



Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

EIGHTH ASSEMBLY

6 AUGUST 2013

www.hansard.act.gov.au

Tuesday, 6 August 2013

Resignation of member (Statement by Speaker)	2467
Announcement of member to fill casual vacancy	2467
Oath or affirmation of allegiance	2467
Affirmation of allegiance by member	2468
Inaugural speech	2468
Estimates 2013-2014—Select Committee	2473
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee.....	2483
Auditor-General Amendment Bill 2013	2484
Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill 2013	2489
Water Resources Amendment Bill 2013	2496
Questions without notice:	
ACTEW Corporation Ltd—water prices.....	2502
Transport—light rail	2503
Budget—project funding	2505
ACTEW Corporation Ltd—dividend payments.....	2509
Transport—light rail	2510
Economy—performance.....	2511
Schools—registration	2515
Education—funding.....	2516
Budget—savings.....	2519
Land—development	2520
Energy—efficiency.....	2523
Personal explanation	2526
Papers.....	2526
Executive contracts	2526
Cost of living pressures—government response	2531
Financial Management Act—instruments	2532
Territory-owned Corporations Act—statements of corporate intent.....	2533
Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission—reports.....	2534
Cotter Dam—enlargement	2535
Papers.....	2536
Getting home safely report (Ministerial statement).....	2536
Papers.....	2540
Philanthropy (Matter of public importance)	2549
Adjournment:	
Communities@Work.....	2561
Greening Australia.....	2562
CBR Collective.....	2562
Acknowledgement of country	2563
Schools—Weetangera Primary.....	2564
Schools—Rosary Primary	2564
Dr Bourke	2565
Canberra Airport.....	2565
Southern Cross Club—community grants	2566
Indian myna birds	2567
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Auditor-General Amendment Bill 2013	2569

Tuesday, 6 August 2013

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

Resignation of member Statement by Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the resolution of the Assembly of 27 March 1992, which authorises me to receive written notice of resignation of a member, I wish to inform the Assembly that I have received a written notice from Mr Seselja, dated 11 June 2013. Pursuant to subsection 13(3) of the Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Act 1988 I present the following papers:

Seselja, Mr Z.—Resignation of office as Member—Letter of resignation in accordance with section 13 of the *Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Act 1988* (Cwlth), dated 11 June 2013.

Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory—Casual Vacancy—Copy of letter to the Electoral Commissioner, ACT Electoral Commission, from the Speaker, dated 11 June 2013.

Announcement of member to fill casual vacancy

MADAM SPEAKER: The Clerk has been notified by the Acting Electoral Commissioner that, pursuant to sections 189 and 194 of the Electoral Act 1992, Ms Nicole Ann Lawder has been declared elected to the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Mr Seselja. I present the following paper:

Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory—Casual Vacancy—Declaration of the poll—Letter from the Acting Electoral Commissioner, ACT Electoral Commission, to the Clerk, ACT Legislative Assembly, dated 26 June 2013.

Oath or affirmation of allegiance

MADAM SPEAKER: In accordance with the provisions of the Oaths and Affirmations Act 1984, which requires the oath or affirmation of a new member to be made before the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory or a judge of that court authorised by the Chief Justice, the Hon Justice Terence Higgins, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory, will attend the chamber.

The Chief Justice attended accordingly—

Affirmation of allegiance by member

Ms Nicole Lawder was introduced, and made and subscribed the affirmation of allegiance required by law.

The Chief Justice having retired—

MADAM SPEAKER: Ms Lawder, on behalf of all members of the Assembly, I bid you a warm welcome.

Inaugural speech

MS LAWDER (Brindabella): I seek leave of the Assembly to make my inaugural speech.

Leave granted.

MADAM SPEAKER: I wish to remind members that as this is Ms Lawder's inaugural speech and as is the convention in all parliaments, she will be heard in respectful silence.

MS LAWDER: It is a great honour and a privilege to be elected to the ACT Legislative Assembly and I must, first and foremost, thank the people of Brindabella for the faith they have placed in me.

I come to the Assembly via a path less trodden, that of filling a casual vacancy. However, I am in good company here. I am joined by Minister Barr, Dr Bourke and Minister Corbell, who also began their time in the same way.

Winning on a countback means that the hard work of those who worked on my campaign still paid off—better late than never. So, as is traditional, I would like to start by expressing my gratitude to all those who worked on my campaign so tirelessly last year: my family, friends, and my campaign manager, the fantastic Mitchell Clout. Thank you. To the divisional office of the Canberra Liberals, the Women's Council and members of the southern electorate branch, thank you for your countless hours of support.

I must make special mention of my husband, Peter, my second campaign manager, who was and is so supportive of my endeavours in all areas of life. Peter managed to incorporate a myriad of campaign tasks, including letterboxing, all the while training for the Kokoda Trail, and of course his emotional support was invaluable to me.

I would not have achieved those vital eight votes without the help of any of those people. I must mention at this point the hardworking, community-spirited Val Jeffery, who missed out on this spot by such a narrow margin. I cannot speak highly enough of his dedication and long-term service to his community.

My evolution to the Legislative Assembly has been determined by my environment, experience and family, and I would like to give a snapshot of those today. I came to

Canberra at the end of 1988. Back then, Lake Tuggeranong was empty, and the Tuggeranong Hyperdome had only just opened. Lanyon valley was unpopulated and you took a packed lunch to go to Tharwa. Now it is a very different story. Suburbia reaches right up to the edges of Lanyon Homestead, and Tharwa seems just down the road—well, almost.

1988 was a fascinating time to arrive in Canberra because it was also the year of self-government in the ACT. I watched on during this time with interest and some amusement at the campaigns of the “no self-government” parties, which then got into government, as well as other entertaining parties such as the Sun-Ripened Warm Tomato Party and the Party! Party! Party! Party. It made for an interesting introduction to the capital.

Prior to coming to Canberra, I had lived in most other states and territories of Australia, as well as some overseas locations. We moved a lot when I was a child because my father was serving our country as a member of the Australian Defence Force. But of all the places I have lived, I chose to stay here in Canberra and bring up my family.

My husband, Peter, and I have five grown children between us, all now with their own families living in Brindabella, and proud to call Canberra our home. My mail has been delivered to Oxley, Gowrie, Chisholm and now Fadden. So I have lived solely in the electorate of Brindabella my entire time since moving to the ACT.

This is also well and truly home to my husband, Peter, who was born and bred in Canberra. His parents came to Australia from Europe after World War II as refugees and were given the option of working on a pineapple farm in Queensland or in the nation’s capital as kitchen staff, and this is where they ended up. Once they arrived here, they realised that Canberra in the late 1940s was quite a different place to the capital cities they had known in Europe.

My parents, Oxley and Joan Gordon-Brown, taught me about hard work, living within your means, caring for others, giving back to the community and that you should never be afraid of trying something new. My parents are here today to see their youngest child sworn in to the ACT Legislative Assembly. My parents were strong believers in education as a way to get ahead in life. In following this lead, I completed my undergraduate degree at the ANU, like many of my colleagues here. I later went on to complete a masters degree.

Being brought up by a working mother meant working outside the home was second nature to me. While this was reasonably commonplace amongst women of my era, there is no question that I have been subjected to sexism in the workplace in my time. This has done nothing but spur me on to try to achieve more and ensure that I am the best person for the job.

I am very, very proud of my beautiful children, Catherine and Alex, and their partners; of my stepchildren, Damien, Shane and Amanda, and their partners; and of my collection of nine grandchildren, for whom I want to ensure that Canberra remains

the best place in Australia to live. In fact I am delighted to announce that it will soon become 10 grandchildren.

I want also to acknowledge my brother and sister, who are here today. Growing up, my siblings taught me about sharing, about not sharing, about tolerance and about unity. They were also pivotal in a life lesson nearly 11 years ago that first prompted my move to work in the community sector.

But let me state that the community sector is not my only experience or interest. I have been privileged to work in a range of different areas, including science and technology, tourism, tax, transport, health, defence and financial services, in addition to disability and homelessness, through my work over many years in the private sector, the Australian public service and the not-for-profit sector.

Many people talk to me about what a beautiful place Canberra is to live, and I agree wholeheartedly with them. But Canberra is more than just a location or another city; it is our nation's capital and, as such, it is a set of values. It is about having hope for the future and ensuring that we, the members of the Legislative Assembly, set in place the mechanisms to best ensure that future.

I want Canberra in the future to be a dynamic, vibrant city where all of our children and grandchildren will be able to find jobs and create new business opportunities, to have the best possible health care and education system, to have a stable economy and affordable housing with a reasonable cost of living, to have excellent amenities in the built environment while still being responsible caretakers of the beautiful natural environment which surrounds our city.

In working towards this vision for Canberra, I want a Canberra that is accessible and inclusive of everyone. This includes people with disability, the aged, visitors, migrants, tourists, those on low incomes, those on high incomes—in fact, everyone from all walks of life. I want a city and a territory with a real sense of community and connectedness. I want us to build on our pride in our city and take on bigger and better things, not just as the hub of our region but as our nation's capital. This is what I want for Canberra, and we have a way to go.

Many of you know that immediately prior to my election to the Legislative Assembly I worked at a national peak body for homelessness. And it is fitting to talk about homelessness today because this week is national Homeless Persons Week. It pains me greatly to say that the ACT has the second worst rate of homelessness in Australia, second only to the Northern Territory. Amongst this appalling statistic there is some good news in that a great number of people experiencing homelessness in Canberra receive support from specialist homelessness services, but we must do more and do better on ending and preventing homelessness. We need to address the structural causes.

Homelessness can be triggered by poverty, mental illness, family and relationship breakdown, substance misuse, and one of the great scourges of our modern society, domestic and family violence. But also here in Canberra a major factor which can contribute to homelessness is the lack of affordable housing.

Housing is the single greatest cost of living expense for households. It is more than rates, more than utilities, food or transport. The median price of established house transfers in Canberra in 2002 was \$275,000. Within 10 years this had virtually doubled to \$530,000. According to the Australians for affordable housing campaign, childcare workers, electricians, accountants, hospitality workers, school teachers and many other occupations in Canberra are in housing stress, meaning that they have to spend more than 30 per cent of their income on housing costs. And cleaners, delivery drivers, checkout operators and many other occupations are considered to be in housing crisis, spending more than 50 per cent of their income on housing.

While we need to improve the supply of affordable housing, we should also be mindful of enabling people to age in place. New homes should be built using universal design principles so that they can be easily adapted to ensure and enable accessibility. This will make it possible for people to stay in their homes longer. This is especially important as the ACT's population is expected to continue to age, with the percentage aged 65 years and older predicted to increase from approximately 10 per cent in 2007 to 14.3 per cent by 2019.

Australia has one of the worst unemployment rates in the OECD for people with disability—21st out of 29 countries. A recent PwC report found that people with disability in Australia are half as likely to be employed as people without a disability. The rate of employment of people with disability in the federal public service in 2012 was 1.7 per cent, and in the ACT public service 2.5 per cent. Both these figures are a substantial drop for the rates of employment of people with disability in the public service compared to 10 years ago. We are going backwards in this regard, and we need to improve.

I am proud of my work over the past five years as a member of the National People with Disabilities and Carer Council. Having played a very small part in the introduction of DisabilityCare Australia, I am pleased with the steps that have been taken, but there is still so much more to do. While offering choice, control and dignity to people with disability, there are still many challenges remaining in the rollout of DisabilityCare Australia, not least here in the ACT as it approaches its pilot.

Accessibility in housing, transport, information, telecommunications and other areas benefits everyone—older people, mothers and fathers with prams, people with literacy challenges, people with a temporary infirmity due to injury or illness and, of course, people with disability, their carers, family and friends. For example, if people with disability cannot get to school or work, they will continue to fall further behind even with an NDIS.

During the election campaign last year many people I met told me they wanted a focus back on the basics, the three Rs—roads, rates and rubbish. We need to be constantly vigilant about delivering excellence in these basic services. It should include fixing the issues we have which surround the lack of parking and the inability of the public transport system to meet the needs of large numbers of Canberrans to get to work. Parking, roads and public transport are key areas we must continue to focus

on. So based on what I hear from Canberrans I would like to add a “P” to the three Rs—for parking. Remember that—three Rs and a P.

Although Canberra benefits enormously from the public service hub we have here, we can recover from the swings and roundabouts of public service cuts, as we have shown in the past. Indeed, over the past few years there have been constant cuts to the public service, yet our housing market remains strong. We do need to acknowledge that the public service is not the only game in town, and consciously be supportive of other ventures.

Canberra has a high business insolvency rate and the lowest business survival rate of any Australian state or territory. Small business in Canberra, just like other towns and cities across Australia, remains a vital part of our economy and we must reduce red tape and support businesses of all shapes and sizes to keep our economy moving.

Canberrans have the right to expect the best possible health care. This is another area we need to improve on. While we spend vast amounts of money on our hospital system, it is clear there is still a lot of work to be done, including on the emergency department waiting times. I have family members and friends who work at the hospital and I know that each and every one of them gives their best possible efforts to provide quality care. It is not those staff on the ground, but more systemic bureaucratic and process areas that we need to focus on to improve waiting times in the emergency department and the health system as a whole.

I also believe in advancing the rights of Canberrans in the gay and lesbian community, a number of whom I am proud to count as my friends. However, I believe that marriage equality is a federal issue, and not something that should be progressed through the Legislative Assembly.

I am a liberal in the traditional small “l” liberal sense of believing in the individual, their rights and their enterprise. I strongly believe in freedom of choice, personal effort and responsibility and reward for hard work.

Labor would like to have us think that they are the party to best represent the community sector, especially in the disability and homelessness areas. I am here to disprove that. I care deeply about my community—local sporting groups, businesses, tourist attractions, community groups and especially those who are most disadvantaged and excluded. Over time I have come to see the economic growth and stability of our Liberal approach as the best way to achieve this. Without growth and stability, you cannot deliver the greatest benefit to the wider community.

I close by once again acknowledging my family, especially my husband, Peter. Many of the things I have done and achieved would not have been possible without the unwavering support of my friends, the love of my family and their honest feedback. I look forward to the rest of my term, to working with my colleagues in the Assembly and representing the people of Brindabella in this place. I look forward to working towards a better Canberra for all of us.

Estimates 2013-2014—Select Committee Report

MR HANSON (Molonglo-Leader of the Opposition) (10.24): Pursuant to order, I present the following report:

Estimates 2013-2014—Select Committee—Report—*Appropriation Bill 2013-2014 and Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2013-2014* (3 volumes), dated 30 July 2013, incorporating dissenting report (*Dr Bourke and Mr Gentleman*), together with a copy of the relevant minutes of proceedings and answers to questions on notice and questions taken on notice.

I move:

That the report be noted.

It gives me great pleasure to follow such a wonderful speech from my newest member, Ms Lawder, and I would like to start by congratulating her on what was a very fine speech which I think is the start of what is going to be an exceptionally good parliamentary career. Welcome to the Assembly. It is wonderful to have you here. I am sure that all members would feel the same way, perhaps those on the opposite side a little less so, but it is great to have you.

The Select Committee on Estimates 2013-2014 was established on 28 February 2013 to examine the expenditure proposals contained in the Appropriation Bill 2013-2014 and the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2013-14, as well as any revenue estimates proposed by the ACT government in the 2013-14 budget. The committee held public hearings over 12 days, from 14 June to 1 July 2013 inclusive and deliberated on the committee's report in three days of private meetings. A total of 205 questions were taken as questions on notice by ministers and officials during the hearings and an additional 70 questions on notice were submitted subsequent to the hearings, taking the total number of questions to 275.

The committee engaged the Centre for International Economics to provide expert advice and review the ACT budget, and the findings of the budget adviser assisted members throughout the hearings. The Centre for International Economics report is appended to the committee's report, and I would like to thank them for their report.

The committee agreed to a reporting approach that provides a brief record of all of the key issues raised in the hearings, with the substantive discussion of issues where recommendations were warranted, and the committee has made 151 recommendations across the portfolios. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of all the committee members to thank the ministers, the officials and community members who appeared at the public hearings and all of the departmental staff who assisted the process, particularly in their answering of questions on notice and questions taken on notice.

As I did in my budget reply speech, let me again quote Jon Stanhope and what he said in 2001:

Too often in contemporary politics—particularly for an opposition—the focus is on the negatives. It almost has to be, and almost always is. Governments must be scrutinised. They must be accountable. This is a role of oppositions, and it is a role that is particularly necessary as governments become lazy, arrogant, aloof and accident prone.

But I would argue that is also a key role of committees and particularly the budget estimates committee, and I would like to say that this committee has performed that role diligently.

As I warned in my budget reply, if ever there was a government that was lazy, arrogant, aloof and accident prone, this is one, and the findings that are contained within the report that I have just tabled validate that assessment. I would expect that the Labor members of the committee will attempt to dispute some of the committee's findings, but I would contend that the findings are consistent with what we heard in the hearings and the evidence that was provided for us. And I think that the fact that Mr Gentleman did not vote against the report would provide some tacit support for that position.

What the report finds in summary is three things. Firstly, this is a dishonest budget and it does not tell the truth or it attempts to hide the truth in a number of areas. On tax reform, this budget shows that we are on a path to tripling tax and that within 11 years rates will have tripled, based on what is contained in this budget. Further analysis of these tax reforms is missing. The changes to ACTEW and the water pricing, based on the ICRC determination, mean there is \$100 million missing in this budget. Light rail is clearly being pursued for a political objective, without the objective analysis required.

Secondly, this budget simply does not deliver. There is more debt than ever. There are bigger deficits than ever, and that is all at a time when revenue is expected to grow so that the budget will have a billion dollars a year more by the end of the forward estimates than it does now. Thirdly, it is a budget from a government that has clearly lost touch with the priorities of the community. There are cuts to basic services, there are big impacts on the cost of living, jobs are being cut, and fees and charges are going up.

The estimates report contains 151 recommendations and a number of key findings that support the committee's analysis, and I will go to a number of the key findings now. Obviously across all the portfolio areas—health, planning, education, JACS—there are detailed findings and detailed recommendations, and I will leave it for members to read the report in detail. But what I will do now is go to just a number of the key findings and recommendations.

Firstly, on the tax reform that has been subject to so much debate in this Assembly and the community, I will quote now from the report:

In the Committee's view the outcome of tax reforms is unclear. In particular, it regards it as a matter for concern that the tax burden is being shifted from taxes to rates, commercial and domestic, without long-term analysis of effects.

...

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government freeze its implementation of the taxation reform until the modelling of the 20 year impact on residential and commercial general rates is known.

I again call on the government to table their modelling. It is important that that modelling does not exist. And when we only have evidence contained in the budget that shows that we are on a path to rates tripling in 11 years and we have a government that refuses to provide the modelling that shows any different solution to that, there is only one conclusion that can be drawn. And this is probably the nub of it:

The Committee recommends that the budget not be passed because of its lack of delivery, high levels of deficit and deceitful plan to massively increase commercial and residential rates.

Moving to the issue of debt—and this is a quote:

The Committee notes that in its public hearings with the Treasurer the budget deficit was also discussed. This is detailed in the budget papers, which indicate a ‘forecast General Government Sector Headline Net Operating Deficit of \$253.6 million in 2013-14’ and a ‘forecast to surplus in 2015-16 and 2016-17’.

It is probably a bit like federal Labor’s forecast of surplus; we will never see it. But this budget hands down a structural deficit of \$668 million over the forward estimates, that is, the government is spending \$668 million more than it is receiving in income, knowing that income is going up massively by about \$250 million a year. And when the effects of that superannuation investment are taken away, the projected surplus in 2015-16 and 2016-17 completely disappears. In fact, when you actually look at it without the effects of the superannuation account, this year we have a \$424.4 million deficit; in 2013-14, it is \$340 million; in 2014-15, it is \$193 million, in 2015-16, it is a \$71 million deficit; and in 2016-17, it is a \$61.8 million deficit. That is how much this government is spending in addition to the revenue it is receiving, despite the fact that revenue is going up \$250 million a year, so that in the last year of this budget it is receiving \$1 billion more than it is now. So just like federal Labor, what we found in this report was that this government has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

Another very substantive issue that was discussed during the committee hearings and is contained within the report is that of ACTEW. And since the budget has been handed down, it has been confirmed by the Treasurer that the bottom line will take a hit due to an expected decrease of the ACTEW dividend. But the Treasurer is not providing a revised estimate for us to debate in this chamber next week. He expects that the Assembly next week is going to pass a budget, knowing that the territory’s financial position is worse than is detailed in the budget. He expects Canberra taxpayers to wait until the midyear review handed down in February so that we can see the real financial position of the Treasury.

During the estimates period, the Treasurer stated:

Early indications are that it will be in the order of about a \$20 million to \$25 million adjustment.

That is every year. That is \$100 million over the forward estimates, leaving the territory with a \$768 million cumulative deficit across the forward estimates. So, according to the Treasurer, that is \$100 million in cumulative deficit, and he said it is a very minor and modest difference. That is what the Treasurer thinks: it is moderate; it is minor; we do not need to worry about it, \$100 million; do not worry about it.

But let us put that in context, that \$25 million a year. That is 260 classroom teachers. Is that what we are going to lose? Is that the plan? Or it is 189 firefighters. It is 233 nurses or 192 police or, if the government decides that, rather than cutting, it will increase taxes further, that is \$192 for every household every year. And that is what the Treasurer thinks is modest and minor, and he is saying to us, "Yes, you can debate this budget without knowing the impact of that."

I quote again from the report:

The Committee notes that the determination by the ICRC on water and sewerage pricing has implications for the budget bottom-line that are yet to be fully analysed and understood.

It views the situation with concern, in particular due to the fact that the Assembly will, as things stand, be obliged to vote on an Appropriation Bill that is not fully costed.

As a consequence, the committee found as a recommendation:

... that the Appropriation Bill not be brought on until such time as the Treasurer has presented an amended bill and relevant budget documents detailing the effect of the ICRC determination on the ACTEW Water dividend and balance sheet.

And I expect the Treasurer to heed the recommendations of the estimates committee.

Madam Speaker, through you, to the Treasurer, this report, which is the findings of the committee, is very clear. And it says that this budget should not be debated until we know the full impact of the ACTEW dividend, \$100 million. Andrew Barr does not think that is substantive. But if it is going to be \$192 a year on every family, if that is the way you are going to do it, or whether you are going to cut 260 teachers, we need to know that. And this place should not be expected to debate a budget with such a hole in it.

Secondly, it is very clear from this report and our hearings that the government can do two things: it should either freeze its implementation of the tax reform until we know what the implication is or, as we have called for repeatedly, present the modelling. Show us how long it is going to take for rates to triple. Based on what is in this budget, it is 11 years. Prove it is not true. And we should not be expected to be voting on tax reform, voting on what is contained in this budget, without knowing what the full implications are, because what is contained in this budget is entirely contradictory to the Treasurer's statement and the Chief Minister's statements that rates will not be tripling.

As I said, there are a range of other recommendations that I will leave to members to read. But what I would like to do, in conclusion, is thank the members of the committee, particularly Mick Gentleman as deputy chair, Chris Bourke and Brendan Smyth, for their diligence. One thing that the committee has all agreed on is the superb effort of the secretariat staff. And I would like to particularly thank Nicola Kosseck, the committee secretary, and wish her well on behalf of the committee for her future endeavours, most particularly a baby that is due soon. We will find out whether perhaps delivering an estimates report is more difficult than delivering a baby if she can come back to us and let us know when she returns from mat leave. And to all of the other staff, thank you very much.

Finally, in accordance with standing order 253A, I would like to present to the Assembly a schedule of questions on notice for which answers are still outstanding. The standing order provides a process for handling outstanding responses.

DR BOURKE (Ginninderra) (10.40): Unlike Mr Hanson's assertion, as deputy chair of the select committee considering the 2013-14 budget, it is clear to me and Mr Gentlemen that the ACT government's overall vision is delivering a responsible budget that leads a way back to surplus. Our view is supported by the CIE, the independent budget adviser advising the committee in their final report. This budget is also about maintaining jobs in the ACT public service at a time when employment, including public sector employment, in Canberra is under threat. The budget is also about doing the essentials needed to deliver good government to the people of the ACT, while at the same time, I am pleased to say, advancing longer term projects for revitalising the city and transforming Canberra, such as city to the lake, capital metro and the University of Canberra hospital.

The 2013-2014 estimates committee held 12 days of public hearings which generated 1,296 pages of transcript. The chair's draft report went for 204 pages, with 137 recommendations. The government members of the committee, Mr Gentleman and I, produced an additional 496 draft recommendations.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, this work was marred—

Members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, members! Dr Bourke has the floor. Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Unfortunately, this work was marred, marred by the poor chairing of Mr Hanson, firstly, in the hearings where he, despite regular protests from committee members, allowed opposition committee members and MLA visitors to the committee vastly more questions than the government committee members. This is in contrast to his public statements last year when he demanded, in the *Canberra Times*, that the democratic basis of the committee be protected and all members get a fair go.

Secondly, Mr Hanson repeatedly badgered and bullied witnesses during the hearings, even after we challenged this behaviour. There is nothing new there, it is his modus

operandi, but we had hoped that his promotion to chair of the estimates committee might have encouraged him to improve. I am sorry to report, no such luck.

Thirdly, during the deliberative phase, Mr Hanson flouted conventions and failed to take the Clerk's written advice on the standing orders, which is included with the minutes, preferring his own bizarre interpretation of the standing orders regarding consideration of the chair's draft report.

Mr Smyth interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Smyth, be careful what you say.

DR BOURKE: An analogy of the extreme degree of contortion of the standing orders would be to look outside this morning and say it was night time. It would be, somewhere in the world.

In essence, Mr Hanson's ruling as chair was that his draft report would be the final report. Instead of carefully considering each paragraph and recommendation for inclusion or exclusion, this chair took it upon himself to say, "All my stuff is in whether you want it or not." Government members opposed this ruling during our deliberative meetings. During the deliberations, time and again, we put forward amendments to the chair's draft. We sought to remove over 100 paragraphs and recommendations—to no avail, because each motion was negated on a 2-2 vote.

The preparation and consideration of the government members' dissenting report, with 575 recommendations and 223 pages, includes our recommendations as well as the selected recommendations and paragraphs from the chair's draft report which we agreed with. This dissenting report is a considerable piece of work and I acknowledge the efforts of the staff in Mr Gentleman's office as well as my own. The Assembly may wish to review the staffing levels of non-executive members and consider allocating staff on the basis of members' committee responsibilities to ensure we have the support we need to do this work.

Despite the assertions of the opposition leader and his efforts to abuse it, the Assembly's committee system is not broken. However, it does require even-handedness, fairness and respect for other committee members and witnesses, including public servants, on the part of committee chairs.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question is that the report be noted. Is someone going to speak or I will close it down.

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (10.45): I note Mr Gentleman does not jump to his feet to defend his abstention. Let us look at what happened here. Let us go to what happened here. We had a process as detailed by the Assembly. We had advice from the Clerk that said that the process that was followed met the standing orders. What did we have as an outcome? We had a report supported by the bipartisan committee of the Assembly—it was two Labor and two Liberal—that said that this budget should not be passed, that it is a budget of debt, it is a budget of deceit and it is a budget of

non-delivery. That is the opinion of the bipartisan estimates committee for 2013-14. Thank you, gentlemen!

It is amazing that we get a dissenting report with 597-odd recommendations, the majority of which are just pats on the back for the government. The dissenters commend the government for doing stuff. That is what the dissenting report is about. It is sort of the job application for the sixth minister. They are both desperate to be there; so they have patted every other minister on the back as many times as they can in a most amazing display. If it was Shakespeare, you would have to rewrite “Methinks he dost protest too much” to “Methinks he dost praise too much”.

It kind of loses any impact that it may have had as a serious document when you have so many recommendations. It just says, “The government delivers services. Let them be commended for that. The government owns roads. They should be commended for that. The government works with people. They should be commended for that.”

That is the business of government. But let us see how it went. First and foremost, it is most important that members know that a majority of members voted that this report be agreed to. Only one member voted against it. The majority of members voted on some very important recommendations. They are primarily recommendation 2, recommendation 3 and recommendation 7. Recommendation 2 states:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government freeze its implementation of the taxation reform until the modelling of the 20 year impact on residential and commercial general rates is known.

That was accepted by the committee. Recommendation 3 states:

The Committee recommends that the Budget not be passed because of its lack of delivery, high levels of deficit and deceitful plan to massively increase commercial and residential rates.

It is in the report, Madam Speaker, that was accepted by the majority of members. And recommendation 7 states:

The Committee recommends that the Appropriation Bill debate not be brought on until such time as the Treasurer has presented an amended bill and relevant budget documents detailing the effects of the ICRC determination on the ACTEW Water dividend and balance sheet.

Again, it is in the report—the report that has been tabled and that was agreed to by the majority of members. It is a good report. It is a report that does what an estimates committee should do, which is analyse what is in the budget and come to a determination about whether or not this is a good budget for the people of the ACT, not whether it is a good budget for the government. It is not about patting people on the back.

If you read the recommendations, it is kind of like a bizarre stream of consciousness where members were just hurriedly typing throughout the entire estimates committee. Every time they heard about a different program, they typed, “I will commend the

government for that.” It is about the taxpayers, and you have lost your way when all of these recommendations simply say that they support the government or congratulate the government on what they have done.

It does not talk about how this is better for the people. It does not talk about how it could be improved for the taxpayer. It does not talk about how it could better expend the finances that the government has. All it does is commend the government constantly. These are members out of touch, supporting a government out of touch with the reality of what is going on in the community.

We had some quite bizarre occurrences in the Assembly. My favourite is in minutes No 28 where Mr Gentleman moved a motion. It is not uncommon for members to move motions. But Mr Gentleman moved a motion. You assume that members believe in motions when they move them, that there is some point to them. Mr Gentleman moved a motion and then abstained from it. He said, “I, Mick Gentleman, believe in this. I want you people to vote on it but I am not going to. I am going to hide. I am going to abstain. I am not going to be here. Nobody will see me if I follow Joy Burch and put my hands over my ears and go, ‘La, la, la, la, la.’ Nobody will notice.”

Read the minutes, members. The minutes are a parody of the behaviour of those members. We can see that when we get into some of the other minutes. The meetings did not even last very long as the two Labor members disappeared, were not to be seen, did not return or got there late. Chief Minister, you ought to ask your committee members why the estimates committee was left without a quorum or why it did not start on time. It was because the two Labor members were missing in action. That is their respect for the committee system.

It is a furphy to defend their own behaviour and their own bizarre positions that they have taken to state that somehow this committee was not conducted according to the standing orders. It is fantastic. Recommendation 1 states that we do not like the outcome; so let us change the rules. Recommendation 1 in the report states:

... recommend that the Assembly consider changing the relevant standing orders to ensure that all committee reports are created in a collaborative manner.

So we are going to legislative for collaborative behaviour. They did not like the outcome; so change the rules. That is fantastic! That is the Labor Party view of the world. Then we have recommendation 2:

Dr Bourke and Mr Gentleman recommend that the Chair of the committee be condemned for his partisan view to proceedings in the creation of the report ...

There was no partisan view. The report was created the same way every other report has been created since I have been here over the last 15 years. If you doubt that, read the advice from the Clerk. It says, “Standing order 248 could be interpreted in a number of ways, but my advice is that your interpretation of the standing orders is one way that the standing order could be interpreted.”

The committee was run by the standing orders. On a number of occasions we sought advice from the Clerk as those opposite floundered in their attempts to stall it. It is funny. When we set out on this journey Mr Hanson said, "All right, I am the chair; this is the way I would like to do the report." Nobody disagreed. It is here in the minutes. They say, "The chair proposed to consider the draft report paragraph by paragraph. Mr Smyth sought confirmation that consideration would be by omission. No member indicated objection to Mr Smyth's proposed approach to report consideration."

No member objected to Mr Smyth's proposed approach to report consideration. Why not? Because it is the way we have always done it. You get the report from the draft. Chairs do it in varying ways, but the chair said, "We will move through this as quickly as we can. If you have got a problem, where is your next problem? Okay, let's vote on that." That is how it has been done in all the estimates committees I have been on. I understand that it is the way just about every estimates committee has been done. It is the way this one was done because that is the way it is done.

If you do not like the outcome, because in a whiff of brilliance the government has nobbled the process, then go and talk to your members about how the committee has been set up. The only thing that varied from the standard way that estimates has been done in my time in this place is that we had an even number of members. If that caused you grief because it backfired on you, then go back to your tactics committee and tell them they need to lift their game.

Madam Speaker, this is a good report. This report moved through the process as it has always done. We started with a day of hearings with the community. The community came and told us that there were things they were unhappy with. In the dissenting report there is this commendation from the government on the way that they have been working with the RSPCA. Now, that is not what the RSPCA told us. The RSPCA told us of the uncertainty they face, the lack of funding they have had to put up with and the dilemma that they still have after five, six, seven years of negotiations with the government in looking for a new site. It has not been resolved. Look at the dissenting recommendations and then actually read the transcript of what happened. You will see that the two opposition members have simply overcooked this little egg a little bit way too much.

It is a good report because we then had the 10 days of hearing and we had a recall day. We had to have a recall day because some very significant issues have not been addressed by the government. It would appear that the government will not address these issues because we have it from the Treasurer that he does not believe an update to the budget is necessary until the midyear review, which normally is not out until February.

It is important that we know what the bottom line is. As Mr Hanson pointed out, if that \$100 million is ripped out of the budget, somebody must pay or some service must be reduced. It is appropriate that the estimates committee hold the government to account on the very basic numbers. If you cannot trust the numbers, or if the numbers are wrong or inaccurate for any reason, then the government should update the

numbers before the debate goes ahead so that we members are actually voting on something that is accurate and real, because at this stage the budget as proposed does not incorporate all that it should incorporate, which is the true bottom line. To say that it will take six or eight months for the government to work through what the impact of the ICRC decision is, is just a nonsense. I commend the agreed report to the Assembly.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella) (10.55): I wish to add my sentiments to what Dr Bourke has said previously. I would like to add a note that this chair's report was created by two people in the ACT Liberals who want to hold two of the highest positions in the ACT Assembly, that is Chief Minister and Treasurer. Madam Speaker, it is no wonder that the Liberals continue to sit on the other side of the chamber if this is the work that we can expect from them possibly in a future government.

I could not support the report put forward by the opposition leader as chair of the committee due to its very clear partisan view against the budget, meanwhile offering no responsible way forward to improve the ACT economy. Let me just talk to the point that both opposition members have made about my abstaining from the final vote on the report. I abstained from the final vote on the report because it was my clear view that it was their intention to crash this committee.

The advice from the Clerk was that if two members voted for the final report and two members voted against the final report, no report could be given to the Legislative Assembly. So I viewed that my position in abstaining was not one of support. I will put that very clearly on the record. I did not support the chair's report. In abstaining I allowed the committee process to go forward. I think that is the appropriate thing to do.

Of course, the opposition want to turn this argument into a discussion on the deficit. We have heard that this morning. Yet in their report they want to lower revenue and increase spending. Madam Speaker, I may not have an economics degree but I do know that if you spend more than what you earn you are going to end up further and further in debt.

The opposition's report also fails to reflect the positivity of the responses in the hearings that were conducted from 14 June to 1 July in which the committee heard of the transformation that this budget is bringing to the ACT economy: health initiatives that have the ability to transform the lives of many Canberrans, educational improvements as well as the transformational tax changes—

Mr Smyth interjecting—

Mr Hanson interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, Mr Smyth, Mr Hanson!

MR GENTLEMAN: making Canberra a fairer territory for all who live and work here. When reading the opposition's report and during the deliberations I was rather shocked to see how real evidence from the hearing was practically dismissed and the opposition's questions and statements taken on as evidence.

Mr Smyth, who is the opposition's answer to who should be Treasurer, has shown yet again that he cannot be trusted with the ACT's budget. While it may be all sounding positive, he wants to reduce revenue—recommendation 5 is a good example—by fixing the lease variation charge to last year's rates and by the reduction of penalties around property development commencements and completions. That is just to name a few.

However, they do not want to be fiscally responsible in their savings. Instead they want to increase spending. There are a number of recommendations that show an increase in spending. For example, recommendation 25 states that we should build another off-ramp on the Majura Parkway. Their apprentice engineer decided that might be a good idea. They recommend we should be spending more on public prosecutions and appointing a fifth judge. That is an old favourite from the ACT Liberals. And let us buy another Bronto, which would cost millions of dollars.

What we have seen from the Canberra Liberals again is a lack of economic maturity in the way they conduct themselves. Our dissenting report recognises and congratulates the government on this transformational way forward, while still being economically responsible and ensuring a return to surplus in 2015-16.

But may I point out, Madam Acting Speaker, that it is not just me who has this view. The special budget adviser Mr Hanson mentioned earlier on notes some very positive things in this budget. Just to quote a few, revenue expectations are strong, tax reform delivers a positive change in revenue and expenditure commitments remain strong enough to stimulate the ACT economy. There is also more funding for support services for homeless people, the expansion of the disability support service, and capital works spending concentrated in public hospitals and community infrastructure.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I think it is time we asked when we will start seeing some political maturity from the Canberra Liberals in this parliament. In closing, I would like to really thank the efforts of Dr Bourke and his staff and my staff especially, but I would also like to thank the work of the committee office and echo Mr Hanson's congratulations for their hard work. Thank you.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee Scrutiny report 9

MR DOSZPOT (Molonglo) (11.01): I present the following report:

Justice and Community Safety (Legislative Scrutiny Role)—Standing Committee—Scrutiny Report 9, dated 29 July 2013, together with the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

MR DOSZPOT: Scrutiny Report 9 contains the committee's comments on 12 bills, 12 pieces of subordinate legislation and three government responses. The report was circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting. I commend the report to the Assembly.

Auditor-General Amendment Bill 2013

Debate resumed from 9 May 2013, on motion by **Ms Gallagher:**

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (11.02): The opposition will be supporting this bill. As the Chief Minister outlined in her tabling speech, the bill includes a number of elements, including amendments to clarify the independence of the Auditor-General, and I think all of us support the independence of the Auditor-General. It requires the Auditor-General to develop and consult on an annual performance audit program, which, of course, she currently does. Since my time in this place Auditors-General have all consulted on their annual performance audit project, but there is no harm in having it clarified in legislation.

One of the important parts is the next dot point, which is to provide a new power for audit of non-government entities in receipt of government funding but subject to some prerequisites set out in the bill. Of course, this is the follow-the-money amendment. Where government gives organisations funding through the appropriation process, through the funds and grants various directorates give out and through tenders, it is important that we actually get what we pay for. It will be interesting to see how this amendment works in reality.

It is a big step because it takes the role of the auditor beyond the standard function of just simply looking at government bodies. So it will be with some interest that I suspect we will all watch this. I am not expecting it to be used a large number of times, but I think we have all had, from time to time, complaints from constituents who think government's money has been abused in private organisations. To have the ability to track that money and make sure it is being spent on what it was given for is a good concept.

The last dot point is a broader approach to performance audits of the Auditor-General to a wider concept of strategic review and a fixed time frame in each parliamentary term for the conduct of such reviews. It is interesting that we talk about a broader approach to performance audits because, of course, every performance audit costs. What is not in this bill is an indication that this government believes the Auditor-General deserves additional funding. Many would know that, for a long time, I have pushed for funding in the audit office to be basically equal between performance audits and the financial audits.

Of course, financial audits which are mandated under law must come first. But we notice that the number of performance audits really has been staggered now for some years. The government always cries hard times, "You can't fund the audit,

everybody's feeling the pinch." But it is quite clear from international research, both in places like the UK and, indeed, here at home in Australia, that everyone agrees that for every dollar spent in the audit office there is a benefit to the community, indeed, to the government, of some \$9 or \$10 through better delivery of services, better use of money and, indeed, greater savings from organisations that are able to manage their affairs better.

We have put in place now a number of additional powers for the Auditor-General, but what we do not see is a commitment from this government to ensure that, over time, the Auditor-General's Office receives additional funding. Mr Hargreaves agreed to it in the previous Assembly; there was some bipartisan support at one stage to see the number of performance audits go up one or two a year with a view from taking it from the current six to eight per year to closer to 14 or 16 audits per year. That will basically equate the funding that is spent on financial audits to performance audits.

We see the interest the government finally have in the Auditor-General's Office. We see they are quite willing to reform and extend their powers. But the real question is: will they actually give the audit office the resources it needs to do its job properly? The easiest way for an executive, for a government, to knobble the audit office is, of course, to knobble the funds.

I note there is not a recommendation that the Assembly, for instance, set the budget of the Auditor-General. We are talking now about officers like the Auditor-General becoming officers of the parliament, and I think there is a natural progression, then, that we discuss how their funding arrangements are settled. We currently have advice from PAC, but, of course, that advice is often not followed by the Treasurer and the executive.

We will support the bill as proposed. I certainly do not believe it goes far enough. I have tabled bills previously in this place. In fact, the bill that probably prompted this bill was a bill I tabled that went to a very long inquiry. We had an interesting process then to appoint a new auditor, and we ended up with the government's bill that has been presented here. But the real question will become whether or not the auditor will have the resources.

Some of the other effects of the bill will be that it will support joint or collaborative audits by commonwealth, state and territory Auditors-General. Again, if there is a new function and, with it, there potentially comes the requirement for doing additional audits, those audits may require the funding. Look at what we are doing. We are saying, "Statutorily you have to do your financial audits. We are now saying in the statutes we will have consultation on the annual performance audit program. We will allow you to audit non-government entities in certain circumstances. We want a broader approach to performance audits. We suspect there will be joint or collaborative audits with commonwealth, states and territories. But you are going to do that with exactly the same budget that you currently have."

Auditors-General make us money; they save us money. They provide assistance for the directorates to give better service to the community. The offices of Auditors-General assist the community to get better outcomes, but they need to be supported.

We will support the bill today. We will keep a watching brief on it. I understand Mr Rattenbury has some amendments that the government has agreed to, so they will clearly get up. Hopefully, what we will have is better legislation for the Auditor-General after this discussion today. What we will not have is the appropriate funding. In a jurisdiction which only has one house of parliament, where officers like the auditor become far more important than they perhaps are in other jurisdictions, there still is the question of whether or not the audit office is getting the funding that it needs and deserves and, therefore, that the people of the ACT get the outcome from the audit office they should have and deserve.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (11.09): This bill is the first step of some important changes to the Auditor-General Act that will improve both the independence of the office and the scope of the audit function performed by the Auditor-General. The second step will, of course, be the officer of the Assembly amendment bill that I will present to the Assembly shortly. This bill contains a number of important reforms, all of which the Greens support. Many of these changes respond to the recommendations of the public accounts committee, and members will notice improvements that have been made to this bill from the one presented to the last Assembly. These changes pick up the Greens' proposed amendments, and thank the Chief Minister for the productive way in which her office and the officials from the Chief Minister and Treasury Directorate have engaged on these issues.

I think the revised bill is significantly stronger and puts the Auditor-General in a better position to fully consider and respond to just about anything that may transpire. We now have a more holistic approach to ensure that the Auditor-General can really follow the money and ensure that public dollars are used as efficiently as possible. Importantly this version of the bill adopts changes to ensure there is a better process to afford non public sector entities procedural fairness.

Some other important points I would like to highlight are: the formal recognition of the independence of the Auditor-General and the Auditor-General's staff; the clarified process for the independent audit of the Auditor-General, including a greater role for the public accounts committee in the appointment and conduct of the audit; and a more formal arrangement for the development and publication of the prospective performance audit program. Members know there is a process in place and that the Auditor-General already publishes her performance audit program on the audit website. The bill will make this a statutory process and clarify for the rest of the community how it works. Another important point is the greater discretion for the Auditor-General to conduct multiple and collaborative audits. And, finally, the bill also has a number of administrative tidy-ups to make the act clearer and more readable.

Another important point is that the government has essentially accepted the Greens' proposal to ensure that the Auditor-General has the ultimate decision about whether to publicly release executive information. This is an important move forward from the current limitation that prevents the Auditor-General from releasing information that it would otherwise be in the public interest to release if the Chief Minister issues a certificate to prevent disclosure.

These are all important reforms and they come about largely as a response to the public accounts committee inquiry. I think it is appropriate and important to stress what a vital role the Auditor-General plays in ensuring the efficiency of public services. The Greens have long advocated for improved accountability mechanisms to assist the Assembly in fulfilling its job of ensuring the probity of executive conduct. We believe our statutory integrity agencies play a vital role, that the Assembly should be investing them with a broad range of functions and powers, and that we should be giving them the discretion to fulfil their functions as they see fit to best protect the public interest.

The bill broadly fulfils these aims, and for this reason the Greens are happy to support the changes proposed in the bill. The bill is an important part of the reform process for the Auditor-General Act, which will be complemented by the Greens bill to recognise the Auditor-General, the Ombudsman and the Electoral Commissioner as officers of the Assembly.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations and Minister for the Environment and Sustainable Development) (11.13): On behalf of the Chief Minister I thank members for their support of this bill. The bill reflects the government's ongoing commitment to open and accountable government. It reinforces the independence of the office of the Auditor-General, and enhances arrangements for her important functions. The government has always acknowledged the importance of the Auditor-General in maintaining accountability and confidence in the public service and public administration. The bill proposes amendments to strengthen the clarity and intentions of the Auditor-General Act, in particular, safeguarding the independence of the office of the Auditor-General and implementing a number of the government's agreed recommendations from the inquiry by the standing committee on public accounts into the Auditor-General Act 1996.

This bill will complement a separate officer of the Assembly bill to be introduced, I understand, later this year. This bill when introduced will establish the office of the Auditor-General as an officer of the Assembly and addresses other related recommendations from the public accounts committee's inquiry.

This bill, however, was introduced last year but was not debated prior to the dissolution of the Assembly in anticipation of the last ACT election. When this bill was introduced, therefore, a number of changes were made from the one previously introduced. These reflect an intention to introduce a separate bill dealing with officer of the Assembly arrangements not only for the Auditor-General but also for the Electoral Commissioner and the Ombudsman. There are also a number of recommendations by Assembly committees that relate to the Auditor-General's appointment and employment arrangements, and these will also be dealt with in the officer of the Assembly bill.

Of the measures that were recommended by the public accounts committee, the bill introduces a number, including the clarifying and strengthening of the independence of the Auditor-General, requiring the Auditor-General to develop and consult on an

annual performance audit program, provision of new powers for the audit of non-government entities in receipt of government funding subject to the important prerequisites in place, and providing a broader approach to performance audits by the Auditor-General through a wider concept of strategic review and a fixed time frame in each parliamentary term for the conduct of such reviews. This aligns existing provisions with new roles that the Speaker will have in relation to the officers of the parliament. Finally, there will be independent auditors or reviewers who will require suitable qualification.

The government is a strong advocate for the key role the Auditor-General plays in maintaining accountability and confidence in the territory's public administration. This bill supports those areas, and I commend the bill to the Assembly and thank members for their support.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Detail stage

Bill, by leave, taken as a whole.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (11.16), by leave: I move amendments Nos 1 and 2 circulated in my name together [*see schedule 1 at page 2569*]. These are relatively minor but nevertheless important amendments to clarify an existing provision of the act. Under the current provision there could be some argument about whether the Auditor-General has a discretion to determine the public interest when one of the listed factors is present. Amendment No 1 both updates the language used and clarifies that the Auditor-General has the discretion about whether or not to include the information in a report. Even if publishing the information would involve the disclosure of a trade secret, for example, it may still be in the public interest to release the information, and the discretion is given to the Auditor-General to determine where the overall public interest lies and if, indeed, it is contrary to the public interest to release the particular information.

The current clause does not recognise the balancing exercise that must take place when competing public interests are involved. The amendment recognises this challenge and ensures the Auditor-General has the ability to balance what will inevitably be, at times, competing public interests. The amendment does not pretend to canvass all the possible circumstances that may arise; however, it limits the circumstances in which it may be contrary to the public interest to publish information. Much like the current act limits the circumstances in which it is contrary to the public interest to release certain information, the amendment adopts a similar formulation, but using contemporary and clearer language.

In effect, when one of the listed factors—for example, where information could reasonably be expected to prejudice relations between the ACT government and another government—is present, the Auditor-General will be required to balance this adverse outcome with any other public interest that may be advanced by the

publication of the information to determine where the greater public interest lies and if, indeed, it is, on balance, contrary to the public interest to release the information. Given the status and importance of the role of the Auditor-General, it is important that the act clearly reflects that it should be the Auditor-General who is best placed to determine what is most appropriate to include in audit reports.

The second amendment is effectively the same as what is proposed in the bill and has simply been slightly changed to reflect the changes in amendment No 1. I commend my amendments to the Assembly.

MR CORBELL: The government will support Mr Rattenbury's amendments. They refine the existing public interest test in the Auditor-General Act. As an example, a reference to the Human Rights Act in the proposed amendment means it is not necessary to retain a separate reference to a right to a fair trial that is in the existing act. A right to a fair trial is one of the rights protected in our Human Rights Act. The government does not object to the proposal by Mr Rattenbury and will support the amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Bill, as a whole, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, agreed to.

Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill 2013

Debate resumed from 6 June 2013, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR HANSON (Molonglo—Leader of the Opposition) (11.20): Mr Wall adjourned this on my behalf, I think.

Mr Wall: On behalf of the former shadow—

MR HANSON: On behalf of the former shadow attorney-general. The Canberra Liberals will be supporting the Criminal Code (Cheating at Gambling) Amendment Bill 2013. This bill would introduce criminal penalties for certain match-fixing behaviours and cheating at gambling activities.

It is in response to a nationally agreed approach to cheating at gambling on sporting activities. Jurisdictions agreed to ensure their criminal codes covered behaviours identified at the national level. Three new offences are introduced into the ACT's Criminal Code. Firstly, actions that corrupt a betting outcome, for example underperformance, interfering with a playing surface and so on, carry a maximum penalty of 10 years. Secondly, betting while possessing information about a corrupt betting outcome, including encouraging someone else to bet on the event in a particular way, also carries a maximum penalty of 10 years. For the offence of betting

with inside information, for example, that is not publicly available, the maximum penalty is two years.

The new laws would apply in the ACT and elsewhere, and they apply to sporting activities as well as events. Examples that we continue to see are the first try scorer or the winning margin. The reach of these new provisions is comprehensive. For example, in the first new offence, a person commits an offence if they do something personally or if they pay someone or pressure someone else into doing something, or if someone enters into an agreement to do something.

In countering those behaviours, the bill does not intend to capture genuine game tactics or conduct like a referee making an honest mistake as to the application of rules. Let us hope it does not include the DRS. That would be problematic. It is also worth noting that for an offence to be proven, intent or in some cases recklessness must be proved, but it is not necessary to prove that the bet was actually placed.

My only concern with this bill is in relation to the clause giving a meaning as opposed to a definition of the phrase “corrupts a betting outcome”. The task of drafters giving a meaning to the phrase was clearly a difficult one. However, the result is somewhat clumsy and unclear, depending substantially on the rather subjective phrase “contrary to the standards of integrity”. I can see the potential for considerable legal argument on this meaning were it to come to court.

Gambling on sport has become a reality. For many in our community, it is a way of life. For others, it is an abhorrence, as we have seen recently in relation to the issue of promoting gambling during games shown in prime time television viewing. Much has also been said over the years about cheating at gambling on sporting events. Indeed, there have been many reported incidences of sporting bodies placing serious penalties, including bans on players and officials who have engaged in the kinds of behaviours this bill addresses. These behaviours have brought shame not only on the perpetrators but on the sport itself. It is a positive move to legislate in an attempt to stamp out activities that serve to impact negatively on the integrity and credibility of sport for the illegitimate gains of a few.

The Canberra Liberals are pleased to support an approach that has national backing and which seeks to bring sport back to where it belongs—in the hands of families and our community at large.

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services) (11.25): The release of the findings of the Australian Crime Commission report *Organised crime and drugs in sport* have certainly focused considerable attention on integrity in sport issues this year.

Sport is indeed a central part of our culture and our community, and the integrity of sport is something we value and something that we expect. However, the release of the commission’s report did not mark the unveiling of “integrity” concerns in sport, nor did it mark the start of a response to integrity issues by governments, enforcement agencies or indeed sporting bodies themselves.

For some time now governments have accepted a responsibility to help preserve the integrity of sport. Matters related to sports integrity have in recent years been high on this government's agenda, including when sports ministers met most recently in Launceston last month, when we endorsed the establishment of the Australian Sports Integrity Network.

The national policy on match fixing, supported by all states and territories in 2011, has provided the foundation for heightened collaboration between all jurisdictions to protect the integrity of sport. It is a shared responsibility to put in place measures to provide protection for all who participate in sport and recreation.

Critically, the national policy on match fixing has identified key match-fixing behaviours needing to be addressed through state and territory legislation. The Attorney-General will provide further detail of the criminal offences targeting these particular behaviours.

These new offences inserted into the Criminal Code 2002 by this bill ensure that all the identified match-fixing behaviours are legislated as criminal acts in the territory, capturing activities that are often talked about in the context of sporting competitions, such as "tanking" and access to "insider information", which have become an unfortunate part of sporting vernacular.

The ACT government is committed to our obligations under this national policy. This bill fulfils this commitment and makes a clear statement of the value that this community, and indeed this government, places on upholding the integrity of sport. While development of the bill has been led by the Attorney-General and his directorate, its development has been achieved through a cooperative approach, including input from both Sport and Recreation Services in the Economic Development Directorate and the Gambling and Racing Commission. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have been involved in the development of this legislation.

This cooperation has also included the presentation of a sports integrity session to the local industry last month, in collaboration with the National Integrity of Sport Unit, updating the sector on issues pertinent to sports integrity and measures being undertaken nationally and locally to address this issue. This session included detail of our commitment to implementation of the national policy on match fixing through this piece of legislation.

It is important that sports, at both the community and the elite level, understand the evolving legal landscape in regard to integrity issues, and that criminal penalties can and do apply. Education for administrators, coaches, players and officials is key, and this recent session is only a starting point that will be further complemented by online education and broader national resources.

Sports integrity extends beyond match fixing alone though. The Australian Crime Commission's report details other areas of grave concern—peptide use, drug trafficking, organised crime and dubious sport science practices, amongst others.

It is fair to say, though, that there is no silver bullet solution to all of these issues. However, the ACT government is playing its role as part of a national approach to addressing this issue and acknowledges the work currently being undertaken to explore opportunities for greater sharing of information between sporting bodies and law enforcement agencies, strengthening the registration process for sports scientists, ensuring that sporting bodies have in place appropriate governance mechanisms to prevent integrity issues and deal appropriately with these if they do occur, and finally to ensure current information and education are available to all participants in the sport and recreation sector to guide appropriate behaviour. The territory government stands committed to protecting the integrity of sport for those who participate, for those who spectate and for those who place a legal bet.

When Ben Johnson crossed the finish line at the 1988 Olympics, although both doping and testing had existed previously, drugs in sport were certainly thrust into the public realm like never before. Governments and sporting bodies around the world have now established legislation and systems that are in place to fight the ongoing battle against drugs in sport. But the infiltration of sports betting and match fixing is a relatively new front in this battle to maintain the integrity of sport. In July 2011 the President of the International Olympic Committee noted this, stating that match fixing “is as dangerous as doping for the credibility of sport”.

The release of the Australian Crime Commission’s report on 7 February may prove to be a watershed moment for Australian sport. This bill, which is a reflection of our commitment and our willingness to act in accordance with the national policy on match fixing, is a key tool in this battle to protect the integrity of Australian sport.

I congratulate all involved in the development of this bill and commend it to the Assembly.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (11.31): The Greens will support the passage of this bill. The bill updates the ACT Criminal Code to ensure it covers four new offences relating to match fixing. The Standing Council on Law and Justice match-fixing working group recommended that all jurisdictions adopt consistent offences as part of a national approach to addressing match-fixing activities in sport. This standing council was established by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General with the mandate of investigating and harmonising match-fixing laws.

A review of ACT laws revealed that there were four recommended areas that were not currently addressed in the ACT Criminal Code. I will not detail the offences, as they are explained in the explanatory statement and they have been covered already in the Assembly. Suffice to say that the new offences are the result of a considerable amount of work in recent years to respond to match-fixing issues and the various permutations in which these offences occur. I note also that the Assembly’s scrutiny of bills committee has looked at this bill and has no comments.

Obviously, sports betting is a major industry in Australia. I am sure anyone watching televised sport in recent months would be aware of the size of this industry and the commercial interests involved. It seems impossible to watch televised sport these days

without being accosted by gambling interests. This gives rise to some problems which policymakers need to turn their minds to. The increasing presence of gambling advertising in sport, and especially the inclusion of bookmaking figures in commentary teams, really blurs the line between sports and gambling. We need to think about how this might affect viewers and, in particular, young viewers.

Members would be aware that this has been the subject of some federal attention already, and I think this has been led very responsibly by my federal Greens colleague Senator Richard Di Natale. Senator Di Natale initiated a parliamentary inquiry into gambling advertisements in sport, which reported in June. Unfortunately, the majority committee, constituted by the Labor and Liberal parties, baulked at taking strong action. The federal Greens and independents recommended legislating to end a loophole that allows gambling ads during kids' viewing times. Industry self-regulation simply will not cut it in this arena.

It is a strong point of difference between the Greens and the other parties. Just like the issue of pokies reform, we are determined to stand up and ensure we protect those things that need protecting, like sport, children and our community life, from the often negative impacts of gambling. Of course, these broader gambling issues will continue to be a subject of debate at the federal level as well as in this chamber.

Returning to the focus of today's bill, as I said, the Greens will support it. The reality is that sports betting unfortunately must deal with the issue of cheating. Match fixing damages the integrity of sports. It is a sad reality that match fixing seems to arise in some permutation in practically every sport. Even Japan has been rocked by match fixing in sumo wrestling, a sport which is premised on an incredibly strong code of honour and ethics. Those scandals have caused a lot of sadness and soul-searching in Japan.

In Australia, the Australian Crime Commission has been investigating match fixing in Australian sport. The head of the Australian Crime Commission, John Lawler, said that match fixing is the single biggest problem facing Australian sport. He said that media zealotry over identifying players or clubs guilty of using performance enhancing and illicit drugs has distracted from the end problem of criminality and match fixing.

Australians love their sport and it is ingrained in our culture. I can only imagine the shock and distress throughout Australia if serious match fixing begins to pervade sports. In addition, of course, match fixing is a fraudulent crime, essentially the same as any other type of fraud. It can cause harm, such as financial harm, to individuals and the community.

So it is appropriate to regulate match fixing and to criminalise the fraudulent behaviour associated with it. I hope and expect that these new offences, which I understand will be paralleled across all other states and territories, will contribute to addressing match fixing and ensuring that ACT and Australian sports retain integrity.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations and Minister for the

Environment and Sustainable Development) (11.36), in reply: I thank members for their support of this bill. All Australians expect that the sport they watch or participate in is played honestly and to the ideals of fair play and good sportsmanship. However, the growth of sports betting in the Australian wagering market has led to increasing risks to the integrity of sport from people seeking to profit from the illegal manipulation of results.

Match fixing in sport is motivated by the opportunity for significant financial or personal gain. It is achieved through the manipulation of results. Sports betting agencies provide the opportunity for large sums of money to be gambled on these events with the prospect of a very high return. This provides strong incentives to influence the result of sporting events. Match fixing and the corruption that flows from it is not limited to professional or high-profile codes. Match fixing has occurred at the sub-elite level in smaller sports, in lower grade team competitions and even in individual events.

Governments, therefore, have a responsibility to take all reasonable measures to stamp out illegal or fraudulent betting. Fraudulent betting on sport and match fixing is an emerging and critical issue globally for sport, the betting industry, governments and community. Match fixing has the potential to undermine public confidence in the integrity of sport, sporting events and even the products offered by legitimate betting agencies. Left unchecked, this corruption will devalue the integrity of sport, and diminish the acceptability and effectiveness of sport as a tool to develop and support those values that we seek in our society.

These risks have been recognised nationally by attorneys-general and sports ministers as needing urgent attention. Minister Barr, as the Minister for Sport and Recreation, and I, together with our respective directorates, have worked closely to give effect to the national policy on match fixing in sport of 2011 and the agreement of attorneys-general on the issue.

We may not all be avid sport and racing gamblers, but many of us enjoy watching sport, whether it is our favourite local or national team or simply watching our kids run around on a local oval on a cold winter's morning. Sports are important to the way many Australians—indeed, perhaps most Australians—see ourselves. Sport plays a significant role in social cohesion and in community health. Its significance to the community cannot be denied.

We rightly expect that sport is free from the interference of unlawful and unsavoury attempts to turn a quick profit. This expectation must sit together with well-regulated betting markets, markets appropriately regulated by government and supported by the self-regulation of national sporting bodies.

Criminal laws that serve as a deterrent and sanction for match-fixing behaviours are an important part of modern sport. I have previously said that the ACT legislation already includes criminal offences that address a number of aspects of the match-fixing behaviours that attorneys-general agreed should be addressed in state and territory law. The bill will make certain that all agreed match-fixing behaviours are criminal acts in the ACT.

The offences in the bill apply to events that occur in the ACT or elsewhere through the rules in the Criminal Code, provided there is a nexus of jurisdiction with the ACT. There will be a nexus of jurisdiction if, for example, the bet on the event occurred in the ACT. This is important because complex schemes to illegally benefit from a fixed event can involve conduct in another jurisdiction.

The bill inserts three new offences into the Criminal Code to criminalise specific match-fixing behaviours and cheating at gambling activities. New section 363F will criminalise conduct that results in a corrupt betting outcome for an event, and obtaining a financial advantage or causing a financial disadvantage in connection with betting on the event.

This offence will deal with actions that corrupt a betting outcome, such as deliberate underperformance or “tanking”, interference with a playing surface, or any actions likely to affect the outcome of betting, contrary to standards of integrity. It is also intended to capture someone who pays another person, or puts pressure on another person, to engage in such conduct.

Madam Deputy Speaker, players and team officials will still be able to make tactical decisions for reasons other than affecting a betting outcome. The offence is squarely aimed at corrupt conduct that affects a betting outcome for financial advantage. Section 363G prohibits betting while possessing information about a corrupt betting outcome. The purpose of this provision is to prohibit a person who possesses information about a fixed event from doing something that results in a bet on that event.

The offence extends to encouraging another person to bet on an event or telling someone else about the fix where the person knows the other person is likely to bet on the event. To prove this offence, it is not necessary for the prosecution to prove that a bet was actually placed by the first person or another person. However, the person needs to engage in conduct, and the person needs to possess information and be reckless as to whether it is corrupt conduct information.

The definition of “bet” includes accepting a bet. In this way, the offence also criminalises accepting a bet on a sporting event knowing that the outcome of the event has been fixed. This means that sport betting organisations can be held equally culpable if they knowingly accept bets on corrupted sporting activity. The maximum penalty for these first two offences is 10 years imprisonment consistent with penalties for other serious fraud and dishonesty offences in the code. Section 363H relates to betting with inside information and carries a maximum penalty of two years imprisonment.

I have previously pointed to the New South Wales Law Reform Commission report on match fixing that noted that inside information relating to sports can be of considerable importance to certain criminal syndicates that employ sports betting in support of money laundering activities. This offence prohibits a person who possesses inside information about an event from betting on that event, or encouraging another person to bet on that event in a particular way, or communicating the inside

information to another person who they know, or it is reasonable to know, is likely to bet on the event. This offence addresses concerns about the use of inside information about an event to manipulate the betting market. However, not all information about an event will be sufficient to prove this offence.

The bill uses the term “inside information” to limit the offence to instances involving information that is not generally available where, if the information had been available, it would likely have affected betting decisions. New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria have also recently enacted legislative amendments to address match fixing. The bill we debate today aligns with those amendments and expands on existing fraud and dishonesty provisions. The bill is a single, but important, component of larger sport integrity strategies which include community outreach, education, and greater oversight and collaboration between the regulatory authorities and sporting codes.

Last month, officers in my directorate participated in an information session held by the Economic Development Directorate with the sport sector. Officers outlined the offences in the bill in the context of national and local efforts to improve integrity in sport. A representative of the national integrity of sport unit of the Department of Regional Australia, Local Government, Arts and Sport also described an anti-match-fixing educational program and interactive software learning package.

This tool will soon be made available to sporting organisations and other stakeholders. It will strongly support the objectives of this bill and the national policy on match fixing. The bill will ensure that those who fix sporting and other events will be subject to criminal sanctions. Furthermore, those who use information about a fix or inside information for a betting purpose will be subject to the criminal law.

The offences in the bill will protect sport and racing organisers and participants by deterring corrupt activity. The amendments will also protect those who wish to participate in lawful gambling activities from the interference of match fixing. I thank members for their support of the bill, and I commend it to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Water Resources Amendment Bill 2013

Debate resumed from 6 June 2013, on motion by **Mr Corbell**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR COE (Ginninderra) (11.46): The opposition will be supporting the Water Resources Amendment Bill 2013. The bill amends the Water Resources Act 2007 and

the Water Resources Regulation 2007 to bring the ACT legislation into line with water resource laws in other states and territories. As a signatory to the national framework for compliance and enforcement systems for water resource management, the ACT is required to work towards water resource enforcement laws that include consistent compliance and enforcement measures, including infringement notices, disciplinary action, sanctions and criminal offences. Adequate and appropriate penalty levels are also required under the national framework. This bill focuses on the protection of water resources.

The bill introduces two strict liability offences. The first relates to a failure to submit a bore completion report to the Environment Protection Authority within the required time frame. This provision aims to ensure that bore completion reports are lodged in a reasonable time to ensure that information about groundwater and potential extraction points is available for water resource management.

The second strict liability offence relates to a person undertaking waterway work without a waterway work licence. This provision aims to ensure that unauthorised waterway work is not carried out and is enforced with a small penalty due to the relatively low environmental impact.

It has been noted that the use of strict liability offences engages the presumption of innocence because there are no-fault elements included in these offences. However, we accept the minister's justification that this is actually the best way to achieve the purpose intended for these amendments since the prosecutor is in a position to assess whether an offence has been committed and the minor offences can be punished.

I am pleased the minister has taken the scrutiny committee's recommendation on board and amended the explanatory statement to include a specific reference to the two defences available for strict liability offences. The new strict liability offences are intended to be linked to a new infringement notice scheme.

The bill clarifies the definition of a drillers licence to make it clear that an ACT drillers licence is required to drill bores in the ACT. An interstate licence is not sufficient. The bill removes the exemption from requiring a licence which currently applies to the taking of water for roadworks, earthworks, construction and landscaping. This ensures that taking water for these activities is regulated and unauthorised taking will be subject to appropriate penalties. A licence to take water for these uses may be granted and a water access entitlement is not required provided that the activity will result in improved environmental outcomes or other public benefit.

Finally, the bill makes it a criminal offence to tamper with a water meter. The definition of "tampering with a water meter" is broad. However, the section does not apply to a person prescribed by regulation who is installing, maintaining, repairing or replacing a water meter or acting with the written permission of the authority or the holder of a licence to take water. This offence is comparable to the meter-tampering offence in New South Wales.

In conclusion, the opposition will support this bill. However, we express some reservations about the potential implementation of the new provisions. The Canberra

Liberals recognise that the construction sector is vital to the continued growth of our city. We are concerned that this bill, if not used sensibly, may simply impose further red tape on industries that are already subjected to excessive regulation. We want to ensure that the pricing and regulations are reasonable and do not put an unnecessary burden on businesses in Canberra. We will be watching how this bill is implemented, and, if need be, we will be back in this Assembly moving amendments to ensure that it is reasonable and fairly applied.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (11.49): The Water Resources Amendment Bill seeks to tighten a number of provisions in the Water Resources Act and align the ACT legislation with the national framework for compliance and enforcement systems for water resource management. The bill seeks to meet the national framework by ensuring there is an adequate range of regulatory tools and adequate penalties. As such, the bill includes roadworks, earthworks, construction and landscaping as activities that will require a licence to take water. They were previously exempt. That seems sensible to include these activities under the regulatory regime.

The bill clarifies the definition of ACT drillers licence and introduces a new criminal offence of tampering with a water meter. It also introduces two new strict liability offences for undertaking water works without holding the required licence and for failure to submit a bore completion report with the EPA within the required time frame. The strict liability offences to be introduced have maximum penalty units of 50 and 25 respectively. The intent of these strict liability offences is to deter non-compliance but also to avoid subjecting a person to criminal prosecution while applying a small penalty. The Greens are comfortable with the use of strict liability offences in this case, given the penalties applied and the public interest is a legitimate objective and that it is clear that an offence has been committed.

I welcome the government's amended explanatory statement which acknowledges the defences of an honest and reasonable mistake or of an intervening conduct event outlined in the Criminal Code 2002 and which, thereby, addresses the issues raised by the scrutiny committee. In conclusion, the Greens will support the bill.

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations and Minister for the Environment and Sustainable Development) (11.51), in reply: I table a revised explanatory statement to this bill. The rivers, lakes, ponds, aquifers and other water bodies of the ACT are regulated and protected by the Water Resources Act 2007. This act is administered by the EPA. The water resources are protected for their environmental functions while maintaining a sustainable level of water extraction for our community.

To ensure compliance with the laws of the act, the act includes a licensing system and a range of regulatory enforcement tools. For example, a licence is required for such actions as pumping water from a river, use of groundwater, building a dam or drilling a bore. Regulatory options exist within the act to deal with people who may perform

unauthorised activities. Enforcement actions can include a warning, a fine, a formal direction or a criminal prosecution.

The government is a signatory to the Council of Australian Governments program, the national framework for the compliance and enforcement systems for water resource management. This national framework requires the states and territories to use their best endeavours to introduce laws to adopt consistent offence provisions for best practice regulation of water resources. The ACT is committed to ensuring that a best practice regulatory system is available to protect our water resources. This bill, therefore, delivers on our commitment to adopt the COAG national framework.

The scope of that framework requires that the water resources laws of each state and territory address a set of compliance and enforcement criteria. For example, jurisdictions are required to ensure there are offence provisions in place for issues such as licensed water use, complying with licence conditions or the construction of bores. The Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate has reviewed the act and found that, for the most part, the criteria were already satisfied by the existing act. However, a small number of improvements were identified and they form the basis for this bill.

The bill proposes several technical amendments to the Water Resources Act and the associated regulation. While minor, they are important. The bill can be summarised as follows: improving interpretation of the requirement for ACT drillers licences and ACT bore licences; introducing two new strict liability offences for minor environmental crimes; providing an offence for tampering with a water meter; and requiring a person to hold a licence for the taking of water for roadworks, earthworks, construction or landscaping.

Turning to each of these amendments in more detail, the technical amendments at clauses 5 and 6 improve readability and interpretation of the requirement for an ACT drillers licence and an ACT bore work licence. The notes added to section 77B remove any ambiguity for interstate drillers operating in the ACT. The notes specifically refer the reader to the offence provision requirement to hold a valid drillers licence and bore work licence issued by the EPA prior to performing work.

The bill ensures the penalty levels for ACT water resource offences are proportional to the scale of water resource activity relative to other states and territories. Clauses 7 and 8 provide two new strict liability offences with infringement notice penalties as an alternative to existing criminal offences that carry larger penalties. This is in keeping with several existing minor offences for licence compliance that are already covered by strict liability offences.

Under Section 77C it is an offence if a person performs work in a waterway, such as the construction of a new dam or building a river crossing, without a licence. The licence ensures that appropriate planning permissions have been sought, approved access to the site obtained and, most importantly, due consideration has been given to work methods and environmental controls to minimise disturbance to the waterway.

Section 77C deals specifically with the criminal offence for a person who does waterway work in a waterway without a licence. It has a high burden of evidential proof and provides a maximum penalty of \$11,000 for an individual or five times that for a corporation; imprisonment for one year or both.

Clause 7 provides a new strict liability offence in Section 77C. The new offence at clause 7 provides an enforcement option better suited for environmental incidents where low level environmental harm may have occurred in a waterway, such as the construction of an unauthorised shallow water crossing. The offence has a lower evidential burden of proof and does not carry a criminal record. For clause 7, the infringement notice fine of \$1,000 for an individual or five times for a corporation provides a suitable deterrent.

Section 77F provides a general offence for contravening a licence condition. The penalty for this criminal offence is a maximum of \$5,500 for an individual or five times that for a corporation.

Clause 8 adds a new offence specific to provision of a bore completion report. Bore completion reports provide valuable information to help authorities manage groundwater as an important natural resource. The strict liability offence at clause 8 for failure to provide such a report provides an enforcement option that is appropriately scaled in preference to the current criminal offence. The new infringement notice penalty is \$500 for an individual and higher for a corporation. The infringement notice option is more reasonable and preferable to a criminal offence.

The choice of strict liability offences was carefully considered for both the unauthorised waterway work offence and bore completion report offence. The rationale for their inclusion was centred on the protection of water resources. Strict liability offences, as members know, displace the fault element of an offence. However, strict liability does not oust a range of defences to criminal responsibility under territory law. For example, a person may raise a defence of honest and reasonable mistake of fact.

For clauses 7 and 8 the infringement notice scheme at clause 1.1, schedule 1 is the most appropriate regulatory tool to use. This is because the associated penalty is considered proportional to the consequential environmental impact of non-compliance. Current alternative offences available in the act carry large penalties, have a high burden of proof and are inadequate deterrents. The strict liability offences are the least restrictive means available to achieve the objective of the amendment.

The bill will ensure that the people of Canberra have water resource laws that are in harmony with other state and territory laws. The bill delivers on the government's commitment to national water reform by introducing a new offence at clause 9 for a person who tampers with a water meter. The act did not have a specific offence for meter tampering. Clause 9 follows contemporary best practice and provides a criminal offence for a person who tampers with a meter and is modelled on similar offence provisions in the New South Wales Water Management Act 2000.

The new section 77J offence contains a reasonable set of circumstances to exclude persons from this offence if they are, for example, prescribed by regulation to perform authorised maintenance of a meter or are otherwise acting with the written permission of the authority. This offence ensures that the Water Resources Act has a specific offence for meter tampering that is distinguishable from existing similar offences for failure to install a meter or failure to maintain a meter in good working order.

Finally, I will talk about the inclusion of roadworks, earthworks, construction and landscaping as activities addressed by clause 4 and schedule 1, clauses 1.2 and 1.3. The original intent of the act was for water licence exemptions to be issued for activities like roadworks, earthworks, construction and landscaping because these activities were thought to use small volumes of water for short periods of time. This was because it was considered an unnecessary burden for a person to purchase a water access entitlement, then apply for a licence and have ongoing administration of the licence.

However, in the five years following the inception of the act, it has become apparent that the volumes and duration of exempt activity have been much larger than anticipated, and non-compliance issues have arisen that would more appropriately be regulated by means of a licence. Take, for example, a large road upgrade or large infrastructure works which require large amounts of water and which may run over several years. If these activities are not regulated under a licence system, enforcement action is not available because the necessary enforcement action makes specific reference to being applicable to a person who holds a licence and not an exempt person.

The amendments draw closure to this situation by requiring a person to hold a licence to take water for roadworks, earthworks, construction and landscaping. In a compliance sense, this provides equity for existing licence holders who already undertake their water-taking activities in a compliant manner and who would otherwise be subject to enforcement provisions of the act.

Although roadworks, earthworks, construction and landscaping water-taking activity will now require a licence, the amendment ensures existing policy remains in place to preclude this water-taking activity from requiring a water access entitlement. The amendments maintain the requirement that all licensed water extraction occurs in water management areas defined by the act.

The bill delivers on the government's commitment to the Council of Australian Governments national framework for compliance and enforcement for water resource management. The ACT will have an improved range of enforcement tools that are reasonable and appropriate to the scale of water resource activity in the ACT and which are in harmony with laws of other Australian states and territories. 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.

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

Sitting suspended from 12.03 to 2.30 pm.

Questions without notice

ACTEW Corporation Ltd—water prices

MR HANSON: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, on 26 June 2013 the ICRC's water determination increased water prices by five per cent rather than the proposed decrease of 17 per cent, citing that "it was not possible to transfer the burden of ACTEW's costs to future water users without unacceptable risk to ACTEW's financial viability". The commission also noted that it had "modified its traditional approach to determining water prices". Treasurer, why is it acceptable to charge Canberrans more for their water to cover what the ICRC has described as an unacceptable risk to ACTEW's financial viability?

MR BARR: I thank Mr Hanson for the question. Mr Hanson would be aware that this particular area of ACTEW's business is regulated by the ICRC. All of its business decisions, its capital and recurrent expenditures, are assessed by the commission to ensure that they are economically efficient, and all pricing determinations must be approved and determined by the commission. So it sets the revenue that ACTEW can get in any given pricing period. It determined, given the capital investment that it has approved to be prudent and efficient, that the appropriate return on that investment was what it set in the pricing determination for the period. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that the ICRC has in fact lowered water and sewerage prices for the people of the ACT in the order of about \$80 a year.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Hanson.

MR HANSON: Treasurer, as a shareholder, how did you allow ACTEW to get into such a precarious financial position?

MR BARR: ACTEW is not in a precarious financial position. As I indicated, the commission makes a determination on the appropriate return on the assets that the community owns through ACTEW and the commission has made that determination and indicated that, given the capital expenditure that has occurred, that it authorised, that it, in its regulatory role, said was prudent and efficient, the return that is required on that investment is the determination for the next period.

I again remind the Leader of the Opposition that water and sewerage prices have fallen. Water and sewerage prices have fallen. It is one bill. Water and sewerage prices have fallen. The Leader of the Opposition would do well to understand the regulatory environment and understand that ACTEW does not make, and the

shareholders do not make, determinations on the pricing path independent of the regulator. The regulator makes those determinations. It sets the rules.

It has made its determination, and water and sewerage prices have fallen. One would anticipate, one would have hoped, although it is clear that the Leader of the Opposition does not support this, that Canberra households will be paying less for water and sewerage in the future.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Treasurer, what strategies are you promoting to address the problems as outlined in the ICRC determinations?

MR BARR: The government has a range of reviews underway in relation to ACTEW. Those processes commenced prior to the ICRC's determination and will report in due course. The government will then respond.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Treasurer, when will you call for a full performance audit of ACTEW by the Auditor-General?

MR BARR: I think the government's position on these matters is quite clear. We have a series of reviews underway, and the government will be seeing those reviews through to their completion.

Transport—light rail

MR COE: My question is for the Minister for Environment and Sustainable Development. Minister, why has the ACT government chosen to proceed with light rail if the government's benefit-cost ratio for the project is 2.34 but 4.78 for bus rapid transit?

MR CORBELL: I thank Mr Coe for the question. The answer to that question is that the analysis that underpins the government's assessment of relative benefit and cost of the two transport modes indicates that while bus rapid transit is an efficient way of delivering improved public transport, in terms of broader, economy-wide benefit and in terms of broader benefit to the way the city grows and develops, light rail is the preferred mode. And that is concluded by the report produced by AECOM, which underpins the government's submission to Infrastructure Australia.

There are points in time where cities have to make decisions about their best long-term choices. We have to understand what the population growth will be in the corridor. We have to understand how that population growth can be accelerated with the delivery of dedicated right of way through light rail. Those are the types of long-term strategic decisions that this government is prepared to make to ensure that we make the right choice for our city into the future.

Mr Hanson: You said that about the government office building too.

MR CORBELL: Of course, Mr Hanson says, “You said that about other things.” Well, there are other things that others have said as well that are perhaps worth reflecting on. Indeed, you, Madam Speaker, have made some interesting comments in relation to light rail. On 13 October 2008 the Canberra Liberals in a policy statement said that light rail will become increasingly viable as Canberra grows. In 2008, of course, the Liberal Party committed to spending \$8 million if elected on feasibility studies and forward design of a light rail system for the ACT. So, somewhere between 2008 and 2013 somebody has lost their way, but I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that it is not the government.

The government is very focussed on the delivery of this preferred transport mode, a transport mode which has popular support and which Canberrans want to see, and that is critical to achieving success for this project. It is interesting, of course, that the Canberra Liberals are now doing a complete about-turn on this very important question.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Minister, given that noise pollution, carbon emissions, population growth, time costs and other social costs have been considered in the economic appraisal, why weren't these other benefits included?

MR CORBELL: Madam Speaker, I am not quite sure which particular document Mr Coe is referring to, but I can assure Mr Coe that the government will continue to build its business case for light rail with Infrastructure Australia. What we have seen, of course, in the initial submission to Infrastructure Australia is not a request for support in relation to either bus rapid transit or light rail transit. The original submission to Infrastructure Australia instead was for support for the development of an improved transport mode for that corridor. Infrastructure Australia have indicated and listed it as an early submission and they have indicated that further work needs to be done.

Mr Hanson: That's a polite way of putting “not a very good submission” on it.

MR CORBELL: Well, they have put it on their early stage national priority list. They have indicated that further work needs to be done. We are going to build that business case and we look forward to engaging with Infrastructure Australia in that process, addressing all of the relevant issues as part of that submission.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, were all the government's relevant parameters in the Infrastructure Australia's submission included in the economic appraisal? If not, is not the appraisal unreliable?

MR CORBELL: I am not quite sure what Mr Doszpot means by “appraisal”. I would welcome some clarification as to which document he is referring to in relation to that question.

Dr Bourke: Madam Speaker—

Mr Doszpot: Madam Speaker—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Doszpot, are you seeking to ask another question or are you seeking to express—

Mr Doszpot: I am seeking to ask another question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Dr Bourke has the call for the supplementary question.

DR BOURKE: Minister, could you tell us about the dedicated right of way that you talked about before and how that will be beneficial?

MR CORBELL: This project has significant benefit. First of all, it is worth highlighting that any cost-benefit analysis over one is a positive analysis and an analysis which indicates there is a net benefit to the economy. Infrastructure Australia's general position is that any project that achieves a cost-benefit analysis of over two is a viable project worthy of further consideration. So we are in a strong position in relation to that cost-benefit analysis.

It is worth highlighting the capital metro cost-benefit analysis with the cost-benefit analysis of other light rail projects around the country. The Gold Coast light rail project achieves a benefit-cost ratio of less than two, and the new inner west light rail project, which has been given the go-ahead by the O'Farrell government, has a cost-benefit ratio of approximately one. So you can see there that the cost-benefit analysis of this project is favourable already, compared to the cost-benefit analysis of other projects.

But we accept, and we have always said, that more work needs to be done because we need to further demonstrate the benefits of this project in terms of the value uplift of property and development along the corridor. We need to demonstrate how that can help change the pattern of urban settlement in our cities so that more people have the choice to live close to the city centre in more affordable housing and with excellent public transport connections. And that is what this project can deliver and that is what the government is focused on delivering.

Budget—project funding

MS PORTER: My question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, the first budget of this parliamentary term is focused on building a stronger economy and creating opportunity and fairness for all Canberrans. What are some of the key priorities that you have set for the first year of this term of government?

MS GALLAGHER: I thank Ms Porter for the question. The budget brought down in June took the vital early steps of a transformation that must occur for Canberra to reach its full potential. The government was re-elected with a clear vision for

Canberra and, nine months into the term, work is well advanced and many of the building blocks are in place for projects that will, over time, transform the city.

The projects we have funded in the budget are all about making sure we keep building Canberra as a city that is liveable, healthy and smart, a city of opportunity, fairness and urban renewal and a city with a strong and growing economy. The budget included funding for up to 70 per cent of the promises we made to ACT voters last October. Just yesterday I released a joint communique with Mr Rattenbury which spells out the progress the government is making under the commitments agreed to under the parliamentary agreement with the Greens.

The government is very pleased with the progress that has been made to date but it is an ambitious agenda to deliver on some very key, major projects over the next four years. These projects include the University of Canberra hospital, initiatives like study Canberra, capital metro, delivering the city plan and the city to the lake project, some of the work that we have to do across the town centres, and of course the standard and core function of the ACT government—to deliver high quality services to the people of the ACT.

Many of the major projects that we are talking about will bring benefits for Canberra's growing population but they are also a key element of a broader economic and planning agenda that will serve the city in the long term.

An investment in light rail now can return many times that amount in future investment along the corridor, more jobs, less car dependency, less road congestion, less road maintenance requirements, greater mobility for seniors, better access to the city centre and less carbon emissions. It will also pay us back for investing before the city is too big and the task is too great. Imagine how different Sydney's transport network would be if the planners could turn back the clock and preserve some of the corridors which are now impossible to reclaim. The same arguments hold for the city plan, the town centre master plans and open spaces and, indeed, all urban renewal projects that we can deliver, because you need to have a vision, the opportunity and indeed the budget strategy to do it.

In terms of growing the economy, the transformation needs to target the economy directly—its capacity, its attractiveness for investment and its diversification. That is why the government is working to help the best educated and best connected workforce in Australia to diversify and export more into national and international markets, through programs such as digital Canberra and study Canberra.

On a macroeconomic level, the government is creating the conditions for growth through our comprehensive tax reform agenda, and we will be continuing with that over this term. There are changes which support business investment and innovation, particularly in the housing and construction sectors.

In relation to fairness and opportunity, our economic reforms and infrastructure investments also hold to the deeply held Labor values of fairness and opportunity. Canberra is a city that values these things and for our government they are both social and economic imperatives. That is why Canberra's transformation includes reforms

and new investments that improve efficiency, quality and fairness in both the education and health systems.

The national education reform agreement will be implemented. Indeed it is great to have bipartisan support for that federally.

Mr Barr interjecting—

MS GALLAGHER: In disability care, it is great to see the WA government joining and creating a truly national disability care scheme for all Australians who have a disability. In health, we will continue our record investment and, indeed, start the very important work on the University of Canberra public hospital.

Mr Barr interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Barr, it was very hard to hear the Chief Minister answer her question because of you. I also take this opportunity to remind members that they need to be orderly. If I call them to order, they need to respond. Supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, what other transformational projects have you committed to?

MS GALLAGHER: The government has chosen to move ahead with major projects, which indeed we did take, and they formed our commitments, to the electorate in October last year. Indeed, in relation to capital metro, for example, it formed a commitment of the ACT Greens. Together the Labor and Greens vote, and I know this is something that those opposite find hard to deal with from time to time, did reach over 50 per cent of Canberrans. We did go to the electorate with a commitment around light rail. Over 50 per cent of the ACT voted to support that election agenda.

Capital metro is an important project for the city. We do need to do the further work that is required to explain the opportunities that will come with capital metro as the project develops. Yes, we do need to spend some money on getting that project to where it needs to be. The money allocated in this year's budget will do that, with \$18.7 million to progress the capital metro project, including \$5 million for the design studies, \$12.3 million for the capital metro agency and \$1.4 million for the master planning process which will investigate and identify issues for a future Canberra-wide light rail network and assess its feasibility.

The first stage of capital metro will be a model for a future Canberra-wide light rail network. It will play an important role in the territory's growth and development. This will be supported by integrated bus services, cyclepaths, footpaths and complementary land uses. In relation to the city plan, the city plan work is well underway. Again, it will set the framework for future development decisions that occur within the city precinct. It is important to get these right and we are taking the time to do it.

DR BOURKE: Chief Minister, why are these projects important, and how will they benefit the whole community?

MS GALLAGHER: I thank Dr Bourke for the question. The city plan, capital metro and, indeed, another project that we are working on at the moment, digital Canberra, are vital parts of how Canberra will be transformed over the next few years. Capital metro will deliver a more efficient and sustainable public transport system. It will create jobs, it will reduce congestion and it will provide benefits for the whole community.

The city plan ensures that we deliver on our vision for our city as a progressive, inclusive and vibrant city with a distinctive urban culture. Digital Canberra will also ensure that we capitalise on the opportunities of the digital age. It will support jobs, investment, economic diversification, improve connectivity to markets and between citizens and support better public services.

These projects are about investing in Canberra and investing for the benefit of the whole community. They will contribute to economic growth, and I think there is agreement that that is good for Canberra's future. They will provide sustainable development and further transport options. Again, I think there is no disagreement about delivering on that. And they will deliver world-class infrastructure and provide better services and more choice for Canberrans. Importantly, particularly over the next few years, they will provide jobs and optimism for the local economy.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Gentleman.

MR GENTLEMAN: Chief Minister, what measures are you taking to ensure there is a consistent investment in urban renewal across the whole of the ACT?

MS GALLAGHER: I thank Mr Gentleman for the question. This is an issue that comes up from time to time, particularly when we are dealing with new development fronts such as Gungahlin and Molonglo, about a view from some parts of Canberra that perhaps all of the effort is going into the new development fronts. I think it is important to realise that when we are framing our budget, we are also looking at the needs of Canberra right across the city.

Mr Hanson: Sure you are!

MS GALLAGHER: We are. I sit around the table, so I know exactly the discussions that we have. And I do not think it is any secret that when Tuggeranong was built—in fact I lived here at the time—there was certainly a feeling from other parts of Canberra that Tuggeranong got all of the new infrastructure and everything looked great there and other parts were not looking as new and fresh. That has been around for many years.

I think any objective analysis of the budget would also see that investments are being made right across the city, to upgrade existing infrastructure, to build new services, to deliver better services such as the new walk-in centre that will be opened down in

Tuggeranong, which will be no doubt very warmly received by the Tuggeranong community, the construction of the new fire station, for example, at Tuggeranong and the new CIT that will be built in Tuggeranong as well.

But it is a balancing act and some of the demands for infrastructure dollars do go to those new areas where new schools are required, where roads and parks are required. I think the balance for us is getting it right and, again, any objective analysis of the budget will show that we have done that and taken decisions in the interests of the entire ACT community.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before I call Mr Smyth, could I just again draw members' attention to the level—this was not an interjection—of general conversation. There was not one person in this chamber, except for me and perhaps Mr Rattenbury, listening to the Chief Minister. It was highly discourteous.

ACTEW Corporation Ltd—dividend payments

MR SMYTH: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, on 1 July 2013 in relation to the impact of the reduced ACTEW dividend on the budget position you stated:

Early indications are that it will be in the order of about a \$20 million to \$25 million adjustment.

Treasurer, when will you provide updated budget estimates given the reduction in the ACTEW dividend?

MR BARR: The usual practice is to update the budget as part of the midyear review. There are a number of variables that impact on the budget over the course of the fiscal year. I can advise members that, following the economic statement issued by the commonwealth government last week, there was an upwards revision of the GST pool, and the territory stands to benefit by something in the order of about \$70 million over the forward estimates from that upward revision in the GST pool. So you have over the course of a fiscal year some variation in a variety of revenue lines.

The government updates its forecasts, its forward estimates, during the midyear review and during the budget process. Information that has come to light since budget day is that, for the next two years we would anticipate a reduced dividend from ACTEW. There is a further pricing determination to be made that would impact on the final two outyears of this budget cycle, but we have also had another update in relation to the GST that presents a more positive story in relation to revenues flowing to the territory. Overall, the government will proceed with the passage of the budget and the debate of the budget next week and we will update the forward estimates accordingly with the midyear update.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Treasurer, why should the Assembly debate a budget that we now know has incorrect figures in it?

MR BARR: The budget presents an important statement of the government's intent over the next 12 months. The government is of the view that the budget should pass next week. There are many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of new projects and important economic stimulus for this economy at this time. The government will support the passage of the budget next week and we will provide further updates to the territory's bottom line in accordance with usual practice when we update the midyear.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mrs Jones.

MRS JONES: Minister, what is preventing you from tabling the updated estimates?

MR BARR: Receipt of information on a variety of budget lines. When we get that information, as we do for the midyear update, we will provide it.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mrs Jones.

MRS JONES: Treasurer, why are you allowing an incomplete or inaccurate budget to be debated by the Assembly?

MR BARR: I am not, Madam Speaker.

Transport—light rail

MR WALL: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, when will funds for light rail construction be included in the budget?

MR BARR: At the appropriate time.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Treasurer, was Treasury involved in the development of the economic appraisal and other elements of the submission for Infrastructure Australia?

MR BARR: Yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Treasurer, what analysis has been undertaken on the impact on rates and land tax in the light rail corridor following construction of capital metro?

MR BARR: That work will continue to proceed. It is, of course, contingent on a number of variables, including a variety of different scenarios in relation to development uplift within the precinct and, of course, consideration of a number of different finance analyses.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

MR COE: Treasurer, what impact will the light rail project have on other transport capital investments?

MR BARR: That is a hypothetical question, Madam Speaker.

Mr Smyth: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, it is hardly for the minister to determine whether something is hypothetical. That is your role.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is for the presiding officer to determine whether a question is out of order.

Mr Barr: I did not say the question was out of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: But saying it is hypothetical would make it out of order—

Mr Corbell interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: I am making a comment, Mr Corbell. If you would like to contribute to the debate, the usual way is for you to rise to your feet; otherwise you can be quiet. If your answer is, “I’m not answering it because I think that’s hypothetical,” that can be your answer but it is not for you to rule that a question is out of order.

Economy—performance

MS BERRY: My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer outline recent economic data that has an impact on the ACT economy which indicates the robustness of the ACT economy?

MR BARR: I thank Ms Berry for the question. I can advise the Assembly that year on year to the March quarter of 2013 state final demand in the territory increased by 3.8 per cent, which was the highest of all of the non-mining jurisdictions. In the 2012-13 fiscal year 3,500 jobs were created in the territory. Employment rose by 1.7 per cent. We now have an all-time record number of people employed in the ACT. Again, the territory recorded the strongest annual employment growth of all of the non-mining jurisdictions. We have the lowest unemployment rate in the country at 3.7 per cent.

The latest ABS data showed that in the calendar year 2012 the ACT population increased strongly by 2.3 per cent. That would have to be amongst the highest growth levels the territory has ever achieved. It is the second strongest population growth rate in the country behind only Western Australia and the strongest growth rate in more than two decades.

I think it is worth underlining this point—a point that I would hope all in the Assembly would agree with—that our city is a fantastic place to live and people are coming to live here. These figures demonstrate just that point. It is worth noting that the territory recorded the largest inflow of interstate migration since self-government.

We have seen very low inflation for the 2012-13 fiscal year. Despite the very strong economic activity and growth in the employment market, inflation was contained to 1.9 per cent. The territory's solid economic performance has also been endorsed by reputable institutions such as CommSec and Deloitte Access Economics. In its state of the states July report, CommSec rated the ACT's economic performance as the second strongest in the country, behind only the mining boom state of Western Australia. Deloitte Access Economics in its June quarter 2013 business outlook revised upwards its forecasts for the ACT in 2012-13.

I would like to remind everyone in this place that our solid economic performance is achieved against a very challenging global and domestic economic environment. The global economy remains very weak and fragile, and economic growth in our major trading partners, such as China, is slowing. The latest world economic outlook issued by the IMF downgraded world economic growth forecasts.

The Australian economy is currently experiencing a major structural transition towards, fortunately for the territory, a broader-based economic growth following years of resource investment booms driven largely by demand from China. As such, in the short term, economic growth is expected to slow nationally and the unemployment rate is expected to rise. The commonwealth's latest economic statement downgraded its budget position and revised down real GDP growth by a quarter of a percentage point for both the 2012-13 and 2013-14 fiscal years.

The ACT economy is not immune from this. It is also not immune from the impact of ongoing commonwealth government spending constraint. In addition, clearly the uncertainty surrounding next month's election result and the possibility of 20,000 job losses in the ACT are certainly weighing on the minds of Canberra residents and ACT businesses.

But regardless of the cloud that looms with the potential election of an Abbott government, this economy is performing well and our economic outlook remains positive in the longer term. As a responsible government, we will continue to ensure that our economy and community can grow.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Berry.

MS BERRY: Treasurer, what is the current state of the construction industry in the ACT?

MR BARR: We have—

MADAM SPEAKER: Sorry, just hang on a second. Sorry, Mr Barr. Ms Berry, can you read me your first question again please?

MS BERRY: The first question?

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes.

MS BERRY: Can the Treasurer outline recent economic data that has an impact on the ACT economy which indicates the robustness of the ACT economy?

MADAM SPEAKER: And your second question was?

MS BERRY: What is the current state of the construction industry in the ACT as it relates to the recent—

MADAM SPEAKER: You did not say that at first.

MS BERRY: If I could add that, if it makes more sense?

MADAM SPEAKER: I make the point that I asked you to read what your question was and I was about to say that that would be out of order; you would need to put it in some context. If you are proposing to put it in some context now, to make it in order, that would be acceptable.

MS BERRY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. What is the current state of the construction industry in the ACT as it relates to the recent economic data?

MR BARR: We are seeing three of the largest projects in territory history, the ASIO headquarters, the Canberra Airport upgrade and the enlarged Cotter Dam reaching conclusion of their construction phases. Those three projects were around \$1.5 billion. They are three of the largest projects ever undertaken in territory history. The Majura parkway project, an approximately \$300 million project, is gearing up into its biggest years of capital spend. This will continue until 2016 and will certainly provide ongoing stimulus to the construction sector.

On the residential side, I can advise the house that the RBA has just lowered the cash rate by a further 25 basis points to, I think, an all-time low for interest rates—always lower under a Labor government, it would seem. This will certainly provide a further stimulus to the ACT housing market and, combined with the measures announced in the budget to boost the first home owner grant and the home buyer concessions scheme, will provide a timely boost to the residential construction sector. Of course the government's ongoing reforms to stamp duty, cutting stamp duty on every single property in the ACT, provide further stimulus. In terms of residential fronts, Gungahlin, Molonglo and west Belconnen are coming on stream over the coming years. So there is a very strong pipeline of work for the residential construction sector.

Of course, the government itself has a significant capital works program. We are eager to get on with the delivery of that, and that is why we will be passing the budget next week.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Gentleman.

MR GENTLEMAN: Minister, what measures are being put in place to help grow and diversify the ACT economy?

MR BARR: The first budget of this parliamentary term includes a wide variety of measures to build a stronger economy. The government, of course, continues our nation-leading tax reforms to create a stronger and more vibrant business community, which importantly reduces taxation on those two most mobile factors of production—labour and capital. It is very important that in setting your taxation policy you ensure that those factors of production that are highly mobile and competitive between jurisdictions are taxed as low as possible while ensuring a sufficient revenue base in order to fund the activities of the territory government.

The government has the right policy mix there. It is endorsed by every sensible economist not just in the country but in the world. In terms of which areas of tax you should apply, all economists agree on this point: inefficient transaction taxes are the worst way for governments to raise revenue. We will, of course, continue the implementation of our business development strategy to diversify our economy and to create new jobs.

The dividends from that policy are seen in the statistics I was able to provide to the Assembly, the facts on our economy and the performance of this economy in recent times. Through our investment in capital works, in the infrastructure that this city needs, through our policy decisions to support the residential construction sector and to support new land release in commercial and industrial estates, we are providing the right policy settings for this jurisdiction. We have the lowest unemployment. We have the highest growth of the non-resource economies. It is a good story for the ACT.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Smyth, a supplementary.

MR SMYTH: Treasurer, if all the economic indicators are, as you quote, so good, why is the budget performing so poorly—as the bipartisan budget report said, a budget full of debt, deficits and deceit?

MR BARR: The budget is performing very well, supporting this level of economic performance. Our policy settings are deliberate. The policy choices are for our economy to be \$250 million bigger or \$250 million smaller. You want it to be \$250 million smaller, according to the sort of muddled thinking that you put forward in your estimates committee report.

The government's view is that we are not crowding out any private investment and if we were not investing in this economy now, no-one else would be. The challenge for the Liberal Party is to provide a convincing argument as to why the economy would be larger if we adopted a different fiscal policy stance. If we were to contract our spending now, what would come in to replace it? Nothing. Our economy would be smaller, fewer people would be in employment and infrastructure would not be being delivered. That is the policy choice. And if you want to take the austerity path, feel free. You have that space; it is all yours. You can be the miserable sad sacks who think that our economy should be smaller. You can be the people who believe our economy should be smaller.

This government is about growing our economy, about ensuring that there are more jobs, a record level of employment and the highest growth of the non-resource jurisdictions, as a result of the policy settings of this government.

Schools—registration

MR DOSZPOT: My question is to the Minister for Education and Training. The approval process for non-government schools is that you firstly give in-principle approval to an application and then appoint a registration panel to assess whether the schools meet the various requirements of the Education Act. Minister, who contributes to the in-principle approval process?

MS BURCH: I thank Mr Doszpot for his question. There are two parts. There is the in-principle approval and then there is quite a period of time for the schools to come back with the registration process, and that is another quite separate, rigorous process. In respect of the in-principle approval process, there is a notification. There are comments sought from the public. There is a public notification. There is the ability for interested groups to make comment in support or non-support for those in-principle approvals.

I am provided with advice that goes to any impact on local schools and then I make a decision about whether I support the in-principle approval state or not. That is quite separate and I think there has been some misunderstanding that it automatically equates to registration. That is quite a separate process altogether, Mr Doszpot.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Doszpot.

MR DOSZPOT: Minister, who determines the composition of the registration panel and what criteria are used for their selection?

MS BURCH: It is pulled together through the Education and Training Directorate. There is certainly a mix of education experience. There are directorate officials. There are people with experience of school leadership, public school leadership and also non-government school leadership, in there. I know there has been some commentary in recent times about the composition of those. I have certainly not had any direct call to me to say that that is a problem, other than the most recent public commentary. I have also written to a number of groups and we are coming close to the end of a call for submissions about what we can do and a look at the processes. To me, it is quite clear under the act, the process about in-principle approval, but there has been public commentary. That has been in play for a number of years, so I am quite happy to take advice and to hear community comments, and I will make judgements on that.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, do you intend to introduce an appeals process and, if so, at what stage would the appeals process be triggered and who would have a right of appeal?

MS BURCH: I thank Mr Wall for his question. Certainly that has been a proposition that has been put forward by some in their public commentary, and there has been other public commentary that an appeal process, indeed, would not be beneficial to the approval-in-principle process. It is all being considered.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, how can Canberra families be assured that you are currently operating within the full principles and intent of the Education Act in respect of non-government school approvals?

MS BURCH: I have absolute confidence that the decisions I have made to date are within the principles and the guidance that the act entitles me to make those decisions on. I have said before, and I will say again and I will say in this place, that it is definitely the community's choice and the choice of parents about where they send their children, and that includes government and non-government schools.

The better schools reforms, I think, once and for all, very clearly, at quite a significant policy and funding level, have said the divide between government and non-government schools now is at an end and everyone has the right to choose the school of their choice. But I will say I will be a proud advocate of government schools and I will do all I can to make government schools the preferred choice of ACT families.

Education—funding

DR BOURKE: My question is to the minister for education. Minister, I draw your attention to the recent announcement by the Prime Minister that Catholic systemic schools have signed up to the better schools plan. Can you inform the Assembly of how this announcement affects the ACT and what has been the response of local Catholic schools?

MS BURCH: I thank Dr Bourke for his question. It is pleasing to see that the Catholic system is joining the ACT public and independent schools in signing up to the better schools plan. This plan is good for all Australian students. In fact, it is so good that even the federal opposition has had to come in and support it. Indeed, Tony Abbott is apparently on a unity ticket with our Prime Minister. It is very good to see.

The Catholic Education Commission in a media release of 23 July said:

The National Catholic Education Commission has today welcomed the commitment of all state and territory Catholic education Commissions to the Commonwealth Government's funding arrangements now known as the 'Better Schools Plan' ... Catholic education is confident that under this legislation no school will be worse off and these funding arrangements will deliver significant increases over time for every child in the Catholic system.

I know that view is echoed by the Catholic schools across the ACT. Moira Najecki, the Canberra and Goulburn CEO, for example, has said that that has brought us one step closer to funding certainty for Catholic schools and that it recognises the needs of

the more than 17,000 students in Catholic schools, their parents/guardians and teachers.

The announcement by the Catholic school system means that Catholic and independent schools now join with New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and, of course, the ACT to commit to a new system of better supporting our schools and our students. By supporting this agreement, the Catholic systemic and independent schools, along with the ACT government are ensuring long-term improvements for every student in every school in the territory.

Currently the ACT has more than 68,000 students enrolled in its schools and roughly 20 per cent are within the Catholic system. We know the Catholic system has around 13 per cent of the territory's Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander students and also around 13 per cent of the territory's students with special needs. These students, too, will benefit from the increased support of the better schools plan.

With all sections of the ACT education sector now committed to these reforms, it means a fundamental shift in our thinking on education. It is more than just a simple question of how much money—it is about how we go about teaching and supporting our students. While Australia has good schools, our performance has been declining, and that is the benefit of the better schools reform. There is no room for complacency, and I want all ACT schools to continue to lead the way. On this the Catholic Education Commission is in full agreement, and with its support for better schools, we can achieve all that we set out to do.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Dr Bourke.

DR BOURKE: Minister, how will our schools—Catholic, independent and government—benefit from these reforms now that all three sectors will be part of the better schools plan?

MS BURCH: Our schools benefit from these reforms in a number of ways. In simple terms, the better schools plan will give every student the opportunity to reach their full potential. Members will be pleased to note that total public investment in ACT schools will be around \$5 billion over the six years from 2014. This is a significant investment in the future of this city and our country.

This means an extra \$190 million for ACT schools. This extra resourcing will see all ACT schools funded to at least the level of the schooling resource standard by 2019. The Australian government has also committed to grow its school education spending by 4.7 per cent from 2014 into 2015 and throughout the agreement. This extra funding is great news for all schools and will deliver reform in the areas we know drive better student outcomes.

Students and their families will see continued improvement in teacher quality throughout the ACT by ensuring that all teachers are registered by the Teacher Quality Institute, using the Australian professional standards for teachers. In classrooms around the city, students will benefit from the full delivery of the Australian curriculum in ACT schools.

School communities will gain by enabling more power for local school leaders as we support principals to better monitor student and school achievement. For students with disabilities and their families, we commit to further implementation of the disability standards for education to provide reasonable adjustments for students with a disability to access the curriculum. These reforms will also promote greater access to quality language programs, including priority Asian languages, in all our schools.

Through these reforms, school funding will be fairer, based on the demonstrated needs of students.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Gentleman.

MR GENTLEMAN: Minister, now that all three sectors, including Catholic, are part of this reform, what opportunities exist for cross-sectoral cooperation?

MS BURCH: I thank Mr Gentleman for his interest in the better schools reforms. We are going through what is possibly the biggest period of reform and transformation in education in decades. Strong links have always existed between the three school sectors in Canberra and these connections will be strengthened as these reforms are delivered.

Examples of the how the sectors have worked together include the establishment of the Gold Creek and Holy Spirit shared campus, the cross-sectoral work of the Board of Senior Secondary Studies and the work of the Teach Quality Institute, where two universities, the University of Canberra and the Australian Catholic University, are working together to strengthen the quality of the teaching profession.

Nationally, we are leaders in the implementation of the Australian curriculum. We are the only jurisdiction to have agreed cross-sectoral implementation plans that ensure a cohesive approach to the delivery of our curriculum to every child in every ACT school. In the ACT we are committed to cross-sectoral work that moves us beyond the boundaries of individual schools or sector needs to the common goals that distinguish teaching as a true profession. These reforms are for all schools and will benefit all our students and their families.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, what does the bipartisan support nationally mean for these education reforms?

MS BURCH: I thank Ms Porter for her question. Indeed, it is very pleasing to hear Mr Abbott and Mr Pyne have revised their previous decisions and now support these reforms. What it means for the schools in the ACT is certainty. It provided certainty for all our schools, government, Catholic and independent. And I know from conversations with both my officials and representatives of the sectors that this is certainly critical.

Mr Hanson interjecting—

MS BURCH: Mr Hanson continues to interject, ill informed as usual. The question is now for Mr Hanson and for Mr Doszpot: where do you stand on better schools? I welcome you both to join me in a unity ticket in making sure that we have the better schools reform funded and implemented here in the ACT.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before I give Mrs Jones the call, I would like some level of civility in the chamber.

Budget—savings

MRS JONES: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, the budget noted that approximately 21 per cent of the government's savings measures will come from procurement whole-of-government savings. Unlike the other savings initiatives, figures for the procurement whole-of-government savings were cited in round figures. Treasurer, as these savings make up 21 per cent of the government's savings measures, if unrealised how much will this delay the government's goal of achieving an operating surplus by 2015-16?

MR BARR: It would not impact. The government will, over the course of the next few budgets, make the necessary decisions in order to ensure the ongoing growth of the territory economy to respond to prevailing economic circumstances. Should, for example, there be a change of government federally next month then we would of course need to respond to the agenda of an incoming government. That would certainly impact upon the territory economy. We would seek to make policy adjustments commensurate with that impact. We will of course seek, through the procurement of goods and services, to achieve value for taxpayer dollars.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mrs Jones.

MRS JONES: Minister, what assumptions were used for these savings, given that they are such neat round figures?

MR BARR: Targets for improved performance, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Smyth.

MR SMYTH: Minister, what are some of the specific initiatives that have been identified to achieve the savings listed in the line, "Procurement—whole-of-government savings"?

MR BARR: Seeking alignment of purchasing across directorates, seeking to get better prices from suppliers, more efficient purchasing and timing of purchases across the procurement cycle, seeking to control demand for particular supplies across ACT government directorates and ensuring that when we go into the marketplace we are seeking the best outcomes from particular suppliers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Treasurer, how important is it to ensure that the procurement decisions you are making are the best for the ACT going forward with this fairly uncertain future?

MR BARR: We have through a change in procurement policy sought to provide an incentive for local suppliers and for those larger national and international suppliers to government to support local small to medium-size enterprises by engaging them as part of their overall package around particular procurements. This loading within the procurement process will provide new opportunity for small and medium-size enterprises within the capital region, as defined by the South East Regional Organisation of Councils, to ensure that we are providing economic opportunities within our region through government procurement.

I think this is an important reform. It is consistent with our international trade obligations. It does not breach any free trade agreements but it certainly provides an opportunity for more ACT firms, particularly small and medium enterprises, to access ACT government procurement rounds. This will be to the benefit of the local economy and I am pleased to see that it has been warmly endorsed by a variety of business stakeholder organisations.

Land—development

MS LAWDER: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, the budget anticipates an increase in the LDA dividend from \$59.8 million in 2014-15 to \$132.3 million in 2015-16, which is an increase of \$72.5 million or 121 per cent. Given that the outlook for the market as a whole is that it is softening, what assumptions and measures did the government use to forecast this increase in dividend income?

MR BARR: I thank Ms Lawder for giving me the honour of answering her first question on her first sitting day.

Mr Smyth: You old softie!

Mr Coe: The worst of a bad lot.

MR BARR: You are too kind! In response to the member's question, I would make a number of points. Firstly, over the forward estimates the government has an ambitious land release program. As I indicated in response to an earlier question, there are three residential development fronts—in Gungahlin, in west Belconnen and in the Molonglo valley. There is also a significant commercial and industrial land release program.

The assumptions that the government made were that population growth would continue at an above long-run average level, although softened somewhat from the 2.3 per cent that we are experiencing. It is interesting to note that each time we think the rate of population growth has reached its peak, it appears to in fact pick up speed. So we anticipated, at the time of framing the budget, that population growth would level off at about 1.7 per cent. It is now up to 2.3 per cent. So, if anything, some of the

projections around demand for residential land in the coming years are somewhat conservative.

We do recognise that we have a backlog of land release to proceed through, and there are of course a number of important environmental approvals that need to be obtained before the balance of land release can occur in Gungahlin in particular. We will go through a process of evaluation of the land release program every six months to ensure that we are keeping pace with market movements.

It is interesting that certainly the residential market in the territory has perhaps held up more strongly than many pundits anticipated, given the uncertainty in relation to the federal election result and what might happen to employment within the territory. The one observation I will make is that, regardless of who wins elections, in the medium and long term it would appear that governments of both political persuasions do in fact increase the size of the public service in the ACT over time, questioning the need really for very sharp contractions in any given period of time.

My evidence for this is that John Howard inherited about 37,000 public servants from Paul Keating and passed on 57,000 to Kevin Rudd. There are now 66,326 ACT-based commonwealth public servants. So in the last six years we have seen growth of about 10,000. There may well in fact be a reversal of that increase of 10,000 over the last six years in the short term. One would anticipate, though, that in the medium term federal governments would want to continue to implement programs and that, if you take a long-run view of the ACT housing market, its fortunes are most closely linked to the size of the commonwealth public service. I think in the medium term there is reason for optimism there. But we do not need a short-term hit of job losses in the order of 20,000.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Lawder.

MS LAWDER: Treasurer, you have mentioned land releases in Molonglo, west Belconnen and Gungahlin. How many blocks of land does the government intend to release to meet its 2015-16 dividend forecast?

MR BARR: In the 2015-16 year, it is around the 4,000 mark. We have brought the land release target down a little from the previous budget in order to recognise changes in market conditions. As I indicated in my initial response to Ms Lawder's question, we will adjust land release accordingly in each six-month period, depending on prevailing market conditions.

What has changed in recent times is that the level of population growth has increased from 1.9 to 2.3 per cent. To put some perspective on that, that is around another thousand people. At an average of about 2½ people per dwelling, 400 additional dwellings are required, just on the back of that population increase in recent times. We will closely monitor population data.

The other variable, of course, is the number of people per household, and that continues to shrink. In the ACT it has come down from about 2.7 to a little over 2.5. I imagine that trend will continue.

The combination of population increase and reduced household size means more dwellings are required. By and large, about 50 per cent of the requirement for that population increase is met through greenfield land releases, the other 50 per cent through urban renewal. That has been the policy intent of government for some time. You are seeing growth in standard residential units, apartments and townhouses across the territory in a variety of locations. I think that trend will continue.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Treasurer, to what extent are you relying on land sales to drive the government's projected net operating surplus in 2015-16?

MR BARR: Land sales obviously contribute, but, of course, when you release new land, particularly greenfield land, there is on the expenditure side a range of infrastructure investments required and on the recurrent side a range of services that, of course, need to be provided. So if, in the circumstance of much slower population growth as a result of a change of government federally and 20,00 job losses, we would then need to make adjustments both on the land release side but also to our forward program for infrastructure and service delivery. So, yes, you would lose some revenue, but you also would not have to commit a certain level of expenditure as well.

Ultimately, the government's planning policies are around targeting more urban growth within the existing footprint of the city to ensure that we can get better economies of scale from our existing infrastructure, but we recognise that we need to be in the marketplace as far as standard residential in greenfield estates. If we are not providing those opportunities on this side of the ACT border, there will be plenty who will provide them on the other side of the border, and then we do not get the GST revenue and those residents, even though they use services in the territory, do not pay taxes to the territory government.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Treasurer, what is your contingency if land sales do not meet forecast projections?

MR BARR: I did obviously go to that in the context of my previous answer in that we have the capacity, of course, if we slow the land release program to slow the infrastructure and service program in those areas that will not go ahead on the same time frame. So we can make an adjustment to our infrastructure and recurrent programs accordingly. But I prefer to take the optimistic view, and I am sure Mr Wall would too, that the city will continue to grow, that we will continue to attract new residents from interstate and from overseas, as well as maintain our very strong natural population increase.

I think the other observation to make, and I am sure Mr Wall would agree as I understand that he is from a family of many generations in this city, is that as the city ages there are more people who retire here because they have family connections here. Our population used to move dramatically because people who came here for work

went back to where they came from when they finished work. That happens less in 2013 than it did 20 or 30 years ago.

Of course, people also used to retire to the south coast but I think it would be fair to say that the baby boomers have now acquired all of the cheap property on the south coast. In fact, the level of services, the health system, the amenity, the liveability of the city of Canberra continue to ensure that we retain people in their retirement years. This is a good thing for the territory economy. It is a good thing for Canberra families that they stay together, that there are many generations of Canberrans living in this city. It is a wonderful thing as we move into our second century that the city is establishing many generations in the same city. (*Time expired.*)

Energy—efficiency

MR GENTLEMAN: My question is to the Minister for Environment and Sustainable Development. Minister, you introduced the energy efficiency improvement scheme on 1 January this year, and you have previously spoken about its objectives in this Assembly. Can you please provide us with an update on how the scheme is progressing?

MR CORBELL: I thank Mr Gentleman for the question. I am pleased to confirm to the Assembly that the energy efficiency improvement scheme is now being rolled out across the ACT reaching thousands of Canberra homes, helping those Canberra families to save money on their electricity bills and also to save greenhouse gas emissions.

The energy efficiency improvement scheme requires electricity retailers to provide free or subsidised energy efficiency services to their customers. As a result of the success of schemes in other jurisdictions, the ACT has implemented this scheme. The scheme draws on the experience of jurisdictions like South Australia and Victoria. It is worth noting that in 2011 the Victorian Liberal government agreed to a doubling of the targets under its Victorian energy efficiency target scheme and also to expand its scheme to small and medium-size business enterprises.

When the scheme commenced in January this year ActewAGL launched a free energy efficiency program to provide ACT residents with energy-saving products. The uptake of this scheme is voluntary for Canberra households, but I am pleased to report that the uptake has been very impressive. The following activities have been undertaken already by the end of June this year by an estimated 10,000 Canberra households: some 5,300 installations of fixed sealing to doors to deal with drafts and prevent leakage from the home, 65,134 installations of a low energy general lighting lamps, 3,355 installations of standby power controllers for information technology such as computers, and over 12,000 installations of standby power controllers for audio-visual equipment.

What this highlights is that Canberrans are warmly embracing the opportunity to save electricity in their homes and to reduce their power bills as a result. It is estimated already that these measures have resulted in deemed abatement of over 78,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions. So these are very, very important savings, not just for

households in terms of their electricity bills but also in terms of achieving our greenhouse gas abatement targets.

The government will continue with this scheme. Indeed, I was pleased to announce on 1 July this year that we will be extending the benefits of this scheme to small and medium business enterprises. We want to make sure that the small shopkeepers of Canberra, the small business people of Canberra, also have an opportunity to reduce their electricity bills. As a result, we will be making sure that the scheme allows those businesses to install efficient space and water heating, lighting and standby power controllers so that they, too, can achieve savings in their businesses and help meet the pressures they face there.

These are very, very important reforms, reforms the government is very proud of, because it is achieving a twofold objective—saving households money on their electricity bills and reducing greenhouse gas emissions helping to achieve our greenhouse gas reduction targets. I encourage those on the other side of the house to rethink their opposition to this excellent scheme. I think the figures speak for themselves, and they should be endorsing the program that helps households save money on their electricity bills and also reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Mr Gentleman.

MR GENTLEMAN: Minister, does the EEIS apply to the ACT government? If not, what is the government doing in its own operations to lead by example in terms of energy efficiency and emissions reduction?

MR CORBELL: I thank Mr Gentleman for the supplementary. The EEIS does not apply to the ACT government. It is only applying to householders who are customers and small and medium businesses who are customers of electricity companies in the ACT. But the government has its own strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to demonstrate energy efficiency in its operations. The government has set out a strategic pathway to achieve greenhouse gas reduction targets, including in government operations. The government has agreed to the implementation of a carbon neutral ACT government framework. As part of that framework, a \$5 million carbon neutral government fund was established in the 2012-13 budget to assist ACT government directorates with this transition.

This fund makes loans available to ACT government agencies to implement energy efficiency initiatives. Savings generated through these initiatives repay the loan amounts lent to the agency from the central fund. Agencies are allowed to keep any additional savings over and above the repayment of the capital amount.

The first project funded under the fund was a \$1.7 million project coordinated by the ACT Property Group to implement energy efficiency lighting across 28 government facilities. A second round has seen five applications received for consideration. Other projects supported to date by this fund include \$138,000 to the TAMS directorate for an LED lighting retrofit at ACT libraries. This is estimated to reduce electricity use in ACT government libraries by 30 per cent. There is \$72,000 to the Education and Training Directorate for solar hot-water installation at the Erindale College and leisure

centre, \$1½ million again to Education for LED lighting upgrades at 10 government schools, and \$178,000 for the conversion of the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate's premises at Dickson to reduce electricity use by over 30 per cent.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary question, Ms Porter.

MS PORTER: Minister, how does the energy efficiency improvement scheme contribute to the government's overall plan to reduce the ACT's greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent by 2020?

MR CORBELL: Energy efficiency will make a very important contribution to achieving our greenhouse gas reduction targets. And I thank Ms Porter for her supplementary question. The government has a clear pathway set out in action plan 2 for the achievement of our greenhouse gas reduction strategy. In particular, the use of energy efficiency is a major component of AP2.

One of the easiest and most cost-effective ways for the territory to reduce its emissions and reduce ongoing exposure to rising electricity and gas prices is to improve energy efficiency and reduce energy use. And that is exactly where the energy efficiency improvement scheme comes in. We expect, over the life of the scheme, to achieve millions of tonnes of greenhouse gas abatement as a result of this scheme. And that is going to directly contribute to our capacity to meet our greenhouse reduction targets.

MADAM SPEAKER: Supplementary question, Mr Wall.

MR WALL: Minister, what measures are being employed to monitor the reduction of costs that households are experiencing on their electricity bills?

MR CORBELL: The savings anticipated were outlined in the regulatory impact statement released with the introduction of the scheme. The estimated saving per household is in the order of approximately \$300 off the average household bill over that three-year period of the scheme. That is a very significant saving to households.

The government now as part of its audit and compliance program in relation to the scheme will be looking at how measures are being installed into households and seeking further information from the retailers as to what impact that is having on electricity bills so as to verify the outcomes that we are anticipating.

We know, based on the modelling to date and based on the experience of other large jurisdictions such as Victoria and South Australia, that these savings are demonstrable and achievable and are occurring on the ground. That is good news for Canberra households. Saving money on their electricity bills and reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a win-win scenario and I encourage the Liberal opposition to reconsider their opposition to this scheme.

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

Personal explanation

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo): I seek leave to make a personal explanation under standing order 46.

MADAM SPEAKER: You claim to have been misrepresented, Mr Rattenbury?

MR RATTENBURY: I do.

MADAM SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

MR RATTENBURY: I believe I have been misrepresented by the Speaker in a response to supplementary question on notice No 224 to the inquiry into the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2013-14. In the response, the Speaker, Mrs Dunne, included, in an answer to a question about staff for Mr Wall's office also working in her office, this statement:

In the 7th Assembly Green members also pooled their staff. I was aware on a number of occasions of staff other than the then Speaker's personal staff assisting in his office.

I would like to clarify for members that staff employed by other Greens members in the Seventh Assembly were never involved in advising me on matters pertaining to my role as Speaker. Staff employed by other Greens MLAs in the Seventh Assembly never attended my briefings from the Clerk or other staff from the Office of the Legislative Assembly. Staff employed by other Greens MLAs never had access to my emails or incoming correspondence, and as such were never exposed to correspondence that related to my role as the Speaker.

Papers

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

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

No. 4/2013—National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness, dated 19 June 2013.

No. 5/2013—Bushfire Preparedness, dated 26 July 2013.

Executive contracts

Papers and statement by minister

MS GALLAGHER (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Health and Minister for Higher Education): For the information of members I present the following papers:

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

Long-term contracts:

Adrian Scott, undated.
Ann Goleby, dated 20 July 2012.
Anne Ellis, dated 29 April 2011.
Anthony Gill, dated 5 July 2013.
Catherine Jackson, undated.
Colm Mooney, dated 31 July 2013.
David Dutton, dated 11 June 2013.
David Nicol, dated 22 July 2013.
David Purser, dated 28 May 2013.
David Whitney, dated 31 May 2013.
Denise Lamb, dated 24 September 2012.
Diane Joseph, dated 7 September 2012.
Dorte Ekelund, dated 1 August 2013.
Elizabeth Chatham, dated 19 October 2012.
Elizabeth Trickett, dated 24 July 2011.
Grant Carey-Ide, dated 8 November 2012.
Jessica Ho, dated 1 June 2013.
Joanne Greenfield, dated 2 August 2013.
Jon Quiggin, dated 28 May 2013.
Judi Anne Childs, dated 16 December 2010.
Judianne Childs, dated 2 August 2013.
Katrina Bracher, dated 19 October 2012.
Leanne Cover, dated 13 July 2012.
Meg Brighton, dated 26 July 2013.
Michael Bateman, dated 10 February 2010.
Michael Kegel, dated 1 June 2013.
Natalie Howson, dated 31 July 2013.
Peter Murray, dated 1 June 2013.
Philip Ghirardello, dated 18 April 2012.
Philip Tardif, dated 23 October 2011.
Robert Barnes, dated 4 June 2013.
Rodney Bray, dated 1 August 2013.

Ronald Foster, dated 24 August 2011.
Rosemary O'Donnell, dated 19 October 2012.
Ross Burton, dated 1 June 2013.
Ross O'Donoghue, dated 19 April 2013.
Sarbjit Sidhu, dated 9 June 2013.
Stephen Gniel, dated 29 September and 14 October 2011.
Stephen Goggs, dated 2 August 2013.
Sue Chapman, dated 7 July 2013.
Tracy Stewart, dated 5 August 2013.

Short-term contracts:

Andrew Kefford, dated 1 and 6 May 2013.
Barbara Reid, dated 29 July 2013.
Benjamin Ponton, dated 20 December 2012 and 2 January 2013.
Brett Wilesmith, dated 15 July 2013.
Carolyn Grayson, dated 18 July 2013.
Catherine Fallon, dated 2 July 2013.
Cheryl Sizer, dated 7 June 2013.
David Collett, dated 2 July 2013.
David Pepper, dated 7 June 2013.
Elizabeth Beattie, dated 28 and 29 May 2013.
Elizabeth Renton, dated 16 April 2013.
Glenn Bain, dated 3 and 4 July 2013.
Graham Hambleton, dated 20 December 2012.
Grant Carey-Ide (2), undated.
Grant Doran, dated 12 November 2012.
Greg Corben, dated 24 and 27 June 2013.
Gregory Curtis, dated 2 July 2013.
Hamish McNulty, dated 1 July 2013.
Heather McKay, dated 21 September 2012.
Heather Tomlinson, dated 4 July 2013.
Jacinta George, dated 21 and 23 January 2013.
Jacinta George, dated 24 and 27 January 2012.
Jancye Winter, dated 17 January 2013.
Jeanette MacCullagh, dated 25 September and 10 October 2012.
Jeremy Roberts, dated 12 July 2013.

John Wynants, undated.
Joshua Rynehart, dated 3 June 2013.
Kaaren Blom, undated.
Karen Hansen, dated 24 and 25 July 2013.
Kellie Lang, dated 29 July 2013.
Kenneth Marshall, dated 25 June 2013.
Leanne Cover, dated 18 June 2013.
Leanne Cover, dated 4 and 6 June 2012.
Liliana Hays, dated 2 July 2013.
Linda Halliday, dated 3 September 2012.
Lisa Holmes, dated 31 July 2013.
Lisa Salerno, dated 28 June 2013.
Lisa Salerno, dated 4 July 2012.
Moira Crowhurst, dated 1 July and 9 July 2013.
Moira Crowhurst, dated 28 May and 3 June 2013.
Neil Bulless, dated 28 June 2013.
Nik Manikis, dated 8 November 2012.
Pam Davoren, dated 4 June 2013.
Richard Baumgart, dated 20 December 2012.
Robert Fraser, undated.
Robert Gotts, dated 20 June and 28 May 2012.
Sandra Georges, dated 1 and 5 July 2013.
Sandra Georges, dated 28 May 2013.
Savvas Pertsinidis, dated 25 and 29 July 2013.
Savvas Pertsinidis, dated 28 June 2013.
Sean McDonnell, dated 16 April 2013.
Sean Moysey, dated 19 and 27 June 2013.
Steven Wright, dated 4 July 2013.
Stewart Ellis, dated 1 July 2013.
Swee Sung, dated 12 and 17 April 2012.
Vanessa Little, 24 July 2013.

Contract variations:

Alison Playford, dated 5 and 6 June 2013.
Anita Hargreaves, dated 11 and 19 December 2012.
Bethan Mitchell, dated 3 September 2012.
Bethan Mitchell, dated 28 June and 8 July 2013.

Bronwen Overton-Clarke, dated 30 and 31 May 2013.
Christopher Reynolds, dated 20 and 22 March 2013.
Daniel Walters, dated 3 and 5 June 2013.
David Matthews, dated 4 and 13 July 2012.
Elizabeth Beattie, dated 28 and 29 May 2013.
Floyd Kennedy, dated 21 June 2013.
Francis Duggan, dated 30 May and 17 June 2013.
Glenn Bain, dated 30 May and 7 June 2013.
Gregory Corben, dated 22 and 23 July 2013.
Heidi Robinson, dated 15 July 2013.
Helen Pappas, dated 30 and 31 May 2013.
Jacinta George, dated 31 August 2012.
Jancye Winter, dated 31 January and 4 February 2013.
Jayne Johnston, dated 28 June and 1 August 2013.
Jeanette MacCullagh, dated 30 May and 3 June 2013.
Jillian Paull, dated 30 and 31 May 2013.
Kate Starick, dated 26 November 2012.
Leanne Cover, dated 3 and 5 July 2013.
Lyndall Kennedy, dated 15 June 2013.
Lyndall Kennedy, dated 25 and 30 July 2013.
Mark Collis, dated 23 July 2013.
Mark Whybrow, dated 28 June and 22 July 2013.
Maureen Sheehan, dated 21 and 30 May 2013.
Maureen Sheehan, dated 30 and 31 May 2013.
Megan Smithies, dated 9 and 12 November 2012.
Moirra Crowhurst, dated 28 and 30 May 2013.
Paul Wyles, dated 30 May 2013.
Peter Murray, dated 26 July 2013.
Russell Noud, dated 11 July 2013.
Sandra Kennedy, dated 4 and 5 July 2013.
Stephen Gniel, dated 28 June and 9 July 2013.
Thomas Gordon, dated 20 and 22 March 2013.
William Mudge, dated 21 and 28 August 2012—

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

Leave granted.

MS GALLAGHER: I present another set of executive contracts. These documents are tabled in accordance with sections 31A and 79 of the Public Sector Management Act, which require the tabling of all director-general and executive contracts and contract variations. Contracts were previously tabled on 4 June 2013. Today I present 41 long-term contracts, 57 short-term contracts, and 37 contract variations. The details of the contracts will be circulated to members.

For the information of members, during the winter recess I became aware that a number of contracts were, in my opinion, overdue for tabling. Although the Public Sector Management Act does not specify tabling time frames, I have reminded the Head of Service about ensuring that contracts are tabled in a timely way. I have asked for processes to be put in place to prevent delays from occurring in the future. By the end of this sitting fortnight, all overdue current contracts will be tabled.

Cost of living pressures—government response Paper and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services): For the information of members I present the following paper:

Cost of living pressures—Government response, pursuant to the resolution of the Assembly of 28 November 2012.

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

Leave granted.

MR BARR: Today I am tabling the government response to the Assembly resolution on cost of living pressures. The Assembly passed the cost of living pressures motion on 28 November last year. This resolution called on the government to note that the territory has many Canberrans experiencing real financial hardship, that the use of renewable energy and sustainable transport options will provide savings for Canberrans, and the benefits to Canberrans from tax reforms announced in the 2012-13 budget.

In response to this resolution the government was asked to report back to the Assembly on the issues raised. The government provides a range of targeted assistance measures and concessions to Canberrans to help them meet the everyday costs of living. In 2012 the government released the targeted assistance strategy. Of the 34 recommendations put forward in this strategy, 18 have already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented.

The government is committed to reducing Canberra's reliance on fossil fuels. The ACT has implemented the most ambitious greenhouse gas reduction targets of any jurisdiction in Australia. The Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act

2010 includes targets to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 40 per cent by 2020 and 80 per cent by 2050, based on 1990 levels.

In 2012 the government released the weathering the change action plan 2, which provides a strategic pathway for the ACT to achieve its 2020 emissions reduction target. The government remains committed to ensuring the long-term prosperity of the territory and all of its citizens, and today I am pleased to be able to table this report in the Assembly outlining all the measures the government has undertaken to help ease the cost of living for Canberrans. I commend the government response to the Assembly.

Financial Management Act—instruments Paper and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services): For the information of members I present the following paper:

Financial Management Act, pursuant to section 18A—Statement of authorisation of expenditure from the Treasurer’s Advance in 2012-2013.

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

Leave granted.

MR BARR: Section 18A(3) of the Financial Management Act 1996 requires that where I as Treasurer have authorised Treasurer’s advance expenditure under section 18 of the act, within three sitting days after the end of the financial year I must present to the Legislative Assembly a summary of the total expenditure authorised for that financial year.

The Appropriation Act 2012-2013 provided \$31.3 million for the Treasurer’s advance. The final expenditure against the Treasurer’s advance for 2012-13 was approximately \$21.8 million, leaving a balance of approximately \$10.3 million returned to the 2012-13 budget. This includes the Justice and Community Services Directorate and the Legal Aid Commission not utilising all of the Treasurer’s advance provided.

Mr Assistant Speaker, you will note that the majority of the authorisations were made towards the end of the financial year. This is very much in line with past practice. All requests for access to the advance are subject to final cash requirements and this is only able to be assessed close to the end of the financial year. Indeed, this is good, prudent financial management.

The government always looks to all other opportunities to manage cost pressures throughout the year in preference to providing funding from the Treasurer’s advance. The Treasurer’s advance is made available for urgent and unforeseen expenditure. In 2012-13 additional costs for agencies that were not foreseen at the time of the original 2012-13 budget included funding for the conversion of Parkwood farm from a cage to

barn egg production facility, increased costs relating to sports ground irrigation as a result of dry weather in 2012-13, the board of inquiry into the conviction of Mr Eastman, and support for the construction of the boundless children's playground.

I present this summary of expenditure and commend this paper to the Assembly.

Territory-owned Corporations Act—statements of corporate intent

Papers and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services): For the information of members I present the following papers:

Territory-owned Corporations Act, pursuant to subsection 19(3)—Statements of Corporate Intent—

ACTEW Corporation Ltd—2013-14 to 2016-17.

ACTTAB Limited—1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014.

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

Leave granted.

MR BARR: In accordance with subsection 19(3) of the Territory-owned Corporations Act, I hereby present the 2013-14 statements of corporate intent for ACTEW Corporation and ACTTAB. The statements of corporate intent outline the key commercial objectives, the main undertakings, business and corporate strategies as well as the financial outlook extending from the 2013-14 fiscal year and throughout the forward estimates period. The ACTEW and ACTTAB statements of corporate intent have been prepared according to the statutory time frames prescribed in the Territory-owned Corporations Act 1990, which must be tabled in the Assembly within 15 sitting days of being received by the voting shareholders.

It is relevant to note that this timing did not enable ACTEW to incorporate the financial impact of the ICRC's final pricing determination for water and wastewater services that was issued on 26 June 2013. As a consequence, ACTEW's statement that I am tabling today includes the financial forecasts identified in the 2013-14 budget papers which do not take into account the impacts of the recent price determination. ACTEW is not expected to be able to confirm the final pricing impact until late August 2013. This matter is highlighted on page 19 of ACTEW's statement of corporate intent, where it is noted that the financial measures are subject to material change once the ICRC's pricing impacts have been determined.

Therefore it is expected that ACTEW may need to submit a modified statement of corporate intent later in the year, as provided for under the Territory-owned Corporations Act. Section 21 of the act requires the modified statement of corporate intent to be prepared according to the same prescribed consultation process as the

original statement. This means that directors must consider any comments that are provided by the voting shareholders within one month of receiving the draft statement from ACTEW. The directors then have another month to finalise the modified statement, including consulting with the voting shareholders about any suggested changes that have been made. The final modified statement must then be tabled within 15 sitting days. This process suggests that the modified statement may not be tabled until the November sittings at the earliest.

In relation to ACTTAB, members will be aware that the government commissioned a feasibility study into future ownership options. It is expected that this report will be shortly considered by the government. The Assembly will be advised of the government's intentions with regard to the future of ACTTAB in due course. I do not expect at this point that ACTTAB will be required to provide a modified statement of corporate intent.

I commend both of these documents to the Assembly.

Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission— reports Papers and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services): For the information of members, I present the following papers:

Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission Act, pursuant to section 24—Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission—

Report 4 of 2012—Retail prices for franchise electricity customers 2012-14—Final report, dated 8 June 2012.

Report 5 of 2013—Regulated Water and Sewerage Services—Final report—1 July 2013 to 30 June 2019, dated 26 June 2013.

Report 6 of 2013—Regulated Water and Sewerage Services—Price direction—1 July 2013 to 30 June 2019.

I ask leave to make a statement in relation to report 4 of 2012 and report 5 of 2013.

Leave granted.

MR BARR: I present today to the Assembly two final reports of the ICRC. The Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission Act 1997 requires the referring authority for an investigation to present the Assembly with the final report of their investigations. As the referring authority for these investigations, I present the commission's final report and price direction for the provision of water and sewerage services in the territory from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2019 and the final report for retail prices for franchise electricity customers 2012 to 2014.

The final report and price direction for the provision of water and sewerage services from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2019 was the result, as I am sure members are aware, of an extensive investigation by the commission, which involved substantial consultation with the community, with ACTEW and with government. The commission has chosen to significantly revise their approach to the regulatory model for setting water and sewerage prices. The new model is based on a six-year regulatory period with biennial adjustments to allow for mid-term reconsideration of key underlying variables such as water consumption forecasts.

The commission has also concluded that in order to implement fully this new regulatory model and provide the appropriate return on equity to the community, a period of transition for prices is appropriate. This will ensure a smooth transition in prices for consumers. As we have discussed ad nauseam, Mr Assistant Speaker, this will see lower returns to government from ACTEW in the early years of the regulatory period, with returns increasing across the period as prices increase. The overall outcome of a decrease in 2013-14 of \$83 in water and sewerage bills for the average household consuming 200 kilolitres of water a year will provide cost of living relief to ACT families and is welcomed by the territory government.

Mr Assistant Speaker, the commission's final report for retail prices for franchise electricity customers 2012 to 2014 increased prices in 2012-13 by 17.74 per cent, again as we have discussed at length in this place. This, of course, is linked to the introduction of the national carbon price which was responsible for 80 per cent of that increase. The recent pricing adjustment by the commission for the 2013-14 fiscal year increased regulated prices by a much more modest 3.47 per cent, mainly due to increased network costs and the costs of the ACT energy efficiency improvement scheme. However, these increases were partially offset by a slight decrease in energy purchase costs.

I regret that the tabling of this report to the Assembly has been delayed. I do note, of course, that the pricing outcome was publically announced in 2012 and has been discussed on numerous occasions. In fact, I think it has been the subject of dozens of questions in the Assembly, in annual reports hearings, in estimates and the like. I commend these reports to the Assembly.

Cotter Dam—enlargement Paper and statement by minister

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services): I present the following paper, which was circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting:

Enlarged Cotter Dam Project—ACTEW Voting Shareholder Information—
Statement on the Enlarged Cotter Dam, dated 9 July 2013, pursuant to the
resolution of the Assembly of 21 March 2012.

I seek leave to make a statement on the paper.

Leave granted.

MR BARR: I am providing this statement this afternoon pursuant to the resolution passed by the Assembly back in March of last year concerning the enlarged Cotter Dam project. The resolution requires that the shareholders of the ACTEW Corporation provide to the Assembly any revised budget and schedule information for completion of the enlarged Cotter Dam project within five working days of any changes being approved by the ACTEW board.

The ACTEW board approved a revised completion date for the enlarged Cotter Dam on 4 July 2013. As the Assembly was not sitting within the stipulated five days, and in accordance with part 2(e) of the Assembly resolution, I provided the information in a letter addressed to Madam Speaker on 9 July 2013. I understand Madam Speaker may have been on leave at that time and the Deputy Speaker would have received the letter.

I now present to the Assembly a copy of that letter and the information statement. I thank members for taking note of the changes that have been presented this afternoon.

Papers

Mr Corbell presented the following papers:

Road Safety Report Card 2012, compiled by Justice Planning and Safety Programs, Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

National Classification Code—Amendments, dated 11 September 2012.

Classification of Computer Games—Guidelines 2012, dated 11 September 2012.

Classification of Films—Guidelines 2012, dated 10 December 2012.

Getting home safely report Ministerial statement

MR CORBELL (Molonglo—Attorney-General, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations and Minister for the Environment and Sustainable Development) (4.08), by leave: When I announced the government response to the *Getting home safely* report, I committed the government to providing six-monthly updates on the implementation of its recommendations. This is the first of those updates. Before I proceed, recently we saw the 12-month anniversary of the death of Mr Ben Catanzariti. The service that was held in his memory was just another stark reminder of the tragedy of workplace deaths and serious injuries and the impact those incidents have not just on the workers themselves and their families, but on the broader community.

However, despite all of this—the government’s acceptance of the report *Getting home safely*, all of the associated publicity, all the information sessions provided by the Work Safety Commissioner—I am concerned to see that some in the construction sector still believe that it is okay to put people’s lives in danger.

I am sure that members of the Assembly would have been disappointed to see the recent reporting in the *Canberra Times* showing photos of a company engaging in unsafe scaffolding practices. The photos published were nothing short of frightening. This article, published on 17 July, also reported two additional work safety issues involving dangerous scaffolding practices, one which resulted in the loss of power to over 600 Canberra homes. Such blatant disregard for safety is simply unacceptable.

As I said when I tabled the government's response, the construction sector must change. If this is an example of the ongoing attitude of some in the industry, then it is simply not good enough. Attitudes must change and everyone in the construction industry must put safety first. What is also important is the need to encourage and empower workers to stand up for their rights when it comes to safety. Workers need to speak up when they are confronted by what is clearly a significant safety risk.

As the Assembly would be aware, the government has accepted all of the 28 recommendations. The government has committed to lead by example, and in returning to the implementation of the recommendations, the government, I am pleased to report, is well advanced in the areas where we have direct responsibility.

As the Assembly knows, the Magistrates Court (Industrial Proceedings) Amendment Bill will shortly be presented to this place. I look forward to tri-partisan support for this bill as it is a key measure to strengthen the capacity of our courts to focus on industrial and workplace health and safety issues.

In the most recent budget the government allocated \$5.7 million over four years to strengthen workplace safety in the territory through the engagement of an additional 12 WorkSafe ACT inspectors, including a dedicated legal capability. Subject to the passage of the Appropriation Bill in this session, which I am sure will be supported by the opposition, WorkSafe ACT will be able to recruit these new inspectors and legal staff. We expect that up to seven will be engaged from around September this year, with the remaining staff likely to be engaged from the beginning of March.

As of 1 July this year an additional 10 on-the-spot fines have been established and work is progressing on introducing more. Combined with the additional inspectors, this demonstrates the government's commitment to improving safety outcomes in the construction sector. As members would be aware, improvements in safety will not only come from compliance. They will also come from engagement with and support to the industry. The government strongly believes that one of the best ways to improve workplace safety is through the active engagement of those who work in the construction sector—building workers.

The Office of Regulatory Services has recently revised and republished the *ACT building and construction industry safety handbook* with the assistance of a consultative group comprising key industry stakeholders. The completed web version went live on the WorkSafe ACT website in May this year. The government is also pressing ahead with its information and education campaigns. In April this year, WorkSafe ACT launched an ongoing campaign, "Speak up about safety", encouraging workers and supervisors in ACT workplaces to actively engage in

discussions about safety. While this is one of the responses to the *Getting home safely* report, it is an important message for all workplaces in all industries: speaking up may just save a life.

The Work Safety Commissioner has a rolling seminar program in place that will focus on key safety issues and key employer responsibilities. The commissioner has also recently run a three-day seminar on safety in the construction industry which was attended by representatives from all over Australia. I was pleased to see the commissioner was successful in securing a presentation from Baroness Rita Donaghy who authored a report similar to *Getting home safely* in the United Kingdom. Her report *One death is too many* was a catalyst for reforms in safety in that country's workplace safety arrangements.

I am pleased to report that we have seen increased collaboration between the government's directorates and the focus they are placing on safety. In March this year WorkSafe ACT and the construction services branch of the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate formalised an information exchange on information that impacts on safety.

Both directorates are now working together on providing education and advice to the construction industry and recently held a joint seminar on the supervision of apprentices on construction sites. There will be more of this type of activity to come. These two areas of government are now working on joint inspection and investigation activities that will run through to December, with the plan of implementing joint delegations when it comes to certain enforcement actions in the fourth quarter of 2013-14.

The territory is also developing a suite of strategies to manage work health and safety in the construction works commissioned by the government itself. The Commerce and Works Directorate has implemented its active certification model, which applies to select ACT government construction projects with project values at or exceeding a quarter of a million dollars where pre-qualified contractors are engaged.

The industry information session to introduce the model has seen a strong level of participation, with over 100 participants attending that session. Complementing this is a weighted assistance criterion that emphasises safety as the key criterion when the government is considering tenders for government construction projects. The message is clear, Mr Assistant Speaker: if a construction company wants to do business with the ACT government, then it must put safety at the forefront of its procedures. If this proves to be too hard, those companies can look for work elsewhere.

The government is also well aware of its responsibilities. All directorates have due diligence responsibilities to ensure that they have procedures in place as far as is reasonably practical for all government construction contracts to be carried out safely. Directorates will shortly finalise a whole-of-government approach to managing work health and safety in construction projects.

The Economic Development Directorate and the Land Development Agency have developed and are implementing interim guidelines which are now being finalised by

the Chief Minister and Treasury Directorate for whole-of-government use. The guidelines set out the expectations for the territory's management of work health and safety and construction works. All territory entities will use these guidelines as the basis to further build a safety culture in its construction projects. In addition, the Chief Minister and Treasury Directorate has developed a project safety management system. This practical business system will assist public servants in the day-to-day management of works where the territory is principal contractor or the works are of a low value.

There is still, however, further work to be done. The Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate will shortly release a discussion paper on the regulation of the engineering profession and other people involved in the design and certification of building and building services. Consultation will focus on a best-practice model for providing accountability of those practitioners for the quality and compliance of their work.

It is important to ensure that persons providing such critical advice clearly have the skills and expertise to do so. Regulation is broader than simply requiring practitioners to hold a particular qualification or an accreditation given by practitioner associations. It needs to include systems for auditing and responding to non-compliance, management of the ongoing education of practitioners, and the defining of the different scopes of work and associated responsibilities for each type of work.

Following the release of this discussion paper and its public consultation phase, I anticipate new legislation to regulate the engineering profession will be introduced during the first half of 2014. The Education and Training Directorate is considering options for the building and construction training fund to deliver the most effective training possible for the industry, and I expect to be in a position to advise the Assembly further on this soon.

As I have previously indicated when the government tabled its response to the *Getting home safely* report, safety on construction sites is not just a matter for government. It requires commitment from industry and from key peak bodies—from employers and employees; from unions; from all engaged in the business of safety. While I am pleased with the cooperation shown through the Construction Safety Advisory Committee established by the ACT Work Safety Council, we still need to continue to build on our commitment to safety.

I emphasise the importance of industry leading by example. There are many in the construction sector who do the right thing, who are committed to the safety of their employees and to best practice on their building sites. But the construction industry is more than just builders and construction companies. There are a range of kindred industries, from electricians to plumbers to formwork workers to cabinet-makers and kitchen companies. They all need to be engaged in making sure they work in a safe environment and focus on safety.

The government will continue to work with these groups to ensure that they are working together, and I will continue to provide the Assembly with six-monthly updates on the implementation of the *Getting home safely* recommendations.

Papers

Mr Corbell presented the following papers:

Subordinate legislation (including explanatory statements unless otherwise stated)

Legislation Act, pursuant to section 64—

ACT Teacher Quality Institute Act—ACT Teacher Quality Institute (Certification Fee) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-81 (LR, 30 May 2013).

Agents Act—Agents (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-100 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Agents Act, Associations Incorporation Act, Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, Business Names Registration (Transition to Commonwealth) Act, Civil Law (Wrongs) Act, Civil Unions Act, Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) Act, Cooperatives Act, Court Procedures Act, Dangerous Substances Act, Emergencies Act, Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Industry) Act, Firearms Act, Freedom of Information Act, Guardianship and Management of Property Act, Hawkers Act, Land Titles Act, Liquor Act, Machinery Act, Partnership Act, Pawnbrokers Act, Prostitution Act, Public Trustee Act, Registration of Deeds Act, Sale of Motor Vehicles Act, Scaffolding and Lifts Act, Second-hand Dealers Act, Security Industry Act, Unit Titles (Management) Act, Workers Compensation Act, Work Health and Safety Act—Attorney General (Fees) Revocation 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-132 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Animal Diseases Act—Animal Diseases (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-75 (LR, 27 May 2013).

Animal Welfare Act—

Animal Welfare (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-64 (LR, 20 May 2013).

Animal Welfare (Humane Shooting of Kangaroos and Wallabies) Code of Practice 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-95 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Architects Act—

Architects (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-147 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Architects Board Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-135 (LR, 12 June 2013).

Associations Incorporation Act—

Associations Incorporation (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-101 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Associations Incorporation Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-15 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act—Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-102 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Building Act—Building (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-148 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Building and Construction Industry Training Levy Act and Financial Management Act—

Building and Construction Industry Training Levy (Governing Board) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-136 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Building and Construction Industry Training Levy (Governing Board) Appointment 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-137 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Building and Construction Industry Training Levy (Governing Board) Appointment 2013 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-138 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Building and Construction Industry Training Levy (Governing Board) Appointment 2013 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-139 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Business Names Registration (Transition to Commonwealth) Act—Business Names Registration (Transition to Commonwealth) (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-131 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Casino Control Act—Casino Control (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-140 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Cemeteries and Crematoria Act—Cemeteries and Crematoria (Public Cemetery Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-165 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Children and Young People Act—Children and Young People (Death Review Committee) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-94 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Civil Law (Wrongs) Act—

Civil Law (Wrongs) (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-103 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Civil Law (Wrongs) Bar Association of Queensland Scheme 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-146 (LR, 24 June 2013).

Civil Law (Wrongs) Professional Standards Council Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-80 (LR, 30 May 2013).

Civil Unions Act—Civil Unions (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-104 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) Act—Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) (Enforcement) (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-105 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act—Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Measurement Method) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-76 (LR, 27 May 2013).

Clinical Waste Act—Clinical Waste (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-149 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Community Title Act—Community Title (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-150 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Construction Occupations (Licensing) Act—Construction Occupations Licensing (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-151 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Cooperatives Act—Cooperatives (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-106 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Court Procedures Act—

Court Procedures (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-107 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Court Procedures Amendment Rules 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-18 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Crimes (Sentencing) Act—Crimes (Sentencing) Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-16 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Dangerous Substances Act—Dangerous Substances (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-108 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Domestic Animals Act—Domestic Animals (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-65 (LR, 20 May 2013).

Duties Act—Duties (Stock Exchanges) Declaration 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-183 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Education Act—

Education (Government Schools Education Council) Appointment 2013 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-188 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Education (Government Schools Education Council) Appointment 2013 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-189 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Education (Government Schools Education Council) Appointment 2013 (No 5)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-190 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Education (Government Schools Education Council) Appointment 2013 (No 6)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-191 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Electoral Act—

Electoral (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-133 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Electoral Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-13 (LR, 12 June 2013).

Electricity Safety Act—Electricity Safety (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-152 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Emergencies Act—Emergencies (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-109 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Environment Protection Act—Environment Protection (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-153 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Exhibition Park Corporation Act and Financial Management Act—Exhibition Park Corporation (Governing Board) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-74 (LR, 27 May 2013).

Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Industry) Act—Fair Trading (Motor Vehicle Repair Industry) (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-110 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Firearms Act—Firearms (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-111 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Fisheries Act—Fisheries (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-154 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Freedom of Information Act—Freedom of Information (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-112 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Gaming Machine Act—Gaming Machine (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-141 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Gas Safety Act—Gas Safety (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-155 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Government Procurement Act—Government Procurement (Non-public Employee Member) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-195 (LR, 11 July 2013).

Guardianship and Management of Property Act—Guardianship and Management of Property (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-113 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Hawkers Act—Hawkers (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-114 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Health Act—

Health (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-93 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Health (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-166 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Heritage Act—

Heritage (Council Member) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-96 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Heritage (Council Member) Appointment 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-97 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Heritage (Council Member) Appointment 2013 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-98 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Heritage (Council Member) Appointment 2013 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-99 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Heritage (Register Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-156 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission Act—Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission (Regulated Water and Sewerage Services) Terms of Reference Amendment Determination 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-134 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Juries Act—Juries (Payment) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-171 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Land Rent Act—Land Rent (Certificate Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-182 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Land Tax Act—Land Tax (Certificate and Statement Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-181 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Land Titles Act—Land Titles (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-115 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Legislative Assembly (Members' Staff) Act—

Legislative Assembly (Members' Staff) Members' Salary Cap Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-185 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Legislative Assembly (Members' Staff) Speaker's Salary Cap Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-186 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Liquor Act—Liquor (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-116 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Lotteries Act—Lotteries (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-164 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Machinery Act—Machinery (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-118 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Magistrates Court Act—

Magistrates Court (Public Unleased Land Infringement Notices) Regulation 2013—Subordinate Law SL2013-17 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Magistrates Court (Work Health and Safety Infringement Notices) Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-12 (LR, 13 June 2013).

Mental Health (Treatment and Care) Act—Mental Health (Treatment and Care) (Official Visitors) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-84 (LR, 3 June 2013).

Nature Conservation Act—Nature Conservation (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-157 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Partnership Act—Partnership (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-119 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Pawnbrokers Act—Pawnbrokers (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-120 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Planning and Development Act—Planning and Development (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-158 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Planning and Development Act and Financial Management Act—

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-89 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-90 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2013 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-91 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Planning and Development (Land Agency Board) Appointment 2013 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-92 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Prostitution Act—Prostitution (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-121 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Public Baths and Public Bathing Act—Public Baths and Public Bathing (Active Leisure Centre Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-193 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Public Place Names Act—

Public Place Names (Gungahlin District) Amendment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-184 (LR, 4 July 2013).

Public Place Names (Molonglo Valley and Stromlo Districts) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-196 (LR, 11 July 2013).

Public Place Names (Weston) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-79 (LR, 30 May 2013).

Public Sector Management Act—Public Sector Management (Executive Employee Conditions of Employment) Amendment Standards 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-187 (LR, 5 July 2013).

Public Trustee Act—Public Trustee (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-122 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Public Unleased Land Act—

Public Unleased Land (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-145 (LR, 24 June 2013).

Public Unleased Land (Movable Signs) Code of Practice 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-144 (LR, 24 June 2013).

Race and Sports Bookmaking Act—

Race and Sports Bookmaking (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-142 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Race and Sports Bookmaking (Sports Bookmaking Venues) Determination 2013 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-143 (LR, 24 June 2013).

Rates Act—

Rates (Certificate and Statement Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-180 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Rates (Deferral) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-82 (LR, 3 June 2013).

Registration of Deeds Act—Registration of Deeds (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-123 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Retirement Villages Act—Retirement Villages (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-124 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Road Transport (Driver Licensing) Act and Road Transport (General) Act—Road Transport Legislation Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-11 (LR, 23 May 2013).

Road Transport (General) Act—

Road Transport (General) (Demerit Point Suspension Notice) Exemption Declaration 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-197 (LR, 9 July 2013).

Road Transport (General) Concession Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-169 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Road Transport (Offences) Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2013-19 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Road Transport (General) Act, Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Act and Road Transport (Vehicle Registration) Act—Road Transport Legislation Amendment Regulation 2013 (No 2)—Subordinate Law SL2013-14 (LR, 17 June 2013).

Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Act—

Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Maximum Fares for Taxi Services Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-77 (LR, 30 May 2013).

Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Maximum Fares for Taxi Services Determination 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-170 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Regular Route Services Maximum Fares Determination 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-168 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Regulation—Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) (Minimum Service Standards for Hire Car Services (other than Restricted Hire Car Services)) Approval 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-83 (LR, 3 June 2013).

Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Regulation—Road Transport (Safety and Traffic Management) Parking Authority Declaration 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-78 (LR, 28 May 2013).

Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Act—Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Early Payment Guidelines 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-88 (LR, 6 June 2013).

Sale of Motor Vehicles Act—Sale of Motor Vehicles (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-125 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Scaffolding and Lifts Act—Scaffolding and Lifts (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-117 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Second-hand Dealers Act—Second-hand Dealers (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-126 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Security Industry Act—Security Industry (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-127 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Stock Act—

Stock (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-67 (LR, 20 May 2013).

Stock (Levy) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-68 (LR, 20 May 2013).

Surveyors Act—Surveyors (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-159 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Taxation Administration Act—

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Duty) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-87 (LR, 4 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Duty) Determination 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-174 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Eligibility—New and Substantially Renovated Homes and Land only—Home Buyer Concession Scheme) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-86 (LR, 4 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Land Rent) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-179 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Thresholds—Home Buyer Concession Scheme) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-85 (LR, 4 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Thresholds—Pensioner Duty Concession Scheme) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-173 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Land Tax) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-178 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Rates) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-175 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Rates—Fire and Emergency Services Levy) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-177 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Taxation Administration (Rates—Rebate Cap) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-176 (LR, 28 June 2013).

Training and Tertiary Education Act—

Training and Tertiary Education (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-192 (LR, 8 July 2013).

Training and Tertiary Education (National Code of Good Practice for Australian Apprenticeships) Approval 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-167 (without explanatory statement) (LR, 1 July 2013).

Tree Protection Act—

Tree Protection (Advisory Panel) Appointment 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-163 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Tree Protection (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-69 (LR, 20 May 2013).

Unit Titles (Management) Act—Unit Titles (Management) (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-128 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Unit Titles Act—Unit Titles (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-160 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Utilities Act—

Utilities (Electricity Network Boundary Code) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-71 (LR, 27 May 2013).

Utilities (Gas Network Boundary Code) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-72 (LR, 27 May 2013).

Utilities (Gas Service and Installation Rules Code) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-172 (LR, 1 July 2013).

Utilities (Water and Sewerage Network Boundary Code) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-73 (LR, 27 May 2013).

Waste Minimisation Act—Waste Minimisation (Landfill Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-66 (LR, 20 May 2013).

Water and Sewerage Act—Water and Sewerage (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-161 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Water Resources Act—

Water Resources (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-162 (LR, 27 June 2013).

Water Resources (Fees) Determination 2013 (No 3)—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-198 (LR, 11 July 2013).

Work Health and Safety Act—Work Health and Safety (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-129 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Workers Compensation Act—Workers Compensation (Fees) Determination 2013—Disallowable Instrument DI2013-130 (LR, 11 June 2013).

Petition out-of-order

Petition which does not conform with the standing orders—ACT Pathology collection centres—Closures—Ms Gallagher (86 signatures).

Ms Burch presented the following papers:

Education Act, pursuant to section 118A—Non-Government Schools Education Council—

Brindabella Christian College Additional Campus—Advice.

Existing processes relating to in-principle approval and registration of non-government schools in the ACT—

Advice of 16 July 2013.

Advice of 27 July 2013.

Cultural Facilities Corporation Act, pursuant to subsection 15(2)—Cultural Facilities Corporation—Quarterly report 2012-2013—Third quarter (1 January to 31 March 2013).

Philanthropy

Discussion of matter of public importance

MR ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Mr Doszpot): Madam Speaker has received letters from Ms Berry, Dr Bourke, Mr Coe, Mr Doszpot, Mr Gentleman, Mrs Jones, Ms Porter, Mr Smyth and Mr Wall proposing that matters of public importance be submitted to the Assembly. In accordance with standing order 79, Madam Speaker has determined that the matter proposed by Mr Gentleman be submitted to the Assembly, namely:

The importance of philanthropy in Canberra, new models and new partnerships.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella) (4.21): It is a pleasure to rise today to speak on this important topic: the importance of philanthropy in Canberra, new models and new partnerships. Of course, philanthropy has a long history in the ACT, and as we celebrate our centenary it is worthwhile reflecting on our history of generosity. Since its early days, Canberrans have contributed their time, money and resources to the community. And every member of this Assembly has the opportunity to appreciate the high level of generosity in our city by meeting constituents, local businesses and community organisations that have contributed to and benefited from philanthropy. Indeed, I am certain every member of this Assembly has also contributed philanthropically to our community.

I would like to touch on some of the philanthropic projects and initiatives underway in Canberra. And there are a number of examples in Canberra of successful philanthropic projects, such as the boundless playground, the Canberra Hospital Foundation, hands across Canberra and, just across the border, HOME in Queanbeyan.

Boundless Canberra is the ACT's first all-abilities playground. It is currently being built on the shore of Lake Burley Griffin and will be a place where children, young people and their families can play, socialise, be challenged and have lots of fun. Boundless is a grassroots philanthropic movement involving the whole community. The ACT and the Australian government public services are pledging time and money to make this playground their gift to the Canberra community for 2013. This is supported by in-kind contributions from the ACT private sector.

There is a commitment to social inclusion throughout the whole project. It will also feature a kiosk to be run as part of that social enterprise. This project is a demonstration of the strength of our local community and the ACT's largest single workforce working together to build a lasting legacy for Canberra.

Hands across Canberra is another innovative ACT project. It is a broadly based collaboration between business, community and government, which is all about giving locally for local projects. The Hands across Canberra Foundation provides grants to community organisations for projects that will help increase their capacity to do their good work. The Hands across Canberra Foundation provides a simple and cost-effective way for people to become involved in philanthropic activity in Canberra. The foundation is actively building its philanthropic funds to be able to support more local community organisations in the future, particularly those that find it difficult to attract government or other funding.

I just want to go to why the Hands across Canberra Foundation was formed. A new approach to philanthropic needs, or giving, is emerging and is seeing a greater focus on issues in areas where we actually live. The foundation found that significant need right here in Canberra. The ACT is generally perceived as a relatively well-off community but the extent of the real but hard-to-find need is not really appreciated. And, of course, this group, Hands across Canberra, has acted right here in our local community last year.

Hands across Canberra donated a grant to local, not-for-profit No Sweat Fashions to help the local manufacturing and sewing studio get off the ground. Ten months on and the organisation has thrived, culminating in the launch of their first project, which was just last month. Hands across Canberra supported No Sweat at the time and No Sweat says that if they had not received the grant from Hands across Canberra, without any money they would not have been able to get going. They have been given some amazing donations of sewing equipment from local people in the community. It did not all work but they did not know that at the time of the donation.

No Sweat Fashions is a local, not-for-profit, small-scale manufacturing and sewing studio that aims to create long-term social change by training and supporting migrants and refugees. The workshop provides training and work experience and facilitates community engagement to counteract the barriers to further employment and education. You can see how some local philanthropy can actually go to increasing opportunities for those coming to the ACT.

The Canberra Hospital Foundation was launched in 2011, beginning life as the charitable arm of the Canberra Hospital in 2008, and is the hospital's principal fundraising body. As the largest public hospital in the region supporting a population of almost 540,000, the Canberra Hospital is a vital piece of public infrastructure for our community and our region. The foundation helps the hospital by raising funds for equipment to support research and to enhance facilities for overall patient and family-centred care. Importantly, 100 per cent of all funds raised by the foundation stay right here in Canberra.

Around Australia we can also look at what has been happening in other jurisdictions. For example, the Victorian government has recently undergone a human services sector reform project which found there was considerable interest in attracting and facilitating additional sources of funding to the community sector beyond government contracts and philanthropic donations.

In Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, the not-for-profit organisation United Way Australia is acting as a social change agent to bring community, government and corporate organisations together to build on their individual capacities for a greater collective impact. United Way Australia builds partnerships between three sectors by tapping into volunteers' personal and professional skills.

In South Australia, the Office for Volunteers coordinates the Premier's business awards. Not-for-profit organisations nominate business leaders in corporate responsibility for the Premier's business award for corporate social responsibility. In 2013, this was won by a legal firm; in 2012, by a credit union. Also in South Australia, the Office for Volunteers' community voices program partners community groups with students from Flinders University to produce short documentaries or television commercials for volunteer recruitment and community organisations. The films can then be screened on television, online, used for public presentations and in other creative ways to help an organisation achieve its goals.

As these examples demonstrate, there is significant opportunity for innovation in how each sector can bring their skills and resources together for community benefit. The cultural and community environment in Canberra is one of huge complexity and change. There is not a single model that works for everyone. And the community sector is changing, not least with the advent of DisabilityCare which will put purchasing power in the hands of clients rather than service providers. DisabilityCare will generate new models and new ways of delivering important social services. And there are other new models emerging, including social enterprises and microfinance. Social enterprises are enterprises that trade for profit to improve social outcomes.

Disability ACT is supporting three demonstrational social enterprises, MULCH, the Branch Out Cafe and Paperworks. MULCH, run by Marymead, is a horticultural enterprise to provide skills development and social engagements to young adults with a disability when they leave school. The Branch Out Cafe, run by Carers ACT, provides an opportunity for up to six young adult school leavers with a disability to gain confidence and learn skills with a view to gaining employment in hospitality. Paperworks is in its third year, providing opportunities for people with a disability to work in a socially inclusive environment in the production of handmade paper products for sale.

Microcredit is another funding model used here in the ACT, and the ACT women's microcredit program, brilliant ideas, is administered by the Lighthouse Business Innovation Centre and provides ACT women on low incomes with access to interest-free loans of up to \$3,000 to help them establish or further develop a business. The ACT government funded the initial implementation of the program. As at 30 June this year, 39 loans had been approved since it began.

The 2013-14 budget provides an additional \$420,000 over four years for microcredit for disadvantaged Canberrans to establish or expand a small business activity. And the ACT government is seeking to expand the program to include migrants, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, young people, women and lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender and intersex people.

Members will be familiar with the many and varied celebrations and events taking place in 2013 to mark our centenary. The impressive program of events would simply not be possible without support from a huge range of organisations—the ACT government, the Australian government, ActewAGL, the Commonwealth Bank, Capital Chemist, Deloitte, the NRMA, Canberra CBD Ltd, contentgroup, SBS, ABC, the *Canberra Times* and many more.

Specific philanthropic support has been provided in a number of centenary arts projects, and this support has been vital for those projects. That includes the Sidney Myer Fund support for one river, a project connecting Canberra to communities in the Murray-Darling Basin and the Yulgibar Foundation support for the catalogue of dreams, an original theatre work about the experience of young Canberrans in the justice and welfare systems. The foundation is also supporting the scentenary garden to benefit mental health patients at Calvary. The Thyne Reid Foundation supported *Hipbone Sticking Out*, at the Canberra Theatre, a highlight of the centenary's Indigenous cultural program.

There has also been a lot of business support for philanthropy here in the ACT and it is important to recognise that businesses are already seeing the value of philanthropy. Influential former head of the Australian public service, Dr Peter Shergold, has spoken on how corporate giving has changed over a generation in the quietest of revolutions. Back in 2010, he noted that there was an increasing recognition that financial benefits can accrue from working with the community. Many companies have reported that employee recruitment and morale improvement have been achieved when they engage in community-based activities that are benchmarked and reported upon. But that is not all. In a world in which ethical consumers and socially responsible investors are flexing their muscles, reputational advantage has increasing value.

There are many examples of the business community's strong philanthropic tradition. While larger organisations often have sophisticated philanthropic programs in place, often there is willingness to give amongst smaller organisations but an uncertainty about how to go about that.

In the ACT last month, the Deputy Chief Minister participated in the future for philanthropic partnerships forum which discussed a growing interest in the collaboration across sectors for philanthropic purposes. I look forward to hearing from the Deputy Chief Minister on this conversation.

Colleagues, in the 20th century philanthropy was often seen as the domain of wealthy individuals and large corporations, usually in America rather than in Australia. But philanthropy is now recognised as an activity we can all encourage and can all take part in. There is a growing recognition that we can all give back to our communities in different ways. And there is a growing recognition that giving our time and skills to an organisation or individual in need would not only improve their situation but also make us feel more connected to our own community.

Philanthropy is not about replacing government funding with private support. Rather, it is about combining the best of philanthropic support with the best of government support. I look forward to continuing to work with my Assembly colleagues, the community and the private sector to support and facilitate philanthropic giving in Canberra.

MR DOSZPOT (Molonglo) (4.36): I welcome the opportunity to speak on this matter, as we believe here in Canberra we have some outstanding organisations, but more importantly some outstanding individuals and businesses who every day of their lives, in big and small ways, make a difference to someone else through their generosity. Mr Gentleman has covered a number of people and organisations in Canberra, but it would be remiss of me if I did not, on behalf of the Canberra Liberals, add our voice in support of these and also some additional ones and acknowledge the work that they do.

Canberra's historical, cultural and scientific life is enriched by longstanding and major philanthropy to the national institutions—the National Gallery, the Australian War Memorial, the National Library, the National Portrait Gallery and Questacon, just to name a few. While these are bequeaths and donations to the nation, Canberra and Canberrans are immediate beneficiaries.

In its 2008 review of philanthropy in the ACT, the Department of Disability, Housing and Community Services highlighted that one of the many distinguishing features of Australian philanthropy is its secretiveness. Many individuals or companies who make gifts do not like their generosity to be known, and they do not for a number of reasons. While it is difficult to assess accurately the level of giving by and to people in any given state, the general rule of thumb is that it is in direct proportion to the number of businesses. On that basis one could assume—and indeed the 2008 review did—that, as Canberra has less businesses located here than other states, our non-profit organisations may be disadvantaged in terms of accessing funds from their local business community.

However, my own personal experience would suggest that it is not the case, and I will take you through some outstanding examples. At the individual level, we know that Canberra has a big heart when it comes to people donating their time to worthy causes. In fact Canberra has among the highest percentage of its population who volunteer their time—people who surveys show work full time and have the usual pressures of family and mortgages and are very time-poor, but who still want to do their bit to help someone less fortunate.

We have many people who support the 65 roses fundraising for those with cystic fibrosis, and who buy daffodils and stage morning teas for cancer. The Canberra Cancerians Committee is renowned as being one of the most successful fundraising groups for cancer research. The “high hat” ladies raise serious money for various schools. There are people who buy red noses for SIDS and Kids, cupcakes for the RSPCA and wear jeans and buy badges on Jeans for Genes Day.

We all know someone who does some form of volunteering. In my trips around schools, I see a number of parents and grandparents who give up their time to help in

the classroom as readers, who work in the school canteen, who help in school gardens, or who make cakes for special morning teas and other fundraising activities.

Every Saturday morning, in every Canberra shopping centre, you will see a stall of some form or another, raising funds for a local worthwhile cause. We have knitters who make beanies for babies in neonatal wards, we have people who collect used stamps to raise funds for church groups and we have others who work in Vinnies or Salvation Army stores each week, for no more than friendship and a feeling of giving something back to their community. I know we have volunteers who give their time on a regular basis to walk a dog at the RSPCA shelter, or to clean a kennel.

We have people who participate in the Cancer Council Relay for Life, as Jeremy Hanson has done for the past two years. There are those who participate in the CEO sleepout or doorknock for St Vincent de Paul, as Zed Seselja has done, and there are those who volunteer to work at 1RPH by utilising their skills as volunteer readers. Hundreds of volunteers during the week do this. As well as reading there are hosts, producers and other volunteering works that are associated with 1RPH. These readings are done on week days, every week day, and on the weekends. Major newspapers are read and they provide information to the many people in our community who are print handicapped. I know many of us here from the Legislative Assembly who have done so over the past four years, and some who still continue to do so.

When it comes to more formal philanthropic organisations, there are several unique to Canberra, founded by Canberrans and doing outstanding work that makes a difference to thousands of people. The Capital Region Community Foundation—GreaterGood—is Canberra and the region's only public charitable foundation, established with the support of the Public Trustee for the ACT. Through GreaterGood, you can start your own named charitable fund, with ease and at low cost, to produce perpetual income for your charitable causes. GreaterGood are not a charity; they are a charitable fund. Their aim is to link good people with good causes. They currently have over \$11 million in 63 individual funds and they distribute approximately \$1.9 million each year.

Among our private benefactors, the Snow Foundation does endless amounts of good work. The Snow Foundation is the creation of two brothers, Terry and George, who established their foundation in 1991 to benefit the disadvantaged community in Canberra and the surrounding district. Its aim is to help those individuals and organisations that freely give their time to help the less fortunate to live fulfilling lives.

Over the years the foundation has assisted in a wide range of areas, such as the purchase of equipment and supplies for people with disabilities—kitchen utensils for the blind, wigs for the Cancer Council, breakfasts and educational scholarships for disadvantaged youth, and art supplies for the painting with Parkinsons programs. In 21 years the Snow Foundation has assisted more than 190 different organisations and provided over \$4.3 million in funding.

Earlier this year Mr Terry Snow decided he wanted to give back to his old school, where he and his brothers were educated and where their children and grandchildren

were enrolled. They gave \$8 million to Canberra Grammar School for a centre for education in the Asian century . This was a generous gift to Canberra, not just to the school. So I was frankly appalled when members of the ACT Education Union criticised the gift in the media. Given the level of philanthropy by this family, where they choose to donate their funds is entirely their business. I was therefore pleased to see that other members of the public shared my views and said so publicly.

Another group worthy of mention is the Capital Chemist group. Each year the Capital Chemist group support a large number of important activities, and the list is pretty impressive: the Cancer Support Group of ACT Eden Monaro; Snowy Hydro SouthCare; ACT junior cricket; 10 \$500 school scholarships to support public school students entering year 11; and technology support and equipment purchases for the Cerebral Palsy Alliance. They also support Menslink, a group helping young men across Australia through mentoring and counselling services. I would like to add here my personal thanks and recognition to Martin Fisk, who gives up so much of his time to get events going to raise funds for this much needed organisation, Menslink.

Capital Chemist also support Pegasus Riding for the Disabled, which is just as well, because the government has dropped them, and they were in danger of having to either close their doors or charge for their services, neither of which outcome would have assisted Canberra families. They also give generously to such wonderful schools as Malkara, who have just staged their major fundraiser, the annual model railway and scale model exhibition, and Cranleigh, whose art show and sale is on in October—and raffle tickets are available from my office. Capital Chemist also sponsor Sailability, which provides the thrill of sailing on our lakes for those with a disability.

Another small group of volunteers who give generously of their time are those who are involved in the school volunteer program—SVP. It involves people, mostly retired, helping students who experience challenges in primary and secondary school. Its national patron, Major General Michael Jeffery, is very active in support. Jenny Muir and Mal Ferguson have also been very active individually in the foundation of this great organisation.

Another small business operator in Canberra, Roger Tall from the Paperchain bookstore in Manuka, sponsors the Litlinks creative writing competition for students in years 9 to 12. I have spoken of them previously in this chamber. They are a great example of a small business helping students in Canberra. Canberra's own Yellow Van is yet another community activity that involves many people in giving and with many beneficiaries. It is an activity about which everyone feels better for their involvement.

Anne's Legacy is also a very caring and industrious group who make beautiful quilts and donate them to children in hospitals. On a smaller scale Mrs Dobrowski runs a soup kitchen in Civic on weekends. She serves anyone who cares to approach her and asks little of government or, indeed, anyone in her personal charity work.

Of course, those on the other side of the chamber have not raised the work that many of our community clubs do. We value the contribution of these community clubs but we do have some issues with the Labor Club that provides many millions of dollars to

Labor politics. It is interesting and perhaps instructive that the ACT Labor Party are the only state Labor Party organisation that collect revenue from the most needy and desperate in the community through gambling and channel back a mere percentage of it to community works and have the audacity to brag about it. If they were genuine they would give back 100 per cent of their gambling revenue and do what other state Labor organisations do, and not have social clubs. But we will never see that, I should think. (*Time expired*)

MR BARR (Molonglo—Deputy Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Events and Minister for Community Services) (4.46): Mr Assistant Speaker Gentleman, I thank you very much for raising this matter in the Assembly today. It is indeed a well-timed debate. There is certainly renewed interest in how government, the private sector and the community sector can work together to achieve better outcomes for everyone in the community.

As noted in your contribution, I had the great pleasure of taking part in a round table last month to discuss new ways of creating philanthropic partnerships in our city. I am interested in contributing to this conversation about how to improve our community with two objectives: firstly, making sure that the community gets the best value out of our people and our organisations and, importantly, their skills and resources; and, secondly, to provide support for innovative new models to ensure that we can best get the resources to those in our community who need them the most.

As you noted in your contribution, Mr Assistant Speaker, philanthropy is traditionally associated with the giving of money. But, more recently, it has broadened to include volunteering, the transfer of skills, particularly from the business sector into the not-for-profit sector and, interestingly, emerging tripartite collaborations between business, government and the community sector.

As I have outlined on several occasions in this place, there are significant challenges confronting our community. Those challenges are largely in the economic sphere but not exclusively. Economic growth in all of our advanced economies continues to be uncertain, and we are not immune to what is occurring in the rest of Australia and around the world. The capacity for governments through their budgets to provide for the ongoing growth in services and service needs within the community is challenging, and the ACT budget certainly faces issues of sustainability in the longer term.

Our population is ageing and demand for services is rising, but revenue growth is uncertain. In the community sector we are embarking on a period of significant change. The advent of DisabilityCare is indeed transformational, as you noted, Mr Assistant Speaker. Investments at a territory level and nationally will certainly lead to a marked improvement in the lives of people with a disability. These issues present challenges and opportunities, not just for governments but for communities.

Our approach must be to engage in cross-sectoral conversations about how all sectors can contribute to improving the quality of life for our community, and particularly improving the lives of the most vulnerable.

I am a firm believer that there is a significant opportunity for innovation in how each sector can bring their skills and resources together for community benefit. There is certainly a growing sense that philanthropy is an idea and practice in which all people and all sectors of society can and should participate. This means we have plenty of thinking to do about how each of the sectors works together for the community benefit. Particularly, we need to rethink strategies and models, from private foundations to collaborative enterprises. As you noted, Mr Assistant Speaker, micro-credit and social enterprises are some of the new models being used in the territory.

I am interested in work that the New South Wales government have undertaken in relation to the trial of social benefit bonds, which have seen considerable private sector investment in a variety of social programs. We need to rethink resources to include not only finance but time, expertise and partnerships. Undoubtedly, we need to embrace new technologies, such as social media and crowd funding.

Indeed, new opportunities are emerging. There is a growing trend in philanthropy from funders who see technology as an instrument for social change. These donors say they can have a bigger impact by funding not-for-profit organisations that find ways to multiply their efforts through technology. Some donors are seeking ideas that they can fund, rather than seeking funding for existing projects, which turns the traditional notions of philanthropy on its head.

Clearly, we must engage younger generations. Far from the stereotype of disinterested youth, I believe there are many young people out there seeking new ways to contribute and, importantly, to be connected to their community. We should be encouraging emerging philanthropists, not waiting until they are older or more wealthy to make a difference. We need to engage the energy and creativity of young people into giving.

We need to find new ways to get everyone involved in our community. These messages should be as simple as, "If you've got the skills, you've got the time to volunteer. If you've got a voice, you can use it for others that don't have a voice." And, importantly, "There are many, many ways that you can contribute to the lives of others."

One possibility that I am exploring is to adopt a more sophisticated brokerage model where an entity links a bank of skilled volunteers with not-for-profit organisations. We are looking at what we need to have in place to establish and support more successful alliances. This is an activity where I think the government could partner with the business and community sector. This was one great idea to come out of the philanthropy forum last month and one I look forward to progressing.

The future of philanthropy in the city will involve rethinking strategies and models currently being used and resources that are currently being allocated. It will likely recognise that new technologies have opened up a wide variety of new possibilities for philanthropy, giving and volunteering.

I would also like to see a conversation about how to promote the idea of “shared value”. Shared value is about having a broader view of value creation; the idea that businesses can make a profit but also create social benefits rather than diminishing them. The idea of shared value recognises that the competitiveness of a business and the health of the communities around it are inextricably linked. Businesses need successful communities to provide demand for their goods and services and to provide important public assets and infrastructure, and communities need businesses to provide services, jobs and wealth creation opportunities for their citizens.

There is a growing community of shared value thinking and practice around the world, which is increasing competitiveness, employment and innovation for businesses and for communities. It will be worthwhile exploring this idea further and its application in the territory.

I am really pleased that the government is seeking to connect the community and private sectors to enhance the opportunities that philanthropy can provide. I see our role as making sure the community can get the very best out of the skilled and talented people that we have in this city and the wonderful resources that are here. We want to make progress throughout the course of this Assembly term, of course, but, above all, the government is targeting a paradigm shift, a generational change in the culture of giving and contributing, one that will be 10 and 20 years in the making—not just more giving but more effective giving. It is about longer term relationships between the business, community and government sectors, and relationships that recognise the skills and priorities of each sector. The sooner we start, the sooner we will get there.

Mr Assistant Speaker, I look forward to the idea of giving and contributing to our community becoming an even more important part of the culture of our city in our second century. Thank you very much for raising this important topic this afternoon.

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (4.55): When I first read today’s matter of public importance I found myself reflecting on what “philanthropy” means in the broader sense. Is it the giving of money by individuals to good causes? Is it the partnerships that strike up between business and communities to fix a problem or address perceived need? Or is it the corporate donations that seek to respond to the human needs of society? Of course, I took the opportunity to look it up—the old definitional strategy—and in the technical sense, it means the love of humanity or the love of humankind. That, for me, is indeed a broad definition and probably answers all of my earlier questions while also allowing much more meaning to be considered. However, I think it is fair to say that the definition provided in the introduction to the ACT government’s review of philanthropy is a lot more relevant to today’s MPI.

The review undertaken in 2008 defines “philanthropy” as an act of giving by individuals and businesses for community benefit involving money, property, expertise or time. This definition allows each and every one of us to be considered a philanthropist and further allows us all as Canberrans to consider our ability to contribute in other ways, not just financially. This is something Canberrans already do

very well; we have probably the highest rate of volunteering anywhere in the country, which is something that we can be proud of as a city.

I think it is important for us to think about what this means. One of the key findings of the review was that there is great interest in philanthropy in the ACT but a general lack of awareness of the details of how philanthropy is organised. I know this is a challenge not just for the ACT but perhaps for Australia. That is not to say that we do not have some very good grants programs or fantastic long-term partnerships in place. There has been discussion of many examples today, such as the Snow Foundation, which is considered a friend of many of the non-government groups that have benefited from their relationship. Similarly, the Village Building Company provides support to projects around Canberra, with the arboretum being perhaps the prominent example.

But in the bigger picture, the fact remains that most financial donations and contributions and most time volunteered is drawn from your average Australian. It is the workers of the major companies who give the most while at the same time the larger corporations perhaps need further support to understand what and how practical philanthropy can best be delivered.

Another key finding of the review was that government has a clear role to play in this area. Sometimes the more cynical amongst us have been heard to say that philanthropy is a way to reduce the burden on government or cost shifting to a big society model, as some of the conservative thinkers in the United Kingdom have termed it. Others may see the words “tax deductible” writ large or consider novelty cheques as a way to buy good publicity.

The government has a clear position—we can each individually as MLAs and as ministers in Cabinet help to identify partnerships, listen to the community and identify needs and provide a leadership role in calling for benefactors. Further, and perhaps more practically, we can consider ourselves as partners in funding programs, and by combining existing funding, a donation from the private sector and a grant from the government, many community services can achieve incredible results.

In the ACT we have a benevolent business sector. We are well placed to tap into these resources with the successful Hands Across Canberra board comprising a group of community, business and government leaders who are committed to improving the lives of the most vulnerable people in our community. This great initiative creates a framework and a central coordination point for all Canberrans to engage in an ongoing process to improve and strengthen the quality of life for those most disadvantaged in the place we live. But it is also clear that we as a city and as a community can engage with these partners more. I would hazard a guess that if the ACT government were to undertake another review of philanthropy today, there would be echoes of the original findings.

I am looking forward to hearing more about this topic in the near future, especially from the ACT Council of Social Services, which just last month showed great leadership on this issue and held an event in collaboration with Australia’s first customer-owned bank, bankmecu. I understand members of the Treasurer’s office

attended to talk about building philanthropic partnerships that will benefit Canberra and the region, and this is the kind of tripartisan approach I would like to see more of in this place.

In my Territory and Municipal Services portfolio there is a new philanthropic project just in its infancy. The Capital Woodlands and Wetlands Conservation Trust has been established to create independent funding for the Mulligans Flat Woodland Sanctuary and for the Jerrabomberra wetlands. This is an opportunity for the private sector to come on board and financially help with long-term funding for a great conservation project which has already seen wonderful collaboration between the ACT government and a number of scientists. It is an optimistic project, especially at Mulligans Flat, which is looking to restore the woodland back to its former state pre-European settlement and to reintroduce species which have not been seen in the area for over a century. It is exciting stuff and just the sort of thing philanthropists can be proud to be involved in.

I thank you, Mr Assistant Speaker Gentleman, for bringing this debate on today. It has been an opportunity for us to reflect on the many positive things that are happening in our city. Certainly as MLAs—and this is something that has struck me very strongly since I became a member—we have an opportunity to see what goes on in the community through the events we are invited to and the constituents who contact us. We all see on an almost daily basis what a high level of philanthropy in that broader sense is going on in the city. I thank the many Canberrans who give of themselves—whether it is time, money or other support—to help those in the community who need that assistance.

MS PORTER (Ginninderra) (5.01): I echo some of the comments that have been made this afternoon by you, Mr Assistant Speaker, and by other speakers and comment on the number of young people I see volunteering in our community and getting engaged in the broader sense Mr Rattenbury and the Treasurer mentioned earlier. For too long we have seen this area of endeavour as something that engages us as we get older or perhaps as we retire. But, in fact, it is something a lot of young people are engaged in, and I am very interested in what the Treasurer had to say about ways we can fully engage them and give them a lot of opportunity.

One of the areas that involves young people that I am particularly interested in continuing is the SPICE program with Volunteering ACT. This is supported largely by small businesses in this city which provide the time and mentoring to young people to help them through the first years of their schooling in high school when sometimes they are disaffected or they are becoming disenchanted or just removing themselves from the school system. The time and effort of small businesses is greatly appreciated to get these young people reconnected with their schooling. Some of them go on to have careers in the areas that they actually have had that opportunity in.

Another great opportunity for corporates to get involved is Greening Australia. When we go up into the Cotter or other places to plant trees, we see many corporate groups up there. It is good to see the families and young people from high schools and university as well as the corporate sector, which proudly works alongside us to get the trees planted and to restore the Cotter to its former glory before the 2003 fires.

I mention the Southern Cross Club grants awards that were held on Sunday. Nearly 100 grants worth many thousands of dollars were handed out at that event to not-for-profit community groups to help them with the fine work we all know they do on a daily basis. The Podmore Foundation is an organisation I belong to. It was formed by people in the Defence Force and it raises funds to help young Indigenous people from remote communities to complete their high schooling in the ACT. Some of these young people would not have that opportunity were it not for the Podmore Foundation. I commend all members to go onto their website and have a look at what they are doing.

I also commend the Snow Foundation for the work it does. I have been involved in a lot of organisations where the Snow Foundation has assisted, and I also mention the Village Building Company that Mr Rattenbury mentioned, particularly in regard to the arboretum and the other work they do in the community.

We could stand up here forever and list all the community groups, all the corporates and all the people that, on a daily basis, work with government, the community sector and business to make Canberra the wonderful place we all know. We all love living here, but the reason it is such a wonderful place is because we have this wonderful contribution by our community.

Volunteering Australia is collecting 100 volunteer stories at the moment for the centenary. It would be good if some of the stories we have talked about today formed part of the 100 stories collection to complete the picture. I hope amongst those 100 stories some of the corporate and business efforts are mentioned along with the community groups and individuals.

Adjournment

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Communities@Work

MR WALL (Brindabella) (5.06): Mr Assistant Speaker, along with you, on 24 June I had the opportunity to celebrate the success of 75 graduating students from the Communities@Work training arm's nuSkills learning and development. The graduates had all completed studies related to early childhood education and child care. For many of the graduates, this qualification is the first formal qualification they have achieved since being at school. For a number of those graduating, a number of years have passed since their school days, and undertaking this qualification makes the achievement even more significant.

Not to overshadow these achievements of those graduating on the night, Communities@Work also unveiled a new name for its registered training organisation, which will now be known as Communities@Work Centre of Professional Learning and Education.

I would like to thank the Communities@Work CEO, Lynne Harwood, for inviting me to be part of their graduation. It was also fitting to find that many family and friends of the graduates were present. This goes a long way towards showing that further study at any level is often not possible if it were not for the support of such a strong network.

I would like to recognise the continuing contribution that Communities@Work make to training and development in the early childhood sector. I also offer my congratulations and best wishes to the following graduates: Razia Akhtar, Suma Allen, Leticia Aronsen, Gurjit Badwal, Caitriona Banton, Laura Barnett, Tamera Beath, Sanae Bouckaert, Sonja Breust, Fabiana Cavazzoni, Angela Collins, Sebastian Cox, Nike Etim, Ashlea Fitton, Demi Fort, Samantha Fuller, Ishani Galkandage, Damayanthi Gamage, Clare Glassford, Kellie Greer, Tayla Hankin, Karla Harris, Melissa Harris, Justin Hiatt, Wendy Hliang, Shayima Hussanee, Lorraine Keaveney, Angela Kelly, Natalie Knill, Elise Koppie, Yvonne Lim, Jessie Lister, Elizabeth Mahon, Samantha McElligott, Norah Mears-Smith, Chimere Mercieca, Rebecca Monk, Ashleigh Monteleone, Grace Montomerie, Monica Murray, Michelle Napier, Keirra Pace, Mallarie Parker, Anna Perry, Sindy Preston, Leah Ramos, Rosario Ramos-Gordon, Theresa Rodda, Tamara Ridley, Antonella Sassu, Nerroli Scott, Ashleigh Smith, Sandra Solomon, Krystal Sparrow, Sonja Taylor, Shirley Tennant, Kara Tierney, Kylie Tojaki, Jahanara Urmeem and Natalie Vrins, who all completed a certificate III in children's services.

I also congratulate Samantha Campbell for completing a certificate IV in children's services in outside school hours care; Yolanda Beniamini, Catherine Buckley, Cherie Cochrane, Ayesha Durrani, Rachna Gulia, Karen Hayden, Rebecca Jones, Mona Kleimann, Hyunsook Rebecca Lee, Shannon Lister, Kate Miller, Ashlea Nicholson and Alena Voysey for completing a diploma of children's services in early childhood and education care; and Julie Koch for completing a diploma of children's services in outside-school-hours care.

Greening Australia CBR Collective

MRS JONES (Molonglo) (5.10): I rise today to highlight the work done by Greening Australia on national tree planting day. I was pleased to accompany Steve Doszpot MLA as we attended Ngunnawal Primary School last Tuesday, 30 July, to help the children with the planting of their bush tucker garden. It was a lovely Canberra winter morning. The sun came out and the children really enjoyed the tree planting. I met many dedicated teachers, assistants and carers at the school who have worked with Greening Australia to make this garden possible.

I would also like to acknowledge the many parents who have contributed time and energy to this wonderful garden for the children. I thank Adam Shipp, whom I met, from Greening Australia for managing the planting. I especially would like to thank the teachers whose hard work made the garden possible. In particular, I was privileged to meet Michelle Northey, Kate Wiley, Janice Schroder, Wendy Barnsley, Lindy Parker and Caroline Evans.

As a mother of four young children I was really pleased to see the enthusiasm and excitement of the children as they rolled up their sleeves, got their hands dirty and helped plant this special garden. There was a group of lovely young ladies who helped me plant a tree—Tessa, Maddison, Eden, Isabella and Amy.

I was honoured to be invited to help with the planting of this garden, and I commend the school for this great initiative and the work they are doing in encouraging and educating the next generation of gardeners.

I also rise today to speak about the great work done by Lighthouse with the establishment of CBR Collective. CBR Collective is a pop-up boutique on the top floor of the Canberra Centre which is proudly showcasing beautiful clothes, jewellery, hats and home wares by Canberra designers. It is wonderful to see the range of designers and the hard work they have put into their beautiful, high quality products.

The CBR Collective store is managed by Karla Groom and has around a dozen local brands, including: E4 with Rohan Thomas, Fibre Studio by Anne Willsford, M&TM (Mec and the Maid) by Sarah Pogue, Pure Pod by Kelli Donovan, Sophia Polak by Sophia Polak, T-Heinrich by Janette Lenk, Hutch by Charlotte Stewart, Cynthia Jones-Bryson Milliner by Cynthia Jones-Bryson, I Heart Threads by Kieran Stopp, Tango & James homewares by Lisa Barrett, PNC Metalsmith by Paula Chavez, BM Designs by Barb Mickelson, and, finally, Henry Carte Neckwear.

All these designers must be very proud to see their hard work available in the heart of our CBD. The work the Lighthouse Business Innovation Centre has done with the establishment of CBR Collective provides new and emerging local designers with the backing, support and tools needed to get their products out to the marketplace. I commend not only the hard work of these talented designers but also the innovative work of the team at Lighthouse.

I commend and encourage the board for backing up hard-working Canberrans by facilitating this shopfront. I look forward to seeing more and more local designers establish themselves and their brands through initiatives like this. People interested in finding out more about the Lighthouse and their innovations should visit lighthouseinnovation.com.au, and people interested in finding out more about CBR Collective can visit the pop-up store at shop DF 16 in the Canberra Centre or visit the CBR Collective Facebook page. Thanks to all involved—great work.

Acknowledgement of country

DR BOURKE (Ginninderra) (5.13): Symbolism matters. Regardless of political leaning—radical or conservative—all of us acknowledge the power of symbols, ritual and ceremony. Today it is common at official occasions and public gatherings to have an acknowledgment of country or a welcome to country ceremony. An acknowledgment of country can be performed by any non-Indigenous or Indigenous person; the welcome to country ceremony must be done by a traditional owner of the land where the meeting occurs.

The form of a welcome to country can be incredibly varied and may include song, dance or speeches in the traditional language or English. An acknowledgement of country can be a short speech or statement at the beginning of the event. My usual words when I acknowledge country in Canberra are: “I acknowledge the traditional custodians, the Ngunnawal people. I respect their continuing culture and cherish their contribution to the life of our city and our region.”

I was concerned during the estimates hearings when Mr Wall asked a question about the cost of welcomes to country. It is appropriate to ask about any government expenditure. My concern was: did he understand the importance of welcome to country? Furthermore, could some in the community interpret this as a dog whistle on race—not that I am suggesting that this was Mr Wall’s intention?

Acknowledging country is very important. Firstly, it is about truth-telling when so many lies have been told in the past. Secondly, it is about respect—respect for the traditional owners and, in the case of welcomes to country, respect from those traditional owners. Thirdly, it is about the future, about what we can learn from the Indigenous knowledge of how to live in this land of rivers, mountains and plains.

The symbolism of this ceremony is about reconciliation, the nation-building task for this century—building a garden of reconciliation where there is goodness for all Australians to enjoy. We have already had a taste of that fruit. Remember the 2000 Olympics, with Cathy Freeman winning gold in the 400 metres? Remember the sense of joy, of national pride? Remember the feeling of release and righteousness which followed the 2008 apology to the stolen generations by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd?

It is in this garden of reconciliation that Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders will find sweet balm to heal the pain and anger of dispossession and discrimination. It is in the garden of reconciliation that non-Indigenous Australians will find ease for their shame and embarrassment at the taking of another’s country, a garden where non-Indigenous Australians will have 40,000 years of Indigenous culture as part of their Australian identity, a garden that can sustain and feed us forever.

Schools—Weetangera Primary
Schools—Rosary Primary

MR DOSZPOT (Molonglo) (5.16): I would like to talk tonight about two school celebrations, one celebrating its 40th birthday and one celebrating its half-century in education. As shadow minister for education I had the pleasure of visiting earlier this year Weetangera Primary School with the Speaker, Mrs Dunne, as their school community was celebrating 40 years of delivering education to many Canberra families in the Weetangera area. The first school was built in 1875 and lasted until 1937. In celebration, a tree planting was held on the old site, which is about a kilometre away from the new school site.

The current Weetangera Primary School opened in 1973 with an initial enrolment of 384 students. It was one of the first two open-plan schools to be built in the ACT and thus the subject of great interest and much debate as new parents were sceptical of this

educational innovation. While the entire school was housed in one building, three or four classes worked together in each of the four open units. I congratulated the current school principal, Mr James Barnett, and his enthusiastic teachers and students on the wonderful things that the school is achieving for the community.

Yesterday I had the pleasure of attending, along with Mrs Giulia Jones, Watson Rosary Primary School's 50th anniversary celebration mass and the unveiling of a specially commissioned, spectacular mural to celebrate the anniversary. On a bitterly cold day it was great to see so many of the school community, Mrs Moira Najecki from the Catholic Education Office, Canberra school principals and current and former teachers and students all join in celebrating this major anniversary.

The principal of Rosary primary, Mrs Maureen Doszpot, welcomed past Rosary Primary School principals. Six of the 11 previous principals were present, including the foundation Dominican Sisters, Sister June Peck, Sister Mauro Campbell and Sister Kath Maher, Mrs Meg Clarke, Mrs Moira Sutch and Mrs Anne Merner. Five other Dominican sisters who had taught at Rosary were also present. Previous assistant principals also attending were Greg Walker, Verlene Marshall, Vicky van der Sanden and Brenda Foley. Father Kieran Adams celebrated mass and blessed the mural.

The mural, whose designer is Michael Winters, formerly of Canberra but now living in Dubbo, shows pages of history being blown across its 17-metre length and depicts aspects of life at Rosary over the 50 years. The mural was painted on a board in Michael's studio in Dubbo, transported to Canberra and erected at 6 am yesterday. It was unveiled by the first principals, Sister June Peck and Sister Mauro Campbell, and the first lay teacher, Mrs Marie Shaw.

Congratulations to all the Rosary school community, including the teachers, students and parents, for all the hard work that went into making this anniversary such a memorable event. There is still one more celebratory event, and that is the 50th anniversary ball this Saturday evening. I am sure this will be an exciting event as well and will provide a great opportunity for former students, parents and educators to celebrate, network and pay tribute to the contributions to Rosary Primary School over the past 50 years.

Dr Bourke Canberra Airport

MR COE (Ginninderra) (5.20): Before I get to the substance of my adjournment speech today, I would like to caution Dr Bourke for the implications that he makes in the chamber and the risk of overstepping the mark. This would not be the first time. It was about this month last year that Dr Bourke made a similar implication which Ms Bresnan referred to as particularly disappointing and basically low. So I would caution Dr Bourke to be very careful.

Now, to the substance of today's adjournment speech, I would like to put on the record my support for the wonderful construction at the new Canberra Airport. The work that has been done from 2009 through to this year has been quite extraordinary and one that I think all Canberrans can be proud of. Of course, for so many visitors to

Canberra, the airport is the first and last impression that they have of Australia's national capital. And I am proud that the impression that is left in their minds is the one presented by the new Canberra Airport.

I have many memories of the old Canberra airport—usually ones where my mum, brothers and I would pick up my dad after he had been away for work. We would wait inside the pokey terminal, which was really just a glorified shed, looking out the window at tarmac level, waiting for the Ansett flight to come in. Back then, and even just a few years ago, the prospect of what has now been achieved would have been unimaginable and seemingly unachievable.

The new terminal represents a wonderful entrepreneurial venture by the Canberra Airport Group, one that saw them invest \$480 million into creating one of the best, if not the best, airports of its size anywhere in the world. The investment comprised four key elements: the terminal, with more check-in areas and new retail ventures and lounges; the roads, including the construction of the modern, two-level system; new car parks, which provide convenient, high tech, multi-level parking for 3,700 vehicles; and new aircraft parking areas or aprons.

Airports can often be stressful and intense places, but the design of the new terminal, especially the grand atrium, helps relieve any feeling of pressure. Both the exterior and the interior have been carefully and tastefully designed, and I commend the architects, Guida Moseley Brown, and construction companies, managed by Construction Control, who worked on the project. I am pleased that there is still more to come at the airport and we are all looking forward to experiencing the additional developments as they come on line.

I would like to commend the more than 100 staff who allow such a smooth and comfortable experience for travellers in and out of Canberra on a daily basis. In particular, I would like to commend and thank the chairman, Terry Snow AM, and managing director, Stephen Byron. I would also like to make mention of the Snow Foundation, which was formed in 1991 by Terry and George Snow. The foundation has made many generous contributions to charitable causes throughout Canberra and beyond. I have seen firsthand the impact that some of these grants have had on various community groups.

In conclusion, I thank the Canberra Airport Group for the investment that they have made in our city and the special contribution they have made in shaping how Canberra will function in our second century.

Southern Cross Club—community grants

MS BURCH (Brindabella—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Disability, Children and Young People, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Women, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Racing and Gaming) (5.23): On Sunday I was very pleased to attend the Canberra Southern Cross Club community grants luncheon, and this year \$140,000 or thereabouts was provided to 93 community groups across the territory. To list just a few of the 93: ACT Children's Week, the

Deafness Resource Centre, Autism Asperger, Bonython Primary School P&C, the Canberra Mothercraft Society, Woden Seniors and Spence Children's Cottage.

These grants are given each year by the Canberra Southern Cross Club and provide valuable support to our hard-working community groups. The \$140,000 presented on Sunday is just a fraction of the Southern Cross's annual contribution of approximately \$1.5 million. For over 11 years, the club has been providing grants to the community, and its continued contribution this year is recognised and valued by the ACT government.

Indeed, I am confident that this is recognised and valued by the Assembly as a whole. Indeed, at the lunch, not only were my colleagues Mary Porter and Dr Chris Bourke there but also Mr Rattenbury, Mr Hanson, Mr Wall and Mr Smyth were all there enjoying the excellent hospitality provided by the Southern Cross Club and lending their support to community clubs.

I note with interest that Mr Doszpot has indeed recognised the model of the community clubs here, but unfortunately he went to the very tired old argument of the connection between the Labor Club and us here in this place. And I just refer to the most recent online publication from the Canberra Labor Club and the contributions that they make to the community.

In 2011, 135 groups were supported, including Volunteering ACT and the Royal Life Saving Society, which provided support to 5,000 Canberra kids. The ACT Eden Monaro Cancer Support Group, the Leukaemia Foundation, TADACT, Sailability and Neighbourhood Watch have all been supported directly by the Canberra Labor Club.

So I find it quite ironic and somewhat hypocritical that those opposite can continue to go into the community-connected clubs, enjoy their hospitality, recognise the support that they offer to community groups but then continue to say that we must be, indeed, an evil beast to also have a connection with those groups that have been well documented to be certainly at a very significant arm's length.

I say to Mr Doszpot and to all the Canberra Liberals that on the ABC website this afternoon a Queensland candidate Dr Glasson said that if he was in the party room, he would stop donations coming from tobacco companies. And so I do say: what is the position of the Canberra Liberals in this and what will they say in the party room about getting financial support to their federal candidates here in the upcoming election?

Indeed, donations from tobacco companies to Labor have ceased and ACT Labor and federal Labor have no connection to tobacco companies, but the Canberra Liberals continue to have donations supplied and accepted from tobacco companies. So I think Mr Doszpot should really question: he is in the party room here and what will he be saying if tobacco dollars reach into the support of the candidates here in the ACT?

Indian myna birds

MR RATTENBURY (Molonglo) (5.27): On 19 June I opened the Indian myna bird conference at the CSIRO Discovery Centre. The event was hosted by the Canberra

Indian Myna Action Group, a local community group that is committed to protecting native wildlife from the impacts of the Indian myna. Myna birds are known to take over nesting hollows from native birds, possums and gliders after harassing and evicting them. They kill the chicks of other birds, destroy their eggs and build their nests on top. They also prey on endangered insects and small skinks. Indian mynas have been present in Canberra for some decades. I am told that in the 1960s the species was released into a single suburb of Canberra and that by the year 2000 they were present in all suburbs and had become the most common feral bird in the territory.

Over the past seven years the Canberra Indian Myna Action Group has led the way in tackling Canberra's Indian myna population. With around 1,470 members and 1,350 traps in backyards across Canberra and Queanbeyan, the group has seen over 44,000 of these pest birds removed from our nature reserves and suburbs. As a result, the species has gone from the third most common bird in Canberra to the 20th most common. The group strongly promote a humane approach in the control of Indian mynas and its members all follow a strict animal welfare protocol.

On 5 July the group won the overall award in the Keep Australia Beautiful ACT sustainable cities awards for 2013 for their trapping program. The awards are open to community, business and government and celebrate achievement in litter reduction and the broader sustainability agenda. The group also took home the community action partnerships and culture category award and the environmental stewardship category award.

I congratulate Bill Handke and CIMAG on their work and the profound impact they have had on protecting native wildlife. They really show what a big impact a small group of people can make. I also acknowledge the work of the detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre who build the Indian myna traps in partnership with CIMAG. The program involves between five and 14 detainees at any time and helps provide them with the skills to assist them gain employment once they are back in the community. They have made over 680 traps so far.

I wanted to share this story with the house; I think it is a wonderful example of a community organisation making a great difference, particularly in light of our earlier conversation about philanthropy. I also acknowledge the partnership with the corrections system and the positive contribution the detainees have been able to make to this project as well.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.30 pm.

Schedule of amendments

Schedule 1

Auditor-General Amendment Bill 2013

Amendments moved by Mr Rattenbury

1

Clause 29

Page 12, line 23—

omit clause 29, substitute

29

Reporting sensitive information

Section 19 (1)

substitute

- (1) The auditor-general must not include information in a report for the Legislative Assembly if the auditor-general considers that the disclosure of the information would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.
- (1A) The disclosure of information may be contrary to the public interest only if the disclosure would be reasonably likely to—
 - (a) infringe an individual's right to privacy, or any other right under the *Human Rights Act 2004*; or
 - (b) disclose a trade secret, or the business affairs or research of an entity; or
 - (c) prejudice the investigation of a contravention of a law; or
 - (d) prejudice relations between the ACT government and another government; or
 - (e) disclose information mentioned in the *Legal Aid Act 1977*, section 92 (2) (a) or contained in a document mentioned in that Act, section 92 (2) (b).

2

Clause 30

Page 13, line 1—

omit clause 30, substitute

30

Section 19 (3)

after

omits information

insert

mentioned in subsection (1A) (a) to (d)