



Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

NINTH ASSEMBLY

21 MARCH 2019

www.hansard.act.gov.au

Thursday, 21 March 2019

Mr Grant Lalor (Motion of condolence)	917
Petitions:	
Violence in schools—petition 5-19	919
Violence in schools—petition 8-19	920
ANU public transport—petition 6-19	920
Motion to take note of petitions	921
Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Motion of no confidence)	929
Unparliamentary language (Statement by Speaker)	958
Questions without notice:	
Taxation—reform	958
Municipal services—waste collection	959
ACT Health—workplace culture	960
ACT Health—workplace culture	961
ACT Health—workplace culture	961
Government—sport and recreation grants	962
Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—unauthorised examinations	964
Government—business support grants	964
ACT Health—performance reports	966
Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—equipment	967
Enlighten festival—autumn festival activities	968
Canberra Hospital—intensive care unit	970
ACT Health—workplace culture	970
Roads—resurfacing techniques	971
Papers	973
Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee	974
Building regulatory reforms (Ministerial statement)	975
Ministerial delegation to Singapore (Ministerial statement)	980
Alexander Maconochie Centre—Winnunga model of care (Ministerial statement)	980
Tolerance and inclusion (Matter of public importance)	984
End of Life Choices in the ACT—Select Committee	990
Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee	999
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee	999
Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee	999
Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2019	1000
Leave for members	1001
Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee	1002
Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee	1002
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee	1003
Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee	1003
Executive business—precedence	1003
Welcoming Cities network	1004
Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2019	1011
Adjournment:	
Arts—Cultural Facilities Corporation	1031
Schools—Lyneham	1032
Sport—Rugby League	1034
Multicultural affairs—mother languages	1035

Yerrabi electorate	1036
Mental health—question, persuade, refer training	1037
Appendix A	1040
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2019	1041
Answers to questions:	
Canberra Hospital—plumbing issues (Question No 2115)	1043
ACT Health—office of clinical leadership (Question No 2116)	1043
ACT Health—organisational changes (Question No 2118)	1044
Answers to questions on notice—timeliness (Question No 2120)	1045
Answers to questions on notice—timeliness (Question No 2121)	1046
ACT Health—workplace culture (Question No 2124)	1047
Mental health—duress alarms (Question No 2126)	1048
Health—immunisation (Question No 2127)	1048
Health—funding (Question No 2131)	1051
Crime—infringement notices (Question No 2132)	1051
ACT Health—health leadership event (Question No 2135)	1052
ACT Health—organisational changes (Question No 2137)	1053
ACT Health—health services advisory group (Question No 2141)	1055
Environment—Strathnairn sheep dip site (Question No 2142)	1057
Municipal services—trees (Question No 2143)	1058
Animals—veterinary fees (Question No 2144)	1058
Animals—livestock care (Question No 2145)	1059
Taxation—rates (Question No 2146)	1059
Environment—chemical disposal sites (Question No 2147)	1060
Ginninderry—environment (Question No 2149)	1060
Animals—desexing (Question No 2150)	1061
Animals—cat containment (Question No 2151)	1061
Environment—Canberra Centenary Trail (Question No 2152)	1062
Environment—blackberry spraying (Question No 2153)	1063
National Multicultural Festival—stalls (Question No 2154)	1064
Public housing—insulation (Question No 2155)	1065
Health—mobile phone technology (Question No 2156)	1065
Education—violence in schools (Question No 2157)	1066
Waste—Hume materials recovery facility (Question No 2158)	1067
Homelessness—services (Question No 2160)	1069
Vehicles—registration (Question No 2161)	1074
Government—land and property acquisitions (Question Nos 2162-2199) ..	1076
Government—workplace bullying (Question Nos 2200-2237)	1078
Government—roofing works (Question Nos 2238-2275)	1079
Municipal services—maintenance (Question No 2276)	1080
Municipal services—maintenance (Question No 2277)	1080
Roads—Ainslie (Question No 2278)	1081
Planning—Ainslie (Question No 2279)	1081
Government—staff wellbeing (Question No 2284)	1082
Economy—budget review (Question No 2285)	1082
Heritage—cultural awareness (Question No 2286)	1083
Municipal services—Hall bike track (Question No 2287)	1084
Parking—Palmerston (Question No 2288)	1085

Children and young people—therapeutic protection orders (Question No 2289)	1086
Children and young people—Melaleuca Place (Question No 2290)	1087
Roads—speed limits (Question No 2291)	1089
Roads—speed limits (Question No 2292)	1089
Roads—school crossing supervisor program (Question No 2294)	1091
Transport—infrastructure maintenance (Question No 2295)	1093
ACTION bus service—network (Question No 2296)	1094
Government—grants (Question No 2300)	1095
Alexander Maconochie Centre—reintegration centre (Question No 2302) ..	1096
Alexander Maconochie Centre—interstate transfers (Question No 2308)...	1096
ACT Health—organisational changes (Question No 2316)	1097
ACT Health—organisational changes (Question No 2317)	1098
Canberra—Enlighten festival (Question No 2321)	1099
Municipal services—trees (Question No 2322)	1100
Planning—Coombs and Wright (Question No 2323).....	1100
Public housing—air conditioning (Question No 2325).....	1101
Municipal services—trees (Question No 2326)	1102
Government—taxes and charges (Question No 2330)	1103
ACT Health—workplace culture (Question No 2331).....	1109
ACT Health—workplace culture (Question No 2332).....	1110
Animals—cat containment (Question No 2334)	1111
Sport—indoor sports facility (Question No 2335)	1112
Roads—Gundaroo Drive (Question No 2336)	1113
Domestic and family violence—community groups (Question No 2341)...	1114
Multicultural affairs—community groups (Question No 2344).....	1115
Questions without notice taken on notice:	
Economy—asset recycling	1115
Municipal services—trees	1116
Mental health—patient outcomes	1116
Schools—bullying	1117
Education—student expulsions	1118
Schools—bullying	1119
Schools—bullying	1119
Municipal services—nature strips	1119
Planning—housing choices	1119
Schools—safe and supportive schools program	1120

Thursday, 21 March 2019

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.

Mr Grant Lalor
Motion of condolence

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (10.01): I move:

That this Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of former Magistrate Grant Lalor and tenders its profound sympathy to his family, friends and colleagues in their bereavement.

I rise this morning to move a motion of condolence on the passing of former magistrate and Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions assistant director Grant Lalor, who passed aged 71 on 26 February this year. Today we mourn the loss of Mr Lalor, a man of significant achievement, who was devoted both to his family and to the law.

Mr Lalor moved to Canberra in the 1960s to study law at the Australian National University, before heading to Papua New Guinea to work as a public solicitor. One of his key achievements whilst in PNG was successfully securing the release of individuals involved in tribal conflict from their unlawful incarceration. From the beginning of his career, Mr Lalor was committed to ensuring the fair administration of justice.

On returning to Canberra, Mr Lalor worked as a commonwealth prosecutor, where he was a mentor and adviser to many young prosecutors and support staff. In his time at the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions, he conducted numerous trials for a wide range of offences, and he always worked with great compassion to achieve justice for vulnerable victims.

While in this role, he was involved in the first case where DNA was of major evidentiary value. He was also involved in the first trial to be conducted in the Christmas Island Supreme Court. The defendants were tried on the basis of a murder charge under the Singapore Penal Code, which at that time applied on Christmas Island rather than Australian law. Mr Lalor also worked on the *Age* tape inquiry, and prosecuted the first criminal trial to be successfully conducted in Jervis Bay Territory.

Mr Lalor was appointed a full-time ACT magistrate in 2004. During his time in that role, Mr Lalor was highly regarded amongst his peers. His hardworking attitude, energy, enthusiasm and commitment to his work as a magistrate meant that his colleagues considered him a person of great integrity and professionalism. I am told

that off the bench his legal brethren found him to be kind, loyal and generous, and a man with a mischievous sense of humour.

During eight years on the bench before his retirement in 2012, His Honour worked tirelessly to serve justice, and had a reputation for being firm but fair. What more could be asked than that?

Madam Speaker, Mr Lalor has left an extraordinary legacy in the Canberra community. This morning, on behalf of the Assembly, I extend our sincerest condolences to Mr Lalor's wife, Mandy; their children; and their extended family.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (10.04): Madam Speaker, I, too, rise today to express condolences on behalf of the opposition at the passing of former magistrate Mr Grant Lalor.

Mr Lalor was a long-term Canberran, moving from Wodonga to study law at the ANU in the late 1960s, a path very familiar to many people in Canberra.

Mr Lalor built a distinguished career in the legal sector throughout his working life, spending time as a private solicitor in Papua New Guinea before returning to Australia and working in a number of public legal offices, including the Deputy Crown Solicitor's office.

Mr Lalor then joined the Commonwealth Department of Public Prosecutions, holding a number of roles, including senior assistant director of ACT prosecutions after the establishment of the ACT DPP in 1991. Mr Lalor spent over 20 years as a prosecutor, during which he also played a prominent role as a mentor and advocate for younger prosecutors.

Mr Lalor was appointed as a full magistrate of the court in February of 2004 by Mr Stanhope, and was known as a no-nonsense magistrate, particularly in instances of serious offences. Cases such as one-punch attacks and assaults on police officers were dealt with by Mr Lalor in this fashion, and he quickly developed a reputation for having little tolerance for inefficiency or ambiguous language.

During his six years in the judiciary, Mr Lalor spent some time as a coroner, before retiring in 2012, months shy of a formal retirement age for magistrates of 65. Even in retirement, Mr Lalor played a prominent role in the ACT legal community and, in particular, he continued his advocacy for the education of young lawyers.

As a prosecutor, as the Chief Minister just said, he was involved in many fascinating cases. As Mr Barr mentioned, he was involved in the first conviction that involved the use of DNA, in June 1989. He was, interestingly, involved in a matter regarding attacks on the Albanian embassy. He also represented an MP in Papua New Guinea who was caught drink-driving.

Mr Lalor was valued by those who knew him as a kind and generous man when off the bench. He was also known to have a mischievous sense of humour, as Mr Barr mentioned. He was a strong advocate for female lawyers throughout his time in the

legal profession. He was an advocate for improvements to the legal system, particularly pre self-government. One such issue related to how consecutive sentences were dealt with in the ACT.

In his retirement, the ACT Magistrates Court lost a strong but fair decision-maker, and at his passing the Canberra community lost an advocate, a teacher of the legal profession, and a committed family man.

On behalf of the opposition, I express my deepest condolences to his wife, Mandy; his four children; and his extended family and friends. I would also like to pass on my admiration to the staff at Clare Holland House for all they do to support people in their last days.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (10.08): On behalf of the ACT Greens, I join my Assembly colleagues in expressing our condolences on the death of Grant Lalor, former ACT magistrate and Commonwealth DPP assistant director. Mr Lalor died peacefully at Clare Holland House on 26 February this year after a long battle with illness.

Mr Lalor moved to Canberra from Wodonga in the late 1960s to study at the ANU. He would spend 20 years as a commonwealth prosecutor after earlier stints as a solicitor in Papua New Guinea and in the Deputy Crown Solicitor's office here in Canberra.

On 1 February 2004, Mr Lalor was appointed a full-time magistrate in the ACT, a position he would serve in until his retirement in May 2012. Steven Whybrow, President of the ACT Bar Association, described Mr Lalor as having a reputation as a no-nonsense magistrate who had little patience with inefficiency or obfuscation. However, away from the courtroom, Mr Lalor was a kind, loyal and generous man, who had a mischievous sense of humour, according to Mr Whybrow.

Mr Lalor was known to be a mentor to, and advocate for, many young prosecutors during his time at the Commonwealth DPP and the Canberra DPP office before the ACT DPP was established in 1991. He was a strong supporter of, and advocate for, bringing more female lawyers into the profession.

The Canberra community has been extremely lucky to have benefited from Mr Lalor's years of service. On behalf of the ACT Greens, I convey my thoughts and sympathies to his widow, his children and his grandchildren.

Question resolved in the affirmative, members standing in their places.

Petitions

The following petitions were lodged for presentation:

Violence in schools—petition 5-19

By Ms Lee, from 397 residents:

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

The following residents of the ACT draw to the attention of the Assembly to the need for an independent inquiry into violence in ACT Public schools and the handling of these incidents by the Education Directorate.

Your petitioners, therefore, request the Assembly to call upon the Territory Government to conduct an independent review into violence in ACT Public schools and the handling of these incidents by the Education Directorate.

Violence in schools—petition 8-19

By Ms Lee, from 207 residents:

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

This petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly to the need for an independent inquiry into violence in ACT Public Schools and the handling of these incidents by the Education Directorate.

Your Petitioners therefore request the Assembly to call upon the Territory Government to conduct an independent review into violence in ACT Public schools and the handling of these incidents by the Education Directorate.

ANU public transport—petition 6-19

By Mrs Kikkert, from 1128 residents:

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

The following residents of the ACT draw to the attention of the Assembly that the ACT Government's new transport network removes the number 3 bus—a route that has serviced the ANU campus for many years, providing transport options to thousands of students who live in residence halls and others who commute to and from campus. This decision disconnects the ANU from Canberra's wider public transport network.

Students will have to walk up to one kilometre to access the nearest bus stop. Those who must travel between the City Bus Station and campus will face a half-hour walk, including at night time.

This decision particularly affects students with disabilities and mobility issues, students living in self-catered accommodation, financially disadvantaged students who cannot afford cars, international students, and students with safety concerns, such as female and LGBTIQ+ students. It also impacts students with acute or chronic illnesses who need access to Canberra's major hospitals, both of which are currently on the number 3 bus route.

Your petitioners, therefore, request the Assembly to call upon the government to:

1. reinstate the number 3 bus route; or
2. divert either the number 53 or another route to travel through the ANU campus via Daley Road, thus servicing the western portion of the ANU; or
3. work with the ANU to provide funding for a regular and reliable shuttle bus running within the ANU to the City Bus Station.

Pursuant to standing order 99A, these petitions, having more than 500 signatories, were referred to the Standing Committee on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs and the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services respectively.

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

Motion to take note of petitions

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to standing order 98A, I move:

That the petitions so lodged be noted.

MS LEE (Kurrajong) (10.11): Four weeks ago this Assembly debated my motion on the need for an independent inquiry into ACT schools to address the reasons for unfettered violence in many of our schools and the failure of the system to deal with them. I thank my colleagues, especially Mr Wall who moved the motion in my absence while I was in hospital. During the debate, Mr Wall said:

There is something endemically wrong in the current structure, approach and attitude of the minister and the directorate in dealing with this issue of antisocial behaviour.

And that an independent inquiry will:

... provide a fresh window on the problem, an unbiased study into the various factors at work. Such an inquiry will hopefully go some way to restoring faith in these ACT schools of a growing disillusioned parent community.

About two weeks ago the minister was quoted in the media as saying that she would have an investigation, then it was a review, and on Tuesday of this week it had morphed into the safe and supportive schools advisory committee. Already it is beginning to feel like a cover-up, notwithstanding the eminently qualified and impressive membership of that committee.

The committee is already severely restricted, with at least one hand, if not both hands, tied behind their backs, because we know they will not take evidence and they will not investigate particular schools or incidents. When pressed, the minister said that parents and teachers will not be excluded from contributing to the committee, but she has failed to explain what that contribution may look like. Instead, the committee will

examine existing school violence processes, the same processes that have clearly failed the school community for over two years.

It comes then as no surprise that a petition was started by parents who were in the gallery on the day my motion was debated only weeks ago. They were bitterly disappointed before the motion was moved; they were even more disappointed after the motion was defeated. So those same parents started a petition. They have collected over 600 signatures and could have collected more had they not decided to get this to the Assembly this week.

Madam Speaker, the petition simply calls for an independent inquiry into violence in ACT public schools and the handling of those incidents by the Education Directorate. It is straightforward and to the point. I have been asked by more than one media interviewer what the government is trying to hide and what they are trying to avoid by refusing an independent inquiry. I have been asked the same question by parents, teachers and other Canberrans. I do not know, but by avoiding open, transparent, thorough, independent scrutiny, it certainly begs the question.

Today's petition is just another attempt by parents, perhaps their last resort, to have their voices heard. The minister was apparently overcome during debate on this issue and was, I understand, earnest in her desire to meet with affected parents and to provide reassurances. I urge the minister: be a leader; do the right thing; show respect for these hundreds of parents. The time to act is now. Demonstrate that behind those tears is an understanding and an acknowledgement that something should, that something must, be done. Agree to an independent inquiry where parents, teachers and school communities can have their voices heard.

Being in government for 18 years does not give you carte blanche to ignore the electorate on something as important as a child's safety, self-esteem and enthusiasm for learning. If the minister's much referenced future of education conversation is to stand for anything, it should demonstrate genuine consultation and a genuine desire to listen.

The Centre for Independent Studies published a report this week that showed that, more important than additional funding for disadvantaged schools, a safe learning environment, school discipline, direct and explicit instruction, and experienced and autonomous school leadership are the key drivers to improved educational outcomes. This is what all ACT schools should be striving for, but we know that for some reason it is not happening and we need to know why.

I congratulate and thank the parents—some are in the chamber today and many more are watching online—and the teachers who have been so committed to driving change in their schools to create safe learning environments for their children and for future students at their schools. We will continue to advocate for change so that every school in Canberra is the best that it can be to serve the next generation of our future leaders.

MR PARTON (Brindabella) (10.16): I was contacted by a number of the parents involved in that petition who were a little dismayed by what has been announced by the minister. They were a little concerned that their voices would not officially be

heard. So they asked me whether there was any way that they could have their voices heard in this chamber. They specifically asked me whether it would be possible to write a letter that could be read out in the chamber. I said, “Yes, sure, I can do that in the debate on the petition.” So I am going to read it unedited. It says:

To the Speaker of the Assembly, the Chief Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Assembly,

We write this to you as citizens, residents of the ACT, and most of all as parents, parents who want to ensure the safety of not only our children but all children in the ACT education system, as well as those working within the Education System.

The petition requesting an independent inquiry into violence in ACT schools and the handling of these incidents is just that. It is not now, nor has it ever been a “witch hunt” or an exercise in “demonising” particular people or schools. We have never requested that the independent inquiry single out a particular person or school rather investigate violence in all schools and the handling of this by the Directorate.

While our main focus is those incidents of violence against children we also recognise and are equally saddened and upset regarding the incidents perpetrated against teachers and principals. This said, all incidents of violence within the Education System must be reviewed.

Due to our experiences with the handling of incidents of violence perpetrated against our children at school by the Education Directorate we believe, as do many others, that an independent review is the best way forward. This gives all relevant stakeholders the chance to input and be heard and work TOGETHER to help recognise the issues and rectify any issues that may arise. In this way, people are heard, included and validated and it makes the process INCLUSIVE for all.

The letter closes by saying:

We implore you to consider voting outside of party lines and with your conscience on this issue primarily regarding the safety of children which is, as has been stated in the Assembly by both parties, an important issue.

It is signed by Emma Warwick, Leanne Manunui, Tamika Pakis and Karen Saleta. I applaud those parents who put the petition together. Thanks to Emma and Leanne for joining us in the gallery today. I know that during this public discussion there have been suggestions that what is going on is Liberal scaremongering. This is not Liberal scaremongering.

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 Sport and Recreation and Minister for Women) (10.19): Thank you, Ms Lee, for bringing the petition to the Assembly today. The government will formally respond to the petition in due course. But I want to take the opportunity today to reassure all the parents who

have signed that petition and parents across all our schools that I do not take this situation lightly and that I am taking it very seriously. That is why I have set up the advisory group to advise me on a constructive way forward and to ensure all the systems that we have in place have been informed by experts. These are systems that have been implemented all over the world. The research backs in that these are the best systems to have in place.

I understand that at the breakfast that Mr Coe and Ms Lee attended this morning, the independent schools agreed with the systems that we have in place as being the best trauma-informed approaches to our schools. Now, as I say that, I understand that there are incidences of bullying and violence in our schools. Overwhelmingly, they are safe and supportive places. However, violence and bullying do, of course, occur in our schools. It is unacceptable anywhere. It is unacceptable in our workplaces, it is unacceptable in our community and it is most definitely unacceptable in our schools. Our community should expect that when their children go to school they should be safe and they should be supported if violence or bullying does occur.

I understand how affected families feel when bullying or violence does occur in respect of their children and how helpless they feel during those situations. I also understand that for families whose children have been the bullies or who have perpetrated violence, they are also tearing themselves up inside at the decisions that their children have made to commit violence or bullying at school. That is why I have set up this group of experts to advise me about what is the best way forward. Are these systems that the experts tell me, that the independent and Catholic schools tell me, are the best systems to have in place working well enough and how can we make them better?

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, I cannot imagine a world where bullying and violence will not occur. It is occurring across the world as we speak. But we need to work harder across our communities and I am committed to making sure that we do better within our school communities to continue to build a strong, supportive and inclusive culture so that every child and family feels safe, that every teacher and school leader is supported appropriately.

I have said that the advisory group will be under the reference group. This is all available online. I encourage people to have a look at the reference group and the eminent people who are on this advisory group who will advise me. They are able to, and they will, look at case studies of situations that have occurred. If they feel they need to interview individuals who have been affected by bullying and violence, I will leave it up to the group to decide whether that is appropriate and helps inform their work. But I have never thought that an independent inquiry was a constructive way forward, particularly in the public domain.

I accept that an inquiry of sorts should be conducted. It should be conducted respectfully and take into account what is appropriate in the public interest. It should not be, as Mr Parton says, a finger pointing, witch-hunting exercise. That is the last thing we want to see in our school communities because I know that parents, families and schools are enormously proud. The last thing they want is any kind of marks on their school or any suggestion that their school is anything other than great.

As I said, the government will respond to this petition more formally at a later date, but I want to assure everybody in this place, the parents who have signed that petition and others in our schools that I am taking this situation very seriously. I understand the trauma that families have experienced as a result of this.

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (10.24): I wish to speak in support of this petition. I remind the Assembly that last month I shared, with permission, the story of a Canberra family from my electorate of Ginninderra whose young child has been repeatedly physically harmed at school. According to what they have shared, he has been punched, pinned, dragged, strangled and more—all by other children. They have kept a catalogue of his numerous injuries. At the end of year 1 the parents requested a meeting with the school. They got nowhere. But their faith in the government's school sector led them to re-enrol their son the following year. The violence continued and worsened. The child became terrified to attend school.

He experienced frequent abdominal pains identified as a consequence of enormous stress. He faltered in his studies so much that a tutor told his parents he was at least a year behind in his learning. Eventually the parents felt compelled to pull their son out of this government-run school for his own protection. Attempts to negotiate a way forward produced no results except to leave the mum feeling, as she said to me, that she now knows what it feels like to be bullied.

Every student, teacher, and principal deserves to be safe in ACT schools. I say that as a mother whose five children have all attended these schools. The sad reality, however, is that kids in more than one school are not safe, and parents know it. They have also learned by experience not to trust this government's internal responses to this problem. This morning hundreds of them are fairly and rightly asking for an independent inquiry. Madam Speaker, I commend the petition to the Assembly.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (10.26): I would like to talk briefly on the other petition about viable public transport for the ANU. This is something about which I have sent at least one letter, I think, to the minister because there clearly are quite a lot of people who go to the ANU. I appreciate that some of these people will be well served by the—I was going to say the blue rapid because I cannot remember the new number that it will have—the blue rapid which goes along Barry Drive and by UniLodge. That will serve quite a few of the users of the ANU. But for an awful lot of people who live or work in the further parts of the campus, it will not.

There are also quite a lot of people in Canberra who, of course, go to the ANU for lectures and things like that who will no longer be able to do that by public transport. Given that the ANU has a policy of reducing parking provision, it is an area that needs to have good public transport.

I do not know what discussions have happened between the ANU and the ACT government about this issue but I know that the ANU does have an internal bus system. But that internal bus system is not available, to the best of my knowledge, to people who are not staff or students at the ANU. And the ANU, of course, gets thousands of visitors to the campus every day.

While I support the government's push to put more resources into the rapid routes—I do not have a problem with that—we need to make sure that we still have coverage of Canberra.

MISS C BURCH (Kurrajong) (10.27): Over 1,100 Canberrans, mostly ANU students who will be negatively affected by the removal of the No 3 bus route, have signed a petition calling for this route to be reinstated. The current No 3 services students on campus as well as those who commute, connecting them with work, study, home and the city. There are over 1,100 signatories to this petition who share our concerns over the removal of this route and the impact it will have on student wellbeing.

It is ironic that this government continues to claim to be the party of inclusion and the party of diversity and yet they are cutting a vital and necessary service that disproportionately affects minorities and vulnerable members of our community, especially young female students and international students.

Last year I received from a 19-year-old student who lived at ANU but who works late nights in hospitality, like so many of our students do, an email regarding the government's decision to cut the No 3 route. In this email she went on to explain how route No 3 drops her outside her college on campus; so she feels safe coming home from work late at night. And it was, essentially, a door-to-door service. She will no longer have this option. This 19-year-old student now has to seriously consider her employment and her financial position in Canberra because she no longer feels safe due to the extra walk that the new route will impose on her. This is not acceptable. Under the new network the Labor-Greens government has effectively cut ANU students off from the rest of Canberra, with students having to walk up to a kilometre to access the nearest bus stop.

International students who attend the ANU college in order to improve their English language skills are often in homestay programs for the duration of their study in Canberra and struggle with the daily commute due to the language barriers they face. International students are already concerned about their safety in our city. The removal of route No 3 just makes it even harder for international students and so many others to receive their tertiary education. Scrapping this route and forcing young, vulnerable students into additional transfers and longer wait times compromises safety and connectivity.

The No 3 route also serves as a direct line to the Canberra and Calvary hospitals for university students, a convenient, accessible and affordable alternative to a taxi or an Uber. The minister has cut off ANU students from health services and employment opportunities. She has made young students feel unsafe travelling at night and has undermined the ability of international students to go to and from classes and, as with everything she manages, she has left behind the people she claims to serve. What is worse is the complete lack of consultation and justification regarding the removal of this service.

I ask the minister to explain to these students how she thought it was in the best interests of ANU students to cut off one of their main connections to the rest of the

city, especially given that there has been an increase of over 1,200 students moving into campus accommodation. It is inconceivable and unacceptable that the Labor-Greens government could ignore the voice of the university community on this matter.

This petition calls on the Labor-Greens government to reinstate this service. We must ensure that both on-campus and off-campus students can get to class and to work and be active members of our community. The government must do better and listen to our community and consult them on these changes that affect their ability to conduct everyday activities. We call on the government to reinstate this service.

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (10.31), by leave: I thank Zyl, the President of the Postgraduate and Research Students Association, who is here today. I have presented a petition signed by 1,128 Canberra residents calling on this Assembly to urge the government to provide viable public transport on the ANU campus. This petition responds to the decision to cut the No 3 bus route which has operated for 39 years.

The ANU student newspaper for 26 March 1980 noted that the government was giving some consideration to the introduction of a bus that would connect the university with the rest of Canberra, and students were encouraged to express their interest. A few months later the bus service was due to begin. That service has continued from 1980 until now. One could argue that the university grew up around this bus route and the assumption that it would continue.

There are now 12 student accommodation facilities located along a 1.5-kilometre stretch of this route, several of them newly built. Together, these residence halls house a staggering 3,274 students. I would like to put this number in perspective. I am a member for Ginninderra; so I will use my electorate for comparison. The 3,274 students who live on the western edge of the ANU campus exceed the populations of Aranda, Charnwood, Cook, Fraser, Hawker, Higgins, Macquarie, Melba, Page, Scullin, Spence or Weetangera.

Imagine what the response would be if this government decided to cut the bus service to one of these suburbs. Yet this is precisely what they are doing to 3,000-plus students, and they have done so with almost no consultation. One poorly advertised feedback session was held on campus in August, with only 30 students attending.

The undergraduate association was separately consulted but the postgraduate student association was not, despite more than half of ANU students being postgraduates. Aware of this inexcusable oversight, the postgraduate association requested a consultation. I have been told that it followed this government's now familiar pattern. Officials show up, tell the students what is going to happen and tell them it is going to happen whether they like it or not. End of problem. Except it has not ended the problem.

This e-petition attracted over 1,100 signatures in less than one week. My office has been contacted by a student who does not have an ACT address but wanted us to know that she finds the No 3 bus "invaluable". This response is not the end of the problem; it is the beginning. The loss of the No 3 bus means that thousands of

students who live at ANU or who commute to its medical, physics and Asia-Pacific departments now face a half-hour walk to and from the city bus station. Maybe this government thinks it is not a big deal but it is.

Many of these students have chosen where they live based on the assumption of the on-campus bus service continuing. Beyond that, I remind this Assembly that not every university student is a perfectly able 20-year-old. Many students at the ANU live with disability or have mobility issues. Others have acute or chronic illness. This is not an easy half hour walk for them. This decision also unfairly targets international students and disadvantaged students who lack access to private transport.

This brings us to the serious issue of safety. A 2016 Australian Human Rights Commission report found that 3.5 per cent of respondents had been sexually assaulted on campus and more than one-third had been sexually harassed. Cutting the No 3 bus means that students will no longer have safe, reliable and affordable transport home at night. For a government that claims to be sensitive to issues facing women and LGBTIQA persons, this decision appears most uncaring and tone deaf.

This petition presents, in order of preference, three possible fixes for this problem. Any one of them will be better than telling the thousands of students who are left stranded by this decision to just deal with it. On behalf of these students and other concerned Canberra residents, I commend this petition with its 1,128 signatures to the Assembly.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (10.35): I rise to thank the petitioners for both these important petitions. They both go to, I think, core issues of what this government is responsible for. The safety of citizens in schools, the safety of citizens catching buses should be central to what this government does. And the fact that we have a minister who is the Minister for Transport as well as the Minister for Higher Education and is unable to grasp the importance of this bus service tells us something about how they are approaching this issue.

But the key reason I am standing now is in response to something that the Deputy Chief Minister just said. In her speech about school violence and bullying the Deputy Chief Minister said, “I cannot imagine a world where this does not exist.” Hopeless and pessimistic statements like that do not bring any comfort whatsoever to the families of kids in our schools who have been traumatised.

Can you imagine if somebody in this place stood up and said, “I cannot imagine a world without domestic violence”? Can you imagine how that person would be howled down? Can you imagine if someone in the community stood up and said, “I can’t imagine a world without domestic violence”? How depressing would such a comment be!

Yet for some reason it is okay for the minister for education, the person who is meant to be putting the interests of children first, to come out with such a demoralising statement. So it is no wonder that so many families in the ACT feel absolutely hopeless about the situation that they have found themselves in. I urge this

government and in particular this minister to change her approach to this issue because there is a lot at stake here.

When you think about the families, you think about the children, when you hear the story that Mrs Kikkert passed on, this is real, this is not politics, this is about ensuring that our children are safe at public schools. And I urge the minister to do a much better job.

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 Sport and Recreation and Minister for Women) (10.39), by leave: I feel like I have to correct the record here, and I am concerned that the Leader of the Opposition has decided to take the chance to have a personal go at me for comments that I have made around violence that is happening across social media; sometimes in our schools, which are overwhelmingly safe places; definitely in our communities; bullying and trolling behaviour all across the world and in this place. I was putting that into perspective: at this moment in time it is difficult to imagine a world where that does not exist. So please do not take bits out of my speech and put them into a different perspective to make people believe that I have said something different. I have not.

We have just come together as a community to bring some love and some inclusion on some particularly awful issues that have happened, across social media in particular, that we want to try to get some control of. For a lot of us it is incomprehensible, some of the things that we are witness to as a community.

At this moment in time, yes, like everybody else, I have been feeling like I cannot imagine a world without it. But I am working as hard as I possibly can to ensure that we heed all the expert advice on systems that are in place in our schools in particular, but also across all my portfolios, to make sure that Canberrans are safe, that they are included in our community in every possible way. And I will continue to do that in the most positive way. I have never made, and will never make, personal attacks on anyone in this place.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Minister for Health and Wellbeing

Motion of no confidence

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (10.41), by leave: I move:

That this Assembly:

(1) notes:

- (a) the need to support the work and wellbeing of nurses, doctors and other staff engaged in the ACT health system;
- (b) systemic failure of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to address bullying and workplace culture in general across the ACT health system;

- (c) the damning interim report of the Independent Review into Workplace Culture within ACT Public Health Services;
 - (d) the published sections of the KPMG report into hospital infrastructure that showed that the ageing Canberra Hospital buildings posed safety risks to patients and were in desperate need of major redevelopment; and
 - (e) the ongoing delays in the development of the Surgical Procedures, Interventional Radiology and Emergency (SPIRE) project; and
- (2) expresses a want of confidence in the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

On 2 February the *Canberra Times* published an editorial responding to the release of the interim report of the independent review on workplace culture within the ACT health services. The editorial described the findings as appalling and as the most damning indictment of the gravely troubled organisation to date. It poses the question: how it is possible that in Australia in the 21st century a publicly funded and allegedly professionally managed institution can be so dysfunctional, the *Canberra Times* went on to say. Under the Westminster system, ultimate accountability for serious failings within a department rests with the minister, in this case Meegan Fitzharris, said the *Canberra Times*.

The editorial concluded by taking the unprecedented step—at least in the history of self-government in the ACT—of musing that:

Based on yesterday's blistering interim report, it would be truly remarkable if she—

the Minister for Health and Wellbeing—

is able to continue as minister once Mr Reid's inquiry is over.

Madam Speaker, Mr Reid's inquiry is over. His final report has come down almost unchanged except to in a sense enliven the extent of the problem by reinforcing a point he felt that he had not made sufficiently in the first report: that poor culture leads to poor patient outcomes.

The *Canberra Times* called for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to take responsibility, firstly, for her continuous denial that there was a problem with bullying and workplace culture in the ACT public health system; secondly, for her continuous failure to take action to fix the problems despite the calls from staff, the AMA, other organisations and the Canberra media as well as the Liberal opposition; thirdly, for her repeated false claims that ACT Health had safe and respectful pathways for employees to follow when they were making complaints; and, fourthly, for her repeated false claim that the ACT government has zero tolerance for workplace bullying and harassment.

On the release of the interim report in February, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing said in a media release:

The report released today provides difficult reading, and I'm sorry that there are people who work within our health services who have experienced bullying, intimidation and harassment.

The minister repeated those words earlier this week. The problem is that this should not have been a revelation to the minister for health. There has been two years of effort by the Canberra Liberals to put Meegan Fitzharris in the picture about what was going on. We have worked hard to bring these issues to her attention. I have brought forward several motions and many stories about broken lives and even suicides and attempted suicides. There have been serious calls for a board of inquiry. There have been damning staff surveys after damning staff surveys, most of which have been covered up.

This minister and this Labor coalition were dragged kicking and screaming via two calls for a board of inquiry to an independent review, a review which they hoped would just cover things up and it would be left in the bottom drawer. But much to their surprise this independent review has revealed exactly what the Canberra Liberals and members of the medical community and the *Canberra Times* and other media outlets have been saying: it finally revealed and affirmed the truth about the state of the culture in the ACT health system.

It has taken an independent review that affirmed the truth for this minister to admit—because she knew all along—that there was a problem in the public health system. As recently as Tuesday this week Minister Fitzharris again admitted that the report was difficult reading. This statement alone is a last-ditch effort to try to downplay the seriousness of what has emerged through this inquiry.

Even her statement that she was sorry that staff had to endure bullying, harassment and intimidation is little more than lip-service. It is the sort of thing you have to say when you are publicly exposed as being a negligent and neglectful employer. I am sorry, too, for those people and their families who had to wait in some cases years for a minister in this government to acknowledge there is a problem with the workplace culture in ACT Health.

Perhaps Minister Fitzharris needs a little more convincing. One former ACT Health worker who read the report has remarked that it was traumatising to relive once again the issues she experienced in Health. Indeed reading the Reid report made her feel physically ill. Perhaps Minister Fitzharris needs to hear a few comments from the staff that were quoted in the report? For instance:

At ACT Health, we feel there is nowhere to go, no one who will listen, no one who will stand up for us ...

That has certainly been the case expounded by Ms Fitzharris.

One staff member commented:

The endless emotional abuse and mind games by management has resulted in many staff members feeling like the only way anything will change is if they find work elsewhere ... Many feel that making a formal complaint would only make matters worse, for fear of later being the target of poorer treatment.

The zero tolerance and safe respectful pathways that Minister Fitzharris as well as Mr Rattenbury have been espousing are cynical and patronising at best and downright

mythical at worst. In contrast to the claims of zero tolerance another ACT employee told the inquiry:

There is ZERO consequence for the bully ... There is no such thing as mediation ... But the biggest psychological insult is that they are invalidated.

Zero consequences for the bullying and a pathway that results only in a psychological insult and invalidation of the victim: the minister needs to dwell on that and think about it. There are zero consequences for the bullying and the so-called respectful pathways only result in insult and victim invalidation.

The Reid report talks a lot about HR services in ACT Health, about backlogs, inconsistent advice, lack of trust and nepotism in recruitment. Indeed, recommendation 15 of the report states:

The recruitment processes in the ACT Public Health System should follow principles outlined in the Enterprise Agreements, Public Sector Management Act 1994 and relevant standards and procedures.

The mere fact that an inquiry like this had to make a recommendation to follow the law is an indictment of this minister. This is in stark contrast to the answer the minister gave to a question on notice in this place in November 2018 about the recruitment that was subject to public interest disclosure. The answer was:

The selection process and appointment of the Director of Medical Imaging was completed in accordance with the provisions of the Public Sector Management Act 1994 and the Public Sector Management Standards 2016.

I think Mr Reid might have disagreed. Perhaps the Minister for Health and Wellbeing also missed some of the results of the week-long survey the review team undertook. The team received nearly 2,000 responses—a whopping 20 per cent of all staff employed in the ACT health system. Mr Reid and his reviewers expressed to me astonishment that they would get such a high hit rate on a review, and it is testament to the reviewers and it is testament to the respectful way that at last people in ACT Health were being treated.

Just over half of those respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “I have confidence in the ways my organisation resolves grievances.” Fifty-three per cent said they witnessed misconduct or wrongdoing at work in the past 12 months and 61 per cent said they had reported it. But these ministers say they never hear anything about that. They set themselves up not to be briefed so they could be the ministers for plausible deniability.

More than one-third of respondents said that they had been subjected to bullying at work in the past 12 months and 55 per cent of the most serious bullying was from a senior manager or an immediate manager or supervisor. The bullying methods employed were most alarming. In one of the answers nearly 60 per cent of respondents said that the bully had given them unjustified criticism or complaints three or more times.

In terms of complaint handling, 38 per cent of respondents had submitted a formal complaint and only seven per cent were satisfied with the outcome of that process. You might ask why only 38 per cent of respondents put in a formal complaint, and the answer lies in what staff told the review panel. One nurse reported to the review panel that they were too scared to put in Riskman reports because her friend had been reprimanded. Another said:

While working in another facility where lots of medication errors occurred I placed many incident reports to enable improvement of issues which were rarely acted upon and when I left the manager made a comment to me about the number of incidents I put in, as if to say I was a pain and created work for her.

Perhaps the most telling is the quote which I referred to earlier:

Many feel that making a formal complaint would only make matters worse, for fear of later being the target of poorer treatment.

These are the many problems the ACT health system has in relation to culture. We must remember that when we talk about culture one of the things that was found in the Reid review was that most hospitals have problems with culture, but the problems of culture in the ACT are significantly and statistically worse than in other organisations.

Yes, we understand that there is a problem across the board and this minister has relied on that—"There's always bullying in hospitals." A bit like Minister Berry this morning, they cannot conceive of an organisation where there is no bullying or where bullying is minimised and they just use it as an excuse. "It goes on everywhere so we just have to put up with it." Mr Reid and his reviewers said, "Yes, it does go on anywhere, but it is palpably worse in the ACT under this minister." One of the things we have seen is that this minister was content to brush under the carpet as much as possible the poor culture of this place.

But not only do the hospital staff have to struggle with the worst culture of any health system in the country, they are doing it in substandard buildings. Some elements of the Canberra hospital are, as we know, more than 45 years old and have been allowed to operate without refurbishment. In April 2017, nearly two years ago, we saw as a consequence of that a fire in the main electrical switchboard in building 2. The work to remediate that and other critical electrical issues has still not been completed. It has not been completed two years down the track. I know that it is a complicated job, but this minister and this government sat on their hands until a fire broke out before they did anything.

We have learned through the AECOM report, which this government and this minister tried to suppress by claiming executive privilege, that there were four extreme risks and 143 high risk issues affecting the Canberra Hospital. AECOM identified 2016 as the year for dealing with the extreme risks—the year in which they should be fixed—and the rest of them should have been fixed by 2017-18. Not all of those risks have been addressed.

Since the forced publication of the AECOM report we have seen a litany of other issues, which my colleagues will dwell upon, but, briefly: the serious water leaks in the birthing suites and the cost of repairs reaching millions of dollars; the serious problems in the bathroom in the paediatric wards which have left parts of that ward closed since 3 August until 17 December and counting; the serious issues the government cannot work out about the warranty; the non-compliant cladding which has cost millions to repair; and the on again, off again, on the never-never, now it's here, now it's there SPIRE project. We all know that was written on the back of a beer coaster in the heat of an election because the ALP was bleeding votes.

The 2016 election commitment was that SPIRE was planned to be opened in 2022-23, which was prior to any feasibility planning and early design work being undertaken. We now know that the government has set the target completion date as 2023-24. But this minister cannot build a tram on time or duplicate a road through the middle of her own electorate on time.

In early February in response to the interim Reid report Minister Fitzharris admitted that heads might have to roll. As I said at the outset, the *Canberra Times* editorial writer picked up on this theme and publicly and in an unprecedented manner called on the minister to embrace the tenets of the Westminster doctrine of ministerial accountability.

This is the minister who has overseen the decline of our hospital infrastructure and who has steadfastly told us that everything was okay. This is the minister who has overseen the decline in culture and steadfastly said it was okay. It is now time for this minister to take responsibility under the Westminster system and resign because of what has happened on her watch. (*Time expired.*)

MS FITZHARRIS (Yerrabi—Minister for Health and Wellbeing, Minister for Higher Education, Minister for Medical and Health Research, Minister for Transport and Minister for Vocational Education and Skills) (10.57): I am pleased this morning to speak on the government's record in health and my record as minister.

Health is a vital portfolio. It is large, it is important, and it is complex. It is the ACT government's highest priority and our biggest budgetary commitment. We have made record investments in the ACT public health system and every Canberran knows we will continue to do so.

We have a strong track record in health. Since becoming minister, I have been clear that I want to expand access to services, focusing on a genuinely territory-wide approach so we can expand access to more Canberrans, whether that is in hospital, in the community, or in the home. I have been clear that we will build the infrastructure of the future, the infrastructure our city needs. And I have been clear that we must improve relationships with our key partners in delivering health care, in particular with Calvary Public Hospital and with our two universities that train the health workforce of the future.

I have always had, and I continue to have, an open and transparent approach to health. I am up-front about the issues we face as our city grows and as our community ages. And I am committed to improving services, but also to addressing the challenges in this portfolio and instituting real change to improve our health system.

Of course we would like our public health system to operate perfectly and efficiently every day of the year. Of course we would, and that is our objective. But the reality is that our health system is complex and it is going through a significant period of reform. Reform is never easy, but it is necessary. I have not shied away from the challenges in our health system. Indeed, I have tackled them head on. I have worked with my colleagues, particularly the Minister for Mental Health, to restructure our health system so that it will work better for our community, our staff, and our patients.

Patients and staff are at the centre of everything that we do in health. That is why we are investing close to \$2 billion a year in our public hospitals and health services. This year we anticipate close to 120,000 admissions to our public hospitals and 150,000 presentations to Canberra's emergency departments. To manage this growth, this year alone we are investing an additional \$65 million in more surgeries, \$34.5 million to expand hospital in the home, \$26 million to boost the number of hospital beds, \$21 million for more emergency department staff, \$15 million to upgrade Calvary Public Hospital, and \$2 million for the new nurse-led walk-in centre in Weston Creek. These are just some of the ways we are delivering better health care.

It is clear that the opposition chooses again and again to ignore all the great work that ACT Health, Canberra Health Services and Calvary Public Hospital are doing. It is all that we have come to expect from an opposition that has nothing positive to say about our public health system—not once. Mrs Dunne should recognise the great work that goes on every day. Does she not realise the impact that this has on staff? While they like to attack our health staff, our nurses and doctors, we are committed to supporting them. Many staff have noticed the relentless negativity. They recognise that the Canberra Liberals have raised a number of issues, but they shake their heads. They never hear anything positive from the Canberra Liberals. There have been years of opposition health spokespeople who have done nothing but attack our public health system.

The best way we can support nurses, doctors and other staff in our health workforce is to invest in the services and infrastructure they need to do their jobs. That is what we do in each budget and that is what we will continue to do. But it is also vital that we ensure that the public health system is operating as best it can. That is why, as I have said repeatedly, I have led some of the most significant reforms in our system, in governance, structure, leadership and culture. These have been tough changes, but they have been necessary.

The new leadership teams within ACT Health, Canberra Health Services and Calvary are committed to supporting their staff and ensuring that they are able to do the wonderful work they do, caring with skill and compassion for our community. It is also, for example, why I have been working with the Australian Nursing & Midwifery Foundation to introduce a ratios framework and develop the nurses and midwives

towards a safer culture strategy, which Minister Rattenbury and I were proud to launch late last year. As for hospital infrastructure, we are in the process of upgrading Canberra Hospital and Calvary hospital to ensure that we can deliver better care where and when people need it.

We opened a brand-new public hospital last year, the University of Canberra Hospital, taking pressure off other hospitals and getting people back on their feet after an accident or surgery through cutting-edge rehabilitation. I do not think the Canberra Liberals even noticed. We opened a new walk-in centre last year in Gungahlin, seeing around 350 people each week, with work underway on the Weston Creek walk-in centre.

ACT Health's building health services program is making considerable progress in planning for the long-term health infrastructure needs of our growing region. I was proud late last year to announce the final location of the SPIRE centre on the Canberra Hospital campus, and this work is well underway. SPIRE was funded in this government's first term, in the first budget, and extensive planning and feasibility work—including, importantly, territory-wide health services modelling—is underway. It is an important health investment for the ACT, one that will futureproof our city and help our public health system respond to increasing demand as our city grows. Work is underway on continued development of SPIRE, including advanced planning, the commencement of early design, and more intensive engagement with the clinical workforce.

We are also undertaking a north-side hospital services scoping study in partnership with Calvary hospital to explore and plan for health services and infrastructure needs in Canberra's north. This is all part of the ACT government's commitment to futureproof our health system as part of a territory-wide approach to health services and infrastructure planning.

I know the opposition like to attack public health care at every opportunity, but the reality is that our health system is of a high quality. In fact, the recent interim report said that the quality of our health care is as good as anywhere in the country. I receive regular emails from people who are so grateful for the high-quality care they receive at one of our health services. Their voices are not heard in this debate. Let me read out a recent letter to the editor of the *Canberra Times*:

In mid-July 2018 we were innocently involved in a head-on collision ...

My stay in the hospital was 94 days and my wife, after some major bowel operations, was released a little earlier.

Now that we are both alive and learning to live with some life-changing medical impositions we wish to let your readers know what outstanding service we received from the rescue team and the hospital staff.

The treatment and care given to us was second to none and world class.

We are fully aware that without the compassionate and professional service we would not be alive.

The following week, there was another letter:

I owe my life to the skill of the surgical team and the follow up treatment I received ...

I was most impressed with the professionalism of the doctors, nurses and ancillary staff during a recuperation which was at times stressful but was eased considerably by their compassion and cheerful attitude ...

We consider ourselves very fortunate to live in Canberra with access to what we would rank as world-class health services.

Of course, we all know that it is not always the case that good news stories make the front page, but it is an important point that every day—every day—there are wonderful heart-warming stories from members of our community who face sickness and injury, and are treated with care, compassion and the utmost professionalism in our hospitals. I think we should all reflect upon that.

This is distressing for me as health minister. And while I have considerable responsibilities, others also have a responsibility, including the opposition and those reporting on health.

There is always room for improvement, Madam Speaker, and we should recognise and celebrate that we have a great healthcare system here in Canberra, with thousands of dedicated, skilled staff, many of whom contributed to the independent review, but many of whom are distressed when they read and hear such consistently negative responses. What they mind most of all is that there is almost never coverage of the immense good work they do every day. Someone needs to shine a light on that, and I will.

The Health Care Consumers Association recently wrote a letter to the editor of the *Canberra Times*. The letter read:

The continuous trashing of Canberra Health Services, under the cover of “reporting” is doing a great disservice to the community who need to understand the reality of their health system and how it’s performing, so they can have confidence in seeking health care when they need it.

HCCA staff have seen recent data which compares the Centenary Hospital quality and safety data with equivalent services in Australia. They do at least as well as equivalent Australian hospitals and in many cases are in the top cohort.

There is a clear need for better public reporting on quality and safety data about our health system. If this material was in the public domain it would be easier for consumers and citizens to have real information ...

How about an article: “In a recent survey of discharged patients, 100 per cent of patients from the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children would recommend the hospital to family and friends”? Perhaps not controversial enough to be news. But it is evidence based.

Madam Speaker, these are important points from the Health Care Consumers Association. I agree with them. We need to improve data reporting, and we are working with the consumers association on exactly that.

The lack of balance from the opposition is staggering. It is unbelievable. In their quest to inflict political damage, the Liberals would do well to reflect on their responsibility as leaders and as an alternative government. So far, in my view and the view of many others, they have done nothing to demonstrate their capacity to lead, only the capacity to tear down.

On the subject of culture within public health services, this is something I have carefully considered in my time as health minister.

Mrs Dunne interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: You were heard in silence, Mrs Dunne.

MS FITZHARRIS: Indeed, I identified early on that there were governance issues within ACT Health that had let our health workforce down for some time. I stood up in front of Health staff a year ago and spoke to them directly about this. I took responsibility for instituting change to turn this around. I was pleased that through the accreditation process these issues were brought to the surface and our new leadership team were able to address them.

Workplace culture is a significant issue, and one that the government will continue to address. I called for an independent review into workplace culture last year following the split of ACT Health into two organisations, to ensure that our health system can continue to deliver high quality care. We have, as I have stated, agreed to all the recommendations from the report in principle.

It is simply incorrect for the opposition to claim that I have not acknowledged this. I stood up in front of ACT Health—now Canberra Health Services—staff over a year ago and spoke to them directly about this. Those opposite have persistently misled by saying that I have not acknowledged this. They can look back on the record to find many occasions when I said that things need to be improved.

The report recognises, as Mrs Dunne said, that this is a national issue. It recognises also that there are some issues here and in other health services that are decades old. But the fact that over 2,000 people engaged in the process, and that the panel members held close to 100 meetings and workshops, shows that they trusted the process. They trusted the process I instituted, and they trusted the panel that I appointed. It was a panel of respected individuals with extensive experience and skill in the health sector and I again thank them for their work.

One of the key recommendations was to establish a cultural review oversight group. Together with Minister Rattenbury, I will hold the first meeting by the end of this month.

Mrs Dunne said I was determined to cover it up. That is patently incorrect. I released both the interim report and the final report the day after receiving them. There is no doubt that it is challenging. I have repeatedly said that I acknowledge that. There has been transparency in this report like no other report into this area before.

I note, as Mrs Dunne did not, that the panel found from the submissions that staff had cautious optimism about new leadership across the public health system. The panel also acknowledged significant changes that had been instituted in recent times. The review has allowed staff and stakeholders to be heard, to share their experiences and their stories and to contribute. I am utterly committed to making sure that the recommendations are fully implemented.

Madam Speaker, in the time that I have left, I would like to focus again on some of the successes in the health service. They go to activity not just in our hospitals but in the community, in health policy, about primary care, prevention, our immunisation program, our alcohol and drug strategy, mental health, and health and medical research. We are leading on many fronts.

These are things that have not been acknowledged once by the opposition, Madam Speaker. Not once have they proposed a new policy; not once have they made a positive contribution to help keep our community healthy. Here we are again today with the same issues, with Mrs Dunne ignoring multiple statements made by me to make her political point. Once again, we see relentlessly negative politics from Mrs Dunne, attacking a minister but undermining the confidence of staff and undermining the confidence of the community in our public health system.

It is not good enough from the opposition. I will continue to stand up for our staff and our patients in our health system, and I will continue to make improvements but also highlight the incredible good work they do every day. *(Time expired.)*

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (11.12): I am disappointed that, once again, we have an example of the minister throwing staff under a bus. Rather than actually deal with this issue head-on, rather than actually deal with her own decisions, instead, awkwardly and poorly, she tries to reconstruct this debate so that it is all about attacking staff. That is what we have heard for the past 15 minutes. Despite the fact that she says people should not be attacking staff, she then spent 15 minutes making up a faux case about attacking staff. Instead what we should have—

Mr Ramsay: A point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Stop the clock, please.

Mr Ramsay: Madam Speaker, last night Mrs Dunne raised a point of order, in relation to using the words “making up”, that that would reflect on the character of the minister. I invite you to make an equivalent ruling today.

Mrs Dunne: On the point of order, this is a substantive motion about the capacity of the minister to do her job, and it is the place where such allegations are made. The

point of order I took last night was not in relation to a substantive motion about the capacity of a member; this one is.

MADAM SPEAKER: I am going to let it go this time, but not so much on your advice, Mrs Dunne. In debates and in interjections, can we up the level a little bit, not be personal, not mock people, and show a level of regard and respect?

MR COE: Thank you, Madam Speaker; I very much hope that those opposite take your advice on board. It is so important that, rather than hide behind staff, she should show some leadership and actually be accountable for the decisions that she makes. That includes the decision to not be informed. That includes the decision to avoid detail. It includes the decision to have plausible deniability.

We all know that the doctors, nurses, clinicians and administrators—all of the staff in the health network—do a magnificent job. We honour them. We thank them for all that they do. They do it in very difficult circumstances. Just a couple of weeks ago, a family member went to the emergency department on advice from a GP, and they were seen reasonably quickly. They then went into the next waiting room, where it took a fair amount of time to be seen. There were a lot of other people in that second waiting room, waiting to be seen. There was one boy in that second waiting room who waited for hours to be treated for his football injury—a child; hours.

That was not because the staff were not working hard; quite the opposite. The staff were absolutely flat out. Conversations could be heard: “There just isn’t another doctor available.” “I’m so sorry, there’s no doctor.” “There’s no doctor.” Apologies kept being made.

Can you imagine working in a workplace where you are constantly apologising for things beyond your control? That is the story we hear so often about our health network: that the staff do a magnificent job but they are simply not backed up with the numbers, with the people and with the resources that they desperately need. It is not simply a matter of spending more money. Obviously, that would help, but it is also a matter of making sure that the money is going to where it is needed most.

To all the doctors and nurses, the staff at the hospital, who are watching this debate right now, I thank you for all that you do for Canberra, because it is admired by everyone. Everyone knows a magnificent story of somebody who was treated with the most extreme professionalism that can be imagined. And we also know the same stories where those same people are absolutely flat out.

Imagine working in a place where you feel guilty for taking a lunch break. Imagine working in a place where you avoid a toilet break because the workload is so intense. Imagine a place where you frequently cancel having family dinners because you feel compelled to do a double shift. Imagine a place where you do not take annual leave and you do not take leave during school holidays, because you know that that would leave your colleagues under too much stress. Imagine a place where, despite all of this, there were not regular feedback channels to pass it on.

Whilst we can imagine that—or we might even struggle to imagine that—there are thousands of honourable people in our health network who are living with this every single day. We thank them for that sacrifice. We thank them for the enormous commitment they show to Canberra every day because to be a doctor, a nurse or a clinician is a calling. To deal with trauma on a daily basis is something that I think very few people could deal with. But thousands of people in Canberra voluntarily take this up, and we need to thank them for it.

We do not just need to thank them; we need to empower them. We need to make it as easy as possible for them to continue their service to Canberra. It is a tragedy when we hear of doctors, nurses or other staff leaving the ACT or leaving the profession because they were not given the resources they needed by this government.

I thank Mrs Dunne for all that she has done to raise the plight of doctors, nurses, clinicians, staff, administrators and patients. Had it not been for her advocacy, the interim report and final report would never have happened. And I thank all of those people who gave feedback. I thank those brave people who, despite having doubts about confidentiality, despite having concerns about whether anything would happen, still had the courage to go through with it.

Now that that process has been completed, the ball is wholly in the minister's court. She has the information. She has the diagnosis. She now has to provide the treatment. I very much hope, for the sake of Canberra, that she actually delivers on what is required.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (11.22): I rise to speak against the no confidence motion, to speak in support of Minister Fitzharris, and to endorse her comments in response to this motion.

There is no doubt that our health system is growing, to cater for a growing city. We are building hospitals to deliver nation-leading rehabilitation and maternity care. We are establishing walk-in centres right across the city so that people can get the care they need where and when they need it.

Minister Fitzharris is taking innovative action to improve bulk-billing by funding expansions of bulk-billing-providing GP clinics on the south side of our city. The government, through the minister's hard work, is getting on with the job of ensuring top-quality care for the community and providing a good working environment for our dedicated healthcare professionals. This is what the Canberra community expects.

As we have heard about and debated in this place on numerous occasions, changing cultural practices in pockets of a large organisation is a difficult task and it does take time. The minister has been unrelenting in her determination to make our health system the best possible care and treatment environment, and the best possible place to work.

The minister has made it absolutely clear that bullying and harassment have no place in the ACT health system, and is acting to root out any such ingrained negative work culture. Throughout the independent health workplace culture review process, the minister has made it very clear that she would both release interim and final reports, which she has done, and that she expected the review panel to speak with as many affected staff as possible throughout the entire organisation.

This process has been both timely and effective. Every staff member has had the chance to contribute, and many have taken up the opportunity. The panel certainly heard from a wide cross-section of employees and it developed a clear set of recommendations for the government to implement. Minister Fitzharris and the government have accepted all of these recommendations in principle, and the actions are now underway.

The AMA itself has recognised the value of this process, with the AMA's ACT president noting that this review was "a necessary first step in ensuring that change occurs", as well as confirming that clinicians continue to provide high-quality care to patients. The government and the AMA agree that this report points the way forward for Canberra Hospital, for Calvary public, for the University of Canberra Hospital, and indeed for ACT Health and Canberra Health Services.

This report, whilst important and valuable, is not the sole measure of the value of our health system. I will give just a few examples of improvements that are underway across the system now. Recently, the minister opened the territory's third public hospital at the University of Canberra, a facility that delivers specialised care for people recovering from surgery and illness. Feedback from patients has been overwhelmingly positive about how the new hospital is helping them to get back their quality of life.

Last July the minister also opened the newly refurbished maternity ward at Calvary Public Hospital, a renewed facility that offers an excellent option for Canberra's mothers-to-be to deliver their babies in the public system. The minister has also advocated for and won funding to support upgrades at Calvary Public Hospital, particularly at the expanded short-stay unit within the emergency department, as well as dedicating an investment of \$122 million in core hospital services at Canberra Hospital, so that more Canberrans can get faster access to the care they need.

The necessary detailed planning is well underway for the revolutionary SPIRE centre at the Woden campus, the biggest single piece of health infrastructure to be delivered by any government in the history of self-government. The minister opened our third nurse-led walk-in centre in Gungahlin in September. Thousands of patients have already taken advantage of this convenient and caring service from our dedicated nurse team.

There is a program of investment in public health services across our city. It is a program coming at a time when the party of those opposite has been engaged, since 2014, in an exercise of dramatically cutting funding for public health services across this nation.

Let us not forget the Tony Abbott-Joe Hockey budget that proudly proclaimed billions, tens of billions, of dollars in savings by cutting funding from public health services across the nation. Let us not forget that in a few months Australians will have the chance to vote in a federal election where there will be a very clear choice between the two major parties on the commonwealth's responsibility to fund health services in this nation—particularly the commonwealth share of public hospital funding.

Mr Hanson interjecting—

MR BARR: There is a clear point of difference between the two political parties. Long may those opposite interject and support their federal colleagues' position, because they are only proposing to fund 45 per cent of public hospital costs into the future, whereas there is a clear alternative position from our federal colleagues to increase the commonwealth share of funding to 50 per cent over time. That increase and that commitment have been made publicly and stand in marked contrast.

Opposition members interjecting—

MR BARR: Those opposite interject because they are very sensitive on this point. They know that their party's credibility on public health funding is in tatters as a result of the decisions of their party in government. Let me be very clear that not only has the ACT government stepped up at this time of funding cuts from the federal Liberal government; we have continued to invest in growing our health system, a system that supports Canberrans every single day.

Minister Fitzharris has my support, and she has the support of all of her colleagues, to continue this important program of investment in the ACT's public health system. She has our support to address the cultural practices, to improve the cultural practices, within the organisation whilst also delivering expanded and improved services for all Canberrans.

Minister Fitzharris has health on a reform path through her openness and her determination. This path is supported by the hardworking staff across the ACT Health system, hardworking staff who help thousands of patients to get the care that they need every single day. We reject this no confidence motion and declare our support for Minister Fitzharris.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (11.30): The Greens will not be supporting this motion today. It is an extremely serious matter to declare a lack of confidence in a minister, and we do not believe that that action is warranted. While, of course, there are areas of the ACT's health system that need improvement, Minister Fitzharris is working extremely hard to drive the changes that are needed. Both Minister Fitzharris and I are committed to working with staff and the community to enact real change in our health system so that we can deliver the best environment for staff and patients.

The fact is that health systems are complicated, and the ACT is no different in this regard. It is also an unfortunate reality that health systems across the country and the world have identified issues of inappropriate behaviours, bullying, discrimination and harassment. None of this is acceptable and it does not excuse this behaviour. But we must also acknowledge that some of the issues that Mrs Dunne references in her motion have existed for many years and blame cannot simply be laid at the feet of the current Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

While that may be an easy political fix for the opposition, these issues are more complex than that, and to change the current culture will require a sustained commitment at all levels of each organisation. Minister Fitzharris has expressed that commitment to the ACT community, and it is a commitment that I share. I also have faith in the new leadership of ACT Health, Canberra Health Services and Calvary to deliver the change we need.

Mrs Dunne's motion outlines the need to support the wellbeing of our staff: nurses, doctors, allied health workers and the many other dedicated people who work across our health system every day. I completely agree, and that is why the government is undertaking significant work in this area to improve culture and governance and to build an environment of genuine engagement. This has included the independent review into workplace culture that the government announced on 21 September last year. The final report was publicly released on 7 March and while it provides some difficult reading it also gives us a practical set of recommendations and a clear pathway forward to improve the culture within ACT Health Services.

I will take this opportunity to briefly outline some of those difficult findings of the review because it is important to acknowledge what is happening and what needs to improve. The report did find that staff members within the public health system have been subjected to inappropriate behaviours, including bullying and harassment in the workplace, and that many of these incidents have not been adequately investigated or addressed.

There are inefficient procedures and processes to deal with complaints, and HR practices require improvement. There has also been an inability to make timely decisions. Historically, there has been a lack of effective leadership and management within the organisations. There is a need to ensure greater clinical engagement to ensure that the system can benefit from the expert knowledge and input of individuals. Additional training is required to assist management to deal with inappropriate workplace practices and there is a need to develop and sustain strong partnerships and relationships internally and externally with NGOs, universities and other health sectors.

As a minister, I do not shy away from these results and recognise that we must do better. I want to acknowledge the work that panel chair, Mick Reid, and panel members, Fiona Brew and Professor David Watters, have done and thank them for their professional and dedicated approach. The fact that there were nearly 400 submissions and almost 2,000 responses to the online survey, and the panel members held close to 100 meetings and workshops to get to this point, is testament to their

efforts. They respected the privacy of individuals and honoured the contributions they received. They have also brought considerable knowledge and experience to this task, and this is reflected in the quality of the report.

I now look forward to getting on with implementing the recommendations which the government has already agreed to in principle. In particular, I welcome the recommendation to sit on the oversight committee to monitor the implementation of these recommendations, which will be chaired by Minister Fitzharris. This is not just another report that will go in a drawer or sit on a shelf. As ministers, we will be directly involved in ensuring that the recommendations are put into action and that we are measuring the outcomes.

At the same time as the review was announced, Minister Fitzharris also established the clinical leadership forum to give clinicians a greater voice in system-wide issues. This is consistent with the review panel's findings and includes issues such as health services planning and infrastructure, clinical culture, and training and education. We know that we need more and better clinical engagement in decision-making across our health system and the forum is one of the ways we can put that into practice. Expressions of interest to sit on the forum are now being sought and I would encourage clinicians at all levels of our health system to take the opportunity to get involved.

Additionally, in December 2018 we released the nurses and midwives: towards a safer culture strategy to improve the workplace, health and safety of nurses and midwives. This was a piece of work that had been under development for some time. We want staff, patients and visitors to our health service to be protected from harm and feel safe at all times. Importantly, the strategy also includes a range of very practical actions. Two dedicated senior nurse project officers have recently been appointed to implement the strategy: one looking specifically at mental health, and the other working across the rest of Canberra Health Services. For me, as the Minister for Mental Health, that is a particularly important point—that there is a specific nurse dedicated to looking at the mental health issues—because I am cognisant that the issues of staff safety have a particular filter and a particular emphasis that we need to consider from a mental health perspective.

Alongside all this, the CEO of Canberra Health Services is chairing a working group to develop a dedicated occupational violence strategy to define best practice in managing occupational violence. We know that health environments can be challenging at times and we want our staff to have the skills and confidence to identify early where situations are escalating so that they can intervene and prevent violent incidents. Of course, violence against our staff, whether from patients, visitors or even colleagues, is never acceptable, and that message is clear and will continue to be made clear. Where incidents can be prevented, that is the best outcome for all involved, obviously.

On the issues of bullying and complaints resolution, work is already underway. Canberra Health Services and the ACT Health Directorate are introducing an employee advocate role. This position will offer staff an alternative model for the

resolution of complaints and allegations of bullying and harassment which focuses on expedient dispute resolution.

Training programs particularly focused on resolving workplace conflicts swiftly are also being considered within all three health organisations. I thought that that was a very powerful point made in the report and by Mick Reid in his public comments about the need to find a way to address conflict and tension between people in a way that deals with it quickly, does not fob it off to HR or make it someone else's problem but seeks to actually resolve matters within an immediate work team. I think there is something powerful in that. It is an observation that, perhaps, has been lost sight of.

There will be cases that need external involvement but I think that the point he made a number of times in his public comments, which I think is very important, is the need to better equip people to take issues up quickly and immediately. And if they can be resolved in that immediate environment, I think it is better for everybody.

What I have just outlined are some of the examples of work that is underway. It is clear that there is a lot of work still to do but we are not sitting still. The review has provided us with a clear set of recommendations and the review oversight committee is due to meet for the first time next week. With new leadership in place across the health system, I share the cautious optimism that the review has spoken of.

I also want to speak briefly on the issues of health infrastructure that Mrs Dunne has raised in her motion. Of course, culture is fundamental to good health systems but we also need to invest in high quality facilities, particularly as our population grows and the demand for health services increases.

As the Minister for Mental Health, I was pleased to see the findings of the 2018 independent review of mental health services, which recognised the excellent quality of our mental health infrastructure. Additionally, the 2018-19 budget provided \$22.8 million for supported accommodation to expand the mental health system and provide more community based alternatives for mental healthcare.

I recognise that some parts of our health system are ageing and there are always opportunities to do more. At the same time we saw a brand new hospital opened at the University of Canberra last year, and the new supported accommodation houses will be coming on line soon. I do not think it is fair to assert that the government or the minister have not invested in health infrastructure.

This motion before us is a serious one and the issues it raises are worthy of serious discussion. There is no doubt that the ACT health system faces challenges but I believe that right now we have an opportunity to put in place some significant reforms that will improve our health system for the long term. I think the minister has acted to make changes where others may have sought an easier path.

For the reasons I have outlined, the Greens retain confidence in Minister Fitzharris and we will not be supporting the motion.

MRS JONES (Murrumbidgee) (11.40): As Minister Rattenbury has pointed out, there are a number of very concerning, longstanding, ongoing concerns in our health system. A fatalism has taken over this government, which is astounding. We hear so often about complicated problems that are hard to fix. The women's and children's hospital in particular has a number of issues in respect of how it is operating. Maternity services and the staff at the women's and children's hospital continue to be under extreme pressure.

Staff exhaustion is a big problem. I was recently in a lift with doctors. They were talking to each other in this hospital about having had five hours sleep in three days. The minister dares to come in here and say that we do not appreciate the staff. Staff who looked after me for 14 days last year sat on my bed telling me about the absolutely unreasonable demands being put on them by this government. The minister must understand that, at the end of the day, those demands are being put on the staff by her.

There are constant, relentless requests for overtime. We now know that there is systemic bullying, leading to poor workplace culture and a high staff turnover. There are infrastructure fails. Even I saw the response to rising damp and ants in the ICU of the main hospital. Now we have confirmation via the KPMG report that there are concerns about the structural integrity of the main building.

When I came in here to speak to a similar motion not so long ago and I said that the hospital looked like something out of the Soviet bloc, everyone on the other side scoffed at me. Now the KPMG report says that it is worse than that, that there are structural integrity issues.

There are delays in delivering the building for surgical procedures, with interventional radiology, emergency dysfunction and massive wait times. Mr Reid's report has shown a completely failed management model. There is no trust because there is no trust deserved. This government has had 18 years to work on these issues. There is no convincing argument being presented by the government, nor any evidence that it is about to stop. That is why we are moving this motion today.

You would think that by now there would be an "I am sorry." You would think that the minister would be saying, "We have actually failed; we have failed the staff; we have failed some patients; and we have failed the people of Canberra." As members know, last year nurses took matters into their own hands at huge risk to themselves, personally and professionally, because they were at breaking point after being bullied and ignored for so long.

These hardworking nurses wrote an open letter to the minister asking her to finally act on overcrowding and the dangerously low levels of staff at the women's and children's hospital. The letter, which should have set alarm bells ringing, stated that given the poor staffing and hospital structure under this minister, patient safety could not be guaranteed.

Nothing that we have been told since that point in time convinces us or the community that matters have changed. It is right, it is just, it is only fair for us to continue to bring these matters to the minister and to ask her to explain how she is going to make it better. Statements that there are processes in place are not an answer. How? What is convincing about the answer? What will change things?

They said that areas of the maternity hospital were constantly over capacity, that there were daily over-bookings in labour and delivery, that there was a lack of available beds and a lack of available breast-feeding assistance, that the postnatal home visiting service had been substantially reduced and that critical functions of our health system were in crisis as a result of the lack of staffing. Now we have confirmation of the toxic culture they referred to.

Since the letter, we have seen time after time health workers and patients come forward to tell their story about overcrowding, understaffing and the poor workplace culture. We have heard stories about instances where there was no room for women to give birth. Rostering is designed to give the illusion of appropriate staffing. Nothing we have been told in this place gives us the confidence that this has in any way changed. It is simply not the case that there is any change.

I can attest to this from my own experience last year. I often witnessed generalist registered nurses without experience in maternity or of the procedures needed to be understood in the maternity unit, being used to cover midwife shifts. People were also constantly being asked to work extra hours or a double shift because staffing was just too low to operate properly.

That is a poorly managed and impossibly busy work environment. Sadly, I think that it is only a matter of time before very serious things happen, more serious than have already occurred. We have had a lot to say about these many failings, but what does the minister say? What does the minister do? How can the minister give any confidence that there is going to be an improvement?

Minister Rattenbury's excuse that this has been going on for a long time, that it predates the minister, is not a reason for us to have confidence in the minister. Just because a problem has been perpetrated by the government since its beginning does not mean that the minister should not be fixing it. What a ridiculous justification!

Rather than take the feedback from the women and men working in the women's and children's hospital and promise to do better, the concerns were dismissed. It was said that they were not accurate. When someone brings you a problem, you do not tell them it is not right. It was said that the hospital provided safe and high-quality care for women. We cannot have it both ways. Either there is a problem or there is not. Now we know. We have had reviews and evidence to say that there is a problem. The reflection on the staff who wrote the letter was that they were lying and that there was nothing to see here. That is nonsense. It is Orwellian doublespeak.

The minister also said that the ACT Health restructure would further provide an opportunity to really focus on service delivery and staff feedback. "It will be vital to

this process over coming months,” the minister said. The restructure was apparently going to fix the problem, although nobody was told exactly how it was going to fix the problem. The problems are not fixed and now we have had the new setup in the health department for some time.

No-one can tell me how the restructure has helped with any of these issues and exactly how it was meant to. The restructure has been promoted as a solution, but a solution to which problem exactly? How will the restructure achieve this solution? None of this has been outlined, evaluated or eventuated.

When I asked Health officials why we had restructured, they could not tell me. They said that it was the fashion in hospital management. It is not an explanation as to how it will help. We have learned that staff have been completely cynical that any change will ever occur. Is it any wonder that staff are completely exasperated when even in the last couple of weeks the Health administration showed its attitude toward staff in a report in the *Canberra Times*.

The report outlined that a member of staff had written into the HACS inquiry with a formal submission saying that women were not being asked permission before being given vaginal examinations. What was the response of the government? The government said that what was said in that submission was not necessarily accurate and that it was not necessarily true. That was the message from the government in a statement the next day after that article.

Yet again the government says, “You are probably wrong.” This goes to the heart of the problems of trust by staff. Why would you trust someone when you put yourself on the line and make a submission to a committee, which is a privileged document in this place, and then get told by the government, and therefore by this minister, that what you have said is probably wrong? What an embarrassment. What a disgrace.

This minister should stand down. Nobody has any confidence when the answer to someone’s complaint is, “It is probably untrue.” No wonder there have been longstanding issues in the management of the hospital and for the staff.

MR HANSON (Murrumbidgee) (11.50): I want to speak today about the issue of what Mr Barr describes as the biggest infrastructure spend in health in the ACT’s history. But in reality it the biggest con ever perpetrated on the people of the ACT in our history. I will go through this sad history, and it is a sad history. It is this government’s failure to properly invest in the Canberra Hospital and properly rebuild this hospital that has in many ways led to the overcrowding, the pressure and the problems that we see today.

I will go back a little in history. The reality is that in 2011 this government put \$41 million into the budget with an announcement that they were going to spend \$800 million to rebuild the Canberra Hospital. That was their announcement. They put out figures in the budget. They put \$41 million in the budget. That was the plan. They put \$375 million into the forward estimates for that proposal.

What then happened is that there was a parliamentary agreement with the Greens. There were changes. Priorities changed. That \$41 million to rebuild the Canberra Hospital was ripped out of the budget. The \$375 million that was put into the forward estimates for the hospital was then relocated into the tram. It was the first availability payment for the tram. That \$375 million was exactly the same amount that had been proposed to rebuild the Canberra Hospital. It was exactly the same amount that the Labor Party, with their Greens colleagues, decided to put into the tram.

Amidst all of this we had people like Dr Hall in the emergency department saying that the hospital was dangerously overcrowded and bed occupancy was at dangerous levels. We know the litany of problems. Many of the problems have flowed over to the enormous pressure that are staff are under.

In that context we then came to the situation in 2016 when the minister for health was the Assistant Minister for Health. What was the government's response? The government's response was, "No, we are not going to rebuild the Canberra Hospital". They said in estimates hearings, "We are not going to do anything to rebuild the Canberra Hospital. We are going to crisis manage the emergency infrastructure. We are going to emergency manage as we go."

That was the way that they were going to approach it. They took the rebuild of the hospital off the table. They said, "This does not need to be done for a decade. We are not going to do anything in terms of rebuilding the hospital for a decade". They said that specifically. They said that they were going to crisis manage the infrastructure. That is what they said in committee hearings. That was a disgraceful response. That was a disgraceful response from the minister—as she was then, the assistant minister—who was part of this proposal.

What then happened in the lead up to the election in August of that year? The Canberra Liberals announced that we would rebuild the hospital. Broadly, we took the plan that had been proposed previously by the government, that they had taken off the table for a decade. We said, "No, we will do it". What was the Labor Pty's response? They said, "You do not need to do that. It is spendthrift. We do not need to do that".

They ridiculed the plan. They said, "We do not need to invest in the Canberra Hospital." That is where their heart is, Madam Speaker. That is what they believe. They said, "No, we are not going to rebuild it for a decade." That was their position.

The Labor Party then put a poll in the field. It might not have been the Labor Party; it might even have been Unions ACT. It is all a bit one and the same. It is difficult to know. But there was a poll in the field asking basically, "Do we need to rebuild the Canberra Hospital?" They wanted to know what the polling said. They wanted to know what the polling was because they knew that this was stinging them in the lead-up to the election.

Obviously the poll came back and said, "No, the people do want this to be done." As Mrs Dunne has said, on the back of a beer coaster they then came up with this plan for the SPIRE centre. Ms Fitzharris, the minister, was out there front and centre conning

the people of the ACT that the Labor Party was now committed. After saying that they would not do it for a decade, after saying to the Liberal Party that it did not need to be done, on the back of polling, she was out there saying, “No, we are going to do it. Trust us. Here is our plan.”

No-one fell for that. No-one who knew what was going on, who looked at the detail, fell for that. Certainly the *Canberra Times* did not in their editorial. I will read that. Certainly the AMA did not. It is not surprising. Mrs Dunne has been a little disingenuous in saying that it was done on the back of a beer coaster, because when you actually look at the Labor Party policy, there was a front page that just said that it was the Labor Party policy. There was a waffling foreword by the Chief Minister that does not talk anything about the policy itself. Then it was on a page, Madam Speaker. There was a page—

Mrs Jones: There was a map.

MR HANSON: Oh, the map on the back! I reckon my 12-year-old could have done a better job of presenting where the SPIRE would go. No, I do not think that that is actually the location it is going to be, is it? We have changed it a few times now. I will table this because it shows you what a mockery this policy was, what a joke it was, cooked up overnight, who knows by whom. But it was—

MADAM SPEAKER: You need leave to table the paper.

MR HANSON: I seek leave to table the document.

Leave granted.

MR HANSON: I table the following paper:

Canberra Hospital—\$500m Infrastructure Investment—Caring for Canberrans
When and Where They Need It, prepared by ACT Labor.

It was manifestly inadequate. That is why the AMA, when the government came out with this, said about the policy, “We have been impressed with the plans of the Canberra Liberals and are urging Labor to take a bipartisan approach.” They were urging them to take a more bipartisan approach. But when they rated this policy, there was the comment:

No detail available about how ‘Spire centre’ was planned ... The physical infrastructure of the Centenary Hospital is already at capacity, so it is unclear where all the additional facilities will be housed and located.
Timeframe None given

But there was Minister Fitzharris out there smiling away and saying, “Trust us, we will build this.” What did the *Canberra Times* say when they had looked at this? This is from a newspaper editorial last year:

While the ACT Government is well known for its willingness to test the credulity of the electorate, its recent claim work on the new hospital will be under way in 2020 is going to be hard to top.

The \$500 million project, commonly referred to under the acronym “SPIRE”, was announced on September 20, 2016, during the closing weeks of the last ACT election ... It had been rolled out to trump an earlier promise made by the ACT Liberals on August 9 ... to construct a new \$395 million hospital building.

The ALP was originally dismissive of the Liberal pledge, describing it as spendthrift and unnecessary.

That is right. That is what this minister and her Labor colleagues thought at the time, that rebuilding the Canberra Hospital was unnecessary. That is what they believed. This is what this minister believed in her heart, that it was unnecessary, until the polling came in. The polling said that it was very necessary if the government wanted to win the election. The government’s position was, “We do not really give a stuff about the hospital. We are going to crisis manage that for 10 years.” But the polling said, “If you want to win the election, you need to do it.”

The *Canberra Times* editorial goes on to state:

Now, two years on from the announcement and after delays influenced by the cost of light rail and the Mr Fluffy remediation program that have already pushed the completion date back from 2022 to 2024, neither the Health Minister, Meegan Fitzharris, or anybody else in her department knows where the facility should go.

This is the heart of the problem. This minister is not committed, is not wholly committed, to this program. Her government has put the \$370 million that was allocated into light rail. It was ripped out of health. When she was assistant minister and was asked about whether the government was going to rebuild the hospital, she was describing it as unnecessary. It is only on the back of polling that they then came and said, “We will do this.”

But, as the AMA, the *Canberra Times* and anyone observing this closely has noted, there was no plan. There was a sketchy PowerPoint photo on the back of a one-page policy. That is why we find ourselves in this position of this minister for health and her colleagues conning the people of the ACT that this government is committed to rebuilding the Canberra Hospital when it is anything but committed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Hanson, I will go back to *Hansard* and reflect on your use of the words “conned” and “conning”. I may come back to you and ask you to withdraw that.

MR WALL (Brindabella) (11.59): We heard the minister, in her response this morning to this motion, stand behind the public servants who are doing all of the heavy lifting in the Health portfolio. Just because there are good things being done by the staff who operate underneath you, it is not a sign of your competence as a manager. This minister has categorically failed to measure up to what is expected of her as the health minister for the ACT.

We heard the minister speak of the good work that is being done in so many areas, and that is even evident from the experience that many in the community and many members of this place have had. I will speak of a recent experience where a relative of mine was in a hospital. The nursing staff and doctors treating her were first-class. But when comments such as these are made, “You’re fit to be discharged but we will not discharge you for fear that you have a relapse and we will not have a bed for you,” it is evidence of the systemic failures at the management level inside ACT Health.

Front-line staff are doing all that they can with their hands tied behind their back. To think that we have a hospital system that is reluctant to discharge patients for fear that they may need to be returned to a hospital setting and there is no space for them; that speaks volumes about the culture and the management failures presided over by this minister.

The minister is also quick to throw accusations back at the opposition, saying that not once have we put forward a policy idea. It is probably worth noting how far out we are from the next ACT election. If she was actually paying attention, just a couple of weeks ago the opposition released our policies on improving the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the ACT. It is a document which includes initiatives across a broad spectrum of areas, initiatives focused on improving not only health but also personal, social and justice outcomes for our Indigenous community.

If she took the time to look at what we were doing, and what we are offering as an alternative, she would have noticed that we are going to provide more cultural awareness training for health service providers across the ACT. We are going to be using sport as an innovative way of improving healthy lifestyles for young kids in our school settings.

Most prominently in the health space, we are going to fix the absolute debacle that this government has presided over in the Aboriginal drug and alcohol rehabilitation space. You only need to look at this week’s *City News* to get some external commentary on that policy and that policy outcome. Madam Speaker, for the benefit of the minister and all other members, I seek leave to table a copy of the policy document.

Leave granted.

MR WALL: I present the following paper:

Improving the Lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples of the ACT, prepared by the Canberra Liberals.

The main crux of what I want to touch on and raise is with respect to issues around infrastructure. We have heard of the cultural failings, the management failings and the capacity failings that this minister has presided over. There are also failures in the maintenance and management of infrastructure. The minister has been either the health minister or the Assistant Minister for Health for three years. Since then, hospital infrastructure, especially at the Canberra Hospital, has continued to

deteriorate badly. It has become broken, unworkable, malfunctioning, posed significant health risks and, in some instances, even caught on fire.

In 2015 the government was advised that hospital infrastructure posed a threat to patients and needed to be replaced. Instead the government's focus, and this minister's focus, was on a shiny tram, rather than on delivering the primary government service of public health.

An AECOM report in 2015 identified four extreme risks on the hospital campus, and 143 other areas of high risk. The government's reaction was to implement the UMAHA program to upgrade and maintain health assets. But this funding, whilst it seems significant, and gave her a good headline, is simply fixing things after they have broken rather than funding the prevention measures. The cost to fix a catastrophe is far in excess of that to prevent it in the first place.

On 6 April 2017, nearly two years ago, the switchboard at the hospital caught fire. Sixty patients needed to be evacuated, surgeries were delayed and it took several days for the hospital to become fully functional again. This kind of degradation of resources puts lives at risk, disrupts the schedule of operations in the hospital and adds unnecessary burden to the already clogged surgical lists.

A year ago, the Australian Council on Healthcare Standards reviewed the ACT hospital campus. The council found that 33 core standards were not met. Some of those standards related to governance, for which the minister is wholly responsible. Others related to maintenance, such as HEPA filters, while the extreme risks were in the adult mental health unit, where deadly ligature points were identified.

They found a number of serious ongoing infrastructure and maintenance issues at the hospital. The Centenary Hospital for Women and Children is full. My colleague Mrs Jones has spoken at length about the problems inside maternity services. The medical paediatric ward at the Canberra Centenary hospital was closed for four months due to plumbing issues. The adult mental health unit has been over capacity for at least two years. The continued need to remove the deadly ligature points at the adult mental health unit has resulted in a reduction in capacity. This issue has been highlighted by both the opposition and Ms Le Couteur; likewise the issue of people being released from the adult mental health ward into homelessness.

A recent freedom of information request has shown that the intensive care unit at the Canberra Hospital was in danger of running out of beds from October this year. What if that were to happen? Members, just think for a moment of the implications if a hospital runs out of space in its intensive care ward. The government is quoted as saying that it is working on a medium-term solution. We have six months to go until October. What is the short-term solution? The medium-term may well and truly be too late for some of those people who require that level of care.

The same documents released under freedom of information have highlighted that the coronary care unit did not meet Australian standards, and it, too, needs to be replaced quickly. An operating theatre at the hospital was out of action for several weeks last year due to mould found in HEPA filters, posing a significant health risk.

The operating theatres at Canberra Hospital only work for eight hours a day, five days a week, with some emergency surgery done out of hours. The Canberra Hospital does not have enough beds for more surgery to be done on the campus. The government has to outsource additional surgeries to the private sector which, lo and behold, is more efficient.

I come from the private sector, and if a manager failed to maintain assets of the business and allowed buildings to catch fire, the responsible manager would be sacked. If the business failed to replace assets when it needed to, the responsible manager would be sacked, because the business would go broke. If a manager failed to maintain assets and plumbing issues led to sites being closed for months at a time, they, too, would be let go.

The health minister may believe that her position is more that of a chair of the board. If the board failed to take action to replace critical infrastructure, the share price of the company would tumble. Shareholders would revolt and would demand that the board be fired; most definitely, the chair of such a board. Shareholders would lose confidence in the chair.

The shareholders of our public health system are the voters of the ACT. They have continued to lose confidence, not just in this minister but in this government, for the past decade. They have run with a “born to rule” mentality, and they have the arrogance of thinking that they have a claim to occupy the executive bench. But it is worth noting that over 60 per cent of Canberrans voted against them at the last election. Over 60 per cent did not want those opposite running the territory.

This government has lost touch. The minister has lost touch. The minister is highly incapable of addressing the critical issues inside the Health portfolio. We have seen a failure in culture, we have seen a failure in management, a failure in managing the capacity needs for the community inside Health: a failure of management. This minister has failed on every front.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (12.09), in reply: This is an important issue, and the Canberra Liberals do not resile from drawing to this Assembly’s attention the failure of the performance of this Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

It is not surprising that this motion will fail today, because the crossbench has become the insurance policy for this government. It is also not surprising because if Mr Rattenbury were to vote as he should in relation to the performance of this minister, it would be an indictment of him as well, because of his failings in overseeing his part of the Health portfolio.

Once upon a time the Greens talked about third-party insurance, but it is actually only insurance so long as it is for the Labor Party. They are there to ensure that the Labor Party and their ministers, no matter how poorly they have performed, stay in their jobs, because they have an interest in doing this.

It is not surprising to us that what we heard from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing was a series of extracts from various ministerial statements that we have heard over the past little while, cobbled together in such a way as to be a justification for her performance. In doing so, the minister perpetuated what she has been doing all the time. “Look how much money we are spending; look at the investment,” she said. “Look at the number of admissions,” she said. “Look at the number of surgeries that are being done. These are some of the ways that I’m performing as the minister for health.”

This is not how Minister Fitzharris is performing as the minister for health. These things are happening in spite of Minister Fitzharris. The staff are performing. The staff are doing their jobs. The staff are going above and beyond. The staff are doing double shifts. The staff, in spite of being disrespected, in spite of all the things that were dragged out into the open through the Reid report, are doing their job.

What we had today was an attempt at victim blaming from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. She likes to say that we on this side never say anything nice about the health system. Actually, that is not true. We spend our time upholding the staff, the people who work there and the great services that are provided. All of us here, in our way, are consumers of health services. We have not only our legislative responsibility but our own personal responsibility to see that we have a great health service.

We spend our time upholding the staff. That is why I have spent the past two years talking about bullying and harassment, because the staff talk to us about bullying and harassment, because the staff are at the end of their tether, and because the staff have nowhere else to go, because this minister does not care.

This minister does not care. As a result we have a situation where the minister had nowhere else to go. The AMA has publicly called for a board of inquiry into the culture of the hospital system. The minister can dismiss what the Liberal opposition says as just a political stunt. That is what she did. They said it was too expensive and that this was just a political stunt.

When the AMA and other doctor organisations and other health organisations say, “Hang on, enough is enough; we really do need to have this inquiry,” the minister for health had nowhere else to go. She was dragged kicking and screaming to instituting an inquiry. I do not resile from my view that, had it not been for the Liberal opposition talking about this for a very long time, and being talked to by distraught, disgruntled, unhappy—and sometimes ex-members of the health service, because they could not work there any longer—this would all still be under the carpet.

The minister did not want this review. She did not want this inquiry. She did not want to see it brought out into the public. And now she is trying to make the best of it that she possibly can. But she has never once apologised and said, “I was wrong. There haven’t been respectful pathways. And even if I personally have zero tolerance for bullying and harassment”—and I hope that she does—“I have not done anything to ensure that that happens in the hospitals.”

Staff are not being ground down just by the stress of their work. It is hard work. We know that. You know that, Madam Speaker. You know how hard it is. As a health consumer, I know how hard people in the hospital system work. They do not need to be ground down by a minister who says, "There's nothing to see here. There is no problem."

The problem has been brought out in stark ways. The *Canberra Times* said, "This is the most searing indictment of this health minister." They did not say it was the only searing indictment, just the worst one they have seen. She does not have the grace to say, "I was wrong. I got it wrong; I misjudged the environment. I have failed the people of the ACT."

If the minister had done that back in January, it would be very hard for us to move the motion that we have moved in this place today, because she would have admitted to her faults. Really, what she is saying is that there is nothing to see. She is saying "Everything is ripe in the garden; we're getting on with the business." It is a bit Polyanna-ish, really. "We're just getting on with the job."

This minister has been getting on with this job for three years, in one form or another. This government have been getting on with this job for 18 years, under successive health ministers, and they have failed. They have failed the health system, they have failed the people of Canberra and they have failed the health workers. Mr Reid's report makes it clear that the culture that they have overseen and allowed to fester impacts on patient care. We have seen from the AECOM report and various other infrastructure reports that the infrastructure they have overseen and allowed to deteriorate impacts on patient care.

The people of the ACT, the health workers of the ACT, the people who work in the building and who are treated in the building, deserve better than this minister. The *Canberra Times* called it for what it is. She is the minister responsible under the Westminster principles that we all adhere to for the failings in the health system. The *Canberra Times* said that she should have resigned. She has not, so it is now our place to tell her to resign. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

Question put:

That the motion be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 10

Miss C Burch	Mr Milligan
Mr Coe	Mr Parton
Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Mr Hanson	
Mrs Jones	
Mrs Kikkert	
Ms Lee	

Noes 13

Mr Barr	Ms Orr
Ms Berry	Mr Pettersson
Ms J Burch	Mr Ramsay
Ms Cheyne	Mr Rattenbury
Ms Cody	Mr Steel
Ms Fitzharris	Ms Stephen-Smith
Ms Le Couteur	

Question resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 12.21 to 2 pm.

Unparliamentary language

Statement by Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: Just before we broke for lunch, I said I would go and reflect on language used by Mr Hanson. He used the words “but is in reality the biggest con ever perpetrated on the people of the ACT”. Later he said “Ms Fitzharris was out there front and centre conning people of the ACT”.

The *Macquarie Dictionary* defines “con” as “a confidence trick; swindle”. The word “conned” is “to swindle, defraud or to deceive”.

House of Representatives Practice—

Mr Hanson interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Hanson, I would suggest you be quiet. *House of Representatives Practice*, the seventh edition, notes at page 515:

Although a charge or reflection upon the character or conduct of a Member may be made by substantive motion, in expressing that charge or reflection a member may not use unparliamentary words.

I have considered this matter and I am not at this point going to rule those words out of order, but I will remind all members to be careful in their choice of words in debate and also remember that they may be ruled out of order and be considered unparliamentary at a future date.

Mr Coe: Madam Speaker, on the point of order I would note that to say someone is a con artist or a confidence trickster would be very similar to saying someone is a snake oil salesman.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Coe, that was not a point of order; that was a statement that I said I would come back on.

Questions without notice

Taxation—reform

MR COE: My question is for the Treasurer. The Canberra Liberals raised concerns about intended and unintended consequences regarding your changes contained in the Land Tax Amendment Bill 2018. These changes have meant that purchasers of off-the-plan apartments are liable for a quarter of land tax in almost every instance. This tax is grossly unfair and puts further strain on the property market, including the cost or rent. Treasurer, why have you not yet introduced legislation to fix this problem?

MR BARR: Yes, the government has identified, through a process of work, that there will need to be an amendment bill, and the government will proceed with that through the normal processes. In the meantime the revenue office is working through individual cases, and the government will waive any unintended charges in this context.

MR COE: Treasurer, why have you called this a loophole or unintended consequence when the fact that people will be liable for a quarter of land tax, based on a single day of vacancy, was the very intention of your legislation?

MR BARR: The intent of the legislation was clear. Where a circumstance has arisen where those who were not meant to be subject to the land tax, because of the principal place of residence exemption—where there has been an issue identified—the government has responded and waived those charges. I will introduce legislation to address that particular unintended consequence as it relates to those who have a principal place of residence exemption, which is the intent of the legislation.

MR PARTON: Treasurer, will all owners, particularly first homebuyers, who have been captured by this circumstance be issued a refund, and will you ask the revenue office to freeze the outstanding invoices?

MR BARR: That has already been done.

Municipal services—waste collection

MS LE COUTEUR: My question is to the Minister for Roads and Minister for City Services, and relates to the recent verge works around the city. Minister, why did the recent verge works on Northbourne Avenue outside the Sydney and Melbourne buildings include only waste bins and not recycling bins?

MR STEEL: I thank Ms Le Couteur for her question. We are currently looking at how we can improve the availability of recycling bins across the city, and we will continue to do that. That will include areas particularly where there is high frequency of traffic, like the Northbourne Sydney and Melbourne building areas, as well as group centres around Canberra. It is not unusual for there to be group centres—Curtin is a good example, in Ms Le Couteur's electorate—where there are not recycle bins available. We will continue to look at how we can provide those, to make sure that we are improving our source separation.

Opposition members interjecting—

MR STEEL: We know what the Canberra Liberals think of recycling. They think that Canberrans do enough recycling. They were completely opposed to the container deposit scheme. They completely oppose our approach to waste management. But we will continue to roll out more—

Opposition members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Members! Mr Coe.

Ms Berry: A point of order, Madam Speaker. I know you are calling attention to it, but there are very loud interjections, as well as being unparliamentary interjections.

MADAM SPEAKER: I remind members that no interjections are allowed, and it does get very noisy. Minister, do you have anything further to add?

MR STEEL: We will continue to take a responsible approach to waste management here in the ACT. We will look at how we can further improve source separation through the provision of recycling bins around the city. I look forward to updating the Assembly as we progress that work.

MS LE COUTEUR: Verge works on London Circuit last year removed large amounts of bike parking, in particular outside Bailey's Corner. Given that this has been missing since last winter, when and where is it going to be replaced?

MR STEEL: I thank Ms Le Couteur for the question. I am happy to provide an answer on notice.

ACT Health—workplace culture

MR MILLIGAN: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. The Reid report states that 60 per cent of respondents working in ACT Health and Canberra Health Services have witnessed bullying over the past 12 months and 35 per cent of respondents had been bullied. Why is it that Canberra performs worse than New South Wales on comparative data?

MS FITZHARRIS: I thank Mr Milligan for his question. It is certainly the case that this was a very comprehensive undertaking through the independent review chaired by Mick Reid, and it is certainly the case that some of those findings were very challenging. But we now have a final report with widely supported recommendations which we are getting on with addressing. I also note that in the report there was cautious optimism in the leadership and a lot of goodwill from ACT Health staff, Canberra Health Services staff—

Mrs Dunne: On a point of order, standing orders require, Madam Speaker, that the minister be directly relevant to the question. And the question is: why is it that Canberra performs worse than New South Wales on comparable data?

MADAM SPEAKER: The minister is referring to the report and the study, and she has a minute left to answer the question. I will keep an ear open for her response.

MR MILLIGAN: Minister, what impact is this workplace culture having on ACT Health's ability to recruit and retain staff from outside the ACT?

MS FITZHARRIS: We continue to recruit staff from outside the ACT and we will continue to do so. The completion of this report provides a high level of certainty as to

the government's commitment to getting on and implementing the recommendations from this report, and I look forward to being able to welcome new staff into the ACT consistently. I note that at the beginning of this year we had new intakes of doctors and nurses, as we do at the start of every year, and that they are highly sought-after positions.

MS CHEYNE: Minister, will the implementation activities address these concerns?

MS FITZHARRIS: Thank you, Ms Cheyne. Yes, they absolutely will. The recommendations are comprehensive, they are well informed and they provide a clear path forward for all our public health services. I very much look forward to having the first meeting of the oversight group with Minister Rattenbury and me in the course of the next week or so.

ACT Health—workplace culture

MR HANSON: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, are bullying and other health culture issues listed on the ACT Health risk register?

MS FITZHARRIS: I will take that question on notice.

MR HANSON: Minister, what risk do bullying and other Health culture issues pose?

MS FITZHARRIS: It is the case, as Mick Reid said in his public statements at the release of both the interim and final reports, culture is enduring and can take some time to turn around. But the report also found that the quality of care provided to our community is comparable with and, indeed, in some cases exceeds that of other jurisdictions.

It is certainly the case that it is vital to understand the culture of public health service delivery in this town. That is exactly what the report has looked into. The recommendations provide a clear path forward for us to address those concerns. I was particularly encouraged by the level of involvement of staff and their desire to see change. I reiterate the government's clear commitment to implement that change.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, what assessment have ACT Health and Canberra Health Services done of the risk of bullying and harassment to its patients and its staff?

MS FITZHARRIS: There is a range of processes and frameworks underway and in place at Canberra Health Services, at ACT Health and indeed at Calvary Public Hospital. Again I note that the report commented on the quality of care and gave a clear path forward for us to get on and implement the recommendations from the review.

ACT Health—workplace culture

MISS C BURCH: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. I refer to the final report of the independent review into Health culture. I quote:

Of great concern was that 12% of staff indicated they had been subjected to physical harm, sexual harassment or abuse at work. Of these staff, 46% indicated it was by someone they worked with and 37% was by a member of the public.

What are the consequences for people found to have perpetrated these serious infringements?

MS FITZHARRIS: If they are found to have perpetrated this sort of behaviour, they should be reported to the relevant authorities including, of course, to the police and those matters will be followed up.

MISS C BURCH: How many former ACT Health employees are no longer employed by the ACT public service as a result of disciplinary action relating to physical harm, sexual harassment or abuse at work?

MS FITZHARRIS: I will take that question on notice.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, what action is taken against members of the public who assault, sexually harass or abuse public health workers?

MS FITZHARRIS: Again I refer to my previous answer: they should be referred to the relevant authorities, including police. I am aware of some instances where that has occurred. What was also instituted very soon after the new CEO of Canberra Health Services started was the establishment of a working group on occupational violence. That complements the work we have been doing with nurses and midwives and their representative through the ANMF on the nurse safety strategy.

Extensive work is underway broadly across ACT Health, Canberra Health Services and Calvary Public Hospital on occupational violence with a specific focus on nurses. Of course, as Minister Rattenbury has outlined, within that there is a particular focus on mental health.

Government—sport and recreation grants

MS ORR: My question is to the Minister for Sport and Recreation. Minister, how is the ACT government supporting Canberrans to live healthy, active and inclusive lifestyles?

MS BERRY: I thank Ms Orr for her question. The ACT government is committed to supporting Canberrans to live a healthy, active and inclusive lifestyle. It is important that everyone feels supported and inspired to improve their health and wellbeing through sport and recreation.

Seventy local sporting organisations have just been provided with funding through the 2019 ACT government sport and recreation grants program to help them provide more training and education opportunities and improve their club facilities. The grants will help local sporting organisations continue to create quality, diverse and safe physical activity experiences and facilities for Canberra's active community.

Some of the organisations receiving funding through the sport and recreation grants programs this year include Volleyball ACT, which will receive \$73,620 to support the installation of an ablutions block at the Lyneham beach facility, which incorporates a female-friendly design. ACT Disc Golf will receive \$22,238 to upgrade the current Eddison Park course. Hockey ACT will be able to upgrade their indoor arena. Athletics ACT will be able to provide assistance to their clubs in Woden which were affected recently with a fire to their storage shed. Triathlon ACT will be able to purchase adaptable hand cycle equipment. Southern District Motorsports Association will be able to involve club members in training for disability access requirements. Squash ACT will receive \$18,000 to install a security system and CCTV to allow Woden courts to have 24-hour access to pre-approved paying participants. YMCA sailing club will receive \$13,650 to upgrade safety boats to support a range of sailing activities.

MS ORR: Minister, how will these grants target increased participation of women and girls in sport and recreation activities?

MS BERRY: Included in these grants announced just recently was the women's sport and recreation participation and leadership program, which was a 2016 ACT Labor commitment and provides financial assistance to support participation, education and training activities for women and girls involved in sport in the ACT. This is a particularly important program because it is about making sure that women and girls get to participate in the ACT equally in sport.

Over the past week we have seen behaviour against a young athlete, a woman in the AFLW competition, Carlton Football Club player Tayla Harris, who was recently bullied incredibly online for her amazing athletic abilities in sport, which should be celebrated and not attacked online. We will be making sure that we provide opportunities for women and girls to play sport, participate equally and get treated equally in their sporting prowess as excellent athletes; through these leadership programs we hope to help them on the way.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, what grants or assistance of other sorts are you giving to the ACT ice community to further their participation in sport?

MS BERRY: I know that Mrs Dunne—

Mrs Dunne: I am not talking about meth addicts. I meant the ice sports community, not the ice community.

Mrs Jones: Thanks for the clarification.

MADAM SPEAKER: When you are ready, minister.

MS BERRY: That is a good clarification because I was going to comment on what a great supporter of the ice sports community Mrs Dunne is. She is a patron, I understand, of the Ice Sports Federation. I know that her interest in this organisation has been very longstanding.

She will know that we have been working closely with the Ice Sports Federation on our election commitment around a feasibility study for an ice sports facility here in the ACT. That work continues and I will have more information to provide to the community on the outcomes of that feasibility work with the ice sports community. I know that Mrs Dunne will be very interested in the outcomes of that.

Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—unauthorised examinations

MRS JONES: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. I refer to media reports that patients at the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children have had vaginal examinations performed on them without their consent. Do you know if this is true?

MS FITZHARRIS: I thank Mrs Jones for the question. As Mrs Jones referred to in an earlier debate, there was a media report based on one submission to the current maternity services inquiry. CHS have released a public statement in which they reject that.

I note that this is a very serious accusation and that CHS has subsequently held meetings with all staff to discuss this and the distress they felt about the way in which this was presented to the Canberra community. I refer also to the letter from the Health Care Consumers Association that was published in the *Canberra Times* after that article which also expressed concern about the way it was reported.

An inquiry is underway in the Assembly. A range of submissions has been made to that inquiry. Canberra Health Services have investigated that and said that it is not the case but they will continue to look very closely at this. It caused a significant amount of distress, but the maternity services inquiry will continue. I am advised that there has been no consumer feedback that that particular issue took place.

I encourage Mrs Jones to appreciate that it is a very serious accusation not that she has made but which she refers to. It is a very serious accusation and one that Canberra Health Services has said has not occurred.

MRS JONES: Minister, why would staff make up such a claim?

MS FITZHARRIS: It is a submission made to an inquiry; it will be looked at in that inquiry, and members of this Assembly will have the opportunity to look into that matter. Canberra Health Services has also released a public statement about it.

MS CHEYNE: Minister, have you been assured that adequate safeguards are in place to protect patients and ensure quality services?

MS FITZHARRIS: Yes, I have.

Government—business support grants

MR PETTERSSON: My question is to the Minister for Vocational Education and Skills. Minister, you recently announced the start of the \$2 million future skills for

future jobs grant program. Can you outline for the Assembly how this program will support businesses and employees in the ACT?

MS FITZHARRIS: I thank Mr Pettersson for the question. Recently I was very pleased to announce the start of the new future skills for future jobs grant program, which will give local organisations and businesses the opportunity to help grow Canberra's skilled workforce through the development of innovative projects.

This program is about working with local industry to see more people take up an apprenticeship, thus ensuring Canberra's workforce has the skills we need for the future. The program is part of a suite of activities to support the ACT's target of just over 4,000 new apprenticeships being taken up over the next four years under the national partnership on the skilling Australians fund.

The program provides the opportunity for businesses to access funding for innovative activities that will address their specific industry and workforce development needs. Businesses will also be supported to achieve the best possible outcomes through a collaborative approach to project development and implementation, particularly through a co-development model.

Projects funded under the program will ultimately support employees and the ACT community to gain valuable workforce skills and contribute to the achievement of higher level skills to meet current and future industry needs and to improve job prospects, particularly in areas where we have identified skills needs in the ACT.

MR PETTERSSON: Minister, can you further outline the types of organisations that can apply and types of projects the government is looking to support?

MS FITZHARRIS: Any organisation or business located within the ACT with a strong physical presence here is eligible to submit an expression of interest for the program. This includes, but is not limited to, employers, industry associations, group training organisations or registered training organisations. Applicants may apply for up to \$300,000 and there is a total pool of \$2 million available.

Funding is available for innovative projects that promote market diversification and aim to increase the number of commencements across pre-apprenticeship, Australian apprenticeship and higher apprenticeship pathways. Applicants are also encouraged to consider partnership opportunities that will support the proposed outcomes, particularly where the project may benefit from existing experience within industry and in the VET sector.

Projects that align with ACT-specific industries targeted for expansion are also particularly encouraged, in defence, cybersecurity, renewable energy, space and spatial science, and tourism. The program is also designed to support projects that will support a range of targeted groups, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, people with a disability, youth at risk, the long-term unemployed, mature-aged workers, women in trade, and veterans.

I am excited to see what local industry can come up with through the EOI process. There really are no limits, with the funding available to a range of industries and organisations across the ACT.

MS CHEYNE: Minister, how will the future skills future jobs grant program also benefit the wider ACT economy while supporting businesses and employees?

MS FITZHARRIS: As members will be aware, the ACT higher education sector makes a huge contribution to Canberra's economy and community across many areas. Vocational education and training is a crucial part of this. It contributes strongly to the development of innovation and skills in the workforce, and to meeting both the current and future needs of the local community and the ACT economy.

Quite simply, this program will contribute to the achievement of a highly skilled and productive workforce in the ACT, with workers equipped with the right skills for both current and future industry needs being a key ingredient for a strong and growing economy. The ACT government is committed to the continued development and growth of a highly skilled workforce in our capital.

This new program will help to get more people into apprenticeships by funding innovative projects that organisations can co-develop with ACT government and local industry. This collaborative approach will lead to more innovation in our local economy, meet the future skills needs of our city and boost the number of people in apprenticeships or other training programs.

ACT Health—performance reports

MR PARTON: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, in your answer to question on notice 1910, which was about quarterly performance reports, you said that the reports for the period between December 2016 and June 2018 would be available on the ACT Health website by the end of 2018. You also said that the report for October to December 2018 would be available on the website within two months of the end of that quarter. As of today, none of these reports is available on the website. And, minister, reports for the first two quarters of 2016-17 are not there either. Minister, why have these reports not been published, as you stated in your answer to the question on notice?

MS FITZHARRIS: I thank Mr Parton for the question. Indeed, I have just had a discussion about the quarterly performance report for the December quarter 2018, and I look forward to that being released next week. It is a couple of weeks late. That was due in part to my absence for a period of time.

I will need to look back on that answer because my recollection was that we were going to publish the quarterly reports that had been suspended while the review was underway, with the December report, this year. I will just look at that question again to make sure—and I will correct the record—but I expect that when the December quarterly report is published those outstanding quarterly reports will be published at the same time.

MR PARTON: Minister, why do you continue to fall behind when it comes to publishing performance data for the ACT's public health services?

MS FITZHARRIS: Indeed I am disappointed but it is partly due to my absence that those reports have not been published. I look forward to publishing them next week. As members well know, with the data review that was undertaken in 2017, members were kept updated on that process. We wanted to get the process right. I believe we have and I look forward to publishing that report next week.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, in your absence earlier this year was anyone acting in your position, and are there any other administrative matters that have fallen behind because of your absence?

MS FITZHARRIS: No.

Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—equipment

MRS KIKKERT: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. I refer to media reports on 1 March 2019 about a fundraising campaign to buy an ECG machine for the neonatal intensive care unit in the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children. Apparently, NICU staff have to borrow an ECG machine when they need one. Why doesn't the NICU at the Centenary hospital have its own ECG machine?

MS FITZHARRIS: Bubbles for babies was a wonderful event that I attended, with the Newborn Intensive Care Foundation, who do remarkable work, and have done for over two decades now, in raising funds for the neonatal intensive care unit. That is certainly not the case; that reporting was slightly inaccurate. There is indeed an ECG machine available to the NICU staff when they need it.

One of the wonderful things about the Newborn Intensive Care Foundation is that they work very closely with the NICU. They wish to raise funds to support the NICU, and they do that. This was a proposal developed between them. It is a wonderful collaboration that the foundation has with our neonatal intensive care unit and a range of other partners across the ACT. I hope that we can all get behind this fundraising campaign.

MRS KIKKERT: Minister, why is the ACT government able to fund expensive leadership seminars but not ECG machines for our hospitals?

MS FITZHARRIS: I have provided my support to the foundations that support our public health services here. That includes the neonatal intensive care foundation as well as the Newborn Intensive Care Foundation and the Canberra Hospital Foundation. There are many people in our community who would like to contribute and raise funds to support public health activities. That is common in every jurisdiction, and I believe that all members here want to support both the Canberra Hospital Foundation and the Newborn Intensive Care Foundation. I hope that we continue to do so. They have wonderful partnerships with our public health system and they work very closely

in collaboration on projects that they wish to be able to support and that they wish their broader networks to be able to support.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, what other areas of ACT Health lack vital equipment, and are those areas relying on philanthropic efforts to provide that equipment?

MS FITZHARRIS: I know that right across our public health system we are always looking to improve and upgrade equipment. I note also that foundations raise funds for staff to undertake research projects and training and development. That is something I will continue to strongly support.

Enlighten festival—autumn festival activities

MS CHEYNE: My question is to the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Events. Minister, Canberrans have recently enjoyed a fantastic autumn festival season. Can you please update the Assembly on the success of the centrepiece of this season, the Enlighten festival?

MR RAMSAY: I thank Ms Cheyne for her question and also for her ongoing interest in and support for the wonderful cultural activities that we have across Canberra. I think that anyone who attended the recent Enlighten festival would agree that it was bigger and better than ever. With the theme of “Eat, see and explore”, there were certainly plenty of sights, sounds and tastes experienced.

Architectural projections and illuminated art installations could be found throughout the parliamentary triangle as well as at the Botanic Gardens, the Mint, the Glassworks, the National Zoo & Aquarium, the Sydney and Melbourne buildings and the ANU. The themes of the 50th anniversary of the moon landing, the 50th anniversary of gay law reform commencing in Australia and the International Year of the Periodic Table were all celebrated throughout the program.

This year it was great to see a high proportion of local artists and performers participating in the Enlighten entertainment program, with 90 per cent local content. The Night Noodle Markets were a huge success and achieved a record on the Saturday night over the long weekend with over 25,000 people attending. I note that that is indeed a lot of noodles! Over 2,000 people attended the Lights! Canberra! Action! short film competition showcasing rising talent from the local film industry.

The festival season ended with a great exclamation mark with the annual Canberra institution of SkyFire. We saw over 100,000 people line the shores of Lake Burley Griffin to enjoy one of the finest fireworks displays in Australia set to a spectacular 20-minute soundtrack.

Now in its ninth year, the Enlighten festival has evolved into a world-class event which captures the culture, the creativity and the innovation of our city. Final attendee numbers are still being calculated but crowd numbers were certainly high and I am sure that we will be topping the 320,000 visitor numbers who attended last year. It was indeed a stunning centrepiece for Canberra’s autumn festival season.

MS CHEYNE: Can the minister please update the Assembly on some of the associated government-funded events that were part of this festival?

MR RAMSAY: I thank Ms Cheyne for the supplementary question. The Canberra Day long weekend in the middle of the Enlighten festival offered something for everyone to go out to to celebrate our pride in our city.

For those who were game to get up with the birds, the Balloon Spectacular had a slightly damp start on the Saturday but still had a great turnout from Canberrans who were keen to see this year's colourful array of hot air balloons, including the special visiting balloon Beagle Maximus, and to enjoy breakfast with a view on the lawns of Old Parliament House with the Belconnen Lions Club or one of the many local food trucks. Attendance at the morning launches throughout the spectacular were strong throughout the nine days. It was great to see Canberrans enjoying the sight of the balloons from vantage points all around the city and even on the water.

On Sunday afternoon I was delighted to attend, with around 10,000 other people, the Symphony in the Park in Commonwealth Park, where the Canberra Symphony Orchestra presented *Sunday Night Fever* with the Best of the Bee Gees. With a group of family and friends we settled in early on picnic rugs with food and drink to share an afternoon and evening ahead of the concert. There was a brief downpour but that did not dampen the spirits or the energy of the crowd, who danced and sang along throughout the night.

Then on Monday we had a wonderful family day in Commonwealth Park, celebrating our city's 106th birthday with food, rides and free entertainment. Overall the long weekend of free fun and great community spirit was reflective of the pride that Canberrans feel about our great city.

MS CODY: Can the minister advise us of some of the other independently run, but government funded, events that have also contributed to the vibrancy of this festival season?

MR RAMSAY: I thank Ms Cody for the supplementary question. In addition to the Enlighten Festival, there are a number of other great events going on in March that have contributed to the liveliness of the season and the diversity of the arts and culture offering for Canberrans to enjoy. Just last weekend, we had both the BOLD Festival and Art, Not Apart. They are both impressive, though very different, and inspiring locally-driven events.

The four-day BOLD Festival, created by local dance icon Liz Lea is now a biennial event conference and performance symposium that celebrates the work of older dance artists. It explores the importance of creativity in personal wellbeing and in healthy ageing, and acknowledges that dance in particular is pivotal in physical, neurological and mental health. BOLD powerfully illustrates the strength of dance in the ACT and featured strong representation by First Nations artists and female choreographers, with a strong focus on inclusion.

Last Saturday I was pleased to attend Art, Not Apart, which showcases and celebrates the vibrancy and diversity of contemporary arts in Canberra. Dave Caffery and his team curated and commissioned a fantastic range of artistic projects featuring over 200 artists of all disciplines, with more than 85 per cent of them coming from Canberra.

Festival goers were treated to a street party atmosphere throughout the New Acton precinct, Shine Dome and NFSA, with exhibitions, street art, dance, theatre, performance art, poetry, installations, music, film and video around every corner, as well as, of course, great food and drink. The ACT government is proud to support both of these events. I personally congratulate all organisers and I thank them for their contribution to the vibrancy of our city.

Canberra Hospital—intensive care unit

MR WALL: My question is to the minister for health. I refer to documents prepared by the head of the SPIRE coordination team which warned that:

There will be an increasing risk to patients if the built infrastructure issues in the ICU in particular are not addressed within the next 18-24 months.

The ICU will run out of beds by October this year. Why have you allowed a situation where the ICU at the Canberra Hospital will not have enough beds to meet demand from October this year?

MS FITZHARRIS: That is not the case, and we have quite significant work planned around the ICU. I look forward to making those announcements at a further date.

MR WALL: Minister, has the government yet developed a plan to address the urgent needs of the ICU, and when exactly will this plan be made public and also fully implemented?

MS FITZHARRIS: I refer Mr Wall to my previous answer, and I look forward to making further announcements in the future.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, why are you constantly scrambling to fix problems at the last minute rather than anticipating them and working to prevent them becoming a crisis?

MS FITZHARRIS: I am categorically not.

ACT Health—workplace culture

MRS DUNNE: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, in the ACT's health system we have seen one-third of staff responding to the independent inquiry into workplace culture. We have seen the continuous deterioration of infrastructure. We have infrastructure that is already, or soon will be, stretched to over-capacity. We have plans for new infrastructure costing half a billion

dollars that will be only a short-term solution to a long-term problem. We have seen hardworking staff stretched to breaking point. We have seen patients not getting the kind of service they should, some, for example, waiting for years to get an initial appointment with a specialist. You have said that the independent review into institutional culture report was difficult reading. As recently as this morning you said that the health portfolio is complex and that it is not easy. Minister, has the time come for you to take a break from responsibility in the health portfolio?

MS FITZHARRIS: No.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, in light of your answer, what are you going to do to restore the confidence of staff in your leadership?

MS FITZHARRIS: I reject that. I note the opposition's view on my capability. I refer Mrs Dunne to my extensive previous answers on these matters and to my extensive response to her failed motion this morning.

MR COE: Minister, what are you doing to restore the confidence of the Canberra community in your ability to provide for the needs of Canberra's healthcare?

MS FITZHARRIS: I believe that I was elected in 2016 to represent the seat of Yerrabi, and I was also appointed health minister over that time. The government has made significant investments in health, is future-proofing our city and planning for major infrastructure investments not only in a few years time but right now.

Last year we opened a new hospital, Canberra's first purpose-built subacute rehabilitation hospital. We opened the Gungahlin walk-in centre. I just recently visited the upgraded, new ward at Calvary hospital and last year I visited the upgraded theatre suites at Calvary hospital that the ACT government funded. I was at Calvary recently celebrating their 40th anniversary and was discussing with Calvary the expansion of their emergency department, which the ACT government funded in last year's budget.

Last year, as I outlined this morning, we made major investments in additional elective and emergency surgery, major investments to expand the hospital in the home program and major investments to increase the bed capacity at Canberra Hospital. We will continue to make these investments so that the Canberra community can have confidence in our health system. They do have confidence in our health system. And it was not so long ago that the community's confidence was put to test, and their views were resounding.

Roads—resurfacing techniques

MS CODY: My question is to the Minister for Roads. What new types of road surfaces is the ACT government trialling?

MR STEEL: I thank Ms Cody for her question. I am very pleased to update the Assembly on our road resurfacing program and the new, innovative methods we are trialling in the ACT, continuing our responsible approach to waste management.

Earlier this month I announced that a new type of asphalt is being trialled on ACT roads made from a range of recycled materials. We have done similar trials before. Unlike the previous trials this asphalt uses a mixture of recycled products. Products recycled include plastic bags, glass bottles, printer cartridges and recycled asphalt sourced from local roads and also soft plastics.

There are close to 3,150 kilometres of roads across Canberra, and beginning a transition to road surfaces with more recycled materials will provide greater environmental benefits, remove waste product from the waste stream as well as reduce the cost of resurfacing.

We also have to ensure that our roads continue to be sturdy and safe for commuters. The new asphalt is designed to be stronger and more resistant to deformation, so Canberra drivers can continue to drive with confidence.

The ACT government will continue to look at innovative ways to re-use materials where we can. The first trial will be taking place at the roundabout on Gundaroo Drive between Palin Street and Hollingsworth Street. These trials support the use of resources as much as possible in a circular economy before they go into landfill, creating jobs, with benefits for road users and the environment.

MS CODY: Minister, how do these resurfacing techniques help to reduce waste going to landfill and contribute to the circular economy?

MR STEEL: I thank Ms Cody for her supplementary. It is important to note the effect of China's national sword policy on the recycling industry in Australia. China has now been followed by Indonesia as well.

I have previously stated that the whole country is facing a massive challenge when it comes to our recycling. We have seen stockpiles building up at materials recovery facilities in multiple jurisdictions around Australia as the market comes to terms with the fact that we can no longer rely on overseas markets to accept recyclable material. Using innovative road surfacing products means that waste that would have originally ended up in landfill can be used in our roads, and we are creating a new market for recyclable material as well in asphalt.

The amount of waste diverted from going to landfill is very significant. Every tonne of this innovative asphalt product will contain approximately 800 plastic bags, 300 glass bottles, 18 printer toner cartridges and 250 kilograms of reclaimed asphalt. For every tonne of this product laid, recyclable material and waste will not end up in landfill. The reclaimed asphalt has also been sourced from local roads, and is being sourced from the ACT's kerbside recycling system, or yellow bins. Some of the material is also made of some of the soft plastic going through the ACT container deposit scheme, so it is great to see that our different waste services in the ACT are working together to promote the sustainable use of waste.

MS ORR: Minister, how can other organisations such as the Canberra Kart Racing Club, contribute to the circular economy?

MR STEEL: I thank Ms Orr for her supplementary. There is a community expectation that government should lead in promoting sustainable procurement, especially where government purchasing power can address a market failure. I would strongly encourage all potential procurers, and in this specific case procurers of asphalt, to consider innovative products that include recyclables. Where appropriate, Roads ACT can assist in providing advice to organisations such as the Canberra Kart Racing Club.

More broadly, the ACT government runs a range of programs to encourage recycling and environmental sustainability, particularly through Actsmart, overseen by Minister Rattenbury. Many methods of recycling have both a broader economic benefit, particularly as we do not need to purchase as much road aggregate in the case of conphalt and there is the potential for it to deliver a more cost-effective product, as well as the obvious environmental benefits.

I look forward to assessing the trial that we are undertaking down the track, providing further information down the track and seeing how we can apply the results and the new resurfacing techniques to the rest of our road network in the ACT more broadly.

Mr Barr: I believe that everyone who is available to ask a question has, Madam Speaker. So I ask that all further questions be placed on the notice paper.

Papers

Mr Gentleman presented the following papers:

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee—
Report 7—*Inquiry into ACT Libraries*—Government response, dated March 2019.

Coroners Act, pursuant to subsection 57(5)—Reports of Coroner—

Inquests into the deaths of—

Siauto Eliuta Tunumafono—

Report, dated 29 November 2018.

Government response.

Timothy Allen Smith-Brown—

Report, dated 14 August 2018.

Government response.

Fires at the—

Premises of Energy Services Invironmental—

Report, dated 1 November 2018.

Government response.

Sydney Building—

Report, dated 1 November 2018.

Government response.

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee

Government response

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) (2.48): Pursuant to standing order 211, I move:

That the Assembly take note of the following paper:

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee—
Report 7—*Inquiry into ACT Libraries*—Government response.

MR STEEL (Murrumbidgee—Minister for City Services, Minister for Community Services and Facilities, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Roads) (2.49): With the indulgence of the Assembly, Madam Speaker, I would firstly like to note that I am wearing some interesting socks today: library card socks. You probably cannot see them from where you are right now in the chamber.

I welcome the opportunity to table the government's response to the inquiry into ACT libraries. Libraries change lives in the ACT. Every day, young children begin their literacy journey; seniors learn digital literacy; the socially isolated connect with others through a club or program at the library; and adults improve their literacy, whether new English speakers or not.

The ACT government is proud that our libraries have the highest levels of membership in Australia, with almost two-thirds of Canberrans being library members. Our libraries provide not only physical and digital resources but opportunities for the community to come together and learn new skills or information, thereby creating a lifelong learning community.

Submissions to the inquiry into ACT libraries were overwhelmingly positive and demonstrated both the high value placed on our libraries by the community and the ways that this value can be enhanced to reach even further into the community to change lives.

There were 14 recommendations made by the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services in the report of the inquiry. Of these, the government has agreed to 11, agreed in principle to two and noted one. Consultation and planning are two key themes in the recommendations of the inquiry, and I am pleased to advise that Libraries ACT will soon begin work on a new strategic plan which will be widely consulted on with the community.

As outlined in the recommendations, the government agrees in principle to engaging in a co-design process with the community when developing the new strategic plan for Libraries ACT. The government also agrees in principle to consider the Weston Creek and Molonglo region as a possible location for a future library as the population

continues to grow. This could be considered further as part of a future co-design process.

One of the recommendations of the inquiry is to improve the library's website. Our library service has been so keen to continue its great work in the community that this recommendation has already been achieved, with the new library website going live on 21 November last year.

A new library catalogue will be available when the integrated library management system project is implemented later this year. This \$2.2 million investment by the government into our libraries provides a more intuitive and user-friendly website and has a greater ability to promote library programs, services and resources, which will dramatically improve both in-person and digital services to the community.

Already in the planning stages are initiatives that relate to recommendations regarding improving library services to people with a disability. The library is planning to recruit a disability inclusion learning officer later this year. Also in the planning process is after-hours access to the community room in the Woden branch library. Set to enhance the availability of community meeting and learning spaces, this project will deliver a new and convenient community space to all.

I would like to thank the many people and organisations in the community, including the committee, who took time to make submissions to the inquiry and conduct the inquiry. I have pleasure in tabling the government's response to this very positive and productive inquiry.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Building regulatory reforms

Ministerial statement

MR RAMSAY (Ginninderra—Attorney-General, Minister for the Arts and Cultural Events, Minister for Building Quality Improvement, Minister for Business and Regulatory Services and Minister for Seniors and Veterans) (2.52): I am pleased to update the Assembly on building regulatory reforms and other work to improve practices in the building industry and compliance with building standards.

Last month I created a new requirement for all applicants for class A and B licences to pass an examination to qualify for these licences. The first of the new exams will be held on 27 March this year. Shortly, the construction occupations registrar will also start to send notices to licensees who are coming up for renewal, informing them that they will also have to sit the exam before their licence is renewed. These changes give the registrar the power to select individuals to sit an examination, including people who have an identified poor compliance history, as well as people who have not undertaken any recent work under their licence, to ensure that their knowledge is up to date and of an appropriate standard.

But, Madam Speaker, the government have a further series of reforms that we will continue to roll out. Work on documentation guidelines clearly defining what is the

minimum sufficient information to include in building approval applications is well underway. I expect to announce them in the coming weeks. Targeted consultation on codes of practice for builders and building surveyors will start in May. There will also be new training for building surveyors and a pre-licence assessment for applicants for a building surveyor licence.

Further improvements to licensing processes will be made, including requiring additional information from people who will be appointed as nominees for corporate and partnership licences. Nominees play a very important role in supervising construction work, and they need to be fully aware of their obligations and rights when they take on the role. We are also working to make contracts for building work or off-the-plan buildings clearer and fairer to purchasers. These steps will make clear the roles, expectations, rights and obligations for different parties and lift skills and knowledge in the industry.

Madam Speaker, we are on track to have 28 of the 43 reforms from the building regulatory review completed by the end of this current financial year, as we have undertaken to do. The next tranches of reforms will include: a new auditing system for building projects; new dispute resolution processes; and finalising work on reviewing security of payments issues and consultation on potential changes to that system.

We will also consult further on licensing and accountability measures for people designing and building, as well as people contracting for off-the-plan sales. Consultation will also seek views on insurance and other protections for clients and building owners. Madam Speaker, recent court and tribunal decisions on building matters here in the ACT, and in other parts of the country, confirm that people designing and constructing buildings must be held accountable to do their work with due diligence and proper skill and ensure compliance with building laws.

While there are improvements we can make and are making to the law, the Building Act already includes distinct obligations for doing, supervising and certifying building work. However, reform is about not only new law but also ensuring that we have the best ways of ensuring compliance with and enforcement of the laws that we already have.

I want to acknowledge that we know there are people who saw problems in their industry, and even made mistakes of their own, and responded with integrity. They took steps to improve their skills, knowledge and management of projects to make sure that the problems they saw did not happen on their projects, or they helped others to improve by sharing their own expertise. Unfortunately, others have not responded. But I think our message has been clear: substandard work is not acceptable.

Madam Speaker, I have to stress that while regulation and enforcement are important, government inspectors are not responsible for supervising and quality assuring the work of every practitioner and every building project. Licensees take on clear responsibilities under the law, and they need to take ownership in meeting these.

Having said that, government building inspectors undertake compliance audits on residential buildings and non-residential buildings regularly. Access Canberra have

further increased their enforcement activities over the last nine months. In that time, they have issued nine notices directing building work to be undertaken to address non-compliant buildings, one rectification order in relation to a multi-unit housing development in north Canberra, and 139 demerit points to construction licensees for issues including failing to comply with the building code.

Most recently, building inspectors issued 17 stop work notices to 12 different builders in Gungahlin for building work that was contrary to building standards and would have potentially led to ongoing problems for the eventual owners and occupiers. Builders continue to be held to account for their actions. In many cases, builders have had to not only rectify works but also lose time on site while rectification works are carried out.

From 1 July 2018 to date, Access Canberra has received 265 new and resolved 309 new and existing building and planning cases. Access Canberra continues to investigate a total of 187 active cases alleging breaches of the building and planning laws.

I am pleased to report that the rapid regulatory response pilot continues to improve how Access Canberra responds to building and planning complaints. Under this pilot, preliminary assessment of the issue occurs and determination of whether a breach may have occurred happens, wherever possible, within five working days from the receipt of a complaint. An important reason for the success of this approach is the team taking the time to talk and listen to all parties so that they can determine what the heart of the issue may be. The team has resolved 191 cases by engagement, education and negotiation without the need to undertake formal enforcement action, which gets outcomes for consumers more quickly and cheaply for those minor matters. For other cases, the team takes strong action when it needs to, including stop work notices and demerit points in relation to builders and building certifiers.

Demerit points are used when another regulatory action is not required. Points are recorded against a licensee and indicate where their practices need to change. The points stay on the licence for three years. If a licensee has 15 current points, the registrar must take formal action against them. If the team consider that the information they have gathered shows that the matter requires further investigation or more serious action, it is escalated to the building investigation team. To date, six of the cases referred for investigation have resulted in notices requiring a party to show cause why enforcement action should not be taken.

Madam Speaker, that is just a sample of the activities on the ground helping to make sure that buildings are meeting the building standards. The government is also helping building owners and purchasers by providing better and more easily located information. We have developed new guides for people buying into or living in unit titled or strata buildings. These guides cover what people may need to know before they purchase, for both existing buildings and off the plan, as well as covering management and maintenance issues.

The government is also developing a new portal for information on building. The portal will bring together up-to-date information for people engaging building

practitioners or buying off the plan, as well as for practitioners who work in the ACT. It will include information about building and planning requirements, approval processes, licensing, standards and codes of practice, complaints and dispute resolution, and building reforms. It will also include links for people to download building, buying and strata guides.

As I have previously said in this place, building problems are not just an ACT issue but a national issue. Under the Building Ministers Forum, building ministers are considering systemic changes that could be made nationally and in each jurisdiction.

I believe that we are further along in this journey than most, due to the work undertaken in the thorough review of our laws and regulatory system. No-one else applies an examination for new licensees, as we do here in the ACT. We have proactive powers available to the registrar to direct all licensees in a category to undertake training, which most other states do not have. We have strong frameworks for rectification above what many other states have. We have significantly higher requirements for building approval documentation than other states. The work that we are doing is to strengthen and clarify these requirements and ensure that practitioners are held to account.

We have considered not only technical issues associated with the national construction code but also how these relate to other aspects of the system such as contracting, dispute resolution and statutory protections for building owners. We have implemented systemic reforms that can make real improvements to the standards of practice in the industry. We have a clear program for reform over the next 18 months, and we will see it through. We have increased education, compliance and enforcement activities to help prevent problems or resolve them quickly and effectively if they occur.

Madam Speaker, the government will continue its work to improve the ACT building regulatory system. I welcome the support that we have received from community and industry members for this work. I look forward to updating the Assembly again at a later date. I present the following paper:

Building Regulatory Reforms—Ministerial statement, 21 March 2019.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

MR PARTON (Brindabella) (3.03): A number of things that we have heard from the minister are quite encouraging. From my observation, he is having more of a crack in this space than his predecessor did. It is encouraging for us to hear more about these real occasions of rectification, in particular the rapid regulatory response unit trial, which I have been watching with much interest. It does look as though it is reaping rewards there.

What we have seen today is the minister responding to pressures on him to recognise the seriousness of the threats to the community imposed by building quality

deficiencies. Those risks and threats are real. Poor quality building construction and finishing can impose financial losses on owners that may, and do on occasions, take a lifetime to recover. The months and years of costly litigation take a toll on the mental health of those caught up in those terrible situations, and we all know that they leave indelible scars.

I remind the chamber again that some years ago the government realised this was a serious problem and that it was of sufficient gravity for the government to undertake extensive consultation on how to improve the building industry and put quality management on a sound footing. That consultation report went for 80 pages, so there was obviously plenty of feedback on the rights and wrongs, and much to think about.

In mid-2016, following that consultation report, the minister announced a package of 43 reforms that would make a good start in addressing these deficiencies. The reform package promised that 29 reforms would be in place by the end of 2016, followed by another 13 by the end of 2017, and the 43rd measure would be implemented by the end of 2017-18. The minister's package was, at the time, a welcome relief. It gave us all much confidence that the worst was over.

But that confidence rested on the belief that the government intended to put those reforms in place in a timely manner. The reality is in stark contrast, with the minister saying on 20 February in question time that 14 were in place as of that date. If there was a barometer of how much the government cared about building quality, I think that was it. The problem was not going to go away. The catalogue of frightening instances of building quality failures that were coming to light was reaching near crescendo. I am sure there are many who hoped that they would fade away, but they have not.

Just on a month ago, in question time, the Canberra Liberals endeavoured to focus the minister's attention on building quality issues. It would appear that this encouragement has succeeded, that the minister has some good news for us. He now promises that 28 of the 43 reforms will be in place by the end of this financial year. That is one short of the 29 originally promised by the end of 2016. So it is progress but it is slow progress. We sincerely hope that the minister can deliver on this latest target. In his statement here today the minister said we are further along on the journey than most due to our laws and regulatory system. If that is the case, I would love to see the proof of it.

If it really applies, the minister is saying, we can look forward to a reduction or outright elimination of the sorts of disasters that we have seen in the last few years. Such a reduction is extremely important. It is important for the reputation and credibility of the territory, the place where we live. It is also very important for the reputation of Canberra's building industry and individual builders, who rely on the confidence of the market. We want our building industry to prosper and to be recognised as the best available. I know that the minister shares my vision on that.

I really do welcome the efforts of the current minister, who looks to have been somewhat more robust than his predecessor on this front. I hope he gets the support he needs from his government to complete the task. It will be a travesty if that is not the

case. The minister should not think that he can pass the problem on to the innocent buyer, as hinted at in relation to the reference to new guides for buying into strata buildings, because, although those guides help, not all buyers are skilled engineers or assessors. It should be recognised that government regulation alone is not the entire solution. In this regard I welcome the minister's acknowledgement of the efforts being made by the industry itself. It is good to see that the industry has recognised that its members are learning from mistakes and sharing their experiences and expertise.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Ministerial delegation to Singapore

Ministerial statement

MS FITZHARRIS (Yerrabi—Minister for Health and Wellbeing, Minister for Higher Education, Minister for Medical and Health Research, Minister for Transport and Minister for Vocational Education and Skills) (3.08): I present a copy of the statement:

Singapore delegation—November 2018—Ministerial statement, 21 March 2019.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Alexander Maconochie Centre—Winnunga model of care

Ministerial statement

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong—Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety and Minister for Mental Health) (3.09): I am pleased to update the Assembly and community on the progress to improve the care and treatment of all detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre as a direct result of the recommendations from the Moss review. Specifically, I would like to update the Assembly and community on the progress of recommendation 5:

That Winnunga Nimmityjah Aboriginal Health Service be integrated into the provision of health care at the AMC in order to introduce its holistic model of care to Indigenous detainees.

The ACT government has long respected Winnunga, the Aboriginal community controlled primary healthcare service provider for the ACT and region. We acknowledge their considerable experience in delivering health care to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Justice health and ACT Corrective Services have worked collaboratively with Winnunga since the Moss implementation inter-directorate working group began in 2017 to develop and agree on a contemporary and best practice model of Aboriginal

and Torres Strait Islander health service delivery at the AMC that meets the human rights obligations of the facility and supports the ACT government's strategic goals towards closing the gap.

Expanded health service provision by Winnunga in the AMC provides a range of benefits supporting the clinical care of detainees. These include better continuity of primary health care for detainees between time in custody and the community; increased information sharing between health teams, leading to better patient care; and increased cultural awareness of staff at the AMC.

The model that has been developed considers culture, infrastructure, human resources, referral processes and relationships with other elements of the human services system. This model also reflects the important roles that friends and family have in supporting the psychosocial welfare of detainees.

It has taken a strong collaborative effort by all parties to achieve what is the first initiative of its kind in the country. I acknowledge the hard work and perseverance of Ms Julie Tongs OAM, the Winnunga CEO, and her team, especially Dr Nadeem Siddiqui, as well as the leadership teams of justice health and the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, in achieving this outcome in such a complex environment.

On 22 June 2018 the ACT government and Winnunga signed a contract to enable the delivery of coordinated healthcare services at the AMC. Since that time, ACT Corrective Services, Canberra Health Services and Winnunga have collaboratively worked together to formalise the service.

A dedicated working group was established to work through the implementation of the Winnunga AMC collaboration in health care model. This working group focused on the clinical and operational arrangements for the successful integration of health services at the AMC. That work informed the development of an MOU and three supporting schedules between the government and Winnunga for the delivery of coordinated healthcare services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees at the AMC.

The MOU and schedules were signed by all parties on 21 December last year. The intention of the MOU illustrates an enduring shared commitment of the parties in working together to ensure Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees have access to comprehensive Aboriginal health checks, chronic conditions care planning and coordination, mental health treatment and care planning capable of recognising trauma experienced by Indigenous people at the individual and collective level, and appropriate referrals to and collaboration with specialist and allied health professionals.

The MOU also includes principles to guide the actions of the parties. These are that all detainees in the AMC assessed as having a health issue are clients of a healthcare service, and all healthcare service clients in AMC are detainees; Canberra Health Services and Winnunga are autonomous providers of healthcare services to their clients; a healthcare model should recognise the important role of corrections officers

in the monitoring of detainees to deliver positive health outcomes for them; the capacity for custodial health staff to intervene effectively and therapeutically depends on appropriate access to information; and staff collaboration is central to managing custodial and health risks, especially those associated with suicide and self-harm.

The signing of the MOU was a positive occasion for Canberra Health Services, ACT Corrective Services and Winnunga. It provides all parties with the opportunity to come together as a team and, by signing these documents, strengthen the collaborative foundations for the integration of the provision of health care to detainees at the AMC. It is positive to confirm that staff of Winnunga have been present in the AMC since July 2018, developing protocols for the integrated service delivery.

As the minister for both corrections and justice health, it is exciting for me to advise the Assembly and the community that on 7 January 2019 Winnunga began to formally operate within the AMC, and on 18 January the first patient's health care was transferred from justice health services to Winnunga. As of 15 March, 15 patients' health care has been transferred to Winnunga.

The Moss implementation steering committee acknowledged that full implementation of recommendation 5 would take time. The committee also noted the parties' genuine commitment to fully progress and implement this recommendation. In line with the recommendations from the Moss review, the government dedicated \$8.2 million in the 2017-18 budget review for further integration of Winnunga into the health services at the AMC. This includes funding to enhance health services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees, with the employment of a dedicated general practitioner and a social and emotional wellbeing support staff member.

The infrastructure of the AMC is also being upgraded to support the expanding health service. A \$4 million capital fund will be used to increase service delivery space for detainees through the renovation of the Hume health centre. This renovation will include a new unit and the provision of temporary accommodation for the staff while the work is being done.

In addition to the expanded clinical space for the provision of holistic care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees, these commitments will also improve the flow and efficiency of the Hume health centre, boost the capacity of corrective services to support detainees requiring health services, and reduce waiting times for all detainees to access their healthcare needs.

It is recognised that Winnunga continues to play an important role in informing a best practice model of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health service delivery at the AMC, as well as in delivering services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people engaged in the ACT correctional system. This model is integral to a holistic model of care for service delivery in the AMC.

Detainees at the AMC have significant and complex health needs and require additional care. It is well evidenced that many detainees have not had the opportunity or willingness to address sometimes chronic illnesses that can be a substantial barrier to gainful employment or training and that can create burdens for their loved ones and families.

I have taken a strong interest in ensuring the timely provision of health care and, in particular, dental care to all detainees. It is my hope that over time, as Winnunga and justice health services grow, we can be sure detainees are leaving in better health than when they came into the AMC. This supports a healthier community for all of us, and reduces the burden on existing waiting times in the AMC.

With the overrepresentation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees at the AMC, there is a clear need to continue to integrate Winnunga to provide a holistic approach to health care at the AMC in a culturally safe way. Increased participation by Winnunga in delivering health services to detainees at the AMC also supports the government's goal to close the gap in Indigenous disadvantage. Since the implementation of Winnunga into the AMC, the senior management staff of justice health services, ACT Corrective Services and Winnunga meet weekly to collaboratively work through issues of the implementation.

Further to this, a formal governance structure to monitor, review and manage the successful implementation of integrated healthcare provision at the AMC has been established. The governance structure is a tiered approach, ensuring the different elements of the implementation can be appropriately addressed. The first senior governance group met on 1 February this year. This group has been established to discuss clinical and operational issues and comprises senior representatives from government and from Winnunga's clinical team. The group will meet monthly to collaboratively go through clinical and operational concerns with the intention of seeking resolution to the satisfaction of all parties.

An implementation steering committee comprising the CEO of Canberra Health Services, the Director-General of JACS and the CEO of Winnunga has also been established, recognising the importance of this partnership. This committee will oversee the successful implementation of the integrated health service, including to monitor and review the MOU and supporting schedules.

I am pleased to confirm that the ACT government has been able to take such strong and positive steps to implement Moss review recommendation 5. I again commend the work done by Canberra Health Services, ACT Corrective Services and Winnunga on the integration of Winnunga into the provision of health care at the AMC. I look forward to updating the Assembly on this important and groundbreaking initiative again in due course.

I present a copy of the statement:

Winnunga Model of Care at the Alexander Maconochie Centre—
Implementation—Ministerial statement, 21 March 2019.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Tolerance and inclusion

Discussion of matter of public importance

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Cody): Madam Speaker has received letters from Miss C Burch, Ms Cheyne, Ms Cody, Mr Coe, Ms Le Couteur, Ms Lee, Mr Milligan, Ms Orr, Mr Parton, Mr Pettersson, and Mr Wall proposing that matters of public importance be submitted to the Assembly. In accordance with standing order 79, Madam Speaker has determined that the matter proposed by Mr Pettersson be submitted to the Assembly for discussion, namely:

The importance of promoting tolerance and inclusion in the ACT.

MR PETTERSSON (Yerrabi) (3.19): I speak today about the importance of tolerance and inclusion in the ACT on the United Nations International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Canberra is a proud multicultural city that welcomes diversity and fosters not just tolerance but acceptance. Canberra has always been a diverse city, but in recent years Canberra has really embraced its status as a diverse city. The people of Canberra have become more diverse as we have drawn future Canberrans from across the world. I have seen this firsthand in my lifetime. I have even had the great honour of presiding over citizenship ceremonies.

Our newest citizens come from all over the world, choosing Canberra to live in. Each time I am always a little bit surprised by the amazing array of nations our new citizens come from. The one thing that never surprises me, though, is when they say they love Canberra and they find it a welcoming, inclusive and tolerant city.

According to the 2016 census, 26.4 per cent of Canberrans were born outside of Australia, with China, India and the Philippines in the top five countries. A further 13.1 per cent of Canberrans have at least one parent born overseas. We celebrate this diversity and welcome those who want to come to our city and those who have already made it their home. This government recognises the importance of promoting tolerance and inclusion in the ACT. We believe a multicultural Canberra is a strong Canberra.

The 2016 census also showed that the number of households speaking a language other than English stands at 23.8 per cent of the population. Being the nation's capital, the ACT is naturally home to over 100 foreign embassies and high commissions, with individuals from over 200 nations residing in our city and calling it home. While our community is enriched by the presence of these embassies, our communities are thriving entities all on their own.

In recent times we had the opportunity to see that at the annual Multicultural Festival. It is a lively affair, with well over 100 countries represented through song, dance, cultural displays and, perhaps most of all, food. It is becoming more difficult with the increasing burden of having to make decisions and choose between all of the amazing outlets on the day. This is, however, a good problem to have.

The ACT has also taken steps to show national leadership on inclusion. We were one of the first jurisdictions to sign up to become a refugee welcome zone. We recognise that people fleeing violence and persecution have lots to contribute to Canberra and to our country. We also strongly opposed changes to section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act. We do not believe people have a right to be bigots and spew hateful rhetoric about others based on their culture or skin colour. Words are powerful and we do not want to give free rein to the disturbing and growing alt-right culture of racial resentment and bigotry. We saw this, unfortunately, in Christchurch just recently.

Locally, the ACT government has committed to the multicultural framework 2015-20, which highlights what we are doing as a government in supporting and protecting our cultural diversity. This includes a range of grants programs such as the ACT participation (multicultural) grants, where we have committed more than \$260,000 each year to grassroots community organisations for projects that enhance our multicultural communities. This funding helps them develop new ideas and programs that promote tolerance and inclusion in the ACT.

We must always lead the way in promoting tolerance but, more importantly, inclusion in our country and our city. Recent tragic events show us what intolerance and divisiveness create. We need to stand together, strengthen our communities and say proudly that we will not offer support to or indulge extremists and racists. Canberra is stronger when we celebrate our differences. Let's keep it that way.

MR STEEL (Murrumbidgee—Minister for City Services, Minister for Community Services and Facilities, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Roads) (3.24): I am pleased to speak today about the importance of promoting tolerance and inclusion in the ACT. Our territory does not rest at seeking tolerance, because tolerance is not enough to build a truly inclusive community. A tolerant existence precludes the opportunity to build fully realised relationships with others. Our city chooses inclusion.

The ACT government's agenda is to continue making Canberra more inclusive, progressive and connected, which means we will get on with the job of delivering better infrastructure, services and community supports. We recognise that owning a home or finding secure, affordable and suitable housing is a challenge for many Canberrans. We will continue to focus on improving housing affordability and supply in 2019 because we know this is central to our city's inclusiveness.

Being a truly inclusive city means ensuring everyone has fair and equal access to justice, whether they are a victim, accused of a crime or involved in a civil case. Following extensive consultation with the disability and legal communities, we will finalise a disability justice strategy for the ACT in the first half of this year.

The government has signed a new 10-year ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreement with the chair of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body and the Head of Service. The new agreement sets out the ongoing commitment of the government, the elected body and the community to recognise and respond to the needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in the ACT.

The ACT is the most LGBTIQ+ welcoming and inclusive jurisdiction in Australia. We pride ourselves on enhancing the visibility of our LGBTIQ community. By funding the safe schools program, after the current federal government ceased their funding, we will ensure that young people are supported to feel included when they are often at their most vulnerable. We are all better when we welcome all people to participate fully and invest their talents, passion, knowledge and ability into our city.

In 1966 the United Nations General Assembly recognised 21 March as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and challenged the international community to do better at stamping out racism. It is particularly important this Harmony Day to recognise that the origins of that day go back six years earlier, to 21 March 1960, when police shot and killed 69 people at a peaceful anti-apartheid demonstration in Sharpeville, South Africa.

Today's recognition of Harmony Day has taken on a new significance following the terrorist attacks in Christchurch last Friday. It seems difficult to celebrate Harmony Day this year; we are still in mourning with the Muslim communities in Christchurch and New Zealand, the victims and their families and friends. But it is more important than ever to come together for inclusion, to stand against racism and with our multicultural communities.

I am so proud to live in our inclusive, progressive and connected city. We recognise that bringing together a mix of people, with different backgrounds, experiences and cultures is essential to a thriving city and a source of innovation. Today Canberra is becoming a welcoming city officially, where we will join with 135 cities and municipalities from around the world so that we can learn from one another and share best-practice approaches and models to ensure that Canberra remains the most inclusive city in Australia.

Our membership as a welcoming city will also enable us to benchmark ourselves against the welcoming city standard and identify practical actions to improve inclusion in our city. It is an important next step for Canberra to continue growing as an inclusive, connected and progressive community, particularly for our migrant and multicultural communities.

International events in relation to terrorism make it increasingly important to develop a cohesive and robust society based on respect and appreciation of differences. The ACT government works closely with the commonwealth and other states and territories through the safer communities initiatives. International research indicates that one of the strongest protective factors for preventing acts of terrorism is inclusion, ensuring that all members of our community feel welcome and, indeed, are welcome in our city and our country. Our actions speak louder than our words. The government know the importance of inclusion and respect for all people and demonstrate it through our actions.

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (3.29): I thank Mr Pettersson for bringing this matter of public importance before the Assembly today. On many prior occasions I have stood in this chamber to speak on tolerance and inclusion, and I am pleased to do so

again now. As I noted in my remarks during the adjournment debate two days ago, each of us has a role to play in promoting tolerance in our communities, both small and large. We can each begin by promoting love and respect for one another in our homes and in our personal lives. This requires us to get to know and spend time with people who are different to us.

Numerous social observers have pointed out that both technology and modern institutions have made it possible for people to divide into tribes of like-minded individuals, essentially existing in echo chambers where their shared ideas and values are never analysed or questioned. In such a world it takes determined, intentional effort to build relationships with people whose cultures, languages, faith and thoughts differ from our own. It certainly is worth it though.

Yesterday evening I had the privilege of hosting a reception for our territory's multicultural and faith leaders on the eve of Harmony Day. Guests from dozens of religious organisation, nationalities and languages came to mingle, share food and conversation and enjoy cultural performances together. Everyone got to spend time with an Afghan refugee whose paintings adorned the reception room, symbolic of what I hoped to achieve by bringing people together.

In light of how horrific the past week has been for Canberra's Islamic communities, I was grateful for the close Muslim friends who attended the event as a show of unity and solidarity. On many occasions these same friends and neighbours have invited me to their places of worship and into their lives. We have broken fast together and had joyful iftar meals and furthered friendship on numerous other occasions. I cherish the opportunity to be with people who desire to share not just their bread but also their faith and compassion.

Last night I took the opportunity to thank these community leaders for all they do. Governments certainly have a role to play in promoting tolerance, but our dedicated multicultural and faith leaders are at the coalface on this issue. I know from personal experience that these good women and men spent thousands of hours in serving their communities and in working to establish real and lasting harmony amongst those communities.

I wish to thank them again today. As Senator Seselja correctly point out last night, harmony does not just happen; it takes planning and hard work, big hearts and heaps of patience. Thankfully, many Canberrans seem committed to this cause.

The desire for harmony does not go unchallenged, though. In recent days a federal politician has again gone public, calling for a ban on Muslim immigration. On behalf of the Canberra Liberals, I proudly denounced Senator Anning's words when he previously stated that our immigration program should actively discriminate in favour of Europeans. I am happy to once again denounce the senator's ugly and vicious statements. This is not how a member of the Australian Senate should behave. I and the Canberra Liberals choose harmony over division, understanding over hatred.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (3.32): I rise today to talk about the importance of promoting acceptance rather than just tolerance. Tolerance, by definition, is the

ability or willingness to tolerate the existence of opinions or behaviours that one dislikes or disagrees with, whereas acceptance, by definition, is the process or the fact of being received as adequate, valid or suitable, or agreement with or belief in an idea or explanation. The discourse concerning tolerance versus acceptance was never more obvious in this country than in the same-sex marriage debates across the nation in 2017.

We must do more than simply tolerate difference. We must accept it, to be a truly inclusive society. The difference adds value to who we are as the capital city of our nation. It adds value to the very fabric of our society, and our own Multicultural Festival is an example of that in action.

Last week's horrific attack in Christchurch has served to strengthen my belief that all people must be valued equally. If we can agree on that principle then we cannot accept that it is okay to perpetuate this type of violence or any violence. We live in a society, and individual rights such as freedom of expression must not come at the expense of the rights of others to feel safe and to be free to go about their lives.

It is a tried and true aphorism that acceptance and inclusion start with individuals and, if one has a partner or children, at home. Any parent who has not felt frustration or anger with their own children is either a saint or a liar or has very, very poor memory. Whether it is a toddler drawing on the wall, a teenager in some sort of trouble, most parents have felt some sort of annoyance, anger or disappointment with their kids at some stage. What matters is not how we feel but how we react. Even when disciplining a child or withholding privilege or just being cross, parents overwhelmingly act out of love.

Similarly, I believe we all have the right to hold views that may be bigoted or sexist or racist, and on this I have to say I disagree with Mr Pettersson's comments earlier today. I do not support thought control. I believe that we are free to think what we think and we are not always going to think calm, loving, compassionate thoughts. The point is, though, that while we may have thoughts which are not edifying it is not okay to act out those bigoted, sexist or racist thoughts. We cannot control what we think—and I think it should be regarded as okay to think—but it is just not okay to act out and promote those thoughts if they are divisive and they come from a place of hate.

Looking beyond home, the recent focus on both domestic and family violence and institutional sexual abuse has led to greater reporting and disclosure of crimes and more robust systems and legislation aimed at preventing further violence and abuse. There has been a national conversation about what we consider acceptable, and work has been done with a view to changing people's behaviour. That work is still ongoing in the Assembly. The issue of consent is one example.

But change, whether to attitudes or behaviour, is possible at both an individual level and a societal level. Consider, for instance, littering. In the 1970s roadsides were often full of litter that had been chucked out of cars. But they are not any more. While smoking rates were declining in the early part of this century, there was a noticeable

change in where people smoked—not just outside because of restrictions but away from children—because that became socially unacceptable.

Another obvious and very positive change is that it is now the exception rather than the norm for people to hit children. This used to be the norm. Behaviour is now managed in different ways, and I think as a society we are better for it. In each of these examples, there has been positive leadership to effect the change. Such leadership can come from individuals, can arise in group settings or come from leaders, including, hopefully, from our political class. That is what I would like to focus on, given that I am speaking in the Assembly.

There have been some wonderful examples of political leadership, not the least of which was demonstrated by Jacinda Ardern over this past week. Her calm, considered, empathetic yet decisive actions are an exemplar of the modern leadership that we require if we want to live in a society that values us all, regardless of our cultural background, religious beliefs, level of ability or gender.

Here in Australia one of the best examples that I am aware of was the campaign to halt the spread of HIV. In a Lowy Institute paper on the matter, William Bowtell noted:

Australia's relatively successful response to HIV/AIDS came about because the Australian people, civil society organisations, clinicians, researchers and provincial and national governments fashioned timely, practical and imaginative responses to the complex political, social, economic and public health challenges posed by the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Australia built its response to HIV/AIDS from the grassroots up, not from the top down.

Crucially, Australia's response was non-partisan. Among other things, it resulted in massive education campaigns and the establishment of needle and syringe programs for injecting drug users. It undoubtedly saved many lives, not to mention the enormous expense of providing medical care for people living with HIV. Overwhelmingly, those affected by HIV at the time were homosexual men and this was happening against the backdrop of a call for tolerance and acceptance.

Political leadership can and does result in social change. Sometimes that kind of transformational leadership risks votes, and unfortunately this is often the tension in politics.

With regard to promoting and enabling a truly inclusive society, we must be prepared to stand up and speak out for what is right. We must stand up and speak out for those who are voiceless, such as the refugees who are mandatorily detained on Manus and Nauru and those refugees who are interned in Australian immigration detention centres who have not broken laws, who are not a danger to our society but who simply sought a better life, free from the fear of persecution. We must not subscribe to the demonising discourse that paints them as wicked or threatening to our society. There has been too much of that, and the massacres in the mosques of New Zealand are an example of what can happen if we promote and peddle bigotry.

This debate must be about much more than the acceptance or tolerance of our Muslim brothers and sisters. It should not be confined to them. It should be extended to all in our society. The Greens, both nationally and locally, have always believed that all of us deserve to feel safe and have equal opportunities in life, no matter what our background, ability, gender, sexuality, income, postcode, religious belief. We believe that this can be achieved not by adversarial, aggressive or divisive discourse but rather by calling out discrimination, bias and bigotry. We should not be using the current national discourse on multiculturalism as an opportunity to have a go at one another.

It is worth noting, as Minister Steel did, that today is the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which of course is an apt day for this matter of public importance to be discussed. In Australia, since 1998, it has become known as Harmony Day. This, I fear, has the effect of watering down the true import of the day. As Minister Steel said, this day was declared by the United Nations because in 1966 the police shot at and killed 69 people at a peaceful anti-apartheid demonstration in Sharpeville, South Africa, on 21 March 1960. It took a really extreme event to prompt this action of the UN declaring this day, just as the extreme events over the Tasman last week have prompted this debate in the Assembly and much more broadly across the nation.

Australia, I am afraid, has always had a deep problem with racism. Our country has been built, unfortunately, on the genocide of Aboriginal people and propped up by decades of assimilation policies, black deaths in custody, restrictions on immigration, brutal refugee policies and an often racist political discourse. This has to stop in order for us to become a truly tolerant and inclusive society. *(Time expired.)*

Discussion concluded.

End of Life Choices in the ACT—Select Committee Report

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (3.43): I present the following report:

End of Life Choices in the ACT—Select Committee—Report, dated 21 March 2019, together with a copy of the extract of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

As chair of the Select Committee on End of Life Choices in the ACT I am pleased to present the report of the select committee to the Assembly. The select committee was established by the Assembly on 30 November 2017. The committee's terms of reference were to inquire into and report on a range of issues which arise in considering end of life choices, including current practices used in the medical community to assist in managing the end of life, including palliative care; the views of the ACT community on the desirability of voluntary assisted dying being legislated in the ACT; risks to individuals and the community associated with voluntary assisted

dying and whether and how these risks can be managed; the applicability of voluntary assisted dying schemes operating in other jurisdictions to the ACT, particularly in Victoria; the impact of federal legislation on the ACT determining its own policy on voluntary assisted dying; and the process for achieving change.

I note that the Assembly amended the committee's terms of reference in August 2018 to enable the committee to pursue matters raised by the debate then occurring in the Senate on the bill proposing the repeal of legislation prohibiting the ACT from enacting legislation to deal with voluntary assisted dying.

At the commencement of the inquiry the committee invited submissions from the public and wrote to a wide range of people and organisations, particularly health support and care organisations, agencies and academic commentators, seeking their views. The committee received an overwhelming response to its invitations. The committee published 488 submissions, all of which are on the committee website. This is the largest number of submissions received by a committee inquiry in the history of the Assembly. The submissions included a number from residents outside the ACT.

The committee also received a number of submissions which it did not publish, at the request of submitters. These submissions, expressing as they do very personal and confidential issues involving end of life choices and often involving personal pain, were equally valuable to committee members as published submissions.

The committee visited Victoria in April 2018 and held talks with Victorian agencies, palliative care program coordinators and members of the Victorian parliament who participated in that parliament's 2016 inquiry into end of life choices. The committee also held talks with Victorian officials responsible for the implementation of the Victorian Voluntary Assisted Dying Act, which is to commence in June 2019. This visit was of great value to the committee and assisted its inquiries and deliberations considerably.

The committee held 10 public hearings between May and September 2018 and heard evidence from 87 witnesses representing a cross-section of organisations involved in daily management of end of life and addressing issues impacting on all elements of consideration of end of life.

Matters that the committee found generated the most interest during its inquiry included the importance of advance care planning and advance care directives for treatment to enable a person's choices and wishes be recognised in treatment toward the end of life; the central and growing importance of palliative care in hospitals, homes, aged-care treatment programs and the training and appointment of specialist practitioners dedicated to palliative care; the particular importance of palliative care to the ACT community, palliative care in our hospitals, residential care and for individual care at home; and views put to the committee both in support of and opposition to voluntary assisted dying.

The committee has made recommendations it considers address the concerns of arguments put to us by witnesses and the committee's views on how best to identify

and put on the agenda recommendations which will achieve change and improvement in end of life care.

The report includes one recommendation that a committee of the Assembly inquire into paediatric palliative care in the ACT—a matter of concern to the committee. The committee also recommends courses of action for the ACT government to ensure that national coordination of end of life care and related matters are pursued with the commonwealth and other jurisdictions. The committee's report makes 24 recommendations. The committee's inquiry encompasses careful consideration of a very wide range of factors, from the most fundamental of human moral issues regarding death and dying through to the importance of palliative care.

As chair I take this opportunity to thank all members of the committee for their collaborative approach in dealing with all submissions received, as well as evidence taken by witnesses, and in their deliberation to come up with this final report. I also thank the committee staff who worked on this report: Brianna McGill, Josephine Moa and Danton Leary as research officers, Lydia Chung as administrative support and Andrew Sneddon as secretary.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (3.49): I that note you, Madam Deputy Speaker, are also a member of this committee and may be speaking on this as well. I second the committee chair's thanks to my fellow committee members and the secretariat. As Ms Cody noted, quite a few people were helping us with this. Even more than that, I thank the literally hundreds of people who responded to our call for submissions, in particular those individuals who gave evidence about the very distressing end of life circumstances in their families. I thank you for your courage and willingness to share.

I am disappointed that for those people who advocated for voluntary assisted dying we were not able to provide a pathway. I apologise to any of those who felt this committee would be able to provide that. I apologise to anyone to whom we gave false hope that we were not able to deliver on.

The timing of the inquiry was exquisite, with the Senate debating but not passing Liberal Democrat Senator David Leyonhjelm's legislation that would have revoked the laws which prevented us and the Northern Territory from making laws on voluntary assisted dying.

The question I am sure I will be asked is: why did we not make recommendations on voluntary assisted dying? There are a few reasons for that in my mind. Given that the Assembly cannot legislate on voluntary assisted dying, any legislation would presumably be done by a future Assembly. I have no doubt that any future Assembly would wish to have its own inquiry into what should happen in this area, if there is any legislation.

Also, there was not consensus amongst the committee as to what we would do with voluntary assisted dying, and you will see that when you read the report. However, I can say that a majority of committee members support the continuing work with the Northern Territory to lobby our federal government to give the territories the right to

make laws in this regard for their citizens. I hope that the forthcoming federal election might lead to some progress on that, but I do not know.

More positively, there was a high degree of consensus about what the ACT Assembly should do if we ever got the right to legislate on voluntary assisted dying. It should include things such as the person should be over 18; the person has to be diagnosed with a terminal illness or a serious condition that could not be sufficiently relieved by palliative care; there is a time frame for their likely demise; the person needs to have independent assessment to ensure they are of sound mind; and the person has to be given adequate information about the scheme and the implications of their decision and access to counselling.

We heard of risks that potentially could not be mitigated: the risk to elderly patients of elder abuse—even without voluntary assisted dying legislation I am well aware it—and particularly financial abuse; risks to people with disabilities; allowance for any healthcare professionals who may quite reasonably not wish to be involved in this; and how to ensure that any healthcare workers have access to the appropriate training facilities, support and counselling. Of course, there is the very important recommendation that, if this is to happen, we need to increase funding for palliative care.

The other thing I should mention is that in about two months Victoria will commence its scheme and it probably would be prudent to have a look at some of the experiences in Victoria before embarking on a whole new scheme.

Some members of the committee did not think there was any possibility of a workable voluntary assisted dying scheme and thus there was no consensus on that. However, there was consensus on a lot of other things related to end of life. It was clear to the committee that while voluntary assisted dying is one potential end of life issue, there are other issues and they are fairly complicated, given that both the aged-care and the health system have considerable commonwealth involvements. Some of our recommendations looked at what the commonwealth should do.

We made 24 recommendations. The first nine of them covered advance care directives. For those of you who have not been involved in this, an advance care directive basically says, “I am currently of sound mind and I may or may not be in good health but at some point in the future when there are medical issues and I may not be of sound mind, this is what I would like to have happen.” It is a fairly new concept and potentially has a lot of nuances. We made lots of recommendations, including training representatives for the CALD community and creating a way for hospitals and healthcare institutions to find advance care directives if they are made, because we are aware that that is an issue.

We would like to see a Medicare item for doing an advance care directive. Ideally you will be doing this in conjunction with your GP and it will take them time to do that. Currently there is not a Medicare number for that. We also talked about doing more work on this via COAG. This is really important work that needs to be done for all of us. I do not have an advance care directive, but we probably all should have one.

Recommendation 10 is to consider trial funding of death cafes so that there is much greater literacy in the community about what death is. We live in a society where many people have little exposure to death and may well have never seen a dead person. We looked at the Productivity Commission, which recently did a report on end of life care in Australia, and we thought that we should implement those recommendations.

Recommendations 13 to 24 are on palliative care. We all recognise that this is an incredibly important part of end of life care. Basically, we are looking at an expansion and more counselling, more palliative care being available in residential aged care and in the home. For many people, better palliative care is the end of life option that they are looking for, and we would like to see that.

I commend the report not only to the Assembly but to the wider community. I hope it will be a step forward to a happier, healthier, more tolerant and inclusive life for all of us in Canberra.

MS CHEYNE (Ginninderra) (3.58): For a range of reasons, it has been a remarkable 16 months since this inquiry began, and we conclude with, I think I can safely say, an extraordinary report. This report is the product of a significant amount of hard work by so many, not least the record-breaking number of people who submitted to this inquiry. It shows, without doubt, how important end of life issues are to Canberrans. I want to put on the record my thanks that so many people took the time to share their experiences and their views—so many thoughtful and considered views—so candidly with the committee through submissions and appearances. For many, it was very difficult to write their submissions and appear before the committee. For still more, it was too difficult to write a submission. But they, too, need to be acknowledged for following this inquiry so closely. Thank you to all.

As a result of the considerable evidence we have heard, as a committee, we have not only prepared a substantial report but also prepared meaningful recommendations. If the government chooses to implement them, I believe they will genuinely make a difference to people at the end of their lives and they will also, importantly, support our healthcare workers.

The work we have done on palliative care and advance care plans in particular is critical. I want to acknowledge that every single recommendation in this report was agreed to by the committee and that, probably to many people's surprise, there is no dissenting report and just one dissenting comment.

It is particularly important for me personally to draw attention to the final chapter, being the chapter on voluntary assisted dying, the appropriateness of a scheme in the ACT and what a possible scheme could or should look like. As most people are aware, right in the middle of this inquiry was the very unfortunate, and, in my view, frankly shameful outcome in the Senate that resulted in our territory rights not being restored, meaning that for the time being we simply cannot legislate in this space.

This Assembly historically passed its first ever remonstrance in response to the Senate. I do not think there is any doubt on my views regarding what happened, and we do not need to rehash them now. I now only hope that there is a change of federal government and, with it, a change of approach to this. I want to put on the record my thanks to the Chief Minister for his continued leadership and advocacy in this area within the party at a national level.

Following what happened in the Senate, as a committee we did not resile from the issue of voluntary assisted dying. But the reality is that, as Ms Le Couteur has noted, it put the committee in a very difficult position in terms of the approach we could take regarding voluntary assisted dying. We considered that it would be very difficult to draft genuine recommendations when taking into account the government's capacity to respond, as it is required to do, within the next three months in the current circumstances. This is all described at length in the report.

We received an extraordinary amount of evidence on this issue, and I and a majority of members of the committee determined that there was consistent evidence, or themes, as to how a voluntary assisted dying scheme should operate if we are ever in a position to legislate for it and if the Assembly were ever minded to do so.

While the comment on that in the report is short, I can assure the community and this place that it is very weighty. How the scheme could and perhaps should operate is backed by an extraordinary amount of evidence which is footnoted. I would draw the attention of anyone reading the report to it, especially those in the future, when I hope we are in a position to agree on doing this and on legislating for it.

This has been incredibly important work. I am proud of Canberra, Canberrans and all of the organisations who have been able to put us in the best possible position we can be in with this evidence for the point in the future when we can legislate, if we decide to do so. I want to draw particular attention to the evidence we heard from the Higgs-Heine family and Ms Katarina Pavkovic, which I think left an indelible impression on the committee. Again, this is highlighted in the report.

It is also appropriate at this point to thank all of the committee members for their work and the collegiate way in which we worked together, most of the time, under the chairing by you, Madam Assistant Speaker Cody, across three parties and at times across quite divergent views.

I really want to put on the record my thanks to Mrs Dunne. I think it will be of great surprise to many that we worked together at all on this issue in particular. We not only worked together but worked very hard together on the final chapter in particular. I personally thank her for her openness to negotiate on perhaps one of the most important reports that this Assembly has ever produced. The result is this report, an agreed report, and an extraordinary report. I commend it to the Assembly.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (4.05): Madam Assistant Speaker Cody, can I begin by congratulating you on your chairmanship of this committee of inquiry and the production of this very important report. I agree with Ms Cheyne that this is an

important report. I believe that the extent of unanimity in this difficult area is important because it means that those people who are having to deal with the recommendations cannot cast them off as being something insignificant. They are not insignificant.

I will start where Ms Cheyne ended, that is, the end of the report and the chapter about voluntary assisted dying. There is some mild dissent from me and Mrs Kikkert in this chapter. The chapter is without a substantive recommendation, by agreement with the committee, on the basis that the ACT cannot legislate in this space. I will not get into that. I have expressed my views on that in the past. Because we cannot legislate in this space, it is a little superfluous to make recommendations about a voluntary assisted dying scheme.

The chapter has in it about six or seven extensive paragraphs, with extensive footnoting, about what the majority of the committee think that a voluntary assisted dying scheme should look like if we ever got to that. But it is not a recommendation of this committee.

It is also worth noting that we had a substantial number of submissions to the inquiry—nearly 500. Of those, 274 came from residents of the ACT. It is worth noting and putting on the record what is said on page 89 of the report. Of the 274 people from the ACT who submitted, 160 were opposed to a voluntary assisted dying scheme and 108 were in favour. There were six submitters from the ACT who did not express a view either way on a voluntary assisted dying scheme. It is worth noting that, on the basis of the submissions received from ACT residents, there is not support in the community for voluntary assisted dying.

Turning to recommendations 1 through 24, all of which are unanimous and agreed, I am very proud to be part of a committee that has put forward such a range and collection of thoughtful recommendations about issues which are vital to the people of the ACT. They are issues which, when you contemplate them, have been ignored, not thought about or not valued as much as they should be.

It has been a long time in the ACT since we have made legislative change in the area of advance care directives or enduring powers of attorney in relation to medical decision-making, and it is quite clear that we are not as up to date as we should be. It is also quite clear that most of us in the community are probably not as informed as we should be about our rights, our responsibilities and the things that we should do to protect ourselves and our loved ones from inappropriate pressure and inappropriate decision-making because we in our lifetime have been silent or have not thought about what we might like for ourselves as we approach the end of our days on earth. It is timely that we spend some time and think about this as an Assembly and as a community, and that we encourage people in our community to be more engaged.

We heard a lot of evidence from the medical profession and elsewhere that there does not seem to be an appropriate locus of responsibility for advance care planning. There is not a place where it naturally falls to someone to say to a member of the public, “Have you thought about this? Are you prepared, if something happens and you fall

gravely ill? You might recover from it or you might not, but how do you want to be treated if you can't communicate your wishes at a particular time?"

It is not always an end of life issue. Some people have catastrophic injuries and are for some time incapacitated and incompetent in decision-making, but they still recover; some of them recover and go on to live healthy and fulfilled lives. It is not always an end of life issue, but there are issues that we need to be better educated on.

The first 10 recommendations in this important report go to those issues of advance care directives and advance care plans. I am particularly pleased that the committee has taken its lead from the important work that was done by the Productivity Commission last year in relation to human services. The Productivity Commission made important recommendations in relation to advance care planning and palliative care. The committee has reflected how it sees that those recommendations are important.

It is not just the work of the ACT government in this space; it is the work of governments across the board to make things happen. One of the recommendations, for instance, is that we follow the Productivity Commission's recommendations to establish a Medicare item number to encourage doctors and practice nurses to have more in-depth discussion about advance care planning. One of the things we heard, Madam Assistant Speaker, as you would know, is that these are difficult and often time-consuming conversations. They are not the sort of thing which a doctor can easily do in a 15-minute, short consultation. We think there would be more of an appetite to have this conversation if doctors were properly remunerated for it.

The thing that I am most pleased about with this report is the extensive recommendations in relation to palliative care. Palliative care is, in many ways, a new science. I think that in many ways it is misunderstood. I think that most people have the idea that you need palliative care if you are in the last stages of dying of cancer. That is a misunderstanding that we need to disabuse the community of. There are many people who have longstanding chronic and life-limiting diseases who would benefit from palliative care for many years before they meet their final end.

Part of the problem in the ACT and elsewhere—this is not just a problem in the ACT—is that we tend to take an acute medical approach to palliative care in the last few days or weeks of someone's life. The general message that we received is that the sooner there is intervention of a palliative nature, the better. When we recognise that people are not going to recover from their disease—it might be years away or weeks away—the sooner you intervene, the sooner you can restore people's equilibrium, reassure them and the like. It makes what remains of their life, generally speaking, better, more peaceful and more reconciled. It is certainly better for their families as well.

Of course, we have a great palliative care service here in the ACT, in Clare Holland House. There seem to be issues about whether patients can get into Clare Holland House soon enough and can stay for long enough. We have also noted that expansions to Clare Holland House have been funded through private philanthropy and the

commonwealth government at a capital level, and that the ACT has committed to funding the recurrent costs of the expansion of Clare Holland House.

Palliative care is about more than Clare Holland House. The committee has written extensively about respite, about the need to care for carers and the need to care for staff. We also looked as extensively as we could into the issues of palliative care in aged-care settings. I am pleased to note—and members will see this on the last page of the report—that the committee wrote to the Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety, raising issues about the need for a proper look at palliative care in an aged-care setting. In many ways this is an area of funding which is beyond the responsibility of the ACT. It is not the responsibility of states and territories. We did note and are very supportive of the trials through Palliative Care ACT and Clare Holland House of assistance for palliative care nurses in the aged-care setting, which is an initiative of the government which we strongly support.

There are a couple of issues that the committee touched on only lightly, where we believe there needs to be more work. Elder abuse was what might be called a leitmotiv through the evidence and the submissions. In some senses, there were never really hard proposals or recommendations that were put to the committee about how to address issues of elder abuse. The committee has made suggestions for further inquiry in that space.

One of the things that was surprising in the context of this report was that there was only very passing reference to palliative care for children and adolescents. The committee has suggested that the health committee inquire further into that. It was easy for us to do it because the health committee was a neat subset of the end of life care committee. Some people needed persuading that it was a really good idea, but I do think it is a very good idea. I think that there is some demand in the community for more child and adolescent palliative care, rather than sending our vulnerable families from Canberra to Sydney.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the people of Canberra and the wider community who contributed with their heart and soul to this very important inquiry. It was difficult for people to make submissions and it was difficult on many occasions for people to tell us their story. It was tough. It is clear that people who work in palliative care, for instance, are hardworking, dedicated and possibly not appreciated enough; there are recommendations about that in here as well.

I also want to place on record my thanks to the staff of the committee office who worked so diligently on this, and my appreciation to the members of the committee who worked so collegiately together. I am flattered by Ms Cheyne's comments, but I hope that she has actually learnt something: just because one can be adversarial in this place, it does not mean that we are always ogres. We do have hearts, and we do believe in good outcomes for important committee inquiries. Getting a good outcome in this inquiry was why I asked to be on the committee in the first place. I am very proud of the work that was done and of the quality of the work that we are presenting here today.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee Report 8

MS ORR (Yerrabi) (4.20): I present the following report:

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee—Report 8—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2017-2018*, dated 21 March 2019, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee Report 5

MRS JONES (Murrumbidgee) (4.21): I present the following report:

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee—Report 5—*Report on Annual and Financial Reports 2017-2018*, dated March 21 2019, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

Today the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety tables its fifth report for the Ninth Assembly. On 25 October 2018 the Assembly referred annual reports from the Attorney-General, Justice and Community Safety and associated agencies, including statutory bodies, to the committee.

The committee held two public hearings and heard from 41 witnesses from the relevant directorates and agencies. Forty questions were taken on notice during the hearings and 19 questions were placed on notice after the hearings. Answers to these questions are available on the committee's web page. The committee made 29 recommendations.

Finally, on behalf of the committee, I would like to thank our secretariat and all involved—government ministers as well as directorate and agency officials—for their contribution to this inquiry. I commend the report to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee Report 10

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (4.21): I present the following report:

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee—Report 10—*Inquiry into the ACT Register of Lobbyists*, dated 21 March 2019, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be adopted.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

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 the Arts and Cultural Events, Minister for Building Quality Improvement, Minister for Business and Regulatory Services and Minister for Seniors and Veterans) (4.22): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to present the Justice and Community Safety Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 to the Assembly. The introduction of this bill demonstrates the government's continuing commitment to improving the operation of the territory's laws. The bill makes a range of minor and non-controversial changes which improve our statute book and which have positive social and regulatory impacts.

Amongst the changes proposed, I am pleased to inform the Assembly that the bill will amend the Juries Regulation so that part-time teaching and emergency service professionals will be treated in the same way as their full-time colleagues for the purposes of determining when they need to serve on a jury. Currently, exemptions from jury duty for these professions only apply to full-time workers, and this raises an issue of gender equality. In data from 2016-17 the Australian Bureau of Statistics found that 45 per cent of women worked part time, while only 16 per cent of men worked part time. This gap widens for families with children under five years old, with 61 per cent of employed women working part time and only 8.4 per cent of employed men working part time.

The bill supports gender equality by removing the distinction between full-time and part-time work which disproportionately affects women, particularly those women with young children and who are working part time. This demonstrates the commitment of the government to achieving gender equality in our community in all respects.

The availability of legal services to all people in the ACT community is critical to ensuring an effective and fair justice system. The bill introduces an amendment to the Legal Aid Act which enables the Legal Aid Commission to make family dispute resolution more readily available. Alternative dispute resolution is generally more timely, amicable and cost efficient than proceeding to trial. The commission's 2016-17 annual report found that 76 per cent of family dispute resolution conferences had a successful outcome.

This bill will help even more people in the community to get help without enduring the cost of litigation. It will especially help middle income earners avoid unnecessary legal action and reduce their costs in family disputes, which in turn reduces reliance on other social services. This amendment brings the territory into line with other jurisdictions such as New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. It reflects the government's ongoing commitment to supporting access to justice for all members of our community.

Among the other amendments in the bill are provisions that will improve the regulation of the legal profession by updating the requirements for practising certificates and withdrawals of trust account moneys by solicitors, enhancing public safety by clarifying the obligations of building occupiers to maintain fire appliances, increasing the number of Indigenous representatives on the Victims Advisory Board, making it simpler for parties who reach agreement during reconciliation of complaints before the Human Rights Commission to enforce those agreements through the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal and updating the oaths and affirmations in the Notaries Public Act, in line with modern text, as recently uniformly updated in other territory legislation.

The bill being introduced today is a human rights compatible bill that improves the operation of our laws and increases the availability of services in our community. These improvements are a result of the government listening to and working with the community to deliver legislation that is accessible, transparent and timely.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

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

Leave for members

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (4.27): I move:

That standing order 22, relating to leave of absence for Members be amended by adding the following words:

“Except that a Member who is pregnant shall be entitled, without a vote of the Assembly, to 18 weeks maternity leave of absence, and that leave shall commence at a time notified by the Member to the Speaker.”

What we are looking at here is a change to standing order 22, which relates to leave of absence for members. The amendment is about a member who is pregnant being able

to have leave of absence from the Assembly. There is a routine. Usually a whip or the manager of government business would stand and seek leave of absence for a member. In this day and age it is our view that if you are having maternity leave that should not be a requirement; it should be accepted as routine business. The amendment will add the following words:

“Except that a Member who is pregnant shall be entitled, without a vote of the Assembly, to 18 weeks maternity leave of absence, and that leave shall commence at a time notified by the Member to the Speaker.”

I think that is a straightforward, very sensible addition to our standing orders. I think it builds on the other changes we have made about children being allowed on the floor, breastfeeding and the other changes in this place. I commend the amendment to the chamber.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee Report 11

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (4.30): I present the following report:

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee—Report 11—*Citizen’s Right of Reply—Mr Joel Dignam*, dated 21 March 2019, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be adopted.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee Statement by chair

MS ORR (Yerrabi) (4.31): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services relating to the inquiry into a territory coat of arms. This inquiry was referred by the Assembly on 28 November 2018.

After the summer break, and taking the necessary time to familiarise ourselves with the conventions surrounding the design of coats of arms, the committee today invites written submissions to the inquiry. We are particularly interested in hearing a range of views on two questions: first, whether there should be a coat of arms for the Australian Capital Territory, in addition to the Canberra city coat of arms; and, second, what symbols might be included in the design of an ACT coat of arms. When suggesting images and symbols, the committee invites people to describe how they are significant to or representative of the people, history or landscape of the ACT.

The closing date for submissions is 21 April 2019, after which time the committee expects to invite further community participation in the inquiry through an online survey.

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MRS JONES (Murrumbidgee) (4.32): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety, in its legislative scrutiny role, in relation to scrutinising amendments from non-government members. New standing order 182A provides that amendments proposed by any member to any bill must be considered and reported on by the scrutiny committee before they can be moved, unless leave is granted by the Assembly.

The committee would like to remind members that, in accordance with its resolution of appointment, the role of the scrutiny committee is to report to the Legislative Assembly, pursuant to section 38 of the Human Rights Act 2004, about, amongst other things, human rights issues raised by bills presented to the Assembly. Non-government members therefore may wish to include a supplementary explanatory statement to assist the committee, particularly in relation to any human rights issue raised by their amendments. While the committee recognises that this is not a requirement, it would be grateful for any efforts made in this respect.

The committee also takes this opportunity to draw members' attention to a document on its web page called "Guide to writing an explanatory statement" which members may find useful when drafting a supplementary explanatory statement in relation to their amendments.

Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (4.34): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning and Urban Renewal. At a private meeting on 7 February 2019 the committee resolved to undertake an inquiry into the ACT planning strategy 2018.

The committee believes that an inquiry into the ACT planning strategy 2018 will not only enable the ACT community to identify and gain a greater understanding of the key elements of the strategic direction for the development of Canberra but also help the committee to gauge whether there are issues arising from the strategy that warrant deeper public examination and inform the committee's consideration of future Territory Plan variations.

The committee will not be inviting or receiving submissions to this inquiry.

Executive business—precedence

Ordered that executive business be called on.

Welcoming Cities network

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (4.35): I move:

That:

- (1) the ACT Government has a long-standing commitment to multiculturalism and inclusion, welcoming and providing support to new migrants, people arriving on humanitarian grounds or seeking asylum as they make Canberra their home;
- (2) the ACT Government has taken a national leadership role in the support of refugees and people seeking asylum. Including:
 - (a) in September 2011, introducing the ACT Services Access Card, which allows eligible asylum seekers access to a suite of ACT services, programs and entitlements;
 - (b) in June 2015, the ACT becoming the first state or territory in Australia to register with the Refugee Council of Australia as a Refugee Welcome Zone;
 - (c) in October 2016, the ACT formally joining the Safe Haven Enterprise Visa Scheme; and
 - (d) establishing the ACT Multicultural Framework 2015-2020, which is built around three broad themes:
 - (i) supporting our multicultural communities;
 - (ii) providing tools and resources for all Canberrans to reach their full potential; and
 - (iii) ensuring that everyone is welcomed and can benefit from our rich cultural diversity;
- (3) the Welcoming Cities Network is a national network of cities, shires, towns and municipalities committed to an inclusive social, cultural, economic and civic life for everyone;
- (4) the Welcoming Cities Network is growing and now includes more than 135 municipalities across Australia and New Zealand, the Americas and Europe;
- (5) becoming a member of the Welcoming Cities Network would demonstrate the ACT's commitment to cultural diversity and inclusion;
- (6) membership of the Welcoming Cities Network would further support the development of new and alternative strategies to create opportunities for all members of our community to participate in and contribute to social, economic and civic life;
- (7) the Welcoming Cities Standard is a central element of the Welcoming Cities Network establishing the framework for local councils to benchmark their cultural diversity and inclusion policies and practices, identify where and how further efforts could be directed, and assess progress over time; and

- (8) the ACT Government and this Assembly supports:
- (a) the ACT's membership of the Welcoming Cities Network to strengthen our ongoing commitment to an inclusive city; and
 - (b) the ACT Government undertaking a benchmark assessment against the Welcoming Cities Standard by the end of 2020.

Canberra is a community that embraces diversity. Our commitment to social inclusion extends to all cultures, races, genders, sexualities and ages. We do not discriminate and we do not just tolerate; we are proud of our achievements in making Canberra a place where everyone can feel welcome.

We led the nation to legalise same sex-marriage, with 74 per cent of Canberrans voting yes and a remarkable participation rate of over 80 per cent in the non-binding voluntary postal survey. We led the nation by becoming the first state or territory in Australia to register with the Refugee Council as a refugee welcome zone. We have led the nation by introducing the ACT services access card, which allows eligible asylum seekers to access a suite of ACT government services, programs and entitlements.

More than 26 per cent of Canberrans were born overseas. One in four Canberrans speaks a language other than English at home, with the most common languages spoken being Mandarin, Vietnamese, Cantonese and Hindi. This wonderful diversity enriches our social and economic life. Today the city of Canberra has among the nation's fastest growing populations. We are expected to be a city of half a million people by 2030. This financial year alone, as a community we have welcomed 51 people from Syria, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Afghanistan.

It is up to all of us in this chamber to ensure that Canberra continues to be a welcoming and supportive place to live. We have a longstanding commitment to welcoming and providing support to new migrants, to people arriving in Canberra on humanitarian grounds and to those seeking asylum as they make Canberra their home. We have taken a national leadership role in the support of refugees and people seeking asylum.

I have mentioned that in 2011 we introduced the ACT services access card to enable asylum seekers to access a suite of ACT government services, programs and entitlements without the need to retell their story to different agencies repeatedly. I am pleased to inform members that the access card is currently being reviewed to ensure that it continues to meet the needs of new arrivals.

In 2015 the ACT was the first state or territory in the nation registered with the Refugee Council of Australia as a refugee welcome zone. In 2016 the ACT formally joined the safe haven enterprise visa scheme. Introducing the ACT services card, becoming a refugee welcoming zone and joining the safe haven enterprise visa scheme demonstrates our commitment to and community support and compassion for refugees and asylum seekers looking to start their new life here in Canberra.

Following these initiatives, I am pleased to announce that Canberra has been invited to join the Welcoming Cities network. Launched in early 2016, Welcoming Cities is a growing network of cities, shires, towns and municipalities across the nation committed to making it possible for people of all backgrounds to feel valued and to fully participate in the social, civic and economic life of our nation. The Welcoming Cities network is part of a growing international movement in more than 135 municipalities across New Zealand, the Americas and Europe. Members of the Welcoming Cities network include community organisations, businesses and governments.

Canberra's membership of the network aligns with our commitment to build an inclusive city where everyone is valued and welcomed. Becoming a member of the Welcoming Cities network capitalises on our cultural diversity. Membership of the network will allow knowledge sharing and access to evidence-based research, resources, policies and case studies across network members. It will allow for the benchmarking of our cultural diversity and inclusion policies and practices. It will identify where and how further efforts should be directed. It will allow assessment of our progress over time and it will allow the celebration of successes and recognition of achievements that demonstrate leading practice and innovation in welcoming efforts.

A welcoming city fosters a culture and a policy environment that makes it possible for everyone to feel valued and to fully participate in social, civic and economic life. Our membership of the Welcoming Cities network will strengthen our ongoing commitment to achieving this outcome for all Canberrans. I encourage everyone in the Assembly to support this motion this afternoon. I thank members in advance for their support.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (4.41): I thank Minister Barr for putting forward this motion today, International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which we talked about earlier today in the MPI debate.

All people, regardless of their ethnicity, culture, religion, language or place of birth have equal rights in our society. Our diversity is a source of our strength and a key part of what makes the ACT such a great and vibrant place to live. This day is an appropriate day for us to be demonstrating our willingness to be a city where everyone can belong and participate in social, cultural, economic and civic life. Canberra will be joining a growing international movement of more than 135 municipalities in New Zealand, New York, London, Glasgow, Frankfurt, Adelaide, San Francisco and, importantly, Christchurch, that work proactively to ensure their localities are open and welcoming to new migrants and people from a range of cultures.

Supporting local governments to advance communities where everyone can belong and participate in social, cultural, economic and civic life is a notion that we should all support. I cannot see any reason not to, particularly given the focus of the massacres in Christchurch nearly a week ago. Now more than ever we need to be mindful of difference. We need to be grateful for that difference too. We need not to

stay silent and we need not to do nothing. Cultural differences in a community make that community richer and more vibrant. When we foster cohesive, resilient and healthy communities, we foster communities where everyone can belong. When people feel welcome, they will participate in community life and thus our local community will benefit.

In Canberra we have so many people who choose to contribute to the life of our city. Our multicultural communities are supported by small voluntary groups and organisations who work tirelessly to advocate for the needs of their diverse members. The ACT Greens were pleased to secure a commitment to establishing the multicultural advisory board and convening the first multicultural summit, through the parliamentary agreement, to ensure that those communities have a voice to government and can contribute to decision-making. Today that voice is more important than ever. We need to continue to listen to diverse voices to be able to combat bigotry and intolerance where it occurs.

The ACT Greens believe that the ACT should be a safe and welcoming place for asylum seekers, refugees and migrants and that those people should be supported through housing, education, life skills and social connections when they settle in Canberra. We are proud that Canberra is the only state or territory to be declared a refugee welcome zone. This reflects the openness and generosity of the Canberra community.

While the federal government's approach to refugees and asylum seekers is simply disgraceful, in the ACT we have chosen to take a different approach. This Assembly has supported a Greens motion calling for refugees and asylum seekers on Manus Island and Nauru to be resettled in here in the ACT as part of a national resettlement program.

We are a welcoming community with a strong sense of justice and will continue to advocate for the rights and wellbeing of refugees and asylum seekers in our care. The approach the ACT has taken reflects the values of the Welcoming Cities network and demonstrates our commitment to these values. Becoming a member of the network will provide us with additional assistance, tools and networks from which we can learn and to which we can contribute.

I am pleased that we will work to undertake a benchmark assessment against the Welcoming Cities standard by the end of 2020. Following that assessment, we can work to implement deliberate policies, programs and initiatives that will have a positive impact on the community. The Greens and I unreservedly support this motion.

MR STEEL (Murrumbidgee—Minister for City Services, Minister for Community Services and Facilities, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Roads) (4.45): I thank the Chief Minister for bringing this motion forward today. I am very proud to live in our inclusive, progressive and connected city, a city that celebrates diversity and where everyone is encouraged to participate in the life of our city. It is a city which recognises that bringing together a mix of people from different backgrounds, experiences and cultures is essential for a thriving city, and a source of

innovation. Inclusion is a choice, and today we make an important choice to take the next step in enhancing our inclusive city by joining the Welcoming Cities network.

Becoming member of the network will further support the ACT government's commitment to celebrating our diversity and ensuring that all members of the community feel included and welcomed and have a sense of belonging, particularly our migrant and multicultural communities. Welcoming Cities actively engage with migrant communities, developing a whole-of-community approach to building social and cultural inclusion, economic engagement and civic participation. They develop comprehensive plans and active messaging for cultural diversity in policy, multi-sector engagement activities and economic development approaches. They also have networks and resources that facilitate effective planning for welcoming and inclusion.

With the support of the Assembly today, we will join 135 cities and municipalities from around the world to encourage the sharing of knowledge, celebrate in successes, facilitate the development of partnerships and look at ways to improve cultural diversity and inclusion with reference to the Welcoming Cities standard. Today we have been joined in the Legislative Assembly by Mr Aleem Ali, the CEO of Welcoming Cities. Mr Ali's attendance at today's Assembly and for the Harmony Day events that have been occurring today in Canberra reinforces the importance of this commitment for our city of Canberra.

One of the key aspects of becoming a welcoming city is continuously improving our approach by reference to benchmarks for Welcoming Cities as well as looking at approaches in other cities. Benchmarking assessments may be familiar to members of the ACT Legislative Assembly, as the Clerk has completed a benchmark assessment on our own parliament, using the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association benchmarks.

The Australian standard for Welcoming Cities is a key part of joining the Welcoming Cities network, as it establishes the framework for assessing our social cohesion and also allows us to celebrate our successes and identify areas for improvement. The standard allows us to benchmark the ACT's current cultural diversity and inclusion practices and policies from which it can be identified where and how we can direct further efforts to improve social cohesion. That will allow a progressive improvement to take place over time.

Assessments may also help to compare and contrast our city to regions across the same area, side by side, and other regions around the world. It is useful to see how different jurisdictions with similar environmental, cultural and socio-economic challenges fare against one another—in this case, how welcoming our city is.

The standard is organised under six categories, including leadership; social and cultural inclusion; economic development; learning and skills development; civic participation; and places and spaces. Each category contains principles, criteria and indicators, many of which are met through collaboration with and the support of local stakeholders and the community. I know that the ACT is already addressing many elements of the standard. However, the benchmarking assessment process will no

doubt identify areas for improvement. I hope it will result in actionable reforms so that we can continue to achieve our aspirations as an inclusive city.

The recent success of the 2018 multicultural summit and the National Multicultural Festival demonstrates the ACT government's commitment to promoting activities and initiatives that nurture the connection between migrant communities and our own and is one of the first steps in starting the benchmarking process by satisfying the standard of leadership.

The standards that are already being met by the ACT government are numerous. A few worth noting include the ACT multicultural framework 2015-20, which has been guiding our vision for an inclusive and cohesive Canberra. It demonstrates our capacity to meet standard 2 of social and cultural inclusion, drawing on diversity to enhance social, economic and civic participation. The framework's principal objectives are accessible and responsive services, citizenship, participation and cohesion and capitalising on the benefits of cultural diversity.

The work experience and support program has been running for over 20 years and supports the network's economic development standard by helping to address the barriers some members of our migrant and multicultural communities face when seeking employment. The program assists ACT residents who have recently moved to the city to gain office skills and training and work experience as well as the confidence to enter the workforce and gain meaningful paid employment. Many participants have gone on to find employment within the ACT public service, bringing their unique experience and perspectives to our workplaces.

Tomorrow night the ACT government is hosting a forum in partnership with the ACT South Sudanese community on the importance of belonging. The Welcoming Cities network actively encourages all residents to participate in civic life. I am pleased this forum will be the first in a series of forums to highlight the contributions of our local communities and promote our understanding of the unique cultures represented in Canberra. Furthermore, it will also meet standard 5 of the Welcoming Cities network that encourages civic participation and civic leadership that reflects the diversity of our community.

There has been enormous interest in the forum, which will feature Mr Aleem Ali as a guest speaker, along with Mr Deng Adut, who is known to many as a former refugee and is now a successful criminal lawyer who has made an enormous contribution here in Australia and particularly in New South Wales.

I am confident that joining the Welcoming Cities network will have a positive impact on the ACT community by strengthening the economic and social participation of all people who have made Canberra their home. By joining a network of like-minded cities we can learn from one another, share best practice approaches and models and ensure Canberra remains the most inclusive city in Australia.

I look forward to sharing with the Assembly in the near future the second action plan under the multicultural framework, which is being developed in collaboration with the ACT multicultural community. The action plan will communicate the outcomes we

are seeking to achieve in our community as well as outlining practical actions and how we will measure our success while embedding areas for improvement. That will also reference the Welcoming Cities standard.

I am pleased to support the membership of Canberra as a welcoming city in the Chief Minister's motion today. Membership of the Welcoming Cities network has a particular significance this week, following both the Christchurch terrorist attack last Friday and Harmony Day today. It is an important next step for Canberra to continue to grow as an inclusive, connected and progressive community, particularly for our migrant and multicultural communities. I hope that Canberra becoming a welcoming city can be supported by the whole Legislative Assembly.

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (4.53): I thank Mr Barr for bringing this motion before the Assembly today. The Canberra Liberals acknowledge that our nation is built upon migration and the principles of multiculturalism. We are proud of Australia's multicultural history. This is not an academic discussion for me; I am a migrant who found shelter in Australia. Without this opportunity my life would have turned out very differently. I note that this is also the case for my Liberal colleagues Ms Lee and Mr Hanson.

The Canberra Liberals also take great pride in the generous welcome our nation gives to new Australians from refugee backgrounds. Whenever I think of refugees I think of my good friend and mentor Steve Doszpot who understood the importance of Australia's refugee and humanitarian program with an intimacy that none of us in this room will ever be able to equal. Steve and his family escaped the Russian occupation of Hungary in 1957 and spent time in various refugee camps before receiving the miraculous news that the entire family had been accepted for resettlement in Australia.

Just last night I met a refugee, a strong and courageous woman from Afghanistan, Hangama, who found a warm embrace and new life here in Australia. As she explained, when she was young she had never even heard of Australia but she knew in her heart that there must be somewhere where life would be better for her. Now she and her young son have found that better life here with us. This is a good outcome for them, but it is also a good outcome for Canberra.

Residents with an assortment of cultures and different faiths, often speaking a multitude of languages, enrich our city. Research has found strong, positive links between culturally and linguistically diverse populations, and things such as business performance, educational outcomes, technological and workplace innovation, improved decision-making, increased creativity, community resilience, livability, economic sustainability and of course, the simple enjoyment that comes from enjoying each other's contributions to the vibrancy of a place. The Canberra Liberals welcome the ACT's membership of the Welcoming Cities network. I commend this motion to the Assembly.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (4.56): I rise briefly to reiterate Mrs Kikkert's comments with regard to the Canberra Liberals' support for this motion. The opposition is proud of the representation of the multicultural community in Canberra, something that enriches our city so much. The demonstration we had in this

place on Tuesday morning in response to the Christchurch attack is indicative of how this chamber is of one mind when it comes to these issues. Having said that, and especially having heard the remarks of Mrs Kikkert, I reassure the government that they have our full support in this initiative.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (4.56), in reply: I thank all members for their contributions to the debate on this Harmony Day and am pleased we have a note of very significant harmony on this matter. It is indeed a very positive reflection upon this place, and I thank each member for their contributions.

I acknowledge Mrs Kikkert's long list of benefits in relation to the importance of diversity and inclusion. It is very clear from all academic research and lived experience in this city and elsewhere around the world that the most successful harmonious communities are ones that embrace their diversity, embrace points of difference and celebrate the joy of diversity. We in Canberra should be proud of our collective efforts over many decades to support and encourage that diversity.

Membership of the Welcoming Cities network is an important next step. I think it is a good thing that on Harmony Day we reach this point of harmony this afternoon. We may not continue that into the debate on revenue legislation; nevertheless, it is a good and unifying moment for this Assembly and for this city in what has been a traumatic week for New Zealand, for us in Australia and around the world.

The commitment in the motion is that the ACT government undertake a benchmarking assessment against the world city standard by the end of 2020. In signing up today, on Harmony Day, we also commit to working through that assessment process by the end of 2020, which will also be the end of this parliamentary term. I thank members for their unanimous support of the motion this afternoon.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

Debate resumed from 14 February 2019, on motion by **Mr Barr**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (4.59): The opposition will be supporting the technical components of this bill, but we oppose some of the other substantial elements. The legislation makes a number of technical amendments. However, it also contains some substantial changes which I believe merit further comment and probably further investigation—namely, the inserted duty exemption for the universities, the change to the default tax rate and the expansion of tax debt recovery mechanisms available to the government. Such a bill probably is best to go to a committee for further investigation. Whilst this is presented as a form of omnibus bill, some significant policy decisions are contained in this legislation. As we have

discussed on many occasions, an omnibus bill is not the bill to use to have serious policy shifts.

The legislation inserts a duty exemption for the University of Canberra, under the Duties Act 1999. When the University of Canberra Amendment Bill 2015 was debated last term, the opposition highlighted our concerns with the planning implications of the legislation and the non-answers from the government on the normal rates and charges that would apply, especially in relation to development. The Labor-Greens government constantly apply double standards on rates, fees, taxes and charges, and this duty exemption is another example. This legislation gives another distinct commercial advantage to the university, or whoever the government deem, to exploit or develop—those actual words—its property.

Universities are rightly seen as a community resource, given that the broader community has a vested interest in the future use and development of these sites. Canberrans should be able to trust that any commercial use is measured, reasonable and complies with the relevant planning and tax laws that apply to any other development. The special treatment of specific classes of entities, individuals or friends of the government needs to stop. The Canberra community cannot trust this government to put the interests of people first and, therefore, special exemptions undermine public confidence.

As I mentioned when we debated the University of Canberra Amendment Bill 2015, it risked majorly undermining commercial property in Belconnen in particular but, indeed, right across Canberra. We have real concerns about this. This is not to say what the university does or could do is bad, but I have really concerns about giving a suite of free kicks to any entity without it being very balanced and measured.

The Taxation Administration Act 1999 is also altered. The bill makes changes to the default tax rate and enshrines the government as the first creditor. It expands the government's tax debt recovery capabilities and allows for charges to be placed on properties. The current legislation incorporates a reasonableness test for the default tax rate. As set out in table 34, the tax default rate is 25 per cent and also applies where a taxpayer fails to take reasonable care but has a reasonable excuse. This reasonableness test is removed for the default rate and the more punitive 50 penalty points is included in this bill.

Specific circumstances are included where the tax rate is raised to 50 per cent, such as delayed payment; delayed provision of information; providing incorrect, incomplete or misleading information; or where it is an individual's second or subsequent tax breach. There is no reasonableness test incorporated into these changes. It does not decrease the penalty rate that will apply to a tax debt. The changes proposed by the bill simply state circumstances where the higher threshold would apply without any mention of reasonableness or a threshold test.

Under the strictest interpretation, if someone is in and out of hospital and misses the due date for their rates bill, will they immediately incur a 50 per cent penalty rate? Could someone inadvertently omit something in a submission to the Revenue Office that the commissioner may deem relevant and, therefore, receive a punitive measure?

The commissioner no longer has to consider reasonableness, a test that is used extensively throughout common law.

We have seen with objections to the increase in rates and land tax that the Treasurer can be very heavy-handed when it comes to the application of these laws. Despite the government's assurance that the vacant land tax will be applied appropriately, we still see Canberrans getting slugged when they should not have been. We said back in May last year that the consequence of the changes would be significant, and this was dismissed by Labor and the Greens. Now, a year on, they are agreeing that there were unintended consequences that have been detrimental. Therefore, we have no confidence that any such discretion the government has in this bill will be used for the benefit of Canberrans.

The legislation also introduces a mechanism to allow the government to claim tax debt from a mortgagee or a credit provider, place a charge on a property and become the first creditor. When a property is sold, money from the sale will first go to the government's coffers before creditors who have a secured and vested investment or interest in the property. This could give rise to situations we have seen in other jurisdictions where a creditor ends up in an inequitable position despite doing everything right in relation to their own assessments.

It demonstrates once again that the government only care about getting their cut, and any notions of fairness and equity are thrown out the window. The government only care about what money they can squeeze out of Canberrans. Those opposite do not care about the hardworking people of Canberra who are fighting to keep up with the ever-increasing cost of living in Canberra.

The threshold for these charges and debt recovery measures is set very low, at \$2,000 or another amount set by the minister. We have heard during the numerous rates inquiries that individuals and businesses' rates and land tax bills have been increased by thousands without warning. It is not unexpected that some people could very easily find themselves in arrears due to the dramatic escalation in taxes and charges.

If you are financially stretched by trying to cope with the effects of the Labor-Greens government's targeted revenue-raising policies, it is not difficult to imagine that you may be in arrears for a year or two as you struggle to keep up with the payments and associated penalties. You should not have to be worried about losing your home or having a charge placed on it because of a \$2,000 unfair liability. This is a devastating way for people to live.

Further to this, at a time of a potential housing downturn when banks are changing their lending ratios, when there are unpredictable valuations, rising rates and land taxes and a federal Labor Party proposing huge housing taxes, now is not the time to be tinkering with the hierarchy of creditors. Even if the government are determined to do this, they should at least do much better analysis than they have done. At the very least, a committee inquiry would be useful. I am very concerned about what impact this will have for banks lending to Canberrans and what risk assessments banks will have to do in order to lend for houses in the ACT.

I note that the government has emulated my colleague's proposed changes to land tax to provide an exemption for community housing. This could have been put in place months ago, had the government simply supported Mr Parton's bill. Of course, they were stubborn and said no, yet here we are months later and they are trying to now do pretty much the same thing. Whilst it is a positive change compared to the current policy, I wonder why the government did not support it when it was first introduced into the Assembly last year. The Treasurer was critical of both the motion and the bill, and it probably was not until after polling came back that the government decided they might implement the policy.

To the Treasurer's credit, he has changed the legislation by watering down its effectiveness through proposed amendments setting a maximum cap on the number of properties eligible and the amount of revenue that may be forgone. It is as shameful as it is unsurprising that the Labor-Greens government continue to prioritise their own revenue scheme, as opposed to actually getting as many people as possible into this scheme.

The Labor-Greens government seem determined to increase the cost of living through ever-increasing rates, fees, taxes and charges. The Canberra Liberals agree everyone should pay their fair share, but those who do not should not get harshly penalised if they have simply made an honest mistake. We believe many Canberrans will be worse off as a result of all these changes. We do not want to give the government more discretion when it comes to rates, taxes, fees and charges. They cannot be trusted.

We do not want to see a situation where the government has an excuse to charge even more for penalties and other charges. We also do not want to see a situation where, because lots of people might apply for the land tax exemption, they should stop it. On the off chance that it is a success, they want to do everything they can to make sure it is not. Why the government is moving an amendment to limit the effectiveness of this is absolutely beyond me, but that how this government rolls. They have no interest in the plight and welfare of Canberrans. It is simply about money in the bank for them to spend on their pet projects.

As I said at the very beginning, there are some technical aspects of this bill that we can support, but there are many substantial policy decisions that we cannot. That is why we will be moving in the detail stage to have the bill split and to vote on clauses separately.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (5.12): The Greens will be supporting this bill. As Mr Coe says, the bill makes a large number of changes to tax legislation, but I am going to focus my remarks on two parts of it: the new debt recovery provisions in the Taxation Administration Act and the land tax exemption for affordable housing. I will start with the new debt recovery options under the Taxation Administration Act before finishing on the considerably happier topic of the land tax exemption.

Most people pay their tax, which is good. However, there are always going to be some people who do not. Broadly, these people will be in three categories: those who are doing something dodgy, those who have made a mistake because they are either confused or got some bad advice or those who are suffering from financial hardship.

Basically, I do not have much sympathy for the people who are avoiding tax; nor do the Greens have a lot of sympathy for them. By not paying their tax they increase the burden on the rest of us. I have no problems with the revenue office cracking down hard on them. However, I want to focus on the other two categories: people who get a tax debt either because of financial hardship or because of a mistake. These people are not trying to deliberately rip off the government. Instead, they have found themselves in a difficult situation that they need a way out of.

I listened to Mr Coe's speech on this. I have to say that I share some of his concerns. I have sent quite a number of emails to the Treasurer about various people who, through what would appear to be no real fault of their own, have been in a difficult situation in respect of tax arrears. I would have to say that the current approach has not always been particularly useful and that a different approach is needed. They need to be dealt with sensitively and carefully.

Basically what the revenue office has been doing at present is not right. We need to do this better. That, of course, is one of the reasons that I put forward a motion in November last year that sought to change the revenue office's practices. That motion was passed—thank you to everybody who voted for it—and I know that that work has now started within the revenue office. They have actually sent out a letter to all the concession ratepayers about deferrals and things that may be available to them.

There are three changes proposed in this amending bill to the Taxation Administration Act for debt recovery. They are: more timely notification to mortgagees about tax debts; recovering tax debts from mortgagees so that they can be rolled into the mortgage; and recovering tax debts from other properties owned by the debtor.

When I first heard about those I thought, "Errrrr!" I don't quite know how *Hansard* is going to record that. However, we spent some time thinking about this and talking to the government. It would appear that these are things that actually could be positive for people who find themselves in financial hardship or who have had bad advice, and they are not going to make the situation worse.

Mr Coe: That might be in one per cent of the cases.

MS LE COUTEUR: We still have the issue of the revenue office being a bit more understanding and compassionate. I totally agree with Mr Coe that that has been an issue. All I can say is that this legislation does not create compassion, but it also does not make the situation in any way worse as far as we can see.

My understanding is that these other methodologies, these changes, are only following what has been done in other jurisdictions. We are not leading the way on this; we are simply doing what other jurisdictions have done. Other jurisdictions have found that these are, in many cases, better ways of looking at tax debt recovery. Basically, what we are giving the government the ability to do is to let mortgagees know about tax debts, which could mean that the bank does not extend further credit to someone who actually cannot afford it and who has no chance of paying it back, or rolling a tax debt into a mortgage, which could really help people if they do have a tax debt because mortgages have a lower rate of interest than a tax debt.

You can argue that that should not be the case. I think that may well be partly what Mr Coe was arguing, but that is, in fact, the case right now: mortgages attract a lower rate of interest than a tax debt. So you are better off if it is part of your mortgage than if you owe the money to the ACT government. The other alternative is to sell an investment property, which could let someone pay a tax debt without the government having to sell their home. Of course, these things can also be used punitively against people who deserve to be dealt with sensitively and carefully. As I said, I have spoken to the government and they have assured me that the provisions will not be used punitively. Whether or not I believe them, really—

Mr Coe: But you will vote for it anyway.

MS LE COUTEUR: I am going to vote for it. The reason I am going to vote for it is that, regardless of whether I believe that they will be more compassionate in the future, basically I do not think these amendments will necessarily make things worse than they are now. Sure, treasuries by definition are parts of the government which are not generally over-endowed with compassion. But I urge the Treasurer to keep a close eye on these new measures and to ensure that they are actually used with compassion, bearing in mind the considerable criticism that has been made in the past of how tax debts are administered.

I am certainly personally aware of someone who had to sell their house because of a tax debt that they incurred because of poor advice about the administration of land tax. I am not talking about the recent changes; this is way back. Something like this might have meant that they did not actually have to sell their house. That would have been a positive thing. Enough of this. I think we are going to have to agree to disagree. I am being more optimistic about the outcome. Hopefully, my optimism is well placed.

Let me move on to what is the more positive part of this legislation. The Greens welcome the government's decision to allow landlords to claim the exemption on their land tax if they rent out their house to eligible low and moderate income tenants through a registered community housing provider. This is a measure that the Greens, due to my actions, wanted included in the 2008 parliamentary agreement. Sadly, it did not happen. I called for it again in an Assembly motion in August last year. I note that Mr Parton also introduced similar legislation in September last year that could not be voted on for technical reasons.

For me, this idea goes back some time. More than a decade ago, I rented out a house that I owned to low income tenants, through CHC, at an affordable rent. CHC suggested to me that I was the first person that had ever done that with them, and I suspect possibly the only person. I felt that if a city government would give an exemption for land tax, they might actually be able to get a few more people like me. That is why I put it in the parliamentary agreement. If we can persuade landlords to go halfway in renting out houses at an affordable rate to people who need that assistance, that is definitely a positive for the ACT.

I have to say that housing affordability has only gone backwards, not forwards, compared to when I rented out that house. This change will also assist in the

implementation of a 2016 parliamentary agreement item, which is the establishment of a not-for-profit real estate agency similar to HomeGround Real Estate in Victoria, which rents privately owned properties to low and moderate income earners at below market rent.

Other groups, such as the YWCA and CHC in Canberra, have also called for such a measure during the last year, arising from my motion and then Mr Parton's aborted bill. However, Mr Coe talked about the amendment which the government is seeking to move which will limit the number of properties and the amount of money potentially expended on this. I have to say, Mr Coe, that I would be incredibly pleased and surprised if those amendments were even needed. My concern is not over-subscription; my concern is under-subscription. I think the government is being wildly optimistic in thinking that the amendments that it is moving today to limit it will be needed.

I would be delighted to find that I was wrong about that. What does disappoint me about the legislation is that it actually only provides for the scheme to run for two years, until 30 June 2021. This could be very helpful to tenants who are able to access rental accommodation as part of this scheme. A measure such as this, even if well-advertised and easy to access, is likely to attract only a modest number of participating landlords. Establishing it with an end date that is only a bit over two years in the future will almost certainly make it a less attractive proposition for any property owners who might be interested.

Even assuming that this is viewed as a trial rather than a short-term scheme, having an end date in the legislation sends a poor signal to prospective landlords and community housing providers who may wish to participate. I am concerned that, more than the amendments the government plans to move, it could result in lower participation. Also lacking in this legislation is any mechanism to review the scheme. If an evaluation were undertaken and reported on within one year of the scheme commencing, this would allow time to make any adjustments to the scheme and possibly an extension so that tenants could re-sign leases. I urge the government to consider doing this.

More positively, hopefully this scheme will complement the federal ALP's proposed funding for affordable rental housing stock managed by community housing providers, which it has said it will introduce if it wins the upcoming federal election. On that point, I note that the proposed federal scheme, which essentially replaces the sadly shelved national rental affordability scheme, otherwise known as NRAS, will be far more generous than what is being proposed in this ACT legislation.

The subsidy, which will only be available for newly built dwellings that are managed by community housing providers, will provide an incentive of \$8,500 per property per year for 15 years. While I acknowledge that land tax has been increasing in the ACT, there are very few, if any, properties that are actually paying \$8,500 per year per property in land tax. I appreciate that there might be some in Forrest and Red Hill, but certainly they would be very few. So the ACT government scheme is considerably less generous than the federal ALP's proposal. I am yet to hear any significant criticism of the federal ALP scheme or the one we are debating today.

The federal ALP scheme, unfortunately, would only be for new construction. Given that most of the houses in Canberra that are going to be available for rental in the next few years have, in fact, already been built, it is of limited use. Thus, I strongly support the ACT government scheme, even if the federal Labor Party is elected and in fact introduces this scheme.

I am really glad that there has not been any further commentary of the sort that we heard from the ALP last year about trickle-up economics or subsidies for rich and greedy landlords now that the government is, thankfully, implementing the land tax discount. I hope that this is because the people who previously criticised the land tax exemption scheme now realise that it will still come as proposed in the ACT, at a net cost to philanthropically minded landlords rather than serving as a handout. It also represents incredibly good value for money in terms of bang for buck and in terms of affordable housing provision, as both I and Mr Parton argued last year. It is a pity it was not done last year, but this year is better than nothing. I look forward to it being a successful scheme.

In conclusion, I really hope that the land tax exemption will form part of a more comprehensive package of work aimed at supporting and growing the community housing sector in the ACT. This was foreshadowed in the housing strategy. I hope it is extended and I hope it is made permanent.

MR PARTON (Brindabella) (5.28): I want to start by reflecting on a comment from Ms Le Couteur because I could not let it go by. I think this is a direct quote, “I’m going to vote for this bill because I don’t think it will make things worse than they are now.” I know that it is taken a little out of context, but I found it to be an extraordinary statement. I am somewhat disappointed to be speaking on this bill for a couple of reasons. One of them is that this omnibus bill has so many moving parts. It has so many genuine changes to policy in a number of areas that it is impossible to consider the bill as a whole, because it moves in so many directions and it does so many different things.

Additionally, on the subject of land tax rebates, it is a little disappointing that we have had to wait for six months to talk about this—six months in which people who are struggling to make ends meet and struggling to find affordable housing could have been able to find relief. At least we have finally reached this point. This does not often happen, but I would like to applaud my Greens colleague Ms Le Couteur. Although on this side of the chamber we talk about the bill that I brought to the chamber, as it is on the record many times, it is something that Ms Le Couteur has been passionate about for a lot longer than I have. The bill that we put together was certainly modelled on the motion that my Greens colleague brought to the chamber, knowing that we were working on pretty much the same thing.

In August last year I had been determined to craft a bill providing property owners with a break on land tax where they were prepared to rent their property through a community housing provider at a discounted rate. I based the proposal on our appreciation of the affordable housing problem, advice from the housing industry, and advice from the Greens and advocates from the social housing sector.

In September I presented a bill, and we now find that it has been copied, word for word, in this bill that is before us today. Obviously, a couple of things have been added to it. We have already spoken about some of the amendments. We do not really understand why we are bringing amendments forward to limit the effect of this measure. But I am pleased that we can do something positive and practical right now to mitigate the plight of at least some Canberrans.

When we tried to debate that bill, I recall interjections from the Chief Minister. I recall the Chief Minister screaming out to me that you could drive a truck through this bill. It has not changed a great deal since then, so I do not know whether or not we can park some trucks in it now.

When I presented the bill in September, I spoke of how it required no anguish or complex research, and I am somewhat amused to report that I was wrong on that point. In order to get this lazy excuse of a government to finally act on something that would provide relief to those in rental stress, some research was required. The research that was required was an opinion poll asking—and this was the question—“To what extent would you support a landlord to access land tax subsidies if they provide their properties to be rented out by community housing at below market rates?” We know that this measure is supported by almost 75 per cent of Canberrans, and that was what was required to get this government to act.

Perhaps we need some damning public opinion polls on violence in schools, the constant culture of bullying in our health system, the gun violence being perpetrated by outlaw motorcycle gangs, the spiralling, out-of-control rates or the lack of basic local services, before those opposite stop ignoring those issues that are unfolding right under their noses.

Instead of putting this into action six months ago and putting into practice real and tangible help to Canberrans under rental stress, we had to wait for an opinion poll to kick these guys into gear. I know it is quoted that we were not able to debate that bill back then; we had the chance as a chamber to step aside from those principles and make a decision as a group of adults to do it, but we chose not to take it.

The bill that I presented back then conceptually was quite simple, and it still is. I am not going to brush over those elements because it is getting late and it would just waste everybody's time. I share the concerns of Mr Coe in regard to a number of the other aspects of the bill that fall outside my portfolio space. Again, as I said at the start, I find that it is nigh on impossible to consider this bill as a whole, because it has so many moving parts in so many different areas.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (5.33), in reply: I thank members for their contributions to the in-principle stage of the debate. As members have commented, the bill is an omnibus bill that delivers on a number of key themes. It ensures equity and fairness for all taxpayers, introducing measures that seek to achieve a better balance between those who dutifully pay their taxes in full and on time and those who do not. It promotes

efficiencies in tax collection and administration by identifying and correcting minor technical inconsistencies to support the overall integrity of the territory's revenue system.

As has just been discussed, the bill also supports housing affordability in the ACT through the introduction of a land tax exemption as an incentive for more affordable community housing. The bill provides the basis for a pilot program to incentivise more private landlords to rent properties at affordable rates for low income Canberra households. It creates the framework to provide a full land tax exemption for owners who rent their properties at below market rates through a registered affordable housing provider. This exemption supports an important objective of the ACT housing strategy, particularly to provide affordable rental housing for people who do not qualify for public housing but who struggle to find affordable rental accommodation in the private rental market.

Importantly, eligibility criteria for the exemption will be determined by disallowable instrument when the bill commences. This will indicate that a qualifying property must be rented at less than 75 per cent of market rent and be accessible to tenants in the bottom two income quintiles. A maximum of 100 properties will be eligible to access this incentive during this initial pilot. In this context I will move a government amendment in the detail stage to clarify the intended cap of properties that may take up this land tax exemption. The scheme is being run as a pilot initially and funding has been set aside to provide two years worth of incentives. It will be evaluated; after the first year would appear to be a logical time to do so. There will be scope to extend the scheme if it is achieving the goals that we as an Assembly have collectively set for it.

In addition to supporting more affordable rental housing, the bill also allows for more flexible options for the recovery of outstanding tax debts that leverage existing mortgage arrangements. This will help people who have a debt to the territory to better manage, control and prioritise repayments before they escalate to a stage where stronger options of garnishee arrangements or the sale of the land are needed. These changes balance the need to ensure that defaulting taxpayers are meeting the same obligations as their neighbours, whilst ensuring that any action taken under these amendments provides opportunities at different stages to take stock of an individual's situation and for the taxpayer to make payment.

These measures, as has already been mentioned in this debate, will bring the ACT into alignment with the approach used in other parts of Australia—for example, New South Wales and Victoria. The bill also reduces the penalty tax rate for tax defaults to 25 per cent, whilst retaining a higher 50 per cent rate for some limited circumstances such as repeat tax defaults. This will encourage compliance with the law while bringing the ACT's penalty tax system in line with other jurisdictions.

I table a revised explanatory statement in response to the comments from the scrutiny committee regarding the operation of these penalty tax changes. The revision makes clear that from 1 July 2019 the 50 per cent rate will apply to tax defaults if the commissioner is satisfied that the circumstances warrant this, whether the tax default happened before or after 1 July 2019. Under the new arrangements, when determining

whether or not to impose penalty tax, the Commissioner for ACT Revenue will have regard to whether a taxpayer has taken reasonable care to comply with the relevant tax laws.

Other amendments in the bill address an earlier omission to exempt the surrender and re-grant of University of Canberra declared subleases from duty where there is no change in beneficial ownership. This change will provide certainty to transacting parties and a duty exemption will apply to declared land subleases on University of Canberra land. That ensures that University of Canberra subleases are treated consistently with other crown leases in the ACT.

The bill makes a range of other modifications, including to limit the ability of third parties to apply for a rates, land tax or other taxes certificate, to protect the privacy of property owners; to facilitate the disclosure of information by tax officers where there are serious threats to the life of individuals, public health and safety; and to update and correct minor description errors and improve consistency in the application of tax laws.

Members in this place will also be aware that the government has recently been working through some unintended consequences arising from an earlier revenue amendment bill. We are aware that the government's measures to extend the land tax to vacant properties in order to incentivise these being made available for rent has resulted in some people who are buying off the plan properties being issued with land tax assessments for the quarter in which they take possession of their property. This is clearly not the intent of the vacant property policy, and the government is now working to address this. We are looking closely at the circumstances of individual owners to ensure that we identify and respond to all the situations where any unintended tax debt may currently be arising. It is our intention to bring forward the legislative amendments necessary to deal with this situation as soon as possible.

In the meantime, the ACT revenue office and treasury officials are working through the various circumstances that have arisen and, where appropriate, waivers will of course be applied, as I have publicly announced.

It is essential that from time to time regular adjustments are made to update and improve upon the territory's revenue system to address changes and developments that are needed in light of our city's growth and development. That is what this bill does. Doing this today is important, and I do note comments from the shadow planning minister that we should have got on with this earlier. I am not sure that he was aware that the Leader of the Opposition approached me, as the debate began, to say we should refer the whole bill to a committee and delay this action that he has just criticised me for not doing quickly enough—to delay it longer. The first time that the Leader of the Opposition raised this with me was about 30 minutes ago. I have said no; I think we should debate and pass this legislation this afternoon.

I look forward to your support on that element, at least, Mr Parton, and I thank you for that. I do want it known that the Leader of the Opposition wanted to defer the whole thing.

Mr Coe interjecting—

MR BARR: I understand that you object to certain elements of the legislation, but it did not require you to seek to defer the whole lot. You can do exactly what you are going to do in the detail stage and oppose certain elements. That is entirely reasonable, and that is what I understood you to be doing, until you floated, at the beginning of the debate, that we should adjourn it. I find it ironic that in the course of the debate I then get chipped by those opposite for not doing this quickly enough, when you come into this place and want to defer it because you do not like some elements of the legislation. It is fine for the opposition to oppose elements of this legislation, and we will go through those. But why did you even raise deferring it?

Mr Coe: Because you might have said yes.

MR BARR: Why do it at one minute to midnight, when we are just about to debate the bill? Why not raise it before?

Mr Coe: What if you had said yes?

MR BARR: If I had said yes, you would have criticised me for delaying the legislation again. You would have criticised me. You would have said, “Unnecessary delays on this legislation.” You cannot have it both ways.

Mr Coe interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Two things: Chief Minister, through the chair; Mr Coe, enough.

Mr Coe: I shouldn’t be collaborative.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Coe, it is late in the day. I have not quite warned you, but I have asked you to stop.

MR BARR: “Collaborative” might have been to have raised the issue at any point in the intervening time after the introduction of the bill, not coming into the chamber at one second to midnight with a proposal completely from right field. Anyway, we will get on with the detail stage of the debate, and that is good. It appears that we will have unanimous support for some elements of the legislation and that the opposition will oppose other parts, as is their right. I present a revised explanatory statement and commend the bill in its entirety to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Detail stage

Clauses 1 to 3, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.1 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.2, amendment 1.4 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.2, amendment 1.5.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (5.44): I will be opposing this amendment. Responding to the Chief Minister's comments just then regarding my offer to send this to a committee, when the Chief Minister said no, we knew there was no agreement, so we did not move that it go to a committee. If we had wanted simply to show up the government, we would have moved that it go to a committee and said, "Look, you guys rejected it." We simply asked in a collaborative way, "Are you interested in sending this to a committee?" The Chief Minister said no, so we did not do it. Imagine if the Chief Minister had said, "Actually there are a few interesting aspects of this bill. We would be happy to do that." That would have been a good outcome. But instead he said, no, so there was no agreement for that, so we did not do it. If you cannot have those sorts of conversations without the Chief Minister breaking confidence in doing that, what is the point? What is the point of having a conversation?

Mr Barr: Why is he chipping me about not doing it quickly? Because—

MR COE: Because you did not do it six months ago when you voted against the very same legislation. Six months ago Mr Parton moved legislation in this place that is identical to what is being moved today in an aspect, and you said you could drive a truck through it. Now you are bringing back the same legislation out of stubbornness, and we are going to get a result now that we could have had six months ago.

This shows the disdain that the Chief Minister has towards people in Canberra who cannot afford the housing that he has created. He has caused so much of the housing crisis we have in the ACT. What we are trying to do is at least have something that treats the symptom, at the very least. This could have been done six months ago but instead the Chief Minister said no out of stubbornness.

The opposition will be opposing the duty exemption for the university. As stated previously, we do not believe that there should be inconsistent standards applied to developments in the ACT. We are not simply talking about university developments; we are talking about for-profit ventures that happen on the university campus. Labor and the Greens want to roll out the red carpet for this. Why do we not therefore, under the same principle, have duty exemptions right across Canberra? That would be consistent.

If you think that getting rid of duty will stimulate investment and growth, let us do it right across Canberra rather than have a two-track system. Why do we do not that? But instead they are going to have a two-track system. Anybody who looked at the revenue for the ACT would know that they are collecting more from stamp duty today than back in 2012. If the government wants to use this as stimulus for the ACT, then why do we not have a level playing field across the territory? Obviously this is more about giving free kicks to pet projects.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (5.48): What an extraordinary statement from the Leader of the Opposition: “Why don’t we get rid of duty across the board?” Yes, exactly. That is what we have been doing every year, and you have opposed it every step of the way.

Mr Coe: Then why are you doing this?

MR BARR: We are doing this is because it addresses a prior omission in 2015 when the provision for the exemption was inadvertently excluded. This change will provide certainty to transacting parties that a duty exemption will apply to the University of Canberra declared subleases with respect to the grant of a new lease on the surrender of a development lease where there is no change in beneficial ownership, that is, the grant of the new lease is to a person who was the lessee under the development lease. This amendment is in line with the intended policy in 2015. I repeat what I said in the in-principle stage: it ensures that the University of Canberra subleases are treated consistently with other crown leases in the ACT.

It is strange that the Liberal opposition has, continuing an approach of several years now, consistently opposed any measure that will improve the sustainability and standing of our city’s own university. What have you got against the University of Canberra? It is a university that is rapidly climbing up the rankings of the world’s best universities. The vice-chancellor and the board are taking the next step to enhance the campus, which will assist in putting the university on a solid financial footing for coming decades. With all of these benefits for our city’s university, our city’s publicly owned university, governed by an act of this Assembly, I am baffled as to why the Liberals continue to oppose the university’s growth and development.

Its one asset, its one major endowment as one of the youngest universities in the nation, is the land it was granted. That is why it is fundamentally important to that institution’s long-term success. Higher education is our city’s single largest export earner. It is an area of economic diversification that is a very significant priority for this city, for its residents and for the students and people who work at that university. Its viability in the long term is fundamental to the diversity of our higher education sector and to the diversity of our economy. That is why we have been so active in supporting our city’s university to grow.

On the more substantive point of why we do not get rid of duties in order to support economic development, that is exactly what we are doing for all properties. Under \$1.5 million we have abolished duty altogether. We have cut commercial stamp duty at every level over a number of budgets now, and it is our intent to phase out that duty over time. Why? Because it is a distortive tax. It is one of the worst taxes levied by this level of government.

In his passion at that moment he just forgot for a second where he was and what he has consistently argued in every other debate on duty reform, and the position that his party took in 2012 and 2016 and clearly looks like taking again in 2020, which has been to support the maintenance of or increase in duties. If you are concerned that we are collecting more duty now, imagine what the total amount of duty collected would be if we had not been cutting rates and removing 70 per cent of commercial property

transactions from duties altogether, given what has been happening in other jurisdictions that have not undertaken the sorts of reforms that we have. That is why it is important. That is why the Assembly should support this clause today.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (5.52): The so-called support for the University of Canberra is actually not for the University of Canberra. It will be for the developer, because it is the developer who pays duty; it will not be for the University of Canberra. The Chief Minister may now be going to argue that the duty will lead to UC being able to increase the price that they will be able to sell the land for. That is just going to result in a windfall. The very same financial gain could be achieved by having exactly the same rules but the government pledging to give any duty received from UC back to UC by way of a grant. You could do that without distorting the market, especially in the Belconnen town centre. That would be a much cleaner way of supporting UC. But obviously they do not want to do that. They would much rather do what they do all too well and have two sets of rules: one for their mates and pet projects and another for every other risk-taking Canberran.

Schedule 1, part 1.2, amendment 1.5 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.2, amendments 1.6 to 1.15, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.3, amendments 1.16 and 1.17, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.3, amendment 1.18 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.3, amendments 1.19 and 1.20, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.3, amendment 1.21 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.3, amendments 1.22 to 1.27, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.4, amendment 1.28 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.4, amendment 1.29.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (5.57): Pursuant to standing order 182A(b), I seek leave to move amendments to this bill that are minor and technical in nature together.

Leave granted.

MR BARR: I move amendments Nos 1 and 2 circulated in my name together and table a supplementary explanatory statement to the government amendments [*see schedule 1 at page 1041*].

I referred to these amendments at the in-principle stage. I commend them to the Assembly.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (5.57): I hope the Assembly notes that we granted leave for these amendments, despite the fact that they did not go through the usual process. I hope that the same luxury will be afforded to the opposition in similar circumstances in the future.

The Chief Minister, when he spoke at the in-principle stage, stated that he is open to extending the scheme or expanding it if it achieves the goals that the Assembly sets. I now invite the Chief Minister to outline what those goals are.

Mr Barr: It is not the time to do that now. We will set those in due course. I am not doing it now.

MR COE: So what the Chief Minister is now saying is that we will determine goals later on but we will put in a hard amount now and a limit of 100. So we are going to evaluate the program but we do not have any goals or criteria as to how we should evaluate it. This begs the question: surely getting more than 100 subscriptions is a good thing, so why would you put this limit in? If the intention is to provide relief to Canberrans by way of land tax that then flows on to rent, is getting more than 100 not a good thing?

The opposition will be opposing these amendments. These amendments did not go before scrutiny, and I think they change the effect of the provisions considerably. They introduce a general cap on the number of properties entitled to an exemption and the value of land tax that may be exempted. The bill applied those limitations to the individual owners. However, these provisions have been intentionally drafted so as to limit the overall impact of the concession. We believe that the initiatives designed to address affordable housing should not be half-measures. They should not be limited. Therefore I will be opposing the introduction of these caps.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (6.00): As I indicated in my statement in the in-principle stage—I set out the criteria in relation to eligibility—I have been very clear in relation to setting aside funding. I have indicated that the program will be evaluated and that the government is open to consideration of expansion, if it achieves the goals that are outlined in the affordable housing strategy and that are outlined in the legislation. But I am not going to make up, on the spot, here for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition goals beyond that. They are outlined in the housing affordability strategy and they are outlined in the legislation.

But we also have to set a budget for these things. This is not an open-ended, uncapped arrangement. We do need to set a budget for it. Once we can evaluate the success of this initial phase, then we can look at expansion. I am not close minded to that and that is why I indicated that in the in-principle stage as it would, I would hope, have given some further comfort to those who are advocating for greater access to the scheme.

I note that Ms Le Couteur put the alternative view that she was pessimistic about even achieving 100. If we get to 100, great. If we have achieved that inside the first

12 months then of course the circumstances will have changed and we can look at that. But we need to budget something. That is why we have put this provision forward.

We can and will evaluate its success and look at making further provision. You can just imagine, if we did this in an unbudgeted way, the questions in the estimates process. “The government has let this concession run away.”

Mr Coe interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Coe, please!

MR BARR: All those sorts of questions.

Mr Coe: Tell me another one that is capped.

MR BARR: We cap a lot of programs and we seek to set budgets.

Mr Coe interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Coe, I am not going to ask you again.

MR BARR: You cannot even finish a sentence when he is in this sort of mood. You just cannot. We are angry, obstinate Alistair. It is late on a Thursday afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER: Use his proper title.

MR BARR: Indeed, it is not helping. I appreciate that there is no point in debating it any further with the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon but I do want to indicate on the public record that we are interested in this being successful and we will evaluate its success. If it achieves the goals outlined in the housing affordability strategy and the goals that we have all spoken about in the debate then of course we will consider expanding the program and will make budget provision for it.

MR PARTON (Brindabella) (6.04): I want to echo some of the concerns from Mr Coe. I do not really understand why we are capping it at 100 parcels. I have no comprehension of it, granted, but I would agree with the Chief Minister, who mentioned comments made by Ms Le Couteur, that if we got 30 properties in the first instance I would have said it was pretty successful.

But I am extremely worried about a number of limiting aspects of this, including the drop-dead date of 2021. When you look at the people who got on board with NRAS, the investors who got on board with NRAS, they did so with the certainty of something that was locked away for a hell of a lot of more than two years. And I just do not think that there is a great deal of certainty.

Mr Barr: Until your mob shut it down.

MR PARTON: Until my mob shut it down?

Mr Barr: You closed the program.

MR PARTON: Mate, seriously!

MADAM SPEAKER: Members, please! Can we concentrate on the debate. Mr Parton.

MR PARTON: Agreed, Madam Speaker, can we concentrate on this debate please. Because this is what we are debating.

Mr Barr: You are the one who brought NRAS into it.

MR PARTON: I am giving NRAS as an example for this scheme.

Members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Members!

MR PARTON: That is all. I will sit down.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (6.05): The Greens will support the amendments, with concern, I guess.

Mr Parton: With a heavy heart.

MS LE COUTEUR: With a heavy heart. As I have made quite clear, I would be incredibly pleased if we got to 100 rentals in the two years. I am very pleased to hear the comments that Mr Barr has just made about wanting it to be successful and looking to expand it and I sincerely hope that he does that. I think probably the most useful way would be to look at expanding the time period. I think that that would be the thing that would enable this scheme to reach more of its potential and reach a potential whereby it might be something that a budget of \$5 billion would not even notice.

Question put:

That the amendments be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 13

Noes 10

Mr Barr	Ms Orr	Miss C Burch	Mr Milligan
Ms Berry	Mr Pettersson	Mr Coe	Mr Parton
Ms J Burch	Mr Ramsay	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Ms Cheyne	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	
Ms Cody	Mr Steel	Mrs Jones	
Mr Gentleman	Ms Stephen-Smith	Mrs Kikkert	
Ms Le Couteur		Ms Lawder	

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 1 Part 1.4 amendment 1.29, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.4, amendments 1.30 to 1.35, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, parts 1.5 and 1.6, including amendments 1.36 to 1.43, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.44 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.45.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (6.11): The opposition will be opposing this clause because, as stated before, we are concerned that the lack of a reasonableness test may mean Canberrans having penalties applied where they would otherwise have been considered for personal considerations.

I also want to touch on what Ms Le Couteur said earlier about the revenue office. We do not have a problem with how the staff of the revenue office operate; we have a problem with the directions that the Treasurer has given the revenue office. Our concerns are not with the people in the revenue office; they are with those opposite.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (6.12): This schedule amends the penalty tax provisions to realign the existing 25 per cent penalty tax rate as the only base default rate. It does this by inserting a discretion and specifying certain circumstances under which a 50 per cent rate may be applied. These circumstances involve the conduct of the taxpayer such as delays relating to payment or provision of information or providing incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or, as I mentioned earlier, someone who is a repeat tax defaulter.

It is required otherwise that the 50 per cent penalty rate will continue to apply as the other base default rate. But the ACT would not be aligned with the penalty tax regimes of other jurisdictions. This amendment is expected to result actually in fewer taxpayers being subject to the 50 per cent penalty tax rate from 1 July. The circumstances for the application of a 75 per cent penalty tax rate remain unchanged. However, an amendment is required for consistency in wording to match the discretion that is proposed for the application of the 50 per cent penalty tax rate.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.45 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.46.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (6.14): The opposition opposes this clause, for the same reason or the same principle that I outlined in regard to amendment 1.45.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (6.14): It is indeed just consequential and it updates the table that sets

out the rates of penalty tax in the different circumstances. I commend it to the Assembly.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.46 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendments 1.47 and 1.48, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.49.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (6.15): The opposition opposes this clause and the following clauses as they relate to expanded debt recovery measures which place charges on properties and make the government the first creditor. We believe that there could be unintended consequences—and they are potentially inequitable—and we do not want Canberrans to be in a worse situation than they were before. As I mentioned earlier, the fact that lending ratios are changing, there is potentially a downturn in the market, rates and land taxes are on the rise, valuations are unpredictable and you have the federal Labor Party's big tax on housing, now is not the time to be tinkering with the hierarchy of creditors.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (6.16): These amendments expand on existing debt recovery powers to enable the notification of outstanding tax debts to mortgagees or credit providers, the recovery of tax debts from mortgagees and the recovery of tax debts from the sale proceeds of land owned by a debtor. These new debt recovery options will help tax debtors and financiers better manage outstanding tax debts earlier. They provide more flexible options for the recovery of tax debts as compared with the existing regime. They provide more aggressive garnishee and sale of land options.

These amendments are required to protect revenue to ensure that all taxpayers pay their fair share of tax but, importantly, also align the ACT with other jurisdictions like New South Wales and Victoria who already utilise this approach.

Question put:

That schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.49 be agreed to

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 13

Noes 10

Mr Barr
Ms Berry
Ms J Burch
Ms Cheyne
Ms Cody
Mr Gentleman
Ms Le Couteur

Ms Orr
Mr Pettersson
Mr Ramsay
Mr Rattenbury
Mr Steel
Ms Stephen-Smith

Miss C Burch
Mr Coe
Mrs Dunne
Mr Hanson
Mrs Jones
Mrs Kikkert
Ms Lawder

Mr Milligan
Mr Parton
Mr Wall

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.49 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.50 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.51 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.52 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.53 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendments 1.54 and 1.55, by leave, taken together and agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.56 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.57 agreed to.

Schedule 1, part 1.7, amendment 1.58 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill, as amended, agreed to.

Adjournment

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Arts—Cultural Facilities Corporation

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (6.21): Recently I received a brochure from the Cultural Facilities Corporation about the contribution that the Canberra Theatre makes to Canberra's life and economy. It told us that in 2017-18 the total economic impact for the Canberra Theatre was almost \$30 million. This is a 50 per cent increase on the figure the year before. And there was nearly a 100 per cent increase in its contribution to the visitor economy.

The popular *Music at Midday* program, which features performances by the band of the Royal Military College, Duntroon, raised nearly \$9,000 for charity. Some 15,000 students attended performances, and the theatre gave work experience to 26 students. Some 235 team members of the Canberra Theatre were paid a total of \$6 million in wages, and patrons spent \$5.5 million on hospitality services in Civic alone. Underlying this success story was a very solid audience satisfaction score of 95 per cent. The brochure quotes one patron saying, "Wow, we travelled from Wagga to see this show. Worth every kilometre in the car. Expect us to return."

Madam Speaker, this single-page brochure speaks volumes about the role of the Canberra Theatre, the flagship of the Cultural Facilities Corporation. It is one of

Canberra's quiet achievers, yet it not only delivers significant social and economic benefits to the Canberra community but also is a respected national leader in the field of the performing arts.

Not afraid to take risks, the Canberra Theatre provides the Canberra community, as well as those further afield, with a wide range of entertainment options from music to dance, music theatre and more. These offerings cover just about every genre in each field of theatre. Through these offerings, Canberrans are able to experience performance by local, national and international artists of the highest calibre.

This is only able to be delivered when you have excellent leadership. Ms Harriet Elvin, the CEO of the Cultural Facilities Corporation, is such a leader. Ms Elvin has created a culture throughout her team that is positive, cooperative, supportive and respectful. Most of all, they claim ownership of and are committed to delivering the organisation's goals and the kinds of outcomes that I have outlined today. We can include in that team the many volunteers who give up their time and skills to enhance the services the corporation provides, particularly with Historic Places.

That culture is not limited to the Canberra Theatre, Madam Speaker. The Cultural Facilities Corporation's other arms, the Canberra Museum and Gallery and ACT Historic Places, enjoy exactly the same sort of spirit and culture and deliver the very best for the people of Canberra. Regardless of which facility one visits, or which event—whether it is a live performance, an art exhibition or an event at one of the historic places—the culture is evident and abundant. One feels welcome, even at home, treated as one of the team that is the Cultural Facilities Corporation. The ambience alone at the facilities evokes that culture.

Our government agencies that have been in the spotlight recently and are struggling with issues of workplace culture would do well to study the success of the Cultural Facilities Corporation and the corporate culture that it enjoys. I have spoken a number of times before about the high regard and respect that I have for the Cultural Facilities Corporation and the team led by Harriet Elvin and the board. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to do so again, especially when we see such tangible results for the city.

I congratulate the Cultural Facilities Corporation for its work and what it does to promote and enhance the arts and history in the ACT. It is a jewel in the crown and it sets an impressive benchmark for achievement in Canberra's cultural life.

Schools—Lyneham

MS STEPHEN-SMITH (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Disability, Minister for Children, Youth and Families, Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety, Minister for Government Services and Procurement, Minister for Urban Renewal) (6.25): I have always been a strong believer in and advocate for our public school system and recognise the important role our public schools play in helping to shape, engage and support our local communities.

Recently, I had the pleasure of participating in celebrations at Lyneham Primary School and Lyneham High School, two wonderful public schools in Kurrajong that are celebrating their 60th anniversaries this year. Both schools are celebrating 60 years of educating and nurturing Canberra's children and providing support, guidance and care for the young people of Lyneham and surrounding suburbs.

I had the opportunity to attend Lyneham Primary School's 60-year anniversary assembly, representing Minister Berry. The assembly was a chance for the school and community members to reflect on 60 years of success, of growing with the community and becoming a school that holds a cherished place in the lives of all those who have passed through it.

There are generations of students and families who have attended this school since it opened in 1959. We heard from one former student, Marilyn, who attended Lyneham primary followed by her daughters. Now her two young granddaughters are happily settling into primary school. Marilyn's connection to Lyneham primary, spanning three generations, shows the significant role a school can play not only in building strong communities but in the lives of families.

When I arrived at Lyneham primary I was greeted by a number of young students in the foyer. It was clear how happy and full of pride these students were to be welcoming people to their school. I am sure their enthusiasm and pride for Lyneham primary will continue long after they graduate.

The assembly was an opportunity to recognise Stan Melville, who passed away last year. Stan was the principal of Lyneham primary for 17 years. The significant contribution Stan made to not only Lyneham Primary School but to the Lyneham community as a whole was obvious from the words shared by current teachers and parents. I was fortunate enough to know Stan and his family from the local pony club. It was wonderful to see his wife, Denise, and children, Philip and Katie, at the assembly.

Naturally, many students from Lyneham primary move on to Lyneham high. So it was very fitting that the anniversary events for Lyneham High School took place not long after the celebrations for Lyneham primary. This celebration was a particularly exciting one for me. Not only was I able to attend representing the minister for education, Ms Berry, and as the local member for Kurrajong, but I attended as a graduate of Lyneham high. I passed on greetings from another graduate of Lyneham high and fellow member for Kurrajong, the Chief Minister, who graduated a couple of years after I did.

It was fantastic to speak at the 60-year anniversary assembly and share some memories from my time at Lyneham, memories like participating in the school musical, an absolute highlight of my time at Lyneham. The song that went through my head a couple of days before was not the Lyneham high song but the first few bars of the song from *Starblaze*, the year 8 musical in which I participated. I did not have a lead role, but it was wonderful to be able to recite a few bars of that song—not singing—at the assembly. It is really great to see how the performing arts continue to be such a strong focus at Lyneham.

Madam Speaker, high school is a place where young people come of age, where they begin to discover who they are and what they stand for. Walking the corridors of Lyneham high, it is clear that students of this school stand for inclusivity, acceptance and respect. These values were very well represented by the four school captains, Emma, Saul, Rosie and Jack, who did a fantastic job emceeing the assembly.

Rosie shared with us what she loves about Lyneham high. To quote her:

I love how we celebrate our differences and support one another's achievements. Whether that's recognising a student's success in academic or sporting competitions, at assemblies or showcasing art created by students in the school corridors.

I love how we are an active community, recognising issues like bullying or domestic violence and standing up against them.

Or recognising those who are part of the LGBTIQ community and standing with them. Encouraging mental and physical wellbeing and building resilience in our younger generation who will become the future.

Rosie's sentiments were obviously shared by present and past students I spoke to on the day. Many of them shared fond memories of growing up in a community where everyone is included, encouraged and welcome.

This was echoed by former students Bev and Lochie, the very first school captains of Lyneham High School, who graduated in 1962. Bev's father was the first principal of Lyneham High School. Again, this shows the strong connection between the school community and the families that belonged to it. The presence of Bev and Lochie at the anniversary celebrations is a testament to the positive impact school can have on someone's life.

Congratulations to both Lyneham Primary School and Lyneham High School in reaching this great milestone. I wish both schools and the community the very best for the next 60 years and beyond.

Sport—Rugby League

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (6.30): I rise this evening to talk about the new initiatives being undertaken by Canberra Region Rugby League. Their chairperson, Gary Green, met with me recently, and I have to say I was really encouraged by what I learnt.

I am someone who does not play an active sport, and the only sport I follow is that played by my grandkids. Nevertheless I am very aware of the positive contributions that sport can make to our community. I am equally aware that some sporting codes can be seen as incubating aggressive and violent behaviours. That is why I was so pleased to learn that in the coming Rugby League season Canberra Region Rugby League will be making a few changes that include introduction of welfare programs for their players. For example, if a young player needs to come before the judiciary

and if there are underlying issues with the young person, they will attempt to mediate a suitable resolution by using counselling mediation in conjunction with traditional sentencing.

They are also introducing a program called score raiders, which is a program for people with disabilities. They will be coached to play against either an under 14 or an under 15 team in a two-handed tag competition, running in conjunction with their normal competition. This team will also play on grand final day and will be given a slot during a Raiders home game. The competition is being run in conjunction with Disabilities Australia. A liaison officer will be appointed to work with the clubs and the score team.

There are now pathways right through from under 6s to the Jillaroos for young girls and women in Rugby League. They now have 17 league tag teams, 21 tackle teams and a representative program aligned to the Raiders with the under 18 Tarsha Gale Cup.

They are also, importantly, introducing programs about respect, designed to teach players to have respect for themselves and others, and for all people to look after each other. For example, if a player is getting out of line then it is up to a mate to talk to him and tell him that he is better than that. This program will be rolled out to both seniors and juniors.

As well as the “I respect” program, they have developed links with Menslink and EveryMan in order to ensure that players can get the counselling and support they need. They are working hard to change their attitude of “toughen ’em up and send them back out” to one of acute awareness of the risks of concussion and the need to have registered trainers attending all matches to ensure adequate care and safety for all of their players.

As I have said, while I am not a sporty person, I was very impressed by the deliberate efforts that Canberra Region Rugby League is making to ensure that their sport is more accessible to women, to people with a disability and to younger players. Combined, these tremendous initiatives will ensure that the sport is more accessible for a much wider range of people. I commend them for their efforts and wish them well in the season ahead.

Multicultural affairs—mother languages

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (6.34): Last month we observed International Mother Language Day. This day has its origin in the Bengali language movement of what was then East Pakistan, now Bangladesh. Protests by Bangla speakers against attempts to force them to speak Urdu actually led to the death of five martyrs and the injury of hundreds of others in 1952. Thirty-seven years later, the United Nations proclaimed this day not only to honour mother languages but also to draw attention to the ongoing extinction of languages.

In the ACT we are lucky to have a large number of community language schools committed to preserving and even expanding the use of various mother languages.

These include Arabic, Bangla, Cantonese, Croatian, Dutch, Filipino, Finnish, Greek, German, Hebrew, Hindi, Indonesian, Italian, Karen, Khmer, Korean, Macedonian, Mandarin, Maori, Mon, Japanese, Persian, Polish, Punjabi, Russian, Samoan, Serbian, Sinhalese, Spanish, Swedish, Tamil, Tongan and Vietnamese. What a wonderful gift to our community this is.

On 9 February this year it was my privilege to attend a fundraiser in support of one of these organisations, the Monaro Portuguese School, held at the Queanbeyan showground. I rise today to thank Sara Dias, the school's coordinator and teacher, for the generous invitation to attend. More than that, I wish to thank Sara for her passion and her determination to enhance and spread the use of the Portuguese language in Canberra and the surrounding region.

She is certainly doing something right. Monaro Portuguese School began with two classes—one for children and one for teenagers—but it now offers four classes—two for beginners, one for intermediate learners and one for adults. I congratulate the entire school community on this success and wish them much more.

The passion and commitment of the school's supporters were evident on the evening of the fundraiser. I enjoyed the time I got to spend with them. One of the best ways to enter another culture is to enjoy with them their food. The Portuguese dishes available on the evening were all delicious, especially my favourite, a rich egg custard baked in a buttery pastry. Even sweeter, however, were the voices of the young students who entertained attendees by singing in the Portuguese language.

In a motion last November, the Canberra Liberals sought to call upon the ACT government to “work more closely with the Community Language Schools Association to share teaching resources so that language education can be offered in a school setting where needed”. I still believe that to be an important objective. I also think that this government could make it easier for community language schools such as Monaro Portuguese and others to provide evidence of achievement on a student's school record, something that I have been told is much easier in other jurisdictions.

A multicultural society is also multilingual. I love that aspect of our city's social landscape and hope that more can be done to increase the acquisition of other languages and to support those already engaged in this task. In the shadow of this year's International Mother Language Day, I give my very best to Monaro Portuguese School and all other community language schools. “Muito obrigado”, or many thanks.

Yerrabi electorate

MS ORR (Yerrabi) (6.37): I rise this evening to update the Assembly on what has been happening in my electorate of Yerrabi since our last sitting in February. Members may remember that in my last Yerrabi yap I congratulated a number of local cafes on taking the straws suck pledge. I am very pleased to report that since then Sunday in Canberra has officially signed up on the Actsmart website, becoming the first ever Yerrabi business to take the pledge. I would like to reiterate how pleased I am to see the ball rolling on this campaign in my electorate.

While I am on the topic of looking after the environment, I would also like to take the opportunity to update the Assembly on a very successful clean-up that took place at the Bonner pond over the weekend. I was joined by Yerrabi locals in spending most of Saturday morning collecting rubbish around Bonner pond. At the end of the clean-up we had bags and bags of trash and the area was looking much more friendly and clean. We were able to facilitate this event through the Clean Up Australia website, which provided us with equipment such as bags and gloves. In fact I encourage everyone here today to consider hosting a similar event in their own electorate.

Clean Up Australia Day is one day of the year, but the job of cleaning up our natural environment will always be an ongoing effort. Whether it is government projects or community events and initiatives, Yerrabi is always full of excitement. Indeed I am happy to report that in February I attended the opening ceremony of the Mini Cricket World Cup at Bonner Oval. There are 16 teams competing in the mini world cup, with players representing countries from all over the world.

In other local sports news, I am excited for the Gungahlin Jets 2019 season launch this week. I am also hoping I will not get too carried away this year during the players auction. Yerrabi is a very attractive community with lots of young rising talent, so I would like to take a moment to congratulate the athletes and their families on their enthusiasm and commitment.

I would also like to note the fantastic work of the Migrant and Refugee Settlement Services of the ACT, particularly at their recent International Women's Day morning tea. It was a pleasure to attend the morning tea and celebrate the amazing multicultural women who contribute so much to the Canberra region.

I would also like to take the opportunity this evening to provide the Assembly and my constituents with an update on the Giralang shops. I understand that due to negotiations with a supermarket operator, a building approval has not yet been submitted by the developer. The developer has informed me that there is plenty of interest from health services, pharmacies, coffee shops and small professional service operators. However, they cannot commit until the much-desired supermarket operator is secured. I continue to follow the progress of these negotiations and I hope to provide a more comprehensive update for the Giralang community in the coming months.

The last thing I would like to note is that on Monday night, I, along with Minister Ramsay and Minister Steel, visited the Gungahlin Mosque. We have discussed quite a bit the terrorist attacks in Christchurch and the impact they have had on our local Muslim community. Members of the Gungahlin Mosque that we spoke to were very touched by the outpouring from the community and the level of support that they have received. I hope that we all go forward with respect and love for one another.

Mental health—question, persuade, refer training

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong—Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs

and Road Safety and Minister for Mental Health) (6.40): I want to talk tonight about QPR training, which I will explain in a moment. Early intervention for mental illness and suicide prevention are key priorities for me, as the Minister for Mental Health, and for the ACT government. According to 2018 ABS data, there were 3,128 deaths by suicide across Australia, the highest suicide rate in the past 10 years. Fifty-eight of these deaths occurred in the ACT and each of them is a tragedy that ripples through the community.

That is why the ACT government has committed \$1.5 million to establish a pilot version of the Black Dog Institute's lifespan integrated suicide prevention framework. Lifespan is an evidence-based approach that combines nine strategies for suicide prevention into one community-led approach incorporating health, education, front-line services, business and the community.

Earlier this month I was pleased to launch a key element of the lifespan framework, which is the question, persuade, refer training, also known as QPR. QPR is a free online course designed to help equip anyone in our community to support those who they suspect may be at risk of suicide. QPR is an up to 60-minute online program designed specifically for anyone over the age of 18 who would like to better understand the warning signs and behaviours that can lead to someone taking their own life.

The content is delivered through a mixture of videos, written content and quizzes, and includes a review of common myths and misconceptions about suicide, warning signs of suicide, how to ask someone if they are experiencing suicidal ideation, how to persuade someone to stay alive, and how to refer people to appropriate professional help.

While there are never any guarantees about how to stop someone taking their own life, at the community level we can educate ourselves to pick up on the signs and to ask the right questions, and, if necessary, support someone to get the right help. I went through the training before I launched the program and I found it very helpful.

It is confronting to consider how we might go about having these conversations, but it is vitally important that we do. Just as we already urge people to know CPR, we are also now asking people to learn how to do QPR. This is a critical part of reducing the stigma around mental health and supporting people to have these conversations.

I want to thank the team at the Capital Health Network, especially the chief executive, Gaylene Coulton, and her team for joining me at the launch and for partnering with ACT Health in funding the lifespan program. While suicide is a difficult and complex issue, and there is no one single answer, these are the kinds of practical initiatives that can make a difference on the ground to people's lives.

Research from the Black Dog Institute has shown that the implementation of lifespan in the ACT could lead to a reduction of up to 20 per cent in suicide deaths and 30 per cent in suicide attempts. I am very hopeful that by rolling out these kinds of initiatives and having these kinds of conversations we will start to see the number of suicides in our community decreasing.

The best preventive mechanism we have is to create a caring, supportive network around people when they are struggling. We can all play a role in acknowledging other people's pain and helping them to link up with professional support if required. For me, the real take-home message from the QPR training is that everybody can play a part and you do not have to be an expert. You do not have to be trained in psychology and those sorts of things. Following the simple steps that are outlined in the training can be the critical act of first aid, if we think of it in that way, that could make the difference. For many people, just knowing that someone has recognised their struggles and cares enough to check is a critical first step. QPR is all about helping people to do that.

I would encourage colleagues in the Assembly, staff in this place and the community at large to complete the course. The content is specifically targeted at audiences with no assumed knowledge of mental health or suicide prevention. As I said at the beginning, it is free. It takes less than an hour, and you can sign up and complete the QPR online by visiting the Capital Health Network website. It is an investment of time that could really make a difference, perhaps when you least know it, to someone who is very close to you.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.45 pm until Tuesday, 2 April, at 10 am.

Appendix A

Citizen's right of reply:

Response by Mr Joel Dignam

Recently in the ACT Assembly Mark Parton MLA to make various claims about me. I would like to set the record straight on a few matters that Mr. Parton raised.

Mr. Parton criticised the “House of ‘Lords’” report that I had worked on for Better Renting. For the record, the report used the best data available. When I worked on the “House of ‘Lords’” report for Better Renting I reviewed public declarations of interest from MLAs. In addition, I contacted MLAs on multiple occasions to ask them to clarify or confirm their own status. Where the public record was ambiguous, I made an effort to follow-up with individual MLAs. Some MLAs frustrated this research by not responding to the survey. I note that this issue could be avoided with greater transparency requirements through the disclosures process.

Further, Mr. Parton stated “... [Joel Dignam] is not actually advocating for renters, ladies and gentlemen; he is pushing Greens policy.”

For the record, Better Renting is non-partisan and focused on policy objectives. I founded Better Renting as a not-for-profit and registered it with the Australian Charities and Non-Profits Commission. The objects of Better Renting are:

- improving housing outcomes for renters with respect to stability, affordability, and liveability, to advance social welfare (‘the principal object’);
- building a community of renters to work towards achieving the principal object; and
- promoting or opposing a change to any matter established by law, policy or practice in the Commonwealth, a state, a territory or another country which furthers the principal object.

All my work with Better Renting is done in pursuit of these aims. The work is not done in support of any one political party, but in support of policy proposals that further these aims. This relies on the best available evidence in assessing the merits of policy proposals. I am happy to be judged on my record of work with Better Renting, which shows an abiding commitment towards obtaining stable, affordable, and liveable homes for people who rent.

Mr. Parton MLA also stated “Joel was probably gathering data for the Greens”, and later implied that data collected by Better Renting is being funnelled to the Greens. For the record, Better Renting is responsible about protecting supporter privacy, and Mr. Parton’s claims have no basis in fact. Better Renting has a publicly available privacy policy and abides by the Australian Privacy Principles. Any data is collected consistent with our privacy policy, to enable people who rent to take part in Better Renting campaigns. I have shared no Better Renting data or personal information with any political party.

Schedule of amendments

Schedule 1

Revenue Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

Amendments moved by the Treasurer

1

Schedule 1, part 1.4

Amendment 1.29

Proposed new section 13A (4) (c) to (f)

Page 11, line 8—

insert

- (c) the owner does not satisfy the criteria determined under subsection (5) (a);
or
- (d) the parcel of land would exceed the maximum number of parcels determined under subsection (5) (b) (i); or
- (e) the amount of land tax exempted would exceed the maximum value of land tax determined under subsection (5) (b) (ii); or
- (f) the parcel of land would exceed the maximum number of parcels for which an owner is entitled determined under subsection (5) (b) (iii).

2

Schedule 1, part 1.4

Amendment 1.29

Proposed new section 13A (5) (b)

Page 11, line 12—

omit proposed new section 13A (5) (b), substitute

- (b) 1 or more of the following:
 - (i) the maximum number of parcels of land that are entitled to an exemption under this section;
 - (ii) the maximum value of land tax that may be exempted under this section;
 - (iii) the maximum number of parcels of land for which an owner is entitled to an exemption under this section.
-

Answers to questions

Canberra Hospital—plumbing issues (Question No 2115)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

In relation to the answer, given on 7 December 2018, to the question without notice taken on notice on the subject of “Canberra Hospital – Plumbing Issues in Neurology Ward”, if the plumbing issue identified in the answer was “linked to planned hydraulic works” undertaken with “extensive planning and consultation with impacted areas to avoid unplanned disruptions to clinical operations”, why was a patient accommodated in a room whose bathroom was subject to this planned maintenance activity.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Once the extensive planned hydraulic works were completed on Level 6 of Building 1, the entire hydraulic system from Level 0 to Level 11 required rebalancing.

The hot and cold water system within Building 1 is highly complex and involves hundreds of valves, and many pumps that support the full operation of the system. It is expected that minor short-term low temperatures in a small number of areas would be difficult to completely mitigate.

ACT Health—office of clinical leadership (Question No 2116)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) In relation to the answers given at part (5) of question on notice No 1900, part (1) of question on Notice No 2021 and part (2) of question on notice No 2022, what is the role of the Office of Clinical Leadership.
- (2) Is the Office a new operational area in Canberra Health Services; if so, why was this not disclosed in the answer to question on notice No 1900 or question on notice No 2021; if not, prior to the restructure of the Health Directorate, did the Office of Clinical Leadership have a physical location; if not, why not; if so, why was its office space not disclosed in the answer to question on notice No 2022.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) The role of Office of Clinical Leadership, now known as Office of Professional Leadership and Education is critical in fostering a high-performance culture through the Canberra Health System by creating an environment for consistent, high clinical standards and multi-disciplinary collaboration, and by engaging in multiple interjurisdictional forums related to professional standards, education and practice.
- (2) The Office of Professional Leadership and Education was created during the transition period in mid-2018 in preparation of the split of the ACT Health Directorate and

Canberra Health Services. This involved reallocating existing positions within the Health Directorate to create this Division. The Office of Professional Leadership and Education was physically located at various locations in the Canberra Hospital and Bowes Street. These positions are now grouped into existing office space at Bowes Street as part of the restructure of the Health Directorate.

**ACT Health—organisational changes
(Question No 2118)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) When was the Minister first advised of the latest plans to restructure Canberra Health Services advised to the Community and Public Sector Union on 11 December 2018.
- (2) Did the Minister approve the latest plans to restructure Canberra Health Services; if not, what is the deadline for approval to be given.
- (3) What impact will the proposed restructure have on the budgetary position of Canberra Health Services.
- (4) What impact will the proposed restructure of Canberra Health Services have on the number of a) Canberra Health Services staff and (b) executive level staff.
- (5) What changes will occur to the reporting arrangements of Canberra Health Services staff.
- (6) What is the deadline for the restructure of Canberra Health Services.
- (7) When were (a) unions, (b) professional associations and (c) staff first advised of the restructure.
- (8) Will there be further changes to the structure of Canberra Health Services when the interim Chief Executive Officer (CEO) departs and a permanent CEO is appointed.
- (9) Will there be any (a) involuntary or (b) voluntary redundancies as a result of these changes.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) I was advised throughout the transition process that further changes to the health service organisational structure would take place once a new Chief Executive Officer (CEO) had commenced.
- (2) Organisational structure is a matter for the CEO.
- (3) None. The proposed structure will be managed from within existing resources.
- (4) (a) None.
(b) There will be no change to the number of executive level positions. Two positions, the Executive Director, Clinical Support and the Executive Director, Chief of

Clinical Operations will be discontinued. These will be replaced with the Executive Director, Allied Health and Executive Director, Nursing and Midwifery and Patient Support Services.

- (5) The reporting lines of some senior executives will change. For the remainder of the staff within Canberra Health Services (CHS), there will be minimal changes.
 - (6) The CHS restructure is being implemented progressively from 1 March 2019 to 28 March 2019.
 - (7) (a) (b) The consultative paper was formally provided on 11 December 2018.
 - (c) Throughout the process to transition into two organisations, all staff were informed that there would be further work required to refine the structures of each organisation post 1 October 2018. A CEO message to staff on 6 December 2018 included brief information on the restructure. Staff forums, and the release of a consultative paper, occurred on 11 December 2018.
 - (8) Mrs Bernadette McDonald was appointed to the role on 17 December 2018.
 - (9) No.
-

**Answers to questions on notice—timeliness
(Question No 2120)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) In relation to the answer to question on notice No 1915, why did it take two hours to prepare an answer to this question.
- (2) How much time was spent on researching the answer to this question.
- (3) How much time was spent on drafting and editing the answer to signature-ready stage.
- (4) How many people, including staffing classifications, from (a) the Minister's office, (b) the directorate and (c) other agencies, were involved in researching and preparing the answer.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The response required consultation within the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate regarding the release of information requested.
- (2) 1 hour and 30 minutes
- (3) 30 minutes
- (4)
 - (a) Minister's office reviewed the answer prior to signature, further the Minister's Office requested an accompanying letter to Mrs Dunne.

(b)

Staff nos.	Classification
2	SOG C
1	SOG B
1	SES 3

(c) Informal advice on privacy concerns and any previous similar questions were sought from Chief Minister's, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate.

Answers to questions on notice—timeliness (Question No 2121)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) In relation to the answer to question on notice No 2023, why did it take more than eight and a half hours to prepare an answer to this question.
- (2) How much time was spent on researching the answer to this question.
- (3) How much time was spent on drafting and editing the answer to signature-ready stage.
- (4) How many people, including staffing classifications, from (a) the Minister's office, (b) ACT Health, (c) Canberra Health Services and (d) other agencies, were involved in researching and preparing the answer.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The response was coordinated across both Canberra Health Services (CHS) and the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD), as CMTEDD is delivering the project on behalf of CHS. Extensive engagement also occurred with the ACT Government Solicitor's Office (ACTGSO) due to the legal issues involved in providing a response.
- (2) 520 minutes were spent researching, drafting and editing the answer.
- (3) 520 minutes were spent researching, drafting and editing the answer.
- (4) A number of people within ACTGSO, CMTEDD and CHS within the following position classifications were involved in researching and preparing the answer.
 - Director
 - Senior Officer Grade A
 - Government Solicitor 3
 - Government Solicitor 2
 - Senior Officer Grade B
 - Senior Officer Grade C
 - Administrative Services Officer Level 6

**ACT Health—workplace culture
(Question No 2124)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Has (a) the Minister, (b) the Minister's office, (c) ACT Health or (d) Canberra Health Services, been given any information that reveals or has the potential to reveal (i) specific matters individuals have submitted, in any form, to the Independent Review into the workplace culture within ACT public health services or (ii) the identity of persons making those submissions; if so, (A) what is the nature of the information provided, (B) why was it provided and (C) what do the recipients intend to do with the information provided.
- (2) What security arrangements are in place within the Review secretariat to ensure submissions made, in any form, to the Review are and will be kept confidential to the Review panel.
- (3) What security arrangements will be in place to ensure the material submitted to the Review will not be revealed to any person after the Review is complete and the Review panel and secretariat disbanded.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1)
 - (i) The Office of the Review has advised that no information that reveals or has the potential to reveal specific matters individuals have submitted to the Independent Review, or the identity of persons making those submissions, has been provided to the Minister or the Ministers Office by this Office.
 - (ii) The Office of the Review has advised that in a small number of cases the Review referred specific matters individuals had raised including their identity to the Director General (DG) ACT Health, and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Canberra Health Services (CHS) where the individual/s agreed to that information being provided.

The information provided by the Office of the Review related to ongoing/current workplace culture issues within the Health Directorate or CHS. The information was provided with the agreement of the individual/s involved to ensure the relevant Executive (DG or CEO) was aware of the issue and could take necessary steps to address it.

- (2) The protection of people's confidentiality and privacy is paramount to the Independent Panel and Office of the Review. All submissions were accepted and dealt with in accordance with the requests of those that made the submission.

The staffing working in the Office of the Review were drawn from across the Commonwealth and ACT Public Service so that ACT health staff can be confident in the integrity and independence of the submission process.

A Conflict of Interest process was implemented to ensure staff did not review submission content pertaining to individuals they knew personally or professionally.

- (3) The Office of the Review has ensured all documents submitted to and held by the Review are securely stored in line with the requirements set out in the Territory Records Act 2002.

**Mental health—duress alarms
(Question No 2126)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

In relation to the answer given to part (2) of the question on notice taken on notice on 29 November 2018 about duress alarms, what action has the Minister taken to ensure that all security systems (including but not limited to duress alarms) at the adult mental health unit and the mental health short stay unit are working properly and are fit for purpose.

Mr Rattenbury: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Mobile and portable duress systems used in the Adult Mental Health Unit and the Mental Health Short Stay Unit are required to be tested by staff at the beginning of each of their shifts to ensure their serviceability.

Hard wired duress buttons are programmed to notify security if they are disconnected or faulty.

**Health—immunisation
(Question No 2127)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What public immunisation services for babies and children are provided in the ACT.
- (2) What are the recommended timeframes for immunisations to be administered for each immunisation type for babies and children.
- (3) For each immunisation type what was the wait time to access a public service as at the date on which this question was published in the Questions on Notice Paper.
- (4) What information do public maternity services provide to neo-natal parents about immunisation programs, including (but not limited to) the benefits of immunisations, and securing appointments for immunisations from a public clinic.
- (5) How many babies and children did not receive their immunisations within the recommended timeframes at a public clinic during 2018, and what were the main reasons.
- (6) What are the possible medical consequences of immunisations not being administered within the recommended timeframes.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Immunisation services for babies and children are provided through the Early Childhood Immunisation Team and School Health Team, which form part of the Maternal and Child Health Service (MACH). Immunisations are also provided by General Practitioners.

The Commonwealth Government funds vaccines for children through the National Immunisation Program (NIP). The NIP is a joint initiative of the Commonwealth and the States, making free vaccines available to eligible individuals through a range of vaccination providers, including general practice, community clinics, Aboriginal Medical Services, hospitals and aged care facilities. The Commonwealth funds the NIP vaccines and ACT Government funds the delivery of the NIP program in the ACT, including the administration of these vaccines through free ACT Health Immunisation Clinics and school based immunisation programs. The NIP provides the free vaccines to children and adolescents that protect against 15 diseases.

National Immunisation Program
pertussis (Whooping cough)
diphtheria
tetanus
measles
rubella (German measles)
mumps
Haemophilus influenzae type b (Hib)
hepatitis B
poliomyelitis
influenza (high risk children)
varicella (Chickenpox)
pneumococcal disease (some types)
meningococcal disease (serotypes A, C, W & Y)
rotavirus
Human Papillomavirus (HPV)

Additionally the ACT Government funds influenza vaccine for all children 6 months to 5 years of age, and, until April 2019, the meningococcal ACWY vaccine for adolescents and young adults. The meningococcal ACWY vaccine for adolescents will be funded by the Commonwealth Government through the NIP from April 2019.

Reminders for parents of children who are identified as overdue for immunisation on the Australian Immunisation Register are sent from the Department of Human Services and the ACT Health Directorate. ACT Health sends reminders to parents of children aged 7 to 9 months (overdue for two, four and/or six month immunisations) and children aged 19 to 21 months who are overdue for any vaccinations up to that age (2, 4, 6, 12 and 18 month schedule points). The Department of Human services sends reminders of overdue children aged 9 to 11 months.

- (2) In Australia, babies start receiving vaccines at birth and again at 2 months (can be administered from 6 weeks), 4, 6, 12 and 18 months and at 4 years of age.

Influenza vaccine is funded through the National Immunisation Program (NIP) for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and children who have medical

conditions that a medical condition that increase their risk of influenza. It is also funded through the ACT Government Immunisation Program for infants and children 6 months to five years. Annual vaccination before the onset of each influenza season is recommended. Vaccination can continue to be offered as long as a valid vaccine (before expiration date) is available.

The adolescent vaccination program offers vaccine to children in year 7 (Human Papilloma virus (HPV) vaccine and Diphtheria, Tetanus and pertussis vaccine (dTpa)) and in year 10 (Meningococcal ACWY vaccine).

- (3) As of 19 February 2019, a number of immunisation appointments were available with varying wait times across Canberra Health Services, Child Health clinics and Child and Family Centres. Wait times range from a 2 to 30 day wait. Emergency immunisation appointments are available at a clinician's discretion.
- (4) Immunisation is promoted through the childbirth education program within Maternity Services and through the MACH universal first home visit.

Immunisation information and the National Immunisation Program (NIP) schedule of vaccines is included in the Personal Health Record (Blue Book), which includes a fridge magnet with the recommended ages (from six weeks to four years), the disease covered, and the type of vaccines. The Personal Health Record also informs families how to book their immunisations through Community Health Intake (CHI) and provides links to the Department of Health Immunise Australia website - <https://beta.health.gov.au/health-topics/immunisation> for further information.

At immunisation, consent is gained from the parent/carer after the risks and benefits are outlined by the immunisation provider. Following immunisation parents and carers are provided a leaflet "After Your Child is Immunised" to inform them what to expect and when to seek medical review.

- (5) Canberra Health Services do not report on children who did not receive their immunisations within the recommended timeframes.

Clients are reminded of immunisation via SMS or telephone, and the child's immunisation status is checked at the Key Developmental checks. Clients are able to make an appointment for "Catch up" vaccination, through CHI, if their child is behind.

- (6) For the best protection, vaccinations need to occur on time. 'On time' means on (or as close as possible to) the due date in accordance with the National Immunisation Program (NIP) schedule. To be fully protected, children may require a full course (often more than 1 dose) of vaccines at different schedule points on the NIP schedule.

A child is not fully protected if their vaccination is overdue, even if they have been up-to-date in the past.

Not being fully vaccinated can mean that the child is susceptible to contracting a vaccine preventable disease (VPD). The medical consequences of contracting a VPD, dependent on the disease, can include; illness, hospitalisation, chronic health problems, lifelong disability or even death.

**Health—funding
(Question No 2131)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Has ACT Health made a decision about use of the remaining \$88 756 from the Bulk Billing General Practices Health Fund; if so, what programs will receive funding from this money.
- (2) Has all of this funding been allocated; if so, which organisations will receive funding.
- (3) What mechanisms have been put in place to monitor use of this remaining money.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A decision is yet to be made on how the \$88 756 (excluding GST) in remaining funding from the Bulk Billing General Practices Grant Fund will be utilised.
- (2) Refer to (1) above.
- (3) Once a decision has been made on the use of the funding, appropriate governance mechanisms will be put in place.

**Crime—infringement notices
(Question No 2132)**

Ms Lee asked the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services*):

- (1) How many traffic infringement notices were issued for motorists travelling faster than the designated 40kph in school zones during school hours for each of the calendar years (a) 2015, (b) 2016, (c) 2017 and (d) 2018.
- (2) How many other infringement notices, other than for speeding, were issued to motorists in school zones or a school vicinity during schools hours for each of the calendar years (a) 2015, (b) 2016, (c) 2017 and (d) 2018.
- (3) At which school did each incident identified in part (1) and part (2) occur.
- (4) How many vehicle collision accidents have been reported in ACT school zones and how many were regarded as serious accidents for each of the calendar years (a) 2015, (b) 2016, (c) 2017 and (d) 2018.
- (5) How many vehicle/pedestrian collisions have been recorded in school zones and how many (a) led to people sustaining injury including medical treatment and (b) if any, led to death, for each of the calendar years (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017 and (iv) 2018.

Mr Ramsay: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Please refer to Attachment A.
- (2) ACT Policing data does not identify whether infringement notices, other than for speeding, are issued in school zones or a school vicinity.
- (3) Please refer to Attachment A. Please note that data is only provided for Mobile Speed Cameras as ACT Policing data does not identify specific school zones.
- (4) All Crashes in School Zones between 2015 and 2018 by year:-

Year	Total Crashes in School Zone*#	Injury	Fatal
2015	166	17	1
2016	193	22	0
2017	199	19	0
2018	199	20	0
TOTAL	757	78	1

- (5) Pedestrian Crashes in School Zones between 2015 and 2018 by year:-

Year	Total Crashes in School Zone*#	Injury	Fatal
2015	4	4	0
2016	5	3	0
2017	2	1	0
2018	1	1	0
TOTAL	12	9	0

*Total reported crashes in the school zone area all year, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day.

#School zones are based on the location of signs as of February 2019

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

ACT Health—health leadership event (Question No 2135)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) In relation to the Health leadership event of 13 September 2018 (a) what was the agenda, (b) who were the guest speakers, (c) where was it held, (d) in relation to ACT Health, how many (i) senior executives, (ii) executive level staff, (iii) doctors, (iv) nursing staff, (v) allied health professionals, (vi) administrative staff and (vii) other staff attended, (e) in relation to Canberra Health Services, how many (i) senior executives, (ii) executive level staff, (iii) doctors, (iv) nursing staff, (v) allied health professionals, (vi) administrative staff and (vii) other staff attended, (f) what food and beverages were provided and (g) what were the costs for (i) venue hire, (ii) equipment hire, (iii) speaker fees and associated costs, (iv) materials, (v) catering and (vi) other costs.

- (2) Have any subsequent Health Leadership events been held since 1 October 2018; if so,
(a) on what dates were the events held and (b) what was the total cost for each event.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) Planning for the implementations of the transition to two organisations, Conscious Leadership, and Change Management.
(b) Abby Rees, PunkPD Pty LTD.
(c) National Museum of Australia, Peninsula Room.
(d) i One Director-General, Five Deputy Director-Generals
ii Twenty-four Executive Directors
iii Five doctors
iv Ten nurses
v Eleven allied health professionals
vi Fifty-nine administrative staff
vii One other – medical physicist
(e) Not applicable, Canberra Health Services was created on 1 October 2018.
(f) The following food and beverages were provided:
Scones and fruit
Hot buffet lunch
Cheese platters
Beverages
Tea/coffee, Orange Juice.
(g) i \$850 (GST inclusive) – Venue (including AV equipment)
ii \$858 (GST inclusive) – Additional screens
iii \$3,630 (GST inclusive)
iv not applicable
v \$12,160 (GST inclusive)
vi not applicable

- (2) There have been no Health Leadership events since 1 October 2018.

**ACT Health—organisational changes
(Question No 2137)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) When will the 2019 restructure of Canberra Health Services come into effect.

- (2) Why is Canberra Health Services being restructured less than six months after the restructure of ACT Health.
- (3) Will Canberra Health Services staff be affected by the restructure; if so (a) how many and (b) in what way.
- (4) How many Canberra Health Services staff will have to move as part of the 2019 restructure.
- (5) How many executive positions will be (a) created and (b) abolished, as part of the restructure.
- (6) How many executive positions will be changed in classification resulting in (a) higher and (b) lower, remuneration.
- (7) How much will it cost to implement the 2019 restructure of Canberra Health Services.
- (8) Will the costs of the current restructure be met within the current funding of Canberra Health Services.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Canberra Health Services (CHS) restructure will be implemented progressively from 1 March 2019.
 - (2) Canberra Health Services is being restructured to;
 - ensure that similar functions that work together closely are aligned under the same reporting lines;
 - ensure greater clarification of roles, functions and relationships across CHS;
 - enable a more streamlined delivery of quality public health services; and
 - reduce duplication and improve accountability for operational service delivery and quality and standards management.
 - (3) (a) Twenty-five.
(b) Changes to reporting lines
 - (4) None. Changes have been to realign reporting lines of senior executives or senior managers who report to the Chief Executive Officer, Deputy Director General Canberra Hospital or Executive Directors.
 - (5) (a) Two.
(b) Two.
 - (6) (a) Six.
(b) One.
 - (7) The consultation process for the new structure has just been finalised and there will be a review by the divisions to identify any gaps in resourcing. As such a costing at the present time is not possible.
 - (8) Yes, all costs associated with the implementation of the 2019 restructure of CHS are funded from within the existing CHS staffing budgets.
-

**ACT Health—health services advisory group
(Question No 2141)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What is the legislative basis for the Territory-Wide Health Services Advisory Group.
- (2) What are the Group's (a) terms of reference and (b) any other operational guidelines.
- (3) Who are the members of the Group.
- (4) What organisations do members represent.
- (5) How often does the Group meet.
- (6) On what dates did the Group meet during 2018;
- (7) To whom does the Group report, how frequently and in what form.
- (8) What matters were referred to the Group for consideration and advice during 2018, by whom and on what date/s.
- (9) What matters were self-referred by the Group during 2018 and on what dates.
- (10) What advice did the Group report during 2018.
- (11) What action did ACT Health and/or Canberra Health Services take in response to each matter.
- (12) Will the Group continue its work in 2019; if not, why not.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There is no legislative basis for the Territory-Wide Health Services Advisory Group (the Advisory Group). The Advisory Group functions under the authority of the Director-General, ACT Health.
- (2) The Advisory Group has terms of reference which are at Attachment A. The Advisory Group does not have any other operational guidelines.
- (3) The members of the Territory-wide Health Services Framework Advisory Group are:
 - Professor Gabrielle Cooper (Chair), formerly the Professor of Pharmacy, University of Canberra
 - Associate Professor Nicolas Cherbuin, ANU Research School of Population Health
 - Lisa Kelly, CEO of Carers ACT
 - Simon Viereck, Executive Officer of Mental Health Community Coalition ACT
 - Gaylene Coulton, CEO of Capital Health Network
 - Douglas Herd, Chair of ACT Disability Reference Group
 - Darlene Cox, Executive Director of Health Care Consumers Association
 - Scott Clouder, LGBTIQ Ministerial Advisory Council

- Donna Murray, CEO of Indigenous Allied Health Australia
- Dr Rashmi Sharma, General Practitioner
- Sandra Turner, CEO of Cancer Council ACT.

Clinical expertise is provided to the Advisory Group by the following key senior ACT Health positions:

- Chief Medical Officer
- Chief Nursing and Midwifery Officer
- Chief Allied Health Officer.

- (4) The Advisory Group includes representatives from the ACT community, who are also part of the following organisations, forums or key interest groups:
- University of Canberra
 - Capital Health Network
 - Health Care Consumers Association
 - ANU Research School of Population Health
 - Carers ACT
 - LGBTIQ Ministerial Advisory Council
 - Indigenous Allied Health Australia
 - Cancer Council ACT
 - ACT Disability Reference Group
 - General Practitioners
- (5) The Advisory Group meets on an as needs basis, and considers matters out of session, in line with its work plan.
- (6) In 2018 the Advisory Group met on the following dates:
- 31 January (Inaugural meeting)
 - 14 March
 - 4 July
 - 8 August; and
 - 19 September
- (7) The Advisory Group functions under the authority of the Director-General ACT Health who will provide input as required, in line with the role, responsibilities, powers and functions. The Advisory Group reports advice and views to ACT Health as required.
- (8) The following matters were referred to the Advisory Group in 2018 (Dates):
- Terms of Reference (31.01.2018, 14.03.2018, 04.07.2018);
 - Territory-wide Health Services Strategy (31.01.2018, 14.03.2018, 04.07.2018, 08.08.2018, 19.09.2018, 31.10.2018);
 - Communications & Engagement Strategy (31.01.2018, 14.03.2018, 04.07.2018);
 - Select Specialty Service Plans (04.07.2018, 08.08.2018, 19.09.2018); and
 - ACT Health Strategic Framework (19.09.2018, 31.10.2018)
- (9) The following matters were self-referred by the Group during 2018:.
- How the future plans of the private and other hospitals in the region are captured to ensure a Territory-wide approach (31.01.2018)
 - Metrics and Outcome Measures for the Framework (31.01.2018)
- (10) The following advice was provided by the Advisory Group in 2018:

- Confirmation of the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Group;
- Comments and contributions to the Territory-wide Health Services Strategy;
- Comments and contributions to the draft Communications & Engagement Strategy; and
- Input into the development of Specialty Service Plans including references to NGOs;

(11) Where appropriate ACT Health took on board comments from the Advisory Group and reported these to the Director-General or Minister as appropriate.

(12) Yes.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

Environment—Strathnairn sheep dip site (Question No 2142)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) Where have the former Strathnairn sheep dip contaminated soils and infrastructure been deposited and if this information is not publically available, why not.
- (2) Have the former Strathnairn sheep dip contaminated soils and infrastructure been disposed of safely and permanently; if so, how have they been disposed of.
- (3) Are Huon Contractors Pty Ltd a registered, specialist sheep dip remediator and have they been given the contract to decontaminate the former Strathnairn sheep dip site and environs, in both distance and depth.
- (4) Has the former Strathnairn sheep dip site/paddock been tested; if not, why not.
- (5) Have any of the surrounding sites/paddocks been tested, for example (a) has the post-dip site been tested, (b) has the “drip-dry” draining site been tested, (c) have the holding paddocks been tested and (d) if none of the above mentioned sites/paddocks have been tested, why.
- (6) Have any of the subsurface soils (cored down to the water-table) been (a) examined; if not why not, (b) sampled; if not why not, (c) evaluated; if not, why not and (d) decontaminated; if not, why not.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) Contaminated soil is in the process of being excavated. When all contaminated soil has been excavated it will be disposed of to a site nominated by the Environment Protection Authority. The disposal information, once completed, will be held by the Environment Protection Authority and would be available upon request.
- (2) Excavation and testing has not yet been completed. When all contaminated soil has been excavated it will be disposed of to a site nominated by the Environment Protection Authority.

- (3) The remediation is being managed by Douglas Partners, specialist environmental consultants in contaminated land management, waste management and remediation. Their work is independently audited by a certified Contaminated Site Auditor working for AECOM, and is then approved by the Environment Protection Authority. Huon Contractors has been sub-contracted to undertake excavation under supervision from Douglas Partners.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) Surrounding areas identified by the consultant and by the auditor as possible post-dip, “drip-dry” and holding paddocks have been tested and additional excavation and remediation is being undertaken to remove any contaminated areas identified.
- (6) (a) Yes
 (b) Yes
 (c) Yes
 (d) No (soil will be removed and disposed of as per the Environment Protection Authority instructions).

**Municipal services—trees
 (Question No 2143)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

Has the review that the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate undertook consultation on in 2015 on a draft of a revised tree species list under Design Standards 23 been completed; if so, (a) when and (b) were any changes made as a result of the review; if not (i) is the review continuing or has it been abandoned and (ii) when will it be completed.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (a) The review of Design Standards 23: Plant Species for Urban Landscape Projects has been completed and the revised document, now called the Municipal Infrastructure Standard 25, is due to be released in the first quarter of 2019.
- (b) A number of changes were made during the review. The plant species list was updated to add new species and remove inappropriate species such as pest plants. Minimum verge width restrictions for tree species have been replaced by soil volume targets and species flowering times and forager information has been provided.

**Animals—veterinary fees
 (Question No 2144)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

Does the ACT Government currently have any mechanism for subsidising vet fees.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The ACT Government currently subsidises RSPCA ACT veterinary services through de-sexing vouchers, which are sold at Domestic Animal Services at a cost of \$190. These vouchers provide access to a de-sexing service at RSPCA ACT, with a normal retail value of \$306.75.

No other veterinary service is currently subsidised.

**Animals—livestock care
(Question No 2145)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for City Services*):

Is lack of shade for livestock lawful given duty of care for appropriate shelter in the Animal Welfare Act; if it is unlawful, has it been enforced at all in the last five years; if it is lawful, what is the reasoning behind the exemption.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

I can't provide legal advice however, in accordance with section 6B of the *Animal Welfare Act 1992*, a person in charge of an animal has a duty to care for the animal, which includes taking reasonable steps to provide the animal with appropriate shelter or accommodation. This includes livestock.

What is deemed appropriate shelter or accommodation is dependent on the species, environment and circumstances of the animal. The various animal-specific codes of practice, including cattle, sheep and horses, gives guidance as to what shelter or accommodation is generally appropriate for each species.

Between 1 January 2014 and 18 February 2019, RSPCA ACT received 56 complaints in relation to matters where livestock did not have appropriate shelter or accommodation. Of these complaints, only one case resulted in enforcement action, with the offender being issued a direction notice, which was complied with. In all other cases, no offence was identified or the owners worked with RSPCA-ACT Inspectors to resolve the issue.

**Taxation—rates
(Question No 2146)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

What were the proportions of residential rates paid upfront and paid in instalments in each of the financial years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17, (c) 2017-18 and (d) 2018-19 to date.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(a) In the 2015-16 financial year there were 156,843 annual rates assessments issued for residential properties; 54,932 ratepayers (35.02 percent) paid their assessments up

front and 101,911 ratepayers (64.98 percent) nominated to pay their assessments by instalments.

- (b) In the 2016-17 financial year there were 158,991 annual rates assessments issued for residential properties; 53,189 ratepayers (33.45 percent) paid their assessments up front and 105,802 ratepayers (66.55 percent) nominated to pay their assessments by instalments.
- (c) In the 2017-18 financial year there were 162,914 annual rates assessments issued for residential properties; 49,791 ratepayers (30.56 percent) paid their assessments up front and 113,123 ratepayers (69.44 percent) nominated to pay their assessments by instalments.
- (d) In the 2018-19 financial year to date there have been 171,305 annual rates assessments issued for residential properties; 41,695 ratepayers (24.34 percent) paid their assessments up front and 129,610 ratepayers (75.66 percent) nominated to pay their assessments by instalments.

Environment—chemical disposal sites (Question No 2147)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (redirected to the Minister for Environment and Heritage):

- (1) Are there any per and/or poly fluoroalkyl (PFAS and/or PFOA) disposal sites in Canberra; if so, where are they located.
- (2) Are there any PFAS and/or PFOA trial sites in Canberra; if so, where are they located.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Known affected sites for PFAS in the ACT, are:
- the former Charnwood Fire Station
 - the former Belconnen Fire Station and Training Centre
 - the former West Belconnen Sewerage Treatment Plant
 - West Belconnen Resource Management Centre (landfill)
 - Mugga Lane Resource Recovery Facility
 - Canberra Airport / Pialligo

EPSDD and EPA conduct ambient sampling of PFAS at sites across Canberra in accordance with the *PFAS National Environment Management Plan 2018*.

- (2) There are no PFAS and/or PFOA trial sites in Canberra.

Ginninderry—environment (Question No 2149)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

Are houses proposed to be located approximately 750m from a nearby poultry farm in relation to the Stage 2 development application at Ginninderry; if so, is there safe distance legislation in the ACT; if there is no safe distance legislation, why not.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Residential development is not permitted within 750m of the Parkwood Egg Farm and Stage 2 of the Ginninderry is located more than 1500m away from the egg farm. This 750m clearance was recommended by the Environment Protection Authority and is included in the West Belconnen Concept Plan.

The Separation Distance Guidelines for Air Emissions (November 2018) provides recommended separation distances between land uses that emit odour, dust and other forms of air emissions and sensitive land uses. In accordance with Appendix 1. Recommended Separation Distances for Airborne Emissions of the Guideline, it recommends a separation distance to poultry farms (keeping of poultry involving an enclosed shed area exceeding 1,000 square metres) of 750m.

Animals—desexing (Question No 2150)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

In the last three years, how many (a) dog owners and (b) cat owners have been penalised for owning a dog/cat that is not de-sexed and what were (if any) the penalties.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The answer to Ms Le Couteur MLA question is summarised in the table below.

Period	Infringements Section 74 (1) Keeping a dog not de-sexed without permit \$500.00		Infringements Section 74 (2) Keeping a cat not de-sexed without permit \$350.00	
	Infringement	Warning Notice	Infringement	Warning Notice
2017 - 2018	22	34	0	0
2018-19 to 15 Feb 2019	19	51	0	1

Animals—cat containment (Question No 2151)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

Are there any existing plans to make suburbs close to nature reserves declared cat containment areas; if so, what is the timeline; if not, why not.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

New suburbs are declared as cat containment areas at the early stages of development. Recent declarations have been made for Strathnairn and Macnamara.

The future expansion of cat containment to established suburbs is considered in the Draft ACT Cat Plan, which is intended to be released for extended public consultation in the second quarter of 2019.

Environment—Canberra Centenary Trail (Question No 2152)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) When was the Canberra Centenary Trail map information last updated.
- (2) How often is it updated.
- (3) Are there plans to update the ACT Government website to label different trails so as to determine which trails permit cycling.
- (4) Is the GPX trail information on the website incorrect, even though the PDF map on the same website shows the trail correctly; if so, will the information in GPX format be available on the website.
- (5) Do ACT laws demand cars to keep a minimum 1.5m separation from cyclists; if so, will an on-road bike lane with a minimum of 1.5m in width be provided on the Horse Park Drive upgrade; if not, why.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Canberra Centenary Trail map itself has not been updated since 2013, however any changes to the route or important information including closures, diversions or safety concerns are published to the page as needed and are currently up to date.
 - (2) An interactive map is now in place. This has replaced the PDF map version and can be updated in real time.
 - (3) The outdated GPX file showing trails has been updated.
 - (4) The GPX link was outdated and has now been updated.
 - (5) In the ACT, under the Road Transport (Road Rules) Regulation 2017, a driver passing a cyclist whilst travelling at not more than 60km/h must provide a passing distance of not less than 1m, a driver travelling at greater than 60km/h must provide a passing distance of not less than 1.5m. Sections of Horse Park Drive currently subject to upgrade works will have an on road cycle lane in both directions with a minimum width at or greater than 1.5m. These works are expected to be completed by mid-2019.
-

**Environment—blackberry spraying
(Question No 2153)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Have Government employees told foragers that all blackberries in the ACT are safe to eat including those growing alongside the roadsides unless signs are posted in the area indicating otherwise.
- (2) How often are the Environment ACT website maps that indicate where blackberry spraying has occurred over the past 10 years or so updated.
- (3) What is the policy regarding signage after a wild blackberry area has been sprayed.
- (4) What type of herbicides are being used on wild blackberry in the ACT.
- (5) Are there any known health implications or side effects for humans that consume blackberries sprayed with the herbicide in question.
- (6) Are there any known health implications or side effects for wildlife that consume blackberries sprayed with the herbicide in question.
- (7) Is the Government of the opinion that it is safe to pick and eat wild blackberries in the ACT; if yes, why; if not, why.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Not to my knowledge. The Parks and Conservation Service web site (under the Biosecurity tab) states clearly: *"Blackberries are controlled with herbicide at priority locations across the ACT. Warning signs are placed at these locations. If you see a sign warning not to eat the Blackberry fruit or a weed spraying in progress sign, then you should avoid eating Blackberry fruit in that area noting that fruiting times vary at each location and can occur anytime from December to May."*
- (2) All Blackberry sprayed on public land is mapped using the 'Collector' an app for smart phones and tablets. The Collector data is summarised in smart maps on the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate web site. These maps are produced annually showing an ongoing history of spray sites.

Members of the public can view where on-going control of invasive plants, such as blackberry is occurring. See the following link:

<https://actgov.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/61137a71362a4deb84e3bc83d8fdccbb>

- (3) Warning signs are placed where blackberries are to be sprayed. These are kept in place till after the fruiting period.
- (4) A number of different herbicides are used to control blackberry: metsulfuron methyl, triclopyr, picloram, aminopyralid and glyphosate.

- (5) One of the main herbicides used is metsulfuron methyl. According to the products Safety Data Sheet, *metsulfuron methyl*, *there have been no accounts of poisoning from this herbicide and there are no significant risk factors associated with this herbicide*. Other herbicides used for blackberry control include: triclopyr, picloram, aminopyralid and glyphosate. According to the product Safety Data Sheets for these herbicides an individual would need to ingest a large quantity of the concentrated herbicide to suffer a toxic effect. It is important to bear in mind that highly diluted forms of these herbicides are used when spraying blackberry.
- (6) According to the official Safety Data Sheets:
- Triclopyr, picloram, and aminopyralid in a combined formulation is slightly toxic to birds if they ingest a significant amount of concentrated herbicide.
 - Metsulfuron methyl has a very low toxicity to animals and is broken down quickly and eliminated from the body.
 - Glyphosate is not harmful to birds.
- (7) Whilst untreated blackberries are safe to eat, as blackberries are actively controlled in many areas of the ACT and signs can be removed or stolen, members of the public should be cautious when foraging for blackberries.

The following advice is provided to people enquiring about eating blackberries in the ACT:

- a. Do not eat blackberries in areas that have signs placed warning that spraying or weed control is taking place.
- b. Do not eat blackberries from bushes that look sick because there is also a rust fungus biocontrol that causes some varieties of blackberry to lose vigour. The fruit from these may be low quality.
- c. If you are interested in viewing maps relating to blackberry spraying in the ACT then visit the Collector for ArcGIS smart map links on the EPSDD web site: <https://www.environment.act.gov.au/parks-conservation/plants-and-animals/Biosecurity/invasive-plants>

National Multicultural Festival—stalls (Question No 2154)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Did organisers say they would assess their policy on information stalls in response to multiple complaints at the National Multicultural Festival in relation to an anti-abortion stall with displays that caused controversy throughout the community; if so, has the policy information on stalls changed since last year.
- (2) Is the ACT Right to Life Association stall, going to be present in this year's National Multicultural Festival.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The National Multicultural Festival (NMF) Participation Policy was reviewed in response to feedback following the 2018 NMF.

All stall categories were reviewed under the Policy's *Stallholder Terms and Conditions* to provide clear information on eligibility and conditions of hire. The changes did not preclude any previous stallholders from applying to have a stall.

The Policy is available online at www.multiculturalfestival.com.au

The Policy will be reviewed again following this year's event.

- (2) The ACT Right to Life Association had a stall at the 2019 NMF.

Public housing—insulation (Question No 2155)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

When new public housing is being purchased or constructed, do specifications require a particular maximum level of outside air leakage (permeability or air changes per hour) into the insulated envelope of dwellings; if so, is actual air leakage performance tested at completion of construction or prior to purchase to verify that the specifications are met.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Housing ACT does not performance test actual air leakage at the completion of construction or prior to the purchase of a dwelling. It is not a requirement under the National Construction Code of Australia.

Housing ACT constructs all new dwellings to a minimum 6 star energy rating.

Health—mobile phone technology (Question No 2156)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment*):

- (1) Has the ACT Government conducted any investigations into the public health and safety impacts of the proposed rollout of 5G mobile phone technology; if so, what were the investigations and what were the findings.
- (2) Has the ACT Government been involved in any discussions or negotiations with other jurisdictions, e.g. through the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), around the public health and safety impacts of the proposed rollout of 5G mobile phone technology; if so, what were the discussions or negotiations, when did they occur and what were the outcomes.
- (3) Is the ACT Government involved, e.g. through COAG, in any discussions or negotiations around public health criteria for the locations of 5G phone towers, e.g.

separation distances from sensitive uses; if so, what were the outcomes and will they be implemented in the Territory Plan.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No, the ACT Government has not conducted its own investigations into the potential public health implications of 5G technologies. The Australian Government is responsible for the regulation of the telecommunications industry including providing advice to the Australian community on potential health and safety implications of telecommunications equipment.
- (2) The ACT Government has not been involved in discussions or negotiations through COAG or other forums around the public health and safety concerns of 5G mobile phone technology. ACT Government officials have consulted with the Department of Communications and the Arts in responding to constituent concerns about 5G technologies and have forwarded on information received from the Department.
- (3) No. The Australian Government is responsible for the regulation of the telecommunications industry. All telecommunication carriers must adhere to the regulations of the Australian Government and the *Telecommunications Act 1997* in relation to network deployments and community exposure to electromagnetic energy from mobile phone base stations and technologies.

Education—violence in schools (Question No 2157)

Ms Lee asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Which section, branch or group/s within the Education Directorate are responsible for the receipt, handling and assessment of bullying, assault, violence and other incident reports that come from ACT government schools affecting both students and/or staff.
- (2) In what form can reports be submitted.
- (3) What is the protocol for submission.
- (4) Does every incident report result in an investigation; if so, by whom and what is the timeframe.
- (5) When is an incident deemed finalised or resolved.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Most incidents are received and managed at the school level, however, the Education Directorate may also assist where required.

ACT public schools are well placed to address incidents such as bullying, harassment and violence in collaboration with students, parents and carers. The Education Directorate has policies and procedures in place to help schools appropriately address bullying, harassment and violence, and to respond to complex and challenging behaviour. Every public school also has a Safe and Supportive Schools Contact

Officer (SASSCO) for students. These officers are trained to provide support to students who have experienced bullying, sexual harassment and racism.

While most incidents are appropriately managed at the school level, the Education Directorate supports schools to manage incidents when required, for example through the work of the School Improvement Group, which includes the Directors, School Improvement.

Schools can also seek additional support and expertise when they are working with students with complex and challenging behaviour. These specialist resources include occupational therapists, psychologists, behaviour experts and social workers. They are located within the Student Engagement Branch.

The People and Performance Branch is available to assist support all Education Directorate staff, including school based staff, about matters that impact on staff health or wellbeing.

Families are also able to raise concerns directly with the Directorate's Families and Students, Complaints and Feedback team, located within the Governance and Community Liaison Branch, either by telephone or online form, which are acknowledged, and responses/actions are coordinated with appropriate teams.

(2) Required reporting for incidents is determined by the incident. Examples include:

- Where an incident involves staff injury, incident details are reported in the whole-of-government Riskman reporting system.
- Where an injury in a preschool system occurs, incident details are reported in the National Quality Agenda IT system.
- Where a student injury occurs, base data is provided to the Directorate's Governance and Community Liaison Branch and the ACT Insurance Authority.
- School-level reporting of incidents occurs in a variety of ways including paper-based and the Directorate's legacy administration system MAZE. Schools are transitioning to Sentral the new School Administration System.

(3) Please see response to question 2.

(4) Schools conduct follow up to incidents which may involve the classroom teacher, teacher on duty, SASSCOs, the school psychologist or executive staff. Where necessary, schools can access additional support through the Network Student Engagement Teams.

(5) As previously identified (Q1) incidents are investigated, managed and resolved by different teams depending on the type of incident. The relevant team is responsible for ensuring all actions identified to manage and resolve the incident have been completed prior to finalisation. The People and Performance branch further supports all schools by reviewing each RiskMan report and providing assistance, follow up and escalation when required.

Waste—Hume materials recovery facility (Question No 2158)

Ms Lee asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What were the reasons for shutting down the Hume Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) from 8 January to 16 January 2019.
- (2) What is the Government doing to prevent another shutdown.
- (3) How likely is another shutdown at the MRF.
- (4) Did the shutdown result in increased volumes of waste at the facility; if yes, what is happening to ensure that increased volumes of waste are quickly dealt with.
- (5) What is the facility's waste capacity.
- (6) Where is the excess waste directed.
- (7) What is the number and percentage of containers eligible under the Container Deposit Scheme going to the Hume MRF.
- (8) What is the amount of waste by tonnage that the Hume MRF took in from outside the ACT (from the Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council area and Snowy Monaro Regional Council area) in the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17, and (c) 2017-18.
- (9) What are the types of waste the Hume MRF took in from outside the ACT (from the Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council area and Snowy Monaro Regional Council area) in the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (10) What do the figures in part (9)(a) to (c) represent as a percentage of overall waste at the Hume MRF in the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (11) What are the circumstances in which the ACT government, or the MRF refuses material from areas outside the ACT.
- (12) What material has been refused from areas outside the ACT in the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (13) What were the reasons for refusal for the answer to part (12) above.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Worksafe ACT issued a Non-Disturbance Notice at the MRF on Friday 11 January 2019, due to safety issues identified during an inspection. As a result, the MRF was not able to receive material from 11 January to 16 January 2019.
- (2) Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) has worked with Worksafe ACT and the MRF operator to rectify the identified safety issues. This includes expanding the area available to the MRF operator to store processed material prior to it going to market, and the engagement by the MRF operator of an onsite safety manager.
- (3) The changes made significantly reduce the likelihood of interruption to normal operations in the future.
- (4) From 11 to 16 January 2019 no deliveries of material were received at the MRF. The MRF operator was allowed to commence processing of material on site on Tuesday 15 January 2019 and was permitted to receive new deliveries on Thursday 17 January 2019.

- (5) As the facility receives, processes, stores and moves to market a range of material it is not possible to attribute a particular figure to the capacity of the facility. The facility processes around 50,000 to 60,000 tonnes of material per annum.
- (6) There is no 'excess material' as such. Recycling material received at the Hume MRF is separated and baled into products and sent to various domestic markets.
- (7) The total number of containers that have been recycled at the MRF from 30 June 2018 to 31 December 2018 is 15,857,550, which equates to 19% of the total recycling processed at the MRF.
- (8) See Below. The figures for 2015-16 cover February to June 2016 only. Re.Group commenced running the MRF from February 2016. The data on interstate material is not available for the previous seven months.

	Queanbeyan / Palerang		Snowy / Monaro	
	Tonnes	% of total	Tonnes	% of total
2015-16	1,941	10%	375	2%
2016-17	4,564	10%	1,030	2%
2017-18	4,474	10%	2,223	5%

- (9) The material consists of household recycling (yellow) bin material.
The MRF does not 'batch process' material from different recycling bin collections, but processes material as it is delivered by collection trucks on a first-in, first-out basis. The composition of material received at the MRF is generally in the following ranges on an annual basis:
- 45-55% paper and cardboard;
 - 30-35% glass;
 - 1-2% PET plastic;
 - 1-2% HDPE plastic;
 - 1-2% mixed plastic;
 - 0.5-1% aluminium;
 - 0.5-1% steel;
 - 10-15% contamination;
- (10) Refer to response question 8.
- (11) Decisions around entering into contracts to receive material from regional customers is a matter for the MRF operator, not the Territory.
- (12) Refer to response to question 11.
- (13) Refer to response question 11.

Homelessness—services (Question No 2160)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What homelessness services were open between 21 December 2018 and 2 January 2019.
- (2) Which days were they open.
- (3) What services did they provide, ie was it referrals or direct service delivery/accommodation.
- (4) What homelessness services are open during weekends and public holidays.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Each year ACT Specialist Homelessness services have plans in place to assist people experiencing homelessness during the Christmas / New Year period.

During the 2018/19 Christmas New Year period, all supported accommodation services/refuges such as Doris Women's, Beryl women Inc, Toora Women Inc, and EveryMan Australia operated at normal capacity and provided an on-call response for existing clients.

Table 1, below outlines the operation of services providing accommodation and outreach capacity between 21 December 2018 - 2 January 2019.

- (2) Please see table below.
- (3) Please see table below.
- (4) Please see table below.

Table 1. Services Providing Accommodation and Outreach Capacity 21 December 2018 – 2 January 2019.

Service Provider	Service Description	Target Group	Operations from 21 December - 2 January
St Vincent de Paul	Samaritan House provides crisis accommodation and support to single men in the ACT, and is a central hub for men affected by homelessness who have complex and multiple needs.	Men who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness.	Samaritan House operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week, including weekends and public holidays.
St Vincent de Paul	The Blue Door is a drop-in centre, open to all people in need, providing support such as a free breakfast and lunch, haircuts, clothing and furniture, vouchers as well as information, advice, advocacy and referrals.	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness.	The Blue Door was closed on the public holidays and 31 December 2018.

Service Provider	Service Description	Target Group	Operations from 21 December - 2 January
CatholicCare Canberra and Goulburn	Minosa House is a supported accommodation program for single men over 18 years, not accompanied by children, who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.	Men who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	Minosa House was open each day with staff in attendance from 9am to 5pm including weekends and public holidays. In addition, a 24 hour on-call system was available to clients.
Barnardos Australia	Youth Identified Accommodation and Support Program provides case management support to young people who are at risk of homelessness.	Young people who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	The Youth Identified Accommodation and Support Program operated 24 hours, seven days a week, including all public holidays and weekends.
Salvation Army	Youth Emergency Accommodation network provides crisis accommodation for young people. The service focuses on the immediate safety and support needs of the young person, providing support such as bus tickets, phone cards and help to access Centrelink and education options.	Young people who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	The Youth Emergency Accommodation Network operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week, including all public holidays and weekends.
Ted Noffs Foundation	Take Hold Program provides mentoring and life skills support for young people at risk of homelessness.	Young people who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	Take Hold was closed from 22 December 2018 to 6 January 2019. During this period an on-call support was available 24 hours per day to both existing and new clients.
CatholicCare Canberra and Goulburn	Youth Housing Support Service (YHSS) provides outreach to young people aged 15-25 who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Youth Housing Specialists assist young people to gain and/or sustain safe, appropriate and affordable accommodation and tenancies.	Young people who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	YHSS operates 9am -5pm Monday to Friday, and does not open on weekends or public holidays. YHSS was closed from 24 December 2018 to 2 January 2019.

Service Provider	Service Description	Target Group	Operations from 21 December - 2 January
Conflict Resolution Service	<p>Family Tree House supports adolescents experiencing homelessness or at risk of becoming homeless due to family conflict.</p> <p>Services include facilitating family mediation and informal facilitated conversations, providing one-on-one support and 'coaching' to family members, outreach services and working in close collaboration with other ACT youth and family focused agencies.</p>	Young people, and families in all their diversity, who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	<p>The Family Tree House program hours of operation are 9am to 5 pm Monday to Friday.</p> <p>The Family Tree House was closed from 22 December 2018 to 6 January 2019. During this period an emergency line was available to all clients.</p>
Gugan Gulwan Youth Aboriginal Corporation	Young Person's Program provides outreach support and case management for young Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people experiencing or at risk of homelessness.	Young Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	Gugan Gulwan operates Monday - Friday except public holidays. However, a Street Beat service operates on Fridays and Saturdays 7pm-11 pm providing safe sex packs and referral information (not funded under homelessness sector). Gugan Gulwan operated until 24 December 2018 and resumed on 7 January 2019.
Winnunga Nimmitjiah	Housing Liaison Program provides support services to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander individuals or families who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals or families who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	Winnunga Nimmitjiah was open on 27, 28 and 31 December for people in need of support. The Housing Liaison program operated until 24 December 2018 and resumed on 2 January 2019
Winnunga Nimmitjiah	Home Maintenance Program provides support services for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander individuals and families who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness.	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander individuals or families who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	<p>The Home Maintenance Program operated until 24 December 2018 and resumed on 2 January 2019.</p> <p>Winnunga Nimmitjiah was open on 27, 28 and 31 December for people in need of support.</p>
Australian Red Cross	Road House provides free food, access to life skills training and warm referrals to support services for people who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness or disadvantage.	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	<p>The Road House operates from the Griffin Centre on Mon, Tues, and Thurs from 4:30 – 5:30pm; and Sunday from 5:00-6:00pm.</p> <p>The Road House operated until 23 December 2018 and resumed on 7 January 2019.</p>

Service Provider	Service Description	Target Group	Operations from 21 December - 2 January
Soup kitchen	Soup Kitchen provides a weekly (Friday) free food service to anyone in need.	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	The Soup Kitchen operates from the Griffin Centre each Friday. The service did not operate on Friday 28 December 2018.
Hare Krishna Food for Life	Food for Life provides weekly free food service to anyone in need	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	Food for Life operates each Saturday and Wednesday from the Griffin Centre The service operated until 22 December 2018 and resumed on 9 January 2019.
Woden Community Service	One Link provides a single access point for a range of universal and targeted services, including housing and homelessness, tenancy support, disability as well as family, child and youth support	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	OneLink was closed on public holidays only through this period.
Woden Community Service	Supportive Tenancy Service works with ACT tenants and home owners whose tenancies are at risk, to maintain a safe and stable home.	People (with or without accompanying children) who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	The service is closed on public holidays and weekends. The Supportive Tenancy Service operated until 24 December 2018 and resumed on 2 January 2019.
St Vincent de Paul	Street to Home provide support services to chronically homeless people living in the ACT. Workers actively seek out people who are sleeping on the streets and attempt to provide intensive case management.	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	Street to Home generally operates between 8am and 5.00pm five days a week. Street To Home operated until 24 December 2018 and resumed on 2 January 2019. Street to Home participants were advised that case managers mobile phones were redirected to Samaritan House who were available 24/7 during the holiday period for immediate support if required.
UnitingCare Canberra	Early Morning Centre (EMC) provides support to rough sleepers through access to lockers, computers, showers, regular medical services and warm referral	People who are at risk of, or experiencing homelessness	The EMC opens for breakfast 7:30 – 8:30am and for community hub activities for an extended 9:00am – 2:00pm, Monday to Friday, funded by the ACT Government in the 2017/2018 budget (\$100,000 per year).

Service Provider	Service Description	Target Group	Operations from 21 December - 2 January
	operating within an early intervention and prevention service model.		It provided food services every day except Christmas and New Year's Day. EMC also provided information on services available to guests during the holiday period, and hampers to guests for the days they were not open.
Domestic Violence Crisis Service	Domestic Violence Christmas Program provides short-term accommodation and support, as well as safe exit accommodation options for families and individuals at risk of homelessness due to domestic violence, over the Christmas/New Year period	People (with or without accompanying children) who have been subjected to domestic violence	Hotel rooms were booked from 14 December 2018 to 30 January 2019. Housing ACT extended the program until 13 February to ensure safe exits for families supported. Support was available as needed from services participating in the program.
Council Of The Ageing (COTA)	COTA Information, Advice and Support	Older people in the ACT	The service generally operates Monday to Friday 9am-5pm and is not open on Public Holidays or weekends. The service operated until 22nd December and resumed on 2 January 2019.

Vehicles—registration (Question No 2161)

Ms Lawder asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What is the total number of trailers, including boat trailers registered in the ACT.
- (2) How many trailers, including boat trailers were registered in the ACT for the first time in (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (3) How many trailers including boat trailers were registered for the full cost of registration of the new trailers during the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (4) How many trailers including boat trailers were registered at a discounted rate or no cost of registration of the new trailers during the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (5) What is the total revenue raised in each of (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (6) What is the total number of caravans registered in the ACT.

- (7) How many caravans were registered in the ACT for the first time in (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (8) How many caravans were registered for the full cost of registration of the new caravans registered in each of the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (9) How many caravans were registered at a discounted rate or no cost of registration of the new caravans registered in each of the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.
- (10) What is the total revenue raised in each of the years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.

Mr Ramsay: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 36,347 (as at 25 February 2019)
- (2)
 - (a) 2015-16 – 2,735
 - (b) 2016-17 – 2,567
 - (c) 2017-18 – 2,560
- (3)
 - (a) 2015-16 – 2,720
 - (b) 2016-17 – 2,548
 - (c) 2017-18 – 2,547
- (4)
 - (a) 2015-16 - 15
 - (b) 2016-17 - 19
 - (c) 2017-18 - 13
- (5)
 - (a) 2015-16 – \$357,169.60
 - (b) 2016-17 - \$367,763.40
 - (c) 2017-18 - \$392,284.50
- (6) 3,077 (as at 25 February 2019)
- (7)
 - (a) 2015-16 - 470
 - (b) 2016-17 - 453
 - (c) 2017-18 - 561
- (8)
 - (a) 2015-16 - 442
 - (b) 2016-17 - 426
 - (c) 2017-18 - 536
- (9)
 - (a) 2015-16 - 28
 - (b) 2016-17 - 27
 - (c) 2017-18 - 25

(10)

(a) 2015-16 - \$183,418.80

(b) 2016-17 - \$186,563.50

(c) 2017-18 - \$190,670.80

**Government—land and property acquisitions
(Question Nos 2162-2199)**

Mr Coe asked the Chief Minister; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Health and Wellbeing; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Higher Education; the Minister for Medical and Health Research; the Minister for Transport; the Minister for Vocational Education and Skills; the Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Events; the Minister for Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for Government Services and Procurement; the Minister for Urban Renewal; the Minister for City Services, the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Roads; the Treasurer; the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Attorney-General; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Chief Minister*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide a consolidated list of all land acquired by the ACT Government agencies or entities for which the Minister is responsible, except purchases made by Housing ACT, between 1 July 2018 and 31 December 2018 including (a) the block identifiers, (b) the type of property or acquisition, (c) the method of acquisition, (d) who approved the acquisition, (e) the date the acquisition was approved, (f) the date the acquisition was made or settled, (g) the date the possession was taken and (h) the price paid.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a consolidated list of properties acquired by Housing ACT, and the price paid for each acquisition between 1 July 2018 and 31 December 2018, and include (a) the suburb of the property, (b) the type of property or acquisition, (c) the method of acquisition, (d) who approved the acquisition, (e) the date the acquisition was approved, (f) the date the acquisition was made or settled, (g) the date the possession was taken and (h) the price paid.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

This response includes acquisition of land from a private sector entity by a government agency or entity, that is transfer of land from the private sector to government ownership.

This response does not cover acquisition of land by a government entity/agency from another government entity/agency.

(1)

Public Housing Renewal Taskforce

The Public Housing Renewal Taskforce purchases properties which are subsequently transferred to Housing ACT, the following purchases were made between 1 July 2018 and 31 December 2018.

Region	Number of Properties	Type of Property	Method of acquisition	Approval	Date of approval	Price paid
Gungahlin	6	Multi-unit	Purchase Through Expression of Interest	Executive Director - Urban Renewal	07/09/2018	\$3,034,000
Inner North	7	Multi-unit	Purchase Through Expression of Interest	Executive Director - Urban Renewal	29/10/2018	\$3,350,000
Inner South	1	Single Residential Dwelling	Purchase Through Expression of Interest	Executive Director - Urban Renewal	31/10/2018	\$380,000
Inner North	8	Multi-unit	Purchase Through Expression of Interest	Executive Director - Urban Renewal	13/11/2018	\$3,864,000

Asbestos Response Taskforce

The Asbestos Response Taskforce acquires land from private residential families, as such the price of these transactions remain confidential.

Suburb	Block & Section	Type of Property	Method of acquisition	Approval	Date of acquisition	Price paid
Aranda	B28 S7 Unit 2	Dual Occupancy Unit Titled	Contract of Sale	Head of Asbestos Response Taskforce	18/07/2018	Not provided for privacy reasons
Chapman	B34 S11	Separately Titled Townhouse	Contract of Sale	Head of Asbestos Response Taskforce	13/12/2018	Not provided for privacy reasons
Chapman	B36 S11	Separately Titled Townhouse	Contract of Sale	Head of Asbestos Response Taskforce	16/11/2018	Not provided for privacy reasons
Curtin	B8 S50	Single Residential Dwelling	Surrender of Lease	Head of Asbestos Response Taskforce	21/09/2018	Not provided for privacy reasons
Rivett	B34 S56	Single Residential Dwelling	Surrender of Lease	Head of Asbestos Response Taskforce	14/12/2018	Not provided for privacy reasons

Suburb	Block & Section	Type of Property	Method of acquisition	Approval	Date of acquisition	Price paid
Waramanga	B7 S14	Single Residential Dwelling	Surrender of Lease	Head of Asbestos Response Taskforce	10/10/2018	Not provided for privacy reasons

- (2) A consolidated list of properties acquired by Housing ACT during 2017-2018 to 23 August 2018 is located at **Attachment A**

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

Government—workplace bullying (Question Nos 2200-2237)

Mr Coe asked the Chief Minister; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Health and Wellbeing; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Higher Education; the Minister for Medical and Health Research; the Minister for Transport; the Minister for Vocational Education and Skills; the Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Events; the Minister for Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for Government Services and Procurement; the Minister for Urban Renewal; the Minister for City Services; the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Roads; the Treasurer; the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Attorney-General; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Chief Minister*):

- (1) What is the total number of occupational violence incidents reported in each area for which the Minister is responsible for each of the last five financial years.
- (2) In relation to part (1), what was (a) the total number and type of workers compensation claims that were made, (b) total number and type of workers compensation claims that were accepted and (c) the total value of compensation for claims related to occupational violence broken down by type.
- (3) What is the total number of bullying and harassment incidents reported in each area for which the Minister is responsible for each of the last five financial years.

- (4) In relation to part (3), what was (a) the total number and type of workers compensation claims that were made, (b) total number and type of workers compensation claims that were accepted and (c) the total value of compensation for claims related to bullying and harassment broken down by type.
- (5) What is the total number of mental stress incidents reported in each area for which the Minister is responsible for each of the last five financial years.
- (6) In relation to part (5), what was (a) the total number and type of workers compensation claims that were made, (b) total number and type of workers compensation claims that were accepted and (c) the total value of compensation for claims related to mental stress broken down by type.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The table at Attachment One includes the requested information.

Workers' compensation claim information is sourced from the Comcare workers' compensation claim database. Incident data is sourced from the ACT Government's Riskman system.

For comparative purposes, the workers' compensation data describes all psychological injury workers' compensation claims during the period in question and separates them into three categories, based on whether the injury in question is attributed to occupational violence, bullying and harassment or mental stress.

Results are subject to change over time due to data maturation.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

Government—roofing works (Question Nos 2238-2275)

Mr Coe asked the Chief Minister; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Health and Wellbeing; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Higher Education; the Minister for Medical and Health Research; the Minister for Transport; the Minister for Vocational Education and Skills; the Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts and Cultural Events; the Minister for Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for Government

Services and Procurement; the Minister for Urban Renewal; the Minister for City Services; the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Roads; the Treasurer; the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Attorney-General; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Chief Minister*):

What roof systems have been installed or roof rectification undertaken by or on behalf of the ACT Government, including works under \$25 000, for each of the last three financial years to date broken down by (a) directorate who authorised the works, (b) building subject to the works, (c) type of works undertaken, (d) value of the works, (e) method of procurement, (f) contractor name, (g) title of contract, (h) contract number and (i) period of contract.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

A whole of Government response has been provided in the attached spread sheet. This information excludes residential properties managed by ACT Housing.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

Municipal services—maintenance (Question No 2276)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Roads*):

How many complaints for each of the last five financial years have been received about the condition of the existing surface car park in relation to the unsealed surface of Angas Street carpark in Ainslie.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

TCCS Records indicate that there have been zero complaints about the condition of the existing surface car park in relation to the unsealed surface of Angas Street in the last five financial years. There have been a number of complaints received about other matters on Angas Street such as parking and line-marking.

Municipal services—maintenance (Question No 2277)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

What urban maintenance has been performed on the surrounding paths, nature strips, and unsealed areas of Angus Street in Ainslie since 1 January 2017, and (a) what work was undertaken, (b) the date the work (i) commence and (ii) was completed and (c) the cost of the works.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The gravel area used for parking was graded and sealed with a dust suppressant in February 2017, completed within one day at a cost of \$5,000.

Roads—Ainslie
(Question No 2278)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Roads, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) How long has the unsealed surface on or adjacent to Angas Street in Ainslie been used for car parking.
- (2) Has the ACT Government investigated or undertaken any reporting or assessments on the site; if so, (a) when was this undertaken, (b) what reporting or assessment was undertaken and (c) what were the results or findings.
- (3) For each of the last five financial years, what is (a) the number of square metres of the carpark on or adjacent to Angas Street that has been resealed as part of maintenance works and (b) what is the number of square metres of the carpark on or adjacent to Angas Street that needs to be sealed to have a fully sealed carpark area.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The gravel surface adjacent to Angas Street in Ainslie is not a designated official carpark, as per recordings in the Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) database. However, the surface has been used informally for this purpose over many years. The date from when parking occurred is not recorded.
 - (2) TCCS undertook a Feasibility Study for the upgrade of this site to a formal carpark. The study was completed in July 2017. It was recommended to upgrade the carpark.
 - (3) a) no sections of this informal parking area have been sealed in the last five financial years. The gravel area was graded and treated with a dust suppressant in 2016-17, however this is not technically classified as a seal which would typically include bitumen, chip seal or asphalt.

b) approximately 1500 square metres.
-

Planning—Ainslie
(Question No 2279)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Roads*):

- (1) What are the development plans for the unsealed Angas Street carpark in Ainslie within the next six months.
- (2) What are the costs associated with these plans.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The design for upgrading the unsealed surface (adjacent to Angas Street) into a formalised carpark is planned to be completed within the next six months.
 - (2) The estimated cost of the design only is approximately \$50,000.
-

**Government—staff wellbeing
(Question No 2284)**

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Have any incidents of self-harm or suicide reported by staff in each area for which the Minister is responsible been linked or related to bullying or cultural problems within the directorate during each of the last five financial years; if so, what was the, (a) general type of incident, (b) general category of employee, (c) financial year it occurred, (d) directorate it occurred in, (e) actions undertaken by the Minister in response to the report and (f) actions undertaken by the relevant directorate in response to the report.
- (2) Have any incidents of self-harm or suicide reported by patients or individuals in custody, or about patients or individuals in custody, in each area for which the Minister is responsible been linked or related to bullying or cultural problems within the directorate during each of the last five financial years; if so, what was the (a) general type of incident, (b) financial year it occurred, (c) directorate it occurred in, (d) actions undertaken by the Minister in response to the report and (e) actions undertaken by the relevant directorate in response to the report.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The Justice and Community Safety Directorate do not have any incidents of self-harm or suicide being reported within the directorate over the past five (5) financial years.
 2. There have been no reported incidents of self-harm or suicide by, or about, patients or individuals in custody that have been linked to bullying or cultural issues within Justice Health (Canberra Health Services) within the last five financial years.
-

**Economy—budget review
(Question No 2285)**

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What is the basis of the adjustments in relation to the Budget Review 2018-19, page 28 containing major technical adjustments to revenue from Large-scale Generation Certificates in 2018-19 (–\$62,010,000) and 2019-20 (–\$52,440,000).
- (2) What changes have occurred in the estimated number and value of certificates in the budget review compared with the budget.
- (3) What is the basis of the major revisions to the three lines (a) land revenue (net cash receipts)—\$169 335 000 to nil, (b) change in inventories: nil to \$135 444 000 and (c)

other movements in non-financial assets \$192 635 000 to \$128 109 000, in the Net Acquisition of Non-Financial Assets for 2018-19 in relation to the consolidated total territory operating statement on page 142 in the Budget Review 2018-19.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Adjustments made in the 2018-19 Budget Review to revenue from Large-scale Generation Certificates (LGCs) were primarily due to forward prices decreasing since the 2018-19 Budget, and also because of a reduction in the number of certificates expected to be generated by 30 June 2019. Forecast revenue to be received from the certificates each year is determined by prices for LGCs on the open market.
- (2)
 - a. **Estimated number of certificates** - there has been a downwards adjustment in the estimated number of certificates to be generated by 30 June 2019 from around 2,900,000 to 2,700,000.
 - b. **Value of certificates** - the estimated revenue associated with the receipt of certificates in the 2018-19 Budget Review has been based on market prices as at 14 January 2019. The forward prices affecting 2018-19 forecast revenue dropped from around \$80 per certificate at budget time to around \$44 per certificate at the time of the budget review. The forward prices affecting 2019-20 forecast revenue dropped from around \$48 per certificate at budget time to around \$25 per certificate at budget review. Revaluing the existing and expected future holdings of certificates based on market price is consistent with previous practice and based on the recommended accounting treatment.
- (3)
 - a) **The basis of the major revisions to land revenue (net cash receipts) – \$169,335,000 and b) the change in inventories: nil to \$135,444,000** - are due to a change in the measurement of *Net Acquisition of Non-Financial Assets* to include *Change in Inventories* and to remove *Land Revenue (Net Cash Receipts)*. This measurement was amended in the 2017-18 consolidated annual financial statements in accordance with the revised Australian Bureau of Statistics Government Finance Statistics Framework.
 - c) **The basis of other movements in non-financial assets from \$192,635,000 to \$128,109,000 in the Net Acquisition of Non-Financial Assets for 2018-19 in relation to the consolidated total territory operating statement on page 142 in the Budget Review 2018-19** - the \$64.5 million decrease in the 2018-19 Budget Review in *Other Movements in Non-Financial Assets* is mainly due to a reduction in the value of LGCs (\$62.0 million decrease) which reflect market prices as at 14 January 2019.

Heritage—cultural awareness (Question No 2286)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What weighting is given to the advice provided by Representative Aboriginal Organisations during a heritage assessment in relation to the proposed construction of a recreational bike track in Hall and powers of the ACT Heritage Council.

- (2) Was the option given to the Heritage Council by local Representative Aboriginal Organisations to develop guidelines for relocating any artefacts that were discovered; if so, why was this was not taken up or explored further.
- (3) What training do Heritage Council members receive in relation to indigenous heritage matters and cultural awareness.
- (4) Can the Minister provide examples of other heritage decisions that have overruled advice provided by Representative Aboriginal Organisations in the last five years; if so, can the Minister provide detail on the final outcome as a result of this decision to help set expectations for the community of Hall regarding the likelihood of seeing the bike track project delivered.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As required under the *Heritage Act 2004*, the Heritage Council consults with Representative Aboriginal Organisations (RAOs) on decisions affecting Aboriginal places and objects. The Heritage Council consulted directly with RAOs as part of its consideration of the recreational bike track in Hall, and available RAOs advised of their preference for the bike track to be located beyond the 'Aboriginal Sites Zone' to avoid cultural heritage impacts. The Heritage Council's decision reflects its consultation with RAOs and their views.
- (2) Conservation of Aboriginal places and objects is one of the functions of the Heritage Council. Enabling Aboriginal places and objects to remain in-situ is considered best practice heritage conservation management. As the proposed bike track could be constructed elsewhere the unnecessary permanent destruction of Aboriginal heritage was not supported. This is a good heritage conservation outcome.
- (3) The composition of the Heritage Council includes a representative of the Aboriginal community and expert members in the disciplines of Aboriginal culture, Aboriginal history and archaeology; who are experienced in Aboriginal heritage management.
- (4) As abovementioned, the Heritage Council consults with RAOs on decisions affecting Aboriginal places and objects and its decisions reflect this consultation. A revised proposal for a bike track within Hall has not been submitted to the Heritage Council or the ACT planning and land authority therefore I am unable to comment on an anticipated project completion date.

Municipal services—Hall bike track (Question No 2287)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) What progress has been made to reach a final decision, in conjunction with the ACT Heritage Council, on the location of the proposed recreational bike track in Hall.
- (2) What other sites have been considered for this project.
- (3) What advice has been provided regarding issues such as parking, road access and other facilities such as toilets and drinking fountains for alternative sites being considered for this project.

- (4) What consultation has been undertaken on alternative sites with the Hall community, Aboriginal stakeholders and heritage bodies to ensure that the issues around artefacts and protocols are not encountered.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) TCCS are continuing to facilitate an acceptable outcome for the proposed Hall Bike Trail working with the proponents in the community and the ACT Heritage Council. The proposed next steps include a co-design process to engage community members, including children. The co-design will provide a basis and direction for progressing the project including location, design, and cost estimates. The resulting concept plans will be made available for input by Hall residents, ACT Heritage and others with an interest in the proposal. Once feedback has been received further developed plans will be prepared to seek formal approval from ACT Heritage.
- (2) Six sites around the village of Hall were considered as part of the initial public consultation and only one was deemed fit for purpose at the time. A new location adjacent to the preferred location is currently being considered as part of the co design process, along with a reconsideration of the type of outcomes that would meet the community's needs while addressing Heritage matters.
- (3) TCCS considers that the provision of supporting infrastructure such as toilets, picnic facilities, drinking fountains and off-street parking will provide an opportunity to enhance the play experience, and would support a proposal such as the Hall Bike Trail. Opportunities to align proposed play spaces with existing infrastructure is generally supported to ensure the benefits of the investment is maximised.
- (4) Consultation on any alternative sites and the nature of the proposal will be undertaken with the proponents, the Hall community, the Village of Hall and District Progress Association, ACT Heritage and Registered Aboriginal Organisations following the outcome of the co design process.

Parking—Palmerston (Question No 2288)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) Is the Government planning to implement the changes to parking arrangements at Palmerston shops as put forward within the proposal consultation plan for Palmerston shops dated 3 July 2018 that was conducted by Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate.
- (2) If the Government is not planning to implement these changes, what are the reasons these changes cannot be accommodated.
- (3) If the Government is not planning to implement these changes, what other measures will be taken to increase the number of parking spaces in the area other than greater enforcement of car park restrictions.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes.

(2) Refer to answer 1.

(3) Refer to answer 1.

**Children and young people—therapeutic protection orders
(Question No 2289)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) How many applications for a therapeutic protection order were made in the years (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17, (e) 2017-18 and (f) 2018-19 (to date).
- (2) How many applications for a therapeutic protection order were granted and how many were rejected in the years (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17, (e) 2017-18 and (f) 2018-19 (to date).
- (3) How many therapeutic protection places are there, and where are they located.
- (4) What locations were declared as therapeutic places for the years (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17 and (e) 2017-18.
- (5) Which therapeutic protection places were used to carry out therapeutic protection orders in the years (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17, (e) 2017-18 and (f) 2018-19 (to date).
- (6) In the absence of a therapeutic protection place, how are the needs of those who are in need of a therapeutic protection order being met.
- (7) What alternatives to therapeutic protection orders are currently available to those whom the Director-General would deem applicable for a therapeutic protection order.
- (8) What alternatives are proposed to improve current practice.

Ms Stephen-Smith: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There were no applications made for a therapeutic protection order in the years 2013-14 to 2018-19 (to date).
- (2) See answer to question (1).
- (3) There are no Therapeutic Protection Places in the ACT, as defined by the *Children and Young People Act 2008*.
- (4) No locations have been declared as Therapeutic Protection Places during the timeframe outlined in the question, 2013-2019.
- (5) See answer to question (1) and (3).
- (6) The Community Services Directorate supports an individualised therapeutic response for each child or young person who requires an intensive service response as a result

of their complex behaviour. This involves a wraparound therapeutic care team that works closely with the child, and their family and/or carers, to ensure that appropriate supports are in place. This includes managing the safety of children and the community.

(7) The Government has established multiple service responses under *A Step Up for Our Kids* to support and respond to children who have experienced significant trauma as a result of abuse and neglect. These services include:

- a. Melaleuca Place, the ACT's Trauma Recovery Centre for children 12 years of age and under;
- b. ACT Together, specifically the Australian Childhood Foundation, which provides specialist trauma informed guidance to staff and carers;
- c. Therapeutic assessors who develop therapeutic plans for children and young people in care; and
- d. Therapeutic care teams to provide children who require intensive support with 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week care and support.

(8) As I informed the Legislative Assembly on 12 February 2019, I have asked the Community Services Directorate to work with the ACT Human Rights Commission to review the therapeutic protection provisions of the *Children and Young People Act 2008*, to develop options that align with best practice and contemporary knowledge.

The Community Services Directorate also continues to monitor the emerging evidence base around supporting children and young people who have experienced complex trauma, and seeks expert professional advice to inform care and safety plans for individual children and young people.

Children and young people—Melaleuca Place (Question No 2290)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) How many children and youth are currently receiving services at the Melaleuca Place Trauma Recovery Centre.
- (2) How many children and youth received services at Melaleuca Place in the year 2018 who are (a) 0-12 months, (b) 3-5 years, (c) 5-7 years, (d) 7-9 years and (e) 9-12 years.
- (3) How many staff are employed at Melaleuca Place, and what are each of their roles and responsibilities.
- (4) What services does Melaleuca Place provide, and which staff administer these services.
- (5) Are there any services provided by Melaleuca Place that are outsourced; if so, which services and who delivers them.

Ms Stephen-Smith: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 32 children are currently receiving services from Melaleuca Place.
- (2) Information is collected by Community Services Directorate under the following age groups.
 - a) 0 – 2 = 5 children
 - b) 3 – 4 = 15 children
 - c) 5 – 7 = 13 children
 - d) 8 – 9 = 6 children
 - e) 10 – 12 = 6 children

Total of 45 children in 2018.

- (3) There are five staff employed by Children, Youth and Families at Melaleuca Place. These are:
 - One Principal Therapist/Manager;
 - Three Psychologist/Social Worker positions; and
 - One Administrative Officer

The Education Directorate provides a Speech Pathologist (.2 FTE) and Occupational Therapist (.3 FTE) who provide speech and occupational therapy services to children who attend Melaleuca Place.

- (4) Staff at Melaleuca Place provide a range of services through a multi-disciplinary team and in line with their specialisation and expertise. These include:

Assessments

- Multi-modal, multi-method comprehensive biopsychosocial assessments;
- Neurosequential Model of Therapeutics (NMT) brain mapping;
- Cognitive assessments;
- Speech and language assessments;
- Sensory assessment;
- Fine Motor Skills assessment; and
- Functional assessments.

Therapy

- Play-informed therapy;
- Sand tray work (trauma processing);
- Interventions for sexualised behaviours;
- Parent education and coaching;
- Arousal reduction strategies for home and school;
- Dyadic Developmental Psychotherapy (DDP);
- Narrative/Life story work;
- Circle of Security Parenting Program (individual or group);
- Connect: Attachment-Based Group Parenting Program for Kinship Carers;
- Eye Movement Desensitisation Reprocessing (EMDR);
- Seasons for Growth Grief and Loss Group Program;
- Speech and Language strategies/interventions; and
- Sensory, fine motor skills, functional strategies/interventions.

Systemic

- Psychoeducation on trauma-targeted practice to the child's care team, including working with schools;
- Chair therapeutic care team meetings;
- Therapeutic consults for CYPS/other professionals; and
- Trauma-targeted training for professionals/agencies

(5) There are no services outsourced from Melaleuca Place.

**Roads—speed limits
(Question No 2291)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Roads*):

- (1) When was a speed survey last taken for Kerrigan Street, Dunlop and what were the findings.
- (2) Can a copy of the speed survey results and recommendations be provided as an attachment.
- (3) What actions will be undertaken by the ACT Government as a result of the survey findings.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The most recent speed survey on Kerrigan Street, Dunlop was completed in August 2017. The survey results indicated that the road carries about 4,934 vehicles per day travelling at an average speed of approximately 61 km/h.
- (2) A copy of the survey results is provided at [Attachment A](#).
- (3) Kerrigan Street was designed and constructed to perform the function of a major collector road within the ACT's road network, with a design capacity of 6,000 vehicles per day and a posted speed limit of 60km/h.

The survey results indicate the road is performing within capacity. The low-level speeding on the road (about 2% over the speed limit) will be managed through enforcement by ACT Policing and the Traffic Camera Office.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

**Roads—speed limits
(Question No 2292)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 15 February 2019:

- (1) How many reports were made to ACT Policing about speeding and other road safety concerns at Kerrigan Street, Dunlop for the years (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-19 (to date).

- (2) How many complaints via other means of contact to ACT Policing were made concerning speeding and road safety concerns at Kerrigan Street, Dunlop for the years (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-19 (to date).
- (3) How often is Kerrigan Street monitored by ACT Policing for speeding, dangerous driving behaviour and other road safety concerns and what measures are undertaken by ACT Policing as part of this monitoring.
- (4) What is the total number of road accidents at or near Kerrigan Street for the years (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-19 (to date).

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) ACT Policing have received the following numbers of reports of speeding and other road safety concerns on Kerrigan Street, Dunlop:
 - a. 2016-17 – 10 reports
 - b. 2017-18 – 14 reports
 - c. 2018-19 (as at 18 February 2019) – 6 reports
- (2) ACT Policing continue works with and encourages the community to identify and report traffic offenders, particularly those engage in dangerous and/or reckless behaviour on our roads. Reports of this nature are encouraged to be submitted through standardised reporting channels such as phone calls to Police Operations or Crime Stoppers which ensure accurate recording of reports. Where particular incidents or offences are identified and reported, these incidents are recorded on the Police Records Online Management Information System (PROMIS) as reported above at the response to question 1.

Policing, by its community focussed nature, requires proactive engagement with the community by other means outside of these standardised reporting channels. This contact may include face to face interactions (both ad-hoc and planned engagement events), written correspondence to office holders, Station Sergeants or individual officers, or verbal contact with any member of ACT Policing.

These interactions occur on a daily basis and cannot be definitively and accurately collated and reported within the terms of the question posed.

- (3) ACT Policing undertake routine patrols and target specific driving offences in response to operational priorities, reported concerns, developing trends, and the 2018-2019 Road Safety Calendar. Direct community engagement, high-visibility deterrence, enforcement of road laws and proactive policing are cornerstones of community policing and important components of reducing road trauma.

While ACT Policing can provide the number of individual reports received regarding a location [see above at Question 1], the fluid nature of the community policing environment precludes the identification of how many times police have attended a particular street for community engagement, high-visibility patrols, or community policing patrol.

ACT Policing advises the following number of Traffic Infringement Notices and Cautions were issued on Kerrigan Street, Dunlop:

	Traffic Infringement Notices	Cautions
2016-17	38	13
2017-18	13	6
2018-19 (to date)	10	10

- (4) Not all vehicle collisions in the ACT are reported to police or require a police attendance. Where a collision is minor in nature, does not involve injury or affect traffic flow, members of the public are obliged to self-report the collision through an online reporting mechanism.

ACT Government records indicate the following collision data for Kerrigan Street, Dunlop:

Year	Property Damage	Injury	Fatal	Total number of crashes
2016	8	1	0	9
2017	7	0	0	7
2018*	4	1	0	5
2019*	2	0	0	2

*Preliminary data

Roads—school crossing supervisor program (Question No 2294)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What is the current status of the school crossing supervisor scheme; if the scheme has not been fully implemented, when is the expected completion date for the rollout of the scheme.
- (2) Can the Minister list all (a) schools, (b) crossings and (c) locations that have had supervisors deployed to them.
- (3) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of (a) hours, (b) number of supervisors and (c) costs per supervisor.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The School Crossing Supervisor program commenced at 20 crossings in February 2018. An additional five supervisors commenced at the beginning of the 2019 school year to support the new integrated transport network.
- (2) School crossing supervisors are located at the schools/crossings listed below.

School	Crossing	Location (between streets)
Amaroo School	Pedestrian crossing	Katherine Ave (Pioneer St & Mornington St)
Brindabella Christian College	Pedestrian crossing	Brigalow St (Boyd St & Longstaff St)
Canberra Grammar School (2019)	Children's crossing	Monaro Cres (Flinders Way & Golden Grove)

School	Crossing	Location (between streets)
Canberra Girls Grammar School	Children's crossing	Grey St (Robe St & Empire Cct)
Chapman Primary School	Children's crossing	Streeton Dr (Darwinia Terrace & Fremantle Dr)
Duffy Primary (2019)	Children's crossing	Burrinjuck Cres (Jindabyne St & Somerset St)
Florey Primary School	Children's crossing	Ratcliffe Crescent (Krefft St & Kesteven St)
Forrest Primary School	Children's crossing	National Cct (Hobart Ave & Franklin St)
Garran Primary School	Children's crossing	Gilmore Cres (Palmer St and Esson Pl)
Gold Creek School & Holy Spirit Primary School	Children's crossing	Kelleway Ave (Oldershaw Ct & Whatmore Ct)
Good Shepherd Primary (2019)	Children's crossing	Burdekin Ave (Yule St & Leven St)
Harrison School	Pedestrian crossing	Wimmera St (Varne St & Topra St)
Hughes Primary School	Children's crossing	Groom St (Whittle St & Wark St)
Lyneham Primary School	Pedestrian crossing	Brigalow St (Hall St & Longstaff St)
Majura Primary School	Pedestrian crossing	Knox St (Windeyer St & Harvey St)
Mother Teresa School	Children's crossing	Mapleton Ave (Otway St & Wimmera St)
Namadgi School	Children's crossing	O'Halloran Cct (Jenke Cct & Jenke Cct)
Ngunnawal Primary School	Children's crossing	Wanganeen Ave (Yumba Ave & Guginya Cres)
Red Hill Primary School	Children's crossing	La Perouse St (Fortitude St & Dalrymple St)
St Clare of Assisi Primary	Children's crossing	Box Hill Ave (Heidelberg St & Handasyde St)
St Francis of Assisi Primary & Calwell High (2019)	Children's crossing	Casey Cres (Were St & Loader Cres)
Sts Peter & Paul & Malkara School	Pedestrian crossing	Wisdom St (Webster St & Boake Pl)
Torrens Primary (2019)	Children's crossing	Beasley St (Gouger St & Torrens Pl)
Trinity Christian School	Children's crossing	McBride Cr (Bromley St & Mackinnon St)
Turner School	Pedestrian crossing	David St (Hay St & Sargood St)

(3)

(a) School crossing supervisors work for an hour each morning and an hour each afternoon around the school bell times. The exact timing varies at each school to suit their individual needs, but generally supervisors start 45 minutes before the bell in the morning and 15 minutes before the bell in the afternoon.

(b) There are 27 supervisors deployed across 25 crossings, with two supervisors working at Hughes Primary and Namadgi School to manage crossings with wide median strips.

(c) The annual cost to the Territory to deliver each crossing supervisor in 2018-19 is \$19,244, which includes the recruitment, training, rostering, uniforms, equipment, incident reporting and educating school communities about the program.

Transport—infrastructure maintenance (Question No 2295)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What is the annual cost of maintaining the current (a) bus interchanges and (b) bus depots, across Canberra.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of maintenance costs from 2010-2018 per (a) bus interchange and (b) depot, and include any (i) major upgrades or (ii) repair works completed.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

In relation to questions 1 (a) & 2 (a) bus interchange has been interpreted to include both bus stations and interchanges.

- (1) a) The cost of maintaining the current bus interchanges is:

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19 Jan YTD
\$74,795	\$155,328	\$64,850

Note: the above maintenance costs exclude asset cleaning costs

- b) The cost to maintain bus depots (including workshops) is:

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Depots	\$ 1,011,670	\$ 499,354	\$ 462,861	\$ 587,712	\$ 859,494	\$ 741,584
Workshops	\$ 528,272	\$ 207,008	\$ 252,120	\$ 173,930	\$ 285,918	\$ 313,030

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19 Jan YTD
Depots	\$ 606,761	\$ 569,838	\$ 317,736
Workshops	\$ 335,992	\$ 366,243	\$ 186,456

Note: the above maintenance costs incorporate depots and workshops maintenance and cleaning costs

- (2) a) Due to changes in the coding of maintenance expenditure data, annual costs for maintaining ACT Government owned bus stops and interchanges is unable to be disaggregated prior to the 2016-17 financial year.

Currently, maintenance cost data is not collected at the level of individual bus facilities. Below are the annual costs for maintaining ACT Government owned bus depots and interchanges:

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19 Jan YTD
\$74,795	\$155,328	\$64,850

Note: the above maintenance costs exclude asset cleaning costs

- b) The costs in relation to bus depot maintenance including repair works completed (ii) (excluding capital upgrades) were:

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Belconnen Depot	\$ 693,878	\$ 307,102	\$ 291,778	\$ 364,775	\$ 527,520	\$ 472,545
Tuggeranong Depot	\$ 317,791	\$ 192,253	\$ 171,083	\$ 222,937	\$ 331,974	\$ 269,039
Belconnen Workshop	\$ 210,067	\$ 66,160	\$ 59,780	\$ 67,644	\$ 160,705	\$ 176,337
Tuggeranong Workshop	\$ 318,205	\$ 140,848	\$ 192,340	\$ 106,285	\$ 125,214	\$ 136,693

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19 Jan YTD
Belconnen Depot	\$ 376,966	\$ 319,691	\$ 193,568
Tuggeranong Depot	\$ 229,796	\$ 250,148	\$ 124,168
Belconnen Workshop	\$ 223,303	\$ 191,538	\$ 114,466
Tuggeranong Workshop	\$ 112,689	\$ 174,705	\$ 71,990

In relation to question 2(i) major upgrades for interchanges and depots are not able to be disaggregated by location and may include upgrades for other transport infrastructure not related to bus interchanges or depots such as suburban bus stops. A list of major upgrades >\$250k is provided at [Attachment A](#).

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

ACTION bus service—network (Question No 2296)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) How many (a) primary-school and (b) high-school students will be required to use interchanges to get to and from school under Network 19.
- (2) What is the cost per extra staff member employed to accommodate the extra patronage at bus changes.
- (3) What assumptions are these figures calculated on.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) It is not possible to provide a figure as it will depend upon individual travel choices. However, in the existing network, around 30% of trips made by students on school days involve changing buses.
- (2) Transport Canberra is recruiting Customer Service Assistants (CSAs), to assist customers at a number of transport interchanges as part of the initial stages of the new network.

CSAs will generally be rostered in two shifts on weekdays to coincide with the presence of students – a morning shift from 7am to 11am, and an afternoon shift from 2pm to 6pm.

Based on an hourly rate for an ASO 2 classification, this option would cost \$35 per hour as a base rate (includes 25% casual loading, excludes superannuation).

(3) No assumptions have been made in this response.

**Government—grants
(Question No 2300)**

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What grants and/or Government initiatives, if any, are available to ACT based businesses that manufacture steel products.
- (2) For each grant and/or initiative what (a) are the details, (b) application process and (c) eligibility criteria.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There are no specific ACT Government grants or initiatives aimed at steel fabrication products or services. The Government funds two grant programs that focus on attracting investment and encouraging commercialisation:
 - The Priority Investment Program (PIP) seeks to drive collaboration between the ACT Government, industry, research and the tertiary sectors to enable investment and grow established and emerging priority sectors of Canberra's economy; and
 - The Innovation Connect proof-of-concept grants program, delivered in partnership with the CBR Innovation Network, is an early stage commercialisation program that supports start-ups to develop a novel product or solution through the early development phase.

The Australian Government supports programs to assist Australia's manufacturing sector to transition towards advanced manufacturing, embracing new technologies and developing innovative products and services. Further details on Australian Government programs and initiatives available for Australian manufacturers can be found at www.industry.gov.au/topic/funding-and-incentives/manufacturing.

- (2) More information on the ACT Government's PIP program, including the program guidelines, application process and eligibility criteria is publicly available at www.business.act.gov.au/grants-and-assistance/grants/priority-investment-program.

More information on the ACT Government's Innovation Connect program delivered in partnership with CBR Innovation Network, including the program guidelines, application process and eligibility criteria is publicly available at www.cbrin.com.au/icon.

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—reintegration centre
(Question No 2302)**

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) Which cohorts of inmates at the Alexander Maconochie Centre will be eligible to be housed in the proposed reintegration centre.
- (2) What other requirements will inmates have to meet in order to be eligible to be housed in the reintegration centre.
- (3) What is the rationale for the reintegration centre being available to only male detainees, rather than both males and females.

Mr Rattenbury: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The new reintegration centre will be a minimum security centre and will cater for detainees who are classified as minimum or low risk.
2. The eligibility guidelines for the reintegration centre have not been developed. The current eligibility criteria for the Transitional Release Centre considers many factors including:
 - Time remaining on sentence;
 - Security rating and risk;
 - Discipline record;
 - Completion of programs; and
 - Impact on victims
3. The mid 2018/19 budget allocated ACTCS design and planning funding to commence work towards the reintegration centre. This design work will finalise the ACTCS operating model which includes how the cohorts mix along with security elements and classification. While current planning for the reintegration centre relates to the male cohort, options are also being considered with regard to female detainees. A key issue would be ensuring the safety of female detainees.

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—interstate transfers
(Question No 2308)**

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

In relation to question on notice No 1838 part (2), is the \$586.36 cost the daily cost for each of the two detainees transferred to the custody of New South Wales, or the total daily cost for both the detainees.

Mr Rattenbury: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The cost for the detainee transferred to NSW in 2018 is \$586.36 exc GST per day. The cost for the detainee transferred to NSW in 2014 was \$316.26 exc GST per day. The cost varies depending on an individual's security classification and associated risks.

For clarification, while the two detainees were transferred to the custody of a receiving jurisdiction in accordance with Section 26 of the *Crimes (Sentence Administration) Act 2005*, their sentences were not transferred. In instances of sentence transfer, the receiving jurisdiction accepts all costs.

ACT Health—organisational changes (Question No 2316)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) Will the restructure of Canberra Health Services proceed, as planned, on 1 March 2019; if not, why.
- (2) Under the restructure (a) will any (i) officer, or (ii) executive positions in Canberra Health Services, be declared redundant; if so, how many of each, (b) how many contracts for Canberra Health Services executives will not be renewed, (c) how many new executive positions will be created and (d) what recruitment processes and arrangements will be employed to fill those new positions.
- (3) How many Canberra Health Services executives have been newly appointed since 1 January 2019.
- (4) Why is Canberra Health Services being restructured, given the new structure has been in place only since October 2018.
- (5) How much will the March 2019 restructure of Canberra Health Services cost.
- (6) Will the cost of the restructure of Canberra Health Services be met from internal resources.
- (7) What issues remain unresolved after the October 2018 restructure and (a) when will each of these issues be resolved, (b) how will they be resolved and (c) by when will they be resolved.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes, it did, and is being implemented progressively.
- (2) (a) (i) No
(ii) No
(b) 2
(c) 2
(d) A National recruitment process has been undertaken to fill vacancies.
- (3) 3
- (4) Canberra Health Services is being restructured to;
 - a. ensure that similar functions that work together closely are aligned under the same reporting lines;

- b. ensure greater clarification of roles, functions and relationships across CHS;
 - c. enable a more streamlined delivery of quality public health services; and
 - d. reduce duplication and improve accountability for operational service delivery and quality and standards management.
- (5) The consultation process for the new structure has just been finalised and there will be a review by the divisions to identify any gaps in resourcing. As such a costing at the present time is not possible.
- (6) Yes, all costs associated with the implementation of the 2019 restructure of CHS are funded from within the existing CHS staffing budgets.
- (7) To ensure CHS has an optimum structure for the delivery of health services further work may be undertaken once the executive structure has been settled.

ACT Health—organisational changes (Question No 2317)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What buildings are on the site of the proposed Surgical Procedures, Interventional Radiology and Emergency (SPIRE) project.
- (2) Which health services, including administrative services, currently use these buildings.
- (3) When will these buildings be (a) vacated and (b) demolished.
- (4) What consultation has occurred with these health services, including administrative services, about relocation.
- (5) To where will the health services, including administrative services that are housed in these buildings currently, be re-located.
- (6) Will these new locations be permanent; if not (a) what will be their tenancy; and (b) where will they located permanently.
- (7) Has a new site been identified for the Child at Risk Health Unit.
- (8) When will the Child at Risk Health Unit move to its proposed new site.
- (9) What arrangements will be in place to minimise any disruption to the Child at Risk Health Unit.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Building 5 and Building 24.
- (2) Services impacted by the decision to demolish Buildings 5 and 24 are:
 - a. CH executive officers and support staff
 - b. Nursing clinical executive and support staff
 - c. Director Allied Health and support staff

- d. Office of Research
 - e. Emergency Management Unit
 - f. Quality Improvement program and divisional support staff
 - g. Staff Development
 - h. Clinical Skills Unit (ANU)
 - i. Tissue Viability unit
 - j. Accommodation & Volunteers
 - k. Sexual Health Unit
 - l. Child and Risk Health Unit
 - m. Education & Training Rooms
 - n. ANU Research Unit
 - o. ANU Australian Child & Adolescent Training Loss & Grief Network
 - p. ANU patient recruitment Office
 - q. ANU IT Workshop
- (3) These buildings will be progressively vacated between now and the construction commencement of SPIRE. Detailed planning to relocate occupants and services from Buildings 5 and 24 has commenced.
- (4) Consultation is ongoing in relation to the relocation of services, and all included areas have been involved in the development of decant planning, with coordination through Canberra Health Services executive.
- (5) The decanting strategy is still under development. There has been no final decision on the relocation at this stage.
- (6) Please see answer to question 5.
- (7) Please see answer to question 5.
- (8) Please see answer to question 5.
- (9) As with any hospital project involving a clinical service relocation, careful consideration will be given to the building and clinical commissioning of the new space, with an emphasis on minimising disruption to the service and their patients.

**Canberra—Enlighten festival
(Question No 2321)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Tourism and Special Events, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What proportion of entertainment is being provided by local artists at this year's Enlighten Festival.
- (2) Was a women's safety assessment undertaken for this event in line with the Women's Plan.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A significant focus for this year's Enlighten Festival has been ensuring participation opportunities for local artists and performers, with local content comprising approximately 88 percent of the entertainment program.

- (2) Yes. A Women's Safety Audit has been undertaken for the events that Events ACT are responsible for as part of the 2019 Enlighten Festival, including Enlighten Illuminations, Lights!Canberra!Action!, Symphony in the Park, Canberra Day and the Canberra Balloon Spectacular.

**Municipal services—trees
(Question No 2322)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What compliance action has taken place in regard to the removal of large established trees on 4 October 2016 that were cut down without approval at Brindabella Christian College.
- (2) Was a penalty was applied to Brindabella Christian College for the removal of these trees; if there has been no penalty applied, why not; if there has yet to be a penalty applied over two years later, why not.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A preliminary investigation was undertaken by Access Canberra.
- (2) No penalty was applied. Conditions of approval were imposed on the development application submitted by Brindabella Christian College (BCC). These conditions require BCC to replant four advanced trees on the southern boundary of the site at the completion of construction works. Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) has provided recommendations for the species selection and placement of the trees and has arranged to be present to ensure planting is undertaken to specifications. The construction compound currently obstructing the planting location is due to be removed in March 2019, with the trees to be planted subsequently during autumn.

**Planning—Coombs and Wright
(Question No 2323)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) How many types of development applications to vary a lease to increase the maximum number of dwellings permitted, in the suburbs of Coombs and Wright have been received each year since 2016 and (a) how many have been approved, (b) what is the total number of additional dwellings approved, (c) how many of these have been rejected and (d) how many of these are still being assessed and of these what are the DA numbers with block and section details.
- (2) What parts of the Territory Plan and the Planning and Development Act 2007 are these types of development application assessed against.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. Two have been lodged.
 - (a) one has been approved.
 - (b) one.
 - (c) one (83 additional dwellings).
 - (d) none.
 2. Relevant Residential Codes in Part 3 and the Leasing General Code.
-

**Public housing—air conditioning
(Question No 2325)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) Is it possible for Housing ACT tenants to purchase and install their own air conditioning units in properties that do not have air conditioning.
- (2) What is the application and approval process for tenants wishing to purchase and install their own air conditioning unit.
- (3) Can tenants purchase any model they choose, or are there restrictions on the type of unit; if there are restrictions, where can tenants find this information.
- (4) Is there a policy regarding the timeframe for replying to tenants regarding applications for the installation of their own air conditioners; if not, can the Minister provide information on the typical time for processing such applications.
- (5) How many Housing ACT tenants have applied to install their own air conditioning units in each of the last three years that data is available for, broken down by the type of dwelling.
- (6) Are there restrictions on the purchase and installation of own air conditioning units purchased by public housing tenants based on the type of dwelling they live in, for example multi-unit apartments, or dwellings in a mixed tenure development where there is an owners corporation.
- (7) Has Housing ACT requested permission from an owners corporation in a multi-unit development for an air conditioning unit to be installed, either (a) by Housing ACT on behalf of a tenant or (b) where the air conditioning unit has been purchased by the tenant themselves.
- (8) Are tenants able to choose their own contractor to install air conditioning units, or does Housing ACT stipulate a particular contractor or contractors; if Housing ACT requires that a certain air conditioning installer be used, can the Minister provide information about (a) the typical cost to tenants, (b) the waiting times for installation when using these installers and (c) whether Housing ACT tenants liaise directly with the installer or whether this is done on their behalf by Housing ACT.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes, Tenants may purchase and install air conditioning in their homes. Housing ACT in partnership with ActewAGL are installing split system heaters / air conditioners

under the Energy Efficiency Improvement Scheme funded through the 2018-19 ACT Budget. This program will replace 2,000 units over the next 3 years at no cost to the tenant and as at the start of March 2019, the program has already replaced 136 inefficient gas heaters.

- (2) A request to modify a public housing property is required, which is a short form that tenants may submit to their Housing Manager. The information required includes the type and location of the installation. Housing ACT will review the request taking into consideration safety, impact on neighbouring properties and planning approvals (if any).
- (3) Tenants can install any air conditioning unit they wish so long as the installation is compliant with regulation including the use of licenced tradespersons where required and with consideration to the impact on neighbouring properties, e.g. noise.
- (4) There is no policy with regards to timeframes for replying to tenants. Housing ACT aims to respond as quickly as possible. Generally, responses are within two working days.
- (5) In total 370 applications were received by Housing ACT since 2016 as outlined below:

Dwelling Type	2016	2017	2018	2019	TOTALS
Flats	29	49	39	28	145
Houses	46	72	62	32	212
Narrabundah Long Stay Caravan Park	1	-	1	-	2
Townhouses	2	4	4	1	11
TOTALS	78	125	106	61	370

- (6) Sometimes there maybe restrictions dependent on the location and individual layout of units within a complex.
- (7) Housing ACT always approaches the Body Corporate management for approval on behalf of the tenants in multi-unit complexes.
- (8) When a tenant chooses to install an air conditioner they are required to engage an appropriate contractor, and this is done at their own discretion. Housing ACT does not require that a tenant use a particular contractor or contractors.

Municipal services—trees (Question No 2326)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What investigation activities have taken place looking into possible damage of the registered plane tree on Franklin Street, Manuka which may have been damaged by a trench.
- (2) Have investigators visited the site.

- (3) Are investigations for this tree being given reduced priority because a development application has been approved that allows for its removal.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Onsite inspections were undertaken on 8 January 2019 and again on 8 February 2019. Testing for the presence of poisons was undertaken in February 2019.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) A development application was approved on 10 October 2018 with the caveat that approval does not take effect unless the registration of the tree has been cancelled. A cancellation of a registered tree is a matter for the Conservator of Flora and Fauna and is still under consideration. Regardless, the presence of a development application would not affect the investigation into any suspected tree poisonings.

Government—taxes and charges (Question No 2330)

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of the total number of (a) objections received by the ACT Revenue Office by type, such as rates and land tax and the (b) appeals lodged by type, during each of the following financial years (i) 2017-18 and (ii) 2018-19 to date.
- (2) Of the number of the objections lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), please provide the number and type of objections that were (a) allowed or part allowed, (b) disallowed, (c) withdrawn, (d) outstanding or (e) any other relevant category.
- (3) Of the number of the appeals lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), please provide the number and type of appeals that were (a) allowed or part allowed, (b) settled, (c) dismissed, (d) outstanding or (e) any other relevant category.
- (4) What was the (a) minimum, (b) median, (c) average, and (d) maximum amount of time it took to process or complete (i) objections and (ii) appeals broken down by type for each of the last five financial years to date.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) **Objections received** – lodged during 2017-18 and 2018-19 (to 22 February 2019)

(a) Table 1: Number of objections, by type

Year	Duty	FHOG	HBC	Land Rent	Land Tax	Payroll Tax	Rates	UV's	Total
2017-18	18	7	29	1	284	15	19	84	457
2018-19	14	4	19	0	146	9	26	138	356

(b) Table 2: Number of appeals, by type

Year	Duty	FHOG	HBC	Land Rent	Land Tax	Payroll Tax	Rates	UV's	Total
2017-18	1	0	2	1	6	7	0	*11	28
2018-19	0	0	2	0	7	0	2	*3	14

*Includes one lease variation charge appeal.

(2) **Objection outcomes** – lodged during 2017-18 and 2018-19 (to 22 February 2019)Table 3: Outcome of **duty** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	6	7	5	0	18
2018-19	1	2	0	11	14

Table 4: Outcome of **first home owner grant** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	2	5	0	0	7
2018-19	0	0	0	4	4

Table 5: Outcome of **home buyer concession** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	5	24	0	0	29
2018-19	0	8	0	11	19

Table 6: Outcome of **land rent** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	0	1	0	0	1
2018-19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Table 7: Outcome of **land tax** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	17	266	1	0	284
2018-19	1	54	1	90	146

Table 8: outcome of **payroll tax** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	2	13	0	0	15
2018-19	0	0	0	9	9

Table 9: Outcome of **rates** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	5	14	0	0	19
2018-19	1	5	2	18	26

Table 10: Outcome of **unimproved value** objections

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Disallowed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	29	48	6	1	84
2018-19	8	54	5	71	138

(3) **Appeal outcomes** – lodged during 2017-18 and 2018-19 (to 22 February 2019)Table 11: Outcome of **duty** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	0	0	1	0	0	1
2018-19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Table 12: Outcome of **first home owner grant** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
2018-19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Table 13: Outcome of **home buyer concession** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	0	0	2	0	0	2
2018-19	0	0	2	0	0	2

Table 14: Outcome of **land rent** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	0	0	1	0	0	1
2018-19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Table 15: Outcome of **land tax** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	2	2	2	0	0	6
2018-19	0	2	1	1	3	7

Table 16: Outcome of **payroll tax** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	0	0	1	4	2	7
2018-19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

Table 17: Outcome of **rates** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
2018-19	0	0	0	1	1	2

Table 18: Outcome of **unimproved value** appeals

Year	Allowed or Part Allowed	Settled	Dismissed	Withdrawn	Outstanding	Total
2017-18	0	*4	3	3	1	11
2018-19	0	1	0	0	*2	3

*Includes one lease variation charge appeal.

(4) (i) Completion times – ObjectionsTable 19: Time (in days) for completion of **duty** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	9	45	181	225	*460
2015-16	9	80	179	157	197
2016-17	12	64	168	147	182
2017-18	13	9	155	138	218
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	10	78	167	160	183

*Includes time waiting for taxpayer information (over 3 months).

Table 20: Time (in days) for completion of **first home owner grant** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	13	18	89	92	184
2015-16	11	64	114	136	263
2016-17	12	91	137	137	181
2017-18	5	33	140	123	183
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	3	164	184	386	*810

*Placed on hold due to related court case at applicant's request.

Table 21: Time (in days) for completion of **home buyer concession** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	14	35	97	115	184
2015-16	14	64	111	119	182
2016-17	8	29	136	123	177
2017-18	17	33	157	144	172
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	20	6	142	125	295

Table 22: Time (in days) for completion of **land rent** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	4	149	171	178	220
2015-16	5	43	122	111	181
2016-17	2	77	78	78	79
2017-18	1	118	118	118	118
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 23: Time (in days) for completion of **land tax** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	144	11	163	150	230
2015-16	176	20	156	135	263
2016-17	134	1	117	113	223
2017-18	171	7	140	135	216
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	205	11	153	148	219

Table 24: Time (in days) for completion of **payroll tax** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	19	85	167	213	*551
2015-16	50	34	161	**705	**2,762
2016-17	18	4	84	85	173
2017-18	30	2	167	166	321
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	3	98	104	122	163

*Included 4 months waiting for objector's information.

**16 objections were on hold for several years awaiting outcome of related ACAT matters.

Table 25: Time (in days) for completion of **rates** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	6	1	83	69	107
2015-16	13	15	121	95	161
2016-17	11	9	120	115	183
2017-18	19	3	139	124	180
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	14	70	164	156	230

Table 26: Time (in days) for completion of **unimproved value** objections that were completed in each financial year

Year	Objections (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	74	10	57	96	478
2015-16	55	9	40	42	90
2016-17	79	3	56	93	*952
2017-18	82	2	54	73	330
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	71	19	148	136	274

*Due to time waiting outcome of related ACAT dispute.

(4) (ii) **Completion times – Appeals**

Table 27: Time (in days) for completion of **duty** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	5	74	84	118	268
2015-16	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	2	19	87	87	154
2017-18	2	99	189	189	279
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 28: Time (in days) for completion of **first home owner grant** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	5	81	103	131	255
2015-16	1	219	219	219	219
2016-17	1	128	128	128	128
2017-18	2	176	176	176	176
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 29: Time (in days) for completion of **home buyer concession** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	4	39	171	162	266
2015-16	1	219	219	219	219
2016-17	2	63	96	96	128
2017-18	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	4	40	83	76	97

Table 30: Time (in days) for completion of **land rent** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015-16	1	23	23	23	23
2016-17	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2017-18	1	105	105	105	105
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 31: Times (in days) for completion of **land tax** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	13	51	114	109	124
2015-16	13	63	126	157	308
2016-17	9	46	103	137	307
2017-18	4	16	155	130	194
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	9	30	127	130	258

Table 32: Time (in days) for completion of **payroll tax** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	4	137	184	319	772
2015-16	13	91	192	312	548
2016-17	3	45	76	188	442
2017-18	1	770	770	770	770
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	5	118	284	255	297

Table 33: Time (in days) for completion of **rates** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	2	89	103	103	117
2015-16	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	1	44	44	44	44
2017-18	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	1	138	138	138	138

Table 34: Time (in days) for completion of **unimproved value** appeals that were completed in each financial year

Year	Appeals (No.)	Minimum	Median	Average	Maximum
2014-15	28	11	114	160	368
2015-16	6	90	289	431	1,071
2016-17	6	91	381	334	482
2017-18	*11	11	60	97	329
2018-19 (to 22/02/2019)	2	64	95	95	126

*Includes one lease variation charge appeal.

ACT Health—workplace culture (Question No 2331)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) How many (a) individuals and (b) organisations that provided submissions indicated they would happy to communicate further about their submission in relation to the Interim Report into the workplace culture within ACT public health services.
- (2) In relation to part (1), how many (a) individuals and (b) organisations were communicated with broken down by type of further communication.
- (3) How many (a) individuals and (b) organisations who made submissions to the review been identified by the ACT Government by their (i) submission, (ii) the reviewer or (iii) through any other means.
- (4) How has the ACT Government followed up on the submissions made to the review to date.
- (5) How does the ACT Government intend to follow up on the submissions made to the review in the future.

Mr Rattenbury: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Office of the Review have advised that individuals and organisations were not specifically asked if they would be happy to communicate further about their submission in relation to the Interim Report. The submission form did not ask this question.
- (2) Nil
- (3) The protection of people's confidentiality and privacy is paramount to the Independent Panel and Office of the Review. All submissions were accepted and dealt with in accordance with the requests of those that made the submission.

The Office of the Review have advised that in a small number of cases the Review referred specific matters individuals had raised (including their identity) to the Director General (DG) ACT Health, and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Canberra Health Services (CHS) where the individual/s agreed to that information being provided.

Some Organisations chose to make their submissions public. Excerpts from these submissions were included in the Interim Report.

- (4) The Review of Culture was established as an Independent Review. The ACT Government has not been provided with copies of individual submissions made to the Review Panel. This is completely appropriate, particularly given the Government's intention that the privacy of individuals was maintained throughout the Review process.

The Review Panel has, in a small number of cases, referred to the relevant Director General or Chief Executive Officer specific matters which have been raised by individuals. The information provided was done so with the approval of the individual/s involved. These matters are being confidentially and sensitively handled (within existing complaints management processes) by the relevant organisation to ensure the upmost privacy is maintained.

- (5) Refer to Question 4.

ACT Health—workplace culture (Question No 2332)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) How many (a) individuals and (b) organisations that provided submissions indicated they would happy to communicate further about their submission in relation to the Interim Report into the workplace culture within ACT public health services.
- (2) In relation to part (1), how many (a) individuals and (b) organisations were communicated with broken down by type of further communication.
- (3) How many (a) individuals and (b) organisations who made submissions to the review been identified by the ACT Government by their (i) submission, (ii) the reviewer or (iii) through any other means.
- (4) How has the ACT Government followed up on the submissions made to the review to date.
- (5) How does the ACT Government intend to follow up on the submissions made to the review in the future.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Office of the Review have advised that individuals and organisations were not specifically asked if they would be happy to communicate further about their submission in relation to the Interim Report. The submission form did not ask this question.
- (2) Nil

- (3) The protection of people's confidentiality and privacy is paramount to the Independent Panel and Office of the Review. All submissions were accepted and dealt with in accordance with the requests of those that made the submission.

The Office of the Review have advised that in a small number of cases the Review referred specific matters individuals had raised (including their identity) to the Director General (DG) ACT Health, and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Canberra Health Services (CHS) where the individual/s agreed to that information being provided.

Some Organisations chose to make their submissions public. Excerpts from these submissions were included in the Interim Report.

- (4) The Review of Culture was established as an Independent Review. The ACT Government has not been provided with copies of individual submissions made to the Review Panel. This is completely appropriate, particularly given the Government's intention that the privacy of individuals was maintained throughout the Review process.

The Review Panel has, in a small number of cases, referred to the relevant Director General or Chief Executive Officer specific matters which have been raised by individuals. The information provided was done so with the approval of the individual/s involved. These matters are being confidentially and sensitively handled (within existing complaints management processes) by the relevant organisation to ensure the upmost privacy is maintained.

- (5) Refer to Question 4.

Animals—cat containment (Question No 2334)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What measures is the Government taking to enforce cat containment requirements in the Gungahlin District.
- (2) How are the consequences for non-observance of cat containment requirements currently enforced in the Gungahlin District.
- (3) How many cats found roaming in cat containment areas in the Gungahlin District have been seized by Transport Canberra and City Services rangers since January 1 2018.
- (4) How many infringement notices have been issued since January 1 2018 to individuals in the Gungahlin District for not complying with cat containment requirements.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Managing cats is the responsibility of the pet owner and TCCS takes an educational approach to managing cat containment through providing advice to residents via individual inquiries and through the TCCS website.

Residents of cat containment suburbs are made aware of the status of their suburb in the early stages of considering whether to purchase a home in these suburbs.

Signage is provided in all cat containment suburbs, advising of the cat containment status and the responsibilities of owners.

- (2) Consequences for non-observance of cat containment requirements are dealt with in a consistent approach across Canberra.

Requests for compliance action in relation to cat containment are triaged according to the 'risk of harms' model whereby threats to public safety are given the highest priority. As a result, managing dog-related incidents takes precedence over cat containment matters, as they are usually considered an animal nuisance issue.

Residents concerned about non-compliance are advised to speak to the owners if the identity of the cat is known and advised of the option to trap cats on their own land.

Where owners are identified, they are advised of their obligations to comply with cat containment and management.

TCCS supports RSPCA ACT in its efforts to manage cat populations through education and de-sexing programs and provides significant funding to RSPCA for cat management activities including rehoming.

- (3) None.

- (4) None.

Sport—indoor sports facility (Question No 2335)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) When will the Indoor Sports Feasibility Study be made available for sporting groups currently managing a shortage of facilities.
- (2) Why has community consultation for the Indoor Sports Feasibility Study only focused on a small number of sports, such as Futsal, Gymnastics and Basketball.
- (3) Is it acceptable for local sporting groups to have to turn away interested players due to a lack of facilities.
- (4) Will the Minister commit to building an indoor sports facility.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The Planning for Indoor Facilities and other Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Report will be released this financial year.

2. An earlier study, the ACT Indoor Sports Facility Report (released in January 2016), determined there were insufficient facilities available to basketball, futsal and gymnastics to meet current and future demand, which is why these sports were the primary focus of the current study. Each of these sports have high participation rates and utilise a large number of existing indoor sport facilities across the ACT. It is expected that by addressing the future facility needs of these sports, more opportunities will be available for smaller participation sports to access indoor facilities across the Territory.
 3. The ACT Government continues to work with the sport and recreation industry regarding access to existing facilities and planning for future facility provision to support the participation of interested players. Particular effort has been made to upgrade existing indoor sport facilities at ACT Government schools to improve community access. Improvements at schools including Lake Tuggeranong College, Lyneham High School and Alfred Deakin High School have increased access opportunities for a number of sports (including basketball and futsal) to meet existing demand.
 4. Any Government funded facility will be subject to Cabinet consideration.
-

Roads—Gundaroo Drive (Question No 2336)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for Roads, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) What is the expected completion date of Gundaroo Drive Stage 1 works at the intersection of Gundaroo Drive, Mirrabai Drive and Anthony Rolfe Avenue.
- (2) When will landscaping works be completed for the totality of the Gundaroo Drive Stage 1 project to restore some of the amenity of the area for residents.
- (3) Can the Minister explain why the speed limit on Mirrabai Drive varies with speed limits for inbound traffic set at 60km and outbound traffic, into residential areas set at 80km.
- (4) What is the expected completion date for construction of Gundaroo Drive Stage 2.
- (5) When will landscaping works be completed for the totality of the Gundaroo Drive Stage 2 project to restore some of the amenity of the area for residents.
- (6) Has Transport Canberra and City Services publically committed that the Horse Park Drive duplication will be completed in the first quarter of 2019; if so, is this date still on track.
- (7) What is the reasoning behind the decision to finish the duplication of Horse Park Drive at Bonner.
- (8) Is an off-road cycle lane going to be constructed as part of the Horse Park Drive duplication project that goes all the way to the Majura Parkway.
- (9) When will the bus stop on Horse Park Drive on the Yerrabi Pond side be completed and ready for commuters to use.

- (10) Are there any plans to resurface roads in the electorate of Yerrabi over the coming 6 to 12 months.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The outstanding works (landscape and guide signs) are expected to be completed by the end of March 2019 (weather permitting).
- (2) The landscape works will be completed by March 2019 (weather permitting).
- (3) The speed limit has been reduced to 60 km/h to allow for outstanding works to be completed.
- (4) Gundaroo Drive Stage 2 road duplication works are planned for completion by mid-2020 (weather permitting).
- (5) Gundaroo Drive Stage 2 landscaping works are planned to be completed by late 2020 (weather permitting).
- (6) The 2016-17 TCCS Annual Report (p277) and the 2017-18 TCCS Annual Report (p260) reported a practical completion date for the Better Roads for Gungahlin - Horse Park Drive duplication project of June 2019. All four lanes are expected to be operational ahead of this date.
- (7) Additional duplication to Mulligans Flat Road intersection was undertaken ahead of planned sequencing due to efficiencies through the tender process for the total Horse Park Drive program.
- (8) The Horse Park Drive Duplication project will create an off-road shared path along the entire length of the road commencing from the Federal Highway Interchange to the Amaroo School and will link with existing off road cycle infrastructure.
- (9) The bus stops near Yerrabi Pond will be put into service with the introduction of the new bus network.
- (10) Yes.

Domestic and family violence—community groups (Question No 2341)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

What is the total number of domestic and family violence-related community groups/organisations known to the ACT Government in the ACT, and what are their names.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The information you need can be found at the below ACT Government website:

- https://vc-act.mycommunitydirectory.com.au/Australian_Capital_Territory/Canberra

Please refer to this for domestic and family violence related community groups/organisations.

Multicultural affairs—community groups (Question No 2344)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

What is the total number of cultural community groups (including cultural associations, community language schools etc.) known to the ACT Government in the ACT and what are their names.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Community Services Directorate (CSD) has an online community group directory that includes details of various community groups, including cultural associations and community language schools. The directory provides basic information about the organisation and their contact details.

The directory is not an exhaustive list of community organisations as some groups have not registered with the ACT Government. There are about 158 entries, with some groups registered more than once in the different categories.

The Office for Multicultural Affairs encourages community groups and organisations to register their details. The directory can be found on CSD's website at:
<https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/multicultural/services/act-community-group-directory>.

Questions without notice taken on notice

Economy—asset recycling

Mr Barr (*in reply to a question by Mr Coe on Tuesday, 12 February 2019*):

A copy of the schedule of assets agreed between the Territory and the Commonwealth for sale under the Asset Recycling Initiative is available at the following link:
http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/npa/infrastructure/national-partnership/Assest_Recycling_Initiative_ACT.pdf

The Territory is continuing to progress the sale of remaining assets under the Asset Recycling Initiative prior to its conclusion on 30 June 2019, and is on track to receive its full allocation of \$67.14 million in funding from the Commonwealth for the initiative.

Assets listed for the Asset Recycling Initiative that have yet to be released to market are:

- Gowrie Court – Block 3, Section 62, Narrabundah (scheduled for auction on 20 March 2019);

- Strathgordon Court – Block 1, Section 70, Lyons (scheduled for auction on 20 March 2019);
- Stuart Flats – Blocks 23, 24 and 25, Section 39, Griffith (scheduled for auction on 20 March 2019);
- Macarthur House – Block 28, Section 50, Lyneham;
- Ambulance Station – Block 3, Section 33, Dickson; and
- Community Health Building – Block 3, Section 31, Canberra.

Municipal services—trees

Mr Steel (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Parton on Tuesday, 12 February 2019*):

The trees that were removed were in variable condition and ranged in height from approximately 6 metres to 12 metres. An overall increase in shade cover is expected as 24 more trees will be planted than were there previously. The majority of these trees are fast growing, hardy and advanced maples which will be approximately 3.5 to 4.0 metres tall at time of planting. Tree growth is expected to be maximised as trees will be planted in soils that promote tree health, growth and resilience in dry periods; watering inlets that capture rain water and release slowly which encourages growth. It is expected that the trees will at least double their height within five years.

Mental health—patient outcomes

Mr Rattenbury (*in reply to a question by Mrs Jones on Tuesday, 12 February 2019*):

The data in question is calculated through the completion of the Health of the Nation Outcome Scales (HoNOS), which records the health and social functioning of people with mental illness, at admission and discharge.

While this indicator in ROGS compares the rates of improvement or deterioration during admission, it does not include information on the nature, complexity or relative severity of the admissions. This is important because it would be expected that people with more severe and complex mental illness would have slower and lower rates of improvement in mental health outcomes from inpatient admission. Consequently, care should be taken when interpreting the figures and comparing averages between jurisdictions.

It is notable that in the same ROGS report, Table 13A.14 describes the proportion of people receiving clinical mental health services by the Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA). According to this table, in 2016-17 the ACT had the highest proportion of people receiving clinical mental health services from the most disadvantaged quintile, at 13.6 percent, compared to the national average of 1.3 percent.

This difference is significant because it is known that the people who are the most socially disadvantaged also experience higher rates and complexities of mental health problems. This is a result of the wide-ranging social and economic determinants that

affect mental health, which include but are not limited to housing status, employment or interactions with the judicial system.

As a result, the large difference in the reported SEIFA data gives us reason to believe that the people in the ACT who are accessing public clinical mental health services would more commonly have more complex and severe mental illness than occurs nationally. In the context of this complexity, it is not surprising that the ACT would have a lower proportion of people reporting significant improvement in the HoNOS scale upon discharge from hospital.

However, this also does not mean that patients are not receiving the support that they need. Acute hospital settings are not always the most appropriate place to address a patients' complex needs. Instead, the ACT has a significant focus on providing mental health care in the community to complement acute hospital services.

Community care helps to manage mental health in less restrictive environments and can prevent people with less severe mental illness from requiring inpatient admission. This balance between acute and community care can influence the make-up of the hospital population in the ACT, skewing it towards a more acute population.

As a demonstration of the ACT's mental health community activity, the AIHW reports that in 2016-17 the ACT had a rate of 769.7 community mental health care service contacts per 1,000 people. This is the highest rate in the country and is more than double the national average of 365.2 community contacts per 1,000 people.

Also, since the release of the 2016-17 data, the ACT Government has made a strong commitment to improve the social and economic determinants that affect people's mental health in the ACT, which will be able to help members of the population with complex mental health needs.

This commitment is primarily demonstrated through the Office for Mental Health and Wellbeing, which was established in June 2018. The Office has a key role in coordinating Whole of Government action and policy to address some of these 'upstream' determinants of mental health. This has already included the establishment of a Stewardship Agency Group to bring all of the ACT Government Directorates into the discussion and begin work towards this shared vision of mental health.

The establishment of the Office was based on the recognition that there are many elements of improving mental health that are outside the traditional purview of health services. However, coordinated work to address the social and economic determinants of mental health in the ACT will help to ensure that people who are more socially disadvantaged in our community will have better mental health outcomes, resulting in fewer hospital presentations and admissions.

Schools—bullying

Ms Berry (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Parton on Wednesday, 13 February 2019*):

Supervision of playgrounds and toilet areas has increased, and the playground areas have been separated for different groups of children. Structured play activities facilitated by staff, including lunchtime clubs chosen by students, are available at recess and lunchtime.

These specific changes are supported by a range of other efforts. ACT public schools are inclusive and strive to provide safe, respectful and supportive environments. Schools are reflective of the community which means complex and challenging behaviours can occur. Schools are well placed to manage these alongside students, parents and carers.

The Education Directorate has policies and procedures in place to help schools appropriately address bullying, harassment and violence and to respond to complex and challenging behaviours.

The evidence-based Positive Behaviours for Learning program is being implemented across ACT public schools, including at Theodore Primary. The program is implemented to provide a comprehensive, integrated whole school approach to student wellbeing and behaviour.

Schools are also able to seek additional support and expert assistance from professionals including occupational therapists, psychologists, behaviour experts and social workers when required.

Theodore Primary is currently receiving additional support to strengthen the Positive Behaviours for Learning implementation and improve parent communication about behaviour management.

The school is also receiving support from a specialist behaviour teacher, an additional learning support assistant, a youth support worker and recruitment is under way to employ a deputy principal who will focus on wellbeing and behaviour management.

Education—student expulsions

Ms Berry (*in reply to a supplementary question by Ms Lee on Wednesday, 13 February 2019*):

The Directorate does not “expel” students. In accordance with Section 36 of the *Education Act 2004*, when students exhibit behaviour that threatens the good order of the school or the safety or wellbeing of a member of the school community they may be suspended for up to 20 days, transferred or excluded. In accordance with the Act, during the school absence, the student must be given reasonable opportunity to continue their education.

When a student is absent from school or exhibiting behaviours of concern that may lead to a suspension schools have access to a range of responses to assist the student, their parent or carer and their school. This includes support from within the school, or additional supports available through the Education Directorate. For example, all

schools have a student support team or equivalent, which considers the learning and wellbeing needs of students.

Schools—bullying

Ms Berry (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mr Parton on Thursday, 14 February 2019*):

In the period between implementation of the Education Directorate's Student Administration System (SAS), in term 2 2018 and 21 February 2019, 14 students were suspended from Theodore Primary School due to physical aggression. The length of these suspensions ranged from 1 to 2 days per student.

Schools—bullying

Ms Berry (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Mr Wall on Thursday, 14 February 2019*):

ACT public schools are required under the *Education Act 2004* to keep a record of attendance for all students enrolled. Student absences are recorded as either explained or unexplained. Parents and carers are not legally obligated to provide a reason for student absence, however parents will generally notify the school regarding a child's absence. Information is not recorded on the type of illness and schools do not capture this level of detail.

Municipal services—nature strips

Mr Steel (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Ms Le Couteur on Wednesday, 20 February 2019*):

The guidelines are currently being finalised, and subject to my consideration, I expect to release the document within the next couple of months.

The guidelines will be published on the Transport Canberra and City Services website and promoted using a range of communication channels such as government newsletters, social media and via community partners and stakeholders. Promotion of the guidelines will seek to raise community awareness of:

- the roles and responsibilities of both residents and government in the ongoing maintenance the nature strip;
- the types of activities that can and cannot be undertaken on the nature strip; and
- the types of activities that require approval.

Planning—housing choices

Mr Gentleman (*in reply to a question by Ms Le Couteur on Thursday, 21 February 2019*):

A draft variation to the Territory Plan for Housing Choices is currently being prepared by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) to implement two of the Collaboration Hub's recommendations. There is an update provided at the following website:

https://www.planning.act.gov.au/topics/current_projects/housing-choices

Collaboration Hub and Stakeholder Reference Group members were invited to attend workshops to discuss possible planning policy changes for the draft variation in November 2018 and February 2019.

I anticipate the draft variation will be released for public comment in the coming months. Other recommendations of the Collaboration Hub will be considered by EPSDD in the upcoming Territory Plan review and in other projects.

Schools—safe and supportive schools program

Ms Berry (*in reply to questions and a supplementary question by Mr Wall, Mr Parton and Ms Lawder on Thursday, 21 February 2019*):

The survey used at Theodore Primary was adapted from an existing data collection tool used by another jurisdiction, which is why some of its explanatory content such as the reference to an annual survey was not accurate. The survey was used on a single occasion at Theodore Primary and it is not anticipated this survey will be used again at an ACT public school.

All schools are expected to keep personal data safe and secure and are very experienced in doing so. For this reason the Theodore Primary surveys were only provided to the school's leadership to limit access and to ensure the privacy of individuals.

It is not uncommon for schools to gather information from their school community at the school level, including by surveys, and parental permission is not routinely sought for this.

The survey is unrelated to the ACT Safe and Supportive Schools Policy.