



# Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

**EIGHTH ASSEMBLY**

**2 JUNE 2015**

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

## Tuesday, 2 June 2015

### Petitions:

Schools—Telopea Park—petition No 6-15 .....	1869
Planning—Giralang shops—petition No 7-15 (Ministerial response) .....	1870
Planning—Narrabundah—petition No 1-15 .....	1870
Schools—Telopea Park—petition No 6-15 .....	1871
Planning—Giralang shops—petition No 7-15 .....	1873
Leave of absence .....	1874
Papers .....	1874
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee .....	1874
Public Accounts—Standing Committee .....	1875
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee .....	1876
Public Accounts—Standing Committee .....	1876
Standing and temporary orders—suspension .....	1877
Planning and Development (University of Canberra and Other Leases)	
Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 .....	1878
Order of the day—postponement .....	1878
Education Amendment Bill 2015 .....	1878
Questions without notice:	
Health—funding .....	1886
Health—referrals .....	1888
Education—funding .....	1891
Roads—congestion .....	1893
Appropriation Bill 2015-2016 .....	1895
Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016 .....	1904
Papers .....	1905
Disability inclusion statement 2015-2017 .....	1906
Papers .....	1907
Adjournment .....	1908

**Tuesday, 2 June 2015**

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

## **Petitions**

*The following petition was lodged for presentation, by **Mr Doszpot**, from 872 residents:*

### **Schools—Telopea Park—petition No 6-15**

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

This petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that:

In February of this year, the ACT government made the decision to acquire approximately 1/3 of Telopea Park School's sporting fields as part of a land swap deal undertaken for urban renewal initiatives (Block 5, Section 36, Division of Forrest). The Canberra Times reported this decision as having been made on February 13th, 2015. The Telopea Park School Parents & Citizens Association sought confirmation of this decision by writing to the ACT government that same month. However, the association only was informed officially of the ACT government's decision and the impact it would have on the school community on 9th April, 2015. In these communications, it has been clearly stated that due diligence on the block and traffic assessments were not performed prior to this decision being made, nor were they done before the lease was transferred to the LOA. Not only was this decision taken without prior public consultation, it has also removed the community's right to respond to planning and decision making that directly affects their lives.

The Telopea Park School Playing Fields, Block 5, Section 36, is currently utilised by the school to deliver its curriculum and promote the sporting development of its more than 1200 students. The loss of this land will result in reduced open space for sporting facilities as well as both structured and unstructured active play. In an increasing 'screen-based' world, these outdoor physical activities, and the space in which to do them, are vital for healthy growth and development; improving movement, balance, coordination; and promoting the teamwork and social skills of our youth.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

- Cease all actions pertaining to the Block 5, Section 36, Division of Forrest, on which the Telopea Park School Tennis Courts reside;
- Reverse the decision to rezone and redevelop the land,
- Issue a new lease to the Education and Training Directorate for the express use of the Telopea Park School

*The following petition was lodged for presentation, by Mr Coe, from 192 residents:*

**Planning—Giralang shops—petition No 7-15**

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

This petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that Giralang has been without local shops for a decade.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to express their support of the completion as soon as possible, the full approved development of the shops currently under construction.

Further we call on the Assembly to enact legislation to limit further legal appeal by those opposing the development.

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

**Ministerial response**

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

By **Mr Gentleman**, Minister for Planning, dated 15 May 2015, in response to a petition lodged by Mr Doszpot on 17 February 2015 concerning a proposed change to existing planning zoning of CZ6 for two vacant blocks on Jerrabomberra Avenue, Narrabundah.

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

**Planning—Narrabundah—petition No 1-15**

*The response read as follows:*

I understand the petition brings to the attention of the Assembly that the Omnibus Draft Variation proposes to change the zoning of two vacant blocks in Jerrabomberra Avenue, Narrabundah, Section 34 Block 12 & 13.

The blocks are part of a Commercial CZ6 - Leisure and Accommodation zone that abuts Jerrabomberra Avenue to the south of Goyder Street. This policy permits a range of entertainment, recreation, leisure and tourist facilities to cater for tourists to the ACT as well as to provide entertainment opportunities to both visitors and residents of the ACT and surrounding region.

The area was considered a gateway to south Canberra as Jerrabomberra Avenue provided direct highway access. Blocks of land were developed in the area that provided services such as motels and clubs, including the Harmonie German

Club. The passing traffic supported the commercial accommodation that was established in the area. The Inner South Veterinary Centre has also established its operations in the area.

When the Monaro Highway was built in the 1980's, and subsequently provided the main route between Canberra and Cooma, the level of passing inter-state traffic declined and the viability and location of the commercial accommodation as an inter-state stopover changed. Subsequently, requests to change the land use policy were received from the land owners and were supported.

When a draft Territory Plan variation is released for public comment the community will have a further opportunity to provide further input on the proposed changes.

It is also worth noting that the Territory Plan and development application process requires the newest development to demonstrate that appropriate noise attenuation measures are in place through a noise management plan, reflecting that the ACT, in effect, has an 'agent of change' principle in place through existing regulation.

### **Schools—Telopea Park—petition No 6-15**

**MR DOSZPOT** (Molonglo): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**MR DOSZPOT**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is a sad indictment on the ability of a government to communicate and work with a community when its citizens are reduced to collecting signatures to demonstrate how upset they are with a government decision. It is an even more unacceptable fact when this decision affects a public entity—in this case a public school—and when it is their own education minister and former education minister that have both failed them so completely.

Telopea Park School is the victim of a land grab that has been foisted upon it without explanation or apology. Its current tennis courts are to be bulldozed to make way for a new childcare centre—a centre not wanted by the current operators of the existing childcare facility, a facility not asked for by the community and a facility that will only cause angst, anguish and anxiety due to its genesis and its location.

Telopea Park School is one of Canberra's iconic public schools. It rates well in NAPLAN results. It is unique in that it is a bilingual school of some standing within international education circles, endorsed by the French government and delivering a French curriculum. It has a passionate and loyal staff, student and parent community that supports the school and its activities. I would like to recognise that members of the Telopea Park School community are here to join us for this presentation today.

This community has been shabbily treated by this government and this Chief Minister. The school and the parents have had absolutely no support in any way, shape or form from the education minister. The community and I are not surprised, sadly, by this lack of support by a government that should know better.

Let me outline what this petition is about. Block 5 section 36 in the division of Forrest is otherwise known as being part of Montgomery oval. For some years—in fact, for decades—this oval, this land, has been part of the school, and the tennis courts that have occupied that space for decades have been managed, maintained, upgraded and generally cared for by generations of parents whose sons and daughters have learnt to play tennis on them.

Six years ago, in order to allay fears of future development of these grounds, the then education minister, Andrew Barr, gave the school an assurance that the land would stay as part of the school. He backed up his promise by gazetting the block as permanent school space, preserved from future urban development.

Fast forward six years, and the first the school community knows about any change is a letter from the principal, who was put in the most uncomfortable position of having to convince her school community about a wonderful gift from the ACT government—the offer of \$800,000 for what was originally described as international tennis courts on another part of the school grounds. The fact that the new site already had another sporting purpose seems to have escaped the attention of this education minister.

The Chief Minister then really turned the knife earlier this year by changing the zoning of the land and transferring the lease to the Land Development Agency so that it can be redeveloped. A lifetime of promise for this government is really not much more than six years, it seems. Is it any wonder that the school community—who believed the tennis courts were theirs, who believed that the land on which they sat belonged to the school, who believed that the Chief Minister's word was to be trusted when he said that he had gazetted the land and that the land would remain with the school permanently—are angry and feel exceedingly let down by the education minister, the former education minister, now Chief Minister, and the ACT government, which is looking the worse for wear after nearly 16 years?

I remind the Assembly that this is a public school that has for years delivered excellence in education, that manages a cohort of some 1,200 students in a mature Canberra suburb, that has every right to believe that its own education minister will stand up for it. This government has failed it miserably—and all in the name of development and revenue. Why else take land from a school that already needs more and dump a childcare centre that has not been asked for on a block of land that is one of the busiest corners in inner south Canberra?

Further, it upset another educational community organisation, the Manuka occasional childcare association, who also had little advance knowledge that their very functional premises were to be resumed for a block of apartments. I wonder just how many residents in Manuka realise that the new Canberra Services Club will be just one little part of a much larger development slap bang in the middle of Manuka. How many storeys? We do not know. How many storeys and what will be built on the old services club site? We do not know. What we do know is that schools are expendable when this government is hunting for revenue. What we do know is that the truth and promises to community groups are expendable when the government decides it needs to cash in valuable land.

Over 870 people have signed this petition today, but it is a mere sample of what the good people of Manuka and Forrest will do if and when these developments proceed. The government have been less than open and less than honest with Telopea Park School. They have treated the parents of MOCCA with the same contempt. The old adage that you can fool some of the people some of the time would come to mind except that in this case the Chief Minister has fooled no-one. And they are his own constituents. Minister Burch has just put yet another school community offside, but that is becoming par for this minister, so it will be neither here nor there to her.

This local Molonglo MLA cares, and so do the Canberra Liberals. Under our watch, it would not happen. If we can prevent this shambolic plan from happening, we will. It can be stopped by a stroke of the pen from the Chief Minister. He did exactly that: he backflipped on his original promise to maintain this land for Telopea Park School. He can just as easily reverse his decision to satisfy the community's call. Or, indeed, Minister Rattenbury could object to this ongoing farce by voicing his objection and for once backing the community that he is meant to represent.

### **Planning—Giralang shops—petition No 7-15**

**MR COE** (Ginninderra): I seek leave to speak to one of the petitions.

Leave granted.

**MR COE:** Members would be aware of the ongoing Giralang shops saga. Residents of Giralang have been without local shops for many years. However, unlike in some other suburbs, Giralang is not without shops because the owner of the site does not want to develop the opportunity or because a viable opportunity does not exist; in this case, years of mismanagement and meddling from the government have led to the situation where the owner wants to build new shops but is unable to. The government has given mixed messages to the developer, to opponents and to the community. Nobody has certainty regarding the current situation. It seems that the only winners in this whole saga are the lawyers.

The first development application for the Giralang shops site was lodged in 2008. After that application was refused, a second application was lodged, in 2009. That application was also refused. In 2010, a development application which included a supermarket and speciality shops was lodged with ACTPLA and did receive approval. However, the decision to approve the development was overturned after it was challenged in ACAT. A fourth development application was lodged in 2011. The then Chief Minister, Jon Stanhope, and planning minister, Andrew Barr, were seen to be against the proposed development. However, the new planning minister, Simon Corbell, called in the development and approval was granted. This was, of course, after the resignation of Neil Savery as the head of ACTPLA.

This was not the end, for residents and traders from nearby suburbs challenged the decision in the Supreme Court. The government's decision to approve the development was upheld by the Supreme Court in 2012 but a further appeal to the full bench of the Supreme Court was lodged. The full bench of the Supreme Court also

dismissed the appeal, but the case was taken to the High Court in 2013. Last year the High Court ruled that the traders did have standing to bring an appeal to the Supreme Court.

The residents of Giralang have waited far too long for shops in their suburb. The process has been mismanaged by the government for years. Instead of allowing the proper planning process to run its course, successive planning ministers have interfered in the process, leading to considerable uncertainty for all concerned.

I would like to think that the government has learnt from its interference in the Giralang development, with regard to this particular site but also to other sites in the ACT, whether they be shops, childcare facilities or other community facilities. However, I am afraid that government interference in the planning process is becoming far too common. I hope this petition will remind the government that the Giralang residents have waited far too long for shops in their suburb and it is time for this issue to be resolved.

## **Leave of absence**

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

That leave of absence be granted to Ms Porter for this sitting week due to health reasons.

## **Papers**

**Madam Speaker** presented the following papers:

Budget 2015-2016—

Financial Management Act, pursuant to section 20AB—

Audit Office—Recommended Appropriation—Copy of letter from the Speaker to the Treasurer, dated 2 April 2015.

Electoral Commissioner—Recommended Appropriation—Copy of letter from the Speaker to the Treasurer, dated 20 May 2015.

## **Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee Scrutiny report 33**

**MR DOSZPOT**: I present the following report:

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee (Legislative Scrutiny Role)—Scrutiny Report 33, dated 26 May 2015, together with the relevant minutes of proceedings.

**MR DOSZPOT**: I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.



**MR DOSZPOT:** Scrutiny report 33 contains the committee's comments on eight bills, 27 pieces of subordinate legislation, two government responses and one regulatory impact statement. The report was circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting.

I commend the report to the Assembly.

### **Public Accounts—Standing Committee Report 13**

**MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (10.15):** I present the following report:

Public Accounts—Standing Committee—Report 13—*Report on the 13th Biennial Conference of the Australasian Council of Public Accounts Committees (ACPAC)*, dated 19 May 2015, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

Madam Speaker, part of the life of PAC is that every two years all the PACs from around the commonwealth get together to look at how they are operating. There are often many international visitors, as there were this year. Again, it was quite an interesting conference.

All of the members participated. I gave a presentation on the topic "Making what governments do more relevant—wellbeing: measuring beyond GDP". Ms Lawder and the secretary, Dr Cullen, gave an international perspective on a Kiribati case study. Ms Porter was on a panel on strengthening perspectives on parliament. I then participated in a panel as well.

One of the unique features of the conference this year was that members gave up one of their lunches. I know how much of a struggle that is some days. We actually had a PAC meeting while we were there to approve a report and discuss a second. While some of the other committees were having their lunch, we did some work, which was very productive and which allowed us to table a report in the last sitting. I commend the report to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

### **Report 14**

**MR SMYTH (Brindabella) (10.16):** I present the following report:

Public Accounts—Standing Committee—Report 14—*Review of Auditor-General's Reports: No 7 of 2014: 2013-14 Financial Audits; and No 7 of 2013: 2012-13 Financial Audits*, dated 19 May 2015, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

There are six recommendations in this report. They go to two broad themes. The two broad themes are compliance with reporting on the progress of the government's implementation of recommendations made in Auditor-General's reports and, the second area, specifically looking at data—data security, IT controls, internal audit committees around data security and privacy controls as well as the use of the one ACT public service framework to ensure that unresolved audit findings relating to environmental controls for information technology be addressed.

I would like to thank members for their participation and their assistance in putting together these two reports. In particular, I thank Dr Cullen, as always, for being a very effective committee secretary.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee Statement by chair**

**MR DOSZPOT** (Molonglo): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety relating to statutory appointments in accordance with continuing resolution 5A.

In the period 1 July to 31 December 2014 the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety considered a total of nine statutory appointments or reappointments. In eight instances the committee noted the proposed appointments and made no further recommendation. In one instance the committee was not able to meet to consider the appointment within the 30-day statutory period set out under the Legislation Act 2001, subsection 228(3), and the minister made the appointment. In two instances the committee asked for further information in connection with the proposed appointments.

In accordance with continuing resolution 5A, I now table a schedule of statutory appointments considered during this reporting period. I table the following paper:

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee—Schedule of Statutory Appointments—Eighth Assembly—Period 1 July to 31 December 2014.

## **Public Accounts—Standing Committee Statement by chair**

**MR SMYTH** (Brindabella): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts in relation to reportable contracts under section 39 of the Government Procurement Act 2001.

The Government Procurement Act 2001 requires agencies to provide the public accounts committee with a list of reportable contracts every 12 months. Reportable

contracts are defined, with some exceptions, as procurement contracts equal to or over \$25,000 that contain confidential text. Agencies provide the committee with the names of the contracting parties, the value of the contract and the nature of the contract.

The committee acknowledges that the information directors-general and their equivalents provide in relation to reportable contracts is readily available in the public domain on the ACT government contracts register. However, its scrutiny is assisted by receiving a consolidated report every 12 months.

The committee has been provided with a consolidated list of reportable contracts for the 12-month period from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015. As per its previous practice, the committee believes there is value in tabling the consolidated list of reportable contracts for the periods specified as a transparency mechanism to promote accountability.

I therefore seek leave to table the list of reportable contracts for the period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015 as received by the public accounts committee.

Leave granted.

**MR SMYTH:** I table the following paper:

Reportable contracts—Agencies reporting reportable contracts for period 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.

## **Standing and temporary orders—suspension**

Motion (by **Ms Burch**) agreed to, with the concurrence of an absolute majority:

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent:

- (1) any business before the Assembly at 3 pm this day being interrupted to allow the Treasurer to be called on forthwith to present the Appropriation Bill 2015-2016 and the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015 2016;
- (2) (a) questions without notice concluding at the time of interruption; or  
(b) debate on any motion before the Assembly at the time of interruption being adjourned until the adjournment questions in relation to the Appropriation Bill 2015-2016 and the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016 are determined;
- (3) at 3 pm on Thursday, 4 June 2015, the order of the day for resumption of debate on the question that the Appropriation Bill 2015-2016 be agreed to in principle, being called on notwithstanding any business before the Assembly and that the time limit on the speech of the Leader of the Opposition be equivalent to the time taken by the Treasurer in moving the motion “That this Bill be agreed to in principle”; and

- (4) (a) questions without notice concluding at the time of interruption; or
- (b) debate on any motion before the Assembly at that time being adjourned until a later hour that day.

## **Planning and Development (University of Canberra and Other Leases) Legislation Amendment Bill 2015**

Debate resumed from 14 May 2015, on motion by **Mr Gentleman**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

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

### **Order of the day—postponement**

**MS BURCH** (Brindabella—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Racing and Gaming and Minister for the Arts) (10.24): Pursuant to standing order 150, I move:

That order of the day No 2, Executive business, relating to the Electricity Feed-in Tariff Schemes Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 be postponed.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

### **Education Amendment Bill 2015**

Debate resumed from 14 May 2015, on motion by **Ms Burch**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

**MR DOSZPOT** (Molonglo) (10.25): I rise to speak on this Education Amendment Bill. In doing so, I note that there have been relatively few amendments to this act since its enactment in 2004. In fact, I think there have been only three prior to this one. The Education Act is a major piece of legislation, so any amendments, one would hope, are done only after serious consideration, contemplation and discussion.

This bill seeks to amend the current act to remove two advisory councils that, by all reports, have served successive government ministers well since 2004. One is the Government Schools Education Council and the other is the Non-government Schools Education Council.

Sections 56, 57 and 109 of the current act outline the membership of both councils. The Government Schools Education Council must include the director-general and the minister must appoint a chair; six people who, in the minister's opinion, have experience in one or more of the areas of business, commerce, public policy, early childhood care, education, the special needs of young people and teacher education; and 10 people who, in the minister's opinion, represent the views of public school education. As a statutory appointment, the Standing Committee on Education, Training and Youth Affairs is consulted on proposed appointments.

The other council, the Non-government Schools Education Council, is similarly structured, with representatives from Catholic schools, representatives from non-Catholic independent schools, someone from the non-government school union and someone chosen from organisations representing parent associations in non-government schools.

The act outlines the Government Schools Education Council's functions as:

- (a) to advise the Minister on any aspect of the ACT government school system; and
- (b) when asked by the Minister ... to inquire into and give advice to the Minister on any aspect of the ACT government school system; and
- (c) to meet with the Non-Government Schools Education Council to discuss matters of mutual interest; and
- (d) to exercise any other function given to the council under this Act or any other Territory law.

The Non-government Schools Education Council's functions are parallel, insofar as they are:

- (a) to advise the Minister on any aspect of non-government schooling; and
- (b) when asked by the Minister under this paragraph, to inquire into and give advice to the Minister on any aspect of nongovernment schooling; and
- (c) to meet with the Government Schools Education Council to discuss matters of mutual interest; and
- (d) to exercise any other function given to the council under this Act or any other Territory law.

So these two councils, which have been in existence for over 10 years, have been tasked with providing advice as required and when required on any subject the minister required them to provide. From inquiries I have made, it would seem that neither council has been overburdened with work or swamped with requests from any education minister.

We now move to the proposals Minister Burch has introduced into the Assembly. I would like to quote from the minister's second reading speech, which suggested that the bill was being introduced to:

... enable new and different advisory arrangements for the minister responsible for education, arrangements which enable the minister to establish thematically focused, multisectoral, time-constrained forums which allow for input from a variety of government, private and not-for-profit stakeholders to provide up-to-the-minute advice on policy issues as they arise.

I am not quite sure where to start with this particular description. It is, at a superficial level, a wonderful example of the pollicie waffle that I guess we have become used to from Minister Burch, referring as it does to “thematically focused, multisectoral time-constrained forums”. I am sure there is a bureaucrat somewhere quite chuffed that their particular phrases are now part of *Hansard* history. If you translate them into plain speak, the minister appears to be suggesting that she wants to be able to get advice about particular issues in a timely manner, and not just necessarily from people within the education sector.

I have to ask: where do the current councils fail in being able to deliver such information to the minister? It would seem that the minister has not been a frequent user of their services. Perhaps if she were, she might have found the resources already at hand.

The minister says:

Cross-sectoral, theme-based advisory arrangements would also support the government’s agenda in streamlining services and operating in a one-service environment with the aim of making interaction and engagement with the government as simple and straightforward for the community as possible.

As an aside, I have to seriously ask if the minister did not have perhaps just a small hesitation about the speech she was delivering.

If the intent of these changes was part of a government red tape reduction strategy, why not say so? I can accept that the two councils appeared large and probably did not need quite so many representatives, but there can be no doubting the breadth of available skills and interests contained in them. I can only ask what the minister was thinking in wanting to throw out two advisory councils that by any measure could be regarded as a great resource, particularly if they had been used to their full capacity. There was little financial impost insofar as the previous councils did not attract sitting fees and, as the new potential committee or committees will be, were serviced from within existing directorate secretarial resources.

As I said, moving amendments to the Education Act is not a regular occurrence. The minister could easily have accessed the extensive resources within these two councils for advice on any number of subjects without the need to disband the existing arrangements.

When I look at the composition of the sitting councils, I see that the chair of the Government Schools Education Council is Craig Curry. I understand he will also be the chair of the proposed new committee. Why go to such lengths to effect changes that could have been managed in a simpler manner? I then look at the current legislation and the amendments and see one quite important difference. Under the current legislation, the minister must appoint members to these two councils, and she is obliged to select from a list delivered, put forward, from various sectors. Presumably then she is also obliged to receive information from them and meet with them. Under the amendments there is no compulsion for the minister to do anything. Section 126 states:

The Minister may establish a school education advisory committee ... as required to advise the Minister, about school education or a related matter, for a specified period.

In other words, “Don’t call me; I’ll call you.” Looking at Ms Burch’s record over the last few years—indeed, the record of any one of the previous four other education ministers on Labor’s side—you can see that they did not call too often on this very valuable resource. I do not believe that is the spirit of wanting meaningful and accessible engagement by government with the community: “Don’t call me; I will call you.”

The minister has highlighted clearly through these changes that she will choose who she listens to and who she takes advice from. Presumably it will only be from people who tell her what she wants to hear. The minister is not known for her willingness to engage with the wider school community and she has been slow to recognise that there are both government and non-government schools. And she does have a reputation for blocking her ears to advice she does not like. I think the changes proposed in this amendment will only serve to further distance her from engagement with the education sector.

The Canberra Liberals believe these changes are unnecessary. We believe they vest too much power in this education minister. Under normal circumstances, that might not be a problem. However, it is a problem with this particular minister. Let us not forget just how disengaged she is with the education sector. She has already had a vote of no confidence moved against her by her own teachers. We know that parent groups in several schools have found her to be wanting in her ability to listen, to take advice and to make meaningful decisions. We know that every other week there is another mistake, another blunder. Now she is reducing her availability to receive advice and expertise from within and outside the education sector. We see this as just another example of her putting her fingers in her ears, as with her visit to Quamby some years ago.

The Canberra Liberals will not be supporting this bill, for the reasons I have outlined. The legislation is unnecessary. It concentrates power too much in the minister’s hands and reduces the opportunity for groups within the education sector to provide advice to the minister and have their views considered and responded to.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Molonglo) (10.35): This is a bill for an act to amend the Education Act to remove reference to the Government Schools Education Council and the Non-government Schools Education Council from the act, so on face value it is a very simple bill. As the explanatory statement says very clearly:

The Education Amendment Bill 2015 removes all reference to the Government Schools Education Council and the Non-government Schools Education Council ... The Bill gives the Minister for Education and Training ... general powers to establish advisory bodies as necessary to advise the Minister on school education matters under the Act.

The Bill has been drafted to allow for flexibility in application and committees may be established to inquire into any school education or related matter.

I would at this point like to acknowledge and thank the current councils and the two chairs of the councils, Mr Craig Curry and Ms Narelle Hargreaves OAM. Ms Hargreaves in particular is well known and has long been associated with education in Canberra. She had many years of teaching experience, including 14 years as a principal in ACT schools, and she also held the position of director of schools and international education and community partnerships with the ACT Education and Training Directorate for 10 years. I trust that she will continue to play a role in education in the years to come.

Having made those remarks, I would like to indicate that the Greens will be supporting this bill, as I understand the motivations of the minister in seeking to provide greater flexibility and increased focus when seeking external advice.

However, I would like to put on the record the Greens' belief that there is great value in these external advisory functions and also in the need for ministerial roundtables and stakeholder engagements. Certainly in my time as minister I have had many occasions to hold these types of engagements. Some I have announced and made public comment on; some have been more targeted and perhaps even "closed door". Regardless of their nature, I have found these sessions to be informative, frank and useful exchanges which have lasting impacts on subsequent policy directions.

I have also appreciated the written advice and submissions of other external critical friends of government, be they boards, statutory authorities or peak bodies. They provide a unique interface between the executive, the relevant directorates, user groups and the coalface service delivery agencies. I would urge ministers to continue to seek opportunities to liaise and listen to these advocacy groups, because I think they bring a great deal of value to the deliberations that we have to make.

I hope this bill will not see a reduction in this kind of quality advice being provided to the minister and the Education and Training Directorate but instead see a clear increase in targeted, topical and relevant advice responsive to the challenging and changing needs of the education sector. In my discussions with Minister Burch about this legislation, she has indicated to me very clearly that that is her intention. This is about having groups that can look at specific issues, and can look at them, perhaps, in a short time frame and bring in particular expertise.

As members will know, the Greens believe that high quality and equitable education is a cornerstone of a healthy democracy, and it is fundamental to Australia's continued prosperity. We understand that learning is a lifelong process, fostered in both formal education and informal settings from early childhood through adult life, and believe that everyone should have equitable access to an education that meets their needs and aspirations and gives them the skills and capacity to participate in society. These high level beliefs require real-world actions and policies to achieve, and the collaboration of both the non-government and government education sectors is vital to ensure we are working together toward a shared vision.

I am optimistic that in making this change to the legislation the government will have at its disposal the ability to bring together groups of people with real expertise and



real passion for particular issues, issues of the day, to provide the minister with clear advice. In creating this greater flexibility there is a real opportunity for the minister to really tap into the vast world of expertise that exists in our community in a way that is more flexible than the current model and that enables both the minister and the directorate to get very clear views and input, and a level of expertise, from the community.

On that basis, I will be supporting the bill today on behalf of the ACT Greens.

**MS BURCH** (Brindabella—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Racing and Gaming and Minister for the Arts) (10.39), in reply: In closing the debate on the Education Amendment Bill, I want to thank Mr Rattenbury for his comments. I agree that it is important to continue to facilitate and give opportunities for broader community input to and discussion of matters of education across the ACT.

This bill makes amendments and introduces a new chapter to the Education Act 2004. The bill gives the minister for education the power to establish advisory bodies as necessary to advise on education matters. I tabled the bill in the Assembly on 14 May, noting that it would establish revised school education advisory arrangements to ensure the provision of strategic advice on school education.

Every minister seeks out fair and balanced expert advice. To impact decision-making, this advice needs to be timely and specific to the issues involved. I can assure those in the Assembly that I will continue to meet with all groups and stakeholders that seek to have conversations with me about things that are important to them.

*Mr Doszpot interjecting—*

**MS BURCH:** Mr Doszpot continues to interrupt. I am glad he paid attention to *Hansard*. While Mr Doszpot was happy to come in here and offer snide remarks about officials and their contribution to tabling statements and other documents, I will not follow that trend of being disrespectful. It was Mr Doszpot who offered those very snide remarks. I think he said that there must be some official very proud of this language, but he did not say it in a positive way; he did not say it in a complimentary way; he said it in a disrespectful and a snide way. I will not follow suit, as I have the highest regard and respect for the officials, including for the support they offer me and for any contribution they make to the debate in this place.

The ACT is leading the nation in educational outcomes. Our challenge is to further improve our students' educational experiences and wellbeing. To do this, we need high quality expert advice from multiple sources. These should be theme focused and on issues relevant to modern education. I also want to reduce red tape and create the flexibility and adaptability that allow the best possible advice on emerging issues to decision-makers.

This bill gives the minister for education general powers to establish advisory bodies as necessary to achieve these goals. The minister can determine the terms of reference and the role of any advisory body to advise on matters relating to school education.

The amendments recognise improvements and best practice in modern education methodologies and new approaches to education policy. These changes are important for our students in the rapidly changing, technology-driven world. Governments everywhere are attempting to become more adaptive and more flexible to community needs. These changes ensure that the government can receive high quality feedback and strengthen community engagement in our education sector while remaining focused on the core of our education system—our students.

The changes are designed to allow for flexibility in advice and the tenure of advisory bodies. Representatives will be sought from a wider field than currently exist. Representatives from universities, nationally recognised specialists, early childhood educators, policy analysts, members from all ACT school sectors and students will be asked to be part of the new advisory bodies.

The ACT currently has the most formalised provisions of any jurisdiction for our advisory arrangements. Membership and meeting requirements are overly prescriptive, I believe, with near identical functions for each of the two councils.

Under the new arrangements, the minister will be able to conduct themed roundtable meetings that have proven to serve other ministers and portfolios well. Being able to coordinate with subject matter experts and a variety of sources will benefit the level of advice and policy direction provided to government.

I have asked Mr Craig Curry, the current chair of the Government Schools Education Council, to chair the first committee under the amended act. I am very pleased to have Mr Curry's courage, experience and expertise, and also his guidance, in steering through this change. Mr Curry is well qualified for the role of chair of the new committee. His extensive expertise includes providing strategic leadership of ACT public schools, including preschool, school, college and disability education. He is well respected across all education sectors and has demonstrated his ability to engage with multiple stakeholders on diverse issues.

This bill, when passed, will see the first committee provide me with advice around digital citizenship. The expansion of internet connectivity in homes, in public spaces and through mobile networks, along with the value of the internet to support learning, demonstrates the need to establish a forum to advise on developing our young people as responsible digital citizens. This is relevant across all sectors, and parental engagement is vital to ensure the safe and effective use of technologies.

In establishing the first committee, I will be seeking expert advice on how ACT families and schools can be better equipped to take advantage of technology and improve student outcomes and wellbeing. I will seek expert advice on how families and schools can work together to better support students to be informed digital citizens. I will seek advice on how to encourage students' safe and productive online participation whilst reducing their exposure to harmful content and illegal activity.

I will also seek advice on how to enable students to engage positively online and to protect themselves from the potential consequences of online behaviour, including recognising an unsafe situation and what can be done about it. This advice will be

sought through one education advisory committee—not two structures, as currently exist. In establishing the first topic-specific school education advisory committee, I will be seeking representation from education stakeholders, along with topic experts.

To resolve issues, governments require the ability to harness the expertise that exists in our community. These amendments reflect the flexible arrangements required to continue to build on the excellent education system we currently have, and to gather the expertise to ensure the ACT remains a nation leader in educational outcomes for our students.

I hope that all members here recognise the importance of answering the first question I put in suggesting these amendments: “What type of advice is required to further improve education here in the ACT?” I would reiterate that balanced expert and timely advice is of true benefit to the government, our schools and our students.

I want to thank the members of GSEC and NGSEC, and particularly to thank Mr Craig Curry and Ms Narelle Hargreaves for their participation in GSEC and NGSEC over the years, for being the respective chairs and for managing the work of those committees.

In the discussions about the amendments to this bill over the past 12 months, both Mr Curry and Ms Hargreaves have been supportive of this change and recognise that after more than a decade it is timely to reflect on the best structure and opportunity to provide the minister with timely advice across a range of issues, with a structure that allows different members from different sectors with different backgrounds and expertise to come together to provide a single point of reference and expertise.

I took the opportunity to thank committee members at a small gathering here in the Assembly last week. Over the decade there have been many members of GSEC and NGSEC, and I want to place on record my thanks to current members and past members alike. I also want to thank Education and Training officials for working through these amendments in such a clear way and for presenting them to the Assembly.

I thank all the members who are supportive of this bill and I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question put:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 7		Noes 6	
Ms Berry	Ms Fitzharris	Mr Coe	Ms Lawder
Dr Bourke	Mr Gentleman	Mr Doszpot	Mr Wall
Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury	Mrs Dunne	
Mr Corbell		Mr Hanson	

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

**Sitting suspended from 10.53 am to 2.30 pm.**

## **Questions without notice**

### **Health—funding**

**MR HANSON:** My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, the government's proposed light rail is estimated to have a capital cost of about \$800 million. Minister, how many new hospital beds could be built with \$800 million?

**MR CORBELL:** Quite a few, but that is why this government has invested almost \$900 million already in health infrastructure since 2009. Our record is very clear: over \$900 million worth of expenditure, not including the University of Canberra public hospital, to increase bed capacity in our public health system.

**Mr Hanson:** Madam Speaker—

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Do you have a point of order, Mr Hanson?

**Mr Hanson:** I do have a point of order, Madam Speaker. I am sure the minister is getting to it, but it is a point of order on relevance. I have asked how many hospital beds could be built with \$800 million, and I ask the minister to answer that question directly.

**MR CORBELL:** On the point of order, Madam Speaker, I have actually answered that and I am now elaborating on my answer.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The standing order says that the answer should be concise and directly relevant to the subject matter of the question. I suppose “quite a few” is concise.

**Mr Hanson:** There is no point of order for “not a very good answer”, is there?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** No, and there is nothing in the standing orders that says that it has to be an answer that suits you, Mr Hanson.

**MR CORBELL:** Indeed; thank you, Madam Speaker. Of course, it does not suit Mr Hanson because this government has invested over \$900 million in health infrastructure works since 2009. It is why the Chief Minister and I have been very pleased to announce additional commitments in health that provide for an extra 16 beds, and then two intensive care beds in the budget that the Treasurer will hand down this afternoon.

These are our priorities and these are our commitments. Of course, they stand in marked contrast to the priorities and commitments of the Liberal Party, a party that has reduced health funding to the territory by over \$228 million, according to the

latest commonwealth budget papers, and that is only out to the 2016-17 financial year. So those are the marked contrasts of priorities—a government that has invested \$900 million in health infrastructure since 2009—

**Mr Wall:** What did they say in estimates about that yesterday, Simon? I think you were told that you were telling porky pies.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Withdraw, Mr Wall.

**Mr Wall:** I withdraw, Madam Speaker.

**MR CORBELL:** A government that will invest over \$40 million in the forthcoming budget in additional bed capacity in our public hospitals, at the University of Canberra, at Calvary public and at the Canberra Hospital. So those are our priorities. In contrast, the priorities of the Liberal Party, nationally and locally, are to defend cuts to our public hospital system that are worth over \$228 million just over the four-year period of the forward estimates. So that is their record. We are very happy to stand on ours.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Mr Hanson.

**MR HANSON:** Minister, how many new community health centres could be built with the light rail \$800 million?

**MR CORBELL:** We have already built two new community health centres. We have built a new one in Belconnen and we have built a new one in Gungahlin. They are outstanding facilities that the community has welcomed. We have also, of course, refurbished other community health centres, including a fantastic refurbished centre in Tuggeranong. That is this government's commitment. We are investing in the public health infrastructure our city needs. We are investing in these important facilities. We have spent, as a government, over \$900 million on health infrastructure since 2009.

Those are our priorities—priorities to better public health facilities right across the territory, whether it is in Tuggeranong, Gungahlin, Belconnen or a range of other locations right across the city. The budget that the Chief Minister and Treasurer will bring down shortly will reinforce those commitments, because we are committed to making sure Canberrans get the public health services they need. In contrast, the Liberal Party is only interested in cutting funding due to the ACT for our public hospital services.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

**MR COE:** Minister, how many subacute beds could be built with \$800 million?

**MR CORBELL:** We are making significant investments in subacute beds. It is this government who are investing in the University of Canberra public hospital. We are delivering in full on our commitments when it comes to the University of Canberra public hospital. The forthcoming budget will make an investment of over \$100 million in a new subacute facility at the University of Canberra. This is the only government that is making those commitments.

We are investing in health. We have invested over \$900 million in health infrastructure since 2009. As I said in my earlier answers, we have invested in better community health, we have invested in the University of Canberra public hospital, we have invested in better cancer treatment services at the Canberra Hospital, and we have invested in new maternity services. And right now we are building an extension to the emergency department at Canberra Hospital, increasing its capacity by over 30 per cent, and we are investing in the development of secure mental health facilities at Symonston.

So no-one can doubt this government's commitment to investment in public health infrastructure. The real question is: why do those opposite continue to defend the cuts that Tony Abbott is making—I beg your pardon; that the Prime Minister is making—to our health system? These are cuts that, according to the latest Treasury projections, mean \$228 million less than we should have been receiving under the national health partnership reforms over the four-year period. That is their record. Ours speaks for itself.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Mr Coe.

**MR COE:** Minister, how many new emergency hospital beds could be built with \$800 million?

**MR CORBELL:** I do not know whether Mr Coe noticed, but we are already expanding the emergency department at the Canberra Hospital. It is underway right now. It is a \$20 million-plus project. It is going to increase bed capacity by over 30 per cent in the Canberra Hospital emergency department. Those are the priorities that Canberrans want to see. We are meeting those expectations because we are making the investment in the emergency department.

**Mr Hanson:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, the minister is required to be concise and directly relevant. The question was: how many emergency beds could be built with \$800 million? I ask him to answer that directly and be relevant.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I remind the minister of the standing orders. They do say that the minister needs to be concise and directly relevant. There has been quite a bit of latitude because there have been four successive questions that have asked the minister how many of various things could be bought with \$800 million. I also remind him of the Speaker's capacity under the standing orders to direct a member to terminate the answer if it is not meeting the provisions of the standing order. I remind the member to be directly relevant to the question, which was: how many new emergency hospital beds can be built with \$800 million?

**MR CORBELL:** I have concluded my answer, Madam Speaker.

### **Health—referrals**

**DR BOURKE:** My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, can you tell the Assembly about the new online tool HealthPathways?

**MR CORBELL:** I thank Dr Bourke for his question. I was very pleased to join with the chair of ACT Medicare Local and health practitioners from across the region at the University of Canberra last week to launch HealthPathways. HealthPathways is an online tool for GPs that provides them with easy ready-reckoner access to the range of referral pathways that they need to be aware of, to make sure they can refer people for expert specialist assistance in a whole range of health conditions.

This is a desktop application that has been rolled out to GP practices since April this year. It allows them to understand the specialist referral pathways that they need to be familiar with, to ensure that they can properly refer their patients through to that level of care.

HealthPathways has been built on from experience in other places, notably in New Zealand. It started in Canterbury in New Zealand and it has been rolled out in a number of regions around Australia. I am very pleased that Medicare Local here in the ACT has taken the initiative to expand its application in the ACT context. This is about better patient experiences, better patient journeys, clearer and more concise referral pathways, and that helps everybody—the patient, the GP and the specialist who receives the referral.

It is all about improving health care in the ACT and in the southern region. In particular, I would highlight that this is not just a referral pathway tool being used within the ACT; it is also being used in the broader region. So the new primary health network that replaces the Medicare Local framework in the immediate surrounding region and all the way down to the Illawarra has partnered with ACT Medicare Local to implement HealthPathways here in the ACT. It is particularly worth highlighting that this has been a really good project that has seen collaboration between ACT Health, the New South Wales southern local health district, the respective Medicare locals, as I mentioned, and GPs and other health professionals.

It is a very important initiative—one that will help our local GPs to stay up to date with the health referral pathways they need for their communities, for their patients. It can be very time consuming and demanding to stay on top of what the specific referral pathways are for a very broad range of conditions. This online tool will allow our GPs to do that much more easily and to make sure that their information and referral pathways are always up to date.

Congratulations to ACT Medicare Local for the work they have done. It is a very important initiative and a great example of partnership, both with ACT Health and with the local area health services in the surrounding regions, who have worked together to bring this very important initiative to fruition.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Dr Bourke.

**DR BOURKE:** Minister, could you expand on how HealthPathways will improve the patient journey for Canberrans?

**MR CORBELL:** I thank Dr Bourke for the supplementary question. Supporting a patient through these referral pathways is not just about diagnosing the condition and prescribing the appropriate medication. It is also about arranging the right tests, referring the patient to the right specialist or the right allied health provider. It is about providing ongoing assistance to the patient in managing their illness. Even when you are referred to your specialist, you still need to maintain that really important relationship with your GP. Your GP will be the person who continues to provide much of the day-to-day advice in between visits to specialists.

This system has been developed by GPs, by specialists and by allied health professionals to identify appropriate and available treatment pathways for patients. It is an ideal tool to manage demand. If the tool gives guidance and advice and prompts to the GP about the types of issues that need to be managed in relation to a specific condition, that reduces the need for further referral to a specialist. It can also potentially head off an increase in acuity and complexity in relation to a particular condition, and that is a good thing. Reducing demand is critically important in the health sector.

So this is about easily accessible, best-practice guidance for general practitioners that is relevant to the local services and resources available. It is a great outcome. I look forward to seeing the results of it and the advice from our Medicare Local on the uptake and the level of utilisation by GPs in our community.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Ms Fitzharris.

**MS FITZHARRIS:** Minister, how will HealthPathways reduce patient wait times?

**MR CORBELL:** I thank Ms Fitzharris for her supplementary question. We do see evidence that these types of referral pathway arrangements can reduce wait times for certain services and save patients time. The pathway tool here in the ACT has only been recently established, so we will need to see the data. But we know that in other places where HealthPathways has been in operation there has been improved access and reduced wait time for specialist services.

For example, in New Zealand, where HealthPathways was first trialled, over 88 per cent of GP and practice nurses found that it assisted them in the provision of better health care to their community. Over 90 per cent found that it improved care and that it made their job easier. It also showed significant time savings, including 996,000 days not waiting for specific types of treatment—91,000 fewer days than would have otherwise occurred in people being acutely unwell and needing treatment in hospital.

Those are the types of outcomes that you can get from demand management through the use of this tool. It is a very important initiative by our Medical Local. This is really the untold story of health. We are very focused in this place on service delivery and on infrastructure spend in the acute care area. That is a very important area; no doubt about it. But if we focus more effort, more collaboration, on demand management, particularly in primary care, we are going to get better outcomes for our community. This is just one tool that is going to help us to achieve those objectives.



**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Ms Fitzharris.

**MS FITZHARRIS:** Minister, could you tell the Assembly about the collaborative way in which HealthPathways in the ACT was developed?

**MR CORBELL:** Thank you, Ms Fitzharris, for your follow-up question. This was the result of collaboration and engagement in the primary health sector. It started with a survey to GPs in the ACT and in the surrounding region, which saw a very encouraging response from the GPs concerned. They provided their feedback on what priorities they wanted to see on pathway development. There has also been a significant amount of engagement between doctors in the region and doctors here in the ACT. It was decided, based on that feedback from GPs directly, that the key areas for focus should be in relation to mental health, palliative and end-of-life care, oncology, cardiology, pain management and cognitive impairment. These were the priority areas identified from that survey work and those were the first areas focused on in the new HealthPathways framework.

### **Education—funding**

**MR DOSZPOT:** My question is to the minister for education. Minister, the government's proposed light rail is estimated to have a capital cost of about \$800 million. Minister, how many new schools could be built with \$800 million?

**MS BURCH:** We can see the theme for today's question time, with 11 or 12 minutes to go. To follow on from the answers from the Attorney and Minister for Health, I think we have got a good record of health and education investment from this side of the chamber. Indeed, the recent Sensis figures show that in public schools we continue to grow our student numbers. I think that for the first time we have more children in our public high schools than in the non-government sector, so that is a reflection of quality teaching and quality investment across the ACT.

**Mr Hanson:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, following the previous points of order, I ask that the minister be directly relevant to the question, and that relates to how many schools could be funded with \$800 million.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order and remind the minister of the provisions of standing order 118(a): to be concise and directly relevant to the subject matter.

**MS BURCH:** On the cost of investment in schools, again this government has a track record of that. Indeed, in last year's budget announcement—I have been out to visit the new school in Molonglo, Coombs, which comes with a price tag of—

**Mr Hanson:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the minister is clearly ignoring your ruling. The question is about how many schools could be built with \$800 million. It is not about what this government did last year in the budget relating to something else. I would ask the minister to be directly relevant and answer the question.

**Mr Corbell:** On the point of order, Madam Speaker, the minister is being directly relevant. She was just interrupted. She was about to give a direct indication of costs for the construction of a new school. If Mr Hanson is not interested in understanding the parameters around the costs of new school construction then it is hard for me to see how she can be directly relevant.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I will remind the minister of the standing orders again and I will ask her to be directly relevant. I will remind her of the other provisions in the standing order. I hope that, in fact, the Minister for Health was prescient and that she was getting to the point.

**MS BURCH:** In fact, I was interrupted in saying the “price tag of”, and that is \$47 million for the new preschool to year 6 school in Coombs. I would also remind those here in the Assembly that schools are different. You might build an early education school; you might build a preschool to year 6 school; you might build a P-10 school; you might build a college. We build a variety of schools that meet the community’s needs. We also refurbish schools. Mt Taylor, down in Kambah, has a most unfortunate—

*Opposition members interjecting.*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order, members! I cannot hear Minister Burch. Have you finished your answer?

**Ms Burch:** Yes.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** You sat down, so I assumed you had. A supplementary question.

**MR DOSZPOT:** Minister, how many new school classrooms could be built with \$800 million?

**MS BURCH:** I refer to the investment in Coombs, for example, where we have open space learning. We might start the school with two streams then build it to three and four streams. It is not quite clear for those opposite that we meet the needs of the community through the different builds, the different designs and the different structures for our schools and our school community.

If you look at Harrison school, which goes right through to high school, we are growing that school from the early years—from the kinder years, the primary years, which have different requirements. When that school matures and has a full cohort of high school students, the school will change. The nature of the school will change and the requirements of the school will change.

**Mr Hanson:** Madam Speaker, again on a point of order, I make the point that the minister is able to clarify that 17 schools could be built. I ask her to give an equivalent number for classrooms, as she has been asked by the member.

**Mr Corbell:** That is not a point of order; that is a question.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Normally the point of order would refer to the standing orders. I could interpolate, given the number of points of order that Mr Hanson has taken today, that he is making a point of order under standing order 118(a). I ask the minister to be directly relevant and to answer the question, which is: basically, how much does it cost to build a new classroom?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Mr Wall.

**MR WALL:** Minister, how many classrooms could have heating or cooling installed for \$800 million?

**MS BURCH:** I thank those opposite for the questions. We have six minutes until 3 o'clock. I cannot wait for the end of question time today, as we will then hear from the Chief Minister when he delivers a very sound budget for the ACT. The question was in relation to the number of heating and cooling systems that could be purchased. I ask those on the other side of the chamber to reflect—

**MADAM SPEAKER:** That is not how question time works. Answer the question according to the standing orders.

**MS BURCH:** that you do not necessarily need a unit to ensure that you have good thermal control in buildings. With smart design and good outlay, we are striving for environmental sustainability and a six-star rating in our buildings, and with being carbon neutral within our schools. It is not a simple equation of the number of classrooms equalling the number of heaters.

### **Roads—congestion**

**MS FITZHARRIS:** My question is to the Minister for Roads and Parking. Minister, I understand that consultation has taken place in Tuggeranong and Gungahlin on future road upgrades. How have the responses to these consultations reflected the need to reduce growth in congestion which was recently outlined in a report by Infrastructure Australia?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Ms Fitzharris for her question. The road network in the ACT needs to keep up with the pace of our rapid population growth; otherwise we face the very real risk of key transport corridors exceeding capacity. In particular, urban transport decisions need to complement land use decisions as well. If nothing is done to upgrade our local road network now, the anticipated delays, queuing and congestion are estimated to cost about \$700 million by 2031. Not only would these delays have a large impact on the economy but also they would present an unfair loss of time on the daily lives of the residents of the ACT. Cities which have relied mostly on private cars for transport options, such as Los Angeles, for example, see commute times which I would never wish to see for Canberrans across the territory. I cannot think of anyone who enjoys sitting in traffic for hour upon hour first thing in the morning.

The recently released report from Infrastructure Australia outlines the fact that if this government or future governments were to ignore the need for building an integrated transport network, unacceptable levels of congestion would become inevitable. This would be most evident in Gungahlin, which is one of the regions in Canberra where higher growth is forecast.

A survey has recently been undertaken by Roads ACT on the delivery of the Gungahlin road upgrade projects. Over 400 people provided feedback, and 73 per cent of these respondents identified that they would like us to get on with the upgrade works as soon as possible. This sort of feedback from consultation is important to government when delivering large infrastructure projects. Understanding what the views of the community are and the priorities they have is an important factor in the effective delivery of those large projects.

I believe the residents of Gungahlin clearly understand the benefits of the projects planned for their area. While the package of works for the area may add some level of traffic congestion during the construction phase, the creation of increased road capacity will allow people to travel to and from and through Gungahlin with far greater ease and improved traffic flow. We are listening to this feedback and will now get on with delivering the road upgrade projects for the Gungahlin community.

When the Canberra community was consulted on the preliminary plans for the duplication of Ashley Drive in Tuggeranong late last year, over 150 submissions were received—

*Mr Hanson interjecting—*

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order! Mr Hanson.

**MR GENTLEMAN:** The 150 submissions were received over a six-week period and congestion delays and queuing at intersections were all key themes that were highlighted in the community feedback. So there was significant support for the duplication of Ashley Drive from the residents that responded, including improved traffic safety, reduced congestion and improved journey times as well.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** A supplementary question, Ms Fitzharris.

**MS FITZHARRIS:** Minister, can you detail the work that is to be done in Tuggeranong and the impact it will have on relieving congestion in the local area?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** The key project to ease congestion for Tuggeranong residents is the duplication of Ashley Drive from Erindale Drive to Ellerston Avenue, which, as previously announced by the Chief Minister and me, will be receiving funds of \$24.6 million. Works as part of the upgrade will include a new southbound road carriageway between Erindale Drive and Ellerston Avenue, new traffic signals, duplication of existing underpasses, on-road cycle lanes, and additional footpaths to link with the existing paths. These works aim to address excessive delays during peak periods where Ashley Drive intersects with Statton Street, Clive Steele Avenue and

Bugden Avenue, and excessive queuing delays on the northbound approach to Isabella Drive during the morning peak. Residents of Tuggeranong who work in Woden or the city will be the direct beneficiaries of this upgrade.

The upgrade to Ashley Drive is the second stage of upgrades to this major commuter corridor. It adds to the Ashley Drive stage 1 upgrade, which was completed in October last year. The works in stage 1 included a left-turn slip lane from Sternberg to Ashley, ramp metering on Sternberg Crescent at the eastern approach of the roundabout with Erindale Drive, the duplication of Erindale Drive between Ashley Drive and Sternberg Crescent, the signalisation of the Ashley Drive and McBryde Crescent intersection, and various footpath improvements.

*It being 3 pm, questions were interrupted pursuant to the order of the Assembly.*

## **Appropriation Bill 2015-2016**

**Mr Barr**, pursuant to notice, presented the bill, its explanatory statement and a Human Rights Act compatibility statement and the following supplementary papers:

Budget 2015-2016—

Financial Management Act, pursuant to section 10—

Budget Speech (Budget Paper No 1).

Budget in Brief (Budget Paper No 2).

Budget Outlook (Budget Paper No 3).

Budget Statements for—

ACT Executive, Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner, Office of the Legislative Assembly.

Capital Metro Agency.

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

Community Services Directorate, Housing ACT.

Education and Training Directorate, Canberra Institute of Technology, CIT Solutions Pty Ltd.

Environment and Planning Directorate.

Health Directorate, ACT Local Hospital Network.

Justice and Community Safety Directorate, Legal Aid Commission (ACT), Public Trustee for the ACT.

Territory and Municipal Services Directorate, ACTION, ACT Public Cemeteries Authority.

Financial Management Act, pursuant to subsection 62(1)—Statements of Intent 2015-2016—

ACT Building and Construction Industry Training Fund Authority, dated 22 and 26 May 2015.

ACT Gambling and Racing Commission, undated.

ACT Insurance Authority, undated.

ACT Long Service Leave Authority, undated.

ACT Public Cemeteries Authority, undated.

Australian Capital Territory Compulsory Third-Party Insurance Regulator (CTP regulator), undated.

Canberra Institute of Technology, dated 21 and 27 May 2015.

Cultural Facilities Corporation, undated.

Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission, dated May 2015.

Land Development Agency, undated.

Legal Aid Commission (ACT), undated.

Public Trustee for the ACT, undated.

Title read by Clerk.

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Tourism and Events) (3.00): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

My first budget as Chief Minister is a budget for Canberra.

Canberrans know this is a great place to live and work—and are proud of the Territory we call home.

This budget will ensure Canberra builds on our achievement as the world's most livable city and remains a place all Canberrans can be proud of, with an economy in which we can all feel confidence.

We are proud of our city's international reputation, proud of our excellent universities, and proud of the renewal that is breathing new life and opportunity into our town centres and suburbs.

We are proud of our world-class schools and hospitals. We are proud of our leafy suburbs and the neighbourhood shops and parks.

This budget for Canberra goes to the heart of our city and its people—it makes sure we have the right services, facilities, and infrastructure that our residents and businesses deserve and expect.

At their core, budgets are about people. Since becoming Chief Minister I have made it my priority to listen to Canberrans, and to provide the services they need. This budget delivers.

Canberrans need quality schools, roads, hospitals and community services. This budget delivers.

And fundamentally they need jobs: our support for the economy and investment in new infrastructure will deliver jobs for Canberra.

And through the record funding for municipal services in this budget, we ensure the look of our city will continue to match the pride we feel in it: well-maintained roads and footpaths, and well-kept parks, playgrounds and open spaces.

Budgets are also about values. This budget is a clear statement of the values my government holds. We make a stand against domestic violence, so Canberrans can feel safe in their homes.

We stand up for Canberra against the Commonwealth's savage cuts, and we will continue to use the budget to safeguard jobs for Canberra and grow our economy.

We are continuing to build new infrastructure, and plan for the Canberra of tomorrow through major long-term projects.

This budget delivers for Canberra.

It delivers a strong economy and growing businesses, quality services and infrastructure, and a welcoming appearance to match the pride we feel in our city.

### **Economic outlook in the ACT**

There is no doubt that the election of the Abbott Government has resulted in a testing period for Canberra and our economy.

Losing about 5,400 Commonwealth public service jobs over the past year and a half from the Territory is a bigger proportion of our economy than the loss of BlueScope Steel from the Illawarra, or Ford from Geelong, or Holden from Adelaide.

Canberrans are Australians too, but while these other regions got a helping hand and tens of millions of dollars from the Commonwealth, there was nothing for Canberra in the recent federal budget.

We have seen unemployment rise from 3.7 per cent in April of 2014, to reach 5 per cent by October. State Final Demand fell by 0.9 per cent in the December quarter 2014 and consumer and business confidence slumped.

The ACT Government had to act decisively to counter this. We did. And it has worked.

We are now more resilient than before.

The last time a Federal Liberal government attacked our economy, unemployment peaked at 8.5 per cent.

This time, unemployment peaked at 5 per cent, and has fallen to 4.3 per cent today—the lowest rate in the country.

Gross State Product is forecast to increase from an estimated 1¼ per cent in 2014-15, to 1½ per cent in 2015-16, before returning to long-term trend growth of around 2½ per cent from 2016-17 onwards.

Hopefully, the worst is now behind us.

But the time for economic vigilance has not ended. Other jurisdictions have shown us what happens when Governments take their eye off the ball early in economic recoveries.

My Government will continue to work hard at nurturing the economy as the recovery takes hold.

### **Fiscal outlook**

Once again, the Territory budget supports the Territory economy.

The Commonwealth was not content to drag at our economy with jobs cuts—they also cut away at our revenue directly last year, with cuts of hundreds of millions of dollars in health funding.

This year, there is a substantial cut to the amount we receive from the Goods and Services Tax from the Commonwealth.

In the coming four years the Territory will lose almost \$559 million in GST funding. Such a large reduction has a significant impact on our budget.

The Asbestos Eradication Scheme, which I announced in the 2014-15 Budget Review, also impacts our finances.

The \$1 billion cost of the scheme covers the purchase, demolition, remediation and disposal of contaminated homes, as well as emergency financial assistance, asbestos assessments and a hazard reduction program.

This is a necessary program for all Canberrans. It removes the spectre of loose-fill asbestos for residents, home buyers, tradespeople, carers and neighbours.

The Territory Government will incur the full net cost of the Scheme, estimated to be about \$370 million. On top of that, the Territory bears the interest costs on the \$1 billion loan provided to the ACT by the Commonwealth over a 10-year period.

It is disappointing the Commonwealth turned their back on the agreement they had made with Canberra and failed to contribute to meeting the costs of the Scheme.

The Commonwealth has also walked away from health funding—this year they are again failing to honour the National Health Reform Agreement.

As we did last year—the Territory Government is stepping up to fill the gap left by the Commonwealth.



Together, the effects of the Commonwealth's past two budgets and the Asbestos Eradication Scheme have put significant pressure on the Territory's finances.

In the face of the Commonwealth's attacks, the Territory Government faced a choice—we could pass those costs on to the community in the form of cuts to support and services.

Or we could stand up for our community and use our strong budget position to protect Canberrans from the worst of the Commonwealth's savagery.

The Government's immediate priority is to support the Territory economy, and this budget does just that.

Supporting the economy and our people, and building productive infrastructure, creates employment, improves services and generates long-lasting benefits for our citizens.

We will continue to leverage our low net debt and strong credit rating to support our community in a time of need—both in economic terms and in reviving consumer and business confidence.

The General Government Sector Headline Net Operating Balance is forecast to be in deficit for the next two years before returning to balance in the 2017 to 2019 period.

This fiscally responsible approach reflects a strategy that partially offsets spending through savings and revenue initiatives over the next four years.

### **Taxation reform**

This budget continues the reforms to make taxes fairer, simpler and more efficient that this Government started in 2012.

We are entering our fourth year of the reform process, and the benefits are clear.

Stamp duty is significantly lower than in 2011-12. For example, the buyer of a Canberra home valued at \$500,000 is now saving \$5,900 in stamp duty compared to before tax reform.

Buyers in the ACT now pay less stamp duty than in Victoria. And stamp duty is lower than in NSW for sales of properties valued up to \$850,000.

I am also pleased to advise that 2015-16 will be the last year that insurance duties will be applied in the ACT, making us the first jurisdiction to fully abolish this inefficient tax—saving households and businesses hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars each year.

With the Commonwealth Government looking at nation-wide tax reform, the ACT can proudly say we are already doing it.

## **Economic growth and diversification for Canberra**

This budget invests in the growth of our economy.

I have no higher priority than making sure our economy grows and creates the jobs and opportunities Canberrans need to reach their potential.

A growing economy means the Government can deliver the services Canberrans depend on, and maintain the Canberra way of life we are all proud of.

This budget funds capital works to modernise the Territory and put in place the infrastructure this and future generations need.

The capital works program of \$2.8 billion over four years is the largest ever by a Territory government.

This funding will progress transformational infrastructure such as new hospital and health facility construction, new schools and TAFE facilities, public and active transport projects, new roads and car parks and new court facilities, as well as a wide range of smaller suburban initiatives right across Canberra.

As well as providing important new facilities and infrastructure, this investment will sustain and create growth in the Territory.

Local businesses and residents also benefit from administrative and technological initiatives that will make it easier and quicker to do business with Government.

Access Canberra, which brings seven ACT Government agencies together and delivers shopfront and regulatory services through a single entry point, will invest in systems to boost private and public sector productivity.

Access Canberra means local businesses will spend less time dealing with ACT Government agencies and more time doing what they do best—building businesses and creating jobs.

We will also continue to work with the private sector to increase business innovation, trade development and investment.

Last week I unveiled the Government's 2015 business development strategy, titled *Confident and Business Ready: Building on Our Strengths*.

This is a blueprint for how the Government will support and partner with the private sector.

We are creating a Local Industry Advocate, and starting the Small Business Innovation Partnership, to help local businesses engage and work with the Territory Government. And this budget funds two of the Strategy's major initiatives—the CBR Innovation Fund and the CBR Trade and Investment Fund.

We will also boost tourism to the Territory and the region, with new initiatives to promote Canberra as a business and leisure destination in domestic and international markets. And we will continue to work with airlines to attract direct international air services to and from key markets.

The Government will also continue to support major events, such as Floriade and blockbuster exhibitions, which provide world-class attractions for Canberrans and attract visitors to the Territory.

### **Health and education investment for Canberra**

This budget makes record investments in health and education.

I said earlier that budgets are about people, and about values.

Our commitment to invest in health and education is where this is apparent: there is nothing I value more than our people, and this budget invests to improve their health and education outcomes regardless of their circumstances.

This budget provides \$1.5 billion for health in 2015-16, including more than \$161 million over four years for growth and new initiatives in the health system.

There will be more services for mental health, end of life care, community, outpatient and primary care, and more elective surgeries and procedures.

There will also be expanded hospital services and more beds at our hospitals, there will be more services for women and children, and we will invest in specialist drug treatment services.

Canberrans can take advantage of healthier and more active lifestyles, with significant funding for a range of sporting and recreational initiatives, the continuation of healthy weight programs, and more walking and cycling projects.

This budget invests more than \$1.1 billion in our education system to support our teachers and improve learning outcomes for all students in Government, Catholic and independent schools, regardless of ability or background.

There are a range of initiatives to assist students, such as extra resources and special needs transport for students with disability. Teachers will also be supported through further online resources.

Capital funding of more than \$75 million will improve infrastructure and enhance information and communication technology in schools.

The Government has introduced a program of revitalising school infrastructure and is also modernising Belconnen High.

The budget also funds the new Coombs Primary School, a state-of-the-art facility for more than 700 students, and begins planning for new schools in Molonglo and Gungahlin.

The Canberra Institute of Technology will also receive a boost. This budget funds a new training centre in Tuggeranong to update CIT's course offerings and facilities for students in Canberra's south, and there will be upgrades to the Bruce and Reid campuses.

### **Enhancing livability and social inclusion for Canberra**

Canberra is the most livable city in the world.

This budget ensures that we continue to be a confident city which gives every member of our society a chance to shine and to contribute.

This is how we should measure our success as a society: do we provide a place for everyone, and the help we all need from time to time, so that we can contribute to what makes our city the place that it is.

More than \$389 million will be provided for community services and housing, including disability and out-of-home-care services, community housing, and homelessness services.

I am proud that this budget provides \$159 million for better public housing. We all know the poor state of some public housing—notably along Northbourne Avenue. This Government is doing something about that—we are building or acquiring modern accommodation to improve the quality of life for tenants.

Canberrans deserve to feel safe in their homes. Violence in the home is unacceptable.

To counter violence against women and children the Territory Government has funded a range of new programs in the budget.

This includes extra funding for domestic and sexual violence services. This will assist the Domestic Violence Crisis Service, the Canberra Rape Crisis Centre, and the Canberra Men's Centre to meet increased demand.

We will also provide social and emotional learning programs in ACT public schools. This will include additional resources for the training of teachers and staff on domestic violence issues, the development of an online resource centre to connect families to support services, and support for children and young people who may be experiencing domestic violence.

In addition, longer term prevention and management strategies are being developed across government.

The ACT Government will also join the Commonwealth and all other states and territories for a national campaign to counter violence against women and children.

The Better Services program will simplify access to, and help from, community services—ensuring vulnerable Canberrans get the right service, at the right time, and for as long as they need it.

Canberrans with disability will continue to be supported with appropriate care in the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

The Government is committed to a safer community. The budget increases funding for fire and ambulance services, including a new ambulance station in Greenway, and upgraded communications systems to better respond to emergencies.

There is extra funding to supplement ACT Policing, including for high-tech crime and forensics services, and information and communication technology.

This budget will protect the people who protect us, giving our emergency services workers the resources they need to do their job and look after the people we care about.

### **Suburban renewal and better transport for Canberra**

I am approaching forty years as a Canberra resident.

I have never been prouder to be Canberran than I am today, and I know everyone who lives here feels the same way.

And I am proud to deliver a budget that helps Canberra grow by investing in our suburbs, in their built environment and natural surroundings.

The Government is building an integrated transport network right across Canberra—encompassing roads, buses, light rail, walking and cycling.

This budget invests heavily in new transport infrastructure. This will deliver duplications to major roads and road upgrades right around the city, notably in Tuggeranong and Gungahlin.

There is also significant investment in public transport, including more services to new suburbs, a new bus station for Erindale, and the establishment of a Community Transport Coordination Centre.

We are making a \$375 million capital contribution to the Capital Metro project—funded by the sale of ACTTAB, the sale of surplus property and land, and a contribution from the Abbott Government as part of the Commonwealth's Asset Recycling Initiative.

Municipal services are rightly important to Canberrans—and this budget delivers a significant program of suburban renewal to ensure Canberra remains the most livable city in the world.

There is new funding for more suburban maintenance. This includes more mowing, cleaning and weeding, upgrades to shopping centres, and services for new suburbs in Molonglo and Gungahlin.

This will ensure our urban parks and trees, shopping centres, and other community open spaces continue to be managed and maintained to a high standard. In particular, we are ensuring our local shops are attractive, clean, safe and ‘ready for business’.

This budget will ensure the Territory continues to lead the country in sustainable energy, waste management, and recycling and climate change policy. There is significant investment to care for our environment and enhance its biodiversity, to protect us from bushfire, and to manage our waterways.

There is also new investment and initiatives to boost animal welfare in the Territory, including extra funding for the RSPCA.

### **Conclusion**

The 2015 budget enshrines the values this Government holds about Canberra.

This budget continues to expand the world-class health and education services Canberrans deserve.

It supports our economy—to help our businesses grow and create jobs.

It holds out a helping hand to the community—to those Canberrans who need assistance.

This budget invests in even better suburbs, parks, roads and transport.

It invests in the infrastructure and long-term projects our city needs.

And this budget builds on the pride we all feel in this city we call home—ensuring Canberra remains a great place to live, work, study and do business, and the most livable city in the world.

This is a budget for Canberra.

I commend the Appropriation Bills to the Assembly.

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

### **Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2015-2016**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MR BARR** (Molonglo—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Urban Renewal and Minister for Tourism and Events) (3.26):

I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

This bill provides funding for the operation of the parliament. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

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

## Papers

**Madam Speaker** presented the following papers:

Auditor-General Act—Auditor-General’s Report No 3/2015—Restoration of the Lower Cotter Catchment, dated 20 May 2015.

Standing order 191—Amendments to:

Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Amendment Bill 2014, dated 21 May 2015.

Government Procurement (Transparency in Spending) Amendment Bill 2014, dated 15 May 2015.

Planning and Development (Call-in Power) Amendment Bill 2014, dated 21 May 2015.

**Mr Barr** presented the following papers:

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

Long-term contracts—Gary Davis, dated 11 May 2015.

Short-term contracts:

Grace Concannon, dated 6 May 2015.

Mark McCabe, dated 10 and 11 May 2015.

Robert Hyland, dated 2 and 6 May 2015.

Tony Carmichael, dated 5 and 6 May 2015.

Contract variations:

Conrad Barr, dated 5 and 6 May 2015.

Craig Simmons, dated 12 May 2015.

Kaaren Blom, dated 13 May 2015.

Territory-owned Corporations Act, pursuant to subsection 19(3)—Statement of Corporate Intent—Icon Water—2015-2016 to 2018-2019, dated 15 May 2015.

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

Section 14—Directing a transfer of funds within—

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate—

Dated 21 and 22 May 2015.

Dated 21 and 22 May 2015.

Section 15A and section 16—directing a transfer of funds between output classes within the Office of the Legislative Assembly and directing a transfer of appropriations from the Office of the Legislative Assembly to the ACT Executive, dated 18 May 2015.

Section 16—Directing a transfer of appropriations from—

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate to the Community Services Directorate, dated 21 May 2015.

Community Services Directorate to the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, dated 28 May 2015.

Environment and Planning Directorate to the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, dated 25 May 2015.

Health Directorate to the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, dated 25 May 2015.

Section 18A—Authorisation of Expenditure from the Treasurer's Advance to Justice and Community Safety Directorate, excluding a statement of reasons, dated 21 May 2015.

**Mr Corbell** presented the following paper:

ACT Criminal Justice—Statistical Profile 2015—March quarter.

### **Disability inclusion statement 2015-2017 Paper and statement by minister**

**MS BURCH** (Brindabella—Minister for Education and Training, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Disability, Minister for Racing and Gaming and Minister for the Arts): For the information of members, I present the following paper:

ACT Disability Inclusion Statement 2015-2017.

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

Leave granted.

**MS BURCH:** I am proud to table the ACT disability inclusion statement, the government's commitment to deliver a local response to the national disability strategy. The statement is informed by our consultative process with people with a disability, government and the community during April and May of this year. The statement responds to the community's feedback and sets out a guiding vision for an inclusive Canberra that enables people with a disability to participate and reach their full potential as equal and valued citizens.



People have said that we should champion our position as a leading human rights jurisdiction and emphasise the role we have in creating a Canberra community where people with a disability have equal rights and can achieve a better future. People with disability and the broader community have told us they want to be involved in co-designing and delivering practical solutions against the priority areas. We have responded to this and focused our attention on key priority areas.

Feedback from the disability community indicated an appetite for a fresh approach that creates shared obligations and platforms for taking action. To achieve this, the statement will put in place five social campaign streams aligned to the priority areas. Each social campaign will comprise year-long communication of activities, events, media, community education and information. Key to the success of these campaigns is shared responsibility and action; it is the role of government to harness support and mobilise the community to take action and to achieve an inclusive Canberra.

These campaigns have the potential to bring about real change in our community for people with disability. Once people are provided with the means to make that positive change, they do. The ACT disability inclusion statement is a call for action for Canberrans to join together to enable people with disability to reach their full potential as equal and valued citizens.

I look forward to formally launching this statement later this month.

## Papers

**Ms Burch** presented the following papers:

### **Subordinate legislation (including explanatory statements unless otherwise stated)**

Legislation Act, pursuant to section 64—

Animal Diseases Act—Animal Diseases (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-74 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Animal Welfare Act—Animal Welfare (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-80 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Building Act—Building (General) Amendment Regulation 2015 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2015-17 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Cemeteries and Crematoria Act—Cemeteries and Crematoria (Public Cemetery Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-87 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Civil Law (Sale of Residential Property) Act—Civil Law (Sale of Residential Property) Amendment Regulation 2015 (No 1)—Subordinate Law SL2015-18 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Domestic Animals Act—Domestic Animals (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-79 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Magistrates Court Act—Magistrates Court (Work Health and Safety Infringement Notices) Amendment Regulation 2015 (No 2)—Subordinate Law SL2015-16 (LR, 6 May 2015).

Nature Conservation Act—Nature Conservation (Brush-tailed Rock wallaby) Action Plan 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-68 (LR, 8 May 2015).

Official Visitor Act—Official Visitor (Children and Young People) Appointment 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-69 (LR, 7 May 2015).

Road Transport (General) Act—Road Transport (General) Application of Road Transport Legislation Declaration 2015 (No 4)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015 70 (LR, 7 May 2015).

Stock Act—

Stock (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-81 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Stock (Levy) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-82 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Stock (Minimum Stock Levy) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-83 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Tree Protection Act—Tree Protection (Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-84 (LR, 14 May 2015).

Waste Minimisation Act—Waste Minimisation (Landfill Fees) Determination 2015 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2015-85 (LR, 14 May 2015).

## **Adjournment**

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

**The Assembly adjourned at 3.32 pm.**