	\$3,563,724

These amounts reflect payments made by ACT Health, and on behalf of ACT Health, by the ACTIA, for litigated medical negligence matters only. They do not include costs incurred in investigating matters which do not eventuate in a claim and are shown gross of reinsurance recoveries and agency insurance excess payments. The amounts include both damages and plaintiffs' legal costs as ACT Health and ACTIA's databases do not make that distinction. In some instances, matters are settled inclusive of plaintiff's legal costs therefore no breakdown between damages and plaintiffs' legal costs is available.

- (3) To respect the privacy and confidentiality of the individuals concerned, ACT Health will not release any details which may identify them.

- (4) (a) All three matters were brought before the ACT Supreme Court and amicably settled via a confidential deed with the consent of the court.

(b)

Legal representation costs	
Matter 1	\$76,285
Matter 2	\$133,240
Matter 3	\$234,054



- (c) To respect the privacy and confidentiality of individuals concerned, ACT Health will not release the details of damages which may identify them.

(d)

Litigation costs	
Matter 1	\$371,070
Matter 2	\$250,000
Matter 3	\$400,000

The amounts above reflect payments made by ACT Health, and on behalf of ACT Health, by the ACTIA. They are shown gross of reinsurance recoveries and agency insurance excess payments.

(5)

Year	Costs
2004-05	\$85,469
2005-06	\$355,377
2006-07	\$706,290
2007-08	\$286,980
2008-09	\$190,724
2009-10 Mar YTD	\$209,028

The figures above represent costs incurred in investigating matters that do not eventuate into a claim. Costs incurred in investigating matters that eventuate into a claim are included at (1).

- (6) The matters investigated above include alleged medical negligence, public liability, professional indemnity, directors and officers incidents.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—needle and syringe program (Question No 906)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What work has been conducted by ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) to date in relation to the need for a Needle Syringe Program (NSP) at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC).
- (2) What is the progress or status of any such reviews into the need for such a program and are any preliminary findings of the review supportive of the introduction of an NSP at the AMC.
- (3) Since the commencement of operations at the AMC, has bleach, or another cleaning agent, been provided to prisoners; if so, how many litres of bleach have been provided since the commencement of operations.
- (4) What opportunity will ACTCS staff, particularly correctional officers, have to share their views about the need to introduce an NSP at the AMC.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) A working group has been established with representatives from both ACT Health and ACTCS regarding an evaluation of drug policies and services. The evaluation process is now underway. The outcomes will inform if there is any need to move to a NSP.

An Evaluation Advisory Group has also been established to provide advice on how to effectively engage with key stakeholders to ensure meaningful input into the evaluation. This Group consists of representatives from both government and non-government organisations.

- 2) As mentioned under question (1), consistent with the *Adult Corrections Health Plan 2008-2012*, a full and comprehensive evaluation of drug policies and services, and their subsequent effects on prisoners and staff within the AMC, will be undertaken 18 months after the commissioning. Data is being collected from 1 June 2009 as agreed by ACT Health and ACTCS representatives. The Evaluation Advisory Group has met once and will meet again on 31 May 2010. There are no preliminary findings from the evaluation.
- 3) In February 2010, 15 dispenser units containing a bleach solution were installed at the AMC for prisoners to use as a general cleaning product. Since the installation of the dispensers approximately 150 litres of the bleach solution have been provided to prisoners. Prior to February 2010, a cleaning solution that did not contain bleach was being used as a general cleaning product.
- 4) Established staff consultative arrangements will be used to seek staff and union views on this issue.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—rehabilitation programs (Question No 908)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many rehabilitation programs are provided at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) and what are they.
- (2) How many sentenced prisoners or remandees are enrolled in rehabilitation programs at the AMC.
- (3) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the number of sentenced prisoners or remandees in each program referred to in part (2).
- (4) How many sentenced prisoners or remandees are enrolled in an educational or vocational training program and (a) what are they and (b) how many in each program.
- (5) How many sentenced prisoners or remandees are engaged in an employment program and (a) what are the programs and (b) how many in each program.
- (6) How many individuals are not currently enrolled in either a rehabilitation program, an educational or vocational training program or an employment program, and for what reasons.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1) There are four rehabilitation programs currently running at the AMC:

- **First Steps Relapse Prevention Program:** this is an eight session education, awareness and relapse prevention program designed to ensure all participants gain the skills and tools needed to prevent relapse into substance misuse.
- **Solaris Therapeutic Community:** the Solaris Therapeutic Community is a 20 bed cottage for participants with substance dependence issues linked to criminal conduct.
- **Cognitive Self Change Program:** this program teaches a set of cognitive based skills designed to increase awareness of thinking, recognition of risk thoughts and thinking patterns and encourages the production of new thinking.
- **Adult Sex Offender Program:** this program endeavours to address general offending attitudes and behaviour amongst adult sex offenders, and equip them with the necessary skills, attitudes and motivation to avoid future offending.

There have been three programs that were recently completed and will recommence once there are adequate numbers:

- **Health and Wellbeing suite:** The Health and Wellbeing suite of programs includes stress management, parenting, conflict resolution, positive communication, budgeting skills, self esteem, goal setting, problem solving and harm minimisation programs.
- **Personal Effectiveness Program:** This is a personal development program and covers communication, mental fitness and working in groups.
- **First Steps to Anger Management:** this program is for prisoners with a history of aggressive behaviour.

There are three programs that are scheduled for commencement:

- **Alcohol and Other Drug Back in Control Relapse Prevention Program:** This program is an 18 session high intensity relapse program designed to assist participants to expand upon and consolidate skills learnt previously in the First Steps Program Relapse Prevention program.
- **Violent Offenders Program:** This is a high intensity program directed at high risk sentenced mainstream prisoners who have scored as medium or high on the Violent Risk Scale.
- **Family Violence Cognitive Self Change Program:** This program targets offenders with a history of family violence.

(2) There are a total of 70 prisoners currently enrolled in rehabilitation programs. A further 16 prisoner recently graduated from a program and 26 prisoners are currently enrolled in programs that are scheduled for commencement.

(3) There are 19 remand prisoners and 51 sentenced prisoners currently enrolled in rehabilitation programs. There were six remand prisoners and ten sentenced prisoners that recently graduated from a program. There are no remand prisoners and 26 sentenced prisoners currently enrolled in programs that are scheduled for commencement.

(4) As at 22 March 2010 there were a total of 208 prisoners enrolled in 21 courses. Prisoners can be enrolled in more than one course.

- (a) & (b) The educational and vocational courses being undertaken are as follows and the number of prisoner enrolled in each are as follows:

Course Name	Number of enrolments
Certificate I in Information Technology	82
Certificate II in Information Technology	10
Certificate II in Asset Maintenance	11
Certificate II in Business	3
Certificate II in General Construction	39
Certificate II in Hairdressing	22
Certificate II in Horticulture	52
Certificate II in Hospitality	11
Certificate III in Business	5
Certificate III in Children's Services	0
Certificate IV in Training and Assessment	5
Compulsory Orientation	94
Art	11
Music	7
University Education	4
Aquaculture	0
Model Ship Building	2
Language, Literacy and Numeracy	35
Tutorial Support	2
Fitness	0
Barista	13
<b>TOTAL ENROLMENTS</b>	<b>408</b>

- (5) As at 22 March 2010 a total of 151 prisoners are engaged in an employment program:

Remand Accommodation Area General Services - 49 participants  
 Sentenced Accommodation Area General Services - 38 participants  
 Education General Services – 1 participant  
 Admissions General Services – 1 participant  
 Health Centre General Services – 1 participant  
 Program General Services – 1 participant  
 Visits General Services – 2 participants  
 Kitchen Operations – 23 participants  
 Grounds Maintenance – 10 participants  
 Main Laundry Operations – 2 participants  
 Baristas – 6 participants  
 Education Assistants – 4 participants  
 Industries Workers – 10 participants  
 Community Work Placements – 3 participants

- (6) As at 22 March 2010 a total of two sentenced prisoners and eight remand prisoners were not enrolled or participating in any Rehabilitation, Education or Employment program. One Sentenced prisoner and one Remand prisoner had been dismissed from their employment program for a period of seven days for poor work performance, five of the Remand prisoners were new arrivals to the centre, the remaining three had recently been relocated from other accommodation areas.

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—population and costs  
(Question No 909)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What was the average daily population of the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) since the commencement of operations.
- (2) What is the current population of the AMC and what is the breakdown of this population by (a) gender, (b) security classification, (c) status, for example, sentenced or remand and (d) Indigenous and non-Indigenous.
- (3) Since the commencement of operations what was the average daily or overnight utilisation rate of the (a) Transitional Release Unit and (b) Hume Health Centre.
- (4) What is the total operating cost of the AMC for the financial year to date.
- (5) What is the average daily cost per prisoner this financial year to date.
- (6) What is the average daily cost per prisoner in other jurisdictions within Australia.
- (7) If there is a variation between part (5) and part (6), why.
- (8) What is the marginal cost for an additional prisoner per day at current levels.
- (9) What depreciation rate is used for the AMC and what is the total annual depreciation cost.
- (10) What is the (a) target average and (b) marginal cost per prisoner.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The AMC average daily population between April 2009 and February 2010 was 142.88.
- (2)

<b>Current AMC population (as at 26 March 2010)</b>			
	<b>Indigenous</b>	<b>Non-Indigenous</b>	<b>Total</b>
Remand	19	66	85
Sentenced	16	99	115
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>200</b>

<b>Current AMC population by Security Classification (as at 26 March 2010)</b>			
<b>Class</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
Maximum	7	39	46
Medium	6	57	63
Minimum	3	88	91
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>200</b>

- (3) Three prisoners were moved into the Transitional Release Centre (TRC) on 23 November 2009. A further two prisoners were moved into the TRC on 18 February 2010. These prisoners are still accommodated at the TRC.

No prisoner has ever been kept overnight at the Hume Health Centre, however on average, between 30 and 40 prisoners are seen at the Hume Health Centre per day.

- (4) The operating cost of the AMC from July 2009 to end February 2010 was approximately \$17.9m. This is the direct operating cost of the AMC and does not include other Corrective Services and departmental support costs. It does not include separate crime prevention budgeted costs.
- (5) Daily average costs are calculated every six months for KPI reporting purposes, and does include support and crime prevention initiative costs. The daily cost per prisoner as at end December 2009 was \$510.
- (6) The table below provides the average daily cost per prisoner per day in other jurisdictions in accordance with the Report on Government Services (RoGS) 2010, which covers the 2008-09 financial year:

NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	NT	AUST
275.86	297.30	280.21	273.87	225.87	320.59	190.48	276.05

The ACT average daily cost per prisoner per day reported in the same ROGS report was 507.86.

It should be noted that the average daily cost per prisoner figure differs between the Justice and Community Safety Annual Report and RoGS due to different counting rules. In accordance with the RoGS counting rules, the operating expenditure per prisoner is calculated using the net operating expenditure, i.e. excluding payroll tax, operating revenues from ordinary activities and superannuation.

- (7) The prisoner numbers at the AMC to date are low compared to bed capacity, and this tends to exaggerate daily prisoner cost figures, as the result is calculated by dividing total applied costs by total prisoner days for a given period. An average prisoner number of 170 was applicable in the December result. This average prisoner number will increase by the end of June 2010, as current prisoner numbers have reached 200.

The fixed cost component also has a large impact on ACT prisoner day costs, given a proportion of these costs must be factored across these relatively low prisoner numbers.

- (8) This is difficult to precisely calculate, given the facility has not yet been operating for one discrete financial year, however an estimate based on the derived average cost of meals, clothing, wage payments, vocational education and other miscellaneous prisoner specific costs allows an estimate of approximately \$20 per prisoner per day.
- (9) The depreciation rate applied to the AMC is based on a 40 year life for the various buildings and roadway, a 15 year life for the main security system and a 10 year life for the kitchen, laundry and RFID security system. The total calculated annual depreciation cost is \$4.72m

- (10) The targeted average cost per prisoner per day is \$430 per day in 2009-10, but was calculated before operations at the facility commenced and was based on higher average prisoner numbers than the actual result at the end of December 2009. There is no targeted marginal cost per prisoner.
- 

**Government—motor vehicles  
(Question No 914)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many vehicles are currently used by the Minister's department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) What are the types and sizes each the vehicles referred to in part (1).
- (3) How many of the vehicles referred to in part (1) are privately garaged.
- (4) What is the purpose of each vehicle.
- (5) How many kilometres are travelled by each year by each vehicle.
- (6) What are the insurance costs, including third party insurance for each vehicle.

**Ms Gallagher:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Health portfolio currently leases 300 vehicles.
  - (2) The agency leases three commercial vehicles and 297 passenger vehicles, most of which are small to medium 4-cylinder vehicles.
  - (3) Fifty-six percent of ACT Health vehicles are privately garaged from time-to-time for essential operational purposes.
  - (4) ACT Health vehicles are used for the support of clinical and non-clinical operations, or as part of executive arrangements.
  - (5) On average, an ACT Health vehicle travels 12,580 kilometers per year.
  - (6) The average comprehensive insurance costs with CTP for each vehicle is approximately \$959 per annum.
- 

**Government—costs  
(Question No 917)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What output costing methodology is used to allocate costs across the Minister's department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) What are the top ten individual depreciation costs for the department and each agency.

- (3) What assets do the costs referred to in part (2) refer to and what was the initial cost of the assets.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the member's question is:

- (1) ACT Health costs fall into two categories, 'direct costs' and 'overheads'. Direct costs are those service delivery area's that fit directly or partly into one of the output descriptions.

Overhead costs (corporate and business functions) are distributed across the seven outputs using three different methodologies. Both Information Technology and Business and Infrastructure Divisions have undertaken exercises to apportion their respective costs on estimated levels of service provided to the front line units. The balances of overheads are distributed based on the pro-rata of direct costs.

- (2) The top ten individual depreciation costs for ACT Health are:

1	Building 1 (Main Building) at The Canberra Hospital	2,848,297
2	ACTPAS Software	1,386,620
3	Building 3 (General Wards/Oncology) at The Canberra Hospital	1,284,516
4	Building 12 (Emergency / D&T) at The Canberra Hospital	1,080,035
5	Building 10 (Pathology) at The Canberra Hospital	583,707
6	Building 4 (Medical School) at The Canberra Hospital	366,067
7	Building 11 (Maternity) at The Canberra Hospital	335,400
8	11 Moore Street Fitout	271,875
9	Building 2 (Administration/Retail) at The Canberra Hospital	264,915
10	Building 5 (Offices and Residential Accommodation) at TCH	261,875

- (3) ACT Health does not have initial cost records available for most of the items listed at (2) as they date back in most cases to the early 1970's and have been renovated and upgraded on a number of occasions since. The amounts listed below are the most recent revaluation where initial cost is not available:

		\$	Basis of recognition
1	Building 1 (Main Building) at The Canberra Hospital	113,931,873	fair value (revaluation)
2	ACTPAS Software	6,933,098	cost
3	Building 3 (General Wards/Oncology) at The Canberra Hospital	83,493,535	fair value (revaluation)
4	Building 12 (Emergency / D&T) at The Canberra Hospital	70,202,237	fair value (revaluation)
5	Building 10 (Pathology) at The Canberra Hospital	32,687,583	fair value (revaluation)
6	Building 4 (Medical School) at The Canberra Hospital	27,455,000	fair value (revaluation)
7	Building 11 (Maternity) at The Canberra Hospital	23,478,000	fair value (revaluation)



		\$	Basis of recognition
8	11 Moore Street Fit-out	2,175,000	cost
9	Building 2 (Administration/Retail) at The Canberra Hospital	12,715,902	fair value (revaluation)
10	Building 5 (Offices and Residential Accommodation) at The Canberra Hospital	10,475,000	fair value (revaluation)

---

### **Government—costs (Question No 920)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

What are the overhead fixed costs for the department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the member's question is:

In attributing total ACT Health costs across its seven outputs, ACT Health separates direct costs from overheads. Direct costs are those service delivery areas that fit directly or partly into one of the output descriptions.

Overheads are corporate and business functions of the department, such as Human Resources, Financial Management, Information Technology, Business and Infrastructure, Policy, Government Relations and the Offices of the Chief and Deputy Chief Executives.

Overhead cost are distributed across the seven outputs using three different methodologies. Both Information Technology and Business and Infrastructure Divisions have undertaken exercises to apportion their respective costs on estimated levels of service provided to the front line units. The balance of overheads are distributed based on the pro-rata of direct costs.

---

### **Government—grants programs (Question No 935)**

**Mr Hanson** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many grants programs are administered in the Minister's department and in each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) What is the cost of administering each grants program.
- (3) What is the total value of grants paid in 2009-2010 to date.

**Ms Gallagher:** I am advised that the answer to the Member's question is:

- (1) ACT Health administers two grants programs for one off projects with limited funding. Information can be found on the ACT Health web site at [www.health.act.gov.au](http://www.health.act.gov.au).
  - (2) The cost of administering the Health Promotion Grants program is \$210,000.  
  
The cost of administering the Health and Medical Research Support Program is \$10,000.
  - (3) The total value of grants paid in 2009-2010 to 25 March 2010 is \$1,911,816.
- 

***Our City, Our Community* brochure  
(Question No 940)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

In relation to the brochure *Our City, Our Community: An annual summary of some important projects and initiatives delivered by the ACT Government* delivered to Canberrans earlier this year, (a) was the document produced in-house or by a contractor, (b) what was the total cost of production, (c) what was the cost of printing, (d) how many copies were produced, (e) to whom was it distributed and by what means, (f) what was the cost of distribution, (g) did all people appearing in the brochure sign talent release forms, (h) were all people in the brochure photographs of Canberrans or people living in Canberra and (i) what agency/agencies paid for the costs.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- a) ACT Government Publishing Services managed the design and production of the *Our City, Our Community* newsletter. The printing, envelope overprint and processing was outsourced to local suppliers, and distribution was by Australia Post.
  - b) The total cost of production for the Newsletter was \$65,779.45.
  - c) The total cost of printing the Newsletter was \$30,668.
  - d) 160,000 copies of the Newsletter were produced.
  - e) All ACT householders including 'No Junk Mail', PO Boxes and roadside addresses received a copy of the Newsletter by Australia Post.
  - f) The cost of distribution of the Newsletter was \$19,338.
  - g) Where appropriate all people appearing in the brochure consented to their photo being taken.
  - h) The majority of images are Canberrans or people living in Canberra at the time the photos were taken. Some images are from a photographic stock library.
  - i) The Chief Minister's Department paid for the total cost of the Newsletter.
-

## Roads—parking revenue (Question No 942)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010 (*redirected to the Attorney-General*):

What is the breakdown in revenue from ACT Government parking ticket machines by (a) month and (b) car park location for the 2009-10 financial year to date.

**Mr Corbell:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(a)

July 2009	\$1,078,444
August 2009	\$1,038,004
September 2009	\$1,120,774
October 2009	\$1,072,405
November 2009	\$1,006,351
December 2009	\$974,268
January 2010	\$799,982
February 2010	\$1,002,310

The above figures include GST.

(b) **City, Turner and Braddon**

Car park adjacent Reid CIT (asphalt)	\$114,049.20
Car park Opposite Reid CIT (gravel)	\$477,478.80
Car park Opposite Convention Centre(City pool)	\$311,114.80
Car park adjacent City pool (entrance)	\$124,412.20
Car park adjacent Army Reserve Allara St	\$47,586.15
Car park on City Hill (multi stay)	\$561,768.30
Car park adjacent Legislative assembly (short stay)	\$243,705.70
Car park opposite Bailey's Cnr (short stay)	\$373,650.20
Car park adjacent Magistrates Court (short stay)	\$412,945.60
Car park Adjacent Canberra Arcade (short stay)	\$125,024.60
Car park Gordon St adjacent Westlund House (multi stay)	\$167,626.30
Car park adjacent Street Theatre Childers St (multi stay)	\$72,658.35
Car park adjacent Pensioners Club (end of Childers St)	\$374,993.50
Car park Regatta Point	\$9,957.40
Car park Barrine Drive (adj bike hire and Café)	\$166,697.00
Car park Barrine Drive (west basin)	\$174,248.70
Genge St	\$4,882.95
Hutton and Childers Streets (on street)	\$33,505.55
Narrellan St	\$7,845.95
Bunda St	\$30,609.90
Car park Cnr Watson St and Barry Drive (dirt)	\$51,572.80
Watson St	\$121,547.60
Car park Adjacent McDonalds Mort St Braddon (from McDonalds to Elouera St)	\$69,273.85
Car park behind NRMA from Elouera to Girrawheen St	\$96,244.00
Car park Haig Park Girrawheen St closest to Northbourne Ave	\$30,218.65
Car park Haig Park Girrawheen St closest to (food bus)	\$23,328.25
Batman St Adjacent Gorman House	\$13,311.75

**Woden, Deakin, Manuka and Greenway**

Car park behind Callum offices	\$91,103.75
Car park adjacent Callum Offices (near Koomarri)	\$105,085.90
Car park in front of Callum Offices (opposite Hellenic Club)	\$79,108.20
Car park (Matilda St) opposite Juliana House	\$240,989.80
Car park Furzer St adj Woden Tradies Club	\$231,486.00
Car park Furzer St adj Air Services Building	\$394,307.80
Car park Corinna St adj Gadai Chambers down to Ball St	\$208,057.90
Car park Corinna St adj Coles (short stay)	\$170,603.60
Car park Keltie St adj Lovett Tower	\$12,339.85
Car park in Spoering St (opposite ice skating)	\$160,719.40
Irving Street (on street)	\$3,430.05
Spoering St (on street)	\$1,722.85
Irving St car park (opposite Hellenic Club)	\$80,407.85
Car park adj Post Office Deakin	\$2,692.95
Car park opposite Tuggeranong College (3 for Free area)	\$45,353.50
Car park adjacent Tuggeranong Health Centre	\$78,997.30
Car park Adjacent Tuggeranong Churches Centre	\$128,121.30
Reed St South (on street)	\$13,690.70
Car park adjacent Home Art and Hyperdome (Reed St North)	\$111,591.30
Car park adjacent Good Guys and Hyperdome (Pitman St)	\$34,900.40
Pitman St adjacent Tuggeranong Southern Cross Club	\$219.15
Holwell St (on street adj Tuggeranong Southern Cross Club)	\$1,253.05
Cowlishaw St (on street)	\$1,140.40
Captain Cook Cr	\$21,986.35
Franklin St	\$9,350.20
Bougainville St	\$162,516.80
Manuka multi deck car park	\$104,964.90

**Belconnen, Dickson and Kingston**

Car park Swanson Court	\$86,322.30
Swanson Court on street	\$6,873.95
Chandler St	\$60,354.20
Cameron Ave	\$7,803.05
Car park adj Labor Club	\$88,818.45
Car park adj Skate Park	\$14,220.65
Car park adj Lighthouse nightclub	\$40,825.60
Emu Bank	\$27,281.60
Benjamin Way	\$18,453.05
Chan St	\$6,851.90
Car park adj markets	\$46,501.45
Lathlain St	\$8,247.90
Car park Lathlain St (3 for Free area)	\$96,765.65
Car park Lathlain St adj Magnet Mart	\$58,411.05
Car park Josephson and Bayles St	\$695.25
Car park Josephson and Purdue St	\$5,054.25
Car parks Oatley Court	\$2,149.05
Westfield Shopping Centre western car park	\$264,310.00
Car park adj Woolworths Dickson	\$119,888.80
Car park adj Dickson Square	\$85,259.40
Car park adj Dickson Tradies Club	\$69,639.55

Woolley St	\$53,870.10
Car park adj Kingston Mobil Service Station	\$69,008.40
Kennedy St	\$43,571.25
Giles St	\$56,448.20
Jardine St	\$18,514.75

The above figures include GST.

---

**Territory and Municipal Services, Department—accounts  
(Question No 943)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

In relation to the payment of accounts by the Department of Territory and Municipal Services for the 2009-2010 financial year to date, what (a) proportion of accounts payable were not paid within 30 days, (b) proportion of accounts were not paid within 90 days, (c) were the major reasons why accounts were not paid on time and (d) actions is the Minister taking to increase the proportion of accounts paid on time.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) The information has been extracted based on 35 days from the invoice date. Due to how the 'due date' field is used in the system, this methodology provides the most accurate payment data possible. A parameter of 35 days has been used instead of 30 days to allow for the normal time lag that occurs before a department receives invoices from suppliers. The proportion of accounts payable not paid within this period for the 2009-10 financial year to date at 31 March 2010 was 23.6%.
- (b) The information has been extracted based on 95 days from the invoice date. Due to how the 'due date' field is used in the system, this methodology provides the most accurate payment data possible. A parameter of 95 days has been used instead of 90 days to allow for the normal time lag that occurs before a department receives invoices from suppliers. The proportion of accounts payable not paid within this period for the 2009-10 financial year to date at 31 March 2010 was 3.7%.
- (c) Invoices can remain unpaid past the due date for a variety of valid reasons:
  - the invoice is being disputed by the agency with the vendor or further documentation is required;
  - the invoice received is an invalid tax invoice;
  - the invoice details are incorrect resulting in the invoice not being received by the correct agency or area within the agency; or
  - the invoice is issued by the vendor well after the date specified on the invoice.
- (d) The following actions are being pursued within the Department to minimise delayed payment of accounts:
  - encouraging transmission of invoices for payment from suppliers by electronic means, rather than by postal services;

- encouraging suppliers to receive payment by electronic means eg direct credit, rather than relying on cheque payments; and
  - reinforcing the principle across the Department for officials to balance the timely payment of invoices with their responsibility to ensure the Department is only paying legitimate invoices for goods or services received.
- 

**Government—departmental costs  
(Question No 946)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

What are the overhead fixed costs for the department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Department's overhead fixed costs that are not dependent on the activities of the Department include office rental, utility costs, finance and human resources, and other corporate and management functions.

---

**Government—grants programs  
(Question No 959)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many grants programs are administered by the department and each agency in the Minister's portfolio and what is the cost of administering each of these grants.
- (2) What is the total value of grants paid in 2009-10 to date.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were no grants programs administered by my transport portfolio.
  - (2) Not applicable.
- 

**Government—costs  
(Question No 963)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What output costing methodology is used to allocate costs across the Minister's department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) What are the top ten individual depreciation costs for the department and each agency.
- (3) What assets do the costs referred to in part (2) refer to and what was the initial cost of the assets.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) This information is included within the response for Territory and Municipal Services.
  - (2) As above.
  - (3) As above.
- 

**Government—costs  
(Question No 964)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) What output costing methodology is used to allocate costs across the Minister's department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) What are the top ten individual depreciation costs for the department and each agency.
- (3) What assets do the costs referred to in part (2) refer to and what was the initial cost of the assets.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The majority of the Department's costs are directly allocated to outputs based on actual consumption with overhead costs allocated on the basis of consumption, for example rental costs are based on space occupied, and HR costs are allocated on the basis of employee distribution.
- (2) Attachment A provides depreciation costs by Asset Class.
- (3) Attachment A provides a summary of the type of assets in each asset class. The initial cost of each asset is not available as assets are revalued on a 3 year rolling basis using a fair value or depreciated replacement cost methodology.

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

**Government—regulatory impact statements  
(Question No 965)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How many regulatory impact statements have been prepared by the Minister's department or each agency in their portfolio to date in 2009-10.
- (2) How many hours were spent on the preparation of each statement referred to in part (1).
- (3) Which areas of the department or each agency were responsible for drafting each statement.

- (4) What economic analysis, if any, has been performed by the department or each agency in (a) 2008-09 and (b) 2009-10 to date.
- (5) What was the cost of undertaking the analysis referred to in part (4).

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were no Regulatory Impact Statements undertaken for the Minister for Transport.
  - (2) Not applicable.
  - (3) Not applicable.
  - (4) Not applicable.
  - (5) Not applicable.
- 

**Government—advertising  
(Question No 970)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Territory and Municipal Services, upon notice, on 25 March 2010:

- (1) How much has been spent on advertising in 2009-10 to date for the Minister's department and each agency within the Minister's portfolio.
- (2) On what campaigns was the money referred to in part (1) spent.
- (3) What form of media was employed to undertake the advertising.
- (4) Which businesses were employed to undertake, or consult on, each campaign.
- (5) How many of these are small businesses from the ACT.

**Mr Stanhope:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I am advised that this request would take a considerable amount of time to complete. I am not prepared to divert resources from important core tasks.

---