



# Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

**NINTH ASSEMBLY**

**16 AUGUST 2018**

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

## Thursday, 16 August 2018

Rulings from the chair (Statement by Speaker).....	3031
Visitors.....	3031
Petition: Mitchell light rail stop—petition 6-18 (Ministerial response) .....	3031
Future of education (Ministerial statement).....	3032
Centenary Hospital for Women and Children (Ministerial statement).....	3039
Civil Law (Wrongs) (Child Abuse Claims Against Unincorporated Bodies) Amendment Bill 2018.....	3046
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Principal Target) Amendment Bill 2018.....	3049
Remonstrance—democratic rights of citizens of the ACT .....	3052
Questions without notice:	
Land—valuations.....	3073
Environment—Lake Burley Griffin .....	3073
Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—upgrade program.....	3074
Carers—support services .....	3074
Molonglo Valley—shopping facilities .....	3075
Education—future strategy .....	3076
Planning—Yarralumla brickworks .....	3077
ACT Policing—criminal gangs .....	3078
Planning—Fyshwick .....	3079
Gungahlin—nurse-led walk-in centre .....	3080
Crime—Yerrabi .....	3082
Justice—accessibility.....	3082
Clubs—community contributions.....	3084
Tuggeranong—streetlighting.....	3086
National Multicultural Festival—government support.....	3087
Supplementary answer to question without notice:	
Mental health—efficiency targets .....	3090
Personal explanations.....	3090
Appropriation Bill 2018-2019—part 1.4 .....	3091
Paper .....	3091
Domestic animals—services management and staff resources .....	3091
ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—report.....	3093
Remonstrance—democratic rights of citizens of the ACT .....	3095
Appropriation Bill 2018-2019.....	3101
Adjournment .....	3133
Answers to questions:	
Planning—Yarralumla (Question No 1333).....	3135
Transport—electric cars (Question No 1361—revised answer).....	3136
Government—vehicle fleet (Question No 1380—revised answer).....	3137
Roads—Tillyard and Ginninderra drives (Question No 1454) .....	3137
Roads—safety (Question No 1457).....	3138
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1459).....	3138
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1460).....	3140
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1461).....	3141
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1462).....	3142
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1463).....	3145

Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1464).....	3146
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1465).....	3147
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1466).....	3149
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1467).....	3150
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1468).....	3151
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1469).....	3152
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1470).....	3153
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1471).....	3153
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1472).....	3154
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1473).....	3155
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1474).....	3157
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1475).....	3158
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1476).....	3159
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1477).....	3160
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1478).....	3161
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1479).....	3162
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1480).....	3162
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1481).....	3163
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1482).....	3164
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1483).....	3165
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1484).....	3167
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1485).....	3168
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1486).....	3170
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1487).....	3172
Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1488).....	3174
Municipal services—shopping trolleys (Question No 1490) .....	3175
Municipal services—street lights (Question No 1491) .....	3176
Transport Canberra and City Services—staffing (Question No 1492).....	3177
ACT Health—cystic fibrosis treatment services (Question No 1493) .....	3179
Arts—venues (Question No 1494) .....	3179
ACT Health—proposed organisational changes (Question No 1495) .....	3180
ACT Health—proposed organisational changes (Question No 1496) .....	3182
ACT Health—proposed organisational changes (Question No 1497) .....	3183
Mental health—psychiatric services (Question No 1498).....	3185
Answers to questions on notice—costs (Question No 1499) .....	3186
Roads—accident black spots (Question No 1500) .....	3188
Municipal services—path upgrades (Question No 1501).....	3189
Schools—trees (Question No 1502) .....	3190
Heritage—representative Aboriginal organisations (Question No 1503) ....	3191
Government—community organisations support (Question No 1504).....	3194
Public housing—relocations (Question No 1505).....	3201
Public housing—renewal program (Question No 1506) .....	3202
Schools—community organisations (Question No 1507).....	3205
ACT Policing—Neighbourhood Watch (Question No 1508) .....	3207
ACT Policing—cycling infringements (Question No 1509).....	3208
Municipal services—libraries (Question No 1510).....	3209
Roads—traffic signals (Question No 1511) .....	3211
ACTION bus service—patronage (Question No 1512) .....	3212
Planning—development applications (Question No 1513).....	3213

Planning—community facility zoning (Question No 1514).....	3213
ACTION bus service—drivers (Question No 1515) .....	3214
Roads—projects (Question No 1516).....	3215
ACTION bus service—patronage (Question No 1517) .....	3218
Access Canberra—service delivery (Question No 1518).....	3220
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1519) .....	3221
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1520) .....	3221
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1521) .....	3221
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1522) .....	3222
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1523) .....	3222
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1524) .....	3223
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1525) .....	3223
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1526) .....	3223
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1527) .....	3224
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1528) .....	3224
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1529) .....	3224
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1530) .....	3225
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1531) .....	3225
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1532) .....	3225
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1533) .....	3226
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1534) .....	3226
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1535) .....	3227
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1536) .....	3227
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1537) .....	3227
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1538) .....	3228
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1539) .....	3228
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1540) .....	3228
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1541) .....	3229
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1542) .....	3229
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1543) .....	3229
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1544) .....	3230
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1545) .....	3230
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1546) .....	3230
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1547) .....	3231
ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1548) .....	3231
Planning—land use (Question No 1549).....	3232
Disability services—funding (Question No 1550) .....	3233
Business—Fyshwick (Question No 1551) .....	3234
Planning—Fyshwick (Question No 1552) .....	3235
Minister for Health and Wellbeing—meetings (Question No 1553).....	3235
Minister for Mental Health—meetings (Question No 1554).....	3236
Government—contractors (Question No 1555) .....	3237
Government—contractors (Question No 1556) .....	3238
ACT Policing—gun ownership (Question No 1557) .....	3238
Alexander Maconochie Centre—programs (Question No 1558) .....	3239
Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—Reconciliation Day (Question No 1559) .....	3240
Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—programs (Question No 1560) ....	3241
Alexander Maconochie Centre—programs (Question No 1561) .....	3242

Alexander Maconochie Centre—housing (Question No 1562) .....	3244
Alexander Maconochie Centre—health services (Question No 1563) .....	3245
Health—chemotherapy (Question No 1564) .....	3246
Questions without notice taken on notice:	
Senator for the Australian Capital Territory—casual vacancy.....	3246
ACTION bus service—Xpresso services .....	3247

**Thursday, 16 August 2018**

**MADAM SPEAKER** (Ms J Burch) 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.

### **Rulings from the chair**

#### **Statement by Speaker**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I wish to go back to a query last night from Mr Gentleman relating to Mr Coe's interjections during a speech made by Mr Rattenbury, and the actions of the occupant of the chair. Yesterday, during a motion about the ABC, Mr Coe was interjecting during a speech delivered by Mr Rattenbury. Mr Rattenbury pointed out to the chair that Mr Coe was on a warning. The Deputy Speaker was in the chair and she indicated that the ruling had not been hers. Prior to moving for the adjournment of the house, Mr Gentleman raised the matter with me while I was in the chair, seeking guidance as to whether a ruling made by one occupant of the chair was, in effect, binding on another occupant of the chair.

A check of the Assembly *Hansard* revealed that Mr Coe was not on a warning, although I did indicate to Mr Coe during question time, and immediately after warning Mr Hanson, that "you will be added to that list, Mr Coe". Neither the companion to the standing orders nor *House of Representatives Practice* offers much guidance on this issue, although *House of Representatives Practice* observes:

If disorder arises or if special circumstances apply when a Member of the Speaker's panel is presiding, the Speaker or Deputy Speaker will often resume the Chair.

Can I indicate here very clearly for members that I intend to adopt that practice, and whenever disorder occurs and I am not in the chair, I will return to the chair and I will continue with my original warnings that occurred earlier in the day.

### **Visitors**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Can I alert members that in the public gallery we have leaders of the next generation, Canberra College students in year 11 and 12 who are studying global studies. Welcome to your Assembly.

### **Petition—ministerial response**

The following response to a petition has been lodged:

#### **Mitchell light rail stop—petition 6-18**

By **Ms Fitzharris**, Minister for Transport and City Services, dated 15 August 2018, in response to a petition lodged by Ms Fitzharris on 20 March 2018 concerning a proposed light rail stop in Mitchell.

*The response read as follows:*

Dear Mr Duncan

I refer to the letter of 20 March 2018 from the Acting Clerk Ms Julia Agostino, regarding petition No 6-18, requesting the reinstatement of the light rail stop planned for Mitchell.

I am pleased to advise that funding has been allocated in 2018-19 for preliminary planning and detailed design of the light rail stop at Mitchell.

Construction of the Mitchell stop will occur during 2019-20.

Thank you for raising this matter. I trust the information provided is of assistance.

## **Future of education Ministerial statement**

**MS BERRY** (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Women and Minister for Sport and Recreation) (10.04): Before I begin my ministerial statement, I would like to acknowledge some other guests in the chamber today. We have Laura Mobini-Kesheh from the minister's student congress, Shaylah McClymont from the minister's student congress, Daniella Titulaer from Bonython Primary School, Toby Krog from Bonython Primary School, Josh Simms from Gowrie Primary School, Levi Davies and his father, Ben Davies, from Charles Weston School, Greg Baines and students from Merici College, Tim McNevin and students from Galilee School, as well as education directorate officials and Glenn Fowler from the Australian Education Union. I also acknowledge and thank my Labor colleagues and Greens members who are here in the chamber today to listen to this important statement.

Madam Speaker, the ACT government went to the 2016 election with a commitment to make our city's education system even better. Our goal was to lay out a plan for how education will be delivered to meet the needs of the next generation, for every student. I kicked this work off at the beginning of 2017 intending to have a big conversation with the ACT community. My aim was a conversation involving parents, teachers, school leaders, other educators, experts and community organisations. Vitality, children and young people were to have a strong voice as the people most affected by the decisions made today.

I am happy to outline today that a big conversation has in fact been had and the product of this conversation is a future of education strategy that lays out a road map for work over the coming 10 years. It is aimed at the whole system and all schools: government and non-government, systemic and independent. Alongside it, the government will be developing an early childhood strategy which will make sure every child is set up for success.

I began work on the future of education strategy by articulating a value that has remained close throughout everything that has followed. Every parent wants the very best for their child, both during childhood and into their future lives. But even in wealthy communities like the ACT, children start life in vastly different places, with different backgrounds and circumstances affecting their chances at a good life. You can see this in schools every day. Some children come to school ready to learn. They are happy and well, eager to take hold of their world. Some children, however, are not as fortunate. These children take on greater challenges and face greater barriers than the rest.

Education has an incredible power to level all of this out. Education allows all children to reach their potential. The ACT government believes that every child deserves a great education and the life chances that flow from it. Our education system must support all children to overcome and achieve. Our education system must mould mature and resilient adults. It must establish success for the future and broaden horizons. It will do this by providing equity and by responding to the personal needs of each individual, because educational equity is key to achieving a fairer, more equal society free from the disadvantage arising from economic, social, cultural or other causes.

The future of education strategy rests on four foundations. They are: to place students at the centre of their learning; to empower teachers, school leaders and other professionals to meet the learning needs of all students; to build strong communities for learning; and to strengthen systems to focus on equity and equality. These foundations will focus improvements to education on what matters most in the government's efforts over the next 10 years.

At the core of the strategy is an acknowledgement of the human diversity among students. Every child has their own needs, abilities, motivations, interests and aspirations, which an education system must recognise, support and address. The ACT education system of the future will be personalised to each child. It will celebrate difference. It will take a holistic view of the people it serves—our children and our young people.

Placing students at the centre of their learning is an expression of equity but also an opportunity to recognise the endeavour of all learning and to celebrate achievement and excellence wherever this occurs. Each student treads their own educational pathway based on their developing interests, knowledge and skills. Through education, children develop into capable adults who have learnt to learn, live productively in society, think, create and work in an increasingly digital future.

Initiatives in the strategy that draw from this foundation will include a continuing implementation of effective, rigorous inquiry and project-based learning models, with an increasing focus on development of the general capabilities in the current curriculum. Building on work already begun, the government will continue to work on measurement and evaluation of student learning growth. We will aim for each student to achieve a minimum of a year's growth for a year's learning, having regard to their starting point.



The government will also look more closely at transition processes and learning pathways from early childhood education through primary, secondary and senior secondary schools to work or further study. This will, of course, involve the Board of Senior Secondary Studies and the vital work that they do. Importantly, the government will continue to prioritise student wellbeing so that, where possible, barriers to learning and development like physical and mental health or social factors are minimised or removed.

The future of education in the ACT relies on increasingly investing in and empowering learning professionals. Teachers and school leaders, together with a team of people, including other educators, allied learning professionals and support staff, make education happen every day. After personal factors related to a child, teachers are the single most significant factor in student achievement. School leaders have a vital role in this by supporting and mentoring their colleagues and guiding schools to be happy, productive environments.

Working alongside teachers and school leaders are people providing health, wellbeing and administrative services who are equally committed to student outcomes. Meeting student needs requires schools to collaborate with families, community and human service providers. Through this, schools become inclusive learning communities for all children and young people.

The strategy begins with an awareness that teachers and school leaders are expert professionals highly skilled at working with their students to lead them through their learning journey. As the strategy is implemented, initiatives based on this foundation will include the design of a workforce plan to increase diversity and expertise in the school workforce and strengthened internship models for new teachers.

It is vital that the right people enter the teaching profession, that initial teacher education meets contemporary needs and delivers classroom ready graduates and that new teachers are supported through their journey into the profession. There is an opportunity for an expanded role for the ACT Teacher Quality Institute in this area, building on its work on ensuring high quality professional experience and practicum for student teachers.

Equally, investment in professional learning and mentoring and coaching, and the sharing of effective practice, will continue and expand. These elements are essential to the strategy. For example, the government will grow its partnership with the University of Canberra. This work is supporting teachers to grow their knowledge and skill in key areas such as facilitating learning in general capabilities, personalising learning and working with data to make sure that their teaching is having an impact.

The government will take a more structured approach to strengthening instructional leadership and making sure the right people progress into school leadership roles. Better professional and wellbeing support for school leaders and principals will enhance their ability to deliver school improvement and ensure a focus on quality teaching in every classroom.

The government will also bring a new focus on making sure that teachers and school leaders have the knowledge, skills and confidence to work as part of a team in a full service community school. While the core function of schools is to provide education, schools are also key community hubs, providing more than access to just learning. Taking a holistic view of students and their needs and recognising that teachers and school leaders work in partnership with families and other professionals and support staff results in a reorientation of schools as multiservice environments, better positioned to meet the diverse range of student academic and wellbeing needs.

Partnerships between schools, government and community service providers also allow schools to be community hubs for people beyond current students, such as their families. Schools are increasingly being asked to facilitate access to a range of services for young people, children and their families. The strategy takes advantage of this to support strong school communities focused on enabling learning but also to enhance wellbeing, resilience and connections throughout the wider community.

Drawing on examples across Australia, such as Doveton College in Victoria, as well as international evidence, the government has begun to explore effective community school models. Arising as an initiative from the strategy, the government will look to bring community school approaches to the ACT education system.

Additionally, the government recognises the effective business, industry and union partnerships that help students to access important learning opportunities and to develop the capabilities that they will need for adult life. This will be a continuing priority through initiatives such as the future skills academy announced in the 2018 budget.

The government will also look closely at the improved integration of early childhood, community and government service providers to make sure that young children are set up for success and given a strong start to their education journey. As schools become more seamlessly engaged with other human services, in the future it may be that children are enrolled in their learning and development journey from birth so that no-one falls through the gaps.

The strategy recognises that achieving this and other aspirations will require a closer look at the organisational systems around our learning communities. Providing the education of the future requires systems that are harmonious with the directions set by the future of education strategy. Things like legislation, resources, structures, culture, public accountability and reporting, teaching tools, data and IT in many ways dictate the outcomes achieved.

With the government's increasing focus on equity and allowing every child the opportunity to achieve excellent outcomes, regardless of their background and circumstance, comes a need to align the systems supporting learning with this pursuit. In some ways this foundation provides the most substantial area of work initiated by the strategy.

Initiatives arising from it include work towards the government's early childhood strategy, which will emphasise helping each child gain a strong start through quality and accessible early childhood education. The government will also look at key statutory frameworks such as the Education Act 2004 and the ACT Teacher Quality Institute Act 2010 to make sure that they are harmonious with the strategic direction that the government is laying out.

The ACT Teacher Quality Institute has been a national leader in supporting an expert teaching profession. The government will take the TQI's role in sharing excellent practice and contemporary research evidence even further by exploring the creation of an ACT teaching evidence clearing house.

Consistent with the government's existing investment in technology in education, the government will implement digital tools and platforms for a range of purposes such as monitoring and evaluating student progress and enabling personalised learning led by a student in partnership with their teachers and parents. The government is also intent on making sure that the strategy has an impact, so it will develop and implement an accountability framework that robustly measures the results of this strategy.

The future of education takes the work already happening as a strong base and looks to the next 10 years at some of the big things that are possible. Initiatives arising from the strategy will be laid out in an implementation plan for the ACT education system as a whole. Over the coming months the government will work with the Catholic and independent school sectors, key government agencies and community organisations on how the strategy will be adopted across school contexts.

How the ACT education system works with the foundations also matters. So, as the strategy is implemented, work will be guided by equity—that is, student achievement that sets aside economic, social and cultural barriers; student agency, which allows students to make decisions about their learning and how their learning environments operate; access, so that supports for learning and wellbeing are available and provided to all students; and inclusion, where diversity is embraced, all students are accommodated and a universal sense of belonging fostered.

Importantly, the future of education strategy is not a static or comprehensive list of disjointed actions. It is a road map for continued focus and investment from a government committed to the very best future for the ACT's children and young people.

Madam Speaker, I present the following papers:

Future of education—A ten year education strategy—Ministerial statement,  
16 August 2018.

The Future of Education—An ACT education strategy for the next ten years.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the ministerial statement.

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong) (10.20): I welcome the opportunity to speak on this important statement. I also welcome its delivery to the Assembly, and I thank the minister for providing in this statement some outline of her current thinking. On reading through it—and you can appreciate, Madam Speaker, it was only a quick but nevertheless concentrated appraisal, given that I set eyes on it for the first time only a few hours ago—it sets out some of the principles that I outlined in my appropriations speech on Tuesday. I hope the minister has had an opportunity to give my speech a more considered view and not just the off-the-top-of-her-head comments she made in her response on Tuesday. Given her comments today, I am optimistic that she has.

The minister talks of four foundations: to place students at the centre of their learning; to empower teachers, school leaders and other professionals to meet the learning needs of all students; to build strong communities for learning; and to strengthen systems to focus on equity with quality.

I notice we continue to have the word “equity” on every other page. I set out on Tuesday why I find this an opaque descriptor or goal, given the specific policies this government has adopted under the guise of equity. And I have to wonder whether the addition of the word “quality” to that last foundation came after the realisation that “equity” does not of itself deliver quality. It is indeed not too dissimilar to what I called for on Tuesday—that is, to seek excellence in education.

I welcome her reiteration of my comments that we should focus on aiming for a minimum of one year’s growth for one year’s learning, irrespective of starting point. It is a point I made very clearly on Tuesday. All students start at different points and all students deserve to have the support and encouragement to achieve to the highest level they can, and our education system should support and encourage them to do it.

The minister’s comments that the ACT government believes every child deserves a great education and “the life chances that flow from it” are obvious principles that, of course, I support. However, I question some of the subsequent comments, including equity being the key to how that can be achieved, but that is a debate for another day.

I note the minister’s statement says that the government will continue to work on the measurement and evaluation of student growth. I am encouraged to think that means perhaps NAPLAN might now get a fairer go. I hope the minister and her directorate talk to teachers who use NAPLAN well and appropriately as a great diagnostic tool to support their students to grow and that the focus of the review of NAPLAN is on how and why the data is being misused.

I am keen to understand more about the transition processes and learning pathways from early childhood through primary, secondary and senior secondary schools to work that the minister refers to. She mentioned the community school model and referenced Doveton College in Victoria. She says she is looking to bring such an approach to the ACT. I await further details on this with interest. Given this government’s frequent disdain for non-government schools, I find this an interesting direction but, of course, the devil is in the detail. I trust the minister will provide more information to me and to Canberra families on how she sees the community school model will apply in the ACT.

I note that the work currently done by the Teacher Quality Institute might well be expanded to provide an ongoing assessment process. Again, I will be interested to understand how creating a “teaching evidence clearing house” might differ from the current work they do.

Elsewhere the minister refers to empowering learning professionals and moving schools to become inclusive learning communities. She talks about teachers and school leaders being “expert professionals highly skilled at working with their students”. She talks of “partnerships between schools, government and community service providers to allow schools to be community hubs for people beyond current students, such as their families”. And—hallelujah!—on page 11 we get the first mention of families.

That brings me to what I consider a few glaring omissions. The first is that there is little reference to the role of parents. We talk of schools, we talk of teachers, we talk of school leaders, we talk of communities—all core to education—but nowhere in the statement does the minister outline the role of parents.

The minister has had conversations with parents—I know this—and acknowledges that parents want the very best for their children, as I am sure she herself, as a parent, does. Parental engagement by the school is a key factor in providing the best opportunities for students that have not had the best start in life, or whose parents through language, health or other impediments are not able to support their child in their education.

On this point, I can speak with personal experience, having grown up as the child of parents who did not understand a single word in a school newspaper or in any notes sent home by a teacher. If it had not been for the engagement that my parents showed in different ways, I would not have had the opportunities to access the world-class education that I have. Some encouraging work was done a few years ago by a previous education minister, and I hope it is again a focus in the future.

The statement also makes no reference to choice in education, so one has to wonder what implications it might have for the substantial non-government education sector here in the ACT. I am not sure what opportunities for consultations the non-government has had in the future of education conversations. The minister references partnerships between schools and organisational systems around our learning communities—whatever that might mean—but does that include non-government schools?

She says that providing the education of the future requires systems that are harmonious with the directions set out by the future of education strategy. I am aware that with little information as to the scope or purpose of doing so, work is being done on altering the principles and objectives in the Education Act, which I understand is the first of a tranche of changes to come.

Home education appears to have also been overlooked in this statement altogether. Is that the first system that might become what the government calls non-harmonious,

and will parental choice be the next victim? Parental choice is one of the key principles underlining any Canberra Liberals education policy, but it has no mention here. Indeed, as I have already emphasised, the role of parents also appears to be diminished. The Canberra Liberals look forward to what interpretation the minister applies to deliver the future of education strategy she outlined in the Assembly today.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Centenary Hospital for Women and Children Ministerial statement**

**MS FITZHARRIS** (Yerrabi—Minister for Health and Wellbeing, Minister for Transport and City Services and Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research) (10.28): I am pleased to rise today, in response to a motion passed earlier this year, to talk about the high quality of public maternity and birthing services we have here in the ACT. As the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, I am extremely proud of the work our midwives, nurses, doctors and other staff do in our maternity wards at both Centenary Hospital for Women and Children and at Calvary Public Hospital. They are all highly motivated, committed people who work hard every day to ensure mothers and their families have the best care possible during an important time when they bringing a new little person into this world.

The ACT government committed \$70 million in last year's budget to expand the Centenary hospital to meet the growing needs of the local community and the demand for maternity services. Before I talk further about the work underway to transform and expand Canberra's maternity services, I acknowledge the concerns raised earlier this year by some staff at the Centenary hospital.

I tabled the anonymous letter referred to in the motion on 9 May this year. I do not take these sorts of things lightly, and I acknowledge that the growing demand for maternity services has placed pressures on staff. Of course, we have to look after our staff as well as our patients, and ACT Health has been working with staff and their representatives to ensure they feel supported and their concerns are addressed appropriately. ACT Health investigate all issues that are raised by staff, whether it is a clinical issue, a safety concern or complaints about inappropriate behaviour. ACT Health make available a range of options to provide support to staff, including the employee assistance program, and ACT Health have at times brought in additional support to give staff another option to share their concerns and manage the demands of their jobs.

The concerns raised by this anonymous letter have been heard. ACT Health have since held forums to engage with staff over the issues raised, and it is important to recognise that all staff at Centenary, including those who wrote the letter, are caring people who want the very best for their patients. I hope they are proud to know that the vast majority of feedback I receive about Centenary is how wonderful the staff are and how great the care and service is. And with so many healthy babies born here every year, how can you not be proud of that? At the end of the day we are dealing with a service that is incredibly popular, with more and more women giving birth there every year.

I want to take this opportunity to reassure Canberra families that maternity and birthing services provided at both Calvary and Centenary hospitals are safe and that we have excellent modern health facilities. We also have a range of strategies to help deal with high demand, to ensure that mothers and their babies are cared for appropriately.

For example, we can use available beds from the birth centre and paediatric ward for postnatal care. And through the last budget we are increasing the number of beds available across the territory by 27 per cent. We are continuously recruiting more nurses and midwives, with the graduate midwifery program recruiting 15 new staff in 2018, a 50 per cent increase since the previous year. We can also extend the hours of the maternity assessment unit, roster additional medical and midwifery staff and introduce assistants in midwifery to maternity services. We actively encourage the community and GPs to utilise Calvary or Queanbeyan hospitals where appropriate for patients.

ACT Health have also been working closely with Calvary Public Hospital, given that it plays a major role in managing maternity demand through its excellent maternity and birthing services. Having more than one hospital in our city providing these services helps to manage demand and share resources across the community. For example, Calvary can support patients with low-risk elective procedures such as caesarean sections.

Longer term, Calvary will have additional capacity this financial year to expand their birthing capacity to 2,000 births per year. I really believe Calvary will become a much more attractive option for new mums, following the opening of the newly refurbished maternity ward at Calvary Public Hospital late last month. I had the pleasure of opening this beautiful ward, which has been expanded by three beds. But more importantly, it has been totally refreshed, with big, bright single rooms and large double rooms offering families a better, more modern experience.

Ensuring that women have comfortable, modern and accessible maternity and birthing facilities is critical to encouraging more women to choose Calvary and feel good about birthing there. The \$2.6 million refurbishment funded by the ACT government really has created a new atmosphere, with an intimate patient and family lounge and a spacious baby assessment room. The aesthetics of the patient and public areas are colourful and contemporary, and I am extremely confident that women and families will be delighted by the new facility, just like Jessica and David and their newborn son, Marcus, were when I visited last month.

But it is not just families who love the new ward; the staff at Calvary are over the moon with the new space, which gives them much more room, better facilities and a much more pleasant place to work in. We know the staff at Calvary are just as amazing as the staff at Centenary, and now they have a ward to work in which is just as good as well. I want to again encourage mums, particularly from the north side, who are expecting a little one soon to visit Calvary's new maternity ward and consider their options. For many north side mums it will be an extremely convenient and easy option to choose.

But improving our maternity services is not just about infrastructure; it is as much about the model of care and ensuring that women can get the type of care they want, whether it is a home birth or midwife-led care in our birthing suites. Through the maternity services offered at both the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children and at Calvary Public Hospital a diverse range of programs are available to women during pregnancy, birth and early parenting. These services have been specifically designed to meet the needs of mothers and their families and their specific circumstances.

Every year over 5,000 babies are born in our city through the public health system. We know our continuity model of care—our CATCH program—is incredibly popular. And we are working to keep up with growing demand for our continuity models of care throughout the expansion of this very popular service. This model of care requires a certain type of highly skilled midwife who is prepared to be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Attracting and keeping midwives for this type of service is known to be difficult across Australia.

ACT Health is currently conducting an internal review of our continuity of midwifery care models at the Centenary hospital, with the intent to increase women's access to these models at Centenary and therefore increase the use of the birth centre space. This review is expected to be finalised later this year and will also inform the new territory-wide approach to maternity service that I will mention shortly.

In addition to this popular model of care, a diverse range of programs are available to women during pregnancy, birth and early parenting at both the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children and Calvary Public Hospital. These services have been specifically designed to meet the needs of mothers and their families and their circumstances. Our specialised health services are of extremely high quality and are provided by a dedicated and hardworking team of doctors, nurses, midwives and allied health professionals, all focused on providing woman-centred, holistic, evidence-based, culturally respectful and high quality care.

The public health services available at both Centenary and Calvary Public Hospital include: comprehensive antenatal education and transition to parenthood programs; continuity of midwifery care services and birth centres for low-risk mums-to-be; standard hospital care also suitable for women with low and moderate-risk pregnancy; multidisciplinary antenatal maternity care in antenatal clinics; special care nurseries for newborn babies who require additional care; and midcall home care and support for new mums in their homes, with midwives able to visit new mothers in their homes every day for the first two weeks.

At Centenary hospital there are also specialty, tertiary-level neonatal services for newborns and premature babies. It is worth highlighting that the neonatal unit at Centenary have won the quality in health care award two years in a row, as well as an award at the Perinatal Society of Australia and New Zealand conference for their presentation on lactation support. Centenary continues to improve its birthing practices, with a recent report by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare highlighting that the rate of episiotomies in the ACT is 17 per cent, well below the



national average of 22 per cent. Through quality improvement at Centenary the hospital has also successfully reduced its rate of perinatal tears below the benchmark rate.

To extend choice for birthing mothers who prefer to birth at home, the ACT government also offers women an opportunity to be part of our homebirth trial. The trial commenced in October 2016 and to date has seen 13 babies born at home. As we collate the results of this trial and plan for the next stage, ACT Health will be considering its options to expand the service, to include the north side through Calvary hospital, which I acknowledge was one of the recommendations in the estimates report.

As we know, our city is growing and with this we can expect to see more babies born every year across our city. To ensure that the care available continues to meet the needs of our growing community, ACT Health and Calvary have been working closely to develop a new territory-wide approach to better manage maternity care across the ACT. We want to make it easier for women to access maternity services and to understand their choices from that very first prenatal appointment to birth, immunisations, 12-month check-ups and beyond. I am pleased to update members on this work today and the government's vision for the future of public maternity services in Canberra. This body of work has been in development for quite some time and I am very excited about it.

To better manage the demand for our maternity services, support our staff and improve the experience of patients, significant work is underway to modernise our maternity services even further. ACT Health has started this conversation with Calvary Public Hospital, the community and key stakeholders, in partnership with the Women's Centre for Health Matters. We are consulting on a new and expanded territory wide approach that will be easier for families to navigate as they get used to the great news that they are soon to become parents.

We are fortunate to have two hospitals that provide low and medium-risk maternity services on both sides of Canberra, as well as a health facility at Centenary that can provide tertiary-level maternity care to those women and babies who need it from Canberra and our broader region. In transforming how maternity services in the ACT are offered, our focus is on providing streamlined access to high quality care at the right place, with supports and connections to women's local community wherever possible.

ACT Health work closely with new mothers through their journey from conception and prenatal care through to birth, as well as after care beyond the birth and their baby, and do so in an individualised, skilled and caring way. Care is taken to acknowledge the wishes of patients along this journey and ensure that mothers are well equipped to manage the demands of pregnancy and have an awareness of important activities, such as attending regular appointments, self-care, nutrition and exercise and monitoring foetal movements. This care extends right through to birth, when different approaches, birthing methods and pain relief may be used.

We have such a fantastic range of supports with our child and family centres that we want to make better use of, as well as our MACH clinics that are so vital during those first few months. As I said, discussions are currently underway with key stakeholders before we begin broader community consultation later this year. I am really looking forward to talking with new mums, expectant families and the community about how we can make our maternity services even better. When this process is complete, I will be very happy to provide an update to the Assembly about what the community have told us they want.

Ultimately, we want to develop a service that will make it much easier for people to navigate. It will be easier for pregnant women and their GPs to understand the range of options available, what the best option for them is, and where to go to get high quality care close to home. Through this consultation, we will be working with stakeholders and families to explore the benefits of a single entry point for birthing services, simply so that women do not have to approach two or three different services to get on a waiting list or find out where and when their first appointment will be. This is a really exciting process, and I look forward to seeing the outcomes early next year.

Of course, we will ensure staff are fully consulted before any changes are made to how maternity services are structured. Indeed, their input will be vital to making sure we get this right. The ACT government is committed not only to making it easier for women to access maternity and birthing services but also to staff sharing their expertise on the best ways to improve our services now and into the future.

As I have already mentioned in this place, the government has long-term plans to manage maternity demand in the ACT. These include the expansion of the Centenary hospital, which was funded in last year's budget. This initiative will see the hospital expand physically and also in its capacity to deliver health services for Canberrans. The expansion will deliver new and increased services for women, children and adolescents requiring inpatient care across a number of disciplines as well as a number of specialist outpatient services for women and children. I am pleased to say the expansion project is currently entering the design phase of this planning work, and I look forward to talking further with the community about this major infrastructure project in the coming months as work continues to progress.

Canberra is a beautiful city, and it is no surprise that more couples are choosing to start families here. I love living here with my three kids; it is wonderful to walk around Gungahlin when there are so many new mums shopping in our town centres, walking around Yerrabi Pond and visiting our community health centre. For many Canberrans, having a baby may be their first experience with our health system, which is why we need to make it as easy as possible for new mums to get the information and care they need when they need it.

We are lucky to have great hospitals and wonderful, kind, skilled staff—nurses, midwives, doctors, specialists, cleaners, wards people, and all our other staff who love what they do and work hard to ensure our community gets the best care possible in our health system. Our health system is complex, and it needs to be. But it should also

be intuitive and efficient, allowing consumers, especially new mums and dads, a good experience at this incredibly important time in their lives. Likewise, it should be a system that supports staff and allows them to feel they can raise issues—personal or professional—in a safe and supportive environment. This is the message I want to convey to ACT Health, and one that I will be making clear to our new chief executive officer and director-general.

The recent accreditation process for Canberra Hospital has also made it clear that ACT Health has turned a corner. It is an organisation that is and always has been focused on providing services that are high quality and best practice. This is something all ACT Health employees can be proud of as we continue to deliver high quality health care for our growing community.

I look forward to talking further with the community about the future of public maternity services in the ACT as we continue to develop this new territory-wide approach. I present a copy of the statement:

Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—Future Planning for Public Maternity Services in the ACT—Ministerial statement, 16 August 2018.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (10.44): I welcome this statement by the minister in relation to maternity services. I am pleased that the minister has such a positive approach to this important part of her portfolio. I hope that the minister has not glossed over some of the important issues that arise in this space. The minister started off by addressing the anonymous letter that was written earlier this year, in April, that outlined concerns in the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children. I will concentrate mainly on the Centenary hospital, because it is a large piece of infrastructure, it was very expensive, it is new and there are problems there.

The minister said in her statement that Health investigated all of the issues, but she did not say what conclusions she and ACT Health had come to about the allegations and issues raised in that anonymous letter. She just said that they were investigated. It is a little like the response I had from the interim director-general of Health yesterday about some issues that I had raised. Again I was told that they had been investigated. They simply said that and nothing else. The minister should be saying more about those things. She should be prepared to give credence to concerns that have been raised or to say that she does not believe that those concerns are there. But just to say that they have been investigated and we should be satisfied is not enough.

She did say that forums were held with staff, but it was reported to me that, in those forums that were held with staff after the letter was circulated, staff were actually asked to raise their hand if they had ever felt bullied or harassed in the workplace. I said at the time that I did not believe that was a respectful pathway for dealing with bullying and harassment—having people out themselves in a semi-public forum.

There are concerns about maternity services. There are many concerns. I agree with the minister that a lot of what I hear is a very positive response at a very joyful time in people's lives. Being delivered of a healthy baby in a routine delivery is an occasion of great joy. The feedback I get is substantially that the staff do a great job.

But the other part of the feedback that I get is that the staff do a great job in extraordinarily difficult circumstances. This was borne out by the head of the women's and children's hospital during the estimates process, when she said that the staff of the women's and children's hospital were under unrelenting pressure; in fact, I think there had been psychologists in the department to assist staff to deal with this unrelenting pressure. That does spill over into patient care, it does spill over into high turnover of staff and it does spill over into a range of criticisms that I have received from midwives, mothers, families and people who are closely associated with the women's and children's hospital that the maternity services are under a huge amount of pressure.

I do welcome the revitalisation of Calvary maternity. I am still very sceptical that a three-bed increase is all that is needed. There is much that I hear about Calvary, and the position put to me is that they would like to expand their midwifery-led maternity teams—that has not been funded—and that they could easily provide three midwifery-led teams rather than the current one.

I know this is an issue that has passed over the minister's desk, and it is an issue that gives me considerable concern. It relates to a particular family, but it shows some of the things that I think are of concern. One of the things that we should always be concerned about is the amount of intervention in births, and we are seeing an increasing amount of intervention. The minister today quoted some very encouraging figures in relation to episiotomies, but there are still high instances of assisted births, either with forceps or by caesarean section. Sometimes I get the impression—and it has certainly been reported to me—that people felt they were pushed into having a caesarean section when they would have preferred at least to have tried for a natural birth.

This highlights a case which I know the minister has dealt with. I know that the constituent has written to the minister as well as to me. A woman was pregnant with twins; this was, I think, her third pregnancy. She had had unproblematic births previously, but when she presented at the hospital she was told that because both her twins were breech they did not have the skills to allow her to go to a natural birth; there would be very few people who could deliver breech-presenting twins at the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children and, if she turned up in an unscheduled way, they could not guarantee that there would be anyone skilled enough to deliver breech-presenting twins.

The family in question eventually took the decision that they would have to go to the private system. They found an obstetrician who had rights at John James hospital, and those twins were delivered naturally, even though they were both breech, whereas the path that they were being pushed down when they were at the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children was that they should have an elective caesarean section and not even try to deliver the babies naturally.

The minister talks in her statement about how she wants to “transform” maternity services. It is one of those words that the government likes to use a lot: everything is “transformative”. But she does not say that she wants to transform them for the better, and I think that is what we should be about.

I also note that the minister has again spoken about the budget appropriation for the expansion of the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children. It was the subject of questions yesterday, and the minister has admitted that the time for completion has blown out to 2022. But I also put on the record here today, and remind members, that the election commitment from Minister Fitzharris and the Chief Minister was for the extension of the women’s and children’s hospital to be completed in 2019. If you go back and read the ALP’s election commitment, that is the time frame. It is now extended to 2022, so there is a three-year blowout in the time frame. The minister has not accounted for that, except to say, “The planning is very difficult.”

I welcome the statement today, but I also note that it is not all rainbows and unicorns, as the minister would have us believe. There are issues that need to be addressed in maternity services. I note my motion in relation to having a full inquiry into maternity services. I hope that the health committee will be able to see its way clear to making an announcement in that regard in the near future. I thank the minister for the statement today and assure members of this place, and members of the community, that I will continue to be vigilant in relation to the provision of maternity services.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

### **Civil Law (Wrongs) (Child Abuse Claims Against Unincorporated Bodies) Amendment Bill 2018**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MR RAMSAY** (Ginninderra—Attorney-General, Minister for Regulatory Services, Minister for the Arts and Community Events and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (10.54): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to introduce the Civil Law (Wrongs) (Child Abuse Claims Against Unincorporated Bodies) Amendment Bill 2018 today. This bill is part of a suite of reforms to make civil litigation a more effective means of providing justice for survivors of institutional child abuse. The ACT government acknowledges the nature and impact of the abuse suffered by victims of child abuse. Many survivors of child abuse suffer long-lasting and severe injuries that can affect them for the rest of their lives.

Today's bill implements recommendation 94 made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in its 2015 *Redress and civil litigation* report. The recommendation and the bill intend to address the challenges that survivors face in identifying a defendant to sue and accessing the opportunity for full consideration of the merits of their claim.

These challenges arise because the way an institution is structured may mean that it does not have legal personality and therefore cannot be sued—for example, if it is unincorporated, even if an institution has legal personality it may not have legal responsibility for the actions of the perpetrator of the abuse and, even if an institution is found to be liable, it may not have sufficient assets to meet a damages award, or assets are held in a trust and cannot be accessed.

The most well-known instance of the challenges this bill addresses was the position taken by the Catholic Church, which is an unincorporated body, in the Ellis case—*Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church v Ellis and Anor*, 2007, New South Wales Court of Appeal 117.

Mr Ellis, a survivor of abuse by a Catholic priest, was not able to establish a case against the individual perpetrator, who was deceased at the time the claim was brought; the archbishop, who could not be liable for the conduct of his predecessor; or the trustees of the property trust for the dioceses of Sydney, who were not liable for the actions of the perpetrator or the former archbishop because the relevant act did not confer power on the trustees to appoint, manage, discipline or remove priests.

The bill is aimed at ending the use of the Ellis defence and to ensure that plaintiffs are not unreasonably deprived of the opportunity for full consideration of the merits of their claim. This bill responds to these challenges by amending the Civil Law (Wrongs) Act 2002 to ensure that survivors of physical or sexual institutional child abuse are able to sue an entity, a proper defendant, that has the financial capacity to meet claims in relation to a personal injury arising from that abuse.

The bill enables an unincorporated body to nominate a proper defendant in a proceeding for a child abuse claim. An unincorporated body could include secular, religious or community-based organisations, volunteer-based organisations, unfunded or government-funded organisations and local, national or international organisations.

By providing the unincorporated body with the option to voluntarily nominate a proper defendant, the bill achieves the balance suggested by the royal commission: on the one hand recognising that institutions should retain the ability to conduct their affairs in a variety of ways; and on the other hand ensuring that plaintiffs have a reasonable fallback option that is not dependent upon the cooperation of the institution. If no nomination is made, or the nominated proper defendant is not suitable—for example, because it has insufficient assets to satisfy a successful claim—the bill provides the plaintiff with the option to apply for a court order to appoint a trust, related to the unincorporated body, as a proper defendant.

The bill allows a court to make an order to appoint a trust as defendant to a child abuse claim if the unincorporated body controls the trust. This applies to all trusts relating to all property, including superannuation trusts, a trust created by will or settlement, a trust created by legislation, and trusts of business assets. The bill enables a related trust to direct trust funds to the settlement of a child abuse claim and provides protection for trustees contemplating using trust property in a way that might otherwise be unlawful to meet claims.

The appointment of a related trust as proper defendant ensures that survivors are not prevented from having their claim heard solely because of the technical legal structure of the organisation against which the claim is brought. A nominated or appointed proper defendant will stand in the shoes of the unincorporated body for the civil proceedings. Therefore, an existing cause of action against the unincorporated body will need to exist to bring the claim.

The royal commission discussion of legal duties demonstrates that claimants will face challenges in identifying a claim against an unincorporated body, even where a proper defendant is nominated or appointed as the legal entity to sue. However, there are situations where a claim could be available—for example, where the nominated entity or related trust had some involvement in employment decisions.

The bill provides greater certainty for these claimants by avoiding or reducing the possibility that the claimant may succeed in establishing liability but not receive any financial benefit because the defendant is unincorporated. The bill applies retrospectively and prospectively, which is consistent with the royal commission's recommendation. This ensures that all survivors are able to sue unincorporated bodies for child abuse, regardless of when that abuse occurred.

Preventing child abuse from happening in the first place is the most important goal of the reforms recommended by the royal commission. But it is also important that, as a community, where we have failed children and institutional child abuse has occurred, changes are made to the law which acknowledge the importance of a survivor having the opportunity for full consideration of the merits of their claim.

The government has accepted all of the royal commission's civil litigation recommendations and is committed to making civil litigation a more effective means of providing justice for survivors. The government has already addressed the royal commission's recommendations about limitation periods in full. This was achieved by removing limitation periods for civil actions for child abuse in the Civil Law (Wrongs) Act 2002 and the Limitation Act 1985.

The ACT is participating in the national redress scheme. The scheme is intended to recognise and alleviate the impact of past institutional child sexual abuse, in particular for survivors who cannot meet the higher evidential thresholds of civil litigation. The remaining civil litigation recommendations are being progressed separately, in particular, those relating to imposing new duties on institutions to prevent child abuse.

Implementing the royal commission recommendations is a priority of this government. Child abuse is unacceptable. It represents an appalling failure to keep those who are most vulnerable safe. We are committed to ensuring children's safety and to providing justice and redress for people who have experienced abuse. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

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

## **Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Principal Target) Amendment Bill 2018**

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

Title read by Clerk.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong—Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, Minister for Corrections and Minister for Mental Health) (11.03): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to present the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Principal Target) Amendment Bill 2018 to the Legislative Assembly. Climate change is one of the great challenges facing the world today. Its impacts are already being felt here in the ACT, and those impacts will increase over time, whether it be more bushfires, more heatwaves or more extreme storms, with an associated risk of greater flooding.

To commend the Legislative Assembly, the ACT has long been a leading jurisdiction in tackling climate change. We immediately brought forward our target for achieving net zero emissions to 2050 after the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of the Parties, COP21, was held in Paris, with other states and territories following our lead. For example, Victoria and New South Wales updated their targets after we did.

We also compare favourably at the international level. Many countries have not set a net zero emissions reduction target, including our own commonwealth government. Currently, the UK aims for an 80 per cent reduction by 2050, although carbon neutrality by 2050 is being considered. Germany aims for up to a 95 per cent reduction target by 2050, and New Zealand is only now setting a net zero emissions target of 2050.

But the world is moving even further forward. For example, Sweden has set a target for reaching net zero emissions by 2045, albeit with the use of offsets. Iceland is going even further, having announced plans for carbon neutrality by 2040. And at the state level, Hawaii has pledged to become carbon neutral by 2045. There is a global push for reaching net zero emissions as soon as possible. We are a part of that global push, but there is clearly scope to do more if we are to remain a world-leading jurisdiction.



We need to make sure that we, as a community, are reducing our emissions in accordance with the latest scientific evidence if we are to limit the impacts of climate change. And the purpose of this bill is to ensure we are doing exactly that.

Madam Assistant Speaker, the bill that I am presenting today will bring forward the ACT's principal target date for achieving net zero emissions to 30 June 2045. Currently, the principal target date is 30 June 2050. Bringing forward the principal target date was the advice to the ACT government by the ACT's Climate Change Council in October 2017, which is made up of leading experts in the climate change field.

The council's advice was based on four things: first, the latest scientific evidence of the impacts and risks of climate change both globally and in the ACT; second, the ambition to limit the impacts of climate change to a two-degree warming scenario; third, the latest information and analysis on the ACT's emissions and technical options for emission reductions; and, finally, the ACT's ability to reduce emissions as a relatively prosperous and well-educated region.

Most importantly, the council's advice suggests we can achieve this new target with technology that already exists today. But we are not adopting this new target just on the council's advice. Tackling climate change requires community buy-in, so we have also tested this target with the community, as part of an extensive community consultation process on the development of the ACT's next climate change strategy.

That process began in December 2017 with the release of a discussion paper on how the ACT can become a net zero emissions territory. We asked the community for feedback on a wide range of issues, including the new target I am proposing today; where we should be aiming to reduce our emissions as a territory; and what the community can do to contribute.

We received feedback from not only the community but community interest groups, industry bodies and businesses. The feedback we received was overwhelmingly positive about us taking action to tackle our emissions, including by adopting new emissions reduction targets. We did not receive a single comment suggesting we should not be taking steps to tackle climate change or should not be adopting targets to do so.

It is safe to say that the community is on board with us. Throughout the consultation process, I have been genuinely inspired to hear the desire of ACT citizens to do their part. Their ambition and creativity on what can be done, whether it be in relation to transport, buildings, living infrastructure or other areas, tell me that we have a wonderful base on which to achieve this new target.

One issue that always arises in setting targets is cost: specifically, how much is it going to cost us as a territory to reach net zero emissions by 2045 and how does that differ from reaching net zero emissions by 2050? The simple answer is that the full cost is unknown at this stage. The answer will ultimately depend on changes we see in the future, such as developments in national energy policy and how much behavioural change can occur from community leadership.

However, we have undertaken some work on costs. The ACT government engaged a consultant to analyse the costs of achieving the 2030 interim target. Their report suggests that a 65 per cent reduction on 1990 emissions can be achieved by 30 June 2030 at an estimated cost of \$5.8 million. This figure comes down when the co-benefits of tackling climate change are taken into account; for example, reduced health expenditure and improved efficiencies in our energy use. It may even be possible to take action in a cost-neutral way.

It is important for the Legislative Assembly to keep in mind that these costs are preliminary. The actual cost will depend on what kinds of steps are sensible from a policymaking perspective. However, it does give you a sense of the task that is before us.

We also know that the cost of tackling climate change now is better than the costs we will have to pay for inaction. If we wait, we will be playing catch-up in dealing with issues like stresses on the health system brought about by extreme heat, and replacing locked in infrastructure that both has a negative effect on our climate and is not built to cope with the impacts of climate change. Businesses will also have additional costs, such as lost employee productivity.

These benefits of taking action now are known as co-benefits, and we have the opportunity to grasp them now or potentially miss them.

We also know that climate-friendly technologies are increasingly becoming more affordable. The price of wind and solar is reducing, and households are finding that they can achieve major energy savings through the use of solar panels. More recent technologies, such as electric vehicles, are also dropping in cost and will eventually be cheaper than their high-emitting alternatives. In other words, such technologies will be business as usual.

Tackling climate change now makes economic sense for governments, businesses and the community.

I am also pleased to inform the Assembly that the government will be adopting a series of interim targets to 2045 that will allow us to track our progress and analyse the costs of tackling climate change over time. As the minister, I will be doing this via a disallowable instrument under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act 2010. To this end, I am also pleased to present the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Interim Targets) Determination 2018. I believe that went up with the previous papers, Madam Assistant Speaker. If it has not, I will double-check that and present it.

The interim targets that will be adopted are: 50 to 60 per cent less than 1990 emissions by 30 June 2025; 65 to 75 per cent less than 1990 emissions by 30 June 2030; and 90 to 95 per cent less than 1990 emissions by 30 June 2040. These interim targets will give the community regular opportunities to hold the ACT government to account.

In summary, the ACT should be commended for the world-leading work it has been doing to tackle climate change to date. We are lucky to have an involved community that is dedicated to being responsible global citizens. We are also lucky to be in a position where we can do our part. Because of this, it is important we continue to do our fair share to reduce emissions, based on the latest science. This bill will keep us on the right track to be doing just that. I commend the bill and the determination to the Assembly.

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

## **Remonstrance—democratic rights of citizens of the ACT**

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (11.13), by leave: I move the remonstrance motion that I have had circulated in the chamber:

That this Assembly:

- (1) recognises that Australia's democracy is one of the best in the world;
- (2) recognises that Territory rights are of paramount importance to citizens of the Australian Capital Territory;
- (3) resolves that subsections 23(1A) and 23(1B) of the *Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Act 1988* are unwarranted restrictions on the democratic rights of residents of the Australian Capital Territory;
- (4) notes that the abovementioned subsections form legislation that the Commonwealth Parliament could not, and cannot, constitutionally enact for the States; and
- (5) determines that the Remonstrance will read as follows:

### **REMONSTRANCE**

The Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory respectfully addresses the President of the Senate and Senators of the Commonwealth Parliament.

#### **Preamble**

With other States around Australia actively considering and passing laws on voluntary assisted dying, the fact that the Australian Capital Territory cannot even consider its own legislation is unjust.

The ACT community wants this issue debated. The Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory established a select committee on 30 November 2017 to examine issues around end of life choices, including palliative care and of life choices. The Committee is due to report by end November 2018.

The ACT Government has stated, repeatedly and in a variety of forums (*The Canberra Times*—*ACT wouldn't rush through euthanasia laws, if Andrews Bill scrapped*—Article, 12 July 2018—Burgess, K. Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory—Inquiry into End of Life Choices in the ACT—*Hansard*, transcript of Committee hearings, 12 July 2018, p376. *The*

*Australian—It's about our rights*—Article, 13 August 2018, page 5—Barr, A & Gunner.), that there is no voluntary assisted dying scheme being actively considered by the ACT Government.

Restoring Territory rights would simply give ACT citizens the same rights to decide on the issue as other Australians.

### **Grievances**

The Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory presents its grievances to the Senate of the Commonwealth Parliament following its vote on 15 August 2018

These are that:

- (1) the Federal Parliament should never determine the rights of Australian citizens based on their postcodes;
- (2) during the debate on the Restoring Territory Rights (Assisted Suicide Legislation) Bill 2015, numerous Senators did one or more of:
  - (a) conflated their personal views on voluntary assisted dying with restoring Territory rights;
  - (b) misrepresented the intentions of the Territory parliaments if the Bill happened to pass;
  - (c) quoted one or more debunked sources as a reference point; and
  - (d) reneged on the position that they had stated to their electors;
- (3) the Senate has denied the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory the ability to debate what is a health and legal issue thanks to Senators' individual personal viewpoints, when the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory otherwise freely debates and determines policy on health and justice issues without federal interference;
- (4) the Senate has refused to properly seek, let alone take into account, the views of 420 000 citizens of the Australian Capital Territory during its debate about Territory rights; and
- (5) the Senate's unjustifiable position has resulted in the distress of citizens of the Australian Capital Territory.

### **Petition**

The Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory and its democratically elected Members respectfully request that Senators reflect on their vote of 15 August 2018 which has denied citizens of the Australian Capital Territory their democratic rights.

I thank colleagues for the opportunity to debate this motion this morning. The proposed remonstrance which I have had circulated to members, for the history buffs, follows a course of action that dates back in the Westminster parliamentary system to 1641. Although I do not expect that the implications of this particular motion will be as dramatic as at that time in British political and social history, this remonstrance has

a more contemporary context in Australian parliamentary history, as it indeed reflects a similar motion moved in the Northern Territory parliament in 1996.

The motion:

- (1) recognises that Australia's democracy is one of the best in the world;
- (2) recognises that Territory rights are of paramount importance to citizens of the Australian Capital Territory;
- (3) resolves that subsections 23(1A) and 23(1B) of the *Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Act 1988* are unwarranted restrictions on the democratic rights of residents of the Australian Capital Territory;
- (4) notes that the abovementioned subsections form legislation that the Commonwealth Parliament could not, and cannot, constitutionally enact for the States; and
- (5) determines that the Remonstrance will read as follows:

### **REMONSTRANCE**

The Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory respectfully addresses the President of the Senate and Senators of the Commonwealth Parliament.

### **Preamble**

With other States around Australia actively considering and passing laws on voluntary assisted dying, the fact that the Australian Capital Territory cannot even consider its own legislation is unjust.

The ACT community wants this issue debated. The Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory established a select committee on 30 November 2017 to examine issues around end of life choices, including palliative care and of life choices. The Committee is due to report by end November 2018.

The ACT government has stated repeatedly and in a variety of forums that there is no voluntary assisted dying scheme being actively considered at this time by the ACT government. This has been made clear in the media, in the *Hansard* of this place and in the statement that the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory and I made publicly earlier this week. The remonstrance continues:

Restoring Territory rights would simply give ACT citizens the same rights to decide on the issue as other Australians.

The grievances on behalf of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory to the Senate would be as follows.

- (1) the Federal Parliament should never determine the rights of Australian citizens based on their postcodes;
- (2) during the debate on the Restoring Territory Rights (Assisted Suicide Legislation) Bill 2015, numerous Senators did one or more of:

- (a) conflated their personal views on voluntary assisted dying with restoring Territory rights;
  - (b) misrepresented the intentions of the Territory parliaments if the Bill happened to pass;
  - (c) quoted one or more debunked sources as a reference point; and
  - (d) reneged on the position that they had stated to their electors;
- (3) the Senate has denied the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory the ability to debate what is a health and legal issue thanks to Senators' individual personal viewpoints, when the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory otherwise freely debates and determines policy on health and justice issues without federal interference;
- (4) the Senate has refused to properly seek, let alone take into account, the views of 420 000 citizens of the Australian Capital Territory—

and, I note, more than 250,000 citizens of the Northern Territory, and the combined population of the territories is greater than the state of Tasmania—

during its debate about Territory rights; and

- (5) the Senate's unjustifiable position has resulted in the distress of citizens of the Australian Capital Territory.

Therefore, this remonstrance petitions the Senate on behalf of members of this place, who have been democratically elected, that we:

... respectfully request that Senators reflect on their vote of 15 August 2018 which has denied citizens of the Australian Capital Territory their democratic rights.

In bringing this motion forward today, I wish to acknowledge and thank all those senators, all 34 of them, who respected the rights of territorians and of this Legislative Assembly and the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly to debate these issues. I acknowledge that many of those senators have a personal view that would not be supportive of voluntary assisted dying but they were able to set aside that personal position on voluntary assisted dying and see this as an issue of territory rights.

I particularly want to acknowledge senators from the Northern Territory on both sides of politics who supported this bill in the Senate last night. I also acknowledge the bipartisanship in the Northern Territory parliament, where both the Chief Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in the Northern Territory parliament, in spite of whatever personal views they hold on voluntary assisted dying, were able to unite on the issue of territory rights.

It is indeed very disappointing that in this debate the only territory senator not to support territory rights represents the Canberra Liberals, and the only political leader in either territory who did not support territory rights is the Leader of the Opposition in this place. That is disappointing. Whatever views Senator Seselja and the Leader of the Opposition hold on voluntary assisted dying—and I respect their right to hold a

very different view from others in their party room, from others in this chamber and from others in the community; of course that is entirely their right—one would hope that we could unite on a fundamental democratic principle that this parliament and this community can be trusted to debate this issue.

To say to our fellow Canberrans that their views cannot be considered and that we do not trust them in electing people to this place is a very sad day for our territory's democracy. If we are so far out of step with public opinion on this issue, then we will not be returned to this legislature at a forthcoming election. That is the democratic process that operates in this territory, one that has operated successfully for nearly 30 years now.

I would argue that, across Australia's states and territories, this parliament has been a shining light in Australian democracy, that our system of proportional representation has ensured all views across the community are represented in this chamber, both within major political parties and across the crossbench, over three decades, and that this parliament has proven itself able to consider the most significant issues that confront the people of the Australian Capital Territory and, three decades into self-government, is certainly able to consider issues around end of life. We have a very robust committee process and we have a very practical example at this very moment of that robust committee process taking a wide range of evidence and considering a wide range of issues associated with the end of life.

We should have enough respect for our own citizens, for our own democracy and for ourselves to be able to have this debate in this chamber. If you happen to live 15 minutes from here, across the border in Queanbeyan, your state parliament and your local MP can consider this issue, can debate it and the New South Wales parliament can reach a conclusion, as the Victorian parliament has done.

The simple point I make is that if the territories are to continue to be excluded from considering these issues then either the commonwealth parliament needs to pass laws in this regard or we will see over time more Australian states passing laws and potentially the ACT being an island within the state of New South Wales where we are unable to debate legislation, where New South Wales may have moved on this issue. The ACT does not seek to be the first jurisdiction to move on this issue. The Northern Territory was the first, in the 1990s. Victoria became the first state in more recent times. There will be other states that will enact legislation. This is inevitable. The Australian community are very clear on their view on this matter.

It has all the hallmarks of the debate on marriage equality in this country, where Australian parliaments are lagging well behind the views of the Australian people. In any democracy you will see parliaments catch up, and catch up quickly, and I am absolutely certain that other Australian states will consider and pass voluntary assisted dying legislation in time. And that will render the situation we have at the moment, where territory parliaments cannot consider these issues, even more absurd. It was absurd in 1996. It is absolutely absurd since the state of Victoria passed legislation. It will become even more absurd as other states move on this question.

This is an unusual motion. This does not happen often but, given the significance of this issue to the people of Canberra and to Northern Territorians, it is important that this parliament be clear in its position to the Australian parliament and that we continue our advocacy to restore territory rights. I commend this motion to the Assembly.

**MR COE** (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (11.27): The opposition was happy to grant leave to have this very serious debate here today on what is, of course, a very significant motion for the ACT. The Canberra Liberals have decided to treat this as a conscience issue because for many people on this side of the chamber it does engage our conscience, as I believe this issue is inextricably linked to euthanasia.

Whilst I accept that there are some, including in my own party, who believe that this is fundamentally a territory rights issue—and I know there are many Canberrans that have that view as well—as far as my conscience goes, this, to me, is a stepping stone to euthanasia. I know that there are people that disagree with that, and I accept that. But as far as my conscience is concerned, I do not support the repeal of the Andrews bill because I think it would lead to euthanasia, and that is something that I am opposed to.

I hope that all members of this place do not engage in partisan politics on this issue. I certainly have not to date, and I have no intention of doing so. As will become very clear over the course of this debate, there are a variety of views within the Canberra Liberals, and I believe the variety of views within the Canberra Liberals reflects the variety of views within the Canberra community at large on this issue, be it territory rights or the underlying issue of euthanasia.

I note that the preamble to the motion that we are debating today has explicitly made mention of end of life issues and voluntary assisted dying. That is why I believe that is further evidence that what we are debating today is very much intertwined with euthanasia. It is not just about territory rights, in my mind. The reason I call for it not to be a partisan debate is that I think the issue of territory rights and euthanasia deserves much more than a partisan debate.

It is, of course, significant to note that there were members on both sides of the Senate chamber that voted differently to their colleagues. I note, of course, that senators Dodson, O'Neill and Gallacher voted against the repeal of the Andrews bill.

On the fundamental issue of euthanasia I also note that my view is somewhat consistent with those of Paul Keating and Jon Stanhope. There are a variety of views on this issue, both in the community and in each of our respective political parties. Having said that, let me reiterate that, as per my conscience, I will be voting no on this issue, but there are a variety of views and I respect all those views.

**MS CHEYNE** (Ginninderra) (11.31): Madam Speaker, the vote was 34 to 36; there were two votes in it. I am devastated for Canberra citizens who are sick of being treated as second class and I am devastated for all the people who are genuinely suffering, and their families. I am devastated for all those who want to have choice



and control throughout their lives, including, for some, the most important part of their lives, the end of their lives.

In supporting this remonstrance, like the Chief Minister, I want to thank the 34 senators who did the right thing by us—many of them, as the Chief Minister indicated, in spite of whatever personal views they hold. I want to make special mention of the ACT senators. Thank you to Senator Dave Smith for his support for this bill, despite not supporting voluntary assisted dying. Senator Dave Smith gets it. He gets territory rights; he gets what is important to territorians; he gets that we should be allowed to have the debate here in this chamber and stand up for the people that we represent, whatever our views are.

Senator Seselja should be ashamed, particularly as a former member of this place, as a former leader of the opposition in this place. The way he has treated Canberrans, the ACT Legislative Assembly and the people who have elected him is absolutely appalling. By standing up for his personal beliefs instead of the rights of the people he represents, Senator Seselja has rendered Canberrans voiceless on this most important issue.

I am particularly glad to hear from the Leader of the Opposition today that Canberra Liberals who want to will finally—finally—be able to speak up for this. But where were they in the lead-up to yesterday's debate? With respect to yesterday's debate, I am sorry, but it is too little too late. With respect to the future, I implore you—through you, Madam Speaker—to join with us together. Join with the ACT Greens and ACT Labor in standing up for territory rights constantly. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition continues to let you exercise your conscience on territory rights.

I want to briefly go through the grievances, and I will echo some of the things that the Chief Minister said. It is absolutely ridiculous—it is absurd—that if I lived 15 minutes from here, in New South Wales, I could have my views represented by my local parliamentarians in the state parliament and they could make laws for me.

With respect to the debate on Tuesday and last night, it was so frustrating to hear so many senators conflate their personal views on voluntary assisted dying with restoring territory rights. They were absolutely paternalistic. It was disgusting to see that they simply could not trust us to make the decisions for ourselves. That they have such disdain for their fellow Australians is reprehensible. They purposely misrepresented the intentions of the territory parliaments if the bill happened to pass.

Madam Speaker, you know as well as I do that there is no voluntary assisted dying scheme on the table. The Chief Minister and the Attorney-General have said time and again that no legislation will be rushed through. We have a committee process, and all members in this place on that committee, because we are represented by all members in this place, know how carefully we are considering the issue in that committee.

There is also the fact that they continue to quote one or more debunked sources as a reference point. Anything by Professor Margaret Somerville, honestly, just needs to go in the bin.

Senators reneged on positions that they had told their electors they would be voting for. Senator Burston is a case in point. I have seen a letter that Senator Burston wrote to a constituent saying, “Yes, I will be supporting this.” It was unequivocal. And then to turn around! What is their excuse?

Many people have contacted me in the last 15 hours. More people have contacted me in the last 15 hours, actually, than the number of people who contacted me in the 15 hours after I was elected. I want to pay tribute to these Canberrans whose rights were denied last night, who were otherwise rendered voiceless, by giving them a voice here today.

One person said:

Please don’t give up on this, Tara! This is so important.

Another said:

I thought politicians were there to represent the community not themselves—unfortunately this yet again proves this is not the case. This is why I’m losing faith in the whole institution.

Another said:

This is not democratic! If we can’t decide for ourselves then we live in a dictatorship.

Another said:

We will not forget or forgive those people who deny our rights.

And yet another:

Why the rights of territorians could possibly be a religious or conscience issue is difficult to comprehend.

Another person, an outsider to the ACT, said:

It’s disappointing ... to see how this has been framed as a vote on voluntary euthanasia, rather than a vote to restore a right for territories to choose in the same way states can.

Another said, with respect to Senator Seselja:

I’m devastated we have a senator who isn’t fighting for the rights of the ACT to legislate the same as the states.

Another said:

There is no rational reason for denying the ACT rights legislated in every State. Seselja’s betrayal is no surprise. His career has shown he is without vision, is a

blatantly cynical, empty man viewing all his political decisions through the prism of his self-interest ... His treachery should give hope to potential Liberal candidates for ACT Senator, who could clearly serve the ACT far, far better than Seselja.

Another said, again with respect to Senator Seselja:

A 'leader' who looks out for his own interests and not that of the people he is supposed to represent, is no leader. He is then just a manipulator of power for his own personal agenda.

Madam Speaker, I commend this motion today. It is unusual, but it is important. What the Senate has done is paternalistic. Madam Speaker, it is repugnant. It is unforgivable, and it is inexcusable. It is wicked. We will not give up. This does not end here.

**MR RATTENBURY** (Kurrajong) (11.40): The ACT Greens will be supporting this remonstrance motion today. We are deeply disappointed by the vote in the Senate last night. In the lead-up to last night's vote, there was cause for optimism. The signs were that this would pass through the Senate and begin the journey for repealing these laws. Whilst there were still challenges ahead in the House of Representatives, we did feel a sense of hope.

I am speaking today on behalf of Ms Le Couteur as well. As members know, her voice continues to not be very strong. She spoke extensively about this in recent weeks, when she did have her voice, and I think conveyed that sense of optimism in some public remarks she typed last night.

After 30 years of self-government, we felt the time was right that the federal parliament restored our rights in this space and gave the territory full voice, full opportunity to debate these matters, just as other Australian parliaments can and just as other Australian citizens have the right to have their representatives discuss this issue on their behalf. These are discriminatory restrictions that place citizens of the ACT and the Northern Territory in a position that none of our other fellow Australians are in. On one specific issue, our parliaments are not allowed to determine the position of their constituents.

I appreciate the comments that Mr Coe made this morning that voluntary assisted dying, which is the issue that sits behind this, is a very difficult and personal topic. I concur with him on that. My views on it are well known. They are formed by experience, stories that people have told me, opinions that have been expressed and, I guess, my own personal desire to have the opportunity for both me and my family to make choices for ourselves when we reach a point towards the end of our lives. But that is not the issue we are debating today. The point is that we should have the right to have that debate, and that has once again been denied to us.

I think that if we were to have the debate, it would be a very complex one. I have been clear in saying that publicly. If this so-called Andrews bill was removed, I do not imagine this would be a quick process in the ACT. We would have to think very carefully about how we constructed a public conversation. And if we were going to go

down the path of legislation, we would have to think even more carefully about how we constructed that legislation. Community views on this are diverse, and we are talking about a very serious matter. But the bottom line is that what happened last night meant that we will not be having that discussion in any substantive way. I am deeply disappointed about that.

I am, as has been discussed, disappointed with the position taken by Senator Seselja, a senator for the ACT. In a vote that was resolved 36 to 34, every vote mattered. To have a situation where a senator for the ACT did not support our right to have these restrictions removed is particularly disappointing. It is in stark contrast to the Northern Territory, as the Chief Minister has touched on. I have no doubt that there are differences of view in the Northern Territory, but the parliamentarians there have united in their support for territory rights.

It is also in stark contrast to a former senator for the ACT, Gary Humphries, who has in the past, despite his personal views on the specific issue, voted for territory rights. Over the years Gary Humphries has been very strong in his views about the Greens—he is no friend of ours—but in the past he has demonstrated the ability to sit down, think about the issues carefully and recognise the greater issue that is at stake, despite his personal difference of opinion.

I am grateful to our Senate colleagues. All nine Greens senators voted in support of this bill last night. Again, it demonstrates—it was Senator Leyonhjelm who brought this bill forward and we know the recent history between Senator Leyonhjelm and some of our colleagues—that you have to stop and take the issue on its merits, despite who brings the bill forward or perhaps sometimes what your personal views may be on these things. I know that we are the only party that unanimously voted in support of the legislation last night, and I very much thank our senators from various jurisdictions around the country for supporting the push here.

Much more will be written and said about this, but I think I can best conclude by quoting the words of Ms Le Couteur in comments that she typed out last night:

While bowed, we remain undeterred. The fight to restore territory rights will continue.

That is certainly a sentiment that we take forward. We are disappointed, but this is not the end of the road. There will come a time when the Australian parliament will realise the error of its ways and restore the territories' rights to debate these issues. I very much look forward to that day.

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (11.46): I am pleased to speak to the motion circulated by Mr Barr today. I believe that the right of the territory to determine its legislation—its own legislation—is important and is paramount to the citizens of the ACT. I think that most people in the ACT would expect that their elected Assembly representatives would have the right to determine laws in all areas of our life. It is not just roads, rates and rubbish. It is not just health, education and our legal system. It should be across all areas of our life.

I do not think it is right that we have been stopped by people from all over Australia from determining our own laws in this way. It is denying us our democratic rights. Mr Barr mentioned that people 15 minutes away, in Queanbeyan, for example, have those rights and we do not. In fact, from where I live, it is only 10 minutes to Queanbeyan; those people only 10 minutes away have a right that we do not have here in the ACT.

I would like to thank my federal Liberal colleagues in the Senate who did support the vote yesterday. I would especially like to thank those cabinet members who supported the vote, including Marise Payne, Nigel Scullion and Simon Birmingham. I also say thank you to Senator Ian Macdonald.

Whilst this is about territory rights, I will take the opportunity to make quite clear my own views on end of life choices. Rightly or wrongly, from the start, this issue has been conflated with voluntary assisted dying. That was problematic from the start. While the dialogue changed over time, it started off about lobbying for euthanasia or voluntary assisted dying and then had to deal with the Andrews bill to get that through. That was what caused a lot of the issues to start with.

My views in this area are informed by something that happened back when I was a young teenager. My mother and I spent weeks on end interstate with my aunt, who was dying of breast cancer. She was in unimaginable pain. I can remember hearing my aunt and my mother sobbing and crying together, and my aunt begging my mother to help her end her suffering. My mother could not bring herself to do it; she was too afraid of the repercussions. My aunt was not physically able to do it herself.

This is something that has stayed with me ever since that time. Of course, there have been other people near and dear to me since that time who have gone through similar end of life issues, but that was the one that has had the most long-lasting impact in my memory. Only weeks later my aunt did die from breast cancer. She was riddled with cancer throughout her body. In those ensuing weeks, she endured terrible pain and suffering. Since then, I have been in favour of voluntary assisted dying.

I would also like to put on record, though, that I have very grave concerns about the way this may impact on vulnerable groups in our community, not least many people in the disability community, who have spoken to me about this over the years. They are concerned that their value, their lives, may be seen as less and that the effort put into looking after them in a medical sense may be reduced with these laws. Down the track, after the committee reports, if we are looking at these end of life choices, that is an area that we need to very strongly look at.

In conclusion, I would like to thank Mr Barr for bringing on this motion today. I would like to say thank you to my colleagues for our discussion about allowing this as a conscience vote today. I will be supporting Mr Barr's motion.

**MR HANSON** (Murrumbidgee) (11.50): At the outset I think it is very important to put on the table that the debate we are having today is only occurring because of the issue of euthanasia, and Mr Coe has made that point. It is unfortunate that states'

rights and euthanasia have been conflated. A point made by one of the senators yesterday is that they are quite separate debates to be having, and I think it would have been better had we had separate states' rights and euthanasia debates because they sometimes evoke different responses.

I thank my colleagues for the fact that this will be dealt with as a conscience issue; I particularly thank Mr Coe as leader. Respecting the views that each of us hold, regardless of our political affiliation on these issues, is very important. I have drawn some of my views on euthanasia from a piece Senator Zed Seselja put in the *Canberra Times* yesterday, a piece from Paul Keating in the *Australian* some time ago and from others who advocate for euthanasia.

In terms of the substantive issue of euthanasia, I am certainly not ethically or morally opposed. I am not a religious person. But I certainly have concerns that leave me very conflicted on the issue. Ms Lawder raised some of those, with regard to the potential for impositions on the elderly and elder abuse, people suffering from mental health, and people with a disability. My father is currently in a home as a result of Alzheimer's, and it can affect people who are very vulnerable in that regard as well.

Ten minutes ago I got a text from a mate of mine who is currently on a boat on his way to Hamilton Island. It is a picture of him with his mates, the sun is shining and there's a picture of whale in the ocean. That guy's name is Matt Owen; he has been in here before and I have spoken about him. Three and a half years ago Matt was diagnosed with terminal cancer and he was given six months to live. He was told, "This is your last Christmas." That same bloke is texting me from a boat on his way to Hamilton Island.

Matt is very lucky to have a supportive family—Karen and his son, Will. They have fought, and it means that Matt is still alive. Not everybody has that; not everybody is so lucky. For older people or those who are isolated in our community, what would have happened to them had they had access to the sort of legislation being talked about now? That is the sort of question that vexes me when it comes to the substantive issue.

When it does come to the important debate about euthanasia, I have to say I am conflicted. I am not yet convinced that we can bring a piece of legislation in here or anywhere else that provides the sufficient safeguards we need. Let me be very clear—my opposition to this is not ethical and it is not moral; it is about the consequences of this legislation and how it may play on people who are vulnerable in our society, and that debate has been articulated well by others.

However, I accept that this is a debate that we are entitled to have. I will be supporting this motion today. That does not mean that, should a piece of legislation on euthanasia eventuate, I would necessarily support that. At this stage it is likely that I would not because I am yet to be convinced.

I want to conclude with words of support for those who have opposed this or will be opposing this today and those who opposed it in the Senate yesterday. These are deeply held convictions by people often with deeply held faith. To demand that

people vote against their conscience is abhorrent to me. Maybe it is what separates us as Liberals from those on the other side, but I would never put a demand on Mrs Dunne, Senator Seselja, Mr Coe or others who may have different world views to say, “You must vote against your conscience.” I would never ask people to do that.

It is disappointing that people come into this place, as Ms Cheyne has, and say that people should be ashamed of their conscience and that to vote in that way is disgusting. That is unedifying, and it certainly is a different world view from that which we on this side of the chamber have.

Increasingly, on the left, if you disagree with their point of view because of deeply held convictions, religious or otherwise, you get demonised, and that is wrong. Let me be very clear that in the battle of ideals there are those who have different views to me. But I respect people who have deeply held convictions. I often do not hold them myself on these matters, but I respect their convictions. I will defend to the very last their right to have their say and to stand by their convictions.

I support Zed’s ability to stand by his convictions and his deeply held views, just as I do for others. I echo the point Mr Coe made earlier in his debate: let’s not go partisan on this; let’s not demonise or slur or smear those who put forward a different view because of those convictions. Let’s have this debate respectfully and let’s acknowledge that there are different views and that those views matter to people just as deeply to your views matter to you.

**MR RAMSAY** (Ginninderra—Attorney-General, Minister for Regulatory Services, Minister for the Arts and Community Events and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (11.57): It is important to note that, although we acknowledge the context of this debate which arose because of the so-called Andrews amendment from some decades ago, it is not primarily a debate around voluntary assisted dying or euthanasia, as it is called. I believe it is possible and important for us to be able to distinguish between those two. The context simply arises because of the limitation placed on territories in this particular area through sections 23(1A) and 23(1B) of the self-government act.

The calls for respectful debate that are coming across the chamber at the moment are actually reinforcing the importance of the very motion today. The fact that we can have this debate demonstrates to the federal parliament that we are grown up enough to be able to have this debate and that the people of ACT deserve the right for their elected members to be able to have this debate.

There does seem to have been in the Senate—either wilfully or not so—a significant misunderstanding of the nature of the debate and the topic before them. As the Chief Minister has acknowledged, the views of a number of senators on voluntary assisted dying—the background context—differ markedly but they have recognised that there is an unreasonable and unwarranted restriction on the ACT and the Northern Territory. This is a matter regarding the democratic rights of the people in those territories.

If we look at the evidence from around Australia in the state jurisdictions that have the constitutional authority to consider this matter and who have considered it, it does not

follow by any means that the mere fact that a jurisdiction can look at this matter means voluntary assisted dying will go through.

I draw to the attention of the Assembly and of the Senate that Victoria has considered the matter and has passed legislation. Three jurisdictions have considered the matter and not passed legislation. Western Australia is currently looking at the matter, and we anticipate that there will be findings of a parliamentary inquiry very shortly. Different jurisdictions look at the matter and come to different views, but they have the authority and the right and the responsibility to look at the matter.

I have made clear in the past and I want to make clear again that there is no ACT government view on voluntary assisted dying. There is no ACT Labor caucus view on voluntary assisted dying. There is no proposal. It has not been considered because we cannot consider it. What may happen if the territories are given the right to be able to consider it is a matter for the elected representatives and those people who carry that responsibility.

I note that former Chief Minister Jon Stanhope has publicly supported the repeal of the Andrews restrictions. I also note that Mr Stanhope has very publicly questioned whether voluntary assisted dying should occur. Again, he is able to distinguish between the two. It is important that we understand that if the capacity of this Assembly to make laws in this area is restored—it did exist and was taken away—it is at that stage that the members of this place may consider, and not necessarily, the proposal. If at that stage it occurred, it would happen with all of the evidence, including I note, any recommendations out of the current committee process in the ACT.

I draw to the attention of the Assembly another correlation that takes place at times. Clearly there are very important matters of conscience in relation to the consideration of this matter. I, too, greatly respect those. I also note that it is not necessarily the case that people of faith will automatically take one position or another. There are people of faith who, on the issue of voluntary assisted dying, will oppose it and then there are others who will not oppose it.

The conflation of a number of issues is getting in the way of the substantive debate at this stage, which is: what are the rights of the people who live in the ACT and the Northern Territory? This motion is about respect for the people of the territories. This is about the fact that the federal parliament needs, in my opinion, to enable the territory legislative bodies to take the responsibility they did have and that was taken away. We need to take the responsibility seriously and fully. It is a deep topic that gives rise to the context of this debate, but the debate itself is about the rights of the people who live in the territories.

I believe we can be strident and I believe we can be unified across the chamber and across the territories to protect the rights of the people in this city and the rights of the people in the Northern Territory to be represented on matters about which people feel so very deeply. I commend the motion.



**MR PARTON** (Brindabella) (12.03): I want to thank Mr Barr for bringing this forward. I want to thank my party and, in particular, Mr Coe for allowing this to be a conscience issue. I am continually dismayed at those opposite on the number of occasions they wish to debate matters outside of our control.

*Government members interjecting—*

**MR PARTON:** I suggest that you hear me out. I think there are far too many debates in this chamber and far too many comments made about what a bunch of federal representatives are doing in another parliament far removed from ours. However, if I stand here and call upon us to stay out of their business, it would be very clearly a double standard for me not to call on them to stay out of our business.

This is an issue I have consulted widely on. I have had many conversations with constituents, elected members from other jurisdictions and journalists. Although I am on the record through one media agency as not supporting the Leyonhjelm motion, I cannot continue to support that position, so I will be supporting this motion.

We need to understand that this particular motion is not about assisted dying. We need to understand that this debate today is purely about the rights of those living in the ACT and the Northern Territory. Throughout this debate over so many years the connections have confused this. I think it was Lindsay Tanner who voted for the Kevin Andrews bill and who said in the debate something like: “Would this be different if we had a territory considering capital punishment?” But I do not think that is the issue.

As a member of the opposition, I often do not have faith that this chamber will make the right decision on a variety of matters. If I had faith that this chamber as it stands now would make the right decision on every issue I would be on the wrong side of the chamber. I sit in here day after day and I watch various motions get debated and amended. I watch bills being debated which often end up passed by this chamber in a way that I do not agree with. But that is democracy. We went to the polls in 2016, and there are more of them than there are of us because that is what the people said.

This motion is about democracy. I continue to have deep conversations about voluntary assisted dying, and I echo a number of the concerns Mr Hanson has shared with the chamber today. As disappointing as it may be to journalists who have asked me about my position on this most important conscience issue, I have not arrived at a final decision. I am still conflicted. I am still listening and I am still seeking out more information. I wish that this were a simple issue, but it is not. But in regard to the issues raised in this motion, as is the case for a number of my colleagues, I will be wholeheartedly supporting it.

**MS FITZHARRIS** (Yerrabi—Minister for Health and Wellbeing, Minister for Transport and City Services and Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research) (12.07): I would also like to thank the Chief Minister for bringing forward this motion. I start by reflecting on some of the speeches today. I walked into the chamber today with a group of Canberra College students. They have now left. But

every so often when there are visitors—students and visiting delegations—I wonder what they must make of us with some of the debates we have. What must they think we do?

To outsiders, sometimes the debates might not make sense. They might not realise the fundamental importance of our democratic system. I was heartened to think that those students were here today. They could hear members on both sides of this chamber having this debate. I could not agree more with Minister Ramsay that, in fact, this is the most stellar example of exactly why we are now an Assembly and a community that is ready to face up to some of the biggest questions.

I am also very disappointed. I acknowledge the incredible efforts of members on this side, particularly the Chief Minister and Ms Cheyne, in working on these issues. I particularly thank Senator Smith. I know he is a new senator and I know that this would have deeply engaged him. I think that he made a very significant decision. I really honour the decision that he made to vote for this bill in the Senate last night.

It is very disappointing—Mr Hanson noted his disappointment—that these two issues, territory rights and voluntary assisted dying, are being conflated. I remind him that the only reason they are being conflated is that the rights of territorians in the ACT and the Northern Territory were taken away. That is the only reason they are being conflated. The simple fact of the matter is that territorians in this country do not have the same rights as everyone else.

I offer some counterpoints to this. As others have noted, the matter of voluntary assisted dying has been debated in parliaments across Australia. Legislation has been passed in one parliament and not passed in three others. But what if, in the process of that debate, those parliaments had voted to relinquish their right? That is the alternative. Madam Speaker, could you imagine a parliament, elected by its own community, relinquishing the right to debate an issue? If that was their vote, it could have been respected. But territorians' rights were taken away.

I offer another counterpoint. I grew up in New Zealand. I spent years living in different cities. But, for argument's sake, let me instance Dunedin, where I went to high school and university. What if, for some reason or another, the people that lived there, who voted for council members and members of their national parliament, simply were not allowed to have the same rights as people who lived in Christchurch, Auckland and Wellington? If you put it in that context and do not conflate the issues, I really struggle to see how members of parliament could not have supported this.

I particularly struggle to understand how Senator Seselja—unlike Senator Smith, who thought deeply about these issues—could have voted in the way that he did. I acknowledge the rights of everyone in this place to hold a deeply held conscience view on the issue of voluntary assisted dying. Again, I reflect that it has engaged parliaments across the country, most recently in Victoria and New South Wales.

It most certainly is the most serious of issues that a parliament could discuss. It goes back to some of the fundamentals of why many of us are in this place. Many of us are challenged daily on balancing our personal views, our political views, the views of

our community and the views of our party. But we manage that juggle every day. However, on some days we manage some of the most fundamental discussions we can have as a community. We are asked by our community, as their representatives, to live up to their expectations and tackle and be thoughtful about some of the most significant issues facing us.

There are many in our community who deeply want to have this conversation. That has been reflected in the submissions to the end of life inquiry. I absolutely respect that. As someone who has also lived with faith throughout my life—and I acknowledge Minister Ramsay's view—I acknowledge that there will be people who view themselves as people of faith who will hold different views and who will find themselves really thinking through what it might mean for a parliament to legislate on this.

If we have the opportunity to have that debate here, I trust that everyone in this place—this is demonstrated today—will bring their best selves to that debate. I am deeply disappointed that we do not have the opportunity, but I think that the momentum is behind those who voted for and supported this bill in the Senate last night. As Ms Cheyne said, we will not give up. Next time I deeply hope that we do have success.

**MS CODY** (Murrumbidgee) (12.14): I will keep my remarks extremely brief because, as many can hear, my voice is not as strong as it could be. I could not in good conscience not rise today to add to this debate. It really is about the rights of people living in the ACT, who have the right to elect members of parliament—members of their parliament, this ACT Legislative Assembly—to make laws, to introduce bills, to make this city a progressive, wonderful, vibrant city and to continue to do the things that make Canberra the place we all want to live in. The motion that was moved in the Senate last night, and unfortunately defeated, was just providing the ACT's elected representatives the right to debate a raft of issues, additional issues that we should be debating, that we should be having conversations about.

As the chair of the select committee looking into end of life choices, we have had many members of the community come and speak to us in public hearings. They have provided us with their stories. I encourage anyone that has not had a chance to read the *Hansard* or to listen to some of those people. Some of those people have implored us as parliamentarians to have the debate, to have a discussion about their rights as citizens of the ACT. I am really only going to say a couple more things, one of which is this: often in debates in this place we reflect on previous chief ministers. I, too, would like to take a moment to reflect on a previous chief minister.

I note that in 1996, under a Liberal Chief Minister, Kate Carnell, we united as one in a debate on this exact matter. The chamber, together, stood up for the rights of Canberrans. I thank Mr Coe today—I am sure he will be baffled by my thanking him; it does not happen very often—for allowing his members a conscience vote on this motion. I am a little disappointed that it has been conflated, that this is about assisted dying. This is about the rights of Canberrans and Canberra's elected representatives to have a debate about Canberra's rights.

Thank you, Chief Minister, for bringing on this motion today. Thank you, Minister Rattenbury, for also standing up for the rights of Canberrans. Thank you to everyone in the chamber today for their polite, respectful and honest debate. This is something that we should be doing more often—working with and for the people of Canberra.

**MS LEE** (Kurrajong) (12.17): I will be voting for this motion. I am very proud to be a member of the Legislative Assembly. I worked hard to be here and I was supported by thousands of Canberrans to be their voice. I respect the ACT Legislative Assembly and, as disappointing as it is to be in opposition, I respect Australia's democratic system and the rights of Canberrans to elect their representatives in the territory parliament.

It is this chamber which comprises Canberrans, elected by Canberrans, that should have the right to make laws for Canberrans. I support the thrust of this motion insofar as it calls on the Australian Senate to reflect on their vote on 15 August in denying the citizens of the ACT their democratic rights.

As the Leader of the Opposition said earlier, the substantive issue of euthanasia cannot be ignored in this debate. As the Leader of the Opposition also said, this is a matter of conscience for the Canberra Liberals. It is an issue of enormous importance that carries with it a strong responsibility that it be debated robustly and explored in great detail on issues of social conscience, of dignity, of health, of the rights of those with a disability, of legal implications. For that reason, I will be paying very close attention to the findings of the Assembly's select committee.

In short, Madam Speaker, this is not an issue that can or should be decided lightly. In voting for this motion I am not saying that I will be voting for euthanasia; nor am I saying that I will be voting against euthanasia, should the matter come before this chamber. But this is an issue that must rightly be debated in this chamber. For that reason I support the motion.

**MR MILLIGAN** (Yerrabi) (12.19): I appreciate the opportunity to speak briefly on this matter. The grievances that are put forward in this motion cast doubt on the ability of federal parliamentarians to make a decision. Democracy is a process. Democracy takes time. There will be, no doubt, future debates on this matter presented in a private member's bill.

I have thought long and hard about these issues, both in terms of territory rights and euthanasia. At the end of the day, it does come down to a matter of conscience. For me personally, I do not support voluntary euthanasia. I have personal experience with this issue, having watched close family members suffer with mental health and other illnesses. I also have values based on this particular issue. As a values driven person, I am guided by my conscience.

This issue under debate is about life and death. These are big issues. I know that Canberrans have views and these views may be different from mine. I also acknowledge that our colleagues in the Senate considered all of these views. They considered expert submissions and advice. They took their time. They listened to a

wide range of inputs and the vote was taken. But I am sure this is not the end of the road. I, too, will keep listening to the community to hear their views and values.

But, at the end of the day, I respect Australian democracy and I look forward to future respectful debates on these issues, debates that allow for all views and for people to express those views without being told they are wrong, ignorant or uncaring just because they have a different view on this very emotional matter.

I also hope that in the coming months Canberrans are shown that same level of respect in terms of democratic process so that we can make a stronger case for territory rights. Whilst I will not be supporting this motion today because the debate has been so closely entangled with the issue of voluntary euthanasia, I do support territory rights and I look forward to the future developments and debates on this issue.

**MR STEEL** (Murrumbidgee) (12.22): I, too, rise in support of the Chief Minister's motion today. All of us in this place have come here because we were elected by the people of the ACT. To get here many of us have run campaigns and particularly got out there doorknocking and meeting with constituents face to face to hear about the issues that matter to them. During the election campaign I knocked on thousands of doors. In the last few weeks of the campaign I was doorknocking the streets of Weston. I was out by myself on a weekday, and the thing about doorknocking on weekdays is that you come across a lot of people who are at home sick. They are sick at home from work and trying to get better.

I came across a lady, who I will call Kate, sitting on her daughter's verandah in a street in Weston. It was a lovely sunny day. She was out there enjoying the sun. I struck up a conversation with her and told her that I was running in the election in just a few weeks time and I wanted to hear from her about what mattered to her, what issues. We ended up having about a 45-minute discussion in her home, with a cup of tea. That is not a very efficient way to go about doorknocking, believe me, but it was certainly very worthwhile. I remember the conversation very vividly. Kate told me about a whole range of issues. She told me how great she thought the Chief Minister was. She'd seen him at Politics in the Pub just a few weeks beforehand.

But in the conversation she also told me, even though she looked very well, that she only had a few weeks to live and that she would not actually be able to vote on election day and was intending to cast her ballot earlier. She had come to terms with her own death, which I thought was just extraordinary. She was very calm, very rational. She talked to me about the issue of euthanasia. While she did not think it would necessarily be an issue for her—the need to be able to access voluntary assisted dying—she thought it was a really important issue that an elected representative should be bringing forward and supporting in the Assembly.

I explained to her the ridiculous and untenable situation that the ACT parliament is in as a result of the Andrews bill in 1997. She, being originally from South Australia, just could not explain the rationality of that bill and encouraged me to continue advocacy against that bill and that law. That is why today I will be supporting the Chief Minister's motion, because the reality is that we do not have the ability to even discuss in this place the matters that Kate raised with me around voluntary assisted

dying. I think that that is wrong and I think the 36 senators were wrong in voting against the territory rights bill last night.

I particularly think it was wrong for Senator Seselja to vote against that bill last night. Senator Seselja has proved that he may be a senator from the ACT but he does not represent the ACT. Democracy was denied last night. It was not a great example of democracy, just because there was a vote in the parliament. Those people are not from the ACT. They do not walk the streets of Weston. They do not represent Kate and they should make sure that in future debates they reconsider these matters.

I will certainly be encouraging all of my federal Labor parliamentary colleagues to reconsider those matters very carefully. That includes Senator Dodson from Western Australia, Senator Alex Gallacher from South Australia and Senator Deb O'Neill from New South Wales. I will certainly be asking them why it is that they think that they can have a say in the way that the territory parliament should be able to legislate on voluntary assisted dying.

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (12.27): I will be opposing this remonstrance motion today. I know that people know my views on euthanasia or voluntary assisted dying or whatever, and that I am opposed to it. But I will also express my views about the notion of territory rights, which are probably almost as unfashionable as my views on euthanasia.

I tend to be a constitutionalist. I believe in the Australian Constitution. And one of the things that have been quite clear in the evidence to the committee on end of life issues is that even those people who object to the provisions of section 23 of the self-government act acknowledge that those provisions are legal, that the commonwealth parliament has every right to have made those provisions and that they are constitutional and can stand. I agree with that. The commonwealth has the power in the constitution to make laws in relation to the territory, which is why we have self-government and why Norfolk Island does not any longer have self-government. It is also incumbent upon the commonwealth to continue to keep those laws under review, which is what the Senate did in the last week, culminating in last night's vote.

I want to put on the record that when the Andrews bill was first proposed, as a staffer in this place I supported it, although my boss did not and we respectfully disagreed on the subject. I supported the passage of the Andrews bill and I support the voting down of the Leyonhjelm bill last night.

I want to put on record my appreciation for those people who voted and who thought about it on both sides, because it was, as the Chief Minister said and from my reading and my listening, a very respectful and statesmanlike debate. I think that most of what has been said in this place today has been respectful and statesmanlike. I have to emphasise "most". I think the mere fact that we are speaking about these issues gives the lie to the point Mr Steel made that we cannot talk about these things. We are talking about these things. We cannot legislate about these things, and there are reasons for that, and some of us agree and some of us disagree.

Various members in here have said that it is a great disappointment that the issue of states' rights has been conflated with euthanasia. We have to be very mindful that section 23 of the self-government act is specifically about euthanasia. Someone recently said to me, "What other lawmaking powers do you think the commonwealth should take away from us?" and a few issues were put forward. But all of those issues were established law when the ACT received self-government. So I said to the person I was discussing this with, "At the time of self-government, euthanasia laws were just about inconceivable, and in fact the territory's laws on euthanasia were among the world's first." It was a reasonable thing for the commonwealth to consider whether it was appropriate for territories to make those laws when the issue arose, which is what they did with the Andrews bill.

I tend to take the view that has been expressed here often in relation to euthanasia: that this is a small parliament with very few checks and balances. They are not the checks and balances that you find in large, bicameral parliaments. We are a small parliament. The passage of laws requires a simple majority. Often between the introduction of a bill and the passing of a bill there is a very short period of time and not much time for scrutiny. We do not generally scrutinise bills for their policy content.

All of these things put me in a position where I am comfortable that in this very limited space, on this absolutely crucial issue where there is so much doubt in so many people's minds, our capacity in this subordinate parliament is circumscribed. These are very difficult issues and there are a multitude of views on both sides. It is interesting to see that the submissions that the end of life committee has received are probably about fifty-fifty in favour and opposed to euthanasia.

There is often a lot said about surveys of voters on this issue, and members of parliament are criticised for not being so-called in step. But legislators often have to look at an issue in a much more detailed and thorough way than somebody answering a survey. Off the top of your head, there would be a lot of people in this parliament who would say yes, they think that voluntary assisted dying is worth considering. And that would be the case across the territory and across Australia. But when you get to the nitty-gritty of having to look at a particular piece of legislation then you have a much more onerous task, and some of those people who thought that, yes, they might be in favour actually find it very difficult to support particular pieces of legislation. So it is not an easy path that we go down in this place.

I want to put on the record my thanks to the people who, probably on both sides of the debate, changed their mind and had the courage to admit that they could change their mind. It was reported, as Ms Cheyne touched on, that there were people who said they initially had a particular view but voted differently. I think it takes extraordinary courage for a legislator to say, "This was my stated position but I have gone away and thought about it and received further counsel," and to not only change their mind but also be prepared to come out publicly and say that they have changed their mind. That takes great courage, and it does not befit us to denigrate people who have the courage to express a change of view and a change of heart.

I also wish to follow on from some of the comments made by Ms Lawder. There are large sections of the community in the ACT and across the country who are deeply conflicted and deeply troubled about the issues of euthanasia. Ms Lawder touched on the disability community, and we have had very powerful evidence from members of the disability community. Not everybody in the disability community holds the same view, but there are many in the disability community who are very strong advocates against euthanasia because they feel that their lives already are not valued enough.

There are also groups in the Indigenous community. Senator Dodson last night and, during the passage of the Andrews bill, Senator Collins from the Northern Territory, spoke about the problems and the vulnerabilities of Indigenous people. I think that that also extends to the multicultural community, where many have come with quite strong religious beliefs but also a concern that perhaps their lack of being able to manage English on important issues might leave them vulnerable.

These are all issues that we need to consider. I thank most of the members for their respectful participation in the debate, and I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to express my views on this important issue.

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

**Sitting suspended from 12.37 to 2.30 pm.**

## **Questions without notice**

### **Land—valuations**

**MR COE:** My question is to the Treasurer. What is the process the government uses to determine the AUV of new blocks of land after they have been sold and settled?

**MR BARR:** There is an independent valuation process through the revenue office. I will provide the details of that process to the Assembly.

**MR COE:** Treasurer—and if you have to take this on notice, please do—how does the ACT government factor in scarcity for government land sales so that there are not major disparities between recently sold land and nearby blocks?

**MR BARR:** I will take that on notice.

**MR PARTON:** Will Canberra families that pay top dollar for land be punished every year through rates based on your inflated sale prices? Again, this refers to blocks where there is a major disparity with nearby blocks.

**MR BARR:** I do not believe so.

### **Environment—Lake Burley Griffin**

**MS LE COUTEUR:** My question is to the Minister for Regulatory Services, including the Environment Protection Authority, and relates to Lake Burley Griffin.



The depth of sediment is being tested as part of the work underway to fill in part of the West Basin. Minister, is the EPA also using this unique opportunity to test the sediment for environmental pollution and contaminants?

**MR RAMSAY:** I thank Ms Le Couteur for the question. I will take that on notice.

**MS LE COUTEUR:** I suspect that this question will also be taken on notice. Is the sediment testing process also being used by water engineers to look at how we can improve the water quality of the lake and enhance it as a native fish habitat, amongst other environmental purposes?

**MR RAMSAY:** Indeed, I will take it on notice.

### **Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—upgrade program**

**MRS DUNNE:** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, in your statement today about maternity services you failed to give a firm date for the completion of the upgrades to the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children. At the 2016 election you promised they would be delivered in 2019. In a press release issued in June 2017 you said it would be in 2020-21. In answer to an estimates question taken on notice this year, the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing said they would be delivered in 2021-22. As each year goes past, will the upgrades to the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children be pushed out by another year?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I thank Mrs Dunne for the question. The answer is no.

**MRS DUNNE:** Minister, in your statement why did you fail to commit to a firm completion date for the upgrades of the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I believe I answered this question yesterday but, as I indicated yesterday, in undertaking significant upgrades and expansions of health infrastructure projects, as more information has come to light, that date has now been moved to a different financial year. As I indicated yesterday, I look forward to giving further advice to the community later this year about all our health infrastructure projects and I very much look forward to doing that.

**MR HANSON:** Minister, why are the delivery dates for the upgrades being pushed out a year at a time?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I will refer members to my answers to the previous questions and to those in yesterday's question time.

### **Carers—support services**

**MRS KIKKERT:** My question is to the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth. Minister, in answer to a question about your decision to reduce funding for some grandparent carers, you stated that those impacted had been referred to Carers ACT, which “provide a wide range of support to carers of all kinds, including grandparent carers providing informal care to children”. As both their website and a

phone conversation confirmed, however, Carers ACT do not actually offer support to grandparents providing informal care to children. When I asked where such carers should turn, I was told it should be to the very organisation whose funding has recently been cut. Minister, why are you referring grandparent carers who need support to an organisation that admits it cannot help them?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Mrs Kikkert for the question. In providing that advice, I did in fact double-check that information to make sure that it was correct. If Mrs Kikkert's advice is that it is not correct, I will go back and check again and come back to the Assembly.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Minister, what instructions have you given those who are currently developing the ACT carers strategy regarding the need to provide support to grandparents providing informal care to children?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Mrs Kikkert for the supplementary question. The ACT carers strategy has taken an inclusive approach. Members may be aware that in previous carers strategies, both locally and at the national level, carers of children, whether foster or kinship carers, have not been included in the definition of carers. We have taken a broad and inclusive approach to the definition of carers and that has been reflected in the composition of the carers voice panel and in the work that has been conducted. I will have a further look at how engaged kinship carers, who are not caring through the statutory system, have been in that process. But we are certainly taking, in relation to the carers strategy, a very broad approach to the definition of carers.

**MR STEEL:** Minister, what has been the impact on carers of the Liberal Party's abolition of the grandparent childcare benefit?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Mr Steel for the supplementary. As in so many cases, cuts made by the federal Liberal government have had a negative impact on the community and those who need support from government the most.

### **Molonglo Valley—shopping facilities**

**MR HANSON:** Madam Speaker, my question is to Planning and Land Management and relates to shopping centres in the Molonglo region. Minister, as you are aware, residents are deeply concerned about the lack of any shopping centres in this region, particularly the Coombs local shopping centre. While acknowledging the difficulties faced, the fact is that the people of this region still have no shopping facilities at all. I wrote to you on 5 July but have not received a response, so I ask you directly in the chamber now: what steps has your directorate investigated to assist with this shopping centre being completed, and when will it open?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Hanson for his question. I also share the concerns of the residents of Molonglo in regard to the shopping centre. The timing of the opening of the Coombs commercial centre is at this stage outside the control of the ACT government and rests fully with the centre's owner. Under the crown lease the

lessee has 48 months, or until 15 April 2019, to complete the development and obtain a certificate of occupancy.

This time frame acknowledges the scale and complexities of commercial developments and the time it takes to plan, gain approval, construct and tenant the development. The majority of commercial land sold by the ACT government has the same 48-month time frame to complete these developments.

**MR HANSON:** Minister, when do you expect the group centre for the Molonglo area, located at Denman Prospect, to be complete?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I am very confident that that will be completed in a timely manner. I have not got the time lines directly in front of me. It is a different proposal from the Coombs shopping centre, but an exciting proposal too. I am happy to take the time line of that on notice and come back to the chamber.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, how did our planning system result in major new communities being built without any ability for the government to ensure any shopping facilities?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** As I said earlier, there are facilities within the Planning and Development Act to ensure that construction is completed in a timely manner. As for the tenancies of those buildings, that is up to the shopping centre owner. I shall say that this is nothing new in the construction of Canberra across its history.

For example, I moved into Calwell in 1989. We had no shopping centre until several years after I moved in. It was serviced by a very entrepreneurial group of young people who had the licence for the newsagency at the time. They set up a bus on the corner and they sold fast food, if you like—hot dogs, that sort of thing—tea and coffee, and newsagency requirements out of that van. Later, as they had the licence for the newsagency, they were the first to set up in the new Calwell centre.

It is not new. Unfortunately it is up to the owner of the building to ensure that they have tenants there.

### **Education—future strategy**

**MS CODY:** My question is to the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development. Can the minister update the Assembly on the government's election commitment to deliver a new strategy for the future of education?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Ms Cody for the question. Today I released the government's future of education strategy, which was a result of around 18 months of big and deep conversation with the community, including parents, teachers, school leaders and other educators and experts as well as community organisations. Vitally, I wanted to make sure that children and young people had a strong voice and were front and centre, as those who would be most affected by the decisions that would be made today.

The strategy is aimed at the whole system and all schools: non-government, government, systemic and independent. Alongside it, the government's early childhood strategy will make sure that every child is set up for success. The future of education strategy takes the work already happening as a strong base and looks to the next 10 years to some of the big things that are possible. There are many initiatives that will be arising from the strategy that will be laid out in an implementation plan for the ACT education system as a whole.

**MS CODY:** Minister, what are the foundations of the strategy?

**MS BERRY:** I thank Ms Cody for the supplementary. The foundations of the strategy are outlined in my ministerial statement that I delivered today. The foundations of the strategy place students at the centre of their learning. It empowers teachers, school leaders and other professionals to meet the learning needs of all students. It builds strong communities for learning and strengthens systems to focus on equity with quality.

By having students at the centre, education will enable people to participate effectively and respectfully in a diverse society. It prepares children for adult life by developing the full potential of their personality, talents and mental and physical abilities. By empowering learning professionals, teachers and school leaders with a team of people, including other educators and support staff, they will be able to make education happen and create strong communities for learning.

While the core function of schools is to provide education, everybody knows that schools are also very much a community hub and provide more than just access to learning. Finally, there must be systems to support this learning. Making sure that we provide education for the future requires that there are systems that are harmonious with the directions that are being set by this strategy.

**MS ORR:** Minister, what are some of the initiatives flowing from the strategy?

**MS BERRY:** In the budget this year the ACT government committed \$9.2 million to progress measures that will arise as a result of the future of education community conversation. The ACT government is already delivering on that, making sure that students are at the centre. We are investing in teacher excellence by ensuring that our partnership with the University of Canberra can provide schoolteachers with the best, most up-to-date and most contemporary skills that they will need. Partnering with schools like University of Canberra Lake Ginninderra senior secondary school and other schools in the ACT will ensure that there are proper supports for teachers, as will working with the Teacher Quality Institute, so that our teaching profession programs ensure that the teaching profession continues to be up to date and provides the best learning outcomes for our students.

### **Planning—Yarralumla brickworks**

**MISS C BURCH:** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Urban Renewal: when will a lease be issued for the Yarralumla brickworks site and for which part or parts?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** In regard to the Yarralumla brickworks quite a bit of work has occurred over many years to ensure that we get a development that is compatible with the Canberra community and which brings some urban renewal to the area. In the time line of lease renewal I would have to ask the member which particular area she would like to discuss, whether it is in the area precinct for residential development or the area precinct for heritage or the area precinct for urban open space.

**MISS C BURCH:** Will the preferred contractor be issued with a lease with a remediation requirement, or will there be a separate contract to remediate the site first?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** That would be up to the developer.

**MS LEE:** Minister, what will be the gross floor area of dwelling units on the lease, what caveats will be included in the lease and what parts of the blocks will be built upon?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** There is quite a bit of detail in that question. I will take that detail on notice and come back to the chamber with a detailed answer.

### **ACT Policing—criminal gangs**

**MS ORR:** My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Minister, are you able to update the Assembly on recent actions taken by ACT Policing concerning serious criminal gangs?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank the member for her interest in community safety and the opportunity to update this place about the actions that have been taken to tackle serious criminal gangs by ACT Policing. As I have said on numerous occasions, tackling serious gangs is the number one priority for police. However, we need to keep in mind that there is no quick or easy solution. These gangs do not care about laws or government. Despite this, ACT Policing are making progress regarding investigations related to a number of crimes associated with the activity of these serious criminal gangs. This year alone, ACT police, through Taskforce Nemesis, has executed more than 76 search warrants against criminal gang targets, seized 22 firearms, seized more than \$61,750 in currency and laid more than 53 charges against criminal gang members.

Not all of Taskforce Nemesis's work makes it into the public domain but there have been a few recent examples. One was earlier this week. On Tuesday, Taskforce Nemesis executed a search warrant that resulted in the seizure of more than 350 grams of cocaine, several kilograms of cannabis head, weapons, \$6,000 in cash and significant quantities of steroids and prescription medication. This action followed another action earlier this month. On 6 August, Nemesis undertook targeted operations as part of investigations into the criminal gang related shooting incident that occurred on 28 June this year. This resulted in police locating and seizing a loaded 22-250 rifle, a shortened 9 millimetre semiautomatic rifle, ammunition and illicit substances. Two men were arrested and charged with 14 cumulative charges. As

I said, these are some examples of the efforts being made to tackle serious criminal gangs.

**MS ORR:** Minister, are you aware if ACT Policing have used the provisions under the Confiscation of Criminal Assets Act in relation to serious criminal gangs and, if so, what has occurred?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** An excellent supplementary question. ACT Policing have been using the provisions of the Confiscation of Criminal Assets Act. ACT Policing recently advised me of their activities under the provision, and I am advised that in 2017-18, 28 matters were subject to restraint or forfeiture, including penalty orders. The total value of these actions was more than \$20 million. I understand that to help facilitate the use of these provisions, the court has set aside two days this month to consider criminal asset matters. This is one more than the usual monthly practice.

The types of cases last financial year ranged from drugs to arson to fraud. In one drug-related matter, two houses were subject to orders under the act and a \$900,000 penalty was imposed. In another drug matter a \$6 million penalty was imposed. Penalty orders require an offender to pay for the benefits derived from the commission of an offence. Of course, drugs are one way that serious criminal gangs can finance their activities.

**MR PETTERSSON:** Minister, how is the government supporting ACT police to investigate the finances and other assets of serious criminal gangs?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Pettersson for his question. In addition to the legislative provisions that have been strengthened by this government, we are providing additional resources and personnel to police.

I have spoken about how serious criminal gangs do not have any regard for the law, but they do care about their cash and assets. This is why it is very important to be able to track and understand the finances and assets that these gangs might be using.

This is why this government has boosted the capacity within ACT Policing to do that. We have already provided funding for a forensic accountant and in this year's budget we are building on this with \$1.6 million in additional funding. This will enable ACT police to recruit an additional forensic accountant to help strip wealth from criminal gangs as part of Taskforce Nemesis's efforts to disrupt and deter serious criminal gangs.

### **Planning—Fyshwick**

**MS LEE:** My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management. I refer to a recent decision by ACTPLA to revoke a DA approval issued in 2017 for construction of a hard stand structure and associated works, including a rail siding, on block 11 section 8 Fyshwick by Capital Recycling Solutions. An internal review found that the project was wrongly assessed on the merit track. Minister, why was a development application mistakenly issued in 2017 for block 11 section 8 Fyshwick?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank the member for her question. I am very pleased that the directorate has been able to look back at the decision-making process in this instance and, of course, take into account the requirements under the Territory Plan and indeed see that the application was incorrect. That is the work they have done. I am pleased that they have done that. They will continue with that forensic, I think, look at future development applications in regard to the accessibility of the Territory Plan.

**MS LEE:** Minister, why did the planning official who made the decision ignore evidence about upgrading the rail siding, in contravention of the zoning of the site?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I have asked for some details on the decision-making process for this particular decision. I am not sure that the word should be 'ignore'. There was certainly some deliberation within the directorate, in particular by the officer who made the decision at the time. As soon as I get some more information on that, I will come back to the chamber.

**MISS C BURCH:** Minister, what actions have you taken to improve the decision-making process for DAs, given that this is the second time this year that planning officials have been found to have wrongly approved a DA?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I have asked the directorate to have a look and review how they have been making their decisions in regard to this. As I said in my answer to the previous question, as soon as the directorate provides me with more information I will come back to the chamber.

### **Gungahlin—nurse-led walk-in centre**

**MR PETTERSSON:** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, what stage is the Gungahlin walk-in centre at and when will it be open?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I thank Mr Pettersson for the question about the walk-in centre in our electorate of Yerrabi. It is a pleasure to update members today on the delivery of another walk-in centre in Gungahlin, which was a government priority fully funded in last year's budget.

The walk-in centre is an extension of the existing Gungahlin Community Health Centre on Ernest Cavanagh Street. It will provide additional services for patients in the region to attend on a walk-in basis with no appointment necessary. Patients can be seen and assessed by a nurse practitioner, advance practice nurse or a clinical nurse consultant if they have a minor illness or injury.

Walk-in centres can be a great alternative to attending the emergency department or a general practitioner. The new walk-in centre in Gungahlin includes four treatment spaces and will be Canberra's third centre, joining the Belconnen and Tuggeranong walk-in centres.

After the official sod turning, attended by Mr Pettersson, Ms Orr and me in February this year, the foundation slab was completed on 14 March. It is very exciting to

announce that practical completion will be achieved on time this month, and under budget, with services commencing next month.

**MR PETTERSSON:** Will the Gungahlin walk-in centre operations be similar to the Tuggeranong and Belconnen walk-in centres?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** Yes. The Gungahlin walk-in centre will operate under the same existing service model that is present at both the Tuggeranong and Belconnen walk-in centres, aiming to complement both GP and ED services. The centres ensure that people can have access to high quality, extended hours healthcare services closer to where they live. All centres are led by a team of highly skilled nurses working under approved guidelines, overseen by a steering committee comprising medical, pharmacy, ambulance and consumer representatives.

Similar to the popular Tuggeranong and Belconnen walk-in centres, the Gungahlin walk-in centre will improve services to the Gungahlin community and surrounding area by providing free one-off advice and treatment for people with minor injuries or illnesses. Just like the other two walk-in centres, Gungahlin will operate seven days a week between 7.30 am and 10 pm, including all public holidays, with no appointment required. It has on-site parking and is conveniently located right in the Gungahlin town centre, collocated with the Gungahlin Community Health Centre.

**MS CHEYNE:** Minister, how will the walk-in centre assist Canberrans to access affordable health care?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I thank Ms Cheyne for the supplementary. Just like the walk-in centres in Tuggeranong and Belconnen, the walk-in centre in Gungahlin will offer fast, free and efficient access to treatment for one-off, episodic care for minor injury and illnesses, as well as health advice and information.

This demonstrates Labor's commitment to the importance of free and affordable health care for Canberrans, unlike those opposite, who continually question the validity of walk-in centres and in fact want to shut them down. This is on top of their federal Liberal colleagues continually cutting money from health, reneging on their previous election commitment to increase funding to hospitals, extending the Medicare rebate freeze and, instead, prioritising the top end of town with generous tax cuts.

Just today we are again reminded by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare that the ACT has the highest out-of-pocket costs for GP attendance, due to our ongoing lower rates of bulk-billing. That is exactly why our government is committed to ensuring access to affordable health care for our community, and committed to not shutting the centres down. We will grow the number of walk-in centres because it is an important part of Labor's commitment to universal health care. Not only are we opening the walk-in centre in Gungahlin, we are also very close to getting work underway on a walk-in centre in Weston Creek and we are continuing to progress work on the inner north walk-in centre.



**Crime—Yerrabi**

**MR MILLIGAN:** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Minister, why has there been an increase in crime across the suburbs of Yerrabi, most recently in Moncrieff, where the community have set up their own community watch group as well as holding a forum next month with Neighbourhood Watch and Crime Stoppers?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I thank Mr Milligan for his interest. I am pleased to see that the number of offences for the 2017-18 financial year shows a decrease overall of 3.2 per cent, or 1,116 offences, compared to the previous financial year. Mr Milligan is referring to a brand-new suburb, so it is very difficult to see how you could compare previous years. Talking about all of Canberra, though, the total number of recorded offences against a person for the reporting period shows a decrease of 14.8 per cent, or 581 offences, compared to previous years. Alcohol-related assaults decreased from 17.6 per cent, or 154 offences, for the 12 months to 30 April 2018. So, overall, in the stats we have seen, over the past year we have seen an average decrease in criminal activity in the ACT. But in new suburbs we will of course see those occurrences going up, because there is no previous data for them.

**MR MILLIGAN:** Minister, why are police refusing to attend to reports made via Crime Stoppers?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I am sorry, I have a little bit of hearing loss in one ear. If Mr Milligan could repeat.

**MR MILLIGAN:** Minister, why are police refusing to attend to reports made via Crime Stoppers?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** I am not aware that police are refusing to attend any calls for assistance.

**MR COE:** Minister, what actions will you take to ensure that crime such as car break-ins and property damage are thoroughly investigated by the police?

**MR GENTLEMAN:** Police have, of course, a responsibility and an operational plan to look after the most serious crimes and dangerous offences first. They will look at those serious categories first, but certainly investigations occur where they can. If there is no evidence or no view for the victim to take action the police cannot do much about that. They do as much as they possibly can. As I said, we are a safe city, crime statistics are reducing and police are doing a good job.

**Justice—accessibility**

**MS CHEYNE:** My question is to the Attorney-General. Attorney, can you please give an update on the government's work to make our justice system more accessible?

**MR RAMSAY:** I thank Ms Cheyne for the question. We have been hard at work over this term delivering on our commitment to make sure that our laws and our courts

serve our most vulnerable members of society. Women, families and people experiencing disadvantage face the greatest risks of harm and they are our first priority. Our law reform program this year reflects that priority.

We have introduced legislation to support survivors of child sexual abuse to come forward and have their abusers prosecuted. We have engaged across the community in developing our response to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. We accepted or accepted in principle 290 recommendations out of 307. No recommendations were rejected. The laws that are currently under development, including new crimes for failure to protect children and failure to report abuse, will enhance the ability of our justice system to hold people and institutions accountable.

This government has also introduced, and the Assembly has passed, legislation to expand circle sentencing to the Children's Court. The Warrumbul Court will begin hearing sentencing matters later this year, and that is an expression of our commitment to ensuring that our criminal justice system is fair and is also culturally sensitive.

We have worked strongly with other jurisdictions to implement the national redress scheme to enable all survivors to be supported so that they can restore and rebuild their lives. I note, as part of the scheme, the power that comes with an apology from those who have done wrong to those who have been wronged.

These measures are just a few of the key examples of our work to make sure that the justice system is more accessible and focuses first on helping those who are most vulnerable.

**MS CHEYNE:** Attorney, how will the appointment of our eighth magistrate support access to justice?

**MR RAMSAY:** I thank Ms Cheyne for the supplementary question. The government has funded the appointment of an eighth magistrate as a direct way of making our justice system more timely, more accessible and more transparent. More resourcing for that court means that matters can be resolved more quickly, which reduces the stress of ongoing court matters on people who are impacted by crime.

I was very pleased to announce recently the successful applicant for this new position, Ms Louise Taylor. She has over 15 years of experience as a lawyer in the ACT, including specialist experience as a prosecutor in criminal law. This has included experience in the offices of both the commonwealth and the ACT directors for public prosecutions and has involved oversight of the ACT's family violence intervention program. As the Deputy CEO of Legal Aid ACT since 2014, Ms Taylor has had direct management of the Legal Aid Commission's litigation practice, specifically in the areas of family and criminal law.

Ms Taylor will also be the ACT's first Aboriginal judicial officer. Hers is an historic achievement for our justice system. I look forward to welcoming Ms Taylor to the

ACT Magistrates Court and to her continued contribution to the ACT community in her new role.

**MR STEEL:** Minister, how will the government support people to exercise their rights and resolve their legal issues beyond the court system?

**MR RAMSAY:** I thank Mr Steel for the supplementary question. We recognise that access to justice is not just about going to court. It is also about empowering people to know about and exercise their rights in the community. Our investments, our policies and our laws reflect our commitment to building a stronger, safer and more connected city.

Just one example of that in this year's budget is funding for Legal Aid ACT. We are supporting a seniors rights service which provides targeted and specialised support for older Canberrans who are experiencing, or who want to seek information on preventing, elder abuse. That will include linking those who need it to relevant support services.

This newest initiative follows a strong record of support for our community legal centres. Canberra Community Law, the Women's Legal Centre and Streetlaw have been hard at work turning the \$2.477 million they received in the 2017-18 budget into legal services, including advice and education for those who are most at risk and most in need.

We will keep prioritising our city's most vulnerable people, and keep supporting those fantastic and hardworking lawyers who help them to know about and exercise their rights.

### **Clubs—community contributions**

**MR PARTON:** My question is to the Minister for Regulatory Services. Minister, I refer to allegations made in this place yesterday by your colleague Ms Cody that clubs have been “fiddling the books” on community contributions. Has Ms Cody written to you or the ACT Gambling and Racing Commission presenting evidence that licensed clubs have been “fiddling the books”?

**MR RAMSAY:** I thank Mr Parton for his question and his purported concern for the strong community contributions scheme. I can certainly assure Mr Parton, as I did yesterday, that the government is ensuring that what we will do with the community contributions scheme is maximise the benefit—

**Mr Parton:** Point of order.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Resume your seat. Stop the clock, please.

**Mr Parton:** The question was very clearly: has Ms Cody written to you or the ACT Gambling and Racing Commission? It is yes or no.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** He has two minutes to answer, and he has 1.36 minutes left. I will ask the minister to come to the point.

**MR RAMSAY:** Indeed. I was putting it in the context of the broader work that we are doing in reforming and making sure that we have a strong community contributions scheme which benefits the community as a whole. We will continue to do that.

I certainly cannot answer for correspondence that the GRC may or may not have received. I have not received any particular piece of correspondence, but I do know that there has been broad consultation on the community contributions scheme recently which the directorate is in the process of working through. I have full confidence that the result of all this work will be to make sure that the benefits for the community are very much maximised.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, have you or a member of your office spoken with Ms Cody to check whether there is any truth to her claims?

**MR RAMSAY:** Again, noting that the overall work with the community contributions sits with the Gambling and Racing Commission—

**Mrs Dunne:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order. The standing orders say that the minister's answer must be directly relevant. Mr Parton asked a fairly straightforward question: has the minister or anyone from his office spoken with Ms Cody? I think that to be directly relevant, the answer is "yes" or "no".

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. Stop the clock, please.

**Mr Steel:** On the point of order, the opposition cannot direct the minister how to answer a question. That is up to the minister.

**Mrs Dunne:** The standing order says—

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you. I think there is a point to both the points of order, but as I have said often times, the minister has one minute and 34 seconds to answer the question. Whilst you might like a direct "yes" or "no", the minister is entitled, within the parameters of standing orders. I will ask the minister—

**Mrs Dunne:** On the point of order—

**MADAM SPEAKER:** in the time he has left to come to the point of question.

**Mrs Dunne:** I have another point of order in that case. Madam Speaker, you also have the power to sit the minister down if he does not comply with a ruling to be directly relevant. You have the capacity to ask him to be directly relevant and you have the capacity to sit him down.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mrs Dunne. The Minister for Regulatory Services.

**MR RAMSAY:** As I say, noting that the primary responsibility for overseeing the scheme and its regulatory compliance sits with the GRC, I will trust that if there are matters there they will continue through. I have not at this stage spoken with Ms Cody in relation to the debate yesterday, which was very strongly aired. I think it was a very helpful debate to make sure that people are aware that this government is committed to making sure that the scheme is maximised for the benefit of the community.

**MR COE:** Minister, are you aware of any evidence that clubs have been fiddling the books?

**MR RAMSAY:** I note my response in the debate yesterday, which was talking through a number of areas where we have seen that the scheme has been broken and where things have not passed the pub test. I think Minister Rattenbury talked about it yesterday as well. We are aware of a number of areas where, as I highlighted yesterday, things do need to be improved. That is why we are seeking to improve them.

### **Tuggeranong—streetlighting**

**MS LAWDER:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and City Services, and is in relation to streetlights and car park lights. Minister, on 19 September 2017 I asked you about the need for better lighting at the car park behind the CIT in Tuggeranong. At the time you took the question on notice and replied on 19 February 2018, informing me that modifications would be made. On 17 May I wrote to you about the fact that the modifications did not fix the lighting issue. On 10 July Minister Gentleman wrote to me on your behalf informing me that further modifications would take place inside the car park, which are now completed. Minister, why did it take so long, nearly a year, to get this resolution to the issue of poor lighting in this car park?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I note Ms Lawder's comment that the lighting has been significantly upgraded. My understanding—and I will provide any further details to the Assembly—was that the initial work that was undertaken was a relatively straightforward task but that subsequent work took a little bit longer, particularly that related to more substantive work underground. That is why it took some time. I am sure that members opposite, many of them having sat in this place for a long time, would understand that very often, when it comes to electrical works and utility works, what happens under the ground is often quite complex and can take some time. But I am very pleased to hear that those works have now been completed.

**MS LAWDER:** Minister, why did it take so long to fix the light outage at the Erindale shopping centre car park?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I am not aware of that issue. If Ms Lawder could provide further information I will be happy to look into it.

**MR PARTON:** Minister, has the backlog of unfixed streetlights been rectified, and can we now expect that all streetlight bulb outages will be completed within three days of being reported?

**MS FITZHARRIS:** As members know, a new streetlight contract has been in operation for a few months now. Mr Parton could probably look on the fix my street app appropriate, the great new app that allows people to look where jobs have been logged and how they are being completed.

To clarify Mr Parton's question, he asked about bulb replacement on a streetlight. Often if a streetlight is out it may not be related to the bulb; it may, in fact, be related to something happening underground. We are working with TCCS and the new streetlight operator to better inform the community.

When a streetlight goes out, yes, the three-day time frame will be met if it is a faulty bulb. That is a simple thing to do. The target being met for a streetlight bulb is actually very high—

**Ms Lawder:** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Resume your seat, minister. A point of order.

**Ms Lawder:** The first part of the question asked about the backlog of unfixed streetlights being rectified. The fix my street app lists by suburb. We are talking about the holistic streetlight backlog and whether it has now been rectified some months after the new contract started.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I heard that the minister was talking about a new addition and enhancement to the site. Perhaps, in the time you have left, minister, you can go to that particular point.

**MS FITZHARRIS:** I was attempting to explain that Mr Parton's question was perhaps misguided and that some of the backlog does not relate to three days for replacing the bulb; it relates to works underground in terms of fixing what can often be quite complex programs. I note that there are 77,000 streetlights in the ACT. I will take on notice the specific question about jobs to be attended to.

### **National Multicultural Festival—government support**

**MR STEEL:** My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Minister, how is the ACT government supporting multicultural communities to participate in next year's National Multicultural Festival?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Mr Steel for his question and his strong interest in the wellbeing of the multicultural community and in the festival. Although the festival is still six months away, preparations are well underway. Last week as part of these preparations I opened the participation (National Multicultural Festival) grant program for applications. This program provides targeted grants to support organisations to highlight and promote community participation, cultural diversity and inclusion at the National Multicultural Festival. A total of \$85,000 is available through this funding round, with up to \$8,000 available per organisation.

Eligible organisations can apply for funding to: showcase the vibrancy and heritage of multiculturalism through celebrations and events at the 2019 National Multicultural Festival; foster cross-cultural awareness, understanding and respect and promote community groups and intercultural relationships; and enable ACT multicultural communities to celebrate, preserve and share traditions and heritage through cultural performances such as dance and music and in other meaningful ways.

Sixty-seven organisations received grants to take part in the 2018 festival, including the Pearl of the Pacific Samoan Cultural and Dance Group Incorporated for costumes and accessories, the Canberra Punjabi Sports and Cultural Association to promote traditional Punjabi dances and culture, and the Canberra Celtic Pipe Band for the Celtic ceilidh showcase.

The government looks forward to receiving applications that will demonstrate the vibrancy and heritage of multiculturalism through celebrations and events at the 2019 Multicultural Festival. Applications for these grants close on Monday, 17 September. I encourage all members to ensure that their communities are aware of this opportunity.

**MR STEEL:** Minister, what other grants are available to promote participation, cultural diversity and inclusion in our community?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Mr Steel for the supplementary. I am pleased to advise that, in addition to the National Multicultural Festival grant round, the ACT government continues to support community participation, cultural diversity and inclusion in the ACT through the multicultural participation grants which will open later this year. The multicultural participation grants will provide funding of \$175,000 to community radio stations and multicultural community broadcasters and for multicultural community participation, social harmony and inclusion initiatives.

Last year a wide variety of community groups and organisations were able to take advantage of the multicultural participation grants. The grants program is an opportunity for organisations to receive a small amount of funding which has the potential to be significantly beneficial for the broader multicultural community in Canberra. For example, in previous grants rounds the Solomon Islands Canberra Association received funding to assist with the Pacific Islands united voice and youth hour radio program, while Integrated Cultures ACT Inc received a grant to assist with their *Radio Harmony* program and organisations including the Australia Mon Association, the Bangladeshi Seniors Club, Canberra, and the Canberra Muslim Community all received funding to support their celebrations and events.

Organisations such as Welcome to Australia received \$2,650 to assist with the walk together community walk and the ACT Bilingual Education Alliance received \$1,200 to assist with social events and seminars. These grants also highlight the value of the programs in promoting inclusion and learning across the ACT.

When I meet with members of our multicultural communities I am impressed with how they are able to use this grant funding to prepare celebrations, to communicate

with their members and to promote their cultures. I look forward to these grants opening for applications later in the year and I also look forward to joining the multicultural community in celebrating the National Multicultural Festival and many other events throughout the year.

**MS CODY:** Supplementary.

**MRS KIKKERT:** Supplementary.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Supplementary, Ms Cody.

**MS CODY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Minister, how are preparations for the 2019 Multicultural Festival progressing?

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** I thank Ms Cody for her supplementary question. I suspect that Mrs Kikkert's may also be answered.

I am pleased to provide a further update on the preparations for this year's National Multicultural Festival.

*Mrs Kikkert interjecting.*

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** Who knows? The festival has developed over 22 years to become one of Canberra's most loved events. This year, as members will be aware, I commissioned an external review to enable continued improvements in the governance and delivery of future festivals.

I will soon be releasing the review report, along with our response, but in the meantime the festival organisers have been progressing with a range of activities. Several planning meetings have been held with showcase coordinators and other stakeholders, including the diplomatic community, to plan an exciting entertainment program for the 2019 festival. The 2019 festival footprint has undergone wide review and consultation with stakeholders. And festival organisers are working to finalise the headline acts, including an exciting new celebrity chef to follow in Poh's footsteps.

As we all know, food and drink are a major attraction, and applications for stallholders will open later this month, taking into account the feedback received through the review and through other channels. And yes, as I have been saying since February, this will include feedback about who can sell alcohol on the footprint. Applications will also open later this month for the multicultural community performers. An expression of interest process will also be run to engage professional artists from the Canberra music scene as well as international artists.

I encourage interested stallholders and performers to look out for the opening of these applications and to get in early with their applications. The success of the festival has always been due to strong community involvement and, 22 years in, we want to see that community involvement continue.

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



## **Supplementary answer to question without notice**

### **Mental health—efficiency targets**

**MR RATTENBURY:** Yesterday in question time I was asked a question by Mrs Kikkert which I took on notice. I also wish to respond to assertions made by Mrs Dunne and Mrs Kikkert during the budget debate on Tuesday.

I can confirm for members today that there is no savings or efficiency target applied to the adult mental health unit. The savings and efficiency target cited in the independent external review of mental health services was part of ACT Health's internal budget management process for 2016-17 and 2017-18. I can confirm that ACT Health's internal budget management process no longer applies this approach of efficiency targets allocated to divisions.

Noting this, I can assure members and the community that mental health services are not subject to an efficiency target in 2018-19. I can also provide assurances that no mental health services were cut or reduced as a result of efficiency targets over the previous two years.

I also caution members against making assumptions about the direct impact of any savings target on services. Use of emotive terms like "budget cuts" is not accurate, and the budget papers back this up. In 2018-19 we are increasing our investment in mental health services to \$157 million, a five per cent increase for this financial year. The government is committed to continuing to invest in mental health services across inpatient services and community-based services, and this is reflected in the significant initiatives in this year's budget.

Mrs Dunne asked me yesterday why I was unable to answer the question. I can confirm that I was actually needing to get the detail, because through the course of Tuesday's debate several different versions of what was being asked about were put. In the initial debate Mrs Dunne said:

But the most concerning thing was the revelation that there is a nine per cent cut over two years in mental health funding.

Later, Mrs Kikkert said:

It is ... disappointing to hear that the government plans to cut funding for inpatient mental health services by nine per cent over two years.

Later, in the adjournment debate, Mrs Dunne made a further reference. So it was important for me to get behind what was actually being talked about. Certainly, the initial assertions bore no resemblance to anything in this year's budget.

## **Personal explanations**

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (3.23): I seek leave to make a personal explanation under standing order 46.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Leave is granted.

**MRS DUNNE:** Just to clarify, I thank Mr Rattenbury, but I think that he overlooked one specific point; that is, in the adjournment debate, when I brought these figures back into this place, I clarified that I had used the term “budget cut” when I should have used the term “efficiency dividend”. Mr Rattenbury should have recognised that in his comments. There is a difference. Some people might say it walks like a duck and it quacks like a duck, but I did use Health’s term “efficiency dividend” and I did correct the record.

**MS CODY** (Murrumbidgee) (3.24): I seek leave to make a personal statement.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Yes, Ms Cody.

**MS CODY:** Today in question time a question was asked about a speech I gave yesterday during a debate. I was misrepresented in that question. My exact words were:

I have got complete confidence that Mr Ramsay will deliver just that, and the only people who will be upset will be those who have either been fiddling the books or who have been spinning the process of review a bit too hard to the community.

I did not say that there was actual evidence or that anyone had been fiddling the books.

## **Appropriation Bill 2018-2019—part 1.4**

### **Statement by member**

**MS LAWDER** (Brindabella) (3.25), by leave: In the debate on Tuesday regarding TCCS, I referred to dog attacks. I specifically mentioned Biscuit, who was attacked in Wanniasa; Jack, attacked in Monash; and Spuz in Theodore. On Tuesday morning I had been corresponding with the owner of Jack and the owner of Spuz, both of whom have been told by their own vets that their dogs’ injuries were the worst they had ever seen, which is what I think led me to slightly mix the facts in the two cases. Spuz in Theodore was attacked by one dog, and Jack by three. I think on Tuesday I said that Spuz in Theodore had been attacked by three dogs. I apologise for my mistake and correct the record.

## **Paper**

**Madam Speaker** presented the following paper:

Visit to Westminster Parliament/Attendance at the CPA/WFD Benchmarks Workshop/Visit to Scottish Parliament by the Speaker and Clerk of the legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory—Report, dated June 2018.

## **Domestic animals—services management and staff resources**

### **Paper and statement by minister**

**MS FITZHARRIS** (Yerrabi—Minister for Health and Wellbeing, Minister for Transport and City Services and Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research) (3.26): I present the following paper:

Domestic Animals—Services Management and Staff Resources, pursuant to the resolution of the Assembly of 9 May 2018.

I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

**MS FITZHARRIS:** In recent days, including in the media and in this place, relating to DAS, and particularly legislation relating to dog attacks, the opposition have made a number of assertions. I would like to put on the record again the detail of the legislation that was passed in this Assembly by all members last year, particularly as it relates to the opposition's claims around preventing dog attacks.

As we know, and as I have said on many occasions, the best outcome is to stop dogs becoming dangerous or attacking in the first place, and to encourage and ensure responsible pet ownership in our community. The opposition bill introduced last year missed exactly this fundamental point.

Their bill, presented last year, did not go far enough in actually dealing with the issues that contribute to dangerous dogs and dog attacks. Under the opposition bill, where a dog accidentally scratched someone or bit its owner's hand when they both went to grab a tennis ball off the ground, the opposition wanted those dogs destroyed. If a dog killed a lizard or a snake, the opposition bill would have required that dog to be declared dangerous and destroyed. This would not have made our community a safer or better place to live.

The opposition bill did not adequately address the need to improve compliance and enforcement for a range of matters that are internationally recognised as significant contributing factors to dog attacks or dogs becoming dangerous, for example, illegal breeding, desexing, and nuisance and harassing dogs.

The government introduced amendments to the package to make it even stronger, going much further than the opposition bill and based on international best practice for reducing the number of dangerous dogs and dog attacks. This gives us some of the strongest laws in the country.

The amendments included a general public safety consideration in dealing with all dogs that could be dangerous; stronger seizure powers; significantly increased fines and penalties; ownership bans and cancellations for irresponsible owners or owners in breach of the act; much greater restrictions on dangerous dogs and when dangerous dog licences can be issued; increased enforcement powers and an ability to seize and act on nuisance, harassing or dangerous dogs, particularly where they pose a threat to public safety; greater enforcement powers and increased restrictions in relation to desexing and illegal breeding; a self-reporting obligation for owners of dogs involved in serious dog attacks; and better control and enforcement in relation to nuisance dogs which may become dangerous dogs.

The government's amendments also went further than the opposition bill and introduced a new provision to destroy a dog in exceptional circumstances, for example, where the dog is extremely vicious or dangerous. And the new laws are being used. Dogs have been seized and, where appropriate, dangerous dogs have been destroyed.

Public safety is paramount under the new laws. A dog is only returned to its owner where public safety has been expressly considered. The emphasis of the new laws is on community safety and responsible dog ownership, with a focus on prevention and proactive compliance. It is based on international best practice for reducing dog attacks in our community. They are some of the strongest laws in the country.

I would encourage the opposition to reflect very seriously on the very extensive debate we had in the chamber about these matters last year, to check some of the facts and actually check the legislation and operation before they continue to spread mistruths in our community.

## **ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee— report Paper and statement by minister**

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (3.30): For the information of members I present the following paper:

Children and Young People Act, pursuant to subsection 727T(3)—Changing the narrative for vulnerable children: Strengthening ACT systems, dated 11 July 2018.

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

Leave granted.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH:** The ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee has a number of functions, including maintaining a register of deaths of children and young people in the ACT, identifying patterns and trends in relation to the deaths of children and young people, determining research that would be valuable in this area and identifying lessons from the circumstances of a child's or young person's death.

The committee is able to make recommendations about legislation, policies, practices and services for implementation by government and non-government bodies to prevent avoidable deaths and reduce the number of deaths of children and young people in the ACT.

The committee report *Changing the narrative for vulnerable children: strengthening ACT systems* seeks to further our understanding of the risk factors that may increase a child's vulnerability. Previous committee reports have found that the youngest children are the most vulnerable to early and often preventable deaths. While many of these deaths occur due to medical causes and extreme prematurity, the committee has taken the opportunity to consider some broader issues in younger children's lives prior to their death. In preparing this report the committee examined the lives of 11 children under the age of three years who died prior to 2014.

All child deaths included in the review were subject to a closed coronial inquiry. In the majority of cases the coroner had reported the cause of death as "unascertained" or "undetermined". These categories of death can be due to a range of causes where there is insufficient evidence to make an accurate determination.

Not all client files were available to the committee, and the findings of the review relate predominantly to information provided by child and youth protection services, ACT Health and Housing ACT. Coronial findings, police and autopsy reports were also considered.

The review considered 16 risk factors associated with increasing a child's vulnerability. These factors are found at the individual, parent, community and socio-economic ecological level, and include domestic and family violence, drug and alcohol use, housing instability, mental health, physical health and low income.

The report highlights that understanding the effect of risk factors existing in the lives of children is complicated by the fact that these factors are often interrelated and intersect at multiple levels. It is also important to emphasise that the small cohort of children and the findings of this review are not representative of all child deaths in the ACT. Nonetheless the committee found that the complex characteristics of the lives of the 11 children echo extensive findings in national and international research.

All the children experienced one or more risk factors. Analysis of 16 principal risk factors evident prior to birth, and in the time leading to each child's death, indicates that for six of the 11 children, life was chaotic, with 12 or more risk factors being present.

The provision of service supports to families was also analysed by the committee. This highlighted a number of systemic concerns which may have increased a child's vulnerability. These concerns were frequently related to key services not fully recognising or responding to children's needs.

The committee makes 19 recommendations related to improving system responses to reducing the vulnerability of children aged zero to three years. The recommendations relate to the policy and practices of government and non-government organisations.

The committee also recognises that significant changes have been made to the ACT service context since the deaths of the children in this review. These systemic changes have been brought about through the step up for our kids: out of home care strategy 2015-2020, the response to the Glanfield inquiry and the family safety

package, and new budget commitments over the past few years. In addition the committee acknowledges the considerable work of ACT services working with families with children under the age of three years, as well as the considerable challenges professionals and families face day to day.

Section 727T(4) of the Children and Young People Act 2008 states that the minister must give information to the committee about any action that has been taken or will be taken in relation to the matters raised in the report within three months. The government will consider this report and make a formal response to all of its recommendations within this time frame.

The death of any child or young person is devastating, and I would like to take this opportunity to extend my condolences to all families and friends affected by the death of a child or young person.

I commend the ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee report *Changing the narrative for vulnerable children: strengthening ACT systems* to the Assembly and thank the committee for their work over the past year.

## **Remonstrance—democratic rights of citizens of the ACT**

Debate resumed.

**MR PETTERSSON** (Yerrabi) (3.36): I rise briefly today to show my support for the Chief Minister's motion. Before I get to the substance of what I want to talk about, I want to share a similar experience to the one you mentioned earlier, Mr Assistant Speaker Steel.

I remember a day when I was out doorknocking in Ngunnawal, of all places. It was a sunny, warm day. I turned down a little cul-de-sac and knocked on the first door of the street. As everyone in this place would know, when you are knocking on doors, if you do not hear anything for a few moments after knocking on a door, you probably turn on your heel and start to walk down the driveway. When I was halfway down the driveway, someone got to the door. I turned back and went in to speak to them. It was a sunny, warm day but they had their heater on. I could feel the heat radiating from their house.

I started talking to them, giving the normal spiel. "What issues matter to you?" I got a very blunt answer back: "I don't care." Of course, as an optimistic, happy-go-lucky candidate, you go, "Surely there is something you care about." He said, "I am dying." It is a tough conversation to have. You do not know exactly what you are meant to say. You know in that moment that you cannot say or do anything to make it any better. You are probably not going to make their day better by talking about your wonderful wares as a candidate.

He ventured into what was ailing him. He did not have long to live. The one thing he was concerned about was how he was going to go out of this world. He was not sure at that point how bad things were going to get, but he knew he only had a short

amount of time left. It was at that moment that my feelings on euthanasia were well and truly cemented.

But that is a side issue to what we are here to debate. It is a minor component of it. It is subsidiary to the first and foremost issue, the rights of territorians. This is a debate about our rights as a territory, a debate about the content of the self-government act. It is a debate about whether the federal parliament should demean the ACT Legislative Assembly.

I, for one, find it bizarre watching senators from all across Australia, senators who probably know only the road from the airport to Parliament House, claim to know what is best for the residents of the ACT. It is incredible watching senators who talk about states' rights and individual liberty exercise their powers to stop small jurisdictions doing things they do not like.

There is a very famous saying about freedom of speech by Evelyn Beatrice Hall, often unfairly attributed to Voltaire: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." It is worth mentioning, as we have this debate, that the federal parliament may disapprove of what territories legislate, but they should defend our right to do it. If you believe in self-government for the territories, you do not get to half-do it; you either believe in self-determination or you do not.

I have watched a few of the previous speakers. I was not planning to speak, but I have taken exception to a recurring argument, that this topic is worthy of federal intervention. I get that this is a tough and difficult debate for all of us to have, and we each come at it with different experiences. But if we allow this issue to undermine our self-determination, what will be next?

**MR GENTLEMAN** (Brindabella—Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for Urban Renewal) (3.40): I rise to make a few remarks in this very important debate. As colleagues have remarked, this debate has been conducted in a respectful and thoughtful manner. I think we all should reflect on this and attempt to undertake all of our deliberations in a similar fashion.

There have been many eloquent contributions from members on all sides of this place in support of the proposition the Chief Minister has put. I am not sure I can be any more eloquent than the Attorney-General or the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, that I can be any more considered than Ms Cody, or that I can bring the passion that Ms Cheyne and Mr Steel have brought to this debate. But I do want to say a few words about the constitution and the history of this place.

The constitution was created in a time gone past. Federation occurred to provide efficiencies in trade, travel and defence, but with an intent to maintain power within the respective parliaments of the colonies. At Federation, power was placed in the hands of legislatures of state parliaments, thereby making the people of each state responsible for their own destinies. I doubt that it was envisaged at Federation that the territories would have their own parliaments, but they do exist.

We are here because almost 30 years ago the federal parliament created this Assembly and gave the people of our territory self-government. Federal parliament empowered our citizens and gave it a body like those that have existed for centuries to govern areas through democratic means. In doing so, they provided the territory with similar powers to those enjoyed by state parliaments, the successors of the original colonies. Our Assembly enjoyed these powers equally, if you like, until the middle of the 1990s.

In creating the Assembly and empowering it with similar powers to those of state parliaments, the federal parliament 30 years ago gave a clear statement that the people of the ACT were equal to other citizens across Australia and the people of Canberra were mature enough to have their own parliament and to elect members from their own community to decide matters on behalf of territorians. Thirty years on, we in this place have demonstrated that the decision by the federal parliament to grant self-government to the ACT was right, that Canberrans can govern themselves.

What we are asking for in this debate is for our rights to be restored, for a restriction that does not exist for state parliaments to be removed. We are asking for members of this place to be able to decide on all subjects, for Canberrans to be able to petition us on all matters and for us to be able to respond.

Canberra has matured since self-government to be a world-class city. We lead the nation in many areas, and are held out as a global exemplar in some of these. It is simply absurd for the federal government and those who are not from our community to restrict our rights on a matter that their own parliaments enjoy. It is time for the territory to have equality again.

**MS BERRY** (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Women and Minister for Sport and Recreation) (3.43): I am very grateful to the Chief Minister, Andrew Barr, for bringing this motion to the Assembly today. I want to say a few quick words on it, to put my thoughts and my views on this important issue forward in the Assembly today.

This is not the first time that the federal government has denied and interfered with the rights of the ACT community in making decisions around its own laws. I take members back to October 2013, when then Chief Minister Katy Gallagher was working hard with the Assembly to bring marriage equality into the ACT. Back then, the Chief Minister was about to do an interview on ABC radio when she received a call from George Brandis, who said that if we went ahead and introduced marriage equality in the ACT, they would take the ACT government to court.

On that decision around marriage equality, some people did not agree with it but many more supported it. At the time, Katy Gallagher stared him down and the ACT government went ahead. Ultimately we lost that case and marriage equality was delayed. Fast-forward a few years. Now, through the leadership of then Chief Minister Katy Gallagher and her deputy, now Chief Minister Andrew Barr, the whole country has marriage equality. The ACT government led the way in some good, socially



progressive work here in the ACT that made a difference to so many lives, not just here in the ACT but across the country.

I feel as though, if the feds had the chance, they would have interfered in the ACT laws when the ACT went about decriminalising abortion. Again, the ACT led the country. Now Queensland have introduced a bill to decriminalise abortion in that state. Things are changing. The world has not ended.

These are sometimes difficult conversations, but these were important social issues that our community was willing to discuss and make change around. In relation to passing laws on euthanasia, these are the kinds of conversations that our community is ready to have.

I support voluntary assisted dying. I have listened to everybody speaking here today. I can hear that, yes, of course, there are differences of opinion on that. We have been discussing it as a matter of debate. But Canberrans should be able to do more than just have a conversation, which is important. Thirty-six senators denied Canberrans the right for the ACT government to have a conversation and then be allowed to make laws around it.

The ACT government has said that it would not rush through euthanasia laws. It does require a considerable, considerate, meaningful, deep conversation. But that is the point. The point is that that is what we want: the ability to have that conversation.

Restoring rights to the ACT would simply give the ACT citizens the same right to decide on this issue of voluntary assisted dying as other Australians have. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Murrumbidgee) (3.47): I was not planning to speak, because I have not got a lot of voice left, but it is hard to sit here and listen to everybody and not add my views, which I think are probably very well known: I support territory rights—we are not second-class citizens—and I support voluntary assisted dying. My mother had 11 years in a nursing home where I visited more than weekly. I will not go into any more detail, because if I do I will start crying.

I thought I would speak because Mrs Dunne had a very novel argument against allowing the ACT the right to legislate. She said that because euthanasia was not an existing bit of law when we got self-government, we should not be able to legislate about it. I just cannot understand how this makes sense.

I would mention one thing: climate change. Whilst scientists knew about it at the time of self-government, it certainly was not part of the popular debate, and no Australian jurisdictions were legislating about it. Despite that, the Carnell government, with Brendan Smyth as the environment minister at the time, was one of Australia's early leaders in climate change legislation. Had all that taken place as Mr Smyth wanted it to, we would be in a much better place than we are now. So I just do not think that that is a very logical argument. Things change, and we, like the rest of Australia, need to be able to react to them.

I want to thank colleagues for what has been a really respectful and well-considered debate that I am hopeful will lead to support for the remonstrance.

**MISS C BURCH** (Kurrajong) (3.49): As a Liberal I am and always will be a strong supporter of individual choice, personal freedom and limited government interference in our everyday lives and, to that end, I support voluntary assisted dying. I also believe, however, in the fundamental role of government in protecting our most vulnerable and, as many of my colleagues have already said today, I too am yet to see a system which I feel gets this balance right. I do believe that this chamber has the maturity to debate this issue but I reject Mr Ramsay's and Mr Steel's notion that we are in some way being hamstrung from having such a debate. As my colleague Mr Parton already mentioned today, we all too often find ourselves in this place debating issues that are outside our jurisdiction.

Political grandstanding by those opposite is a regular occurrence when I am sure the majority of Canberrans would prefer to see them getting on with the job. I am quite certain that the majority of Canberrans would have preferred to see us spend the day debating where their rates dollars are going and how their services may or may not improve. And yet here we are again. Why did those opposite suddenly think this issue is in some way different and they are being silenced on this?

I will not be supporting this motion. The substance of this motion is unnecessarily antagonistic in its wording. The suggestion that Senator Seselja or his federal parliamentary colleagues have not already seriously considered this issue is not fair and is not true. As Mr Hanson also acknowledged earlier today, I do not think anyone on our side of politics ever takes a conscience vote lightly.

Only yesterday Minister Fitzharris had a rather emotional outburst following our claim that she is not genuinely listening to the people of Canberra. So it seems rather hypocritical to be today accusing our federal senators of the same thing. To claim that the Senate has refused to take into account the views of the 420,000 citizens of the ACT is an incredibly arrogant claim that ignores the fact that there are varied views in relation to both assisted dying and territory rights right across our city.

It is this kind of antagonistic language which I cannot bring myself to support. And it is this antagonistic language that, rather ironically, further demonstrates that those opposite refuse to listen to anyone who disagrees with them and more often than not will not even acknowledge that these people exist or have a right to their views. To claim that opposition to the bill in question was in some way undemocratic, as this motion implies, or to claim that it was against freedom of speech, as Mr Pettersson has just implied, fails to acknowledge that this is the same democracy under which our senators were elected.

Ms Cheyne may not like it but Canberrans elected Senator Seselja. I also reject Ms Cheyne's assertion, and that articulated in the motion, that the federal parliament should never determine the rights of Australian citizens based on their postcodes. The fact of the matter remains, whether we in this place like it or not, that we are a territory and not a state. While I believe in federalism I also believe in the constitution.

If the ACT government is serious about progressing either the issue of territory rights or the issue of assisted suicide, I call on those opposite to engage constructively with our federal colleagues rather than using this chamber to continuously grandstand on issues beyond their jurisdiction.

Finally, if the Chief Minister is so preoccupied with federal jurisdictional matters then perhaps he should have sought preselection for a federal seat.

**MS ORR** (Yerrabi) (3.53): I too want to add my voice to what I think has been quite a respectful and, for the most part, sincere debate on the issue at hand. I was not going to speak today but hearing everyone come out and say what they were saying I too want to note that I believe the territory should have a right to have the conversation itself. It was put today during the debate that perhaps we are a small parliament and we are not quite mature enough. I disagree entirely with that.

In my first speech I spoke of my two grandfathers who both passed away in 2016. One of my grandfathers lived in New South Wales, the other in ACT. One had the right to have a parliament debate how their life should end; the other did not. One was in pain for days and one, even though he was in palliative care, suffered immensely with no choice because his parliament does not have a choice.

It is something we should be able to decide. We are big enough, we are mature enough, to have that discussion ourselves. And we are big enough and mature enough to make the decision ourselves. We should not be stopped from having that conversation. Based on the respect of the debate we have had today I think we are capable of doing that. And I support our having the right to do it.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (3.55): I rise in support of the Chief Minister's motion today. I also listened to this debate and was not intending to speak but I want to briefly add my voice, as everyone else has done, to a debate that could at times almost be better characterised as a conversation among colleagues.

The respectful way in which this debate has largely been conducted demonstrates the maturity of this place, although, as Ms Fitzharris pointed out, the place can also get pretty willing at times. That is fine too. That is what democracy is about.

Fortunately I have not had the personal experience of a loved one dying a slow and painful death. I do, however, have a personal view on the issue of voluntary assisted dying. I am on record as supporting a person's right to die with dignity, to exercise choice and control until the end of their life. I also recognise that this is a complex issue and that people of goodwill can have different views and that even people who support voluntary assisted dying will have disagreements about how we would give effect to that if we had the right to make that decision.

As others have said, this is not about my opinion on voluntary assisted dying and it should not have been about the opinion of 36 senators on this issue. This is, as others

have said, a question of territory rights. It is a question of the 400,000 Australians who live in the ACT and the 300,000 Australians who live in the Northern Territory having the same rights as those who live in Tasmania, Western Australia or, as Ms Cheyne and Ms Lawder have pointed out, 10 to 15 minutes away in Queanbeyan, for their own parliaments and their own people to make policy in relation to this matter.

As our advertisements have said, Canberrans do not need assisted thinking on this issue. What we need is the right to make our own decision.

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (3.57), in reply: I thank colleagues for their contributions. It has been an important discussion on a very important issue, one that obviously members feel very strongly about. Both issues, territory rights and end of life issues, are ones that bring strong passions, although I expected there would be more passion around end of life issue. I will acknowledge Mrs Dunne's contribution on territory rights. I will say I was a little surprised by that. Nevertheless it is good that the diversity of views was able to be aired over the course of this debate.

From here, noting the stated position of a majority of members of the chamber, this remonstrance will then be provided to the Australian Senate. I understand that our colleagues in the Northern Territory parliament are also considering a similar approach. There will be opportunity for the territories to continue to work together on this issue in the weeks and months ahead.

I want to particularly thank Ms Cheyne for her passion and commitment over what has to date been a short parliamentary career but one that I think will be a very long parliamentary career as a result of the passion that she shows, both for her constituents and on significant issues of public policy. I think the electors of Ginninderra should be very proud of their local member today.

In saying that, I particularly welcome the contributions of those across the chamber. It is good to hear some voices from the conservative side of politics in support of these issues. And that has been a positive out of today's debate.

I commend this motion to the Assembly and thank members for their support.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## **Appropriation Bill 2018-2019**

[Cognate bill:

Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2018-2019

Cognate papers:

Estimates 2018-2019—Select Committee report

Estimates 2018-2019—Select Committee—government response]

Debate resumed from 14 August 2018.

**Detail stage**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I remind members that in debating order of the day No 1, executive business they may also address their remarks to executive business order of the day No 2 and Assembly business orders of the day relating to the report of the Select Committee on Estimates 2018-2019 and the government response.

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate—Part 1.5

**MR COE** (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (4.01): This particular directorate—and this particular item for discussion—is huge, to say the least, as far as the scope of ACT government activity is concerned. I will be speaking to several aspects of it, in particular, the treasury and economic development components. My colleague Mrs Dunne will chat about arts, and there may be some other contributions as well.

We have heard the Chief Minister say much about the state of the territory's finances. Much of what he says is about the government's headline operating balance, but there is much more to the budget than just that rather narrow figure. To echo the comments of former Chief Minister Jon Stanhope and former Treasury official Khalid Ahmed in a recent *Canberra Times* piece, this surplus is an illusion. The Treasurer's management of our finances has been pretty ordinary. A return to surplus has been promised but not delivered since 2012. This has occurred again and again despite promises from the government every year that a surplus is just over the horizon.

The treatment of the government's stock of renewable energy certificates as revenue, despite the policy being clear that they are planning to surrender them in 2021, hides a significant budget deficit that will continue to add to the territory's debt. Excluding these certificates, the underlying budget position is a deficit of \$96 million, moving to another deficit of \$66 million in 2019-20 according to the headline position.

The government continues to spend more than it receives. When you consider all incomings and all outgoings, the deficit is \$485 million. It is a figure the government does not like to talk about. They would much rather talk about the headline net operating balance.

The headline figure does not include government trading enterprises, so it does not include Icon Water and ACTION, and it does not include the sale and purchase of land or other physical assets such as buildings and infrastructure. Instead the figure includes estimated long-term capital growth on superannuation investments and is not included in the audited financial accounts signed off by the Treasurer, Under Treasurer and Auditor-General. It also does not conform to government accounting standards. So we have to be very cautious when we base decisions purely off the headline operating balance or before we simply judge the government's financial management on that figure alone.

The government's net operating balance is not a comprehensive measure of the state of the finances. There is a reason it does not get audited by the Auditor-General.

While it may be indicative of aspects of the books, it is not indicative of the complete state of the books which is why it is not audited by the Auditor-General.

As projected, the territory debt will reach \$2.9 billion by 2022, with taxpayers forced to pay more than \$200 million per year in interest. That is roughly two or three brand-new schools such as the one in Coombs and the new one being built in Taylor. Two and a half of those per year is our annual interest bill.

It is this net borrowing figure that best encapsulates the poor state of the territory's finances. The last time the ACT had a fiscal surplus was in 2007-08, when John Stanhope was Chief Minister. And by fiscal surplus I mean all incomings and all outgoings: the very figure the Auditor-General actually audits. All incomings and all outgoings is what a real surplus or deficit should be based on, not this headline figure that excludes ACTION, Icon Water, land and other purchases.

Despite the claims of revenue diversification, the commonwealth remains the single largest source of funding for the ACT government and will continue to be so well into the future.

**Mr Barr:** It is for every state.

**MR COE:** The Chief Minister interjects that the commonwealth is the biggest contributor to all states, and that is spot on; that is exactly right. But the Chief Minister keeps talking about himself, keeps talking about his rates reform, keeps talking about being the great financial reformer of the territory, yet the reality is that while that has a massive impact on the households he is collecting it from, the majority of money that comes into the ACT coffers comes through the commonwealth. That is the reality.

**Mr Barr:** Tax reforms are revenue neutral, remember. You have just confirmed that that it is revenue neutral.

**MR COE:** To say that it is revenue neutral is such a stretch. I mean, tell someone who has got a rates bill that actually it is revenue neutral. The reality is that the majority of our money comes from the commonwealth and that the own-source revenue is increasing as well. It is increasing significantly and it is having a massive impact on the households of Canberra. That is why when the Canberra Liberals said in 2012 that rates would triple, the then Treasurer went on the attack on the Canberra Liberals, saying it was a lie. They said it would never happen. Guess what: it is happening all right. The vast majority of Canberrans know that all too well.

I believe that Canberrans have been betrayed by this Labor government. In 2012 the rates revenue was \$200 million; by 2022 it will be over \$600 million. In actual fact from 2012 to 2016 the rates revenue doubled. So the impact of this so-called rates reform is far from being revenue neutral for households. It is a gouge. It is a gouge for people who cannot afford it.

That is why former Chief Minister Jon Stanhope is spot on when he writes in today's *City News*:

It goes without saying that all of these cuts will impact disproportionately and dramatically on the most poor, disadvantaged, vulnerable and marginalised people in our community.

This is probably the most progressive Labor Chief Minister the ACT has ever had, and perhaps one of the most progressive Labor first ministers Australia has ever seen, having a go at his former colleague. Today Jon Stanhope wrote:

Labor and the Greens have announced that Land Tax will increase by a further 45 per cent over the next five years. I imagine the fact that the Greens have supported these massive hikes in Land Tax was an additional consideration in their decision not to support the Liberal Party motion. To have done so would certainly have exposed the depth of their hypocrisy.

Jon Stanhope goes on:

However, the price the community will pay as a result of the bargain struck between the two parties is the consequential funding cuts which Labor and the Greens have agreed to make to other functions. These include a cut of 3.7 per cent (compounding) to Environmental Protection (the first casualty of which is the decision to defund Frog Watch—oh, Shane; oh, Caroline, how could you?), a cut of 0.6 per cent (compounding) for Social Protection, and effective cuts to Housing and Community Services and to Health in relation to both of which the agreed growth in funding is less than inflation.

*(Second speaking period taken.)* It would have been very hard to imagine a few years ago that you would have Jon Stanhope coming out on a regular basis attacking this government because of their inability to represent vulnerable and marginalised people. That is exactly what is happening. Obviously Mr Stanhope feels compelled to represent them because it is clear that the Labor Party does not.

The Labor Party has gone from representing those in the bottom two quintiles to those in the top two quintiles. They are quite happy to see those struggling the most in our community pay for their grandiose schemes and for their grandstanding. The government continues to pull the wool over the eyes of Canberrans, spending thousands on a PR unit which is tasked with trying to make the government look as good as possible while hiding data on cost blowouts, funding costs, and low staffing levels in key budget areas.

The budget that we are debating is a bad budget for everyday Canberrans. It is a bad budget for business in our city. Under this government, payroll tax will double and it will drive even more businesses across the border into New South Wales. The Canberra Liberals want to see this trend reversed. We want to see people choosing to live in the ACT rather than choosing to live over the border. We want to see the ACT government competing with the New South Wales government to be the best jurisdiction when it comes to the cost of living. Instead the government has given up the race.

The scale of the government's plan for higher rates and taxes has been confirmed. Back in 2012-13 when tax reform was first introduced the government rhetoric was that it was a fairer, simpler, and more efficient tax. Instead, Canberrans will have experienced 10 years of rate paying when it comes to 2022, with rates revenue going from \$209 million to \$605 million.

In Hawker there has been a 110 per cent increase. In my electorate of Yerrabi, Palmerston has had a 112 per cent increase, while in Chisholm there has been a massive 123 per cent increase since 2012. It is because of this dramatic increase in the cost of living that we are seeing so many people move to areas surrounding the ACT.

There are many things that I would like to see the budget concentrate on. I believe that there is not enough clarity with regard to the percentage of the capital works budget that is expended in the relevant budget year. I note that the government response to recommendation 34 of the select committee report says:

This information is not available at the time of publication of the Budget papers, as reporting for the prior financial year is not finalised at that point in time.

That is the same for every single line item in the budget. That is why we have a commonly called estimates outcome. For them to say they are not able to publish the percentage of the capital works budget expended in the budget year because it is not available at the time of publication is a sham. You could use that excuse for every single line item in the budget. The budget is produced and published in early June. The financial year does not close until 30 June. They could use this excuse for everything. If that is going to be the approach, let us shift the budget to August and let us have final year-end figures included. But if they are going to keep going with a June budget, they should not hide behind the excuse that the figures are not available because it is not 30 June yet. It is an absolute crock that they would base their refusal to publish the percentage of the capital works budget on that defence.

I also believe that the government should be publishing with absolute clarity the total value of the large-scale generation certificates and work into that valuation what their intended purpose is for the treatment of those certificates, because if the budget is meant to be a reflection of your financial policies, and your financial policies are to surrender these certificates at no revenue, how can you possibly say that to value them as being worth \$80 million is a true reflection of your accounting statement? It is just not. You cannot say that you have this asset worth \$80 million but you have no intention of ever realising it and in actual fact you are going to write it down by \$80 million. It should be there up-front.

That is exactly what Mr Stanhope and Dr Khalid Ahmed said a couple of weeks ago: that the writedown should take place in the same year, because that is what the financial policy was last year. The accounting and budget policy last year was to record the revenue and record the expense in the same year so that it had no impact on the bottom line. Instead, through the tricky financial arrangements that they put into this budget, they have written in the revenue for the first three years and then written in the expenditure in the final year, thus propping up three years of budget outlooks



that do not reflect this government's financial policies. It is wrong, and that is exactly what Dr Ahmed said.

I also believe that the budget should have regard for those who have paid stamp duty either prior to 2012 or since 2012. It is all very well for this government to say that stamp duty has been abolished, but for the vast majority of Canberrans stamp duty is alive and well. That is why the government continues to bring in more money from stamp duty today than it did in 2012. The money keeps rolling in for this so-called abolished tax. And for those who paid the full stamp duty before 2012 and are now paying escalating rates to substitute for stamp duty they already paid, it is of course double dipping. There is no regard and no fairness in this. I note that Ted Quinlan had a recommendation in his tax reform package that there should be some consideration for people that had already paid stamp duty. They conveniently ignored that recommendation.

I also believe there should be much more done with regard to the lease variation charge, particularly in town centres. If we are serious about having density, as the government supposedly is, I believe that town centres are where that density is best located. However, the lease variation charge policy apparently drives more and more into the suburbs and not enough into the town centres.

There is much more that can and should be said about the state of the finances. I will certainly take up opportunities in relation to other budget line items, such as Icon and the Suburban Land Agency, to give further commentary.

**MS LE COUTEUR** (Murrumbidgee) (4.20): Like Mr Coe, I will concentrate on the revenue side, not the expenditure side. First, I would like to correct something that, possibly foolishly, Mr Coe said. He put forward Jon Stanhope as an authority in respect of what happened in the Assembly last week. Members may remember that the Assembly passed a motion to implement a plan relating to houses rented at market rent at least by community housing providers. The plan was to exempt them from land tax. Mr Stanhope's article would give you the impression that the exact opposite happened.

Turning to rates and stamp duty, as Mr Coe did, virtually every economist in the world thinks that we would be better off phasing out stamp duty. The ACT has been doing this since 2012. The Greens have supported it for reasons of economic rationality. So far I think that, basically, it has been successful. But because we are the first part of Australia to deliver this tax reform, we are also the first to uncover some of the downsides.

For most people, of course, paying rates is not one of their more significant financial problems. For a median income household paying median rates in the ACT, it is less than two per cent of their income. But for lower income people in older suburbs like Curtin and Garran, they can be paying well over 10 per cent of their income. This is a real issue.

The Greens support economic efficiency, but it has to be balanced with fairness. One effort towards fairness is deferment. This lets people put off paying their rates until

the property is sold. I am very pleased that the age deferment scheme is being expanded to virtually everybody over 65. It used to be available only to people with expensive properties. I believe that as tax reform continues we are going to have to make more adjustments like this to ensure that our rating system is fair. Unfortunately, the ACT, like other jurisdictions at our level, has only a very small range of things we can tax, and they do not tend to be progressive taxes.

I move on to a more cheerful subject. Community engagement has always been a key Greens priority. We welcome the extra \$5 million in funding. We are very pleased to see that the government is now making much more use of participatory democracy, which has been a long-term Greens priority. We see it as a way, hopefully, of improving the decisions that we make and of improving the trust in the decisions. I am very pleased to see it being used for both CTP and housing choices.

But the good work of some parts of the government on this is being let down by others. For example, I would have to say that I was really shocked by the decision to reconsider the DA for the Curtin shops rather than put in a new DA. I hope that the new funding will allow for more improvement in community consultation.

Another issue on which the Greens hold concern is the intergovernmental agreement on identity matching services signed at the Council of Australian Governments last year. In particular, we are concerned that, based on the bill tabled in federal parliament, the private data of ACT residents could be handed over to the Department of Home Affairs, which could in turn disclose this information to private corporations.

We welcome the Chief Minister's commitment that the ACT signed up to the intergovernmental agreement only on the basis that it would be compatible with our Human Rights Act. We really look forward to seeing how this will be implemented in a way that is human rights compatible.

Moving to the arts, there are a few initiatives I would like to mention. There is funding for both major events and Canberra's events calendar. I would like to reiterate the Greens' concern that it is time to set a minimum local performer content target to ensure that at least a certain proportion of this funding goes towards supporting our local artists and performers.

It is great to improve tourism numbers and to have more events here in Canberra. But if there is no commitment to ensuring that our local artists are supported, a major part of the plus may not be happening. We need to know that these funds are going towards local art as well as interstate and overseas performers.

Obviously, like everyone else, we are very pleased that the Belconnen Arts Centre is getting additional funding for stage 2 of the centre. This will help with integrating the centre's expansion with landscaping and park network around the broader town centre and Lake Ginninderra.

Speaking of theatres, this budget funds the commissioning of a business case for a new Canberra theatre complex. The Greens are supportive of this preliminary work but we want to caution that this work needs to look holistically at the Civic Square

precinct and make sure that any new theatre buildings and surrounds work in to provide good community access to the square.

We would really like to see the Civic Library and CMAG integrated into any plans as well as, of course, having a few more trees for shade and amenity. While I am noting the arts infrastructure expenditure, elsewhere in Canberra I note that my electorate of Murrumbidgee, in particular, Woden, could well use some of that expenditure in the next budget.

The Greens are pleased to see funding to better enable the Ombudsman to undertake investigations in relation to the reportable conduct scheme. Members would know that we have been particularly pleased to see that religious institutions have now become part of the scheme; so this funding will be able to support any investigations necessary in this regard.

I am pleased also that \$7.5 million is being invested into 1 Moore Street upgrades, including addressing energy efficiency issues. This building, of course, is better known as the home of the ACT Health community health service and ACAT. It is an old building, I believe from the Whitlam days. I cannot imagine that it is now a hugely energy-efficient building. It could well do with an upgrade.

There are many good initiatives in this budget. We are pleased to support them.

**MR RAMSAY** (Ginninderra—Attorney-General, Minister for Regulatory Services, Minister for the Arts and Community Events and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (4.27): I am pleased to speak in this part of the debate as Minister for Regulatory Services and also as minister for arts. The 2018-19 financial year will be another wonderful year, I am sure, for Access Canberra. The government is eager to build on the success Access Canberra has had since its inception to be a one-stop-shop for the ACT government and members of the community to transact services efficiently and effectively. As the city is growing, so is Access Canberra. We will be delivering even more front-line services through Access Canberra.

The ACT community is quite clear on how Access Canberra is performing. This year's independent customer satisfaction survey, which Access Canberra commissions every year, revealed that 96 per cent of customers are satisfied with the customer service received while completing face-to-face transactions with Access Canberra. Building on these excellent results, the government continues to invest in Access Canberra as our city continues to grow.

This financial year Access Canberra has been allocated further funding to continue improving customer satisfaction and reducing application processing times. This funding will provide additional concierges in the service centres and five additional contact centre officers, which will allow 1,700 additional calls per week to be taken while continuing to bring down call wait times.

In addition to our work improving customer service we will also continue to make Canberra a safe place through effective regulatory regimes and compliance checks. The government is funding two additional WorkSafe ACT inspectors to focus on

areas of high risk. Health and safety remains a big focus in the territory, and everyone deserves the right to return home safely. These extra inspectors will assist WorkSafe ACT to respond to workplace health and safety complaints or incidents as well as conduct workplace inspections in priority areas to improve the overall safety performance for the territory. With these extra resources, WorkSafe ACT anticipates conducting an extra 300 workplace inspections in 2018-19.

The government will also be funding from this financial year two additional building inspectors to enhance consumer protection and undertake engagement, education and enforcement activities in the building and planning regulatory space. These additional resources will also allow a new rapid response team to foster faster complaint resolution. They will also focus on responding to any outstanding historical complaints, which Access Canberra aims to have resolved by the end of this calendar year.

Turning to small business, this year Access Canberra will be focusing on providing an easier registration process for local cafes. This is a thriving part of the small business sector, and the ACT government is currently negotiating with the commonwealth government to source funding under the small business regulation reform bilateral agreement. When an agreement is reached, Access Canberra will develop a customer-centric online platform for prospective cafe and food business operators to streamline the application process for registering businesses in the territory. Five full-time project staff have been funded in this year's budget for this initiative to assist with bringing all relevant information for operating a cafe into a single online registration process that will satisfy all regulatory requirements, saving precious time for business owners.

As members in this place would be aware, Access Canberra has been working tirelessly to reduce the time frame for processing working with vulnerable people applications. Close to 110,000 Canberrans are registered, and the additional funding in this budget will ensure that decisions are made in a timely manner.

Additional risk assessment officers are also being recruited to consider the more complex applications as well as supporting improvements to protection for children and vulnerable people through the reportable conduct scheme and implementing the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. To assist Access Canberra in this effort, the government has allocated \$1.8 million.

The government will also be investing in better road safety by replacing fixed speed cameras with new and improved technology and by purchasing two additional licence plate recognition cameras to tackle dangerous and illegal parking in the territory. There will also be funding for four additional staff to operate licence plate recognition cameras.

The introduction of these cameras last financial year was a great success and is proof that this initiative significantly increases Access Canberra's ability to regulate compliance and undertake education efforts to change behaviours with the public parking zones, focusing on vehicles parked in short-stay parking and school zones.

Ten fixed speed cameras will also be replaced over the next two years, replacing ageing camera infrastructure.

In the 2018-19 financial year, Access Canberra has committed to meeting some ambitious targets with this new funding. This includes: maintaining its customer service satisfaction of at least 90 per cent; having at least 80 per cent of the services available online by 2020; completing at least 85 per cent of transactions online; and achieving at least a 90 per cent compliance rate during targeted inspections.

But there is more to the regulatory services portfolio than that which happens in Access Canberra. The ACT government remains committed to increasing economic productivity in the territory through a dedicated regulatory reform program and better design and delivery of programs and services. Given this commitment I am extremely pleased that we have renewed our commitment in the budget to continue and to expand our experienced policy and evaluation capability.

The 2018-19 budget provides ongoing funding of \$4.13 million over four years to maintain the regulatory reform team to deliver the government's four-year plan for regulatory reform from 2018-19. This involves both major reform projects as well as the annual red tape reduction bill program. Building on this work, from 2019-20 additional funding of \$1.64 million will be provided to establish a dedicated evaluation team to work with all ACT government directorates to improve the design and delivery of policy and services across the ACT.

The government's regulatory reform achievements have been significant, but we will not rest on our laurels. We need to make sure that our statute book does not get out of date and does not hold back the potential of innovative, connected and progressive community into the future. This new central evaluation function to work across all directorates will support ongoing analysis and program review. This government is strongly committed to a regulatory reform program and evaluation capacity that ensures that our government continues to meet the needs of the ACT community into the future.

Finally in this portfolio, through this budget the government continues to demonstrate its commitment to making Canberra one of the world's most livable cities; a city where transactions with government are easy and simple; a city where Canberrans are able to access services at any time of the day at their fingertips; and a city where the services offered by government are customer-centric and flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual. This is what the government achieves every day through this portfolio, and through this budget we will be growing the services for this growing city.

Turning to the area of arts, also a portfolio within this area of the budget debate, I note that the arts are a central part of Canberra's vibrant and creative spirit. Our vibrant arts scene is a home to a number of arts organisations with strong reputations for producing high level work and developing industry-leading artists across a range of media. Our arts organisations not only support professionals but they also value social inclusion and open access to the arts.

Madam Speaker, as you are well aware, Canberrans enjoy the arts in a different way—some like to participate as an audience member, others like to be actively involved through making or through doing. This is demonstrated by the fact that we had the highest attendance rate at cultural venues and events at 94 per cent and the highest cultural participation rate at 39 per cent of any jurisdiction in Australia.

The recent national arts participation survey conducted by the Australia Council for the Arts, revealed that the majority of Canberrans felt that the arts have a big or a very big impact on their understanding of other people and cultures, child development, mental stimulation, their ability to express themselves, their ability to think creatively and develop new ideas, and their sense of wellness and happiness.

I am pleased to say that almost nine in 10 Canberrans agree that first nations arts are an important part of Australia's culture, and that the arts in general make for a richer and more meaningful life. In 2016 for the first time the national arts participation survey collected data on engagement with the arts as part of Australia's cultural background. It revealed that one in three Canberrans engage with their cultural background through the arts.

Data available for the first time also shows that the community arts and cultural development sector is a leader in the use of arts to support social cohesion, enabling diverse voices to be heard and connected through creating art. We know from the 2016 survey that 17 per cent of Canberrans were involved in community arts and cultural development activities that actively engaged community members in decision-making and the creation of art and collaboration with professional artists. The government continues to support individual artists as well as arts organisations to provide activities and programs which enable participation in and access to the arts for the ACT community.

The ACT government is investing an additional \$2.6 million in the arts as part of the 2018-19 budget. This is on top of the \$21.6 million in funding allocated in the 2017-18 budget and initiatives related to the Cultural Facilities Corporation, which are up for debate later. The ACT government is currently delivering \$879,000 a year in grants to local artists. We are also supporting artists and arts organisations through a more flexible and accessible funding and capacity-building program.

A component of this capacity building is demonstrated through a commitment to strengthening the live music sector in the ACT with the recently announced investment of \$108,000 to support live music in Canberra during 2018-19 to be delivered by Music ACT. The ACT government will establish a \$5 million Canberra screen fund to be administered by Screen Canberra. The fund will invest in commercial screen productions undertaken in Canberra and help our local film industry continue to grow by attracting more major projects.

The government is providing support of over \$2 million in total funding over the next three years as part of its funding agreement with the ANU School of Music and the School of Art and Design to deliver the community outreach program. The new program better aligns to the ACT arts policy, which has a focus on developing the arts

and participation in the arts for the whole community. The ACT government also continues to provide support to the Canberra Writers Festival, Design Canberra, Art Not Apart, and Kulture Break in accordance with our election commitments.

We are also focused on engaging with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to celebrate their unique cultures and improve their wellbeing. Earlier this year we released the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts consultation report and action plan. As an initiative of the action plan ArtsACT will employ a dedicated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander-identified arts officer, with \$567,000 of funding over four years ongoing to continue our engagement. This position will provide culturally appropriate advice to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders, and work with the newly established ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander arts network and other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities to continue to develop and to deliver specific programs.

I was pleased recently to announce that the Canberra-based company PBS Building has been appointed to build stage 2 of the Belconnen Arts Centre. Belconnen Arts Centre already offers a great range of programs and events, including dance classes, art exhibitions, workshops and concerts. The government's investment of \$15 million for stage 2 will deliver a new multipurpose performance space, dance studio, expanded exhibition space, cafe and conference room, as our 2017-18 budget announcement made clear.

In 2018-19, the government will also provide Belconnen Arts Centre with operational funding of \$700,000 over two years to support innovative approaches to exhibitions, and manage the increased costs associated with the capital works. The opportunities for the Belconnen community to get involved with the centre will grow when the building is completed at the end of 2019.

In areas of infrastructure investment we have allocated \$1.2 million for early scoping and design on a new Canberra theatre complex which would be able to host a larger arrange of local, national and international events than the current theatre. We will also be undertaking further upgrades at government-owned arts facilities in the territory through the development of a specialised asset replacement scheme and design and rectification of the Watson Arts Centre kiln shed as part of the strategic asset management plan.

The ACT government will provide \$2 million in further support for the major events fund, which boosts visitation to Canberra by attracting significant events and exhibitions like *Hyper Real* and Cartier at the National Gallery of Australia. I also look forward to our new pop-up arts events and activities in Woden and Gungahlin which will provide collaborative opportunities for an artistically active and connected community culminating in neighbourhood community arts events in these localities from 2019 to 2021.

In conclusion, art has the ability to bring us all together through a shared experience. Whether it is through listening, watching, making, or moving, the arts provide us with many ways to express ourselves and connect with other people in our community. The ACT government is proud to support Canberra's art sector in order to deliver the

ACT's arts policy vision to be a diverse and dynamic arts ecology valued locally, nationally, and globally.

**MRS DUNNE** (Ginninderra) (4.43): It is certainly the case that arts deliver many positive outcomes for both artists and observers. For example, it has been shown that music, especially the playing of musical instruments, is the only discipline, not only artistic discipline but any endeavour, that engages the entire brain in processing information and converting it to sound.

Research shows that music is a very powerful therapeutic tool. Who would think that a person suffering Parkinson's disease, displaying a severely stuttering gait when walking, can walk and dance smoothly and fluently when music is played. Who would think that a person suffering severe dementia, even unable to recognise their closest relatives, let alone remember anything else in their lives, can remember words to songs when music is played or can hold a lucid conversation after hearing a favourite piece of music. And who would think that a stroke sufferer, who has lost their speech, can learn to speak, and sound perfectly normal by training that part of their brain where singing is based. Did you know, Madam Speaker, that learning a musical instrument, even late in life, can help to delay the onset of dementia because it exercises the brain and can help with arthritis therapy by promoting new motor skills and movement?

Arts give us a great leveller. The arts speak all languages. The arts promote different cultures in an engaging, non-confrontational manner. The arts are a great calmer. And speaking of engagement, anyone can engage in the arts. It does not matter how proficient you are at your chosen artistic field, you can still be involved. There are people in choirs who cannot read music. There are people who are colourblind who can paint.

The arts cross all kinds of boundaries. They provide the link between cultures, between young people and old people, between people who are well and those who are sick. They give vulnerable people confidence. Take, for example, the Choir of Hard Knocks, set up to give homeless people and drug addicts an outlet, or Canberra's own Alchemy Chorus, a choir for people with dementia and their carers.

All this brings me to a state of bewilderment as to why the ACT government defunded a long-term, successful initiative called the music engagement program which runs out of the ANU School of Music. Thankfully, there is still some information available online about this program, which I will share with the Assembly. Its still existing website tell us:

Established in 1984, the MEP is built around a simple, practical way of making music, the practical result of a philosophy, not a method.

The philosophy assumes that music-making is a normal human activity that has an important social function.

By prioritising the social function of music, we can develop an alternative model for music in education as it is usually practised in modern Western society, which has lost much of the basic, social enculturation processes for music that might exist in other societies.



A social model of music-making does not place central importance on achievement or technical virtuosity, but on joyful and sustained engagement.

The principal intent behind our music-making—

the music making of the MEP—

is, therefore, to prioritise shared music-making by all in a stress-free, non-judgemental and joyful environment, where each individual develops his own musical identity and musical skills in a way that promotes ongoing involvement.

Through the music engagement program, primary school children were engaged in music making and, through their music making, were connected with people in aged care facilities. They not only shared music but they shared stories. The children would perform and then talk one-on-one with the residents. The program gave valuable insights to young people, including the rebellious young. The program helped change those rebellious students. They became happier, more understanding and better students in their schools. A year 5 student said about the program, “When I sing in a nursing home I feel good because I know I made someone happy, and that makes me happy.” Can you imagine the joy of residents being able to see and interact with these young people in such a positive and engaging environment. And it is all because music, the great leveller, had been brought to them.

Yet the ACT Greens-Labor coalition government does not think a program like this is of any value to our community as a whole. This ACT Labor-Greens coalition government defunded the program. I asked the minister about this program:

Given that, under the ACT arts policy, one of the principles of artsACT is participation in and access to the arts, achieved in part through partnerships and collaboration, and that artsACT recognises that the ACT government’s priorities include health and education, how, and to what extent, did the future funding of the music engagement program fail to align with those attributes and qualities?

In his answer the minister waffled on about the Education Directorate being responsible. His answer failed to recognise the broader social engagement and the long-term benefits of the program. His answer failed miserably to address the question in the context of ACT arts policy, the context in which the question was asked.

In an opinion piece published in the *Canberra Times* on 14 February this year Toni Hassan told the story of John, a primary school student, and how his life had been changed through the music education program. John was a troubled young man whose life was changed as a direct result of the music engagement program. Ms Hassan wrote that John was “just one of tens of thousands of students the program had enriched”. The self-esteem of tens of thousands of young Canberrans has been enriched by the music education program.

Imagine what this has done for the long-term benefit of the Canberra community as a whole. Perhaps this program’s successes were just a little too much for the

government to bear. This ACT Greens-Labor coalition government defunded this program with little explanation and little apprehension of the impact that it would have.

The people running the music education program were under the misapprehension that the funding contract was to be renewed. But it turns out that, despite advice they received from artsACT, there was no intention of renewing this contract. To rub salt into the wound, just a week before Christmas last year the music engagement program was told that although they were successful they would no longer be funded: \$400,000 of funding withdrawn without any notice.

This is a government that says it cares. This is a government that says it is for the people. This is a government that says it is for social conscience. The act of defunding the music engagement program shows that this is an uncaring government; it is the act of a government incapable of looking at the benefits of the program and the broader social impacts of the program. It is a government that is totally unconscious of the impacts that decisions like this will have on the community. It is a government that cannot look into the future. It is a government that is ignorant of tried, tested, true and successful outcomes. And the government should be condemned for its failure in this regard.

No longer will our young students have access to a program that gives them skills in the arts as well as self-esteem, confidence and an eye for the future. No longer will people in the broader community, particularly our older people in aged care facilities, enjoy the musical innocence of primary school aged children. No longer will those residents be able to share their stories with these young people. No longer will music, the great leveller, bring these young and old communities together in such a safe, joyful, sharing and confidence-building environment. And this is because this government and this minister no longer care.

**MS BERRY** (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Women and Minister for Sport and Recreation) (4.52): I am speaking on this item as it relates to sport and recreation. The government has made an unprecedented commitment to the support and participation of women in sport as athletes, coaches, administrators and leaders. An array of initiatives supporting this commitment are either complete or already underway. This includes specific women's grants, our her Canberra active portal, improved gender equity on local sporting boards and a commitment to ensure female-friendly sporting environments.

The government's 2016 election commitments included \$400,000 over four years to support participation and leadership of women in sport, a \$500,000 commitment across four years to support female-friendly infrastructure, a women's active portal \$100,000 over four years, and improved support for our elite Canberra Capitals and Canberra United. The women's sport and recreation participation and leadership program, as part of the broader sport and recreation grants program, was implemented for 2018 providing \$49,000 to eight separate initiatives while also supporting the establishment of a multi-sport women in sport program, which will commence and

roll out this year. New agreements with the Capitals and United, \$250,000 and \$125,000 per annum respectively, were executed in December 2017, with the Capitals now playing matches on their new home court at the National Convention Centre.

Female-friendly infrastructure guidelines have been made available informing new facility design and progressive upgrades. Key works have been completed at Gowrie, Lyneham and Dickson, with the new Melrose football facility almost compliant. In partnership with her Canberra, which was formally launched on 10 October 2017, to April 2018 her Canberra active published 40 articles and received almost 99,000 total visits while also hosting an active directory.

Tri-annually funded sporting organisations continue to move towards greater gender equity on their boards, supported by the new diversity register, as at April 2018. And as at April 2018, 43 per cent of tri-annually funded sporting organisations are meeting the 40 per cent target, which is an increase from 28.5 per cent in 2017. A major women's sport symposium hosted on 9 August 2018 at the National Convention Centre focused on inspiring and informing continued progress and supporting more women and girls in sport.

The ACT government is partnering with the Canberra District Rugby League and the New South Wales government on the construction of a \$19 million rugby league centre of excellence and community hub to be built at Northbourne Oval in Braddon. The ACT government is providing \$5 million in funding over three years. The New South Wales government will provide \$4 million from its cross-border commissioner's infrastructure fund. The Canberra District Rugby League will contribute the remaining \$10 million. The facility will be used by the Canberra Raiders as a high-performance training venue, the calibre of which will greatly aid in the attraction and retention of elite players. Construction is anticipated to start in the coming months and to be completed in 2019.

The ACT government committed \$75,000 in the lead-up to the ACT election to undertake a scoping study for the future provision of an ice sports facility in the ACT. The scoping study is underway and is nearing completion. The study included consultation with key stakeholders including the ACT Ice Sports Federation, which represents the interests of local ice sports groups such as the CBR Brave, a comparative analysis of the existing ice sports facilities around the country including the O'Brien Group Arena in Melbourne and consideration of potential delivery and ownership models for any proposed facility.

We have also had consultation with the community around the ACT government's \$33 million commitment for a new pool at Stromlo Forest Park. Consultation was completed in January 2017, with over 700 submissions. The most popular additional facilities were a splash park, gym-health club and seating capacity of 500 to enable sport and recreation organisations to hold competitions. On 19 January 2018 the government agreed to provide an additional \$2.41 million in funding to the Stromlo leisure centre project, bringing the total of the project budget to \$36.6 million, to also deliver a gym-health club, leisure pool, inclusive of a toddlers pool, splash park and increased seating capacity.

The government is continuing to work with stakeholders to develop a new regulatory framework for combat sports. The controlled sports bill, expected to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly in October 2018, will address a range of high-risk activities including events with clear and identified risks to the community and sports that are yet to be invented in a rapidly involving combat sports base. Consultation on the bill will soon commence following any final amendments that will be introduced into the Assembly.

On Manuka pool, in 2018-19 \$1.848 million from the pools improvement program and aquatics repair and maintenance budgets will be invested in capital works at Manuka pool to upgrade the filtration plant as it does not meet modern health standards. Upgrades to the pool gutters and filtered water return lines are also required as they are too small and do not feed the water over quickly enough.

On the indoor sports study, in line with the parliamentary agreement, the ACT government committed \$160,000 in the 2017-18 budget to further investigate feasible options for providing indoor sporting facilities in Woden, Gungahlin and Belconnen. The subsequent future indoor sports facility provision feasibility study commenced in November and is focused on determining the preferred facility mix for further indoor sports provision in the ACT. Consultation has been undertaken with large-participation indoor sports including Basketball ACT, Capital Football Futsal and Gymnastics ACT as well as the Woden, Gungahlin and Belconnen community councils as part of the feasibility study.

While this will highlight projects for future consideration the government has continued work with the sector to improve available sporting assets and has included work over recent years to upgrade community netball facilities, work with Tennis ACT and Tennis Australia to redevelop the Canberra tennis centre, support Basketball ACT in the addition of a new outdoor three-on-three complex at Belconnen basketball stadium as well as improving disability access, supporting Capital Lakes Rowing Club in the development of the Grevillea Park rowing facility, supporting Volleyball ACT in the development of the Lyneham beach facility, upgrading the Burley Griffin Canoe Club at the Molonglo Reach, supporting the Capital Petanque Club to establish a new home at Weston Park and invest significantly in multiple community tennis clubs including Red Hill, Kippax, Kambah, Turner and Belconnen.

The ACT government committed \$200,000 towards improvements at Lake Tuggeranong's rowing club facility located at the Tuggeranong Library. It is intended that the funding will be utilised to improve the functionality of the facility, including the addition of toilets and showers for participants. Early planning work has commenced, with a development application expected to be submitted in the second half of this year.

On Boomanulla Oval, the government will restore and revitalise the main building, community area and garden of achievement to return it as a focal point for Indigenous culture, community and sporting activities. This initiative will also deliver a multipurpose function room and an open park along with repairs to the perimeter fencing, site cleaning and other restoration works. The elected body and a number of

community representatives have been closely consulted about the extent of the works to be undertaken as part of the interim restorative works. The local community and other key stakeholders are being kept informed about the site clean-up and restoration activities.

\$1.664 million has been contributed to the Nicholls district playing fields. This is a highly activated, joint-use sports and recreational facility for the Gold Creek Primary School and Holy Spirit Primary School as well as sport and recreation. The objective of this project is to replace the current aged synthetic grass with another synthetic grass cover utilising improved technology. The synthetic facility, which includes two soccer pitches, a six-lane 300-metre running track and lighting for night-time use, will be replaced with like-for-like sporting facilities.

Finally, in west Belconnen in the electorate of Ginninderra \$1.556 million, with \$600,000 provisioned in 2019-20, will be provided to restore the Higgins neighbourhood oval to make more sportsgrounds available for local sporting groups in west Belconnen. As west Belconnen grows, more sporting facilities will be needed in that area. The restoration will include new turf, a new irrigation system and a water meter pit, sportsground lights to accommodate after-hours training activities, two combination football fields and a synthetic cricket wicket. Capital funding as well to construct a pavilion and toilet block will be held in central provisions for 2019-20.

I am happy to talk about the ACT government's budget commitments in sport and recreation.

**MS STEPHEN-SMITH** (Kurrajong—Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations) (5.02): I rise today to talk about two very important initiatives in the 2018-19 budget which have been introduced to address issues faced by some of the territory's most vulnerable workers.

The first of these initiatives is the secure local jobs reform package. Prior to the 2016 election the Chief Minister outlined ACT Labor's commitment to deliver a secure local jobs package which would use the purchasing power of government to deliver better outcomes for Canberra workers. Fundamental to this initiative was a recognition that the government can and should play an important role in delivering better outcomes for workers by setting the highest standards for workplace safety, workers' rights and the delivery of quality goods and services.

To this end, the government will leverage its procurement processes to provide stronger protections for workers in organisations and businesses that perform work for the territory government than have been achieved in any other state or territory. To support the secure local jobs package, \$3.36 million has been allocated over four years. This will provide important resources to strengthen the government's procurement and contract management processes and ensure compliance with these new higher standards for territory-funded work.

The secure local jobs reform package will ensure that government contracts are awarded to businesses with exemplary ethical and labour standards; ensure that the creation of local jobs is a key consideration in procurement; introduce measures to promote job security and deliver ethical procurement outcomes; highlight the important role that unions play in ensuring that employees are well represented, paid fairly and get home safely; create an efficient, clear and transparent governance regime for the resolution of disputes related to government procurement, and continually monitor the performance of contracts; and simplify the procurement process and reduce duplication by establishing standard contract terms which include strong representative rights and protections for workers.

We make no apologies for standing up for workers and their families. We believe that these reforms will provide better lives for not only those employed to undertake territory-funded work but also those elsewhere in the ACT, as businesses spread these practices across their operations and other companies begin to strive to meet the high ethical and labour standards that we establish.

The second initiative is the creation of the young workers advice service. It is an unfortunate reality that young workers are often the most vulnerable to exploitation at work, as a consequence of not yet understanding their employment rights or being afraid to speak up. This was highlighted earlier this year when, prompted by complaints from young workers, the Fair Work Ombudsman reported the recovery of \$27,000 on behalf of 28 employees in the Canberra region, with breaches mostly related to underpayment of employees.

In August 2017 I requested the ACT Work Safety Council to establish a subcommittee to consider and provide advice to government on how best to ensure that apprentices, trainees and young workers are working in safe environments and are aware of their workplace safety rights and obligations. The subcommittee has identified that there is a lack of awareness of employment rights among apprentices, trainees and young workers in the ACT, and also raised concerns that the ACT does not currently have a single service which provides safety and industrial relations advice to young workers.

In order to empower apprentices, trainees and young workers with knowledge of their employment rights, the government has committed \$470,000 over four years for the establishment of a young workers advice service. This initiative is aimed at establishing a trusted source of information in the community and will provide a one-stop shop for all industrial relations and occupational health and safety inquiries. The services will be facilitated by an independent provider to encourage young and vulnerable workers to freely access information on rights and responsibilities in the workplace. The government will soon commence work on the procurement process to establish the young workers advice service.

Madam Deputy Speaker, both of these initiatives aim to address issues that have been identified to ensure that vulnerable workers have adequate protections regarding their workplace rights and obligations while creating secure local jobs for the people of the ACT. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

**MR BARR** (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Economic Development and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (5.07): I will speak in three parts to each of the streams within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

I will start with the Chief Minister's portfolio, which, of course, plays a leading role in ensuring that our jurisdiction is at the forefront of progressive policy, has agile responses to policy challenges in a changing world, and ensures that a diverse workforce of around 26,000 Canberrans is prepared for the future of service delivery to our broader community.

This year's budget continues to build on the capacity of the ACT government for innovation in public policy. We are investing more in the team that has a strong track record of delivery, from the implementation of ride-share regulation and smart city initiatives through to ensuring that our children are protected.

The ACT government believes in investing in better public policy through directly employed public servants whose only interest is the public good. Good public policy is the product of a variety of voices, and through the Chief Minister's portfolio the government will be investing to ensure no-one is excluded from a career in the ACT public service.

We will deliver additional whole-of-government inclusion employment programs over the coming years. This includes the disability carer and retention program for up to 40 employees with a disability; mentor training for up to 50 employees to develop individuals with or without disability to mentor and support staff with disabilities; membership and additional staff development training, support and awareness sessions with the Australian Network on Disability and other local providers; and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander career development and retention program for up to 40 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees.

The ACT PS Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander leadership program is a new program which will provide up to 20 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees at the senior officer and executive levels with the opportunity to develop in their current leadership roles and to assist these employees to reach their full potential in the ACT public service.

There will be mentor training with specific cultural focus to provide training for up to 50 employees to develop individuals, both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and non-identified, to mentor and support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees.

There will be additional membership and increased staff development training and support and awareness sessions with Pride in Diversity and other local organisations.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the community's preferences for how they engage with government are changing, and ways in which the community can engage with government are increasing exponentially. The ACT government is changing the way it communicates, through funding in this budget, to seek the views of more members

of our community, engaging in ways that are more meaningful and convenient, and improving coordination to reduce engagement fatigue.

The government will deliver a central strategic engagement team, establish and operate an online “insights community”, and deliver a customer relation management system to streamline engagements with the community.

Across government, a number of deliberative democracy processes have either been carried out or are about to be carried out. These include the carers strategy; compulsory third-party insurance; housing choices, which is currently underway; and better suburbs, which is coming up soon. We are learning how beneficial these processes are in giving a representative group of Canberrans the time and information to gain an understanding on complex policy issues and be able to make informed recommendations to government.

Using deliberative processes and approaches is just part of the broader program of strengthening the way we engage with the community. As well as ensuring that we are delivering good policy that is the product of quality engagement with the community, the government is ensuring that there is absolute trust and confidence in the process of government through the establishment of the integrity commission. All parties in this chamber are committed to establishing an integrity commission, and funding of \$8.4 million over four years is provided in this budget to establish the ACT integrity commission. This appropriation also provides funding for an inspector. The 2018-19 funding is being provided to the Office of the Legislative Assembly to allow the Speaker to access the funding and commence initial establishment arrangements, including the recruitment of the integrity commissioner.

To ensure that Canberra continues to be the most LGBTIQ-friendly city in the country, the Office for LGBTIQ Affairs will deliver a small grants program and support the engagement of an additional part-time staff member to work on trans and intersex issues.

The ACT government continues to invest in core support functions for higher quality public services. Increasingly, these support functions are digital. The government is expanding on the establishment of the Chief Digital Officer position with the new ACT centre of data excellence, to enable the government to make better decisions based on our rich data whilst protecting the privacy of citizens.

The budget includes funding to increase the rate of ACT public service transition to digital record keeping. Increased use of digital record keeping systems will deliver a range of benefits, including more efficient use of office space, allowing the ACT public service to take full advantage of the savings offered through activity-based working in its new office accommodation; increased ability to share reliable and authoritative records, information and data across government, supporting efficient customer service, informed decision-making and improved data analysis capabilities; and greater environmental sustainability through the reduced use of paper. This initiative will also help public servants transition to a “paper-lite” office environment by providing advice on approaches to managing existing paper documents.



Madam Deputy Speaker, the treasury portfolio is rarely at the top of the list when Canberrans are looking for exciting new budget initiatives. I will acknowledge that. Treasury's main role, of course, is in putting together the budget itself, working with other directorates to prepare and analyse proposals; developing forecasts and projections of underlying drivers like population and economic growth; and making all the numbers of spending and revenue add up in the back end. The government is very grateful to the team within treasury who do all of that work to ensure that we can actually deliver the budget each year.

I am pleased to say that the 2018-19 budget includes a number of important new initiatives within the treasury portfolio that will help tackle some of the big challenges that this city faces, like housing affordability and how we best protect Canberrans on our roads.

One of the signature initiatives in this year's budget is the abolition of stamp duty for eligible first homebuyers. We understand that buying a home is a huge challenge for many, particularly young people and those on low incomes. Stamp duty can put another hurdle in front of these Canberrans by adding tens of thousands of dollars to the price of a home. From 1 July 2019, first homebuyers with a household income below \$160,000 will pay no stamp duty, whether they are buying an established property or a newly built home.

At the same time, we will abolish the payment of first home owner grants. There are plenty of experts and analyses out there that have found that the grants have not been effective in helping first home buyers enter the housing market. In fact, they can actually make housing less affordable by inflating people's borrowing power and channelling too much demand into one small segment of the market. Together, these changes will help more Canberrans buy their first home, and help them buy it sooner. I have written to all of my state and territory counterparts to get their formal agreement to this policy switch, following discussions previously through the Board of Treasurers, and we will be bringing legislation forward shortly to implement this change.

Another important new initiative delivered through the budget in the treasury portfolio is the implementation of compulsory third-party insurance reform. CTP insurance matters to every Canberra driver because it protects us when we are on the road but under the current scheme a significant number of Canberra drivers are excluded from proper treatment and support simply because of the circumstances of their accident.

Canberra's first citizens jury examined the issues around CTP at considerable length and recommended a clear way forward to better protect all road users. We have commenced work on legislation that will give effect to the jury's recommendations, and plan to table an exposure draft of that bill with the Assembly in the September sitting period.

The development of a new scheme is also a good opportunity to update our systems and renew how the CTP regulator works to support the smooth operation of the scheme. The funding provided through this year's budget will support that work as part of delivering a reformed no-fault CTP scheme in the second half of 2019.

There are only a handful of new revenue measures in the 2018-19 budget because the government has worked hard to fit our new recurrent and infrastructure investments within the existing revenue envelope. We understand that some Canberra households are facing cost-of-living pressures, and we will not raise one dollar more in revenue than is necessary to deliver the high quality services and infrastructure that this community expects and deserves.

One revenue initiative worth highlighting is the introduction of a point of consumption gaming tax. At the moment, betting taxes are levied at the point of supply, such as where a betting operator is located, but shifts in technology and in consumer gambling tastes have led to growth in the market for online betting. Suppliers who offer online services to customers in other jurisdictions are not captured by traditional point of supply legislation. This means that online gambling suppliers can base themselves in a low or no tax jurisdiction, and so potentially avoid paying tax on a large number of betting transactions. Jurisdictions are then unable to use this tax revenue to support gambling harm reduction where it actually occurs and other community priorities.

In moving to implement a point of consumption tax, the ACT is acting in parallel with other Australian states and territories. From January 2019, all Australian jurisdictions except the Northern Territory and Tasmania will have implemented a point of consumption gambling tax, with states and territories agreeing to a harmonised base and collection framework. This is a very good reform and an important integrity measure to ensure that our tax regime keeps up as technology changes how products and services are delivered.

The treasury portfolio also has responsibility for administering two important areas of existing government policy: the concessions program and tax reform. In 2018-19 the government will deliver an estimated \$75.6 million in direct assistance for Canberrans, including concessions on rates for over 15,000 households, and will help with utilities bills for 32,200 households. We understand these concessions programs are crucial for ensuring that low-income and vulnerable Canberrans do not fall behind. We will continue to work to ensure that those who need it get the most support and the right support from government.

Of course, treasury will continue to deliver the government's tax reform agenda, which is making our revenue system simpler, fairer and more sustainable. We have cut stamp duty rates in every budget we have delivered since 2012 and we will continue to do so in every year across the forward estimates. By 2020-22 the buyer of a half-million-dollar home will be paying half the amount of stamp duty they would have been when we started this reform, a saving of \$10½ thousand.

We are also continuing to reform commercial conveyance duty. Since 1 July this year there is no conveyance duty payable for commercial properties worth under \$1.5 million. This means that around 70 per cent of commercial property purchases no longer involve stamp duty. This is, of course, at the small and medium size end of the commercial property market, but it is 70 per cent of the transactions. This is a significant boost for small businesses and for investment in the ACT.

These are just some of the priority initiatives detailed in the budget that will be delivered through the treasury portfolio in the year ahead. Each of these initiatives is another step in making our city fairer and providing more support for Canberrans in meaningful and practical ways.

Finally, in the economic development area of Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development, I am pleased to once again advise the Assembly that the ACT economy is growing the fastest among state and territory economies. We have one of the strongest economies in the country, and this is not happening by accident.

The government has made it a priority to invest in programs and initiatives in innovation, trade and investment to boost economic growth and to diversify our jobs space to benefit all Canberrans. In 2018-19 the budget has a series of initiatives to continue that important work.

We must continue to grow our economy by diversifying beyond the solid foundation that is the commonwealth: the commonwealth public service and commonwealth government procurement. This means building on the recent strong growth in education and in the research sector, as well as private sector growth that has created a range of new jobs and opportunities.

Our \$9.7 million priority investment program delivered through this budget will support this work by investing in collaborative sector-building projects in partnership with industry and our higher education and research institutions across key sectors. These priority sectors include plant and agricultural sciences, defence, health, sports and active living, cybersecurity, space industries and spatial information, education pathways, and new energy.

These are sectors with significant growth potential which can attract new investment and jobs to Canberra. The majority of the funding delivered through the priority investment program will be provided on a competitive basis to collaborative projects or initiatives that will drive investment opportunities and help attract more strategic and globally significant companies to Canberra.

Just as important as growing our research and innovation sectors is growing our cultural industries. That is why the 2018 budget delivers a \$5 million injection to establish the CBR screen fund to support the development of the ACT screen industry. This is the ACT government's largest single commitment to the film sector in a decade and builds on the work of its predecessor, the screen production fund, which was delivered by the ACT government in collaboration with Screen Canberra.

From that experience the ACT government has confidence in Screen Canberra's ability to manage this new fund, which will support local production and create more opportunities for our writers, directors, actors, musicians and film technicians to gain firsthand industry experience here in Canberra.

**Mr Hanson:** Any roles as an extra?

**MR BARR:** Unlikely. As members in this place would well know, tourism is a strong focus of the government's agenda to grow our economy and to create more good, secure, long-term jobs. According to the most recent state tourism satellite account data released by Tourism Research Australia in April this year, tourism contributes \$2.3 billion to the territory's gross state product and supports 16,800 jobs. This represents growth of 9.5 per cent from the previous year and is the second highest rate of growth of any state or territory across the nation—we were just beaten by Tasmania—and it is well ahead of the national average, which was 5.6 per cent.

The ACT government is committed to the ongoing development of the tourism industry in Canberra. We have focused our efforts on attracting more visitors to the city, both from within Australia and from overseas. I am delighted that we have reached all-time record highs for both domestic and international visitors. Over the next four years we will continue to boost international and domestic tourism, with \$47½ million earmarked for a suite of campaigns and programs that will grow our city's profile and provide even more compelling reasons for people to visit Canberra.

This includes continuing to work to attract new aviation services and expanding on existing routes. It also means having a bold and diverse major events calendar that encompasses artistic, cultural, sporting and community activities to attract a diverse range of visitors throughout the year.

The 2018-19 budget includes funding for the development of two new major events for Canberra. The first of these will be delivered in winter 2020 and will focus on promoting Canberra's strengths in innovation, design, gaming, culture and creativity. The festival will become a new anchor event on Canberra's annual calendar, alongside our popular spring event, Floriade, and our increasingly popular autumn event, Enlighten.

We will also deliver a new Canberra arts biennial. Building on the major contribution that Canberra's arts community made to the city's centenary celebrations, the biennial will showcase local artists and arts organisations, along with recognised national and international creators.

Our events calendar is more than just a tourist drawcard; it also creates opportunities for the Canberra community to come together and celebrate what we are proud of as a city. We marked our city's first Reconciliation Day public holiday on 28 May this year with a fantastic community event in Glebe Park celebrating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures. The budget includes funding to make this an annual event from now on.

We will also deliver a third edition of the popular Windows to the World event in 2019. This was first staged by the ACT government in 2013 as part of Canberra's centenary program. The event celebrates Canberra's multicultural diversity with open days and tours that showcase our city's embassies and high commissions. Windows to the World tells the story of international relations and the role that Canberra plays as Australia's internationally connected capital city.

Whether it is growing our local innovation and knowledge economy sectors, boosting our creative industries or strengthening Canberra's reputation as a must-visit destination for tourists seeking new food, cultural and natural experiences, our government is hard at work investing in this city's economic development. Through the 2018 budget we are backing local industries to create more good jobs, because we understand that a strong and inclusive economy is at the heart of a successful and thriving city.

I commend the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development appropriation to the Assembly.

Proposed expenditure agreed to.

Justice and Community Safety Directorate—Part 1.6

**MR HANSON** (Murrumbidgee) (5.30): I start by acknowledging some of the work in the budget that the opposition supports, for example, underway is a victims of crime charter of rights. I would like to recognise the achievements of the previous Victims of Crime Commissioner, John Hinchey, for the work he did progressing that. I am very glad that the government has taken that on. I know that that will be continued by the current commissioner, whom I have met with. There is also support for areas like Legal Aid and community legal groups. I would like to acknowledge as well the by and large cooperative relationship that has developed between my office and that of the Attorney-General and our staff, David Ferguson and Ian Hagan. Our principal staff are right into this, and I think that is good; I hope that continues. That does not mean we will not have the occasional dust-up, I am sure, Attorney-General.

**Mr Barr:** It wouldn't be you, Jeremy, if there were not.

**MR HANSON:** It would not. So, on cue, let me segue to the areas where the budget is unfortunately not fulfilling the promise it should. For example, that of a new magistrate who has been appointed. I certainly add my welcome to Ms Louise Taylor, the eighth permanent magistrate, to our Magistrates Court. I wish her well as she serves our community.

The appointment of an eighth magistrate has been described as not enough by the Chief Magistrate. As the *Canberra Times* reported, and I will quote:

The ACT's Chief Magistrate said on Tuesday that the addition of an eighth full time magistrate to the court will not be enough to improve timely access to justice.

Chief Magistrate Lorraine Walker said the modelling that had been done suggested the court needed more than eight and at least nine magistrates if it wanted a "slight increase" in efficiency.

So I make that point and I urge the government to address that issue.

Another area that I raise concern about is that of domestic violence. This area has enjoyed tripartisan support in this place, but on 22 June this year ABC news reported the following:

The ACT is still working on a key Domestic Violence policy a year after it was expected to be delivered.

A plan for regular reviews of family violence deaths remains outstanding. The Domestic Violence Prevention Council did a pilot death review in 2015, and its Chair Marcia Williams says it gave valuable information. The government says it will consult stakeholders this year and legislate sometime after that.

It begs the question as to why there has been such a delay in that important body of work, consulting the stakeholders; and what does “sometime after that” actually mean?

This area enjoys tripartisan support; in actual fact, it was the support by the government of an ACT opposition motion that led to a roundtable from which much of this work has stemmed. So it is really not good enough, and the government would enjoy our support in addressing this issue in a more timely fashion.

Another area that has again enjoyed tripartisan support but seems not to have progressed in the timely fashion one would expect is that of the drug and alcohol court. In the budget publication the government is committed to continuing design work on the establishment of a dedicated drug and alcohol court. The phrase “continuing design work on the establishment of a dedicated drug and alcohol court” is, frankly, weasel words of the worst sort. I reiterate: I am baffled. This area enjoys tripartisan support, so why is the government dragging its heels on this matter?

We have seen in other jurisdictions how effective these courts can be, particularly in redirecting offenders away from more serious engagement with the criminal justice system. Yet all we are hearing is “continued design work”. The budget papers show some support, but it is limited in the first year and apparently non-existent in the outyears. It really is not good enough; we really need to see outcomes and we need to see them sooner rather than later.

I turn then to the new court buildings, and we are aware of the significant delays in completion which seem to be dragging on. Again, this is an area that enjoyed tripartisan support, but the government has failed to deliver on time. I am disappointed in the response we have received from the government on this matter. When we asked when the new court would be finalised, we got the response, “In due course.” It is really not good enough. It reminds me a little of the frustration you may be feeling, Madam Deputy Speaker, with the upgrades to the women and children’s hospital where we are just not getting the answers that we deserve when there are delays. We have been reassured that any costs related to the delay will be the responsibility of the partner in this project, but we will be keeping a close eye on that to make sure that it is, indeed, the case.

I raise these issues where the government enjoys tripartisan support but unfortunately is still failing to deliver. It is disappointing and I urge the government to address these issues by the next time we are in this place debating the budget.

There is one area I want to address where it does not seem there is tripartisan support and which is a real issue of significance to this whole community: organised crime

and violence and threatened violence in our suburbs. That is, of course, the issue of bikie violence and the desperate need for anti-consorting laws. Budgets are where governments set priorities, and policy development in JACS is specifically listed in the budget papers and it has been discussed during estimates hearings.

The government talks about responding to violent criminal acts and acts of bikie violence, but, as we know, until we have laws that prevent and disrupt—and they are words from the Chief Police Officer—rather than just react and respond, we will continue to see violence play out in our suburbs.

For years we have warned of the real dangers of these gangs. We have warned about the risks of being an oasis when other jurisdictions have introduced laws specifically targeting bikie gangs. I go back in history but we will recall that Nathan Rees when he was the Premier of New South Wales said, “We will drive the bikies out of New South Wales,” and he did just that by introducing tough laws. What have we seen? In many cases those bikies and those bikie gangs have come here, just as was warned of by the opposition and others.

We warned of the dangers of increased violence. That, too, is what we are seeing in our suburbs now, with report after report of everything from mass brawls to street bashings, from fire bombings to drive-by shootings. We warned that sooner or later the failure of Labor and the Greens to prevent these activities by introducing anti-consorting laws would end in an innocent bystander being maimed or killed. That, thankfully, has not yet come to pass, but I put this government on notice now that if you do not act, it is only a matter of time.

As we have seen from the evidence over a decade, without anti-consorting laws more bikie gangs and more bikies will come to Canberra. That has happened. When more bikie gangs and more bikies come to Canberra, there will be more violence and there will be a bikie war. That has continued. Without anti-consorting laws, that bikie war will continue, and with the violence that we have seen with shootings, fire bombings and brawls in the street, it is only a matter of time before an innocent civilian in this case is killed or seriously injured. (*Second speaking period taken.*)

At that point the responsibility for that will lie directly with this government. As I have said before, it will be for the ministers opposite to look the families of victims in the eye and explain why their loved ones have been killed or seriously injured when that could have been prevented years ago.

Let me go to some of those reports: “Outlaw bikie gangs heading to Canberra because of the ACT’s soft laws on consorting” from the *Daily Telegraph* 2017; “Bikies drawn to Canberra due to lack of anti-gang laws” from the ABC in 2017; “Canberra becoming a Bikie Mecca”, *Daily Telegraph* 2017; and from the New South Wales Police themselves reported in the *Daily Telegraph* in 2017:

A lot of clubhouses have been closed down and bikies are no longer roaming in packs in NSW but it’s frustrating because they can still operate freely in Canberra.

When we first came up with these warnings, you will recall, Madam Deputy Speaker—I think at that stage you were the shadow attorney-general—we were warned that it was scaremongering. There would be no extra violence. This would not increase the number of gangs here in the ACT. But that has now happened. As the ABC reported on 29 June this year:

Innocent people have again been caught up in an ongoing bkie feud, with a bullet from an alleged targeted shooting coming within a metre of a sleeping neighbour in Canberra's south.

A metre to someone being killed or very seriously wounded.

Other reports show the same. From 19 June this year, “Home invasion-shots fired in Ngunnawal”—a home invaded, shots fired, the house set on fire. A bkie formerly lived at the address, but the people affected were totally unrelated to bkie gangs. Another report, “Man shot in Fisher”, from October 2017. Two cars on the property were torched and man was treated for gunshot wounds to his groin and shoulder.

The *Canberra Times* wrote in an editorial at the time:

As matters stand Canberra is now viewed by some as a safe haven for these gun-wielding thugs who have fled across our border to avoid being persecuted elsewhere. Pity the terrified residents of Canberra suburbs listening to assault rifles being fired meters from their homes ... That has to change and change now—these are not the signals we want to send to lawless individuals. This is not a problem the Barr government can leave in the “too hard” basket any longer.

The reality is irrefutable. There is evidence that has been provided by the Chief Police Officer and, indeed, by the police minister. There has been an influx of bikies into Canberra. The violence has increased. There is a greater number of bkie gangs that are engaged in a war, and it must be stopped. As members know, the Canberra Liberals tried to introduce laws to prevent and disrupt this very real and current danger to our citizens. As we know, those laws were not supported. We have seen a litany of false and frivolous objections to those laws.

I will talk about the laws as they stand. In New South Wales there are anti-consorting laws and there are criminal control orders. The government has said that they will not support anti-consorting laws because of the human rights compliance issues. We brought into this place criminal control orders, similar to those used in New South Wales. They are not used extensively in New South Wales because they have the anti-consorting laws. They do not need to use them.

In respect of those proposed laws, we worked with the Human Rights Commissioner. She said that they are better laws than those in other jurisdictions. She said herself that it is not a human right to belong to a criminal gang. Even though the proposed laws had that support, the government changed the goalposts and said, “They are not effective enough; they are not strong enough. We do not like them. They will not be effective enough in dealing with organised criminal gangs.”



It seems that when you put legislation forward, the government will then change the goalposts. We will hear from the government. It will say, “No single piece of legislation is going to fix this.” I do not believe it will. There is no silver bullet. But it is very much the case—it is also shown by the evidence—that without this legislation and because there is no consistency between us and New South Wales, we have created an oasis. The absence of this law is what has led to the massive increase in violence and bikie activity in the ACT.

As the Australian Federal Police Association said:

It is the last part of the suite of resources we need to battle outlaw motorcycle gangs.

I have been going on like a broken record. We are an island in New South Wales. We have become a safe place to operate. As the police association said:

For goodness sake, bring these laws in.

That is the police association pleading with the government. I say it again: we have become a safe place to operate. As the association says, “For goodness sake, bring these laws in.” That is a plea on behalf of the members of the Australian Federal Police Association—ACT Policing. Members opposite are ignoring the pleas of that member association.

It is disgraceful. There is a lot of hyperbole; there is a lot of rhetoric in this place. But let me be very clear. You have the Australian Federal Police Association, on behalf of its members, pleading. You have the Chief Police Officer herself saying this:

If there’s something that keeps me awake at night, it’s gangs in Canberra in the sense of their serious organised criminal activity and their violent activity they undertake here ... We’ve seen an incident where shots have been fired into a residence at Ngunnawal. That residence was the previous home of a Comanchero member, but it’s not anymore. It’s a family home for a completely innocent family ... Over recent weeks my concern has only grown because unfortunately we now have evidence to suggest that the Finks motorcycle gang is establishing itself here in Canberra which would increase our criminal gangs from three to four and would obviously increase the presence of gangs in the ACT ... I’ve said consistently and I’ll continue to say—

This is the Chief Police Officer—

that police need preventative powers to ensure that we can prevent the sort of crime I’ve just referred to, occurring—

What she means by that is the same sorts of laws that are in New South Wales: anti-consorting laws. We do need laws that are about prevention to keep our community safe. The Australian Federal Police Association is saying it and the Chief Police Officer is saying it. We will do what we can from this side to stop that from happening. You have not heard the last from us.

If you do not like criminal control order legislation, if it is not strong enough for you over on that side of the chamber, I will bring into this place anti-consorting laws, the same as those in New South Wales, and you can have a go at them. Then you can argue why you do not support those, because they are the laws that I have been calling for, that Mrs Dunne has been calling for, that the opposition has been calling for, that the Australian Federal Police have been calling for, that the Chief Police Officer has been calling for, that the association has been calling for for nearly a decade, and you refuse to bring them into this place.

We will be back with those laws. Then we will see you vote no. We will divide. Every one of you who votes no to those laws that we will bring forward can take the responsibility on your hands, as you have for the past decade, for the increase in violence in our community. This is happening through your negligence.

**MR RAMSAY** (Ginninderra—Attorney-General, Minister for Regulatory Services, Minister for the Arts and Community Events and Minister for Veterans and Seniors) (5.49): As Attorney-General I am pleased to speak in support of the appropriation bills for 2018-19 and particularly the measures that offer the provision of high quality access to justice for the vulnerable people in our society through strong and efficient justice institutions that operate as a coherent system, place people at the centre of the system and focus on harm reduction and restorative resolution of conflicts.

The 2018-19 budget provides additional funding of \$32.1 million over four years to keep the ACT safe by continued investment in efficient courts, effective prosecutions, and innovative justice initiatives that respond to community need.

As our city continues to grow it is essential that we have a responsive and flexible justice system, so \$5.4 million over four years has been provided to appoint a full-time eighth magistrate, including \$3.1 million for the ACT courts and tribunal to look after the additional magistrate and support staff, and \$2.3 million for Legal Aid and the Director of Public Prosecutions to respond to the increased workload. This additional magistrate will improve certainty, efficiency, availability and consistency in the Magistrates Court, and will facilitate faster access to justice. The Coroner's Court will receive \$1.9 million over four years to appoint a resident full-time forensic pathologist who will help to ease pressures on the coronial system.

The budget includes measures to improve the infrastructure of the courts and tribunal, namely \$1.1 million over four years to modernise the Supreme Court jury management system and \$70,000 in 2018-19 from the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal for a quantity surveyor to examine the ACAT's future accommodation needs.

The budget also supports the government's election commitment to deliver a dedicated ACT drug and alcohol court to reduce drug and alcohol dependency and related criminal activities. It will provide \$625,000 in 2018-19 for further preparatory work, building on the \$1.1 million provided in the 2017-18 second appropriation to develop procedures and a model of care and to finalise the new court's costs and design. The government is committed to ensuring that the model and the supporting services are appropriate for the ACT.

The budget responds to a growing city and more complex criminal trials by providing the DPP with \$7.3 million over four years for more staff and resources. The staffing increase will be incremental, with an additional six full-time equivalents in 2018-19, growing to a total of 12 additional FTE by 2021-22. This resourcing will enhance quality prosecution services for the Canberra community and will support a timely, transparent, and accessible justice system.

The DPP received \$970,000 over 18 months in the 2017-18 second appropriation to address organised crime, with additional prosecutors specialising in seizing criminal assets, depriving criminal organisations of the financial proceeds of their crime. The government recognises that it is essential that the DPP and ACT Policing have the necessary tools to effectively deal with serious organised crime. We will continue to provide effective ways to deal with this situation.

The budget includes one-off funding of \$6.1 million in 2018-19 for the retrial of Mr David Eastman for the alleged murder of Mr Colin Winchester. With the delay of the retrial to June 2018, most of this funding is rolled over from 2017-18. It includes \$2.1 million for judicial resources and database management costs, subsequent proceedings, jury costs and other related expenses in relation to the Eastman matter; \$2.2 million for the DPP; \$695,000 for ACT Policing; and \$1.025 million for ongoing Legal Aid representation for Mr Eastman in his retrial.

This budget also responds to significant issues in our community, including supporting victims of crime. Survivors of child sexual abuse will be supported with \$14.2 million over four years to implement the national redress scheme and to deliver redress payments, counselling and psychological care, and direct personal responses to survivors. The funding also includes extra resources to ensure that ACT government agencies fulfil all obligations under the scheme. The ACT government is working closely with the commonwealth and with other jurisdictions to implement a redress scheme that meets the needs of all survivors. This funding builds on the \$293,000 in the 2017-18 second appropriation for the implementation of the national redress scheme. The scheme commenced on 1 July this year. The 2017-18 second appropriation also includes \$547,000 over 18 months to implement criminal law reform recommendations arising from the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The government is committed to criminal justice system reform to support survivors of institutional child sexual abuse.

There will be \$187,000 made available in 2018-19 from the confiscated assets trust to develop Canberra as a restorative city. This initiative aims to develop awareness and the application of restorative approaches to social and community challenges across the ACT through events and workshops.

There will be \$1.7 million over four years to expand CBR NightCrew and allow it to continue to assist people affected by alcohol and/or drugs in the Civic nightlife precinct. This is partially offset by \$954,000 over four years jointly funded by JACS, Access Canberra, ACT Health, ACT Policing and the City Renewal Authority. Canberra NightCrew's successful trial and pilot has assisted over 9,000 people since commencing in December 2016. Over 1,900 of its cases involved higher levels of

support such as contacting family or friends, providing sober-up support, de-escalation of potential violent incidents, first aid, and minimising the risk of sexual assault. This funding includes two Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identified positions on each night that the program operates. This will better equip CBR NightCrew to engage with and to assist vulnerable Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are out in the city.

The budget also includes measures to assist vulnerable people in the community. One such measure is \$640,000 over four years to establish Legal Aid's seniors' rights service to provide targeted legal services to older Canberrans who are experiencing or are vulnerable to elder abuse. There is \$152,000 to establish the Warrumbul court in the Children's Court for a culturally appropriate sentencing process for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander youth in the justice system. This is part of the government's \$1 million investment to reduce reoffending by 25 per cent by 2025.

Finally, the 2017-18 second appropriation included \$2.6 million over five years to increase the capacity of the ACT Government Solicitor to support the implementation of the ACT digital strategy and provide legal advice to directorates on employment law and workplace rights.

I commend the budget to the Assembly.

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

## **Adjournment**

Motion (by **Mr Gentleman**) agreed to:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

**The Assembly adjourned at 5.58 pm until Tuesday, 21 August, at 10 am.**

## Answers to questions

### Planning—Yarralumla (Question No 1333)

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Urban Renewal*):

- (1) What is the status of consultations with affected Yarralumla residents in respect of the developer's application to vary the Heritage Council register to allow the approval of 15 additional large blocks on the area known as the quarry spur.
- (2) Why have neither the Minister, nor the Minister's office, responded to repeated requests by affected landholders for a meeting or other advice on intended action on this issue.
- (3) When will the matter be resolved and a final decision on the application made.
- (4) Who is charged with responsibility for the final decision in respect of this application to alter the Heritage Council register to give planning approval for the 15 additional blocks requested by the developer and when will that decision be made.
- (5) When will affected landholders be advised of the decision.
- (6) What appeal process is available to affected landholders if they disagree with the decision.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. Currently no applications for heritage or planning approvals have been made for the quarry spur. Any proposal to amend the ACT Heritage Register entry for the Yarralumla Brickworks, including the quarry spur, would be considered by the ACT Heritage Council on application.

Future redevelopment proposals for the heritage area would also be considered by the ACT Heritage Council under the Heritage Act 2004, in addition to approvals sought under the *Planning and Development Act 2007*.

2. I have now responded to correspondence received and my office has met with an affected home owner.
  3. Please refer to the response to question 1.
  4. Please refer to the response to question 1.
  5. Please refer to the response to question 1.
  6. Please refer to the response to question 1.
-

**Transport—electric cars**  
**(Question No 1361—revised answer)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) How many electric vehicles have registered or renewed registration in the ACT during 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many times has the 20 percent discount on electric vehicles registration been applied each financial year since the commencement of the discount to date.
- (3) What is the total value of the discounts applied to electric vehicle registrations as part of the 20 percent discount program during 2017-18 financial year to date.
- (4) What is the total projected value of discounts that will be applied to electric vehicle registrations as part of the 20 percent discount program in the (a) 2018-19, (b) 2019-20 and (c) 2020-21 financial years.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As at 16 May 2018, there are 292 electric vehicles registered in the ACT.
- (2) The figures below are the number of individual vehicles that obtained a 20% registration discount during the financial year. If the vehicle has been registered more than once during the year (ie 3 month renewal periods) it was only counted once.
  - 2006/7 – 48
  - 2007/8 – 50
  - 2008/9 – 57
  - 2009/10 – 55
  - 2010/11 – 68
  - 2011/12 – 79
  - 2012/13 – 90
  - 2013/14 – 134
  - 2014/15 – 178
  - 2015/16 – 224
  - 2016/17 – 260
  - 2017/18 – 287 (as at 16 May 2018)

Only one concession can be applied per vehicle registration, so the 20% electric vehicle concession may not be applied if another concession of a higher rate also applies.

- (3) \$24,203.56 (as at 16 May 2018).
- (4) The value of discounts applied to electric vehicles is relatively low and does not materially impact on forward estimates. Therefore they are not separately forecast. Motor vehicle registration fees are forecast in aggregate – taking into account fee indexation and estimated growth in registrations annually.

**Government—vehicle fleet  
(Question No 1380—revised answer)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of vehicles registered in the ACT by vehicle type during (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09, (c) 2009-10, (d) 2010-11, (e) 2011-12, (f) 2012-13, (g) 2013-14, (h) 2014-15, (i) 2015-16, (j) 2016-17 and (k) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) Can the Minister provide the total number of electric vehicles registered in the ACT in the financial years (a) 2007-08, (b) 2008-09, (c) 2009-10, (d) 2010-11, (e) 2011-12, (f) 2012-13, (g) 2013-14, (h) 2014-15, (i) 2015-16, (j) 2016-17 and (k) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1)
  - (a) – (k) Please refer to the attached spreadsheet for number of vehicles registered as at 30 June each year by vehicle type.
- (2)
  - (a) 57
  - (b) 61
  - (c) 59
  - (d) 72
  - (e) 83
  - (f) 97
  - (g) 147
  - (h) 191
  - (i) 241
  - (j) 278
  - (k) 313 (as at 16 May 2018)

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

**Roads—Tillyard and Ginninderra drives  
(Question No 1454)**

**Mrs Kikkert** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) Was the feasibility study for the Tillyard and Ginninderra Drives intersection submitted to the ACT Government on 14 February 2018; if so, was this study submitted on time for the 2018-19 budget considerations.
- (2) What was the cut-off date for submissions of such studies/reports to the ACT Government for budget considerations.
- (3) Have there been any instances of submissions made past the cut-off date, but accepted for budget considerations; if so, what were the submissions and how long past the cut-off date were they submitted.

- (4) What is the criteria for a successful budget consideration for (a) smaller traffic project proposals ie speed bumps, signage, road islands and (b) larger traffic proposals such as the Tillyard and Ginninderra Drives intersection recommendations.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Budget proposals are subject to deadlines set by Cabinet. Each Minister must comply with these deadlines but may seek my approval to bring forward proposals after those deadlines have passed. As the 2018-19 Budget has not yet been presented to the Legislative Assembly, it would be premature for me to release any details relating to a particular submission. Each budget proposal is considered on its merits and effectively competes with proposals from all agencies.

### **Roads—safety (Question No 1457)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) For road traffic incidents that resulted in a fatality in (a) 2014, (b) 2015, (c) 2016, (d) 2017 and (e) 2018 to date, that involved drivers aged 16-24, how many obtained their licence via the (i) one-off Government test or (ii) competency-based logbook system.
- (2) How many lessons were completed in logbooks, for the drivers identified in part 1(ii).

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1.

(a) 2014	(b) 2015	(c) 2016	(d) 2017	(e) 2018
(i) 0	(i) 0	(i) 0	(i) 1	(i) 1
(ii) 1	(ii) 2	(ii) 2	(ii) 2	(ii) 0

2. This information is not recorded by the government.

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1459)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each



directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Corruption:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	2
Investigations Commenced	0	2
Investigations Completed	0	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	1
Adverse Findings	0	1

## (4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	1
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	0	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	1

## (5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	1
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	1*	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	1*	1

\* Investigation commenced in FY 2015-16.

(6) Cost to Territory of fraud related matters: Nil

(7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related): Nil

(8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets: undetermined

(9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets): Nil

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1460)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Urban Renewal, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1473 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1461)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Economic Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.

- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1462)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Speaker, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms J Burch:** The answers to the member's questions are as follows:

- (1)-(5) I am advised that during 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 there was one investigation into five allegations that potentially fall within the general scope of questions (1), (3), (4), and (5).

There were no adverse findings in relation to the investigation.

- (6)-(9) Questions 6-9 are predicated on the Territory having suffered a loss arising from different 'incidents'. The investigation did not find that a loss to the Territory occurred.

The ACT Electoral Commission did not receive any (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to:

1. Corruption; or
2. Bribery; or
3. Unauthorised disclosures; or
4. Fraud; or
5. Misuse of timesheets

during the 2016-17 financial or to date in 2017-2018 financial year.

- (1) In the ACT Audit Office there has been the following number of allegations, investigations and adverse findings related to corruption for the following financial years:

(a) Allegations:

- (i) 2016-17: nil; and
- (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

(b) Investigations:

- (i) 2016-17: nil; and
- (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

(c) Adverse findings:

- (i) 2016-17: nil; and
- (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

- (2) In the ACT Audit Office there has been the following number of allegations, investigations and adverse findings related to bribery for the following financial years:

(a) Allegations:

- (i) 2016-17: nil; and
- (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

(b) Investigations:

- (i) 2016-17: nil; and
- (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

(c) Adverse findings:

- (i) 2016-17: nil; and
- (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

- (3) In the ACT Audit Office there has been the following number of allegations, investigations and adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information for the following financial years:
- (a) Allegations:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.
  - (a) Investigations:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.
  - (b) Adverse findings:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

The ACT Audit Office would like to advise that in August 2017 an email including an attachment was incorrectly sent to an unintended recipient. This occurred as a result of a typographical error in the email address. Actions were taken by the Audit Office in response to this including requesting the recipient to destroy the email and its attachment and notifying the affected individual and apologising for the error. This was reported to the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner who advised that it 'does not intend to take any action in response to your data breach notification at this time'.

- (4) In the ACT Audit Office there has been the following number of allegations, investigations and adverse findings related to fraud for the following financial years:
- (a) Allegations:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.
  - (b) Investigations:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date.
  - (c) Adverse findings
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.
- (5) In the ACT Audit Office there has been the following number of allegations, investigations and adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets for the following financial years:
- (a) Allegations:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.
  - (b) Investigations:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.

- (c) Adverse findings:
    - (i) 2016-17: nil; and
    - (ii) 2017-18 to date: nil.
  - (6) For incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents. **N/A**
  - (7) For incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory. **N/A**
  - (8) For incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents. **N/A**
  - (9) For incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory. **N/A**
- 

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1463)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.

- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1464)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.



**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1465)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Corruption:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

## (2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

## (3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	2	3
Investigations Commenced	0	2*
Investigations Completed	3**	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	1**	0

*\*No formal investigations were undertaken, each case was managed via an internal review.*

*\*\*Investigation commenced in FY 2015-16.*

## (4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	3	2*
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	2	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	1
Adverse Findings	0	0

*\* Multiple allegations are contained within the same investigation.*

## (5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	2*
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	0	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	1

*\*Multiple allegations are contained within the same investigation.*

(6) Cost to Territory of fraud related matters: Matter still under investigation so amount not proven, alleged amount is \$470.

(7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related): Nil at this stage

(8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets: Nil

(9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets): Nil

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1466)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1465 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

I considered ACT Policing fell outside the scope of this question as, under the *Australian Federal Police Act 1979 (Cth)* (the AFP Act), members remain officers of the Commonwealth and the AFP Commissioner retains responsibility for the general administration, and control of the operations, of the AFP.

In addition, ACT Policing has robust internal and external integrity mechanisms, including the AFP's Professional Standards Framework, independent oversight from the Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity and the Commonwealth Ombudsman, enshrined in Commonwealth legislation (the AFP Act and the Law Enforcement Integrity Commissioner Act 2006). ACT Policing has extensive reporting obligations to the ACT Government under Section 16 of the 2017-2021 Purchase Agreement for the provision of policing services to the Australian Capital Territory which requires the Chief Police Office to provide six monthly reports to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services on complaints management issues, and the public release of a Professional Standards report on conduct breaches and outcomes through its annual report.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1467)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1468)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1469)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1487 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate.

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1470)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1471)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1473 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1472)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.



- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1473 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1473)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate is as follows:

(1) Corruption:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

(2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

(3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

## (4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	4*	0
Investigations Commenced	2	0
Investigations Completed	2	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	2	0

\* The four allegations resulted in two investigations.

## (5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

(6) Cost to Territory of fraud related matters: \$6,842.

(7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related): \$5,600.

(8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets: Nil

(9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets): Nil

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1474)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1465 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1475)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1476)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.

- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1477)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for the Arts and Community Events, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1478)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Veterans and Seniors, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1479)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1473 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1480)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:



- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1465 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1481)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1465 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

---

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1482)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.

- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1486 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for ACT Health.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1483)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.

- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Corruption:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	4
Investigations Commenced	0	4
Investigations Completed	1*	3
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	1
Adverse Findings – Delegate	1*	1

\* Investigation commenced in 2015-16.

- (4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	4
Investigations Commenced	0	4
Investigations Completed	1*	4
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings – Delegate	2**	2

\* Investigation commenced in 2015-16 staff member resigned before sanction imposed.

\*\* Investigations completed in 2015-16, Adverse Findings were finalised in 2016-17.

(5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

(6) Cost to Territory of fraud related matters is approximately: \$9,300.

*Note – Costs to the Territory are the actual amounts defrauded by staff members and do not include investigation and legal expenses incurred.*

(7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related): The Community Services has commenced recovery action for \$4,300 and is working on a resolution for the remaining \$5,000.

(8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets: Nil

(9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets): Nil

---

### **Government—directorate integrity (Question No 1484)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.

- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1483 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Community Services Directorate.

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1485)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.

- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Corruption:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	1	4
Investigations Commenced	1	4
Investigations Completed	0	3
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	1
Adverse Findings	0	2

- (2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	1	0
Investigations Completed	0	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	1	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

- (6) Cost to Territory of fraud related matters: Nil

(7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related): Nil

(8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets: Nil

(9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets): Nil

---

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1486)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please Note: The data provided is for the total of the Health Directorate and is not able to be broken down into specific areas within the Health Directorate.

- (1) Corruption:



	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

## (2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	0
Investigations Commenced	0	0
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	0

## (3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	2	1
Investigations Commenced	1	0
Investigations Completed	1	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	1	0

## (4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	4*
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	0	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	1
Adverse Findings	0	0

\* Two allegations relate to one investigation.

## (5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	5*	3*
Investigations Commenced	3	2
Investigations Completed	3	0
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	2
Adverse Findings	2	0

\* Multiple allegations may be contained within one investigation.

## (6) Cost to Territory of fraud related matters:

Nil, investigations are pending and no allegations have been substantiated.

## (7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related):

Nil, investigations are pending and no allegations have been substantiated.

- (8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets:  
Nil cost associated with the completed investigation.
- (9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets):  
Nil, investigations are pending and no allegations have been substantiated.

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1487)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Corruption:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	5 Nb. 3 allegations did not result in an investigation.	8 Nb. 2 allegations did not result in an investigation.

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Investigations Commenced	2	6
Investigations Completed	2	6
Investigations Pending (year-end)	2	0
Adverse Findings	1	6

*Multiple allegations contained in investigations, above count is by employee not the number of allegations per employee.*

(2) Bribery:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	1
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	0	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	1

*Note: Data above for corruption and bribery refer to the same investigative matter.*

(3) Unauthorised disclosures of confidential information:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	1
Investigations Commenced	0	1
Investigations Completed	0	1
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	0	1

(4) Fraud:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	5 Nb. 3 allegations did not result in an investigation.	Nb. 2 allegations did not result in an investigation.
Investigations Commenced	2	6
Investigations Completed	2	6**
Investigations Pending (year-end)	2	0
Adverse Findings	1	6**

*Multiple allegations contained in investigations, above count is by employee not the number of allegations per employee.*

*\*\* One investigation opened in previous financial year.*

(5) Misuse of timesheets:

	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
Allegations Received	0	2
Investigations Commenced	0	2
Investigations Completed	1	2
Investigations Pending (year-end)	0	0
Adverse Findings	1	1

*\* Investigation commenced in FY 2015-16.*

- (6) Total cost to Territory of fraud related matters: \$9,938.
  - (7) Costs recovered by Territory (fraud related): \$90.
  - (8) Cost to Territory from misuse of timesheets: \$9,847.
  - (9) Costs recovered by Territory (misuse to timesheets): nil recovered.
- 

**Government—directorate integrity  
(Question No 1488)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to corruption have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to bribery have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to unauthorised disclosures of confidential information have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to fraud have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) How many (a) allegations, (b) investigations and (c) adverse findings related to misuse of timesheets have there been for each directorate and agency for which you are responsible, for the financial years (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) For the incidents described in part (4), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (7) For the incidents described in part (6), how much of those costs have been recovered by the Territory.
- (8) For the incidents described in part (5), what was the total cost to the Territory of those incidents.
- (9) For the incidents described in part (8), how much of those costs has been recovered by the Territory.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please refer to the response to Question on Notice 1459 for the requested information concerning allegations, investigations and adverse findings for the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

---

**Municipal services—shopping trolleys  
(Question No 1490)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018:

- (1) Has a review been undertaken to review abandoned shopping trolleys in the ACT.
- (2) How many trolleys were impounded by the ACT Government during the “two-week blitz” on shopping centre trolleys in February 2017.
- (3) How many trolleys were impounded (a) in the 12 months after the blitz and (b) for each 12 month period for the 10 years prior to the blitz.
- (4) How does the ACT Government’s decision to encourage supermarkets to have coin-lock trolley control issue comply with the Government’s priority to reduce regulatory burden.
- (5) Have city rangers received any instructions of KPI’s in regards to abandoned shopping trolleys.
- (6) How many fines were issued and how much money was received from these fines in the 12 months (a) after and (b) prior to the blitz.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) No.
- (2) One.
- (3) (a) From February 2017 until January 2018 four shopping trolleys were impounded.  
(b) Between February 2016 and January 2017 fourteen shopping trolleys were impounded.

The number of shopping trolleys impounded by financial year is as follows:

• 2017-2018	0
• 2016-2017	17
• 2015-2016	177
• 2014-2015	326
• 2013-2014	315
• 2012-2013	288
• 2011-2012	25
• 2010-2011	0

Legislation regulating shopping trolleys commenced in 2011 and there is no impoundment data prior to this time.

- (4) The Litter Act requires retailers to operate and maintain a trolley containment system at their retail premises to discourage abandonment of trolleys outside shopping precincts. The implementation of a coin-lock system by major retailers in the ACT is one containment option. Other options available include electronic wheel locking

mechanisms and perimeter surveillance by staff or security. The ACT Government does not mandate which option retailers should use for trolley containment. This is a commercial decision made by each of the retailers.

- (5) City rangers use publicly available apps to report abandoned trolleys to the relevant retailer.
- (6) (a) 0 fines issued. (b) 0 fines issued, however where trolleys were seized and impounded in the past, retailers were required to pay an impoundment fee before the trolley was released.

---

### **Municipal services—street lights (Question No 1491)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) In relation to the street light contract with Electrix, what performance indicators have been included in the seven year contract with Electrix.
- (2) How often will (a) these performance indicators be reviewed and (b) the contract be reviewed.
- (3) How many street lights are there in the ACT.
- (4) How many street lights were reported broken or not working as of 1 May 2018.
- (5) Has this backlog of broken or not working street lights been fixed.
- (6) How long has Electrix been given to clear the backlog.
- (7) How will new requests to fix lights coming in be prioritised over existing or backlog jobs.
- (8) What is the estimated date for the backlog of requests to be completed.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Performance indicators are provided in the General Conditions of Deed – Energy Performance Contract for Territory Streetlight Assets (EPC) and found in Schedule 17 and 20.
- (2) The EPC abatement regime is outlined in Schedule 17 and 20, and is assessed on a monthly basis.
- (3) Approximately 80,000.
- (4) 2,130 lights were registered as requiring maintenance.
- (5) No. Roads ACT has separately engaged Electrix to repair pre-existing defects as at the commencement of the current contract.

- (6) Until the end of August 2018.
  - (7) New requests will be serviced according to the requirements of the new contract.  
Abatement could be applied from 1 August 2018 if performance is not satisfactory.
  - (8) Early August 2018.
- 

**Transport Canberra and City Services—staffing  
(Question No 1492)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 11 May 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) What is the staff configuration engaged in the Licensing and Compliance Branch (branch or equivalent) of Transport Canberra and City Services including the Domestic Animal Services (DAS), City Ranger and Licensing Sections (section or equivalent) in each of the past three financial years to 30 June 2017 broken down by (a) staff levels in each section, (b) the classification levels of these positions in each section and (c) the status of these positions including permanently occupied or occupied by short term or contract person in each section.
- (2) What is the staff configuration engaged in the Licensing and Compliance Branch (branch or equivalent) of Transport Canberra and City Services including the DAS, City Ranger and Licensing Sections (section or equivalent) in the period 1 July 2017 to 31 April 2018 broken down by (a) staff levels in each section, (b) the classification levels of these positions in each section and (c) the status of these positions including permanently occupied or occupied by short term or contract person in each section.
- (3) What is the staff configuration engaged in the Licensing and Compliance Branch (branch or equivalent) of Transport Canberra and City Services including the Domestic Animal Services, City Ranger and Licensing Sections (section or equivalent) in the process of currently being engaged in the period 1 May to 30 June 2018 broken down by (a) staff levels in each section, (b) the classification levels of these positions in each section and (c) the status of these positions including permanently occupied or occupied by short term or contract person in each section.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The staff configuration for the past three years cannot be accurately determined due to staffing changes and turnover. However the configuration has been similar to the October 2017 configuration shown below.
- (2) and (3) The staff configuration prior to the addition of eight new positions (as of October 2017) is shown below. The staffing configuration including the eight new positions (in bold) is also shown as a direct comparison (as of June 2018). All positions noted in the table below are permanent positions.

**Licensing & Compliance Organisational  
Structure as of October 2017**

**Licensing & Compliance Organisational  
Structure as of June 2018**

<b>Licensing &amp; Compliance Executive</b>		<b>Licensing &amp; Compliance Executive</b>	
<b>Title</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Classification</b>
Senior Manager	SOGA	Senior Manager	SOGA
Finance/HR & System Support	AS04	Finance/HR & System Support	AS04
<b>Animal Welfare</b>		<b>Animal Welfare</b>	
Animal Welfare Officer	AS06	Animal Welfare Officer	AS06
<b>Managers</b>		<b>Managers</b>	
Manager Administration Services	SOGC	Manager Administration Services	SOGC
Manager Compliance	SOGC	Manager Compliance	SOGC
Manager Licensing	SOGC	Manager Licensing	SOGC
<b>City Ranger Services</b>		<b>City Ranger Services</b>	
Ranger in Charge	AS06	Ranger in Charge	AS06
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
City Ranger	AS04	City Ranger	AS04
<b>Domestic Animal Services</b>		<b>Domestic Animal Services</b>	
Ranger in Charge	AS06	Ranger in Charge	AS06
Senior Ranger	AS05	Senior Ranger	AS05
Senior Ranger	AS05	Senior Ranger	AS05
		<b>Senior Ranger Education and Victim Support</b>	<b>AS05</b>
DAS Ranger	AS03	DAS Ranger	AS04
DAS Ranger	AS03	DAS Ranger	AS04
DAS Ranger	AS03	DAS Ranger	AS04
DAS Ranger	AS03	DAS Ranger	AS04
DAS Ranger	AS03	DAS Ranger	AS04
		<b>DAS Ranger</b>	<b>AS04</b>
		<b>DAS Ranger</b>	<b>AS04</b>
		<b>DAS Ranger</b>	<b>AS04</b>
Ranger - Animal Behaviour	AS03	Ranger - Animal Behaviour	AS03
Kennel Master	AS03	Kennel Master	AS03
		<b>Ranger Ops Support</b>	<b>AS03</b>
		<b>Ranger Ops Support</b>	<b>AS03</b>
<b>Land Use Unit</b>		<b>Land Use Unit</b>	
Public Use Coordinator	AS06	Public Use Coordinator	AS06
Park Booking Officer	AS05	Park Booking Officer	AS05
Public Use Booking Officer	AS04	Public Use Booking Officer	AS04
<b>Investigations Unit</b>		<b>Investigations Unit</b>	
Ranger in Charge	AS06	Ranger in Charge	AS06
Senior Ranger Investigations	AS05	Senior Ranger Investigations	AS05



Investigations Unit		Investigations Unit	
		Senior Ranger Investigations	AS05
		Senior Ranger Investigations	AS05

### **ACT Health—cystic fibrosis treatment services (Question No 1493)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing*):

- (1) In relation to the Minister's answer to question on notice No 606 (19 October 2017), has ACT Health publicly released the report and recommendations of Cystic Fibrosis Australia's peer review group report on ACT Health's cystic fibrosis treatment services; if not, why not.
- (2) What is the target date for public release of the report.
- (3) Has ACT Health publicly released the Government's response to the report; if not, why not.
- (4) What is the target date for public release of the Government's response to the report.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No. The report was originally intended as an in-house report to inform service and workforce planning. It was not prepared with a view to public release.
- (2) A decision about whether to release the report, and if so when, will be made after feedback from the local Cystic Fibrosis Association has been received and considered by ACT Health.
- (3) There is no Government Response to this report, because one is not required, as the report was originally intended as an in-house report to inform planning.
- (4) Not applicable.

### **Arts—venues (Question No 1494)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for the Arts and Community Events, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) In relation to the Register of Notifiable Invoices for March 2018, why were air conditioning upgrade works required at Albert Hall when a new system was installed in recent years.
- (2) Who assessed the need for the upgrade works.

(3) What works were undertaken.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The air conditioning upgrade works were required to provide heating and cooling services to the main hall and stage. Air conditioning installed in 2010 services the balcony, foyer, kitchen, office and toilets.

Upgrades to the 2010 HVAC system were identified out of hirer feedback and through consultation with the Albert Hall Management Reference Group.

The upgrade to the HVAC system in 2010 did not include air conditioning to the main hall. This upgrade will provide air conditioning to the main hall, ensuring climate control for hirers.

- (2) ACT Property Group assessed the need for upgrade works taking in to account the regular feedback from hirers. Hirers have expressed concern that the temperature of the main hall and stage is cold in winter and too hot in summer. To increase the use and repeat business of the Albert Hall, it needs to have a reputation of being comfortable and functional throughout the year making it a viable venue for hire.

These upgrade works are an integral element of the works required to protect the heritage fabric of this iconic building and prolong its life.

The need for the upgrade works has been flagged in the Albert Hall Conservation Management Plan, the Place Management Plan (Planning Legislation) and supported by the 'Friend's of the Albert Hall'.

- (3) Works currently underway will provide climate control in the main hall and stages areas with completion expected in the second half of 2018.

### **ACT Health—proposed organisational changes (Question No 1495)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) In relation to the lead-up to the Chief Minister's formal agreement, on 15 March 2018, to the proposed restructure of the Health Directorate, was the Chief Minister, at any time before 15 March 2018, involved in any discussions about the proposal to restructure the Health Directorate; if so, (a) on what dates were those discussions, (b) with whom were those discussions held, (c) what evidence was provided to the Chief Minister in support of the proposal, (d) did the Chief Minister undertake his own analysis of that evidence, (e) what conclusions did the Chief Minister draw, (f) to whom did the Chief Minister convey those conclusions and (g) on what dates did the Chief Minister convey those conclusions.
- (2) At any time before 15 March 2018, was the Chief Minister given any formal briefing minutes or other documents about the proposed restructure of the Health Directorate; if so, (a) what briefing minutes or other documents were given to the Chief Minister, (b) on what dates did the Chief Minister receive those minutes or other documents, (c) what was the Chief Minister's response to those minutes or other documents and (d) on what dates did the Chief Minister communicate that response to the relevant persons.

- (3) Did the Chief Minister refer the matter to Cabinet before agreeing to the proposed restructure on 15 March 2018; if so, on what date did (a) the Chief Minister refer the matter to Cabinet and (b) Cabinet consider the matter; if not, why not.
- (4) If Cabinet did not consider the proposed restructure before the Chief Minister agreed to it on 15 March 2018, did the Chief Minister refer the matter to Cabinet after he had agreed to it; if so, on what date did (a) he refer the matter to Cabinet and (b) Cabinet consider the matter; if not, why not.
- (5) On what date did the Chief Minister first become aware that the former Director-General of the Health Directorate would be seeking other opportunities,
- (6) Was the Chief Minister, at any time, involved in any discussions about the former Director-General's attitude towards the restructure of the directorate and her future with the directorate; if so, (a) on what dates were those discussions held, (b) with whom were those discussion held, (c) what did the Chief Minister discern was the former Director-General's attitude, (d) what scenarios were considered and (e) what conclusions were reached.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1) Yes

- a. The proposal was discussed at several points over some months prior to the decision.
- b. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Minister for Mental Health, and the Head of Service.
- c. The brief from the Head of Service dated 15 March 2018 provided the rationale and the recommendation for the new governance arrangements. It provided a substantive analysis of the appropriateness of the structure of the ACT Health Directorate and drew on the report by PriceWaterhouseCoopers that considered the governance structures in place across all jurisdictions. The brief drew on the key finding in the PwC report that all jurisdictions other than the ACT have structurally separated their public hospital and health service delivery from the health system stewardship functions of their respective departments of health. I gave full consideration to the brief and my Ministerial colleagues' views, and determined that I agreed with the brief's recommendation to move forward with a proposed new governance structure for the ACT Health Directorate.
- d. See response to question 1c.
- e. See response to question 1c.
- f. The signed brief was returned to the Head of Service for action.
- g. 15 March 2018

- (2) The brief of 15 March 2018 was the formal briefing. See the response to question 1c.
- a. Not applicable.
  - b. Not applicable.
  - c. Not applicable.
  - d. Not applicable.

- (3) The proposed separation of the ACT Health Directorate was not referred to Cabinet for decision. The Chief Minister determines the Administrative Arrangements and has sole discretion over their provisions. Changes to the Administrative Arrangements are not required to be provided, and have not previously been provided, to Cabinet for endorsement.
- a. Not applicable.
  - b. Not applicable.
- (4) See the response to question 3.
- (5) 19 March 2018
- (6) No
- 

### **ACT Health—proposed organisational changes (Question No 1496)**

**Mrs Dunne:** To ask the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing*):

- (1) On what date did the Minister become aware that the Chief Minister had agreed formally, on 15 March 2018, to a proposed restructure of the Health Directorate.
- (2) Was the Minister at any time before 15 March 2018, involved in any discussions about the proposal to restructure the Health Directorate; if so, (a) on what dates were those discussions, (b) with whom were those discussions held, (c) what evidence was provided to the Minister in support of the proposal, (d) did the Minister undertake her own analysis of that evidence, (e) what conclusions did the Minister draw, (f) to whom did the Minister convey those conclusions and (g) on what dates did the Minister convey those conclusions.
- (3) At any time before 15 March 2018 was the Minister given any formal briefing minutes or other documents about the proposed restructure of the Health Directorate; if so, (a) what briefing minutes or other documents were given to the Minister, (b) on what dates did the Minister receive those minutes or other documents, (c) what was the Minister's response to those minutes or other documents and (d) on what dates did the Minister communicate that response to the relevant persons.
- (4) On what date did the Minister first become aware that the former Director-General of the Health Directorate would be seeking other opportunities.
- (5) Was the Minister, at any time, involved in any discussions about the former Director-General's attitude towards the restructure of the directorate and her future with the directorate; if so, (a) on what dates were those discussions held, (b) with whom were those discussion held, (c) what did the Minister discern was the former Director-General's attitude, (d) what scenarios were considered and (e) what conclusions were reached.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Minister for Health and Wellbeing became aware on 15 March 2018.

- (2) (a) Yes, on several occasions. As many of the discussions were informal in nature it is not possible to provide a list of dates.
- (b) With the Director-General of ACT Health, the Minister for Mental Health, the Chief Minister and the Head of Service.
- (c) The PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) report titled '*Australian Health Departments and Directorates – Governance Scan*' was provided to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.
- (d) Yes.
- (e) The Minister for Health and Wellbeing concluded the restructure was the appropriate course of action.
- (f) The Minister discussed this matter with the Minister for Mental Health, the Chief Minister and the Head of Service.
- (g) Discussions between ministers and the Head of Service were held on several occasions.
- (3) There were no formal briefings provided to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing by ACT Health in relation to an organisational separation prior to 15 March 2018. The PwC report titled '*Australian Health Departments and Directorates – Governance Scan*' was informally provided to the Office for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing by ACT Health on 22 December 2017 via email.
- (4) 16 March 2018.
- (5) There was a discussion between the former Director-General and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on 16 March 2018, and the conclusion reached was that the former Director-General would seek other opportunities. Ministers discussed the issue of executive leadership as part of broader discussions about the restructure of ACT Health.

---

### **ACT Health—proposed organisational changes (Question No 1497)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) In relation to the answer, dated 10 May 2018, given to the question without notice taken on notice on 11 April 2018, on what date did the Minister become aware that the Chief Minister had agreed formally, on 15 March 2018, to a proposed restructure of the Health Directorate.
- (2) Was the Minister at any time before 15 March 2018, involved in any discussions about the proposal to restructure the Health Directorate; if so, (a) on what dates were those discussions, (b) with whom were those discussions held, (c) what evidence was provided to the Minister in support of the proposal, (d) did the Minister undertake his own analysis of that evidence, (e) what conclusions did the Minister draw, (f) to whom did the Minister convey those conclusions and (g) on what dates did the Minister convey those conclusions.

- (3) At any time before 15 March 2018, was the Minister given any formal briefing minutes or other documents about the proposed restructure of the Health Directorate; if so, (a) what briefing minutes or other documents were given to the Minister, (b) on what dates did the Minister receive those minutes or other documents, (c) what was the Minister's response to those minutes or other documents and (d) on what dates did the Minister communicate that response to the relevant persons.
- (4) On what date did the Minister first become aware that the former Director-General of the Health Directorate would be seeking other opportunities.
- (5) Was the Minister, at any time, involved in any discussions about the former Director-General's attitude towards the restructure of the directorate and her future with the directorate; if so, (a) on what dates were those discussions held, (b) with whom were those discussion held, (c) what did the Minister discern was the former Director-General's attitude, (d) what scenarios were considered and (e) what conclusions were reached.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 16 March 2018.
- (2) Yes
  - a. As outlined in the response to the question taken on notice on 11 April 2018, the proposal to restructure ACT Health was discussed and developed over a number of months and involved a number of phone and in-person conversations between myself and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Noting the informal nature of some of these discussions it is not possible to provide a comprehensive list of dates when the matter was discussed with me.
  - b. Refer to answer to Question 2a.
  - c. A range of information was presented and considered as part of these discussions, including the Governance Scan of Australian Health Departments and Directorates prepared for ACT Health in December 2017.
  - d. The information was discussed and considered by both myself and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing over a number of months. This involved consideration of a range of factors including what the benefits of a potential restructure would be, any potential issues this could create and strategies for mitigating those issues.
  - e. Ultimately, after considering all of these factors, I concluded that the separation of ACT Health into two separate entities would enable a clearer focus on efficiency and effectiveness for health service operations, and also free up capacity to undertake core strategy and systems manager functions.
  - f. I conveyed these conclusion to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing as part of our discussions.
  - g. As noted in the answer to Question 2a, I am unable to provide specific dates for when these discussions took place.
- (3) No.

(4) 16 March 2018.

- (5) As you would expect I discussed the structure of ACT Health with the Director General on several occasions as we sought to ensure ACT Health operated as effectively as possible.

The issue of executive leadership was one of a number of issues discussed between myself and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing as part of the broader considerations relating to the restructure of ACT Health.

---

**Mental health—psychiatric services  
(Question No 1498)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) How many full time equivalent (FTE) permanent psychiatrists were employed in the Adult Mental Health Unit (AMHU) as at 30 April 2018.
- (2) What was the optimum number of FTE permanent psychiatrists for the AMHU as at 30 April 2018.
- (3) If the answer to part (1) is less than the answer given to part (2), why was it less.
- (4) What percentage of psychiatric services were provided by locum psychiatrists in the AMHU during the year to 30 April 2018.
- (5) What specific strategies is the directorate pursuing to secure at least the optimum number of permanent psychiatrists for the AMHU.
- (6) How many FTE permanent psychiatrists have been recruited to the AMHU in the period since 15 February 2018.
- (7) In relation to the answer to question on notice No 1268 part (3), and noting the advice given in the answer dated 4 March 2018 to the question without notice taken on notice that “in 2018-19, all 40 beds will be used to measure occupancy rates”, and noting the Minister did not answer the question fully, as asked, will the Minister now provide an answer to the question.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) One full time equivalent (FTE) permanent psychiatrist was employed in the Adult Mental Health Unit (AMHU) as at 30 April 2018.
- (2) There has not been an articulated optimum number of permanent psychiatrist within the AMHU, either before or after 30 April 2018. The reason for this is that the permanent status is less important than other factors such as the FTE and expertise of the consultants involved in provision of services.

The current medical staff establishment is 4.5 FTE Consultant Psychiatrists (including the Clinical Director for the Adult Acute Mental Health Services), four FTE Psychiatric Registrars and three FTE Resident Medical Officers. The 4.5 FTE Consultant Psychiatrists is aligned with staffing in other jurisdictions for an acute inpatient facility with 37 funded beds.

- (3) The established staffing level and profile does not dictate that staff must be permanent. The workforce of psychiatrists is currently a suppliers market. Across the country there are difficulties in filling positions for public psychiatrists, and many are not seeking full time or permanent positions, instead preferring to work as Visiting Medical Officers (VMO).
- (4) The percentage of psychiatric services provided by locums in the AMHU during the year to 30 April 2018 was variable throughout the period. The percentage of psychiatric services provided by locums was:
- a. 65 per cent from 15 June 2017 – 30 September 2017;
  - b. 75 per cent from 2 October – 2 March 2018; and
  - c. 100 per cent from 5 March 2018 – 30 April 2018.
- (5) The Office of the Chief Psychiatrist places advertisements for all vacant consultant psychiatrist positions within Mental Health, Justice Health, Alcohol and Drug Services (MHJHADS) in the relevant publications on a more or less continuous basis. As soon as practicable after the closure of an advertising period for a position a new advertisement is posted.
- A Medical Workforce Working Group was convened in August 2017 and tasked with contributing to the development of a medical workforce strategy to address the ongoing problems with medical recruitment and retention for MHJHADS. In May 2018 this working group was superseded by the Mental Health Medical Workforce Workshops which are jointly led by Executive Director for People and Culture.
- These groups have sought relevant analyses of workforce shortages in other public mental health services and utilised several local sources of information regarding the contributing factors to difficulties in recruitment and retention and barriers to improved performance.
- The group is working with the Division of Psychiatry to update psychiatrists on recruitment efforts and progress with senior and junior medical staff and to expedite practical measures to improve work efficiency.
- (6) There was one FTE permanent psychiatrist recruited to the AMHU in the period since 15 February 2018.
- (7) As advised in the previous answer to Question on Notice 1268, additional staff are being recruited to AMHU to assist with the level of occupancy. Details of the number of staff and the cost were provided in the previous answer.

### **Answers to questions on notice—costs (Question No 1499)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing*):

- (1) Why did it take 1,530 minutes costing \$2,296.66 to answer the question on notice (QON) 1033.



- (2) How was the information provided in the answers to QON 1033 parts 1 (a) and 2 (a) compiled.
- (3) If the information in answer to QON 1033 was compiled manually, why was it not readily able to be extracted from Health Directorate or Shared Services systems.
- (4) Why is the communications staff structure so top-heavy with senior officers and a member of the senior executive service.
- (5) What communications collateral is produced by directorate communications staff apart from media releases.
- (6) At what intervals is that collateral issued.
- (7) What is the assessed reach and frequency of that collateral.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The response required input from multiple areas across ACT Health. These areas of ACT Health provided input:

- DDG Corporate;
- DDG Canberra Hospital and Health Services;
- DDG Performance Reporting and Data;
- Office of Chief Nurse;
- Office of the Chief Allied Health Officer;
- Office of Chief Medical Officer;
- Chief Health Officer;
- Territory Wide Service Redesign;
- ACT Health Library and Multimedia Services; and
- Senior Manager Media.

Further clarification was sought from BreastScreen, Donatelife and the Minister's Office.

2. The information related to the number of communications staff in the directorate was provided by the Workforce Reporting Team, DDG Performance Reporting and Data. The data was extracted from Health Directorate Human Resource Information system. The information from other areas across ACT Health was compiled manually.
3. The Communications Branch do not have access to human resources information for all work areas across ACT Health and thus had to seek input from:
  - DDG Corporate;
  - DDG Canberra Hospital and Health Services;
  - DDG Performance Reporting and Data;
  - Office of Chief Nurse;
  - Office of the Chief Allied Health Officer;
  - Office of Chief Medical Officer;
  - Chief Health Officer;
  - Territory Wide Service Redesign;
  - ACT Health Library and Multimedia Services; and
  - Senior Manager Media.

4. ACT Health is a large and complex organisation. The scale and scope of the department's service delivery reform program has expanded substantially over the years. As explained below in the answer to question 5, the ACT Health Communications Branch is responsible for creating and sharing a large amount of information to explain to the public, clinical areas and stakeholders changes to service delivery, reform programs, infrastructure and service expansion, developing and managing public health campaigns, as well as respond to a wide range of media enquiries. On this basis, the Communications Branch is appropriately structured considering the functions being undertaken and the size of the organisation.
5. Over the past 12 months, ACT Health's Communication Branch has written or is implementing in excess of 30 communication strategies/communication action plans, for example, University of Canberra Hospital Communication and Engagement Strategy, Meningococcal ACWY Vaccine Communication Strategy, Ways to Wellbeing Communication Action Plan and the ACT Health Digital Communications Plan.

Each of these communication strategies/communication action plans involve a range of communication including:

- Social Media products;
- Web;
- Advertising;
- Video;
- Emails;
- Direct mail;
- Print product (brochures, posters etc); and
- Media (media releases, media alerts).

In the last year ACT Health's graphic design team was involved in designing 226 pieces of collateral.

6. A constant stream of communication collateral is produced and distributed throughout the year. The timing is dictated by new programs or facilities coming online, ministerial announcements, or major health awareness days such as Donate Life Week. More information can be found on the ACT Health Website - <http://www.health.act.gov.au/>
7. The reach and frequency of this collateral varies depending on the communication objectives and the size of the target audience/s identified in the relevant communication strategy/action plan.

### **Roads—accident black spots (Question No 1500)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) How many crashes have been recorded at or within 100 metres of the intersection of Kent and Groom Streets in Hughes over the last seven years.
- (2) For each crash, what (a) was the location of the crash, (b) date and time did the crash occur at, (c) was the accident type of the crash, (d) was the severity of the crash and (e) were the weather conditions at the time of the crash.

- (3) For each crash, referred to in part (2) were any fixed objects struck; if so, what kind.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There have been four reported crashes over the last seven years (2011-2017) in the vicinity of the Groom and Kent Streets intersection.
- (2) Two of these crashes occurred at the Groom Street and Kent Street intersection and one crash occurred around 50 metres south of this intersection.

Location	Date/ Time	Crash type	Crash severity	Weather conditions
Groom St/ Kent St intersection	27 Feb 2013 15:35	Rear end	Property damage only	Light rain
Groom St/ Kent St intersection	23 Mar 2017 18:40	Struck object – light pole and trees	Property damage only	Heavy rain
Kent Street ( between Kitchener Street and Groom Street - 50 metres south of Groom Street )	9 Mar 2012 17:20	Rear end	Property damage only	Fine
Groom St/ Wisdom St Intersection (This intersection is located within 100 metres of the intersection of Kent and Groom Streets )	9 Mar 2016 12:00	Right angle	Property damage only	Fine

- (3) Reference table above – crash type.

### **Municipal services—path upgrades (Question No 1501)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) Has the ACT Government received requests for widening and other upgrades to the shared path on the eastern side of Lake Tuggeranong, parallel to Mortimer Lewis Drive, Greenway, in the last five years; if so, has any action been taken to address these requests.
- (2) Is widening (or other upgrades) of this path included in the ACT Government's list of potential future path network upgrades; if so, how does this project rank on the list.
- (3) Are any upgrades or other improvements to paths in this area scheduled as a result of the land release currently underway on the eastern side of Lake Tuggeranong.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) TCCS has received one request in the last five years for the upgrade of the cycle path adjacent to Lake Tuggeranong. This request was assessed based on the existing path width (which on average is between 2.5 to three metres wide) and current usage. This path width was considered suitable for the usage at the time.

- (2) Given the above there are no immediate plans to upgrade the path on the eastern side of Lake Tuggeranong.
- (3) There are currently no plans to upgrade existing shared path infrastructure associated with either of its current developments on the eastern side of Lake Tuggeranong/Tuggeranong Pond. Design work is currently underway for the last stage of the shared path loop around Tuggeranong Pond which will realise the final portion of works associated with the Southquay development. These works will include a southbound three metre wide shared path on the eastern side of the pond that will cross the pond via a new non-vehicular bridge and link with the existing three metre shared path on the western side. Narrower paths will head further south around the natural landforms to the base of the Isabella Weir and will link in with the Southquay East estate path network parallel to Drakeford Drive. Another minor path is proposed to be provided on the southern side of the Isabella Weir providing access to the Drakeford Drive/Athllon Drive intersection from Anketell Street.

### **Schools—trees (Question No 1502)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) When did the Government move from multiple contactors undertaking annual tree assessments to one unified contractor for all Government schools.
- (2) What was the cost of annual tree assessments in the three years before and after this change.
- (3) What was the cost of tree maintenance and removal work in schools in the three years before and after this change.
- (4) Is the contractor who conducts tree assessments also allowed to quote for the tree maintenance and removal work that results from these assessments; if so, (a) why and (b) how does the Government manage the conflict of interest that may lead to annual tree assessments including excessive recommendations to remove or maintain trees.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The first year of operation for a single contractor was in the 2015-16 financial year and followed a tender process. In the 2015-16 financial year, the Education Directorate engaged the ACT Property Group to procure annual tree surveys in ACT public schools.
- (2) What was the cost of annual tree assessments in the three years before and after this change?

<b>Financial Year</b>	<b>Cost</b>
2012-13	\$162,849
2013-14	\$145,963
2014-15	\$155,495
2015-16	\$78,199
2016-17	\$57,095
2017-18	\$55,532

- (3) What was the cost of tree maintenance and removal work in schools in the three years before and after this change?

2016-2017	\$349,382.62**
2017-2018	\$875,943.07

Prior to January 2017, schools directly managed tree maintenance and removal works. This data was not collected centrally.

\*\*Due to a policy change implemented at the commencement of the 2017 calendar year, ACT Property Group took management of tree maintenance and removal work.

- (4) a) School tree audits are managed by the ACT Property Group. The ACT Property Group uses a single contractor to undertake school tree audits.
- b) The ACT Property Group advises that the same contractor also undertakes the rectification works up to the value of \$25,000.

---

### **Heritage—representative Aboriginal organisations (Question No 1503)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) How many Representative Aboriginal Organisations (RAOs) are there in the ACT.
- (2) What are the functions of the RAOs.
- (3) Do all of the current RAOs currently have the organisational capability required to undertake these functions; if not, how many do.
- (4) How were the current RAOs selected, and when.
- (5) Have there been approaches or applications made by other organisations to become RAOs in the last four years; if so, (a) how many and (b) who from.
- (6) What steps need to be taken by an organisation to become a RAO.
- (7) What minimum standards are required for existing RAOs to maintain their status, for example around governance, or availability to undertake Indigenous Cultural Heritage consulting work.
- (8) Are RAOs required to involve their community of traditional owners in their decision-making and consultancy advice; if so (a) is their decision-making and advice required to be “representative”, (b) what compliance checking is undertaken by the ACT Government to ensure this is occurring, (c) what methods do they use and (d) what can traditional owners who feel that they are being excluded from decision making by the RAOs do.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) Four RAOs have been declared under Section 14(7) of the *Heritage Act 2004* (the Act). As set out in the *Heritage (Representative Aboriginal Organisations) Declaration 2006 (No. 1)* (NI2006-298), these RAOs are:
- Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation;
  - Consultative Body Aboriginal Corporation on Indigenous Land and Artefacts in the Ngunnawal Area (now King Brown Tribal Group);
  - Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council; and
  - Ngarigu Currawong Clan.
- (2) The Act does not specify RAO functions, but it does require that RAOs are consulted on a range of matters such as:
- ACT Heritage Council (the Council) decisions to register Aboriginal places or objects;
  - Council decisions to cancel registration of Aboriginal places and objects; heritage guidelines for Aboriginal places and objects;
  - the assessment of heritage significance of reported Aboriginal places and objects; and
  - Minister declarations of repositories for Aboriginal objects.
- (3) All RAOs have the capacity to provide their views on Aboriginal heritage matters. However, there can be times when RAOs choose not to provide their views on heritage matters, such as in times of Sorry Business or when Elders and cultural knowledge holders are experiencing poor health.
- (4) In 2006, the Minister sought expressions of interest (EOIs) from entities willing to be declared as RAOs, in accordance with Section 14(5) of the Act. This consisted of:
- An advertisement in the Canberra Times on 25 February 2006, publically inviting expressions of interest; and
  - Personalised letters to 32 members of the Aboriginal community who may have had an interest in being declared as RAOs, including all chairs of previous Registered Aboriginal Organisations under the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*, all members of the United Ngunnawal Elders Council (UNEC) and all members of the Namadgi Board.

Entities were asked to identify their contact details, membership details and to explain why they should be considered for declaration as a RAO.

As a result of this process, six EOIs were received.

The Minister considered all EOIs received and declared four groups as RAOs. The two remaining entities who submitted an EOI were not declared as RAOs as they did not fully meet the considerations.

- (5) Other entities have made approaches or applications to the Minister in the past four years, expressing their willingness to be declared as RAOs.
- (a) 10 approaches have been received in the past four years.

- (b) For privacy purposes, it is not appropriate to disclose this information, on the individuals who approached.
- (6) Under Section 14 of the Act, RAOs may be declared by the Minister once: (a) the Minister invites expressions of interest from entities willing to be declared as RAOs; and (b) entities willing to be declared as RAOs provide an expression of interest.
- (7) The Act does not set out requirements for RAOs to maintain their status as RAOs. However, under Section 14 of the Act, the Minister has the power to amend or repeal the declaration of RAOs as required.

While the Act requires RAO consultation, there is no provision in the Act requiring that RAOs be engaged to provide commercial consultancy services; although this commonly occurs in Aboriginal heritage assessment and management projects. In this context, RAO governance and capacity to provide commercial services is not regulated by the Act.

- (8) The Act does not require that RAOs consult with other entities prior to providing advice on Aboriginal heritage matters; and accordingly, this is not regulated by the ACT Government or the Council. On this basis, no answers are provided to questions (a), (b), (c) and (d).

However, there are a range of ways that Aboriginal entities who are not RAOs can also provide advice on Aboriginal heritage matters. For example:

- The Council consults with the United Ngunnawal Elders Council (UNEC) – and therefore representatives of each Ngunnawal family group – on a number of its decisions, including registration decisions, heritage guidelines, and repositories for Aboriginal objects;
- The Council also consults with the ACT's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body (ATSIEB) on the above decisions;
- When considering the provisional registration of Aboriginal places and objects, the Council has a four week public consultation period in which any person or group may provide comment;
- When considering Territory Plan Variations, the ACT Government has a minimum six week public consultation period in which any person or group may provide comment, relating to (for example) zone changes that would allow for new suburbs to be built;
- When considering Environmental Impact Assessment for major development and infrastructure projects, the ACT Government has a minimum 20 day consultation period for draft Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), and a minimum 15 day consultation period for EIS Exemptions, in which any person or group may provide comment; and
- When considering Development Applications, the statutory public notification timeframes vary between two and four weeks, depending on the type of application, for all merit track and impact track applications. The bulk of applications, in the merit track, are notified for a period of three weeks.

**Government—community organisations support  
(Question No 1504)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Do any ACT Government offices make office space, equipment, conference/board rooms or meeting rooms available to members of the public or community organisations outside of working hours; if so, (a) what conditions are imposed on groups using those spaces and (b) what is the average cost per hour for hiring these spaces.
- (2) What is the reason for this cost.
- (3) Has the Government considered making office space available for free to members of the public and community organisations on the weekend.
- (4) What are the impediments to making ACT Government offices better utilised on weekends and after hours by members of the public and community organisations.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1)

**ACT Property Group (ACTPG)**

ACTPG have a range of hireable venues available, including Custodianship of approximately 30 Community Halls, ranging from those embedded within community hubs or centres (15 approximately) to standalone facilities. The halls offer substantial space for hirers including kitchen facilities, storage and meeting rooms. Their purpose is to provide the ACT community with hireable space to support the provision of broad based activities that provide social and community benefit. Details on hireable venues can be found at <https://apps.treasury.act.gov.au/venues/home>. Community Halls are currently being added to the list at the above link. In the meantime hirers can contact the venue hire team on 6213 0700.

Historically, community halls have been offered to the community on a peppercorn licence agreement, many of these arrangements were put in place within the Community Services Directorate (CSD). As a result, low cost Community Halls have been made available for hire across the Canberra community.

- (a) Community hirers are required to submit an application for hire, pay a bond and provide a copy of their Public Liability Insurance.
- (b) The type of space varies across halls with hire costs generally offered in the range of \$15–35 per hour. Discounts are offered for regular/ongoing and 'block' bookings for half and whole days.

**Community Services Directorate (CSD)**

The Theo Notaras Multicultural Centre, Level 2, 180 London Circuit, Canberra City, is available to the public and community organisations outside of working hours. This includes use of meeting rooms and the main function room.

- (a) The conditions for the use of meeting and function room space outside of regular working hours are the same as those during working hours.



The meeting room and function room space at the Theo Notaras Multicultural Centre is available to tenants of the facility. In recent months, the number of tenant organisations leasing space at the centre has risen from 17 to 24 – a 41 per cent increase. Under lease agreements issued to new tenants, a clause has been included limiting free use of the function room and meeting rooms to 24 and 104, respectively, per calendar year. This is to ensure parity of use for all tenants. Lease agreements are reviewed, and re-signed when organisations are offered the option of continuing their tenancies, on 31 December each year.

- (b) The cost of meeting room hire for non-tenants not-for-profit community organisations is \$40 per hour, for the function room the cost is \$180 per session (three hours). These spaces are also available to hire by for-profit organisations at a cost of \$40 per hour for meeting rooms, and \$200 per session (three hours) for the function room. The government rate to hire meeting rooms is also \$40 per hour and \$250 per session (three hours) for the function room.

The Child and Family Centres allow access for community/community organisations to meeting rooms and activity room/gym spaces at each of the centres both within core working hours and outside core working hours, including weekends at no cost.

The agreement for use of space is set out in the *Shared Room Bookings at the Child and Family Centres Procedures*. Community members and community organisations are able to request use of space by completing the *Child and Family Centre Room Booking Form*.

#### **Environmental Planning and Sustainability Development Directorate (EPSDD)**

The Renewables Innovation Hub (the Hub) is a co-working space that is rented by the ACT Government. There are no ACT Government employees working from this space. It is managed by a third party, Entry 29, through a contract with ACT Government. Office space is made available to businesses, academics, community organisations and the public, including outside of hours, through paid memberships.

Wildcare NSW regularly run caring sessions from the London Bridge Woolshed area within the Parks and Conservation Services (PCS) Googong precinct. ACT Wildlife occasionally use the Mitchell depot meeting room to undertake meetings and training sessions. The Woodlands and Wetlands Trust and City Farm regularly make use of the Jerrabomberra Wetlands Office.

- (a) All members using the Hub must adhere to a code of conduct. PCS: event and use of public place applications are submitted by the proponent, PCS ensures that the area requested is available and in a suitable condition to be utilised. PCS negotiates conditions and arranges access through the Public Land Use team for the London Bridge Woolshed area.

With the Mitchell depot meeting room, ACT Wildlife is required to notify the Ranger rostered on after hours of their attendance to allow for building access. The Woodlands and Wetlands Trust and City Farm have an agreement to use the Jerrabomberra Wetlands Office.

- (b) A variety of Hub memberships are available ranging from \$120 to \$330 per month. Events spaces are available from \$80 per hour. No charge to community groups.

**Justice and Community Safety (JACS)**

Community Rooms at the following ACT Emergency Services (ESA) facilities are available to be used by community groups and not-for-profit organisations outside of normal business hours:

- South Tuggeranong Fire and Rescue Station
- West Belconnen Co-Located Facility (ACT Fire and Rescue and ACT Ambulance Service)
- Belconnen Co-Located Facility (ACT Fire and Rescue and ACT Ambulance Service)

Community groups will need to book the room with the respective facility Station Officer on the following numbers:

- South Tuggeranong Fire and Rescue Station: 6207 8580
- West Belconnen Co-Located Facility: 6207 8560
- Belconnen Co-Located Facility: 6207 8540

The ACT Courts and Tribunal (ACTC&T) make courtrooms and hearing rooms available to community and non-government organisations, usually for moot courts or educational purposes.

The Human Rights Commission has allowed Community Groups to use office space, however this is during normal office hours.

ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) does not make its facilities available outside of normal working hours. ACTCS has a Memorandum of Understanding in place with Karralika Programs Inc. for space to use as interview room services and to provide other services to offenders serving community based orders.

- (a) Groups that use the Community Rooms at ESA facilities are required to leave the rooms in the condition that they were found in (for example: clean and in good order).
- (b) The use of ACTC&T courtrooms or hearing rooms must be approved by the relevant head of jurisdiction.

The Community Rooms at ESA facilities can be utilised by members of the public and community organisations for free.

The hire cost for ACTC&T courtroom and or hearing room is around \$83 per hour (\$664 per day) plus the actual costs of security/sheriffs (which under the relevant contract or industrial agreement must be for a minimum of three to four hours depending on the services to be provided).

The Human Rights Commission has allowed community groups to use space for free.

**Cultural Facilities Corporation (CFC)**

CMAG meeting rooms are made available to members of the public or community organisations outside of working hours on a venue hire basis.

- (a) A staffing fee is applied after hours for security and workplace health and safety requirements.

- (b) Not-for-profit organisations are eligible for a 30% discount on the room rate. In order to claim not-for-profit discount, charities must provide a copy of the certificate issued by the Australian Taxation Office at the time of registration. Not-for-profit organisations must provide a copy of the relevant section of the organisation's constitution which declares its not-for-profit status.
- (b) It not possible to provide an average cost as costs vary depending on the type of space and equipment required. Full costings are available via the CMAG website at <http://www.cmag.com.au/about/venue-hire>.

### **ACT Health**

ACT Health does not make office spaces or meeting rooms at ACT Health's office building at 2-6 Bowes Street in Phillip available to members of the public to hire outside of working hours. The building is a modern administration facility which primarily contains open plan office space supplemented with small meeting rooms. Additionally, there is a purpose built Training and Conference Centre on level two which is used for staff training, presentations and forums.

The Staff Development Unit provides classrooms at the Canberra Hospital for community groups to use on the weekend. There are currently two classrooms used for an hour each by two different community groups each Saturday. The classrooms are used:

- (a) on the condition that they are left tidy; and
- (b) at no cost.

Canberra Hospital and Health Services (CHHS) makes conference rooms, meeting rooms and auditorium facilities available to members of the public or community organisations outside of working hours. The facilities are used

- (a) at the discretion of the Deputy Director-General of CHHS; and
- (b) at no cost.

### **Education**

Hedley Beare Centre for Teaching and Learning (HBCTL) is the only Education Directorate owned office space and is currently available for hire to other Directorates, the public or community groups. The spaces include the hall, the multipurpose room, gymnasium and small meetings rooms.

- (a) Facility Hire Agreements and Licence Agreements are utilised to clearly articulate the terms and conditions of the use of the facility.
- (b) The average costs are as follows:

#### **Hall**

- \$130.00 per hour during standard working hours
- \$195.10 per hour Saturday
- \$254.80 per hour Sunday

#### **Multipurpose Room**

- \$103.80 per hour during standard working hours
- \$156.00 per hour Saturday
- \$208.00 per hour Sunday

**Mezzanine**

- \$101.80 per hour during standard working hours
- \$153.00 per hour Saturday
- \$204.00 per hour Sunday

**Other Meeting rooms**

- \$64.80 per hour during standard working hours
- \$97.30 per hour Saturday
- \$130.00 per hour Sunday

**Gymnasium**

- \$45.00 per hour Monday to Sunday

**Multimedia equipment**

- \$26.80 per item per hour

**Other costs based on needs of the event:**

- Additional cleaning (minimum 3 hours) - \$390.30 Saturday or Sunday
- Additional staff (BSO) - \$113.60 per hour Saturday and \$142.00 per hour Sunday
- Weekend security - \$67.00 per hour Saturday and \$84.00 per hour Sunday

(2)

**ACTPG**

Community organisations who manage government stand-alone halls and associated meeting rooms do so under 'peppercorn' licencing arrangements. The hire fees charged by the organisation are utilised for 'outgoings' for example, utility costs. The fees can be waived in special circumstances.

**CSD**

Community organisations (non-tenants of Theo Notaras Multicultural Centre) are invoiced for these amounts to assist with covering the cost of electricity, security services after hours, cleaning services, etc. The costs are minimal and are well below the cost of hiring other public venues throughout Canberra after hours. There is no cost involved for use of space within the Child and Family Centres.

**EPSDD**

Pricing is based on analysis of comparable co-working offerings across Canberra.

**JACS**

The cost charged for the use of ACTC&T court and hearing rooms reflect the actual costs of opening the facilities outside of normal operating hours, such as security costs and property operating expenses (including power, air conditioning). The cost is usually waived for non-profit organisations.

**CFC**

A greater subsidy is occasionally applied where a hire benefits a program being delivered in partnership with CMAG consistent with the policy on subsidised access to CMAG venues.

**ACT Health**

There are no costs imposed on the community groups who use the classrooms in the Staff Development Unit at the Canberra Hospital, or those who use the CHHS facilities.

**Education**

Fees and Charges were originally established by Strategic Finance based on the market value for similar facilities in Government and private enterprise.

(3)

**ACTPG**

Office space is not made available for community use on the weekends, as ACTPG's offices are not operational at that time. To do so would incur additional costs and create security issues. ACTPG is located inside a working depot that includes parking for government vehicles and machinery storage. As well, 'on call', after hours and weekend tradespeople operate from the site. Other government tenants are also located within the building complex.

**CSD**

Office space is available in line with the response to Question 1.

**EPSDD**

The Hub occasionally makes space available for free to support relevant community organisations. However, it is the intention of ACT Government to increase the Hub's financial self-sufficiency over time and so such support is only provided in exceptional circumstances and on a case-by-case basis.

Further, the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy has identified that there is an opportunity for the ACT Government to utilise publicly accessible buildings to be used as a "heat oasis" during prolonged, extreme heatwave events. This would enable at-risk individuals to seek out areas where they can go for relief during extended periods of hot weather and reduce the vulnerability of residents and visitors to the ACT during heatwaves.

The Climate Change Adaptation Strategy has identified that current risk management and coping strategies may not be sufficient in the future, especially for vulnerable communities and that the further development of policies and procedures that identify and provide public buildings and spaces as heat oases needs to be undertaken.

PCS does make offices such as Jerrabomberra Wetlands available on weekends upon request. The London Bridge Woolshed is the only building within the Googong precinct that can be made appropriately available for the type of use requested. Using the office space would be disruptive for staff that need to access this space during their shifts which include weekends.

**JACS**

Rooms are made available as outlined in the response to Question 1. Generally, JACS Directorate office accommodation is not provided out-of-hours as these premises are not open or occupied at that time and additional resources and costs would be incurred to make them available.

**ACT Health**

ACT Health has not considered making its office spaces or meeting rooms at 2-6 Bowes Street available to members of the public. It would be unsuitable due to the need for confidentiality and maintaining security associated with the function of ACT Health. The Training and Conference facilities could be made available to the public or community organisations outside of working hours, with appropriate access control and security measures in place, including security staff.

**Education**

In July 2017 the Education Directorate entered into a social enterprise licence agreement with Marymead allowing them to establish a garden/urban farm and office accommodation on the grounds at HBCTL. No fee has been charged for occupying the space except for utilities costs.

(4)

**ACTPG**

Impediments are described in the response to Question 3.

**EPSDD**

Current Hub membership options allow access by members on the weekends and after hours.

Major impediments for other EPSDD buildings are related to security, and managing access and movements:

(i) security: the design and associated security systems for our existing buildings do not enable access to be limited within a building, this would allow general access for the public and community groups across the whole building, with attendant security issues. Addressing this issue would involve additional costs; and

(ii) arranging and managing after-hours access: additional costs would also be involved in providing after-hours access to secure premises, managing and updating after-hours access, and providing assistance if our employees are required to be on-site to escort and assist external users.

During heatwaves there are trigger arrangements for the ACT Extreme Heat Plan, the criteria of a mean temperature of 28oC using the BOM forecasts. An impediment may include that these triggers may not be identified in time to respond, that the trigger is not adequately communicated throughout ACT Government or that the building operators may not be in a position to respond to requests to open the building as a heat oasis. There may also be issues communicating this with the public and providing information on what the heat oasis offers as well as impediments for vulnerable people in particular to actually get to the defined heat oasis. This could all be rectified by having heat oases identified as well as policies, procedures and communication messages in place.

Currently in the ACT, when the criteria to activate the Extreme Heat Plan is met, the Chief Officer of the Ambulance Service is to advise the Chief Health Officer that the Plan would be enacted and commence actions to deal with the forecast heatwave, currently this does not include the provision of ACT Government buildings outside regular operating hours, or during operating hours beyond the current policy context.

Whilst the ACT Government already has a number of publications and information on how to stay cool during heatwaves and general heat refuges (e.g. community centres, shopping centres, libraries, public galleries or cinemas) there is no clear directive on the use of ACT Government facilities such as libraries, offices or community facilities and making them available to the public during heatwaves to be used as a heat oasis. The directorates responsible for this educational material regularly promote this information at the beginning of summer, when heatwaves are imminent, and during heatwaves.

PCS: Unsupervised public access to most Parks and Conservation Service run depots is inappropriate. These facilities store machinery and materials which require training and development to use safely. Also PCS runs a seven day a week operation so using office space, other than some meeting rooms on weekends, would be disruptive for staff undertaking their normal duties.

### **JACS**

As outlined in the response to Question 3, office accommodation is not generally provided out-of-hours, as these offices are not open at that time. Impediments include access, security and resource implications, insurance considerations and restricting access to sensitive areas and information.

Access to the ACTC&T court and hearing rooms also needs approval of the relevant head of jurisdiction.

### **ACT Health**

In terms of the Bowes Street building, all office spaces are within a secure government facility. Maintaining the security and confidentiality of these office spaces is an impediment to the spaces being better utilised after business hours, given the nature of ACT Health's work and information contained within its offices. The impediments to using CHHS facilities are the safety of buildings and equipment, and the safety of people using the rooms. A swipe pass is often required to gain access outside of normal business hours. There is also no technical support available if equipment faults occur.

### **Education**

The impediments to increase utilisation on weekends and after hours at HBCTL are the fees and charges applied to cover overheads, maintain the security of the building and its location within a residential area some distance from a retail node.

Despite these impediments and in addition to Marymead, accommodation at HBCTL is used out of hours and on weekends by a local basketball group, and for yoga and pottery classes. The Education Directorate supports the use of office accommodation by the public and community groups and recognises the benefits of increased presence out of standard business hours.

---

## **Public housing—relocations (Question No 1505)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Was 11 Boan Close, Florey, ACT Government owned public housing until recently; if so, (a) why was this house sold, (b) when was the decision made to sell the house and (c) was the former tenant provided with alternative public housing or evicted.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) The decision to sell this three bedroom property was made following the property becoming vacant in March 2018, taking into consideration the low wait list demand for three bedroom accommodation in the Belconnen area and was sold by auction on 20 June 2018.

(b) The decision to sell the property was made on 19 April 2018.

(c) Housing ACT cannot provide details of client's private information.

### **Public housing—renewal program (Question No 1506)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) What is the number of Housing ACT dwellings that have been sold in each of the three most recent years for which data is available, broken down by (a) type of dwelling (apartment, townhouse, detached house etc.) and (b) the number of bedrooms per dwelling.
- (2) How much revenue has Housing ACT received from the sale of housing assets in each of the three most recent years for which data is available, broken down by (a) type of dwelling (apartment, townhouse, detached house etc.) and (b) the number of bedrooms per dwelling.
- (3) What is the number of dwellings that have been constructed as part of the Public Housing Capital Delivery Program in each of the three most recent years for which data is available, broken down by (a) type of dwelling (apartment, townhouse, detached house etc.), (b) the number of bedrooms per dwelling and (c) the number of Class C adaptable dwellings, or compliance with the Liveable Housing Design guidelines (none, Silver, Gold, or Platinum).
- (4) What is the average construction cost per dwelling (not including the acquisition cost or land value) of new public housing stock that has been built as part of the Public Housing Capital Delivery Program in each of the three most recent years for which data is available, broken down by (a) type of dwelling (apartment, townhouse, detached house etc.), (b) the number of bedrooms per dwelling and (c) the number of Class C adaptable dwellings, or compliance with Liveable Housing Design guidelines (none, Silver, Gold, or Platinum).
- (5) What is the number of dwellings that have been purchased by ACT Housing in each of the three most recent years for which data is available, broken down by (a) type of dwelling (apartment, townhouse, detached house etc.), (b) the number of bedrooms per dwelling and (c) the number of Class C adaptable dwellings, or compliance with Liveable Housing Design guidelines (none, Silver, Gold, or Platinum).

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) Number of dwellings sold by type:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Land</i>	1		2
<i>Houses</i>	65	66	49
<i>Flats</i>	12	22	9
<i>Older Persons Accommodation</i>		1	



(b) Number of dwellings sold by bedroom:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>1 Bedroom</i>	6	7	2
<i>2 Bedroom</i>	14	24	14
<i>3 Bedroom</i>	49	56	38
<i>4 Bedroom</i>	8	2	4

(2) (a) Sales revenue (net) received by dwelling type:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Land</i>	\$0.175m		\$1.139m
<i>Houses</i>	\$35.424m	\$28.595m	\$31.469m
<i>Flats</i>	\$3.432m	\$7.991m	\$3.457m
<i>Older Persons Accommodation</i>		\$0.179m	

(b) Sales revenue (net) received by bedroom:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>1 Bedroom</i>	\$1.533m	\$2.009m	\$0.800m
<i>2 Bedroom</i>	\$5.858m	\$9.794m	\$7.144m
<i>3 Bedroom</i>	\$26.141m	\$23.803m	\$25.089m
<i>4 Bedroom</i>	\$5.324m	\$1.159m	\$1.893m

(3) (a) Number of constructions by dwelling type:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Houses</i>	39	47	34
<i>Flats</i>	61	28	8
<i>Older Persons Accommodation</i>			10

(b) Number of constructions by bedroom:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>1 Bedroom</i>	40	2	2
<i>2 Bedroom</i>	37	47	34
<i>3 Bedroom</i>	11	16	7
<i>4 Bedroom</i>	10	8	2
<i>5 Bedroom</i>	2	1	7
<i>6 Bedroom</i>		1	

(c) Number of constructions by class of dwelling:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Class C</i>	50	37	29
<i>Liveable Housing Design</i>	Gold 50	Gold 38	Gold 23

## (4) (a) Average construction cost per dwelling by type:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Houses</i>	\$0.380m	\$0.377m	\$0.439m
<i>Flats</i>	\$0.387m (see Note 1)	\$0.327m	(see Note 2) \$0.280m
<i>Older Persons Accommodation</i>			\$0.271m

## (b) Average construction cost per dwelling by bedroom:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>1 Bedroom</i>	\$0.382m (see Note 3)	\$0.230m	\$0.246m
<i>2 Bedroom</i>	\$0.346m	\$0.311m	\$0.349m
<i>3 Bedroom</i>	\$0.471m (see Note 4)	\$0.400m (Note 5)	\$0.344m
<i>4 Bedroom</i>	\$0.440m	\$0.497m	\$0.470m
<i>5 Bedroom</i>	\$0.386m	\$0.567m	\$0.600m
<i>6 Bedroom</i>		\$0.803m	

## (c) Average construction cost per dwelling by class of dwelling:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Class C</i>	\$0.364m	\$0.362m	\$0.344m
<i>Liveable Housing Design</i>	Gold 14 \$0.405m (see Note 6)	Gold \$0.354m	Gold \$0.431m (see Note 7)

## (5) (a) Number of purchases by dwelling type:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Houses</i>	31	63	19
<i>Flats</i>		5	1
<i>Older Persons Accommodation</i>	1		
<i>Land</i>			8

## (b) Number of purchases by bedroom:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>1 Bedroom</i>			1
<i>2 Bedroom</i>	20	31	3
<i>3 Bedroom</i>	5	10	3
<i>4 Bedroom</i>	4	22	7
<i>5 Bedroom</i>	3	4	6
<i>6 Bedroom</i>		1	
<i>Land</i>			8

## (c) Number of purchases by class of dwelling:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Class C</i>	12	0	0
<i>Standard Dwelling</i>	20	68	20

Notes:

1. 2014-15 average construction cost per dwelling by type – flats. The average construction cost for flats in this year was high due to the construction of a 40 unit multi-storey complex with lifts under the Common Ground project.
2. 2016-17 average construction cost per dwelling by type – houses. The average construction cost for houses in this year was high due to the construction of nine non-standard townhouses under the new Karinya House project and five non-standard townhouses under the Housing for Older People in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community project (Mura Gunya).
3. 2014-15 average construction cost per dwelling by bedroom – one bedroom. The average construction cost for one bedroom dwellings in this year was high due to the construction of 40 x one bedroom flats in a multi-storey complex with lifts under the Common Ground project.
4. 2014-15 average construction cost per dwelling by bedroom – three bedroom. The average construction cost for three bedroom dwellings in this year was high due to the construction of nine townhouses in Garran built to higher specifications specifically for the purpose of selling these properties on the market.
5. 2015-16 average construction cost per dwelling by bedroom – three bedroom. The average construction cost for three bedroom dwellings in this year was high due to the construction of three townhouses in Deakin built to higher specifications specifically for the purpose of selling these properties on the market.
6. 2014-15 average construction cost per dwelling by class of dwelling – Liveable Housing Design Gold. The average construction cost for Liveable Housing Design Gold dwellings in this year was high due to the construction of nine townhouses in Garran built to higher specifications specifically for the purpose of selling these properties on the market.
7. 2016-17 average construction cost per dwelling by class of dwelling – Liveable Housing Design Gold. The average construction cost for Liveable Housing Design Gold dwellings in this year was high due to the construction of nine non-standard townhouses under the new Karinya House project and five non-standard townhouses under the Housing for Older People in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community project (Mura Gunya).

---

**Schools—community organisations  
(Question No 1507)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Are school playgrounds and ovals accessible to members of the public outside of school hours.
- (2) Which school playgrounds and ovals are accessible to members of the public and with what restrictions.

- (3) Which school playgrounds and ovals are no longer accessible to members of the public and for what reason.
- (4) Has the installation of fences and gates around school premises impacted the usage rates of playgrounds and ovals.
- (5) How many community organisations, social groups or not-for-profits utilise schools facilities, including hall hire, in ACT government schools.
- (6) For facilities of (a) school classrooms, (b) creative arts and manual arts workshops, (c) music and drama rehearsal spaces (d) music and drama performance spaces, (e) assembly halls and (f) theatres, which schools offer public hire and (i) with what conditions, (ii) for what average price per hour and (iii) what is the average utilisation rate.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The majority of ACT public school playgrounds and ovals are accessible to members of the public outside of school hours. The Education Directorate's *Community Use of School Facilities* Policy states that Canberra Public Schools are ACT Government facilities and these facilities are to be made available for community use when not in use by the school. The policy can be found at the following link:

[https://www.education.act.gov.au/publications\\_and\\_policies/School-and-Corporate-Policies/facilities-and-assets/communityout-of-hours-use/community-use-of-school-facilities-policy](https://www.education.act.gov.au/publications_and_policies/School-and-Corporate-Policies/facilities-and-assets/communityout-of-hours-use/community-use-of-school-facilities-policy)

The policy also notes that positive partnerships between community organisations and schools can contribute to strong relationships and improved student learning. Provision of school facilities for community use should not adversely affect the operation and management of the school's core business. Neither should it require significant works to segment school property for provision of facilities for community use.

- (2) Data about specific school arrangements regarding access to their enclosed spaces is not collected centrally by the Directorate.
- (3) When a fence is installed in a school, consideration is made to continue community access to ovals and other play areas such as basketball courts and play equipment. On some occasions, due to local site conditions, this is not always possible. Data about specific school arrangements regarding access to their enclosed spaces is not collected centrally by the Directorate.
- (4) There is no data available on the impact from the installation of fences and gates around school premises has on the usage rates of playgrounds and ovals. There has been one issue raised in the last twelve months relating to group access to a school playground. In this case the Directorate was able to provide an alternative site for usage.

There have also been two complaints to the Directorate. Both relate to personal access to school grounds.

- (5) The latest data collection of June 2017 indicated there were 485 users of school facilities made up of community organisations, social groups and not-for-profit

organisations. This is a 7 per cent increase in usage from the 2016 data and a 20 per cent increase in usage from the 2015 data.

- (6) a-f. Data regarding specific spaces that are used in individual schools is not collected centrally by the Directorate:
- (i) The conditions of an agreement vary depending on the type of agreement being used. In the case of a standard user utilising space for an ad-hoc period, generally a standard Facility Hire Agreement will be used. A Licence Agreement will be used for more formal arrangements such as exclusive use of a space of the facility. Both the Facility Hire Agreement and the Licence Agreement will clearly articulate the terms and conditions of the use of the facility.
  - (ii) Schools must adhere to the standard Directorate community use rates when hiring out school facilities to the community.

*The Community Use of School Facilities* policy states that individual school principals may waive and/or reduce hire rates based on the marginal costs of usage or in consideration of non-cash benefits to their individual school, students and community (e.g. community sport organisations coaching of students, supporting the school in providing alternative activities to their students and wider community).

- (iii) The Directorate does not collect average utilisation rates.

The data collected from schools in June 2017 indicates that at that time, there were 485 users of school facilities that is made up of community organisations, social groups and not-for-profit organisations.

Currently, all schools except for Narrabundah College, hire out their facilities to the public. Narrabundah College is currently undergoing significant infrastructure works at their site.

---

### **ACT Policing—Neighbourhood Watch (Question No 1508)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) What steps are required to establish a local Neighbourhood Watch group.
- (2) What are the minimum requirements residents need to meet to operate a Neighbourhood Watch group.
- (3) What steps does ACT Policing take to ensure Neighbourhood Watch groups have genuine community support and are not being used to intervene in the concerns of an individual rather than the local community as a whole.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Whilst a valued partner of ACT Policing, Neighbourhood Watch is an independent community led safety and awareness program.

The ACT Neighbourhood Watch Association Inc. is registered under the ACT *Associations Incorporation Act 1991*. It is this body that regulates Neighbourhood Watch groups in the ACT, including setting operating policies and procedures for such groups, rather than ACT Policing.

### **ACT Policing—cycling infringements (Question No 1509)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) How many fines and/or warnings have ACT Policing issued for the minimum passing distance offences by year.
- (2) Have ACT Policing staff received training or education regarding these laws.
- (3) Have ACT Policing investigated or used any lateral measuring devices to assist in enforcing these laws.
- (4) During the recent focus on “vulnerable road users” what fines or warnings did ACT Policing issue for offences relating to vulnerable road users.
- (5) How many complaints/reports has ACT Policing received relating to driver behaviour/attitudes towards bicycle riders, in each of the last 5 years.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) Between 1 January 2016 and 31 May 2018, ACT Policing issued the following Traffic Infringement Notices (TINs) and Cautions for the offence Overtake Bicycle Rider too Closely:

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
<b>TIN</b>	1	4	0
<b>Caution</b>	3	2	2
<b>Total</b>	4	6	2

- (2) ACT Policing conducts regular Media campaigns to increase awareness and educate ACT Policing and the broader community on amendments to legislation through a variety of communication mediums. This included specific public messaging of the trial in 2015, internal awareness training and further messaging through the ‘Share the Road’ Campaign. A further campaign during March 2018 targeted a range of behaviours which impact on safety for vulnerable road users, including maintenance of a safe lateral distance between motor vehicles and bicycles.
- (3) ACT Policing does not currently use or has not to date investigated any lateral measuring devices.
- (4) Between 1 January 2016 and 31 May 2018, ACT Policing issued the following TINs regarding vulnerable road users:

Infringement type	2016	2017	2018
ENTER AREA/LAND-NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN ON ROAD	0	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY AT LIGHTS TO PEDESTRIAN ON ROAD	1	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO BICYCLE RIDER ON PEDESTRIAN CROSSING	0	1	3
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN (FLASHING YELLOW LIGHT)	0	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN (INTERSECTION WITH NO LIGHTS)	0	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN (LEFT TURN)	1	0	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN (RIGHT TURN AT TERMINATING ROAD)	1	0	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN AT T-INTERSECTION	1	0	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN IN SHARED ZONE	1	0	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN ON PEDESTRIAN CROSSING	7	8	3
NOT GIVE WAY TO VEHICLE/PEDESTRIAN (STOP SIGN)	14	11	3
NOT GIVE WAY TO VEHICLE/PEDESTRIAN GIVE WAY SIGN/LINE)	2	6	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10</b>

Between the same date range as above, ACT Policing issued the following Cautions regarding vulnerable road users:

Infringement type	2016	2017	2018
ENTER AREA/LAND-NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN ON AREA	1	0	0
LEAVE AREA/LAND NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN ON AREA	0	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY AT LIGHTS TO PEDESTRIAN ON ROAD	1	1	1
NOT GIVE WAY TO BICYCLE RIDER (FLASHING YELLOW LIGHT)	0	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO BICYCLE RIDER ON PEDESTRIAN CROSSING	1	0	2
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN (INTERSECTION WITH NO LIGHTS)	0	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN (LEFT TURN)	1	1	0
NOT GIVE WAY TO PEDESTRIAN ON PEDESTRIAN CROSSING	2	6	1
NOT GIVE WAY TO VEHICLE/PEDESTRIAN (RIGHT TURN)	1	1	1
NOT GIVE WAY TO VEHICLE/PEDESTRIAN (STOP SIGN)	5	3	1
NOT GIVE WAY TO VEHICLE/PEDESTRIAN GIVE WAY SIGN/LINE)	2	2	1
RIDER NOT GIVE WAY (SHARED/FOOTPATH)	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>

(5) ACT Policing is unable to produce this data.

## Municipal services—libraries (Question No 1510)

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) What changes have there been to the cost and conditions of hiring library meeting/conference facilities over the past 10 years.
- (2) What is the utilisation rate of library meeting/conference facilities.
- (3) Has that rate increased or decreased over the past three years.
- (4) Has the Directorate received any complaints over the cost, conditions, insurance restrictions or accessibility issues by groups seeking to hire library meeting/conference facilities over the past two years; if yes, what were the details of those complaints.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Room hire charges for Libraries ACT facilities are increased annually in line with CPI. In 2015, Libraries ACT updated the room booking system to a centralised system to ensure equity and fairness in access and hire arrangements and to provide customers with one centralised contact point. At this time current users were asked to periodically submit room hire applications so that library records remain current with contact details and to ensure that new groups have fair access in making a request. At this time the definitions of the categories of users – commercial, not for profit, government and free use were better defined.

In 2016, Libraries ACT implemented revised 'Conditions of Hire' regarding items being left in library community rooms by users.

- (2) Total hours booked for the last three years are:

Financial Year	Hours booked
2015-16	12,635
2016-17	16,733
2017-18 (@ May 2018)	13,010

\*These figures include usage by the Gungahlin College

- (3) The rate has increased over the past three years.
- (4) Thirteen complaints or queries have been received by Libraries ACT over the past two years. The queries related to:
- November 2016 - A community group questioning the type of category they had been charged.
  - December 2016 - A complaint was received about the number of community groups/unregistered groups that use Libraries ACT community rooms, information about availability of rooms and the suggestion that Libraries ACT have a mobile booking app.
  - January 2017 - A complaint was received about the processes for room bookings and the need for groups to renew their application periodically.
  - March 2017 - A request was made for information and complaint made about how categories are defined and assessed. The hirer questioned the Commercial rate they had been determined at.
  - March 2017 - A community group questioned the Not-for-Profit rate they had been determined at.
  - July 2017 - A query was received regarding insurance, room usage, and funding information requested from applicants.
  - A community group questioning the Not-for-Profit rate they had been determined at.
  - October 2017 - A complaint about how categories are defined and assessed. The hirer questioned the Commercial rate they had been determined at.
  - October 2017 - A customer disputed the invoice that had been issued after non-cancellation of a booking.
  - December 2017 - A community group questioned the Not-for-Profit rate they had been determined at.



- January 2018 - A query was received about how categories are defined and assessed. A community group questioning the Not-for-Profit rate they had been determined at.
  - January 2018 - A customer expressed concern about the time taken to confirm a booking.
  - April 2018 - A query was received about how categories are defined and assessed. A community group questioning the Not-for-Profit rate they had been determined at.
- 

### **Roads—traffic signals (Question No 1511)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) At which locations does the ACT provide buses in bus lanes with traffic signal priority.
- (2) Why is the bus lane not given traffic signal priority heading eastbound into the City at the intersection of Barry Drive and Kingsley Street, City.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The following intersections have 'B' signals which allow buses and taxis and motorcycles to proceed while the adjacent traffic is held on a red signal:
  - Barry Drive/Clunies Ross Street;
  - Athllon Drive/Drakeford Drive;
  - Drakeford Drive/Taverner Street;
  - Athllon Drive/Hindmarsh Drive;
  - Belconnen Way/Gungahlin Drive Extension;
  - Canberra Avenue/Geelong Street;
  - Cotter Road/Kirkpatrick Street;
  - Cotter Road/Streeton Drive;
  - John Gorton Drive/Cotter Road
  - John Gorton Drive/Steve Irwin Avenue
  - John Gorton Drive/Opperman Avenue; and
  - John Gorton Drive/Wyndham Avenue.

In addition a similar facility will be provided at Gungahlin Drive/Gundaroo Drive when the current improvement project is completed.

- (2) Traffic signals at this intersection allow buses to turn right into Kingsley Street from the bus lane on the left hand side of Barry Drive. When this happens all other vehicle and pedestrian movements are held on red signals. This occurs during the normal sequence of the signals. If absolute priority were given for this phase it would result in unpredictable operation of the signals that would cause long delays to all other road users, including pedestrians.
-

### **ACTION bus service—patronage (Question No 1512)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) Where there has been changes in bus routes, can the Minister provide; (a) patronage data for the corresponding previous route, (b) patronage data for the corresponding new or combine or altered route and (c) this data should be based the same period for the year before.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Of the changes to bus routes in the 7 October 2017 network changes, the tables below displays the (a) patronage data for the corresponding previous route (based on ACT school term 1 2018 data) and (b) patronage data for the corresponding new or combine or altered route based the same period for the year before. Term 1 2017 is defined as 31 Jan 2017 to 7 Apr 2017 and Term 1 2018 is defined as 6 Feb 2018 to 13 April 2018. Of the changes in weekday bus routes (effective 9 October 2017), the table below displays the changes in the average number of boardings each weekday:

<b>Route</b>	<b>Term 1 2017</b>	<b>Term 1 2018</b>
18	193	262
182	357	602
19	300	42
250	1,193	963
251	990	832
252	858	1,024
254	613	592
255	946	844
259	629	571
300	2,820	2,417
313	3,917	4,033
318	1,482	1,640
319	1,590	2,929
343	3,933	4,124
4 & 5 & 6 <sup>a</sup>	3,204	3,758
52	510	723
54	451	728
712	235	218
714	182	145
717	168	169
743	385	369
744	262	293

- (a) The introduction of the Green Rapid (Route 6) in October 2017 saw changes to the old route 4 with the old route 5 no longer serviced.

Of the changes in weekend bus routes (effective 9 October 2017), the table below displays the change in the average number of boardings each weekend day:

Route	Term 1 2017	Term 1 2018
950/200 <sup>b</sup>	1,852	2,367
900/300 <sup>c</sup>	5,532	5,790
930 & 931 & 932 <sup>d</sup>	779	870
935 <sup>e</sup>	355	408
938 <sup>f</sup>	617	1,011
971	185	296

- (b) The introduction of the 7 day Red Rapid (Route 200) meant that route 950 will no longer be in service.
- (c) The introduction of the 7 day Blue Rapid (Route 300) meant that route 900 will no longer be in service.
- (d) Route 932 was redesigned to align closer with the weekday network and became routes 930, 931 and 932.
- (e) Route 935 was redesigned to follow the new weekday route 4.
- (f) Route 938 was redesigned to follow the introduction of the Green Rapid (Route 6).

---

### Planning—development applications (Question No 1513)

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) In relation to the recently completed construction of a new building at the north-western corner of Block 4, Section 41, Lyneham, fronting onto Brigalow Street at Brindabella Christian College and the Brigalow Street frontage that includes a curved wall on a slab, is the separation between the block boundary to Brigalow Street and the curved wall (not the slab) consistent with the approved development application for the building.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Access Canberra Building Inspectors have attended the site and have concluded that the 'curved wall' is not consistent with the approved development application for the building.

Access Canberra is continuing to investigate any potential harm caused by the 'curved wall' encroachment and will consider what action to take, if any.

---

### Planning—community facility zoning (Question No 1514)

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Why has the rezoning in Belconnen Town Centre Draft Variation 342, to Block 41, Section 54 from Community Facility Zone to a Commercial Zone been proposed.

- (2) Does Draft Variation 342 propose to offset the loss of this community facility land elsewhere in the Town Centre; if so, how.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Belconnen Town Centre Master Plan recommended rezoning Block 41, Section 54 from Community Facility to commercial CZ2 Business zone as it is consistent with the zoning of adjoining blocks. The Draft Variation, 342 is consistent with the agreed policy in the master plan.
- (2) The Belconnen Town Centre Master Plan determined there was sufficient Community Facility zoned (CFZ) land in the Town Centre, including Canberra International Sports and Aquatic Centre (CISAC, skate park, library, arts centre, community centre, basketball stadium etc). Several of these are located on land zoned other than CFZ (e.g. CZ3 basketball, CZ2 health centre). The relocation of the library and community centre from Chandler Street to a more visible location on Lathlain Street was supported and documented in the master planning process.

---

**ACTION bus service—drivers  
(Question No 1515)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) Are ACTION bus drivers given specific training or education regarding driving safely around vulnerable road users.
- (2) Are ACTION bus drivers given specific training or education regarding the rules relating to the minimum passing distance for bicycle riders.
- (3) How many complaints has the ACT Government received relating to bus driver behaviour/attitudes towards bicycle riders, in each of the last five years.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Transport Canberra has a strong emphasis and commitment to safe driving practices. Upon commencement as a (trainee) Bus Driver, trainees are educated and trained on Transport Canberra's expectations and policies including (but not limited to) safe road craft and how to safely share the road with all road users. Trainees are also given a copy of the 'Sharing the Road' brochure developed by the ACT Government which details driver and cyclist obligations. Information on cyclist safety, including the safe passing distance, is also included in the (Transport Canberra) Bus Driver Handbook, which is given to all Transport Canberra bus drivers and is a common and regular point of reference for policies throughout their employment. In addition, Driver Continuity Training (for existing drivers) is run on a continual basis whereby the above information is again provided and reiterated as well as updates on road rule changes; coupled with an on-road assessment to ensure their adherence to the Bus Driver Handbook and associated policies.
- (2) Yes. See response to (1).

- (3) On Sunday 1 November 2015 a two year trial of laws was introduced that required motorists to provide a minimum lateral distance of one metre when overtaking a cyclist in speed zones at or below 60km/h and one and a half metres in speed zones above 60km/h. From this period, Transport Canberra identified feedback regarding incidents that included cyclists separately.

Time Period	Feedback Received
January 2018 – 15 June 2018	33
January 2017 – December 2017	73
January 2016 – December 2016	73
January 2015 – December 2015	6
January 2014 – December 2014	1
January 2013 – December 2013	14

### Roads—projects (Question No 1516)

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide road usage data for (a) Mirrabai Drive to access Gundaroo Drive and (b) how many residents use Gundaroo Drive, both now and what is projected for 2022 and 2025 due to population growth in the Gungahlin region.
- (2) Can the Minister confirm the following details regarding stage 1 of the Gundaroo Drive/Mirrabai Drive Duplication project; (a) when will all construction be completed, (b) how much has the project cost, (c) how many car collisions and/or accidents have been reported within the construction area, (d) how many incidents regarding pedestrian safety have been reported within the construction area, (e) how many near miss accidents have been reported within the construction area, (f) what pedestrian safety measures have been put in place to enhance resident safety during construction, (g) what pedestrian access and crossings will be provided once construction is complete, (h) how many Work Health and Safety (WHS) incidents have been reported within the construction area and (i) what WHS hazards were identified and how have these been mitigated.
- (3) What were the reasons for determining which portion is duplicated and which is not, in relation to the rationale for duplicating this particular section of road, for example Mirrabai Drive from Paul Coe Crescent to Gundaroo Drive.
- (4) What is the logic to duplicating a small section but leaving portions of the road untouched and therefore forcing traffic to form a single lane between Paul Coe Crescent and Gundaroo Drive.
- (5) Are there plans to duplicate additional section of these roads; if so, when will these projects commence.
- (6) Has the Minister's office received complaints directly or through Access Canberra regarding these roadworks.
- (7) What issues have been raised with the Minister's office and/or the Directorate over the construction period, and what has been done to respond to these concerns.

- (8) Is construction of Gundaroo Drive duplication (stage 1) running on time and on budget; if not (a) how far behind is construction and (b) what is the cost overrun.
- (9) Have residents been notified of any schedule changes to the duplication of Gundaroo Drive (stage 1); if so, how have residents been notified of any changes.
- (10) When will construction of Gundaroo Drive duplication (stage 2) commence.
- (11) When will construction of Gundaroo Drive duplication (stage 2) conclude.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a)

Road	From	To	Direction	AM Peak Hour (0800-0900)			PM Peak Hour (1700-1800)		
				2016	2021	2031	2016	2021	2031
Mirrabai Drive	Paul Coe Crescent	Gundaroo Drive	Southbound	1,309	1,400	1,593	710	848	939
	Gundaroo Drive	Paul Coe Crescent	Northbound	546	658	853	1,115	1,093	1,369
Gundaroo Drive	Mirrabei Drive	Gungahlin Drive	Westbound	987	1,659	1,700	819	1,152	1,407
	Gungahlin Drive	Mirrabei Drive	Eastbound	925	1,350	1,546	938	1,436	1,460
	Abena Avenue	Barton Highway	Westbound	1,342	2,056	2,016	920	1,032	1,255
	Barton Highway	Abena Avenue	Eastbound	746	764	951	1,088	1,450	1,671
Estimated Gungahlin Population				69,058	80,940	92,778	69,058	80,940	92,778

- (b) Predictions for 2022 and 2025 are not available through the Canberra Transport Strategic Model. Refer to the above traffic modelling analysis.

- (2) (a) Civil works on the duplication of Gundaroo Drive including the signalisation of Mirrabai Drive intersection are scheduled for completion by 30 September 2018 (weather permitting). Landscaping consolidation works will follow civil works completion however the road will remain operational during these works.
- (b) \$31.185m was allocated in the Territory budget for the duplication of Gundaroo Drive (Stage 1). A further \$2.8m has been allocated for signalisation of the Gundaroo Drive/Mirrabei Drive intersection in 2018-19.
- (c) Nine reported accidents have occurred within the construction area since the commencement of works.
- (d) No incidents specifically relating to pedestrian safety have been reported as occurring within the construction area since the commencement of works.
- (e) Two near misses has been reported occurring within the construction area since the commencement of works.
- (f) Approved Temporary Traffic Management plans are implemented on site to safely manage traffic and pedestrian and cyclist access. Temporary paths have been used to provide alternative routes for pedestrians and work areas are isolated from pedestrian paths.
- (g) There will be full signalised pedestrian movements at the Gundaroo Drive/Gungahlin Drive intersection and the Mirrabai Drive/Gundaroo Drive intersection on completion of the works. A new mid-block signalised pedestrian crossing between Nari Street and Gungahlin Drive is also being constructed as part of the project. There is an underpass under Gundaroo Drive between

Gungahlin Drive and Nari Street available for pedestrian and cyclist use that is retained as part of the project.

- (h) 14 WHS incidents have been reported within the construction area.
  - (i) Hazards identified and mitigation measures include: 1. Risk of objects falling into traffic lanes while loading/unloading – use of spotter when loading/unloading and use of stop/slow bat on adjacent traffic lanes. 2. Risk of service strikes when excavating – additional service locating undertaken and amendment to Safe Work Method Statements to utilise mud buckets in lieu of toothed buckets.
- (3) Future estimated transport demands taken from the Canberra Strategic Transport Model are used to determine which sections of roads require additional capacity or duplication.

When undertaking the intersection traffic analysis for the proposed signalisation of the Gundaroo Drive/Mirrabei Drive intersection it was identified that there is a high demand in the AM peak for vehicles turning right from Mirrabei Drive into Gundaroo Drive through the intersection. To accommodate this, a two lane right turn movement was required to minimise queuing and delays for this movement.

- (4) Mirrabei Drive is having an additional lane constructed southbound between Paul Coe Crescent (south) and Gundaroo Drive. This will provide two lanes southbound from Paul Coe Crescent to Gundaroo Drive. The traffic modelling does not show a demand for northbound duplication at this time.
- (5) Duplication of Mirrabei Drive northbound is not currently on the 10 year infrastructure plan.
- (6) Transport Canberra and City Services and the Minister's office have responded to a number of concerns raised during construction.
- (7) Key concerns raised and responses to these include:
  - i. Duration of the works – The project has experienced significant challenges in adjusting or relocating third party utility services which has caused delays beyond the original forecast completion. TCCS have worked with the construction contractor to expedite completion of the works, mitigating some of the impacts of recent wet weather.
  - ii. Concerns regarding the continuity of noise walls along the extent of the duplication – Additional noise walls totalling 138m of extra length have already been provided as part of the project (beyond what was originally proposed and DA approved). Investigations are being undertaken into providing additional mitigation measures at breaks in the noise walls.
  - iii. Site tidiness – The contractor has consolidated stockpiles of materials, slashed long grass and removed waste from the site. TCCS is continuing to work with the contractor to ensure the site remains in a tidy state.
- (8) Works are being delivered within with the contract program which accommodates approved extensions of time of approximately 15 months. The project is still being delivered within the approved budget.

- (a) See response to Question 7.
- (b) See response to Question 8.
- (9) Local residents have been provided with updates regarding the project via letter box drops on three occasions in the last 12 months. In addition there have been updates on the Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) website, and regular updates have been provided to the Gungahlin Community Council.
- (10) Construction has commenced.
- (11) Stage 2 duplication is programmed for completion in the second quarter 2020.

**ACTION bus service—patronage  
(Question No 1517)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) What was the total patronage for each Transport Canberra bus route on Wednesday 23 May 2018.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The total patronage for each Transport Canberra bus route on the regular network for Wednesday 23 May 2018 are as follows:

Route	Patronage on 23 May 2018
1	1,699
10	387
101	618
11	518
12	451
14	355
15	366
16	369
160	144
161	115
162	151
163	335
164	135
17	840
171	502
18	212
182	594
19	43
2	2,647
200	5,205
21	241



Route	Patronage on 23 May 2018
22	172
23	235
24	255
25	427
250	927
251	941
252	955
254	546
255	863
259	534
26	430
27	500
3	2,566
30	1,498
300	2,650
31	1,061
313	3,996
314	1,713
315	1,570
316	1,196
318	1,570
319	3,036
343	4,075
39	1,428
4	821
40	1,682
43	52
44	410
45	150
51	895
52	708
54	671
55	337
56	927
57	721
58	765
59	173
6	2,813
60	454
61	314
62	369
63	302
64	386
65	753
66	480
67	614
7	1,555
705	202
71	737

Route	Patronage on 23 May 2018
712	191
714	136
717	173
718	156
719	166
720	175
725	131
726	107
732	140
743	419
744	277
749	76
765	174
767	139
775	76
783	52
791	145
792	237
8	449
80	659
81	26
83	377
88	40
9	305
<b>Total</b>	<b>71,188</b>

---

### **Access Canberra—service delivery (Question No 1518)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) How many of the 41 full-time equivalents employed as Access Canberra contact centre operators (in relation to question on notice No 1296) are assigned to answer phone calls at any one time from (a) 7am-9am Monday to Friday, (b) 9am-5pm Monday to Friday, (c) 5pm-8pm Monday to Friday, (d) 8am-5pm Saturday and (e) 9am-5pm Sunday.
- (2) How many are assigned to respond to other forms of contact, including emails, mail, and online contact forms at any one time from (a) 7am-9am Monday to Friday, (b) 9am-5pm Monday to Friday, (c) 5pm-8pm Monday to Friday, (d) 8am-5pm Saturday and (e) 9am-5pm Sunday.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Access Canberra Contact Centre rosters staff according to call volumes and trends. The total available call takers vary throughout the day depending on demand.

- (2) As above, depending on work load, staff are rostered on to complete administrative tasks or written customer requests within the 41 full time equivalents, based on workload. Outside of normal business hours operators complete this contact between calls.

---

**ACT public service—contractors**  
**(Question No 1519)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Chief Minister*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 92 staff on a temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, which represents 3.8% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- (b) There are currently 69 staff on a temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, which represents 2.9% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- (c) There are currently 88 staff on a temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, which represents 3.7% of the public servants within the Directorate.

---

**ACT public service—contractors**  
**(Question No 1520)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Urban Renewal, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1533.

---

**ACT public service—contractors**  
**(Question No 1521)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Economic Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Economic Development*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

### **ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1522)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Speaker, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms J Burch:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

As at 8 June 2018, the number and percentage of public servants employed on contracts within the Office of the Legislative Assembly was as follows:

	<b>FTE</b>	<b>% of the Office's total FTE</b>
(a) 3 months or less	Nil	—
(b) from 3 months to 6 months	0.8	1.8%
(c) from 6 months to 12 months	1.0	2.2%

In addition to those individuals, there are a total of 14 staff who the Office employs periodically on casual contracts.

### **ACT public service—contractors (Question No 1523)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Treasurer*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1524)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1543.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1525)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 58 staff on temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, which represents 3.1% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- (b) There are currently 56 staff on temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, which represents 3.0% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- (c) There are currently 49 staff on temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, which represents 2.6% of the public servants within the Directorate.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1526)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1525.

I am advised that ACT Policing fell outside the scope of this question as, under the *Australian Federal Police Act 1979* (Cth), members remain officers of the Commonwealth and the AFP Commissioner retains responsibility for the general administration, and control of the operations of the AFP.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1527)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1543.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1528)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1529)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1530)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1543.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1531)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1543.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1532)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1533.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1533)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 34 staff on temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, which represents 4.4% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (b) There are currently 28 staff on temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, which represents 3.6% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (c) There are currently 42 staff on temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, which represents 5.4% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- 

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1534)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1543.

---



**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1535)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Tourism and Major Events*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1536)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1537)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for the Arts and Community Events, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1519.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1538)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Veterans and Seniors, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1543.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1539)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to Question on Notice 1533.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1540)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1525.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1541)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1525.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1542)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Health Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1546.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1543)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 48 staff on a temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Community Services Directorate, which represents 5.1% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- (b) There are currently 46 staff on a temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Community Services Directorate, which represents 4.9% of the public servants within the Directorate.

- (c) There are currently 34 staff on a temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Community Services Directorate, which represents 3.6% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- 

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1544)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

With regards to the employment of temporary contract staff within the Community Services Directorate, I refer the Member to the response provided to question on Notice 1543.

---

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1545)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 120 staff on temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Education Directorate, which represents 1.8% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (b) There are currently 112 staff on temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Education Directorate, which represents 1.6% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (c) There are currently 747 staff on temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Education Directorate, which represents 11.0% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- 

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1546)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 93 staff on temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Health Directorate, which represents 1.2% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (b) There are currently 285 staff on temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Health Directorate, which represents 3.7% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (c) There are currently 617 staff on temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Health Directorate, which represents 8.1% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- 

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1547)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Transport and City Services*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 28 staff on temporary contract of 3 months or less within Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, which represents 1.5% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (b) There are currently 30 staff on temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, which represents 1.6% of the public servants within the Directorate.
  - (c) There are currently 50 staff on temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, which represents 2.6% of the public servants within the Directorate.
- 

**ACT public service—contractors  
(Question No 1548)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Higher Education, Training and Research*):

How many and what percentage of public servants are employed on contracts of (a) 3 months or less, (b) from 3 months to 6 months, (c) from 6 months to 12 months, for each directorate and agency for which the Minister is responsible.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are currently 39 staff on temporary contract of 3 months or less within the Canberra Institute of Technology, which represents 4.4% of the public servants within the Institute.
  - (b) There are currently 26 staff on temporary contract of 3 months to 6 months in length within the Canberra Institute of Technology, which represents 2.9% of the public servants within the Institute.
  - (c) There are currently 106 staff on temporary contract of 6 months to 12 months in length within the Canberra Institute of Technology, which represents 12.0% of the public servants within the Institute.
- 

### **Planning—land use (Question No 1549)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Urban Renewal*):

- (1) What is the status of ownership of the land at Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick.
- (2) Has any agreement for sale of the land been entered into by the government with Capital Recycling Solutions; if so (a) what is the status of that sale, (b) when will the transfer be complete and (c) is the transaction no longer on foot; if not, why not.
- (3) What valuation for the property was conducted prior to the agreement to sell.
- (4) What price has been, or was agreed to by the government with Capital Recycling Solutions for the sale of the land.
- (5) Did the sale require public listing; if not, why not.
- (6) What other offers were received for the site.
- (7) What is the current zoning for Block 11 Section 8.
- (8) Do zoning requirements allow railway activities to be carried out on Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick; if not, has any agreement been made between the buyer and the government to allow railway activities to be carried out on this block.
- (9) What remediation works need to be carried out on Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick and who (a) has the responsibility for conducting those remediation works and (b) will be financially liable for these remediation works.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick is currently unleased Territory land.

- (2) The Minister for Planning and Land Management has agreed that Capital Recycling Solutions (CRS) is eligible for a direct sale of Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick, however the proponent (CRS) is required to satisfy the terms of the Minister's agreement to the direct sale before a Crown lease can be issued.
- (3) Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick has been valued in accordance with standard operating procedures relating to the direct sale of land. In lieu of a competitive process three market valuations were originally undertaken in May 2017, and the highest valuation was adopted as the market value for the site. At that time the land was valued at \$970,000 (ex GST). In May 2018, this valuation was updated and reconfirmed by the same valuation provider that supplied the adopted valuation.
- (4) The price for the land has been agreed to be \$970,000 (ex GST), less a contribution of \$181,818 (ex GST), independently costed, for infrastructure works to be undertaken by CRS on behalf of the ACT Government.
- (5) When a Crown lease is granted by way of direct sale the details of the sale are required to be tabled under section 242 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. This is undertaken on a quarterly basis.
- (6) None, the direct sale is as a result in an application made by CRS under a former business name.
- (7) Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick is zoned *IZ2: Industrial Mixed Use* under the Territory Plan.
- (8) Railway activities are not permitted within the zoning of Block 11 Section 8 Fyshwick; and no agreement has been made between CRS and the Government. However, it is understood that railway activities are permitted within the adjacent existing railway corridor, that being Block 11 Section 47 Fyshwick.
- (9) Given that the land has been proposed to be sold as a contiguous parcel at the request of the proponent, the Government has not undertaken any studies to determine whether there is any requirement for remediation works on the site.

It is standard practice for the purchaser of a site to accept the land as it is at the time of sale and as such all costs associated with remediation works (if required) are the responsibility of the purchaser.

---

### **Disability services—funding (Question No 1550)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Has the government cut funding for Epilepsy ACT from the 2018-19 budget; if so, why has the funding been cut.
- (2) Will Epilepsy ACT be able to access the \$1.8 million set aside in the 2018-19 budget for those with support needs not covered by the NDIS.

- (3) On what basis was funding provided to organisations providing support for those with disability.
- (4) How was the sum of \$1.8 million arrived at as an adequate budget allocation for those not eligible for NDIS support.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Funding for Epilepsy ACT was not cut in the 2018-19 ACT budget. ACT Government disability funding was transferred to the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) in 2016 as part of the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS). NDIS participants engage a provider for their required disability supports and pay the provider using funds from their NDIS plan. The NDIA provides funding to providers through the Information Linkages and Capacity Building (ILC) grant program. From July 2016 until February 2018 Epilepsy ACT received \$142,000 in ILC transitional funding. Epilepsy ACT has also received \$44,800 in funding through an NDIS Business Investment Package to assist them to develop their business model.
- (2) The ACT Government has allocated \$1.120 million for an emergency funding pool in the 2018-19 budget. The provision of funding will be assessed on a case by case basis for people with disability who have high and complex disability support needs and for people who may not be eligible for the NDIS due to residency or eligibility requirements. Funding will then be provided to an appropriate disability support provider who the participants choose and who has the relevant skills and experience to support people with disability. The remaining funding from the \$1.8 million budget allocation includes funding for the provision of individual advocacy services and for the employment of coordination staff within the Office for Disability to work with the NDIA and the mainstream service system.
- (3) See response to (2) above.
- (4) When determining the budget allocation request, the Office for Disability assessed historical Disability ACT data which included the number of people who previously received emergency funding, the amount of funding that was accessed and the types of disability supports that were required. The potential requirement for additional funding in 2019-20 will be informed by the outcome of negotiations with the Commonwealth on NDIS full scheme arrangements, which will take effect from 1 July 2019.

---

### **Business—Fyshwick (Question No 1551)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) What is the current number of businesses with a registered address In Fyshwick.
- (2) Has any assessment been made as to the type of businesses operating in Fyshwick; if so, how are they categorised.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Business registration is not a function held by Access Canberra or the ACT Government. *Business* names are registered with the Australian Securities and



Investments Commission (ASIC) and information about business registrations or the business name register should be obtained from ASIC.

- (2) No assessments of this type has been undertaken.

---

### **Planning—Fyshwick (Question No 1552)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Does Fyshwick have a Master Plan; if so, (a) when was it last updated or community consultation undertaken and (b) if not, why does it not have a Master Plan.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No. Fyshwick does not have a master plan.
- (a) n/a
- (b) The Master Plan Program was an initiative of the 2012 ACT Planning Strategy that prioritised studies on centres and areas of urban intensification in and around town and group centres and along the major public transport routes.

The planning requirements for Fyshwick are set out in the Fyshwick Precinct Code which confirms the permissible and non-permissible uses of the land. Fyshwick was not included as part of the Master plan Program as there was no view to change the zoning for the area and it is not a group or town centre. It did not therefore meet the criteria for review in the Master plan program. The locations identified for the master plan program are now all either finalised or being finalised.

---

### **Minister for Health and Wellbeing—meetings (Question No 1553)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing*):

- (1) Are notes taken at each meeting that the Minister attends in her capacity as Minister for Health and Wellbeing; if not, are there any circumstances in which notes would not be taken after a meeting.
- (2) Who is responsible for taking these notes.
- (3) Does the Minister, her Chief of Staff, or other senior members of her staff review the minutes or notes taken after meetings to ensure that the notes reflect what happened in the meeting.
- (4) Does the Departmental Liaison Officer ensure that relevant notes from meetings are forwarded to the Department for follow up.

- (5) If the Minister holds a meeting with another Minister, are both Ministers responsible for ensuring notes are taken in this meeting and for ensuring the notes reflect the decisions taken in the meeting.
- (6) If the Minister holds a meeting with Directorate officers, are notes taken by her office, the Directorate or both.
- (7) Does the Minister refer to notes from previous meetings as a way of following through on decisions from previous meetings.
- (8) Who is responsible for ensuring that copies of records of meetings are retained and stored for future use.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Notes are not taken at every meeting the Minister attends as this is not always necessary.
- (2) Staff members, Directorate Liaison Officers or the Minister may all take notes. It depends on the meeting.
- (3) Sometimes.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Ministers might not need to take notes if they are meeting informally, but this will depend on the meeting and who is involved. Both Ministers are responsible for following up on issues that are raised and asking staff to action any outcomes.
- (6) Depends on the meeting.
- (7) Yes, when required.
- (8) Depends on which staff or officials attend the meeting.

---

**Minister for Mental Health—meetings  
(Question No 1554)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Are notes taken at each meeting that the Minister attends in his capacity as Minister for Mental Health; if not, are there any circumstances in which notes would not be taken after a meeting.
- (2) Who is responsible for taking these notes.
- (3) Does the Minister, his Chief of Staff, or other senior members of his staff review the minutes or notes taken after meetings to ensure that the notes reflect what happened in the meeting.

- (4) Does the Departmental Liaison Officer ensure that relevant notes from meetings are forwarded to the Department for follow up.
- (5) If the Minister holds a meeting with another Minister, are both Ministers responsible for ensuring notes are taken in this meeting and for ensuring the notes reflect the decisions taken in the meeting.
- (6) If the Minister holds a meeting with Directorate officers, are notes taken by his office, the Directorate or both.
- (7) Does the Minister refer to notes from previous meetings as a way of following through on decisions from previous meetings.
- (8) Who is responsible for ensuring that copies of records of meetings are retained and stored for future use.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Notes are not taken at every meeting that the Minister attends. Notes may be taken, either by the Minister or other staff in attendance, if it is deemed necessary in order to be able to identify actions and issues raised at a meeting and follow up on them. There are no formal minutes taken out of meetings between Ministers.
- (2) Refer to answer to Question 1.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes, where appropriate.
- (5) Refer to answer to Question 1. Both Ministers are responsible for following up on the range of issues that are discussed at those meetings.
- (6) This will depend on the content of the meeting and which staff are in attendance.
- (7) Yes, where relevant.
- (8) This will vary depending on which staff are in attendance at each meeting.

---

**Government—contractors  
(Question No 1555)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Why were so many contractors engaged on 3 April 2017, in relation to question on notice No 1312.
- (2) If contractors were needed for significant projects at that time; what was (a) the specific project and (b) the number of contractors engaged in relation to that project.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The number of contractors appearing to commence contracts as at 3 April 2017 was due to the existing contractors transitioning from previous arrangements with the Territory to the new Contractor Central arrangements.

- (2) These contractors were engaged across a number of Territory projects for different directorates/agencies at the time. Specific details of what particular projects they were engaged for is not held centrally.

---

**Government—contractors  
(Question No 1556)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Does the ACT Government publish contracts valued above \$25,000 that were engaged through the Contractor Central system or Comensura on the Notifiable Contracts Register; if yes (a) what is the total number of the contracts valued above \$25,000 that were engaged through Contractor Central or Comensura that have been published on the Notifiable Contracts Register since the commencement of Contractor Central to date and (b) if not, why not.
- (2) How many contracts valued above \$25,000 have been engaged through the Contractor Central system or Comensura since its commencement to date If the answer to part (1) is no.
- (3) Do ACT Directorates publish contract information for contracts valued above \$25,000 that were engaged through the Contractor Central system or Comensura as part of annual report requirements; if not, why not.
- (4) How is expenditure on the ACT Government's contingent workforce (a) monitored and (b) reported.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Individual employment contracts arising from engagements of contractors are not published on the Notifiable Contracts Register as they are not required to be notified under the Government Procurement Act 2001.
- (2) Up until April this year, 381 contracts over \$25,000 have been undertaken.
- (3) No. These details are not published in the Annual Reports for the same reasons that apply as for response (1) above.
- (4) (a) Directorates and agencies are responsible for managing their individual expenditure.  
  
(b) Comensura provides regular reporting to the directorates as to the activity relating to the Contractor Central arrangements.

---

**ACT Policing—gun ownership  
(Question No 1557)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) What is the average cost of undertaking a mental health check when applying for a firearms licence in the ACT, and is this cost borne by the individual or the ACT Government.
- (2) Are all individuals who apply for a firearms licence in the ACT required to undergo mental health checks.
- (3) Does this differ depending on the category of firearms licence and does this differ if the individual currently holds a firearms licence for a different category of firearm.
- (4) How many mental health checks have been required in order for an individual to obtain a firearms licence in the ACT in 2017-18 to date and how many have resulted in a licence being declined.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Any costs associated with undertaking a mental health check are the responsibility of the individual applicant. If a person is asked to provide further information regarding their mental health status or treatment, it is most commonly provided in the form of a letter from their physician (preferably a treating mental health professional) commenting on the ability of the applicant to responsibly handle firearms. Therefore, the costs of the check are based on the individual physician's service charges.
- (2) Not all individuals who apply for a firearms licence in the ACT are required to undergo mental health checks. Mental health checks are only sought if the applicant discloses an issue, or if a mental health issue comes to police attention. This is consistent with other jurisdictions in Australia.
- (3) This does not differ depending on the category of firearms licence and it does not differ if the individual currently holds a firearms licence for a different category of firearm. The category of licence is not a consideration.
- (4) The Registrar for Firearms may request that an applicant disclose personal health information relevant to the applicant's ability to handle firearms responsibly, and may refuse to consider an application if the information is not provided.

Mental health checks are not a mandatory requirement to obtain a firearms licence, and as such the number of checks required in 2017-18 have not been tracked by ACT Policing. Notwithstanding this ACT Policing has advised me that during 2017-18 to date, three licence applications have been declined on mental health grounds in the ACT. During the same time 10 licences have been suspended on mental health grounds.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—programs (Question No 1558)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Is there a new eligibility criteria for the Throughcare program at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC); if so, can the Minister outline (a) what the revised

eligibility criteria are to access Throughcare, (b) how these criteria are impacting on participant numbers at the AMC and (c) if these changes have impacted on the participation and completion rates for indigenous participants, both male and female.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. (1) A 2017 evaluation of the ACT Corrective Services' (ACTCS) Extended Throughcare Pilot Program by the Social Policy Research Centre of the University of New South Wales (the Evaluation), identified weaknesses in program eligibility criteria. In recognition of the recommendations made in the Evaluation, the eligibility criteria for the Extended Throughcare Program were amended. These changes have allowed ACTCS to appropriately target clients who are in most need of support by setting a lower eligibility point for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander clients and extending the program to male and female remand and sentenced detainees.

(a) The Extended Throughcare Program can now be accessed by:

- women who have served greater than 30 days (one month) in custody;
- men who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and have served greater than 91 days (three months) in custody; and
- men who do not identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and have served greater than 182 days (six months) in custody.

These changes recognise that detainees subject to a lengthy period of remand require support to successfully reintegrate into the community.

(b) Changes to the eligibility criteria for the Extended Throughcare Program came into effect on 1 April 2018. As the program is available to clients for up to 12 months post release from the AMC, current participant numbers include clients that were eligible for participation in the program prior to changes to the eligibility criteria. Given this, there is insufficient data to evaluate any significant impact on participant numbers at the AMC.

(c) ACTCS cannot provide completion rates for male and female Indigenous clients. The Extended Throughcare Program aims to provide a service coordination point for other community providers in the ACT and works with a wide range of services and non-government organisations to best support the diverse needs of clients. Clients access the service voluntarily and the length of time a client engages with the program varies based on the individual's needs. As such, clients do not 'complete' the program – the depth and duration of each client's engagement varies.

---

### **Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—Reconciliation Day (Question No 1559)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Tourism and Major Events*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the costs associated with the inaugural Reconciliation in the Park event held on 28 May 2018 in Glebe Park, Civic, including both operational costs and Directorate staff costs.

- (2) What was the estimated public attendance at this event.
- (3) Can the Minister specify which community run indigenous organisations that participated in this event.
- (4) Were any individual performers or participants paid for their role in the event.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1)

Category	Cost EX GST
Operational costs	\$23,362.95
Infrastructure costs	\$28,350.86
Program costs	\$58,920.76
Marketing/campaign	\$15,000.00
Marketing/campaign external	\$500.00
Staff overtime (Events ACT)	\$3,060.09
Staff overtime (CSD)	\$0
Contingency	\$15,000.00
<b>TOTAL EX GST</b>	<b>\$144,194.66</b>

- (2) The estimated attendance was 8,000 across the event duration. This calculation is based on crowd density per square metre (4 people), crowd flow for ingress and egress, and comparative estimates with other event venues e.g. Civic Square on New Year's Eve. These movements are monitored by the event team throughout the day.
- (3) The following community Indigenous organisations participated in the event:

Organisation	Category
Burrnju Art Gallery	Indigenous Community
United Ngunnawal Elders Council	Indigenous Community
Thunderstone	Indigenous Commercial
ANTaR ACT	Indigenous Non-Government Organisation
Reconciliation Australia	Indigenous Non-Government Organisation

- (4) All performers were paid in accordance with their individual fees. Some activities such as *Making Peas/ce* and the *ACT Schools Reconciliation Challenge* were funded by grants that enabled their participation. Exhibitors were not paid, however they received a marquee at the event free of charge (paid for out of the event budget).

---

## Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—programs (Question No 1560)

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Given that Tjillari Justice Aboriginal Corporation is an important service provider for indigenous cultural and training programs, and that there is no agreement in place, can the Minister confirm if Tjillari will be engaged to deliver additional programs at the Alexander Maconochie Centre in the financial year 2018-19.

- (2) Is it typical for service providers to be engaged on an ad hoc basis or should Tjillari expect to receive a contract, agreement or memorandum of understanding in the near future.
- (3) Is there a schedule for the next twelve months for the highly successful Tjillari program “Strong Culture, Strong Families”.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) confirms Tjillari Justice Aboriginal Corporation will deliver the “Strong Culture, Strong Families” program in the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) in the financial year 2018-2019.
- (2) Tjillari Justice Aboriginal Corporation donate the “Strong Culture, Strong Families” for detainees at the AMC. ACTCS do not provide contract’s to services that are not funded by ACT Government.
- (3) There is one day of “Strong Culture, Strong Families” scheduled in July 2018.

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—programs (Question No 1561)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Can the Minister outline the proactive measures being put in place to source employment for detainees once released from the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC).
- (2) What are the current employment rates for; (a) non-indigenous and (b) indigenous detainees once released across, (i) full-time, (ii) part-time and (iii) casual employment for (A) male and (B) female detainees.
- (3) Can the Minister provide details on the literacy and numeracy testing results and training programs offered to detainees from a broader training perspective.
- (4) What are the results for the literacy and numeracy testing for (a) non-indigenous and (b) indigenous detainees across (i) male and (ii) female populations.
- (5) What are the participation rates for all employment and education programs currently offered at the AMC for (a) non-indigenous and (b) indigenous detainees across (i) male and (ii) female populations.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) Extended Throughcare program, in conjunction with case management in the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC), assists individuals to explore training or employment options post release.

Extended Throughcare has relationships with several training providers and job network providers within the ACT. ACTCS continues to explore the Canberra work landscape to source and create new partnerships designed to support higher numbers of people into employment.



- (2) ACTCS do not record this data in a format that is easily extracted.
- (3) During AMC education induction, detainees are assessed against the nationally recognised Australian Core Skills Framework (ACSF) which assesses against the five cores skills of Learning, Reading, Writing, Oral communication and Numeracy, at five levels of performance ACSF 1 to ACSF 5, and across 3 domains of communication.

Approximately 60 per cent of detainees at the AMC assess at an average ACSF level 2, indicating that they would encounter difficulties completing Australian Skills Quality Authority Certificate levels III and above. Accordingly the majority of training courses provided at the AMC are at Certificate level II.

Detainees assessing at ACSF levels 1-2 (43.4 per cent of male and 46 per cent of female detainees on 12 June 2018) are enrolled into Foundation Skills Certificate 1 courses while detainees assessing at ACSF 2 and above (48.4 per cent of male and 54 per cent of female detainees on 12 June 2018) are enrolled in Foundation Skills Certificate II.

Detainees enrolling in Vocational Education Training (VET) qualification units at Certificate II level generally require core skills at ACSF level 2 and above.

If individuals assess at less than ACSF level 2, but wish to enrol in certificate II VET units they are supported to complete a Foundation Skills qualification at Certificate I level.

- (4) While the combined number of detainees assessed at ACSF level 2 and below is similar, the number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees assessing at ACSF 1 level within that group is higher, approximately 60 per cent compared to 40 per cent for non-indigenous.

Data in table 1 to provides an indication of where detainees are completing foundation skills units in June 2018 as a result of ACSF assessment.

Level	Male Non Indigenous	Male Indigenous	Total Males Enrolled	% of *total	Female (Non Indigenous)	Female Indigenous	Total Females Enrolled	% of *total	Total enrolled	%
FSK20113 (LLN routine ACSF $\geq 2$ )	146	19	165	48.4%	16	3	19	5.6%	184	54%
FSK10213 (LLN simple ACSF $\leq 2$ )	57	11	68	19.9%	3	2	5	1.5%	73	21.4%
FSK10113 (LLN basic ACSF $\geq 1$ )	57	23	80	23.5%	2	2	4	1.2%	84	24.6%
Total	260	53	313	91.7%	21	7	28	8.3%	*341	100%

\* Figure contains duplicates as it also shows detainees who are enrolled in more than one qualification as a result of their VET elective choices.

- (5) Participation rates for education courses in the AMC vary widely from 50 per cent to 100 per cent, and do not accurately reflect education engagement. The variance is due to many factors including the location of detainee cohort accommodation area, relevance to AMC employment, scheduling conflicts, security requirements and course particulars.

However, enrolment rates for education programs offered at the AMC are high across all the AMC detainee cohorts (approximately 78 per cent overall – of which 92 per cent are male and 8 per cent female).

Employment and education data from June 2018 is listed in the below table.

	Non Indigenous		Indigenous	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Service Industry (R102)	151	13	27	4
Education programs (OP105)^	230	20	56	12

^Education programs include Pre-certificate Level 1, Secondary School, AQF Vocational Education & Training Education and Higher Education courses.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—housing (Question No 1562)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) Can the Minister provide detail of the support options provided to detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) to source suitable housing.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of rates of homelessness prior to entering the AMC for (a) non-indigenous and (b) indigenous detainees.
- (3) What role does Throughcare play in assisting with securing housing as well as follow up with recently released detainees.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) assists sentenced detainees to find suitable housing as part of pre-release planning. This involves exploring options and sourcing appropriate post-release accommodation, whether it is with family and friends, Housing ACT, residential rehabilitation centres, local community-based services or supports in other jurisdictions.

If no suitable accommodation is available, and usually only where the detainee is due for release on a head sentence or supervision order, ACTCS will refer detainees to OneLink or a suitable crisis accommodation provider.

If a detainee is eligible for supported accommodation under the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), ACTCS will explore accommodation options in partnership with the detainee, guardian, family/carers or other nominated persons, the NDIS Coordinator and relevant stakeholders.

- (2) ACTCS does not keep information of this nature in a format that can be easily translated into rates of homelessness for non-Indigenous and Indigenous detainees. Information about a detainee's homelessness prior to entering the AMC is self-reported and, as such, data garnered from detainee records may not provide an accurate rate of homelessness in the detainee population.
- (3) Extended Throughcare Program staff provide clients with assistance in exploring accommodation options and completing referrals. Financial support may also be provided through the payment of the first week's rent or other fees associated with securing a detainee's placement in community or crisis accommodation. Throughcare staff will continue follow-up with clients for the duration of their engagement in the program.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—health services (Question No 1563)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 8 June 2018:

- (1) What is the policy pertaining to the supervision of inmates receiving health services outside of the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC).
- (2) What is the minimum number of AMC guards required to supervise these inmates.
- (3) Are ACT Policing or other ACT Government employees required to supervise these inmates.
- (4) Are inmates provided with regular hospital meals while receiving care at the Canberra Hospital, or are they given the option to order takeaway/delivery from external restaurants; if so, who pays for the meals from external restaurants.
- (5) While receiving health care outside of the AMC, can inmates engage with visitors.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The *Corrections Management (Escort) Policy and Operating Procedure 2017* outlines the supervision requirements for detainees to attend an external health care facility. This Policy and Operating Procedure is restricted.
- (2) Staffing levels for escorts are determined based on risk, however in most circumstances a standard escort would necessitate two corrections officers.
- (3) No, ACTCS supervises all escorts of detainees in ACTCS legal custody.
- (4) Detainees are entitled to be provided with sufficient food and drink to avoid hunger and poor nourishment. Where a detainee is receiving outpatient care, or health care services not requiring admission to an external health care facility, the detainee may

be provided with a packed lunch, prepared by the AMC Catering Unit. Where a detainee is required to be admitted to an external health care facility for an extended duration, the detainee will be provided with patient meals by the health care facility. ACTCS does not provide detainees with takeaway food or delivery options.

- (5) If a detainee's admission to an external health care facility has required ACTCS to notify the nominated Next of Kin (NoK), the NoK are able to arrange visitation while the detainee remains in the health care facility.

---

### **Health—chemotherapy (Question No 1564)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 8 June 2018 (*redirected to the Acting Minister for Health and Wellbeing*):

- (1) In relation to the answer given at (2) in question without notice taken on notice, dated 11 May 2018, does the “co-payment for chemotherapy” refer to the chemotherapy medication or the chemotherapy treatment service.
- (2) What is the average amount of the co-payment across relevant chemotherapy medications if the co-payment refers to the medication.
- (3) If the co-payment refers to the treatment service (a) why is a co-payment required and (b) what is the average amount of the co-payment across relevant chemotherapy treatment programs.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) “Co-payment for chemotherapy” refers to the chemotherapy medication.
- (2) Chemotherapy co-payments are set in accordance with PBS schedules. Currently, per medication, the general rate is \$39.50 and the concession rate is \$6.40.

On 4 July 2018 the ACT Government announced that ACT cancer patients will receive more financial support during their chemotherapy treatments, with the ACT Government delivering on our commitment to meet the cost of chemotherapy medication co-payments. Work is underway to have this in place by the end of July 2018.

- (3) “Co-payment for chemotherapy” does not refer to the chemotherapy treatment service.

---

## **Questions without notice taken on notice**

### **Senator for the Australian Capital Territory—casual vacancy**

**Mr Barr** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Coe on Wednesday, 9 May 2018*):

I first became aware that former Senator Katy Gallagher may have been ineligible to stand as a candidate for the 2016 Federal Election on or around the 29 August 2017 through media reporting.

**ACTION bus service—Xpresso services**

**Ms Fitzharris** (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Le Couteur on Tuesday, 31 July 2018*):

Travel times will vary in individual circumstances. Network timetables will be developed following finalisation of the route network, which is currently the subject of community consultation. Timetables will be available later in 2018.