



Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

NINTH ASSEMBLY

6 JUNE 2019

www.hansard.act.gov.au

Thursday, 6 June 2019

Petitions:

Canberra Hospital—hydrotherapy pool—petition 18-19	2179
Canberra Hospital—hydrotherapy pool—petition 10-19	2179
Motion to take note of petitions	2180
Canberra Hospital—hydrotherapy pool—petitions 10-19 and 18-19	2180
Paper (Out-of-order petition)	2181
Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee	2184
Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee	2185
Ministerial delegation to the United Kingdom (Ministerial statement)	2194
Government—safer families policy (Ministerial statement)	2202
Alexander Maconochie Centre—report of a review of a critical incident— government response (Ministerial statement)	2207
ACT Teacher Quality Institute Amendment Bill 2019	2213

Questions without notice:

Budget—rates	2217
Community housing—land release	2218
Budget—employment	2219
Budget—rates	2221
Budget—emergency services	2223
Government—fees and charges	2224
Housing—rental	2225
Building—quality	2227
Housing—finance	2228
Budget—housing and homelessness	2230
Housing—affordability	2231
Planning—land release program	2233
ACTION bus service—network	2233
Child care—costs	2234
Appropriation Bill 2019-2020	2236
Papers	2249
ACT Place Names Committee and guidelines review	2250
Auditor-General's report No 2 of 2019—government response	2254
Bimberi Youth Justice Centre report—government response	2255
ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—annual report	2256
Auditor-General's report No 2 of 2019—government response	2258
Sentencing (Drug and Alcohol Treatment Orders) Legislation Amendment Bill 2019	2260
Road Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2019	2262
Litter Legislation Amendment Bill 2019	2264
Republic of Kiribati—40th anniversary	2267
Public Accounts—Standing Committee	2274
Executive business—precedence	2275
Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2019	2275
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Renewable Electricity Target) Amendment Bill 2019	2277
Adjournment:	
Mental health—R U OK	2282

Budget—Kurrajong electorate.....	2283
Mr Frank Armstrong—tribute	2284
Australian Broadcasting Corporation police raid	2285
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2019.....	2287
Answers to questions:	
Canberra Hospital—radiology department (Question No 2140).....	2289
Canberra Hospital—operating theatres (Question No 2312)	2290
Health—ophthalmology services (Question No 2349)	2293
Hospitals—cleaning procedures (Question No 2352)	2295
Hospitals—pharmacy dispensing arrangements (Question No 2372).....	2299
Hospitals—staff stress leave (Question No 2373).....	2300
Government—working groups (Question No 2382)	2302
Municipal services—littering and dumping (Question No 2391)	2304
Animals—animal welfare complaints (Question No 2393)	2305
Sport—ground hire (Question No 2397)	2307
Bimberi Youth Justice Centre—staffing (Question No 2399)	2308
Education—staff behaviour (Question No 2404)	2310
Light rail—tree planting (Question No 2405)	2311
ACTION bus service—animals (Question No 2411).....	2312
Animals—breeders (Question No 2417)	2313
Budget—health (Question No 2422).....	2314
ACT Health—non-ACT patients (Question No 2424).....	2315
Alexander Maconochie Centre—remandees (Question No 2429)	2316
Emergency services—communications (Question No 2433).....	2317
Emergency services—minimum crewing (Question No 2434).....	2318
Bushfires—management (Question No 2435)	2318
Roads—William Slim Drive (Question No 2436)	2319
Roads—resurfacing (Question No 2437)	2319
Roads—resurfacing (Question No 2438)	2321
ACTION bus service—route alterations (Question No 2439)	2323
ACT Health—domestic violence training (Question No 2440)	2325
ACT Health—child protection (Question No 2441)	2326
ACTION bus service—school services (Question No 2442).....	2327
ACTION bus service—school services (Question No 2443).....	2327
ACTION bus service—school services (Question No 2444).....	2329
ACT Health—child protection (Question No 2445)	2330
ACT Health—cultural competency training (Question No 2446).....	2333
Child and youth protection services—review (Question No 2447)	2335
ACT public service—workers compensation (Question Nos 2448-2485)...	2336
Government—visa applications (Question No 2486)	2337
Light rail—launch (Question No 2488).....	2338
Government—taxes and charges (Question No 2489)	2340
Government—taxes and charges (Question No 2490)	2341
Sport—ice rink (Question No 2494)	2342
Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—housing (Question No 2496)	2343
Transport Canberra—staffing (Question No 2497).....	2344
ACTION bus service—patronage (Question No 2498)	2345

Access Canberra—working with vulnerable people check (Question No 2499)	2345
Vehicles—registration (Question No 2500)	2346
ACTION bus service—staffing (Question No 2501)	2348
ACTION bus service—data (Question No 2502).....	2349
Canberra—events (Question No 2524)	2350
National Multicultural Festival—funding (Question No 2547)	2350
Questions without notice taken on notice:	
Disability services—specialist accommodation	2351
Canberra Health Services—unauthorised examinations	2351
Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—examinations policy.....	2351
Canberra Health Services—consent for procedures	2352
Canberra Health Services—unauthorised examinations	2352
Parking—Palmerston.....	2352

Thursday, 6 June 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.

Petitions

The following petitions were lodged for presentation:

Canberra Hospital—hydrotherapy pool—petition 18-19

By Mrs Jones, from 2,618 residents:

Requesting that the Assembly call on the ACT government to keep the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital open and maintained until a new, dedicated hydrotherapy pool is built on the south side of Canberra.

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

This petition of residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital (TCH) is due to be closed in June 2019, despite the importance of this health service. It is vital that these facilities are retained to provide accessible hydrotherapy services to the residents in Canberra's south.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

- Call on the ACT Government to keep the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital open and maintained until a new dedicated hydrotherapy pool is built on the south side of Canberra.

Canberra Hospital—hydrotherapy pool—petition 10-19

By Mrs Jones, from 460 residents:

Requesting that the Assembly call on the ACT government to keep the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital open and maintained until a new, dedicated hydrotherapy pool is built on the south side of Canberra.

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

This petition of residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital (TCH) is due to be closed in June 2019, despite the importance of this health service. It is vital that these facilities are retained. to provide accessible hydrotherapy services to the residents in Canberra's south.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to call on the ACT Government to:

- keep the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital open and maintained until a new dedicated hydrotherapy pool is built on the south side of Canberra.

Pursuant to standing order 99A, the petitions were referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Ageing and Community Services.

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.

Canberra Hospital—hydrotherapy pool—petitions 10-19 and 18-19

MRS JONES (Murrumbidgee) (10.02): Today I table two petitions, with a total of 3,290 signatories, regarding the hydrotherapy pool at the Canberra Hospital, asking the government to keep the pool open until a suitable alternative is found on Canberra's south side. These petitions were started only two months ago but before the debate on the same topic which we had in this chamber in the last sitting. The good news is that, after being faced with a debate that the minister should have seen coming, she did agree with the request by today's petitioners.

The announcement that the government made that they would close the hydrotherapy pool on 30 June 2019 was met with severe concern by south side residents who use or know someone who uses the pool for hydrotherapy. Hydrotherapy is exactly the kind of health activity that we need more, not less, of in Canberra. It is used by those suffering chronic illnesses, as well as some who are recovering. The process of building up strength is often the only exercise that these individuals can undertake. They spend several hours each week in the water to regain or maintain the ability to walk, live with less pain or function without the aid of carers or even more intensive medical help.

I applaud the hydrotherapy users for taking their health in their hands, getting up often at the crack of dawn to attend the limited sessions at the Canberra Hospital hydrotherapy pool, and for taking action on the impending closure of the facility in this way.

This is a very sizeable petition that I bring to the Assembly today, and it will be referred to a committee. I hope the committee seeks clarification from the government on what process it is undertaking to ensure that there are always suitable hydrotherapy facilities on both the north and the south side of Canberra.

According to last month's debate, the government has engaged a consultancy firm to understand the increased demand for hydrotherapy and to lay out a plan for the provision of services. The Canberra Liberals will be listening and watching carefully to ensure that the minister achieves the stated aim of finding a suitable solution on Canberra's south side.

In a somewhat cruel twist, the government, throughout this process, seemed to fail to understand that the hydrotherapy pool users require the pool to be heated to between 34 and 36 degrees Celsius. Minister Steel, Minister Fitzharris and the Chief Minister made commitments over the last 12 months that the new Stromlo leisure centre would include a hydrotherapy facility. It turns out that it will not. Possibly it was never going to. There is a difference between hydrotherapy at 34 to 36 degrees and what the government refers to as "warm water usage", which is not the same and is not suitable for many of the hydro users. It was cruel treatment of this group of people, who are reliant on limited time at these facilities, that there seemed to be an offer of a public hydrotherapy facility, only to find that it was never really an offer at all.

Finally, I return to the over 3,000 petitioners and say, "Good on you." Good on you for not taking no for an answer, for exercising your democratic right and for doing the hard work to bring this issue here to the Assembly and to our committee system, in order to show the minister the level of support in our electorate and further south for adequate facilities to keep you mobile, to keep you off heavy painkillers and to keep you as independent as possible for as long as possible. You are the reason we are here, and I hope the government will do as the minister for health has promised this time, and make sure that you have the right hydrotherapy facilities and a growth in the availability of these facilities in the years to come.

I thank Arthritis ACT, the Woden Valley Community Council and all of their great members and supporters for helping to spread the word and collect signatures for the petition. I hope that all of their hard work yields positive results for the community.

I seek leave to table an out-of-order online petition, which has an additional 212 signatures.

Leave granted.

MRS JONES: I present the following paper:

Petition which does not conform with the standing orders—Hydrotherapy services in South Canberra—Mrs Jones (212 signatures).

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Paper

Out-of-order petition

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (10.06), by leave: I table the following paper:

Petition which does not conform with the standing orders—Kingston—Section 24—Mature tree canopy—Mr Rattenbury (56 signatures).

I thank members for allowing me the time to address this matter in the chamber today. The petition, organised by residents of Kingston and Barton and signed by 56 residents, was not directed to the Assembly; it was given to the executive committee of Unit Plan 212 at 14 Currie Street, Kingston. It concerns the removal of 34 trees on the property. While this is not a matter for debate in the Assembly and will be dealt with by the residents and the organisations involved, it does highlight concerns from residents in our older suburbs about the removal of trees from shared spaces and from across our suburbs.

The petition calls on the committee members to recognise the value of trees for quality of living. They offer shade, cooling and privacy and play a role in the protection of biodiversity in our city. These are important parts of our suburban lives and of maintaining Canberra as the bush capital.

Members may recall that last year the ACT government commissioned, and I released, a report from the CSIRO on mapping surface urban heat in Canberra. It was a very interesting report. It is probably not bedside reading for most people but it highlights some really important things.

Areas that typically experience above average temperatures on summer mornings include areas with large surfaces such as rooftops, car parks and paving, commonly found in commercial and industrial areas, major roads and intersections and new housing developments; areas with low, sparse, dry vegetation; areas with few trees and little irrigation; and some artificial playing surfaces. By contrast, areas that typically experience below average temperatures on summer mornings include irrigated areas, water features and lakesides; areas with green vegetation, trees and forest cover; and shady areas.

This next point is perhaps the most startling. Neighbourhoods with tree shade canopy of 30 per cent or more can be up to 13 degrees cooler on a hot summer day. This is an extraordinary difference that goes to both quality of life and issues of energy usage and energy affordability in the ACT. It underlines how essential it is that we have a good tree canopy going to the future as Canberra gets hotter and drier.

A study released this year by the ANU, in partnership with the Australian Conservation Foundation, models that by the middle of this century we can expect to have, on average, 101 days per year in Canberra where the maximum temperature hits 30 degrees or above. That is every day of summer plus some either side, if you just think about it in numerical terms. It is an incredible contrast to what this city currently experiences. It highlights the critical role that trees will play in protecting this city from increasing heat in the future, aside from all of the other benefits that this petition clearly highlights.

As Ms Le Couteur has identified through her research, Canberra is currently losing, on average, 7,000 trees per annum. That is from a combination of factors. One of the

key factors is that we have two generations of trees reaching the end of their natural lives: the exotic trees that might be described as being of the Western era around the 1920s and 30s, and then a big swathe of the eucalypts that were planted in large numbers through the 60s and 70s. Both of these generations of trees—in what might be described as a perfect, or probably an imperfect, storm—are reaching the end of their lives. Over the next two decades we will see a significant dying of those trees because of those natural long-term factors.

This really puts this issue into clear focus. It will require a response both from government and from the private sector in its broader sense. It means we need to make sure government lifts its effort to plant more trees across the city to fill the gaps that are there, but it also means we need to work very hard to protect the trees that are there. That is where I think the private sector, in the broader sense of the term, plays a really important role.

We recognise that Canberra landscapes will change and that it is largely up to residents, landholders and related stakeholders to make decisions for their properties. But as Margaret, who contacted my office about this petition, has noted, the removal of large numbers of mature trees on strata properties impacts not only on the residents of a particular property but also on residents of adjoining strata complexes, as well as the local streetscape. These issues are going to require a lot more focus from government and from this Assembly. Minister Steel has flagged a review of the Tree Protection Act. I think that that needs to take these matters into account as well.

This is the second particular issue that has come to my attention in Kingston. Last year we had an issue in Gosse Street in Kingston, around the site of the Greek Orthodox church. On the property next door, a retirement village or an aged-care facility is going to be put in place. That has seen an application for the removal of somewhere between six and 12 large mature *Eucalyptus mannifera*—if I remember rightly. I would like to think that, as these sites are redeveloped, we can design our sites to take advantage of those trees. Those trees are quite magnificent. They are visually spectacular and also provide the sorts of cooling effects I talked about earlier.

The tree in Manuka has been another issue where we need people to think more thoughtfully about how we redevelop locations and actually make these trees part of the building, part of the redevelopment and part of the continuing landscape, not an inconvenience to be knocked over as quickly as possible, subversively in some cases, just to make it easier. People who are moving into these sites or coming to use the hotels that we build or whatever it is will value having these mature trees built into the new designs in these places.

I acknowledge the effort of the residents to bring this issue to the attention of the body corporate. I hope that a sensible way forward can be found. I am pleased to have the opportunity to flag these matters in the Assembly today, because they are ones we will continue to come back to and ones that things like the Tree Protection Act review need to take into account. We need to make sure we have better protections in place to ensure that, going forward, the mature trees in this city are valued more than they are being on some occasions by some parties at the moment.

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee Report 12

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (10.13): I present the following report:

Administration and Procedure—Standing Committee—Report 12—*Protocols for Visits by Members to Government Schools*, dated 6 June 2019, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

MR WALL (Brindabella) (10.14): I move:

That the report be noted.

I thank the members who took the time to make a submission to this inquiry. It was a bit of an unorthodox committee inquiry. While the issue of whether the existing protocol contravenes the members code of conduct was really only touched on by one submission, extensive views and opinions were canvassed by members on the way the existing protocol operates and, in many instances, some inflexibility in its operation, particularly around a member's attendance at public events.

I commend the work that was done by the committee and all members who contributed to it. The recommendations that we see largely call on the Education Directorate to adopt a visits protocol similar to that in the Justice and Community Safety Directorate and likewise that schools be free to invite members from all sides to public events that they are hosting, as issues were raised around attendance at school fetes and the like potentially being incompatible with the existing protocol without ministerial permission.

The opposition will be seeking today to adjourn this debate. We will look to bring the motion back once the minister has had a chance to review these recommendations, and next sitting we will seek to move a motion that they be adopted by the minister. We will seek an adjournment to this debate once other members have had a chance to speak.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (10.16): I add my support for these findings. The education minister is actually on the administration and procedure committee, so the committee came to this with some relevant perspectives on the matter.

This is a matter to be careful on. I have spoken to Minister Berry about this matter at times. It is very important that we do not create a free-for-all in our schools. Their job is to get on with educating children. They do not need members wandering through all the time. But, equally, it is appropriate that members be able to visit schools. Frankly, I do not think this is a matter that the minister needs to consider. I think we can have clear protocols in place and the directorate can deal with it.

There is a useful distinction drawn in the report between visiting during school hours—for example, for an official visit—versus things like public events such as fetes or end-of-year concerts where the broader public is invited anyway. There is no

reason why an MLA might not be one of those broader members of the public and require a special approval process. That is a very useful distinction that was drawn out during the committee discussion. It gives clarity to what members think is the right set of expectations. I look forward to hearing others' reactions to the report.

MS CHEYNE (Ginninderra) (10.18): I add my support for the recommendations. They strike the right balance in, as Mr Rattenbury said, having an orderly way of going about things while still perhaps delegating that responsibility to some extent, which may address some of the issues that some of the submitters raised in what they provided to us.

I am not really sure why we need to adjourn this debate—this has been sprung on me and probably on Mr Rattenbury as well—given that admin and procedure supports the report and the minister would be replying to it anyway. Having it adjourned for further discussion and bringing it back on later is an unusual approach that the opposition has decided to take today and one that I do not completely appreciate or understand.

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

Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee Report 7

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (10.20): I present the following report:

Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee—Report 7—*Inquiry into Drugs of Dependence (Personal Cannabis Use) Amendment Bill 2018*, dated 3 June 2019, including additional comments (*Ms Le Couteur*) and a dissenting report (*Mrs Dunne*), 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 Health, Ageing and Community Services is tabling its seventh report for the Ninth Assembly. This report presents the committee's findings from its inquiry into the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Cannabis Use) Amendment Bill 2018, which was referred by the Assembly on 20 February 2019.

The committee received 36 submissions from a range of organisations and individuals, as well as the commonwealth Department of Health and ACT Policing. The committee also received an outline of proposed amendments from the ACT Greens and the ACT government. The committee held four public hearings, where it received evidence relating to a range of matters, including the relationship between commonwealth and ACT legislation, health and mental health matters and operational aspects of the proposed amendments.

The report makes an initial recommendation which supports the legalisation of cannabis for personal use. The report also makes a number of comments and subsequent recommendations which apply directly to amendments proposed in the bill, as well as recommendations that consider the overall impacts relating to the legalisation of cannabis for personal use in the ACT. In total the report makes 16 recommendations.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank all of those who have contributed to this inquiry by making submissions or appearing before the committee to give evidence. I would like to thank the committee secretary, Josephine Moa, for all of her hard and tireless work in helping us to present this report and for collating the additional comments in the dissenting report.

I would like to take this time to thank the other members of the committee, Mrs Dunne and Ms Le Couteur. Working with them has meant this report was able to be tabled on time. I commend the report to the Assembly.

I would also like to make some additional personal comments today. Prohibition of recreational drugs has not worked. It has been a disaster. It has increased harm for drug users. It creates a perverse incentive for police that has repeatedly ended in corruption scandals around the world. It funds organised crime. We do not have all of the answers. The ACT alone cannot fix all of these problems. There are layers of international and federal law that prevent us from addressing the big picture, but that should not stop us from doing what we can. This report gives us a good guide as to what we can do.

Mr Pettersson has put a proposal on the table saying that we can, and we should, do more. He could not be more correct. Admitting that the war on drugs is an absolute failure should not be controversial in 2019, but in many circles it is. Mr Pettersson should be congratulated on his common-sense approach. He has pointed out to all of us that we can and should do more to end the ridiculous policy of prohibition.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (10.24): Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to put on the record my dissent from the major recommendations of this report. I formally dissented—and it is recorded in the minutes—from recommendations 1 to 6, 10 to 12 and recommendation 16. I also formally dissented from some of the committee comments, which is also outlined in the report.

The reasons for doing this are manifold. But before I comment on those, I would like to comment on the collegial way in which this inquiry was conducted. It was quite clear from the outset that there was a diversity of views in the committee about the process. But the process was conducted collegially and respectfully, and I commend the other members of the committee for doing that, and also for tolerating, in the nicest sense of the word, the fact that I had quite divergent views—quite different views from the other members of the committee. I thank the members for the respectful way in which this matter has been dealt with.

I cannot disagree more with the comments made by Ms Cody. With respect to the clear message that came to me through this process, we got it in a nutshell from the Chief Minister when he gave evidence. He said, “The Nancy Reagan approach of ‘just say no’ has failed; therefore we should do something else. This is something, and therefore we should do this.”

The Chief Minister was perfectly clear and quite candid that this was the least optimal option that you could possibly think of. The complexities that arose in our deliberations about, “If we do this, how does that work? How does this interact here? What are the implications there?” made it very clear that this is a suboptimal piece of legislation.

My view is that it is so bad—this is not a reflection on the proponent, and I understand why the proponent wants to do this; he really does believe that this is something worth doing—that it is not worth doing in this space. It would have been much more difficult to critique this legislation if there had been a better form of legislation before us. I will go to some of the reasons why I am opposed to this legislation and why I recommend that the Assembly not proceed with this legislation.

The proponent himself, Mr Pettersson, said that he was doing this because there was a global trend—his words—in this way, that it would reduce the burden on our criminal justice system and that it would bring us—this, I think, is very important—a step closer to a cannabis market. What we have at the outset is the member saying, “What we would really like to have is a cannabis market,” but he did not have the courage, the wherewithal, the wit or whatever to put forward a piece of legislation about a cannabis market.

Let us be frank, and I do make these comments in the dissenting report: there is no global trend. There are a handful of countries and a handful of states in the United States who have legislated in some form or other for the legalisation of cannabis. But that is not a global trend. And the way in which they have legislated is so diverse as to not create a global trend.

It was, however, interesting; during the time that the committee was deliberating, I spent some time in Canada, so I did take an interest in what was happening in Canada, because they had recently created a national cannabis market, and it is also rolled out for sale at a state level. There was a particular occasion when I was almost accosted in a hotel dining room by a Canadian lady who had discovered that I was a legislator from Australia. She immediately said, “I’m very strongly in favour of the legislation that is currently passed in Canada. I have been an advocate for this for all of my life. What are you doing in Australia?” I said, “That’s a very interesting thing. This is what we’re doing in my legislature at the moment.” I described the legislation being put forward by Mr Pettersson. This person, who was quite active in the area and quite knowledgeable on the area, although we did disagree on a lot of things, said, “No, you can’t do that. That is the worst possible thing that you could do.” This was the expression used by a reformer from Canada who had just been part of the process of changing the laws in Canada.

This bill does not do any of the things that Mr Pettersson says it will do. It does not create a market, it does not move us any closer to a market, it does not reflect a global trend and it does not reduce the burden on the criminal justice system.

One of the most interesting things that we heard, in the whole part of it, was when the government officials came along, and one of the government officials said—and I will quote what was said, because it is worth putting it on the record here as well:

Back in the mid-1990s we went to simple cannabis offence notices. This effectively decriminalised cannabis use. I have some statistics from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. In 1998, which is around the time that these changes were introduced, we had 20 per cent of ACT residents aged 14 years and older using cannabis in the past 12 months. In 2016 this figure had fallen to eight per cent.

We have seen a reduction to a third of the cannabis use, according to the AIHW figures, over that period. They collect the figures in the same way. There might be faults in the way they collect them but they collect the figures in the same way. This is a substantial trend, and it is my belief that we should be looking at what is behind these trends before we make legislation to change the way in which we deal with it.

Mr Hanson said, at one stage during the debate on this process, that he believed we had it in about the right space with the simple cannabis notice. We are in a space where cannabis is not legal, but, generally speaking, people found in possession of small amounts are not put into the criminal justice system. The simple cannabis notice system could be improved; there could be more use of diversion and, with drug courts coming online, which is something that we welcome, there could be more scope for diversion of people out of the criminal justice system.

I agree with almost everybody who came before the committee who said that we should be treating this primarily as a health issue. But we do not deal with it primarily as a health issue by opening up the capacity for people to use this; rather, we should be looking at the issues of how to encourage people away from the use of this. Mr Pettersson's legislation does anything but that.

The other thing that Mr Pettersson said is that it would keep people away from the black market. By his own evidence, it fails to do that. The mechanism or the rationale for keeping people away from the black market is that we will have a grow regime, and with a grow regime people will not need to go out and buy cannabis from organised crime gangs, bikie gangs and the like.

However, the grow regime requires someone who wants to grow cannabis to obtain seeds, seedlings or some other growing medium from somewhere. And doing that will still be illegal. It will still be illegal to go and buy cannabis seeds. If you plant them and keep them in your backyard and you meet all the requirements, the growing of them is not illegal but the acquisition of the growing medium is still illegal. By Mr Pettersson's own admission, the only way you could do that would be on the black market. So Mr Pettersson himself admits that the aim of his legislation fails in this regard.

One of the other things which is most important, and which was touched on a little bit—and it was probably remiss of us as a committee that we did not delve into this as much, but we did have a very limited time span—was that, time and again, the Chief Minister, proponents for drug law reform and people who opposed drug law reform came along and said, “Cannabis is a dangerous drug, but—” Sometimes they said, “So don’t do anything about it,” and at other times they said, “But we may as well do something about it.”

As legislators it behoves us to look at the issues before we make decisions about opening up the cannabis market and saying to people, “It’s all right.” The educative power of the law will say to people, “It’s all right.” It will be all right for 18-year-olds and older to use small amounts of cannabis and have small amounts of cannabis. That tells the 14, 15 and 16-year-olds that, in a little while, it will be all right, so it is probably all right now.

The cumulative research—which has not been debunked, although people like to ignore it—is that cannabis is a dangerous drug. Research going back to the 19th century indicates that cannabis is a dangerous drug. It causes psychosis, and psychosis, as we know, often leads to dangerous and violent crimes.

One of the things that is most startling, from the research that I have done, is that in some US states where cannabis has been legalised we have seen a combined increase in murders of 35 per cent against a 20 per cent across-the-board national trend, and a combined increase in serious assaults of 25 per cent when the national trend in the United States over the same period was 10 per cent. We do not know the reasons for that, but I think it behoves us to look into the reasons for those upticks in violent crime before we legislate in this space here.

The other problem we have is that there is an unknown interaction between ACT law and commonwealth law which has not been fully explored in this committee. Quite frankly, the only way that we can probably fully explore it is through a test case. At one stage during its deliberations the standing committee considered a recommendation that this legislation should not be commenced until this matter was clearly defined. I was happy to support that recommendation, but the proposer eventually walked away from that, because I think she thought it would undermine the overall intent of the report.

It is a very important issue, and until we understand the implications, we might be telling people in the ACT, “Yes, you can possess small amounts; you can have it for your own use.” If we do not tell them that if we vacate the field in the ACT they could still be charged under commonwealth law, we are remiss. We are essentially entrapping people. This is a very important issue which should be resolved before this legislation is passed.

On the basis of all of those levels of uncertainty—the fact that this bill is not fit for purpose, that there are a multitude of amendments from both sides, from the government and the crossbenches, about this—even if we pass the bill with all of

these amendments, it still will not be fit for purpose. It will not reflect the global trend, because there is no global trend. It will not protect people from increases in mental illness. It will not protect the community from violent crime. And we do not know the impact of commonwealth law in this space.

There is a sense of inevitability, and Ms Cody spoke about it today: “Drug prohibition does not work.” We only really say that about drugs, but in the same breath, when you say, “Drugs are dangerous,” they say, “Yes, but alcohol and tobacco are dangerous.” Yes, alcohol and tobacco are dangerous. We do recognise that. But if we were starting from scratch, we would not legalise tobacco and alcohol in the way that they are. They came into our community gradually, over time. They have filtered into our culture and our way of life. But if we were starting from scratch and saying, “Here is a substance; should we legalise it?” we would not be legalising it. (*Extension of time granted.*) We would not be in the space of legalising alcohol and tobacco if we were at ground zero. I think this is a fallacious argument.

There is a problem with the legalisation of cannabis and other recreational drugs, because of the impact that they have on our community. To say, “Prohibition doesn’t work; therefore we should just legalise everything,” is a counsel of despair, and we do not say it in other places. We do not say, “We’ve got laws about murder, but people still murder one another, so we should give up and legalise murder,” or domestic violence or armed robbery. We do not do that. While it is true that we should be dealing with people who are affected by what we call recreational drugs—and I think we do people a disservice by calling them recreational drugs—in the health space as much as possible, we do not serve the community well by saying, “It’s all right.”

It is not all right to consume cannabis. It is bad for your health. It is not something that you do privately, and everything is cool and laid-back. This is what is being said across the world: “There’ll be more mellow people because they’re able to legally consume cannabis.” Actually, if the crime figures that come out of Alaska, Colorado, Oregon and Washington are to be believed, there are fewer mellow people. There are many more psychotic people who commit dangerous crimes. That is the main reason—because of the impact on people’s mental health and the flow-on effects that that has into the community and to public safety—that we should not be supporting this legislation.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (10.41): I would like to start by thanking my fellow committee members, echoing Mrs Dunne’s comments about the collegiate way in which we worked, and thanking the committee secretary and all of those who made submissions or appeared before the committee.

I one hundred per cent support the basic idea behind this legislation. I am totally of the view that drug issues should be treated as health issues. As has been mentioned, alcohol and tobacco both cause more health issues than cannabis, and they are legal. As a society, we have done the experiment with alcohol, and prohibition does not work. What you get with prohibition is whatever health issues there may be with that drug plus a criminal element who can make money out of supplying the drug.

The evidence given to the committee in the course of the inquiry makes it abundantly clear that having an inquiry was worth while. There are some quite substantive issues with this legislation, most of which Mrs Dunne touched upon. I will speak with a different emphasis.

The main issue, from my point of view, is: can the ACT pass legislation that will effectively legalise the personal use and cultivation of a small quantity of cannabis, given commonwealth law? If we can, there are a number of other issues with the implementation of this legislation that the committee has commented on. But the number one issue, the main issue, which I will discuss first is: can the ACT go it alone on cannabis legislation? Is it legal? Can we make it legal somehow, given the commonwealth legislation?

The committee asked the Solicitor-General about this. As a non-legal person, I interpreted his evidence as a definite “don’t know”. Mr Garrison said:

If I might be so bold as to say that there are many laws that have been drafted over the years that one is confident will withstand legal challenge, and it would be very bold to assert that it will until such time as the challenge occurs, so that all that can be done is anticipate what those challenges might be in terms of ensuring that if the bill is to move forward the provisions are drafted in as careful a way as possible to minimise the prospect that it does not—double negative—amount to a justification or excuse; in other words, to say that it is a justification or excuse.

The Australian Federal Police were much clearer in their views. Ms Smith, who is the President of the Australian Federal Police Association, said:

Over the course of the past few weeks I have had the opportunity to speak to a number of ACT Policing AFPA members about this bill and all are opposed to it.

Mrs Dunne, at a subsequent hearing, asked Assistant Commissioner Johnson:

As commonwealth officers, would you be obliged to charge under commonwealth law because we had abandoned the field?

Assistant Commissioner Johnson replied:

“Obliged” is the wrong word. I think it comes back to discretion. Each constable has their own discretion and is responsible for the decisions they make. I am at pains to say that all our officers are keen to do the bidding of government in terms of achieving policy outcomes, and their use of SCONs and so forth is part of that effort. I am not for a minute suggesting that if this was passed suddenly everybody would be being arrested all over the place under commonwealth law, but police officers have a responsibility to turn their minds to it and I cannot guarantee that, depending on the circumstances of the day or the time, a charge might not be laid under commonwealth law.

The other thing that comes into play is that, because under commonwealth law it remains an offence to possess, whilst a police officer may choose not to take a

prosecutory path, they are left with a decision about whether to seize the cannabis, which still leaves them in an awkward position. Our very strong direction to members now is that you have a very clear way to ensure your own integrity. If you are not going to take action on a particular matter, you need to handle what is an illicit substance very carefully—seize it appropriately, record it appropriately et cetera. So there are issues with not only the potential for a charge to be laid but also what we do about possession and what advice we would give our members about how they handle that. That is the other key part of my concern around how we will operationalise it.

I asked the government a series of questions on notice about the legal protections given by the bill. Their summing up answer was not inspiring:

The Government is working toward a model that would give ACT residents confidence about the type of conduct and circumstances that would be lawful under the proposed amendments.

More cheerfully, the committee heard evidence from the Law Society that there may be a solution to the legal problems. They suggested the inclusion of express authorisation. They said:

Expressly stating that it is an authorisation in the legislation would seem to at least avoid vacating the field. The commonwealth do not seem to have expressed a desire to cover the field themselves, but in the absence of any other law—and that seems to be the issue.

It remains unclear whether Mr Pettersson's bill can achieve its objective. If it does not but Canberrans think that it has, then, as Mrs Dunne pointed out, there are possible criminal implications for people who may believe that they can safely grow and possess cannabis for personal use. This is why the committee made three recommendations on legal issues.

The first is recommendation 10. It says:

The Committee recommends that Section 171AA of the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Cannabis Use) Amendment Bill 2018 be amended to include express authorisation for the cultivation and use of cannabis by individuals for personal use.

This is based on the evidence from the Law Society which I just quoted. It was disappointing that, despite the fact that the government appeared after the Law Society, the government had not taken the time to read the transcripts of the committee's hearings. Thus, when they were asked to express an opinion about this proposed solution, all they could say was that they had not heard of it. That was remarkably unhelpful.

Recommendation 15 said:

The Committee recommends that strong public information about the provisions of the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Cannabis Use) Amendment Bill 2018 proceed or coincide with the implementation of the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Cannabis Use) Amendment Bill 2018.

This recommendation is meant to be specifically about the legal issues, not the health issues. The health issues also, of course, require information, but they are covered elsewhere. This is specifically saying: if and when this legislation is passed, the government needs to tell the people of Canberra how this can work in a way that will keep them legally safe.

Recommendation 11 says:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government intervene in any prosecution by the Commonwealth of ACT residents who cultivate or possess cannabis in accordance with the Drugs of Dependence (Personal Cannabis Use) Amendment Bill 2018 to defend the intent of the Bill.

Basically this is saying that if someone follows what we believe to be the intent of the bill and possesses quantities or cultivates quantities which are within the limits of this legislation, then, if they are prosecuted by the commonwealth, the ACT government should support them legally as far as the intent of the bill goes. I am not suggesting that the ACT government should be intervening on questions of fact particularly, but they should be intervening on questions of law as to what it is legal or not legal for ACT residents to do and to possess.

We discussed this at some length because it is our understanding that, as it would be a criminal case, it would not be possible for the ACT to organise a test case. I am not a lawyer, and I do not believe that any of my fellow committee members are lawyers, so it is possible that there is a better way of doing this to give greater certainty, given that this was the intent of the recommendation. The Solicitor-General told us that only a court case could determine how the ACT and commonwealth laws interact. If that is the case, it would seem that this test case is going to be necessary if the legislation is passed. I would have to say that this is not a satisfactory situation, but I trust that if the bill is passed Mr Pettersson and the government will be able to provide much more significant legal certainty to the people of the ACT.

This is also made particularly necessary as the committee heard evidence that if the bill is passed then simple cannabis notices, otherwise known as SCNs, which have been in use in Canberra for a couple of decades, will no longer be an option for people over 18. As Ms Smith from the AFP Association said:

So it becomes quite problematic for the ACT community. If they are going to consume cannabis and have cannabis in their possession and cultivate cannabis, the option is there for us to charge under the commonwealth legislation.

I did consider that possibly we should recommend that the legislation should not be passed until the legal situation was clear, but the Solicitor-General's evidence seemed to me to imply that this situation would possibly never eventuate: that it would never be clear or it would only be clear if it was legislated and then prosecuted. I am also trying, in not saying that the legislation should be not passed at this stage, to give the government and Mr Pettersson the benefit of the doubt. I hope that the Law Society's suggestion or some other suggestion is legally sound. If so, I am trying to give the proponents the benefit of the doubt and have confidence that they will fix these issues in a more complete manner before the bill is brought back for debate.

I note, as Mrs Dunne did, that the issue of how potential growers could access seeds or plants legally is one that the committee could not resolve. I asked the government how this could occur and they could not provide guidance as to a legal source of supply. The committee made recommendations to make the legislation work better in operation, assuming the basic legal issues are solved. These recommendations are around artificial cultivation, quantities of cannabis, and cannabis social clubs. They are designed to make it easier for people to do what the legislation intends: use small quantities of cannabis without fear of criminal prosecution or involvement with illegal activities.

From that point of view, possibly recommendation 16 is the most interesting one, because it is around the cannabis social club concept. It is a concept that is used in other jurisdictions, and basically it just allows group cultivation. All the plants would still have to be owned by ACT residents, and there would continue to be limits on the number of plants. But it would make it more practical for people who are not gardeners to pool their resources and successfully cultivate cannabis.

The committee made a number of cannabis health-related recommendations, 13 and 14, that should happen irrespective of whether this bill is passed. As Mrs Dunne mentioned, there are health implications with cannabis consumption.

I commend the committee's report to the Assembly. I very much look forward to the government's response to it, in particular their response to the legal-related recommendations, 10, 11 and 15.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Ministerial delegation to the United Kingdom

Ministerial statement

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries) (10.55): Our emergency services and police are amongst the best in the world but they are also in a period of transition. This is occurring not only because of our city growing but also because of new challenges that these agencies must deal with and from territorians wanting more from our first responders. A place that has been at the forefront of this transition and that has charted new ways of dealing with emerging challenges has been the United Kingdom.

To learn more about how police, fire, ambulance and emergency services are changing, and to better understand their challenges, I was accompanied in April this year by the Chief Police Officer and the Deputy Director-General for Community Safety within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate on a mission to the United Kingdom. The delegation was fortunate enough to meet with elected officials, civil servants and senior officers from police, ambulance and fire services. Our visit encompassed the cities of London, Glasgow and Birmingham.

In London it was clear that a crucial focus of the emergency services in that city is on counterterrorism, both protecting the community and being able to respond in the event of evil striking. For London, unfortunately, this is not a new challenge. Having been at the centre of reprisals from the IRA years ago, they are now faced with a modern evil that seeks to undermine democracy. In the past 15 years Londoners have been subjected to some horrific attacks, from the bombings of the underground in 2005 to the series of attacks in 2017 that targeted the foundation of our parliamentary system, Westminster, and everyday life in London, the Borough Markets and bridges that connect the city over the river Thames. We also cannot forget the callous attack on worshippers at the Finsbury Park mosque.

Despite these tragedies, it is clear that Londoners are resilient. This resilience is not just from the measures taken by the police and security services but also from steps taken by councils and the government to prepare Londoners and implement protective measures.

As a capital city, we have much to learn from London, but our visit also showed us that Canberra has much to offer as well. The structure of our emergency response, guided by the Emergencies Act 2004, provides a strong framework for collaboration and response across government. The Emergency Services Agency Commissioner and ACT chief police officers over the years have sought to develop responses in a whole-of-government effort.

Under the crowded places strategy, our agencies are also strengthening their engagement with the non-government sector in helping to build preparedness but also improve awareness and planning for emergencies. This includes work by the ACT State Emergency Service, the Community Services Directorate and the security and emergency management branch within JACS.

However, there is much to learn from what is occurring in London. This includes implementation of the Sendai framework, endorsed by the UN General Assembly. The Sendai framework recognises that helping reduce the risk of disasters and building resilience is a shared responsibility that needs to include non-government and business sectors. I was pleased to be able to sit down with the Deputy Mayor for Fire and Resilience and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, of the Greater London Authority, to discuss the London resilience partnership strategy and share insights from the territory.

Our discussions also included broader approaches to fire preparedness, crime prevention and the community engagement initiatives being undertaken across London. The latter includes a local neighbourhood policing model that incorporates staff from the London Metropolitan Police working with individuals from local wards.

Engaging the public is something that the City of London Police have also been pioneering. Recognising the enormous specialist skill within the square mile of the heart of London, the City of London Police have been able to capitalise on the corporate social responsibility policies of firms by enlisting specialists in accounting, finance law and other fields as special constables for specific purposes, including

helping with casework. The City of London Police are also looking at how to best engage those members that they have had to retire to maximise their pension, helping bring back invaluable experience that can be used to fill skills gaps as younger members learn. Our discussions with the City of London Police also included confidential security briefings on counterterrorism, security preparedness and crowded places.

I am grateful to the City of London Police for trusting us by sharing deep insights into their work in these areas. As our government continues developing and implementing our own crowded places strategy and other strategies to enhance the safety of Canberra, these insights are invaluable, as are the relationships that have been built and the shared knowledge and experiences. As you might appreciate, much of this information is classified or sensitive and it would be irresponsible of me to share anything further.

Another emerging area within the security response framework is fixated threats. Fixated threats are not just a concern in relation to countering violence and terrorism but also important in helping protect democratic institutions and those that work in them. Distrust in democracy and broader political systems can increase the dangers faced. While a response from government is needed, we all have a role to play in improving discourse and trust. All of us in this place need to work harder to ensure that trust in democracy can be maintained, demonstrating that the democratic system listens and is the right way to make change and demonstrating that solutions to grievances are being properly considered without the need for violence or other forms of unlawful protest.

In responding to the threat of fixated persons we simply cannot deploy a tactical law and other responses or a traditional law as well. These situations require creative and collaborative responses from law enforcement and health authorities to best manage and deter individuals from committing crimes and acts of violence. We need an integrated approach that recognises that there is a role for mental health professionals, working closely alongside law enforcement and informed by the best intelligence. That is the best approach.

In London our delegation was able to sit down with the United Kingdom Fixated Threat Assessment Centre, FTAC, and receive confidential insights into their work. FTAC is one agency amongst a broad suite tasked with keeping safe individuals, including members of the royal family and members of the UK parliament. The UK FTAC model is a well-tested and proven model that comprises teams that are made up of both law enforcement and mental health clinicians. Our visit helped further relationships with key experts who have been at the forefront of this work in the United Kingdom. It also provided an opportunity to discuss models that could be adopted by the territory. The territory government has committed to developing a fixated threat assessment model for the ACT as part of a national security COAG agreement, and I am pleased that in Tuesday's budget funding was provided for this aim.

I am also pleased that this year's budget continues vital support for mental health in the community. We must recognise that a holistic approach is needed when it comes

to law and order. Our police and other first responders often become the last resort if there is not adequate support and services for those that need help. Funding for mental health is vital not just for individual wellbeing but also for broader community safety. I am pleased that ACT Policing and other emergency services agencies have been able to work with JACS and the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health in a broader justice reform package designed to further help improve our community safety.

Recognising and improving mental health responses as part of a law enforcement approach is something that the delegation discussed with almost all the police forces we met with, as well as the London Ambulance Service. This year's budget has provided funding for the development of a model that could be adopted for the territory where certain calls to the police and emergency services could receive a response from a specialist team composed of a mental health practitioner, an ambulance officer and a police officer. I look forward to the development of this model and to working with my colleagues the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and the Minister for Mental Health. I believe a model such as this could help improve mental health care as well as have a positive impact on the broader health and justice systems.

In addition to discussing mental health, the delegation was able to receive an in-depth insight into the broader operations and challenges faced by the London Ambulance Service, and I am grateful to the senior members of staff, along with others from the London Ambulance Service, who made time to sit down with us to provide a deeper understanding of their work and the challenges their service faces. Through our engagement with the London Ambulance Service it is clear that many of their challenges are not dissimilar to those we face in Canberra, albeit on a larger scale.

Like the ACT Ambulance Service, the London Ambulance Service has been going through staffing challenges. When speaking with front-line ambulance officers in London they were pleased to hear of our efforts to improve the professionalism of our ambulance service through the blueprint for change project and indicated that such workforce initiatives are important.

In recent years the London Ambulance Service have also been undertaking a data exercise to better understand the data they have, what this means and how it can be put to better service delivery. To this end they have created a business information service within their service model and engaged data scientists. This helps them to understand both what should be measured and how this information can guide work—things such as resource requirements, response times and the deployment of resources.

Here ACTAS has started this work. For example, the Chief Ambulance Officer has changed resource allocation to better reflect actual demand. This was based on an extensive analysis of data held by the agency. The chief officer has also committed to yearly reviews to ensure that resources reflect what the data is saying. Based on what is occurring in London, I believe ACTAS is heading in the right direction.

I was also delighted to meet with the male and female Australians who are now working for the London Ambulance Service, many of whom had joined after completing their training in Australia. London provides an invaluable experience for

these individuals, much of which no Australian city would ever be able to replicate or wish to. These remarkable young Australians have already witnessed firsthand the trauma terrorism can bring, having been deployed alongside police to incidents to help care for injured patients. As part of their preparedness, London has specialised ambulance officers who are provided with specialised protective wear and training to enter hot zones during times of an emergency—what others would call a combat situation.

These Australians are to be commended. They are very mature and are already fine leaders, having much more to offer. You may also be interested to learn that almost a quarter of the staff in the London Ambulance Service are Australian.

Our visit allowed me an opportunity to spruik ACTAS and the benefits our city has to offer as one of the most inclusive, connected, diverse and safe cities in the world in which to live and work. In coming years I hope to see these skilled ambulance officers working amongst our ranks within ACTAS and as our future leaders.

My visit also allowed me to gain an insight into the London Fire Brigade. The delegation was able to see firsthand the operations of its control centre. The control centre is wholly operated by professional staff who undergo appropriate training to be call takers, answer calls and dispatch fire and rescue appliances. I understand that this training program is approximately a 10-week course. I was also advised by officials at the control centre that civilians have always operated the centre.

From speaking with staff in the control centre, it is clear that they are very professional in their work and they each take very seriously their responsibilities to support firefighters in the field. It is also clear that the control centres within a fire and rescue context can operate safely and effectively as we move to reform the ESA Comcen in the ACT to free up firefighters to be where they are needed most—out in the community fighting fires and protecting citizens. Like ACT Fire and Rescue, the London service undertakes fire safety campaigns and also advises on fire safety in buildings. The London Fire Brigade also trialled, in 2014-15, a co-responding model where they partnered with other emergency agencies.

In regard to more current innovations, the service is assessing the use of drone technology, considering whether that can help provide better situational awareness during a fire, provide equipment to those in high buildings or be able to more easily provide rescue equipment as well, such as flotation devices, to those in need.

The delegation's engagement with the London Fire Brigade also included a briefing by and discussion with the assistant commissioner responsible for special operations and his team. These individuals are responsible for engaging with the London resilience framework, including planning and preparing responses to various incidents that might occur. Under their statutory framework the London Fire Brigade has a responsibility to collaborate with other agencies. As part of their preparedness, all fire appliances carry a first-aid kit and all firefighters are trained in basic levels of medical assistance in the event that they are the first at a scene or an incident that requires first aid or medical assistance. Given London's focus on possible incidents that might occur, which I spoke about earlier, the London Fire Brigade has also developed specialist response teams.

It was disturbing to learn about incidents where first responders had been the specific targets of offenders. This is to be abhorred and we need to protect those who work in our front-line roles to keep them safe.

While many of the insights provided were confidential, they nonetheless have been valuable when considering the territory's level of preparedness and its response capabilities. What I can say is that the London Fire Brigade have adopted the joint emergency services interoperability principles, JESIP, which is to be commended. Our own services, including various services within the ESA umbrella and ACT Policing, already work closely together using similar principles and are committed to strong operational relationships that best protect our community.

Our mission also enabled the delegation to gain insights from four leading police forces in the UK: Police Scotland, the London Metropolitan Police, the City of London Police and the West Midlands Police. I am very grateful to the senior members of each jurisdiction who made time to sit down with us and discuss their reform strategies. This included discussions with the recently appointed Deputy Chief Constable of Police Scotland, the Chief Executive of Community Justice Scotland, the Chief Digital Officer of London Metropolitan Police, the Assistant Commissioner of the City of London Police, the West Midlands Police and Crime Commissioner and the Deputy Chief Constable of West Midlands Police. These meetings not only provided comprehensive insights into the reforms each service was taking but also allowed us advance collaboration and knowledge sharing with each jurisdiction.

Both the West Midlands Police and the London Metropolitan Police have a focus on technology and the role it can play in supporting modern policing. Members may recall that technology improvement is something ACT Policing has begun and that was supported by the government through last year's budget. While the rollout of new technology can sometimes receive a mixed reaction when first implemented, both forces reported an overall positive impact on policing.

Amongst the many advantages presented were the benefits around improving the quality of life for their members. We were told of members being able to more easily complete their reports at the end of the shift and go home on time, rather than having to stay back at work and complete them. Technology can also help to empower police and help increase community confidence and trust. For example, the implementation of body-worn cameras provides a reassurance and an extra safeguard that police exercise their powers appropriately and only apply force where needed. This gives the community greater confidence, particularly more vulnerable members of the community.

It is clear that technology has a positive role to play in the future of any modern police service model. And this was a key lesson from each of the forces we met. Each was also looking at ways to improve community engagement through new portals and innovative uses of technology to better explain the work modern police undertake to support citizens' needs.

Another area that plays a crucial role in improved service delivery is data. Both the London Metropolitan Police and the West Midlands Police have relied on data to guide their reforms and drive improvements within the force and broader service to the public. For example, West Midlands Police utilises a data scientist to help with analytics, informing their performance dashboard and service delivery. ACT Policing have also been analysing the data they hold and how this could be better used to improve their work.

One thing is very clear: the setting of performance measures for police will be ongoing work across forces, given that it can often be very difficult to accurately capture the community benefits of all the work they do. Each of the forces we met with has a performance measure. Each also has a program to work to refine them. Our discussions were mutually beneficial to this overall aim of developing a framework that accurately reflects the service police provide to the community. A performance and outcomes framework will remain a focus for our policing engagement, of course, with the Australian Federal Police.

Our discussions also included insights from those who have led the reform process and those who have observed from outside. Both Police Scotland and the West Midlands Police have undergone significant reform to their policing models. Each has been focused on service delivery for the community by moving from a reactive to a proactive policing model. The fact is that the job of a police officer is very different now to what it was 40 years ago, and very different to when someone joined the force only 10 years ago.

We heard from one service that only 20 per cent of the incidents attended resulted in a crime being recorded. This reflects the broader social role that our police members play in supporting and protecting our community. Police services around the world are recognising this and changing their operational models. This is something ACT Policing began working on and looking at a few years ago, and I am pleased this year's budget commits initial funding to begin this transition to a new police service model over coming years.

Unlike those forces in the UK, our reforms are not being driven by austerity. Rather, we recognise that the nature of policing has changed and we need to reform and find better ways of serving the needs of our community to ensure future sustainability and continued crime reduction. We need to find better ways to help police do their job, helping to improve broader workforce and service delivery outcomes. And this is part of the almost \$34 million investment that has been made by the government to support ACT Policing announced as part of this year's budget. This is in addition to more than \$9 million committed to capital works to improve the support infrastructure for ACT Policing.

Our discussions with policing counterparts in the UK will further inform our work as part of the ACT Policing futures project and also provided valuable lessons for us to consider on its implementation. These lessons have been taken on board by the Chief Police Officer. The futures project is not one that we will rush into. It will be implemented methodically and we will take as much time as is needed to get it right.

We have provided the initial investment and now the task for the leadership of ACT Policing is to broaden their discussion with the membership of their force and to refine the model, taking the troops along the journey.

There is also more work to do in bringing the ACT community along with the changes that will result from the futures work and a new police service model. As I work with the Chief Police Officer to implement these reforms we will draw on the lessons of the forces we met in the UK and continue liaising with them to ensure that ACT Policing remains one of the best policing models around the world.

Our discussions in West Midlands also included pill testing. This initiative has been in place in that region for some time. It is clear that, from a harm reduction perspective, it is supported by their Police and Crime Commissioner and also by the police. Pill testing is good for the community and good for law enforcement. West Midlands has shown the benefits of this initiative. I am proud to serve in a government that has championed this for our territory. I thank the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for her leadership on this important initiative.

Before I finish, I briefly comment on austerity, something I mentioned earlier. My visit made it clear to me that austerity is bad for law and order and negatively impacts upon our community. Austerity in the UK has cut support for those that need government help the most. Removing this support impacts on our community in many ways. Firstly, it increases the burden on health services and, secondly, it increases demands on first responders such as police and emergency services. Mental health callouts have increased for first responders and more time is spent by them on these issues because the necessary support services are simply not there.

Other adverse outcomes have included an increase in certain crimes. For example, cuts to alcohol support services have seen crime increase. This is because those that need help cannot access it, and in order to deal with their addiction they turn to crime. These are just some examples. It is clear that if you want to be tough on crime, tough on law and order, you need to look at the whole picture and take a systemic approach. Simply filling prisons does not serve anyone well. If anything, it increases the overall burden on the budget and reduces the limited moneys available to invest in other important community safety initiatives.

The mission to the United Kingdom was timely and has helped shape many of the investments made in this year's budget for police and emergency services. I am proud of this year's budget, proud that this government is looking after all our community and is investing in a range of services that help build communities, not prisons.

In closing, I thank all the officials we met while in the UK. They were very generous of their time and provided frank advice. I am also grateful for their insights into the endeavours we are looking at and their efforts to provide valuable information and the knowledge of their experience in support of our own reforms. I also thank the Australian Federal Police officers posted at the High Commission in London for their assistance in helping set up the meetings and being conduits for information. We are very well served by having them there. It was clear that the Australian Federal Police is very well regarded across the world by its counterparts. And we are fortunate for our own relationship with the AFP through ACT Policing as well.

While our visit showed that there is much for us to learn from the experience of others, we should also be proud of our own achievements. Our city may not be as big as London, Glasgow or Birmingham but our first responders are leaders and the work that they perform day to day is world class. They are excellent at their job and amongst the world's best. Thanks to their work, our city is one of the safest cities in the world in which to live, work and visit.

The government will continue investing in our police and emergency services as our city grows to ensure that we remain a very safe city and continue to provide care for all Canberrans. I present the following paper:

Ministerial delegation to the United Kingdom—April 2019—Ministerial statement, 6 June 2019.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Government—safer families policy Ministerial statement

MS BERRY (Ginninderra—Deputy Chief Minister, Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Women) (11.21): Today I am delivering the third annual safer families statement. This statement will highlight some of the significant achievements the ACT government and the community have made over the past 12 months and describe future directions for continuing that work to support women, children and others impacted by family violence and to enable them to be safe and to get on with their lives.

In 2016 the ACT government made a historic funding commitment of \$21.42 million over four years, under the ACT government's response to family violence, to address domestic and family violence and to provide additional supports to families, women and children dealing with psychological, physical, emotional and financial costs. The safer families levy, at \$30 per household, was introduced to create an ongoing revenue base to fund long-term system reform and service improvements, and it provided offset funding for this first phase of safer families package initiatives.

Since 2016 safer families funding has provided additional resourcing for Legal Aid, ACT Policing and the courts to improve their capacity to help those affected by domestic and family violence to navigate the justice system and to enforce justice responses that keep victims safe. Families and individuals affected by domestic and family violence already experience trauma without the additional stress of navigating a complex and lengthy justice process. In 2019-20 these initiatives will be in their

fourth year of the initial safer families funding. These original commitments have helped to improve capacity and the integration of necessary supports and services for individuals experiencing domestic and family violence.

The implementation of the safer families package funding also increased resources and capacity for front-line services to meet the increasing demand they were experiencing. This allowed trusted and local specialist domestic and family violence support services, the Domestic Violence Crisis Service and the Canberra Rape Crisis Centre, to expand their support to Canberrans. In addition to increasing the capacity of front-line services, the first phase of the safer families package has given us the opportunity to test new approaches to responding to domestic and family violence. The Domestic Violence Crisis Service was funded to establish Room4Change, a therapeutic residential men's behaviour change program.

Room4Change is an important new program for the ACT, as it has the capacity to support the whole family. It is one of a small number of residential behaviour change programs nationally. Room4Change helps men make their own lives better by stopping their use of violence and assisting them to explore what is important for them and their current and future relationships. The program also supports the partners and children to stay safely in the home while men are engaged in the six-month therapeutic program which includes group work and one-on-one case management as well as accommodation.

Room4Change is being independently evaluated, but it is already showing important short-term successes. Since the program began in April 2017, data shows that 48 men have engaged in the program and 21 were accommodated; 30 men have successfully completed the program; and 41 partners and/or ex-partners have accepted partner support, with the support flowing onto their children. There were 94 children in the families supported by Room4Change.

As at 6 May this year, other promising signs are that no men who participated in the program were incarcerated for a domestic and family violence offence; no women were required to leave their home due to domestic and family violence; and child and youth protective services have not been required to support any children receiving support via Room4Change. In the first phase of safer families, the government committed \$964,000 over four years to establish the program. From 2019-20 the government will commit to an additional \$4.243 million over four years to fund the Room4Change program, allowing for a full evaluation of this program after two years and ongoing service delivery.

In 2016 the role of the Coordinator-General for Family Safety was established to provide strategic leadership and drive whole-of-government collaboration and coordination in our response to domestic and family violence. The coordinator-general works across government and with the community to develop new policy, services and approaches that address emerging problems and strengthen our capability to address domestic and family violence.

The coordinator-general and her office have led the development of a comprehensive training strategy to build capability across the ACT public service. The strategy will

also embed a focus on domestic and family violence capability into future training of the public service workforce. Under the strategy, foundation training will be provided to all ACT public servants, with specific training for managers, and with more extensive training for all public service employees in front-line roles. This strategy was a core commitment for government to deliver consistent training for all government front-line workers to ensure that there is a common understanding of what constitutes domestic and family violence and a shared capability to respond effectively and appropriately.

The office of the Coordinator-General for Family Safety has been leading this delivery, in collaboration with the ACT public service domestic violence community of practice, representing all ACT directorates. This newly established community of practice is assisting with sharing past practice across government and ensuring that the training meets the needs of the wide variety of different roles; that the levels of training are appropriately targeted for people in both generalist and specialist roles; and that the training is consistently delivered across all directorates and ACT Policing.

Foundation training for all ACT public servants and managers will commence in 2019-20, with some front-line roles having already received foundation training in 2018-19. More intensive training for front-line roles will be delivered in the following years. There will be two levels of training for front-line staff: tier 1 for teachers and nurses and tier 2 for people in more specialist roles who regularly deal with clients with domestic and family violence and related issues. This includes hospital social workers and tenant support workers. It is expected that in total 21,000 staff will receive the foundation training. In addition to this, 4,000 staff in supervisory roles will receive the manager training. Of the specialist front-line workers, an additional 7,000 will receive tier 1 training and 6,000 will receive tier 2 training.

This is a large and complex undertaking to provide universal training across all government workplaces. In the first phase of safer families, the government allocated \$770,000 to front-line worker training, which has paid for the development and testing of the training package for foundation training, managers training and tier 1 and tier 2. This funding has also provided for the initial e-launch of the foundation training, the development of an evaluation framework and the establishment of a specialist training panel to continuously improve training with best practice and evidence.

From 2019-20 the government has committed an additional \$2.476 million over four years to complete delivery of the strategy and train all 21,000 ACT government staff. Delivery of the front-line worker training strategy will continue the ACT government's commitment to be a leading employer in supporting employees impacted by domestic and family violence.

The coordinator-general led a comprehensive co-design process for the family safety hub, with people with lived experience, community organisations, crisis services and the government together to identify system gaps and reforms needed and build a robust evidence base for future ACT reform.

The family safety hub is a space for new ideas, a connector for service providers and a champion for change. The family safety hub draws on existing research and the insights gathered during co-design to understand the barriers, gaps and opportunities for change that exist in the service systems. Potential solutions progress through the family safety hub's innovation process—a framework for the development, testing and evaluation of new ideas—to a prototype or pilot. The family safety hub tackles one problem at a time and brings people together with expertise and experience to develop new solutions.

The first problem the family safety hub has looked at is improving early intervention for pregnant women and new parents. This has led to the family safety hub's first pilot program, which is a health justice partnership that is providing free and confidential legal services and advice in healthcare settings, particularly to vulnerable women who have multiple legal issues. Evidence shows that one in five women whose partners use violence experience that violence during pregnancy.

Although the pilot is still in its first few months, feedback from our partners has been positive, and the service is meeting an unmet need, as almost no clients have had legal assistance before. Around one-quarter of clients are from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. At one partnership site, 25 per cent have identified as having a mental illness or disability. In this budget \$300,000 for 2019-20 has been committed to ensure that this new legal service for pregnant women experiencing domestic and family violence can continue for another year to provide time to evaluate the service and build system capability.

The family safety hub's second challenge topic is preventing housing and financial crisis for people leaving a violent relationship. Discovery research identified many barriers and opportunities as well as service gaps that can lead to a crisis. In early May this year, over 40 people, from sectors including banking, real estate, housing, community services and government, and people living with the experience of domestic and family violence, came together for an intensive workshop to generate and refine ideas that could prevent this crisis. The next stage of this work will take the ideas generated and test their feasibility for becoming pilot projects.

These examples demonstrate the momentum being built through the family safety hub, which has been operating for just over 12 months. In the next 12 months it is expected that the development and delivery of solutions will make an even greater tangible change to the lives of people affected by domestic and family violence.

As I mentioned earlier, 2019-20 is the fourth year of funding for the first phase of commitments under the original safer families package. The cumulative impact of these investments has built an important foundation. The first phase of safer families has strengthened the capacity of front-line services to respond to domestic and family violence. It has improved coordination across government, built important partnerships with the community sector and tested promising new approaches.

Some of the early initiatives that have been funded through the safer families package will be transitioned out of the package after 2019-20. During the coming financial

year, directorates will be reviewing these initiatives to determine the best approach. Transitioning these initiatives out of the safer families package creates funding capacity for new initiatives. This has also enabled the government to continue to enhance its investment in front-line worker training and the Room4Change program and extend the first family safety hub pilot program for an additional 12 months.

Reviewing the impact of the first phase and reflecting on what has been learnt over the last three years has helped inform future priorities for the safer families package. To ensure that safer families funding continues to be directed towards the highest priorities and that there is capacity to respond to emerging issues, initiatives will be prioritised that focus on building whole-of-government and multi-agency domestic and family violence capacity, capability and infrastructure; improving the capacity of front-line domestic and family violence services to meet increased demand; and supporting the testing of new approaches for preventing and addressing domestic and family violence, particularly those generated through the family safety hub.

With those criteria in mind, the government has invested a total safer families package funding envelope of \$24 million over four years. Following a community consultation in 2018, the government has committed \$813,000 over four years to develop and implement the ACT family violence death review, which was a commitment included in the 2016 government response to domestic and family violence. The review will analyse and report on all domestic and family violence-related deaths and support regular system-wide reviews. These reports will help us identify the best ways to prevent deaths from domestic and family violence occurring in the future.

Future work on preventing and responding to family violence for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community will align with the principles of the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreement for 2019-28 and support self-determination. There are two community-led reports that set out priorities for action to address family violence. They are the *We don't shoot our wounded* 2009 report and the 2017 *Change our future: share what you know* report from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Forum: Domestic and Family Violence.

In the budget, the government has committed \$354,000 over four years to work with representatives from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, including the elected body and the Domestic Violence Prevention Council's new Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander reference group to develop a specific action in response to the recommendations of these reports and support community-designed responses.

There is a long way to go to fully realise the objectives outlined by both reports, and working with the community to address family violence is now embedded in the government's commitment to the new Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreement for 2019-28. The objectives of these reports include improved family-centred supports for those impacted by domestic and family violence; prevention and de-escalation of domestic and family violence; and diverting men who use violence from the justice system, where appropriate, to reduce demand on the Alexander Maconochie Centre.

From the 2018-19 Domestic Violence Prevention Council's extraordinary meeting on the needs of children and young people affected by domestic and family violence and sexual violence, we heard that children and young people witnessing and experiencing domestic and family violence have special needs and are impacted differently by domestic and family violence than the adults around them. But our current service system and policy responses are not adequately informed by the needs and rights of children and young people.

To ensure that children and young people feature at the heart of service design and delivery responses going forward, the ACT government is working across directorates to integrate and improve interventions and to improve data collection and monitoring through a coordinated government response to the Domestic Violence Prevention Council's extraordinary meeting in 2018.

The final report also advised that the needs, experiences and desires of children and young people need to be better understood. This is why a new project has commenced, led by the family safety hub, in conjunction with the ACT Children and Young People Commissioner. This project is engaging with children and young people to gain their insights and to equip the sector to meet and better support their needs.

The safer families package has created more capacity and significantly driven system reform. As new issues and priorities emerge, the safer families package will continue to direct collective efforts to keep families safe and reduce and prevent domestic and family violence. I present the following paper:

Annual Statement 2019—Ministerial statement, 6 June 2019.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the paper.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Alexander Maconochie Centre—report of a review of a critical incident—government response 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) (11.38): I welcome the Inspector of Correctional Services report of a review of Correctional Services *The Care and Management of Remandees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre 2018*, which was tabled in the Assembly on 20 February this year.

The report considered how remanded detainees are being managed in the current circumstances of the Alexander Maconochie Centre. It makes 39 findings that identify strengths and areas for improvement to lead sustainable change towards best practice

in corrections management. In summary, the findings relate to the separation of remand and sentenced detainees; the induction regime; out of cell hours and managing cohorts; telephone, email and visits; dedicated cultural space areas for detainees; the care and treatment of women detainees, specifically those remanded; and ACT Corrective Services policies.

It has been a year since the on-site component of the review was conducted at the AMC. Since that time, ACT Corrective Services has implemented a range of policy changes that have addressed many of the issues raised in the report. ACT Corrective Services has carefully considered all of the findings made in the report. Today I am tabling the ACT government response to the report. It addresses each of the 39 findings and notes the government position on those findings, and indicates actions and time frames for the completion of actions being undertaken, where appropriate.

Establishing an Inspector of Correctional Services was a commitment of the government in response to recommendation 8 of the Moss review, following the death in custody of Steven Freeman at the AMC in 2016. A number of reviews, including the Moss review, have recognised that effective independent oversight is vitally important to maintain public confidence in our correctional system. These reviews include the 2007 human rights audit of the operation of ACT correctional facilities under corrections legislation; the 2016 justice and community safety standing committee's inquiry into the Auditor-General's report on the rehabilitation of male detainees; and the 2016 Morison security review.

Following the Moss review, and in recognition of the unique make-up of the ACT's correctional system and increasing population pressures, the ACT government committed to establishing an external and independent Inspector of Correctional Services, intended to strengthen and improve existing oversight arrangements. The government allocated \$1.661 million over four years to establish an external and independent Inspector of Correctional Services to strengthen and improve oversight arrangements.

On 30 November 2017 the ACT Legislative Assembly passed the Inspector of Correctional Services Act. This legislation established an independent inspector tasked with conducting biannual reviews of ACT adult correction facilities and, by the end of 2019, youth justice centres. The act ensures that the inspector makes these reports public unless there are public interest grounds against disclosure.

In May 2018 the government announced the appointment of Mr Neil McAllister to the role of Inspector of Correctional Services for the territory. Mr McAllister has extensive experience conducting comprehensive reviews of correctional facilities across Australia and providing clear advice to governments on ways to improve operations and policies. The office of the Inspector of Correctional Services is now fully operational and is committed to ensuring continuous improvement through its systematic and regular reviews of correctional services.

In June 2018 the inspector initiated this review under section 18(1)(b) of the Inspector of Correctional Services Act. This section of the act provides that the inspector must examine and review a correctional service at least once every two years. This

requirement of the act ensures a systemic and preventative approach to the oversight of these services. The review examines specific needs of the remand cohort at the AMC and considers whether remanded detainees are being afforded their legal and human rights in accordance with their legal status as defined in the Corrections Management Act.

I acknowledge the findings of the inspector around the human rights of detainees. The report makes a statement regarding possible, unreasonable or significant limitations on detainees' human rights, a matter that I take very seriously. The government has received advice through proactive and ongoing relationships with a range of existing oversight bodies such as the Human Rights Commission, the official visitors and the Ombudsman. I continue to work constructively with all of the relevant stakeholders to ensure a consistent appreciation of the matter.

The ACT government takes its human rights obligations very seriously. Observance of human rights is fundamental to good correctional centre management, and the safest and most effective way of managing correctional centres. As Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, I am committed to providing a correctional services regime that supports human rights obligations.

I recently released the first human rights principles for ACT correctional centres. These principles give clear meaning to the government's commitment to human rights in the adult corrections context and will be used to support better outcomes for detainees' health, safety, education, wellbeing and integration back into the community. The principles provide a clear statement that detainees must at all times be treated with humanity and respect for the inherent dignity of the human person. These principles are being used by Corrective Services to guide the update and development of correctional centre policies and procedures to best support all detainees, including male, female, intersex and gender diverse, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and culturally and linguistically diverse detainees, those with a disability, and older detainees.

The separation of sentenced and remanded detainees remains a challenge for ACT Corrective Services due to the high numbers of remand detainees and the complexities of managing a range of detainee cohorts in one facility. I note the inspector's finding relating to non-separation of remanded and convicted detainees at the AMC. The separation of sentenced and remanded detainees was also canvassed through the government's response to recommendation 6 of the Moss review, which recommended:

That ACTCS establish a separate remand prison within the AMC to ensure remanded detainees are segregated from sentenced detainees.

In October 2018 I advised the Assembly that the Moss review implementation steering committee had found that recommendation 6 of the Moss review could not be met until the ACT government commits to build a separate remand facility within the AMC. The committee has noted that a separate remand facility would meet existing legislative requirements under both the Human Rights Act and the Corrections Management Act.

ACT Corrective Services continues to segregate and separate detainees where necessary, as at the present time the design of the AMC does not allow for complete separation to occur, especially with increased detainee numbers. The issue of separation continues to be addressed by Corrective Services through the refreshing and review of existing policies and the introduction of pro-social methods of detainee management. These include the implementation of the ACT Corrective Services rehabilitation framework and the development of the AMC's operational model.

On 15 February this year the ACT government announced new funding to support the building communities not prisons initiatives. This has seen an initial \$14.5 million of funds dedicated to a range of community programs, legislative reforms and policy initiatives. As part of the building communities not prisons strategy, the ACT government is investing \$997,000 to design the Alexander Maconochie Centre reintegration centre, which will add another 80 beds. Formerly known as the transitional release centre, it will allow a range of rehabilitation and reintegration programs to be delivered in partnership with non-government and government agencies.

At the time of the review, Corrective Services did not have a specific policy pertaining to remand detainees. This will be rectified with the remand policy that will be notified by 30 June this year. The remand policy will set out the general principles for the management of detainees on remand. It states that remand detainees are to be subject to fewer restrictions than sentenced detainees and recognises the presumption of innocence for any offence for which the detainee is remanded. It also establishes the broad arrangements for remand detainees to maintain their ties to the community and attend to their legal matters.

ACT Corrective Services acknowledges that, at the time of the report, the management of newly received detainees was not best practice, as it did not maximise access to time out of cells. The process for managing new reception detainees at the time was originally implemented as a direct result of the Moss review. The recommendations of the Moss review were very seriously considered by the government, as the government was required to improve practices after the tragic death of Aboriginal man Steven Freeman at the AMC in 2016. The Moss review concluded:

... had measures and processes adopted since Steven Freeman's assault been in place when he was admitted, including the assessment of new receptions in a separate unit generally for five days, the likelihood of his being assaulted would have been significantly reduced.

The separation regime for new detainees at that time allowed sufficient time for intelligence checks of all new detainees at the AMC to occur with ACT Policing and youth justice, to inform appropriate accommodation placement. A full review of the induction process is being undertaken in 2019 to enhance current practice and embed a full program aimed at utilising those critical first few days within the AMC as both an information provision and an assessment period for new detainees.

In November 2018 ACT Corrective Services repurposed a dedicated unit within the AMC for the purpose of supporting detainees in their first seven to 14 days. The regime of the unit is still under development. It will have a constructive regime in place which supports detainees to adjust to their new environment. It will also provide detainees with information regarding their period of incarceration and the services and supports that can be accessed while at the AMC. The longer intent will be to provide a full induction program, including the commencement of sentence management processes and detainee peer support.

The corrections management induction policy 2019 will be notified by 30 June. The policy sets out the requirements for a structured induction process for detainees. It stipulates that the general manager of custodial operations will ensure that the induction process meets or exceeds the requirements of the corrections management regime planning policy 2018 for time out of cell hours, which is 10 hours, and consideration of risk and safety. The enhancements to the induction unit will improve outcomes for this vulnerable cohort and reduce the risk of suicide and self-harm for new detainees.

The AMC is a complex prison, as it hosts and manages a wide number of different cohorts of detainees. The management of cohorts can impact on the out of cell hours more than in other jurisdictions. The reasons for lock-ins are varied. They can be due to events such as incident management, detainee health escorts, or training commitments. At present, rostering arrangements at the AMC are under review to ensure that staff resourcing is optimised to meet operational needs.

Time out of cells is defined in the regime planning policy as the number of hours per day that detainees are not confined to cells or units. This policy confirms the requirements of the regime for the AMC, including access to exercise. This is now the expected standard for the AMC. Corrective Services continues to examine operations of the AMC, including a number of detainee cohorts and locations. As this work is completed, a placement policy will be developed to inform the management of cohorts.

The current telephone system technology at the AMC is 10 years old, and the number of phones has not increased to meet the detainee population. Replacement of the telephone system is being funded in the 2019-20 budget so that it can allow for the implementation of findings 16 and 17 by increasing the number of phones and the amount of privacy afforded to detainees when making phone calls.

Corrective Services appreciates the inspector's acknowledgement of the AMC's progressive initiative in providing detainees with email and limited internet. Both email and telephone accounts are routinely established within the first week of admission for all detainees. For detainees to add people to their email or telephone account list, verbal permission must be confirmed from the nominated individuals.

In exceptional circumstances delays may occur as ACT Corrective Services officers attempt to make telephone contact with the nominated person to obtain permission. At times the relevant person does not answer or respond in a timely manner. This is a

necessary process to ensure that victims are not contacted and/or re-traumatised, and people in the community that do not wish to be contacted by a detainee are protected.

I acknowledge the significant proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees at the AMC. I wish to assure the Assembly and the community that the ACT government is committed to addressing elements of the criminal justice system that disproportionately impact on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Corrective Services offer a range of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander specific programs, services and events to support cultural connection for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees. These events and programs are supported by custodial operations and are well attended and participated in by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees.

The AMC has several culturally appropriate areas, including two yarning circles and a cultural area within the horticultural program, which are used for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees to gather. Corrective Services is currently considering how it may enhance these services by increasing detainee access to them.

In November 2017 I presented a ministerial statement to the Assembly advising members of the planned relocation of female detainees. Due to population pressures, on 28 November 2017 ACT Corrective Services relocated female detainees to a 57-bed special care centre area of the AMC.

Corrective Services acknowledge that the use of the SCC for female detainees is not ideal, but at the time of the relocation this was the only viable option available. When the decision to relocate female detainees was made, a risk assessment was undertaken to assess the impact of the move on female detainees. Winnunga Nimmityjah Health and Community Services were engaged to support female detainees in the move by providing additional counselling sessions.

Corrective Services considered the risk of the potential re-traumatisation of women, and significant works were undertaken to prevent this from occurring. The AMC infrastructure was altered, including the erection of fencing and enhancing the availability of services and supports within the female unit for female detainees.

There has been a significant increase in the availability of purposeful activity for female detainees since the move. A women's and children coordinator position has been created to enhance supports and advocacy for this group. The women's and children coordinator works closely with families of all detainees to mitigate the negative impacts on children of incarcerated parents. The women's care team, comprising a women's case manager and two program facilitators, develop programs and services targeted to the specific criminogenic needs of the female detainee cohort. The availability of unsupervised access to open air and a grassed area has been resolved.

ACT Corrective Services are currently developing a female offender framework to further address the needs of female detainees, to be finalised by the end of 2019. The development of the framework will require consultation and active engagement with non-government organisations and key stakeholders in the coming months. The

framework aims to meet the specific needs of female offenders and address their issues in order to optimise the chances of successful rehabilitation and reintegration into the community post release.

The ACT government agrees with the inspector's finding that a policy recognising the status of remanded detainees as convicted persons was needed. This has been rectified with the notification of the remand policy, which establishes the general principles for the management of detainees on remand and recognises that remand detainees are to be subject to fewer restrictions than sentenced detainees. It also establishes the broad arrangements for remand detainees to maintain their ties to the community and attend to their legal matters.

As part of ongoing continuous improvement, ACT Corrective Services is undertaking a full review of all policies and procedures, which will be completed by mid-2019. The review will provide Corrective Services with updated policies to uphold best practice processes, and better manage the needs of all detainees within the ACT's correctional system. The Justice and Community Safety Directorate are developing a new website for the directorate. When completed, it will provide an easy-to-access location for ACT Corrective Services to place all of their policies.

I would like to acknowledge that the inspector made a point of commending the professionalism, assistance and friendliness of staff and detainees at the AMC during his review visits. It was reassuring for me to hear from an independent oversight body that there is a positive culture operating at the AMC. I take this opportunity to thank the inspector for his report and its findings. The independent oversight provided by the inspector is important to build and maintain public confidence in the ACT's correctional system and helps contribute to the continuous improvement of the care, treatment and safety of all detainees.

I present the following papers:

Inspector of Correctional Services Act—Report of a review of a correctional service by the ACT Inspector of Correctional Services—The care and management of remandees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre 2018—Government response—

Ministerial statement, 6 June 2019.

Government response.

I move:

That the Assembly take note of the papers.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ACT Teacher Quality Institute Amendment Bill 2019

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

Title read by Clerk.

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) (11.58): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to introduce the ACT Teacher Quality Institute Amendment Bill 2019. A key focus for this government in the education portfolio has been respecting and investing in the teaching profession. It is a priority for the government because the evidence about the impact that teachers make is clear.

After personal factors related to a school student, the single most significant factor in their learning outcomes is the standard of teaching available to them. Teachers are expert professionals. As professionals, the knowledge and skills of a teacher are in working with students to lead them through a learning journey. Teachers should be respected and valued because of the specialist knowledge they have and the skills they possess.

Gone are the days when schools were seen as factories, churning uniform children through a mass standardised process. Every child is unique and brings their personal circumstances and background to their school education. Because of this, teachers need to work with dissimilarity, diagnosing and designing learning to support the individual needs of each student.

The government respects and values the ACT's teachers. We are investing in our teachers. So significant is the government's commitment to teachers that one of the four foundations of the 10-year future of education strategy is directed at empowering learning professionals—the teachers and school leaders, other educators, allied learning professionals and support staff that make education happen in ACT schools every day. The strategy laid out our initiatives under this foundation and the bill I introduce today provides a clear step forward on several key directions, providing a strong basis for work that is to follow.

A key part of the government's work with teachers builds on the existing work of the ACT Teacher Quality Institute, established through the ACT Teacher Quality Institute Act 2010. The institute's function is to build the professional standing of the ACT's teachers and to enhance the community's confidence in the teaching profession through professional regulation and practical initiatives to raise teacher quality. The institute is well respected nationally and is known as a leader in many areas. It is well placed to take on an expanded role and this bill begins the process towards that.

The bill makes three key amendments to the act. First, the bill establishes in legislation a framework for the registration of preservice teachers. Since the commencement of the act in 2011 there has been an increasing emphasis on

strengthening preservice teacher education to ensure graduates are ready to teach. In the same way as practicum is a core part of medical professionals advancing towards attainment of a status as a member of the profession, practicum is becoming increasingly important in the teaching profession.

An integral part of preservice teacher education is professional experience, and it is therefore already a compulsory part of the education program that a preservice teacher must complete. The institute has administratively contributed to raising the quality of this part in the act through the introduction in 2017 of a professional experiences framework which provides guidance on how schools and teachers can provide high quality practicum to preservice teachers.

Through the bill, preservice teachers will now need to be approved by TQI to undertake professional experience at a school in the ACT and will be captured on a preservice teacher register. Establishing a preservice teacher register, as occurs through the bill, will assist universities and schools to provide high quality, practical in-school teaching experience so that school teachers are better equipped with the classroom skills they need when they graduate. The government is conscious that any administrative burden and cost of a framework like this should be minimised; so there will be no fee or charge required for preservice teacher approval and registration.

Quality teaching is founded in high quality preservice teacher education which ensures that graduate teachers start with the skills, knowledge and experience necessary to have a positive impact on teacher learning. Again the ACT is showing that it takes this issue seriously through the unique approach introduced today. Second, the bill provides lawful authority for the sharing of information held by the institute for research and workforce planning purposes, provides privacy protections when this occurs and clarifies the functions of the institute in this regard.

A sustainable supply of teachers and school leaders is essential to the quality of the education system and the ability of schools to facilitate student learning. The effective management of this supply is far more complex than simply matching the number of available teachers and school leaders to the number of students in schools. It involves detailed understanding of the many factors affecting teacher supply and demand. For example, the skill needs of the labour market and economic development policy have upstream implications for the skill and capability needs of school leaders. Meeting these needs requires appropriately skilled teachers, including specialist teachers. Equally, our community expects that school students are supported with learning and development in important social and cultural knowledge and skills like languages and music. Again, appropriately skilled teachers, including specialist teachers, are required.

The bill provides authority to collect, share and analyse preservice teacher data and teacher workforce data for research and workforce planning purposes. In doing so, the government, through the institute, will be able to participate in the development of the Australian initial teacher education and teacher workforce data strategy, a national strategy for the collection and analysis of preservice teacher education program data and teacher workforce data.

The bill will also allow the government to undertake the kind of workforce planning that the future of education strategy forecasts, such as preparing sector and industry-level workforce plans and ensuring that there are sufficient languages teachers available to provide continuity of language education. Alongside the existing privacy and information management obligations that the institute must comply with, the bill ensures that sharing and use of information as proposed by these amendments protects individual privacy.

For the government to participate in the national strategy, the bill provides that data identifying a teacher may only be shared with a data linkage agency approved by the minister, and an approved agency must not share data in this form with anyone else. Data shared with an approved agency may only be used for a planning and research purpose and must not be used in a manner that will identify a teacher.

An approved agency must meet privacy and information management standards equivalent and relevant to ACT or commonwealth legislation and the Australian government protective security policy framework. Equivalent protections are provided for other sharing and use of information held by the institute, with special exception made for the legitimate purpose of allowing an employer or prospective employer to request information about the status of a registration or permit to teach. The collection of suitable life cycle data at the level of preservice teacher, teacher and school leader will provide sound information to assist in the development of evidence-based policies and programs in education workforce planning and enhancement.

Third, the bill removes a transitional allowance that permitted people without teaching qualifications meeting current expected standards to be registered as a teacher. Through this amendment, the act will require newly registered teachers to hold a minimum of four years teacher education. When the act commenced in 2011 there were a number of experienced and effective teachers who did their initial teacher education when three-year courses were the norm. Consequently the act provided an exception for teachers in this circumstance to access registration to teach. In effect, this provided teachers and sectors with flexibility about teacher qualifications in a time of transition, following the act's introduction. These provisions also allowed for people with a partial or no teaching qualification to be registered to teach.

The institute has never drawn on these provisions to grant full or provisional registration to a person who is without a completed teaching qualification. It is appropriate to remove these provisions from the act, given that after the passage of the transition period they have not been required and have the potential to weaken the teaching profession. It will remain the case that the institute must, under mutual recognition legislation, grant registration to eligible people who apply for teacher registration in the ACT.

The opportunity for people with partial qualifications or acceptable teaching experience to be considered for eligibility to teach in the ACT will be maintained through their opportunity to access a permit to teach. No currently registered teachers will be disadvantaged by this amendment. The amendment will not affect those

teachers who are already registered and who wish to renew their current registration. Teachers must be recognised as highly qualified professionals. ACT teachers want to be part of a high-status profession that values excellence and has the confidence of the community. This requires that registered teachers have suitable academic teaching qualifications, a requirement which is achieved through this bill.

Building the professional standing of ACT teachers and enhancing the community's confidence in the teaching profession through professional regulation is a key purpose of the TQI Act. It is important that the government supports the professionalisation of the teacher workforce and safeguards the quality of the teaching profession in the ACT. It is important that the government can adequately plan for the workforce needs of schools. The ACT community expressed its view, in the future of education consultation, that teachers are the most important part of a child's school experience, consistent with well-established research evidence, and the bill makes important steps to respond in kind.

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

Sitting suspended from 12.09 to 2.00 pm.

Questions without notice

Budget—rates

MR COE: My question is to the Treasurer. Minister, are you aware of any Canberrans that are suffering hardship because of your increases to residential rates?

MR BARR: Yes, the government is aware that increases in rates put some financial pressure on some sections of the community, and we have in place a range of measures to address that, including access to concessions and deferral of payments as well as a range of individualised and tailored circumstances where any ratepayer who is experiencing financial difficulty can engage with the revenue office in relation to how rates may be paid—there is a great degree of flexibility in annual, quarterly, monthly, fortnightly payments—in order to meet the individual circumstances of ratepayers. We recognise, through our concession schemes, that further government assistance can be provided to assist those who may be particularly asset rich but income poor.

MR COE: Treasurer, how many households in Canberra will see their rates increase in the next financial year?

MR BARR: Most. Some will receive very modest increases, or potentially a decrease, depending on the respective valuation of their properties. I would note that this is no different from every other year in the history of the city. Rates have gone up under every government, conservative or Labor, in the history of Canberra. There is no world in which rates have not gone up each year. There are, of course, differences in the level of increase from year to year and from property type to property type. As a result of the tax reforms that we have been progressively introducing, other taxes and charges either have been abolished or are going down.

It is not a new debate; this is the eighth year that we have debated this very topic. It is very clear that we are abolishing or have now abolished taxes on insurance products. We are phasing down stamp duty; from 1 July, first home buyers will no longer pay stamp duty on their first purchase. And we have increased the payroll tax free threshold. On the commercial stamp duty side, we have now exempted 70 per cent of commercial property transactions that take place below \$1.5 million and we have reduced the top tax rate from over seven per cent to under five per cent.

What if we had left the tax settings alone? Stamp duty was 22 per cent of total own-source revenue back when tax reforms began. Stamp duty now would be raking in \$450 million. Rates would also have increased, by the wage price index. The total tax take would be the same. The point is that it has shifted away from stamp duty, away from insurance taxes and away from payroll to rates. *(Time expired.)*

MS LAWDER: Treasurer, when will the yearly rate increases stop in Canberra?

MR BARR: The yearly rate increases will reduce in size as we progress further through tax reform, as they have been doing since the reform commenced. The heaviest lifting is now behind us.

Mr Coe: It means it is every year now.

MR BARR: One tax is already abolished: insurance taxes. So everyone who has comprehensive motor vehicle insurance and everyone who has home and contents insurance is not paying insurance tax every year, Mr Coe. They are paying less. Everyone who buys a house is paying less stamp duty.

The simple point here is that we all consume services in Canberra every year and we should all contribute every year, not just extortionate amounts when we buy a house. Why should seven per cent of the population be contributing 25 per cent of revenue because they buy a house, because they have a child or another child and need a bigger house, because they are buying their first home or because their family have left home and they are downsizing? Why is it okay to hit those people with \$50,000, with \$60,000, with \$70,000?

If we had not reformed those tax rates, we would be like New South Wales; we would be in a position where we would be gouging homebuyers. We are not, because we have shifted our tax base. It is fairer because it means that everyone contributes every year to the services that we all consume. That is the simple and fair proposition.

Community housing—land release

MS LE COUTEUR: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development and relates to land release for community housing. How many of the 34 dwelling sites identified for community housing in 2017-18 and the 20 dwelling sites in 2018-19 have been offered and then sold to community housing providers so far?

MS BERRY: I do not have that detail in front of me. I will have to get that and bring it back to the Assembly for Ms Le Couteur's information. Of course, working with the community sector is important for the ACT government. In our partnership now with Community Housing Canberra, and particularly HomeGround, we are providing opportunities for people to get into below-market rents. For people with investment properties who want to contribute to that program, it has been an important way forward for the ACT government. I look forward to seeing the outcomes of that program that we are working on with Community Housing Canberra.

MS LE COUTEUR: What, if any, price discount was offered when these blocks were offered for sale?

MS BERRY: I do not believe there were discounts on the blocks but I will check and get some advice. If there is a different response to that then I will provide it to the Assembly.

MS LAWDER: Minister, what process do you and your department go through to determine which blocks will be up for sale and how?

MS BERRY: There are a number of processes that are gone through around what land is available and then what parts of that land would be appropriate for community housing, including other housing opportunities, whether that is public housing, community housing or affordable housing through the indicative land release process. Housing ACT works with EPSDD and the planning minister to make sure that we get the balance right and that the land that is provided to those organisations meets the needs of those organisations.

Budget—employment

MR PETTERSSON: My question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, how is the ACT government investing to boost local jobs and growth through the 2019-20 ACT budget?

MR BARR: I thank Mr Pettersson for the question. Our economy has grown by 12 per cent in the past three years, and that has supported the creation of more than 16,000 new jobs. Ongoing strong economic growth delivers more good jobs and opportunities for Canberrans and local businesses.

Through this budget we are delivering the territory's largest ever infrastructure program. That will support thousands of jobs in our construction industry and across a range of professional scientific and technical service areas. The budget outlines \$3 billion worth of infrastructure investment, with a strong focus on health, education and transport infrastructure, investing now to meet our city's future needs. We are also supporting a more diverse territory economy by supporting the growth of key local industries that build on our territory's strengths.

Over the next four years there will be a nearly \$16 million investment in supporting continued business development activities in sectors like defence, higher education,

cybersecurity, space, renewable energy and agri-technology. There is an investment of \$5 million in the CBR Innovation Network, which assists small to medium businesses with grants, partnership arrangements and access to venture capital. Since its launch five years ago, the Innovation Network has assisted more than 1,000 entrepreneurs and businesses.

We are releasing land for 15,600 new dwellings over the next four years as well as more land for commercial, industrial and mixed-use projects across the city. Delivering a strong pipeline of land will help to maintain activity in the construction sector and ensure we can meet the demand for land created by new and expanding businesses.

MR PETTERSSON: Chief Minister, what does a re-elected coalition government mean for our economy and local jobs? How is the ACT government responding through the budget?

MR BARR: I hope that we can move the debate about our city beyond it being a bubble. It would be useful if Capital Hill could be separated from the rest of Canberra. There is a concern, given the election eve announcement of a further \$1.5 billion worth of job cuts coming to the Australian public service and a decentralisation agenda that is principally driven by the National Party. That clearly remains a concern not just for this side of the chamber but also potentially for those opposite.

I do not think there is any prospect of the Nationals giving up their agenda of wanting to shift jobs out of Canberra into their own electorates. We recognise that reality. We will continue to campaign against decentralisation and APS job cuts. At the same time we will step up our own efforts to invest in Canberra because the federal government will not. They have made that pretty clear through the election campaign. We will invest in our schools, hospitals and transport infrastructure. We will continue our focus on building infrastructure to meet our city's future needs. Where we can partner with the commonwealth government, like on the Monaro Highway, we will. But that is it; that was their project. We do not even get anywhere near our per capita share of commonwealth infrastructure. That is a decision that the coalition took prior to the federal election. If they stand by that, we will not get our per capita share. We will need to do more, and we will.

MS CODY: Chief Minister, what steps is the ACT government taking to improve job security for workers through the 2019-20 budget and set an example for the ACT labour market as a whole?

MR BARR: We have taken some very deliberate decisions through this budget round, leading by example to ensure more secure jobs within our own ACT government service. This year's budget also invests in a task force focusing on improving job security by reviewing the use of casual and temporary employment across ACT government directorates. This will identify work currently being undertaken by temporary staff which can be transitioned to secure and permanent roles over time.

We will also transition externally contracted school cleaning services to a territory-run service by establishing a cleaning workforce within the Education Directorate. This

will deliver better job security and working conditions for our hardworking school cleaners. Transport Canberra and City Services will increase the ratio of permanent staff to contract staff over several years. This year's budget advances this aim by converting temporary and contract roles within the city presentation unit to permanent positions. We are also working within Access Canberra to convert labour hire contractors to ACT public service staff, giving more security to the workers who are the public face of many of our government services. We do so because we are committed to improving job security for our staff and setting a standard for the ACT workforce.

Budget—rates

MR WALL: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, have you been contacted by any businesses in Canberra that are struggling to keep up with increases to commercial rates?

MR BARR: I have not had any direct personal approaches. There may have been some emails; I will need to check. I have certainly heard through the media and had a letter or two over the years, particularly related more to revaluation of properties, as has obviously been discussed through the commercial rates review, and we have instituted the beginning of a government response in relation to those questions and highlighted that in the budget papers.

But I note that we have 3,000 more businesses operating in the territory than we did a few years ago. Our stamp duty cuts, our insurance tax cuts and the lifting of the payroll tax free threshold to the highest in the nation, which means 90 per cent of businesses do not pay payroll tax in the ACT, make us a very competitive place to do business, and we are seeing that in the growth in the number of businesses operating in Canberra.

MR WALL: Chief Minister, why are businesses struggling to keep up with the increases in commercial rates, from what you have heard in the media?

MR BARR: There are a range of factors in the broader economy that impact on profitability for business. ACT taxes and charges are a relatively modest part of total business expenditure. We are making the transition away from taxing capital and taxing labour. There are three factors of production: land, labour and capital. Labour is quite mobile; capital is extremely mobile; land is not. The simplest, fairest and most efficient form of taxation available to our level of government is land. That is why we have the lightest taxation in Australia of labour and capital. That is why we have 3,000 more businesses operating in the ACT.

Opposition members interjecting—

MR BARR: That fact is very inconvenient for the Leader of the Opposition and his campaign of mistruths but it is a fact. There are more businesses operating now than there were three years ago. That is a fact.

Mrs Dunne: Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order. I ask that the Chief Minister withdraw the assertion that Mr Coe has a campaign of mistruths. It is accusing him of lying and it is unparliamentary.

MADAM SPEAKER: Among the interjections and the noise from your side, I did not hear that word.

MR BARR: I will withdraw, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Barr. Continue.

MR BARR: Mr Coe's campaign is not backed by the facts. The facts are that there are more businesses, 3,000 more, operating in the ACT now than there were three years ago.

MRS DUNNE: Chief Minister, what percentage of commercially rateable properties will see an increase in their rates this year?

MR BARR: It is similar to my answer to the earlier question in relation to residential—a very similar proportion that has received an increase every year in the history of the city. Unless the opposition are proposing that they will never increase a tax or charge ever again in the future, every year there is an increase in rates and in other taxes and charges. Every year people pay more income tax as well. The economy grows. People pay more tax to government as the economy grows. It is the same at this level as it is federally.

Mr Wall: And that's why there are tax cuts by a coalition government: to put more money in people's pockets.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Wall, that is enough.

MR BARR: That the coalition at a federal level is handing back some bracket creep is a good thing.

Mr Wall: Money back in people's pockets.

MR BARR: They are handing back some bracket creep. Hurrah to them! A round of applause; fantastic! We are cutting stamp duty. We are handing back more in payroll tax concessions than any other government in this nation. We are handing back more.

Ms Lawder: A point of order, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Barr, resume your seat. There is a point of order.

Ms Lawder: It goes to relevance. The question specifically asked what percentage of commercially rateable properties will see an increase. He has not answered the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: There is no point of order, Ms Lawder. Mr Barr made reference to that at the beginning of his answer.

MR BARR: We are making deeper stamp duty cuts than almost every government in this nation. Only South Australia, which, under the former Labor government, phased out commercial stamp duty altogether over a period of time, has done more than this government on the commercial stamp duty side. Small and medium-sized businesses that want to invest in Canberra do not have a \$70,000 stamp duty hit when they make that investment to buy commercial property in Canberra. That is a big difference. And they do not payroll tax here either. *(Time expired.)*

MADAM SPEAKER: Before I give Ms Cody the call, I remind members that there are rules on interjections. Can you please remain silent?

Budget—emergency services

MS CODY: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Minister, how are you supporting the ACT Ambulance Service?

MR GENTLEMAN: I thank Ms Cody for her interest in a safer Canberra. Keeping Canberrans safe is one of this government's highest priorities, and that is why the government is making ongoing investments in our emergency services. The 2019-20 budget that the Chief Minister handed down just the other day provides funding for our emergency services, including ACTAS and ACT Fire & Rescue.

The investment in ACTAS builds on the funding in the 2018-19 midyear budget review in which the government announced it would recruit two additional ambulance crews to help ensure the ACT's emergency response times remain the best in the country. The ACTAS fleet will also be expanded, with five new ambulances fitted with state-of-the-art electronic stretchers, power loaders and defibrillators. I was recently contacted by a constituent who was attended to by two paramedics and was the beneficiary of these new state-of-the-art stretchers. My constituent was grateful for the ease and care with which she was transferred to hospital and she was also extremely appreciative of the professional, efficient and compassionate treatment which she received from the attending crew.

I add my own gratitude to that of my constituent and thank the women and men of ACTAS for the important work they do in our community.

MS CODY: Minister, is there additional support for ACT Fire & Rescue in the budget?

MR GENTLEMAN: Yes, there is additional support. The government is delivering more firefighters, emergency services vehicles and stations to keep Canberra safe as our city grows. The 2019-20 budget will help to recruit 36 more firefighters through two new recruit colleges. These firefighters will replace retiring staff and continue strengthening our firefighting workforce. The government will also purchase a new aerial firefighting appliance that will be able to navigate urban areas more effectively and provide a better response at multistorey building fires.

The government will purchase a new pumper for ACT Fire & Rescue, augmenting the agency's existing vehicle replacement program. The government will help to keep our first responders safe at work by providing new structural protective clothing to firefighters, including the latest generation outer tunics and overpants.

Work will commence to establish new stations in Ms Cody's electorate. The budget provides funds to complete due diligence and undertake preliminary design for new fire and ambulance stations in the city and the Molonglo Valley.

Through these investments in emergency services, the 2019-20 budget builds on our commitment to ensuring the safety of our community and our first responders—now and in the years to come. These investments will also help to keep our city safe from the threat of bushfires.

MS ORR: Minister, how is the government supporting bushfire preparedness?

MR GENTLEMAN: I thank Ms Orr for her interest in the safety of Canberra, particularly around bushfires. We will continue improving the ACT's preparedness for bushfires, including by upgrading the ACT's aerial bushfire fighting aviation fleet to include a specialist intelligence gathering enabled helicopter. Through the 2019-20 budget, we are delivering \$2.2 million to contract this helicopter to enhance the early detection and suppression of bushfires in remote locations across the ACT and surrounding region. This will enable livestreaming of video and still images so that the Emergency Services Agency can accurately map fires, inform the deployment of firefighting resources and assess emerging risks.

The government is also upgrading workspaces for the ACT Rural Fire Service and ACT State Emergency Service. Through the budget the ACT Rural Fire Service volunteers and staff will benefit from upgraded workspaces, with the refurbishment of a multipurpose room at the Hume heli-base and modernised change areas for the Hall brigade through a \$178,000 investment. To cater for a growing volunteer membership base, we are also investing \$1.9 million to refurbish the ACT State Emergency Service Majura unit facility.

Identifying and tackling bushfires before they threaten lives or homes in Canberra's urban areas are a critical part of our work to keep this community safe. As our city grows, we are better prepared to tackle the threat from bushfires.

Government—fees and charges

MRS DUNNE: My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, how many people have asked for tax concessions because they cannot keep up financially with your rates, taxes, fees and charges?

MR BARR: Asked for tax concessions? I am not quite sure that is what you mean.

Mrs Dunne: To clarify: how many people have asked for a deferment or any other means of spreading the cost of their taxes?

MR BARR: If you mean specifically deferments, I believe that that number is in the low hundreds, but I will get that checked. Obviously, it changes. It has increased in recent times as people have become more aware of that option—that it is available. It is a very sensible and rational option that, when I reach that age, I will certainly be taking up.

MRS DUNNE: Treasurer, how many households are expected to be pushed into financial hardship because of your changes in rates, taxes, fees and charges in 2019-20?

MR BARR: None.

MS CHEYNE: Chief Minister, how many households are going to benefit from changes to stamp duty this year?

MR BARR: Everyone who buys a house in Canberra and has bought a house over the last seven years has benefited—some to the tune of up to \$25,000 and soon to be even more. Every single person who has bought a property in Canberra has paid less stamp duty in recent years. That means they are not paying mortgage interest if they had to borrow for that stamp duty and it also means that more property is more affordable for Canberrans.

That stands in marked contrast to what has been occurring in other jurisdictions where the stamp duty that is being charged, particularly in New South Wales and to a lesser extent in Victoria, has been astronomical. Billions and billions of dollars have rolled in to the New South Wales government, to the point that they were embarrassed by how much money they were gouging out of homebuyers and they had to do something about it. We have seen, in the property market collapse in Sydney, that their stamp duties are now starting to tank, and that is causing them a great deal of difficulty in budgeting for the long term.

The other side of this equation is that when you are in government and you have responsibility to deliver services for people, you have to do it every year. You cannot just guess how many houses and at what value they will transact and try and set long-term budgeting on that basis.

One of the advantages of the tax mix shift is more predictability and stability in revenue, which allows for better long-term service delivery planning. That is an important element as well. It is fair because everyone who consumes services every year contributes. In what world is it fair that we ask people who buy a house to pay so much—25 per cent—of our own-source revenue? How is that fair? If you were designing a tax system from scratch, you would not do that. *(Time expired.)*

Housing—rental

MR PARTON: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development. Minister, the most recent ACT Council of Social Service cost of living report indicated that rents in Canberra have increased by three per cent whereas nationally they have only increased by half a per cent. Why is this?

MS BERRY: This is a question that goes to the state of the market in the ACT, where there are more people with means to pay more to purchase a home. Unfortunately, for people on low incomes, that means their rent goes up because the market value of the home that they rent goes up. That is not a problem that is unique to the ACT; it is a problem that the whole country is grappling with around affordable housing and how we work with the sector.

Mr Parton: A point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: A point of order, Mr Parton.

Mr Parton: It is on relevance. The question was about why the rents have increased in Canberra six times higher in terms of the percentage than nationally. I would ask the minister to be relevant and refer to Canberra rather than the national picture.

MADAM SPEAKER: I do not believe there is a point of order. The minister was referencing pricing of the market within Canberra. Minister, you have a minute to go more directly to that.

MS BERRY: That is right, and the market in Canberra has influenced that. Of course, population growth in the ACT has been significant as well, and that is probably one of the primary reasons for the increase in the price of homes and therefore rent for low income earners.

For the ACT government, working with community housing organisations, making sure that we provide, through our indicative land release program, affordable housing, having an affordable housing purchase database where people can apply for affordable housing, and having stamp duty not existing any more for first home buyers from 1 July will make a difference to people being able to get into a home of their own. And there is the government's significant investment in public housing.

MR PARTON: Minister, are you aware that earlier this year Canberra overtook Sydney as the most expensive place to rent a house in Australia, and the second most expensive place to rent a unit? Why is this?

MS BERRY: I responded to the second question in my answer to the first question, on the reasons why rents and house prices in the ACT are high. It is an issue that the whole country is grappling with. Population growth has played a significant role.

MRS KIKKERT: Minister, how will increasing residential rates affect the cost of renting in Canberra?

MS BERRY: I refer to the Chief Minister's many responses about changes to our taxes and rates in the ACT. More people will be able to get into homes of their own after 1 July, particularly first home buyers. This will make a huge difference, with more people being able to buy a home of their own and perhaps get out of the private rental market.

Mr Parton: Madam Speaker, I have a point of order on relevance. The question was about how the residential rates will affect the cost of renting in Canberra. It was not about home ownership; it was about the cost of renting. I ask that the minister be relevant to the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: In the minute and 15 seconds that you have left, Ms Berry.

MS BERRY: I have completed my answer, thank you.

Building—quality

MS ORR: My question is to the Minister for Building Quality Improvement. Can the minister update the Assembly on the recent budget announcement on the expansion of the building inspectorate?

MR RAMSAY: I thank Ms Orr for the question and for her very clear interest in the quality of buildings in the ACT. Just over a week ago, alongside two of our city's hardworking, excellent building inspectors, I was very pleased to announce the biggest expansion of the building inspectorate in recent history. Sixteen additional officers across a number of functions will be working to improve the quality of buildings in Canberra because of the investment that will come from this year's ACT budget. This more than doubles the current number of people who are on the ground working in this area for the people of Canberra.

There will be eight new inspectors to boost the rapid regulatory response team. They will be delivering over 1,000 extra inspections per year to ensure that what is being built is being built up to code. That means more assets on the ground undertaking more inspections and holding more builders to account.

There will also be four extra staff to run our builders licence exams. These staff will be ensuring that the high bar we have set to entry into the building industry will be maintained and enforced. They will be making sure that only those with the required skills and knowledge are able to obtain a licence. They will also be holding to account those renewing their licence and those who are required to sit the exam, to ensure that only those who should remain in the industry do remain in the industry.

Finally, there will also be four extra staff to undertake community and industry engagement and education. They will be crunching the numbers to look at the issues in the ACT and working with industry to make sure that industry lifts standards. They will be working with the community, developing resources and helping people to navigate buying and renovating homes. They will be making it easier and simpler for the people of the ACT to navigate our building system and increasing the level of knowledge in the community.

MS ORR: Can the minister explain how this expansion will increase building quality in the territory and help to inform consumers?

MR RAMSAY: I thank Ms Orr for the supplementary question. These new staff for the building inspectorate will have a substantial impact on building quality in the territory. The new staff for the rapid response team will turn this very successful trial into a permanent feature of the inspectorate. The team will be expanded by four and will be on the ground responding to building complaints within hours or days.

They will have the power to shut down building sites where they see an issue and they will work with builders and consumers to ensure that the issues are fixed before the work is completed—when it is far more cost effective to do so. They will work hand in hand with our inspectors to ensure systemic issues are stamped out, major compliance breaches are investigated and appropriate action is taken. There will be, as I say, around 1,000 extra inspections every year.

The team running examinations will help to hold those seeking a licence or renewing their licence to the highest standard. They will ensure that people have up-to-date knowledge of how to interpret the building code and to ensure that those who are not able to work in this sector do not do so as a builder.

The engagement staff will be doing a lot of hard work behind the scenes to do the data analytics to get the increased data collection that Access Canberra has been undertaking over the last year. They will be looking for patterns in what is occurring and they will be creating resources and working with the community to address those patterns. They will be creating resources to help the community to understand how to navigate the system. They will be working with builders to ensure that they are building the highest quality buildings, and they will be working directly with consumers to ensure that they are armed with the information they need to ensure they have what is necessary when they are seeking to build, buy or renovate.

MR PARTON: Minister, how much will these changes add to the cost of every construction in Canberra?

MR RAMSAY: Obviously, the investment by the ACT government is strong. The way that it will work is that the investment in the inspectorate will be partially offset through a small increase in the costs associated with the building levy. For an average home, that is probably \$400 in terms of the cost of the levy.

We know that investment and savings can be made at the time of building. It is far more cost effective if we are able to deal with matters quickly rather than allow issues to be present and to grow, and then have to deal with issues afterwards. We are making sure that it is far more cost effective and far more efficient, so that the investments that people make in their homes are of the highest quality and so that they can rely on those with great certainty.

Housing—finance

MRS JONES: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development. Minister, the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures published in May indicated that during March this year only 146 lending commitments were made to first home buyers in Canberra, the fewest recorded since October 2016. At the same

time the cost of living report from the ACT Council of Social Service published in May says that the cost of new dwellings rose 3.6 per cent, double the national average. Minister, why did the cost of new dwellings in Canberra rise at double the national average?

MS BERRY: Madam Speaker, that sounded very similar to the question that Mr Parton asked me about the cost of housing and rentals in the ACT. I refer Mrs Jones to my previous answer—that the population growth in the ACT has been significant, particularly in Gungahlin, one of the fastest growing areas in the country. That means that when there are more people buying homes, particularly—

Members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Barr! Mr Coe! Members, I ask that the minister who is on her feet is able to finish.

Members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Coe! Mr Barr! “Outside, gentlemen,” I think is the phrase.

Mrs Jones: I have a supplementary.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before I go to your supplementary, Ms Berry, did you have anything to add?

MS BERRY: No, I think it was resolved.

MADAM SPEAKER: A supplementary, Mrs Jones.

MRS JONES: Minister, why are lending commitments to first home buyers in Canberra at the lowest recorded level since 2016?

MR BARR: I will take that question. There are a number of factors, not least of which has been the crackdown on lending practice from APRA, in relation to the rules and regulations they require of the banks to be able to lend. Another very significant factor has been the banking royal commission. Mrs Jones, I note that this very issue was one of the reasons why your federal leader introduced ScoMo bank, the mortgage lending insurance 15 per cent gap cover.

This is an issue that faces the nation. One other factor clearly would be that our stamp duty goes to zero on 1 July. That would be a very sensible decision for some people, depending on the sort of purchase they are seeking to make—to wait until then.

MADAM SPEAKER: Just before I give Mr Parton the call, could we refer to Mr Morrison or the Prime Minister? I am not quite sure if there is a ScoMo bank.

MR PARTON: Madam Speaker, I am sure the Prime Minister would be chuffed. My supplementary is to the Chief Minister, based on the answer to the previous question. Why have so few first home owners been able to afford to buy new dwellings in Canberra?

MR BARR: If you look at the long run, as in over the last four or five years, we have in fact generally been above the national average in terms of our share of home owners entering the market. The reasons that there has been a dip largely relate to the banks clamping down on lending and certainly not being prepared to lend to people who have only a five per cent deposit. One contributing factor to people being unable to save both for a deposit and for stamp duty is that stamp duty is one of the biggest inhibitors. If you have to find a deposit and you are expected to pay significant stamp duty then it is very hard to get into the market.

What is one practical thing we could do to help first home owners to get over that hurdle? Let us get rid of stamp duty—and that is exactly what we are doing. Those opposite who profess to care about first home buyers and who ask questions like this want to slug them with stamp duty. That is the irony of this line of questioning. You are the party of stamp duty. You are the party that want people to have to borrow for their stamp duty and pay mortgage interest on that for the rest of their lives. That is what you want. That is your policy position.

Members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Members, towards the end of Mr Barr's answer I had trouble hearing him. There were two sides going at that end and two sides going at this end. Can you please refrain and have a bit of regard and respect?

Budget—housing and homelessness

MS CHEYNE: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development. Minister, what investments is the government making in public housing in this year's budget?

MS BERRY: I thank Ms Cheyne for the question. Under the new housing strategy the ACT government is taking action to grow and renew public housing in the ACT. This investment begins in this year's budget with the first \$20 million of a \$100 million investment. The program will build 1,200 new homes right across Canberra, including 200 extra homes to be made available for people who are in need of housing. This is the single largest per capita investment in public housing in the country. If this investment were being replicated nationally, we would see almost \$6 billion invested into growing and renewing public housing.

This investment builds on the current renewal program, which will soon finish around 1,288 dwellings across Canberra—new, energy-efficient homes that better suit the needs of our tenants. Together the current renewal and the incoming growth and renewal programs will see around 20 per cent of our public housing replaced with new homes for our tenants over a period of 10 years. This year's budget also allocates funding for Common Ground Dickson, which will provide 40 units of social and affordable housing for people who are experiencing chronic homelessness.

MS CHEYNE: Minister, how will this investment under the housing strategy affect the lives of current and future tenants?

MS BERRY: Moving into new homes can significantly improve the lives of tenants and give the best possible chance for them and their families to thrive. I have seen firsthand the change in tenants' lives when they get the keys to their new home and become connected with a new community of neighbours, schools and services. This new program will be slightly different to the current program but will maintain the care and understanding of tenants' needs as well as their preferences.

The initial focus of the growth and renewal program will be on renewing and replacing the homes of tenants who themselves have indicated that they would like to move. Housing ACT will continue to work with all tenants affected by the program to understand their needs and preferences, to figure out where they want to live their lives, and even to return to the same site of the redevelopment if they want to.

During the current renewal program and this new program, a team of officers support tenants before and after their moves to assist them in any way and cover all the moving costs. In both the investment in public housing as well as the construction of Common Ground Dickson, more people will be supported into long-term affordable housing. This investment is a clear expression of the values of the ACT government.

MR PETTERSSON: Minister, what other ongoing investments are being made under the housing strategy to address homelessness and housing affordability?

MS BERRY: Investments under the housing strategy are continuing into this year's budget, with the two largest investments being for the growth and renewal of public housing and Common Ground Dickson. Other initiatives include the \$5.7 million initiative to improve the energy efficiency of public housing and upgrade approximately 2,200 public housing properties to help tenants reduce their power bills and provide more energy efficient appliances. As at 28 May, as part of this program, 333 public housing properties had benefited from this scheme.

More funding for front-line homelessness services will continue, with a \$6.5 million investment in early crisis interventions to prevent chronic homelessness for groups, including women and children escaping domestic and family violence; older women; young, pregnant women at risk of statutory intervention; and migrant families. At least 10 more dedicated and culturally appropriate homes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tenants are being built, working closely with the elected body. A second site will soon be under construction.

These budget-funded initiatives are on top of the day-to-day operations of Housing ACT, which is providing housing options to around 21,000 Canberrans, providing \$150 million a year in rental rebates to tenants and \$24 million a year to front-line homelessness services.

Housing—affordability

MR MILLIGAN: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development. Minister, figures collected by Anglicare on rental affordability show

there are no affordable rental houses for a single person on a single, low income in the ACT. Why are there no affordable rentals for single people on low incomes in Canberra?

MS BERRY: I think it is like the questions that have been asked previously by the opposition during question time today, around rental affordability in the ACT. Yes, rental affordability is a challenge that the country is facing at the moment. There are a number of reasons why rental affordability is an issue.

I believe that removing stamp duty for first home buyers will provide opportunities for people to get into homes of their own. It is something that Mrs Dunne and I actually agree on: people should have that opportunity; it should not just be left to the rental market, for people to have to rent for the rest of their lives. Just like the rest of us in this place, except for Mr Pettersson, and everyone else in the community, people should be able to aspire to get into a home of their own. That is often provided for really low income or no income families, or families on modest incomes, by public housing. More needs to be done to provide opportunities to other people in our community on low incomes to get into homes of their own and to provide opportunities to rent.

Of course, population growth in the ACT means that there are more people in the ACT who want to purchase and live in our community, which is a good thing, but that places pressure on other people in our community who might not have the same opportunities.

MR MILLIGAN: Minister, how many individuals have contacted the ACT government regarding housing affordability issues or housing stress over the last year?

MS BERRY: I do not think that data would be available in the form Mr Milligan has asked for it. Information on the number of people who have applied for public housing is available on the website; that is public information. The ACT has its affordable housing database now. A number of people have signed up to that. I think close to 1,000 people have registered on that database to access affordable homes that meet their needs. It has been a really successful program in matching up families and individuals to houses available on the market that meet with their income.

The ACT government is continuing to provide opportunities, particularly around rental bonds as well, making sure that people can access a rental bond loan. This means they can get their rental bond loan straightaway rather than that being a barrier to their getting into a rental property of their own. There are a number of initiatives available for people trying to rent a property or trying to get into a home of their own.

MR PARTON: Minister, how much is this lack of affordable housing contributing to Canberra having Australia's highest rates of repeat homelessness?

MS BERRY: The repeat homelessness data that Mr Parton is referring to is not a very clear dataset to refer to, because it might apply to, for example, someone who has been in a crisis service, then ended up in the AMC and then come back out of the AMC and ended up back in a crisis service. So there is some—

Opposition members interjecting—

MS BERRY: I am explaining the data and how it works. It is often not a single repeat of homelessness; it is often a number of different periods of homelessness because of circumstances surrounding particular individuals.

On the strong sign-up to the affordable home purchase database, that will provide opportunities for people to, as I said, get into homes of their own in ways that they have probably not been able to before, because they are matched up to a home within a new area of the ACT that is releasing properties.

Issues around the availability of good homelessness services drive that data as well. In the ACT we have the best homelessness services in the country. That is the reason why in the ACT homelessness figures have gone down when nationally homelessness figures have risen.

Planning—land release program

MR HANSON: My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management. Minister, why have your government's monopolistic practices in relation to land release caused land prices to more than double since 2011?

MR GENTLEMAN: I do not agree with the premise of Mr Hanson's question. Our land release program has been set in relation to the amount of opportunity for land purchases—that is the way we look at land release in the future—and how many blocks would be available for those people wishing to purchase land in the ACT. The rates are set by the appropriate measures.

MR HANSON: Minister, how much further are land prices expected to increase in 2019-20?

MR GENTLEMAN: I do not have a figure on how much land prices will increase in the time period. I can say that there are still around 400 blocks available on the SLA sheet at the moment, remaining unsold, so there is an opportunity for people wishing to buy land in the ACT to do so. That is on top of what we are releasing.

MISS C BURCH: Minister, what is the average cost of land per square metre in the ACT?

MR GENTLEMAN: That varies depending on the area concerned, and the block of land.

ACTION bus service—network

MISS C BURCH: My question is to the Minister for Transport. Minister, last year the *Canberra Times* reported that Canberra households spend the most in Australia on owning and running vehicles. Minister, why do Canberrans spend the most in Australia on owning and running vehicles?

Ms Cheyne: She is not the minister for private vehicles.

MS FITZHARRIS: I am not the minister for private vehicles; thank you, Ms Cheyne.

MISS C BURCH: Minister, why are your changes to the bus network forcing more Canberrans to use their cars when Canberrans already spend the most in the nation to use and maintain them?

MS FITZHARRIS: I disagree with Miss Burch.

MR WALL: Minister, how many Canberrans have contacted you stating that they now have to use their cars because of the network 19 changes?

Opposition members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Members, you have asked the question. Allow the minister to provide an answer.

MS FITZHARRIS: I will take the question on notice. I am not aware of too many at all.

Child care—costs

MRS KIKKERT: My question is to the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development. Did you know that Canberra has the most expensive child care in Australia, and why is that?

MS BERRY: There are a number of reasons why the cost of early childhood education in the ACT is more expensive.

Opposition members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Members, please allow the minister to answer.

MS BERRY: It is in some way due to how the country looks at where early childhood centres sit. If you consider the ACT as a region as compared to states and territories and other regions, that makes our early childhood education more expensive. Also there are a number of private operators in the ACT who charge significant fees for early childhood education.

Of course, the ACT government's announcement to provide universal access for three-year-olds in preschools will make a huge difference for families in the ACT, particularly for the development of children from the ages of three to four. They will be able to access free universal early childhood education from three years, which will provide significant opportunities for those families but particularly for those children's development as they head to primary school education in the ACT.

That has been a significant investment by the ACT government in the future of our children and our families in this city—something that was never, ever able to be committed to by the federal Liberal Party and was still not committed to after the election by the federal Liberal Party. Had the Labor Party been elected we would have been able to phase that universal access to early childhood education in much sooner. But we are still going to provide universal access for three-year-olds and four-year-olds in the ACT—something that the ACT government is incredibly proud of.

MRS KIKKERT: Minister, why do people in the ACT pay \$70 more on average for the same service than those in New South Wales and Victoria?

MS BERRY: The ACT government does not set the price of early childhood education in the ACT. We have recognised and listened to the evidence.

Mrs Dunne: Successive ministers have been saying that for far too long.

MS BERRY: Well, it is the truth.

Mrs Dunne: It's your only excuse.

MS BERRY: It is not an excuse; it is a fact.

MADAM SPEAKER: Members, it is not a discussion across the floor.

MS BERRY: What we are doing, that the Liberal Party has never done, and that the federal Liberal Party has never done and would not commit to, is expand early childhood education and universal access to four-year-olds and three-year-olds as well. That will make a significant difference to a child's early learning. It will provide opportunities for families to access preschool like they never have before.

MR WALL: Minister, what is the impact of Australia's highest childcare costs on families in Canberra who are on low incomes?

MS BERRY: Again universal access for three-year-olds and four-year-olds in the ACT will make a difference for families in the ACT.

Mrs Jones: Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order on relevance. The question was about why the policies are making—

Opposition members interjecting—

Mrs Jones: Sorry, the question was—

Mr Wall: What is the impact—

MS BERRY: I can answer it. I cannot really but I can say again—

Opposition members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: I make the point that you raised a point of order 10 seconds into the answer.

MS BERRY: The point is that the ACT government does not actually set the price of early childhood education fees. I agree that they are too expensive. I agree that it should be more affordable. But no state or territory government sets the fees. If there were some way that the federal government wanted to subsidise the wages of the workers in those centres so that those centres could charge less and more families could access those services, that is something I would absolutely get behind. What we are doing is using the levers that we have responsibility for: providing universal access and expanding it from four-year-olds to include three-year-olds as well, which is more than the Canberra Liberals have ever done.

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

Appropriation Bill 2019-2020

[Cognate bill:

Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2019-2020]

Debate resumed from 4 June 2019, on motion by **Mr Barr:**

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (3.00): Canberra is a great city. It is the place that we choose to call home. I want the best for this city. I want the best days to be ahead of us.

We are blessed to live in this wonderful environment, but what really makes Canberra so special is the people, past and present. There have been Aboriginal people here serving as wise custodians for thousands of years. We honour them. We have had past generations of people who pioneered the capital; they designed and built this city. We have a wonderful current generation that sustains us.

Great cities have great people, and great people deserve a great government. I want a government that empowers Canberrans to live to their potential. I want the ACT to be a beacon: a city of choice for families; a city of choice for people in business; a city of choice for workers, for retirees, for migrants, for students, for kids, for everyone.

I believe the role of government is not to determine what is best for people but to do the behind-the-scenes work to ensure that dreams are possible. I want to be part of a government that opens doors, not one that closes them.

Unfortunately, this government treats Canberrans with contempt. The government say that they know best. This government does not trust the people it represents. If the government does not trust the citizens, how can we expect the citizens to trust the government? It seems to me that right now we have a government that is actively working against Canberrans, particularly poorer Canberrans. This government has an agenda that deliberately prices thousands of people out of this city.

In contrast, the Canberra Liberals are proud of what we do, and we are proud of what we are working towards on the issues that affect Canberrans: housing affordability; rental affordability; planning reforms; ending homelessness; land release; bulk waste collection; language education; school safety; anti-bikie laws; Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander policies; support for police, paramedics, the fire service and small businesses; school buses; disability support; environmental and heritage groups; multicultural engagement; care and protection; and much, much more. We will keep proposing ideas, and we will keep working towards an even better city.

The government have record revenues that will soon surpass \$7 billion per year. When you add all the borrowings, it really does beg the question: where is it all going? We have debts climbing to \$3.3 billion and interest-free payments of \$250 million per year.

Despite huge revenue and huge expenses, what are Canberrans getting for this money? The reality is that this government has abandoned thousands of Canberrans. I do not say this glibly; I do not say this lightly. I say this knowing countless stories of people that are doing it tough. This government, this Labor government, should be ashamed of itself.

Mick sent an email to the Chief Minister and copied me in. He said:

In the last week we have had water, rates and power. My wife and I get just over \$1400.00 from the pension, our total bills comes to \$1422.00, how are we expected to live, we cannot afford to turn on the heating anymore, we have just enough money for our food and that's it. I am having to sell my car because we cannot afford to run it, how is this possible ... we have lived here for 40 years ... we are hurting, but you—

the Chief Minister—

just can't see it.

Karen wrote to me and said:

Our rate notices have just been received and the rates have increased by \$800 in ONE YEAR. We are retired on a fixed income and like many others will have to cut into our standard of living to pay this bill. The policy will send retirees like us to NSW.

Whilst there are some Canberrans that can afford Labor's tax increases, is it right just to govern for those who can afford it? Is it right to ignore retirees like Mick and Karen? Is it right to ignore the thousands of working poor in this city?

What about the courier driver earning \$48,000 a year, \$1,534 a fortnight after tax? How does she afford \$930 a fortnight for rent? That is 60 per cent of her income. Even if someone has a partner earning the same amount, 30 per cent of their income for rent is deemed to be Struggle Street. How does the courier driver survive in this

city? Well, they go without. Their kids are conveniently sick on the day of the school excursion to Sydney. Their kids do not have birthday parties because they are embarrassed. These are proud, humble and hardworking people. They do not complain; they remain silent but they are silently struggling.

This year the Smith Family received 2,000 requests to support kids going back to school. How many others didn't have the confidence to ask?

The Labor Party used to be a party that represented working families, the vulnerable, migrants, the working poor. The Labor Party has abandoned all of them. In the ACT, here in the national capital, it is estimated that there are 8,000 kids living below the poverty line—8,000 kids. This is the city that Labor has presided over for 18 years. After 18 years of Labor, you get 8,000 kids living in poverty.

We have the worst rental stress in the country because the Labor Party and their coalition partners only govern for their mates. In the ACT today, right now, there is not one property, not one single property in the entire city, that is available for rent that is affordable. Anglicare states that the median rental weekly asking price is \$465 for a unit and \$570 for a house. Eighteen years of Labor gives you not one single property that is deemed to be affordable. This is the Canberra that Labor have manufactured. This is the Canberra that they have designed. This is the known, intended and deliberate outcome of their policies. They are all committed to it. They are all complicit. There are 27,000 people living in poverty, 8,000 kids.

For those that are able to try to get ahead, how can it be that a 400 square metre block of land in Throsby is \$400,000 before you build a house? This scandal is entirely of Labor's creation. They control the zoning, the land release, the civil works and the planning approvals. They have systematically and deliberately driven up the cost of land in the ACT. They have systematically and deliberately priced tens of thousands of Canberrans out of the housing market. If the same property, after something was built, was rented out, \$150 a week would be the cost of rates and land tax.

This tax reform is wrong. This tax reform is unethical. Through their massive increases to rates, especially unit rates and land tax, the burden that has fallen on renters is high and getting even higher. Around a quarter of rent is rates and land tax that is passed on to tenants. Renters in Canberra are experiencing massive pain as a result of Labor's tax reform. What is more, it is not as if renters are feeling pain but investors are making squillions. It is quite the opposite. Labor has successfully strangled the supply of rental properties, meaning even higher rents. Units have been hit particularly hard.

Is it any wonder that when you do not have any houses that are affordable, when you squeeze renters for all their worth, we have such a high rate of homelessness in the national capital. We have the highest rate of repeat homelessness in the country. Here in the national capital, we have a homelessness scandal. I am sure the homeless people of Canberra, thousands of people who are couch surfing and thousands of people who are unsafely, unsocially and unhygienically squeezed into group homes are really pleased that this government has cancelled out insurance duty.

Back in 2012 Andrew Barr said that rates would not triple. He said that his new system would be fairer. He said it would cost less than a cup of coffee a week. Seven years on we know that that was a lie. We know that rates went from \$209 million in 2011-12 to \$558 million today and will be \$697 million in 2021-22. In fact, the total tax mix—residential and commercial rates, land tax, stamp duty, insurance and the fire levy—will have increased from \$600 million in 2012 to \$1.2 billion in 2020-21. This increase is considerably more than inflation and population growth combined. It is a rort.

Something has to be done. It is not going to happen from the Labor Party. We need to do it for the families, the workers, the retirees, the pensioners, those living in poverty and the young people. We need to do it for Canberra.

Andrew Barr said that his increases will keep on going. He said that at some point he will reduce it to just WPI. When is that decrease going to come? When is that WPI rate of growth going to kick in? If he has committed to rates reform, it has to keep on going by more than WPI until stamp duty is gone. If Mr Barr were serious about bringing in WPI, he would be abandoning the rates reform agenda.

The people of Canberra need relief. That is why, if elected, the Canberra Liberals will freeze rates. When we come into government, the rates that each Canberra household receives will not increase for the term of that government. This is a genuine cap on rates. Canberrans need relief, and the Liberals will deliver it. This will take the pressure off households, give certainty and end Labor's punitive tax regime. Whether you are a home owner or a renter, you will benefit.

I am sure Andrew Barr will say that it is irresponsible. I say that it is harsh and reckless to keep on going with his agenda. Labor's reforms are unjust; they are unethical; they are hurting the poor. Enough is enough. We will freeze rates and we will end Labor's rip-off.

Canberrans are not getting value for money. This government is not governing well. There is a lack of direction in the public service and they do not feel valued. They are not empowered to do what they do best. Just as the government do not trust taxpayers, they do not trust and empower public servants. We have a professional service. They are capable and they are willing. We need to empower these public servants to make the sound decisions and the sound judgements that they can. Instead, they are forced to constantly second-guess what the Chief Minister wants.

The structure of government in the ACT is very unclear. Cabinet government has been thrown out the window. The significant work that was done by Dr Allan Hawke in the city state report has been lost.

Icon Water is one such example of an organisation losing its way. The point of the corporate structure, a territory corporation, is to bring about the efficiencies of the private sector at arm's length from the government. At the moment, it seems that we have the business acumen of government but the largesse of a corporation. We are getting the worst of both worlds.

Executive remuneration at Icon is one such example. How can it be that the head of Icon Water earns double the salary of the head of the ACT public service? How can it be that the head of Icon Water earns well more than double the salary of the head of Canberra Hospital? The latest annual report of Icon states that the chief financial officer earns about \$100,000 a year more than the head of treasury. The chief information officer earns around \$100,000 a year more than the head of Shared Services in the ACT.

What is more, most of the IT, the systems, the billing and the payroll have been outsourced. It begs the question: what are we getting for the money? Salaries at Icon Water of more than \$700,000, more than \$400,000, more than \$300,000 are not keeping pace with community standards. I have no ill will for the people who seek these jobs. Who would not want that salary? My problem is with the Labor government that facilitates it. Corporate structures often work best in a competitive environment. There is no competition for water in the ACT.

We trust departments and public servants to run our hospitals. We trust them to run our schools, our bus system, our public housing, our roads, our care and protection system, our IT services, our critical infrastructure, our fire services and our police. What is the rationale for not trusting departments with our water assets? Do you think that our public servants are capable of this?

Whilst I accept the good intentions, and indeed successes, of Actew in the past, the time has come for us to have a fresh look at the best structure and governance for Icon Water. For example, is it time for us to simply establish a water directorate or a simple water authority? Is it time to review how the board and the executive operate and how they report to the public? Do we need to de-corporatise Icon Water? Do we need to bring it back in house?

The complex structure of Icon Water probably means that shell companies would be required to continue the government ownership of Evoenergy and ActewAGL. Ensuring that Icon's EBAs and employee entitlements were rolled into the new arrangements would be essential. Unpicking the financial mess, ending the largesse and shedding light on the outrageous \$300 million shared services deal is required. We need to have a conversation about it.

Canberrans are smart; Canberrans are innovative; Canberrans are compassionate. Here in the ACT, we are amongst the most generous when it comes to charities. We are amongst the highest plasma donors in Australia, and we have the second highest number of organ donors. We have Summernats and the amazing National Zoo and Aquarium. We have amazing beers and wines. We have the Canberra Glassworks. We have expert tradespeople and craftsmen. We have businesses leading the world. We have universities kicking goals. We have health professionals undertaking extraordinary operations. We have teachers leading the nation.

The ACT is also the best in the country when it comes to volunteering. Volunteering contributes \$1.5 billion to our economy. There is much to celebrate in Canberra. We have much to be grateful for and we have much to look forward to.

My aspiration is that every person is respected by their government: that nobody is living in poverty; that nobody is homeless; that owning a property is not out of reach; that we have policies that promote business growth and employment; that we have a health system that is the envy of the world and is a place where people want to work; and that our teachers are given all the resources, options, pathways and training that they deserve and need to support them in delivering education where every single student reaches their potential. I want a city where every person exiting our corrections system leaves more educated, more supported, and free of deadly addictions. I want a city that promotes apprenticeships, trades and tertiary pathways. I want one where every one of us values the enormity of the Aboriginal legacy and future.

I want a city where every parent, grandparent and carer would be joined on their journey by support networks, systems and policies that are working with them, not against them; where every single public servant, on the front line or behind the scenes, is and feels appreciated and supported. I want a city where we all recognise the risk, sleepless nights and benefits of those in our local business community; where we properly manage our environment, whilst ensuring access and enjoyment; where every community and community group can thrive, with places to congregate, to learn, to share, to care and to feel connected; where every person is safe, and nobody needs to flee from their home or live on the streets.

I want every person, regardless of where they come from, who they are, their age, their status, their faith or their ability, to thrive in the national capital. I want a place that every person can afford to live in, and a place where every person is valued by their government. The reality is that this government is ripping them off. We need a government that empowers them. This city is too good for a bad government. Madam Speaker, over the next 500 days, we will continue to do all we can to bring about a government that respects all Canberrans.

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) (3.23): Madam Assistant Speaker, politeness prevented me from rising in the middle of the Leader of the Opposition's address in reply. There is a certain amount of leeway that is given for that speech, but he accused me of lying, which is unparliamentary, and he should withdraw.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER (Ms Cody): Mr Coe?

Mr Coe: If you are requesting me to withdraw, I will do so. However, I am also happy to review the record to see whether I did in fact say that.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Mr Coe, I am asking you to withdraw.

Mr Coe: I withdraw.

MADAM ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (3.24): The ACT Greens welcome the 2019-20 ACT budget. This budget delivers for Canberra now and also for the future. The Greens are focused on making sure we leave a territory fit for future generations. We know it is vital that this government addresses the climate emergency, looks after our community, especially vulnerable people, works towards fairness and reconciliation, and looks after country.

This budget addresses the needs of our growing community and city. It has also necessarily had to adapt to the outcome of the recent federal election and the resulting budget impacts on the ACT. It is a balanced budget, viewed across the four years. We are now three-quarters of the way through this Assembly term, and this budget delivers on our parliamentary agreement.

However, for the Greens, the scale of our agenda is unapologetically ambitious. We believe budgets need to go further to address the needs of our community, especially in climate, housing and transport. We cannot simply make decisions based on what is easy or what is popular.

If we are to deliver for the people of Canberra, today and for future generations, business as usual and the politics of old simply will not cut it. Canberrans want a budget which faces up to the big challenges with both a vision and a strategy for how to get there.

Over the past decade, in holding the balance of power the Greens have shown we are not afraid of tackling large-scale challenges. Through our role in government we help shape the budget. We are investing where it matters, taking our lead from the community on the ground, and from the experts and the evidence, to ensure our city delivers for the many, not the few. This budget takes firm steps in this direction and provides a stable strategy in response to the federal Liberal government's wilful neglect of the ACT. But there is still more we can do to ensure that we are delivering for future generations.

Let me start with the issue that is most important to the ACT and to our planet; that is, climate change. The message is simple. We are facing a global catastrophe, an ecological breakdown and massive impacts on our environment, our society and our budget.

Last month this Assembly agreed that we are in a climate emergency. We cannot let that be a platitude. We are in an emergency. The government and our budgets need to orient around the issue of climate change and impacts on future generations. People who care about the territory economy should be focused on climate change, because without climate action we will face significant extra costs. Already the impacts of climate change are having costs for our community and for our infrastructure—through hotter and more extreme weather, greater bushfire risks, health impacts, and disruption to social and recreational activities.

Unchecked climate change is an economy destroyer. People who care about social outcomes should be focused on climate change, because it is the most vulnerable in

our communities that are most impacted. And people who care about the environment should be focused on climate change because it is already causing environmental destruction, with more severe consequences to come.

The path to a livable and sustainable future Canberra is through climate change action. A clear majority of Australians agree that we are facing an international climate emergency which requires emergency action and a response on par with the response to the world wars.

My message from the Greens is this: all of our budgets now need to be climate change budgets. We need climate action and emissions reduction, and we need it now. We ask: is this budget a climate change budget? It certainly makes some important climate action investments—in climate policy work, in school heating improvements and in organic waste, for example. But it is not a climate change budget.

A climate change budget would put mitigation and adaptation front and centre, with significant funding to reduce emissions in critical areas like private transport emissions, gas use and inefficient buildings. There would be significant investment in adaptation measures like green infrastructure to draw down carbon and cool the city.

In this context the Greens need to challenge certain decisions in the budget. Take, for example, the tens of millions of dollars for road duplications. This is not the mark of a climate change budget. Yes, more roads temporarily make life easier for car drivers, and sometimes they are justified. But we should be prudent, and even reluctant, when it comes to expanding roads and car parks; and we certainly should not be rushing to double the size of every road that faces any delay then spruiking it as a win.

These investments build the car-dominated city of the future. Roads are like storage in your home: the more you have, the more you need. Roads expenditure inevitably entrenches congestion and emissions, and essentially disadvantages the most vulnerable in our city who do not have cars.

Importantly, what could those funds build instead of roads? Imagine, for example, if they went to building the most impressive active travel network, or to public transport improvements. What about housing for those in need, or cutting edge, zero emission buildings?

These ideas are not always popular. Car drivers and local politicians tend to want unmitigated road growth. But this is one of the alternative views that the Greens bring to these discussions, and we will continue to highlight the reasonable and beneficial alternative of investing heavily in sustainable transport.

The Greens' role is to tirelessly push the government towards better and stronger climate action. We are pleased to be ticking off more and more achievements like light rail, the best renewable electricity and climate change targets in the country, all-electric schools, and a leading zero emission vehicle policy.

In coming months I look forward to releasing the government's climate change strategy to 2025, in partnership with my cabinet colleagues, marking another

significant phase of climate action in the ACT. The Greens will be looking to ensure that future budgets are climate focused and strongly invest in mitigating and adapting to climate change.

At the 2016 election the Greens put forward a suite of policies and initiatives that put our community first. We are not a party for big business or corporate interests. We listen to the community and we represent the community.

The Greens believe in a Canberra that is inclusive and looks after the most vulnerable in our community; a Canberra that has high quality health care and education for all, no matter your income or postcode; a Canberra that is diverse and supports people of different race, gender and culture; and a Canberra that protects our local environment and does our part as global citizens. And we must tackle the ever-widening gap between rich and poor.

The Greens have been campaigning for these things in the Assembly since 1995. Through the balance of power we have made progressive reform a reality in Canberra, from legislating greenhouse gas targets to improving community consultation, banning battery hen farming, and building the ACT's first light rail. This year we will see the independent integrity commission and the drug and alcohol court coming to fruition.

We have worked hard for a fairer and more sustainable city, and we are starting to see this become a reality. This budget, along with previous budgets this term, is delivering these priorities, many of which are in the parliamentary agreement, and more.

The Greens are very pleased to see the government developing wellbeing indicators for the ACT. This balance of needs—not just economic—is something we have long advocated for. Determining how we measure wellbeing and whether it has improved will be key.

We are pleased to see a separate budget statement for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Whilst there is also a separate statement for social inclusion, a women's budget statement should be reinstated. This has been called for repeatedly by the women's sector, as many adverse impacts on women of seemingly benign policies and programs often go unnoticed.

The long-term vision for our city should be fair and support all Canberrans, not just those at the top end. Our concessions system is key to maintaining fairness. The Greens have focused on ensuring that concessions are targeted at those who need them most. This budget sees concessions assistance rise by over \$7 million—a 10 per cent increase. In particular, the \$46 annual utilities concession increase commences on 1 July and will benefit many older Canberrans and people on very low incomes. We have also proposed progressive revenue measures. Last year we called for the investigation of income-based fines, as set fines do not recognise the unequal impacts of high costs of living and people's ability to pay.

The Greens also want our tax system to be fair. Since 2012 tax reform has made important changes, like scrapping insurance duty and reducing stamp duty. The

Greens support this overall shift from stamp duty to rates but want rates and land tax to stay fair while reforms continue over the next 10 to 20 years. We also understand the broad range of both state and municipal level services that the ACT has to provide through our taxes.

The Greens see a review of tax reform as essential to ensuring that economic needs are properly balanced with fairness, and we strongly support the government's current review, to be completed before next year's budget.

This budget includes a change to residential tax rates to maintain a fairer balance between houses and units. We see this as an interim measure, while the broader review is completed. We have suggested that rates should be based on property value rather than land value, making rates fairer for all members of our community. The review will test the fairness and benefits of a large number of options and help to clarify the best way forward.

As the first party in the ACT with a formal reconciliation action plan, the Greens appreciate that we must all make better efforts to hear local knowledge, and share new science, with the original inhabitants of this land. Around Australia we are hearing calls for treaty with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, and the Greens agree that it is time for us to listen and that such treaties should be part of our future. But we also acknowledge the need to heal many outstanding injustices and redouble our efforts to close the gaps. We need to engage with local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community members as we work together in a spirit of respect and we must empower them to contribute to and lead culturally appropriate solutions.

I hope and trust that the many initiatives we as a government have committed to in this budget are seen as steps in that journey and that in time we can come together to achieve our shared goals.

In 2016 the Greens led a platform of justice reform to address the growing number of people entering the criminal justice system. We strongly believe in justice reinvestment—diverting funds from prison expansions to supporting people through smarter, more sympathetic and cost-effective approaches to improving criminal justice outcomes, leading to reduced crime, improved public safety and stronger communities.

The parliamentary agreement includes a commitment to reducing recidivism by 25 per cent by 2025. Meeting this target will certainly be a challenge, but we all know that we cannot keep building larger and larger prisons in the hope that this will slow imprisonment rates. I am pleased that building communities, not prisons, is now a government priority for both the Greens and Labor, and I am both proud and excited to see funding for our nation-leading justice reinvestment strategy in this budget.

We have already committed to ruling out an expansion of the AMC high security campus—an Australian first, providing more supported housing options for people on bail and exiting detention, establishing a family-centric support model for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families in contact with the justice system and early support for people living with a mental illness or disability.

This budget funds a further \$70 million to improve rehabilitation options for detainees at the AMC, including a purpose-built reintegration centre, expand the bail support program, and more.

I am particularly proud to establish a justice housing program, especially for women and Aboriginal and Torre Strait Islander detainees exiting custody or on bail. We know that housing is one of the key social determinants of life outcomes that makes an enormous difference to people's lives. This week's AIHW report tells us that around 33 per cent of prison entrants nationally had been homeless in the four weeks prior to imprisonment—and even higher for Indigenous prisoners, at 42 per cent. I am proud to join my colleagues in a collaborative effort to address disadvantage at its core, with new and expanded programs for those who too often are left behind.

The Greens want all Canberrans to access safe, secure and affordable housing. We welcomed the housing strategy, a key parliamentary agreement item. Its implementation plan now requires funding to back it. We support the government's \$100 million investment in 200 new public housing dwellings over the next five years and we view that as a starting point. To ensure that the proportion of social housing stock does not continue to decrease, this level of investment will be required each year into the future.

This budget funds the new land tax concession scheme first proposed by the Greens in the first parliamentary agreement in 2008. Under the scheme, private landlords renting their properties at affordable rents through registered community housing providers like CHC and the YWCA are exempt from paying land tax. Unfortunately, the program is limited to 100 properties and is only funded as a two-year trial, which may not provide the certainty needed for success. We welcome the introduction of a 25 per cent lease variation charge remission for community housing providers from October. Taxation measures like these are great innovative and incentivised supports for community and affordable housing.

Housing is the single biggest cost of living for most low income and moderate income earners. We know people can and do give things up like food and community activity before they will go without paying rent.

While we are pleased to see a Common Ground in Dickson funded, more is needed to address homelessness, starting with expanding Common Ground in Gungahlin, which would be cost-effective and relatively easy. We also need more capacity across our homelessness sector and more crisis and emergency accommodation, especially for people under the age of 16.

People at risk of or experiencing homelessness often struggle with health and wellbeing and cannot participate in productive daily life. Expenditure on housing and homelessness is an investment in our community and reduces other costs to our system.

The Greens want everyone to be able to access the right healthcare services at the right place and the right time. This budget includes significant additional funding for key health programs and infrastructure, including mental health.

Nurse walk-in centres are free, high quality and popular, as well as reducing pressure on our emergency departments. This budget delivers on our commitment for an additional centre in the inner north, in Dickson, as well as funding for the new one in Weston.

This budget invests in both acute and community-based mental health services, delivering better support for people experiencing severe mental illness and those managing chronic conditions. The budget also focuses on early intervention, which improves lives, builds resilience in our communities, keeps people well for longer and reduces avoidable use of acute in crisis services.

The Greens welcome the investment in drug and alcohol supports for vulnerable Canberrans. We have long called for drug use to be treated as a health issue, not a criminal one. While one aspect of that is through drug law reform, the other is providing the necessary health services to deal with issues of addiction and dependence. The budget funds the ACT drug strategy action plan, expanding early intervention and diversion programs and a new opioid treatment service on the north side of Canberra.

An Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander alcohol and drug residential rehabilitation facility has long been a priority for the community. I urge the government to use the allocated funds to ensure that a new facility is up and running as soon as possible.

We are pleased this budget supports our health staff to feel safe at work, particularly through implementing the nurse safety strategy and the independent health culture review.

We welcome over \$40 million to support people with a disability who may not be receiving sufficient supports through the NDIS. While the NDIS has been of great benefit to some, we know many people are falling through the cracks. These are some of the most vulnerable people in our community, and it is important that the right supports are there for them when they are needed.

Moving on to city services, we are pleased to see that this budget implements outcomes of the recent better suburbs process. Better suburbs came after a Greens motion calling for a participatory budgeting pilot based on a discretionary portion of the city services budget. Participatory budgeting is an important way to increase citizen participation in democracy. It involves direct community decision-making on expenditure.

The better suburbs process included a citizens forum of 54 Canberra residents. The forum was empowered to make budgetary decisions for playgrounds funding and also make recommendations on the reprioritisation of many other parts of the city services budget. This budget implements forum recommendations, including increased funding for their top priorities of lakes, ponds and wetlands, trees, and waste and recycling, as well as several playgrounds and two new natural play spaces near Yerrabi Pond and in Kambah.

Our urban forest has been declining by around 3,000 trees a year, with at least 40,000 existing gaps to fill. This has prompted my colleague Ms Le Couteur to ask for an additional 7,000 trees to be planted per year. This budget starts this, with 17,000 new trees over the next four years. I spoke earlier today about how vital trees are for keeping our city cool in summer. This will be even more important in the future as our climate gets hotter.

The Greens have long called for action on organic waste, so we are pleased to finally see funding to start this work, an important step in tackling the war on waste. This budget also provides a major upgrade to our Hume materials recovery facility so that more recyclable material can be recovered from our bins.

We note that the agreement item to install 100 recycling bins around the city is finally being funded. The first rollout of public recycling bins happened in the Seventh Assembly but they did not seem to make it west of Northbourne Avenue. We are pleased to see them finally crossing the road.

The Greens have a vision for a world-class transport system that reduces pollution and congestion and improves our quality of life. Putting aside the roads investment, which I discussed earlier, the Greens welcome over \$49 million for initial works towards light rail stage 2 to Woden, including funds to start work on a new Woden bus interchange.

There is also funding for transport improvements around schools and for age-friendly suburbs. These build on last year's additional \$30 million investment for active travel infrastructure in the parliamentary agreement.

We are pleased to see 84 new buses funded, which will meet demand growth and allow some of our oldest, most polluting buses and those without wheelchair accessibility to be phased out. We must stop investing in long-lasting polluters like diesel buses. The Greens believe that, to face the climate challenge, every bus purchase from now on should be zero emissions technology like hydrogen or electricity.

It has been great hearing about the surge in public transport use with network 19. If this continues, the next budget will need a commensurate surge in spending to meet demand. We will need even more buses, more light rail services and perhaps even more light rail vehicles.

We will also need to consider improvements for people who cannot use normal bus routes, like those who do not have the mobility to get to their nearest stop. The budget extends the flexible bus service for another year. However, this service remains limited in hours and usability. Work needs to be done on developing real demand-responsive transport. There is also a need to build on the age-friendly suburb investments to address safety and accessibility of the last mile—the distance between public transport stops and home—ensuring that streets and footpaths meet the needs of women and of people with a disability.

The Greens are a party of courage, of care and of community. We will continue to build on the achievements delivered in this budget and previous budgets this term. As part of government, we are proud to continue to make Canberra a world leader in climate action, to support the vulnerable in our community and to transform Canberra to be fair and sustainable. We welcome the opportunity to support this budget in the chamber.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Reference to Select Committee on Estimates 2019-2020

Motion (by **Mr Barr**) agreed to:

That the Appropriation Bill 2019-2020 and the Appropriation (Office of the Legislative Assembly) Bill 2019-2020 be referred to the Select Committee on Estimates 2019-2020.

Papers

Mr Gentleman presented the following papers:

Ministerial delegation to China—March 2019, dated June 2019.

Territory-owned Corporations Act, pursuant to subsection 19(3)—Statement of Corporate Intent—Icon Water Limited—Business Strategy 2019-20 to 2022-23.

Domestic Violence Prevention Council Extraordinary Meeting regarding children and young people—ACT Government response to the Final Report, dated 6 June 2019.

Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee—Report 7—Draft Variation to the Territory Plan No 350: Changes to definition of ‘single dwelling block’—Government response.

ACT Place Names Committee & Guidelines Review, dated June 2019, pursuant to the resolution of the Assembly of 28 November 2018.

Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment, pursuant to subsection 21(2)—Lower Cotter Catchment Restoration Evaluation—The Heroic and the Dammed—Government response.

Auditor-General Act, pursuant to subsection 21(2)—Auditor-General’s Report No 2/2019—Recognition and implementation of obligations under the Human Rights Act 2004—Government response.

ACT Human Rights Commission—Commission Initiated Review of Allegations regarding Bimberi Youth Justice Centre Report—Government response, dated June 2019.

Children and Young People Act, pursuant to subsection 727S(5)—ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—Annual Report 2018, dated 30 April 2019.

Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to section 39—Copies of notices provided to the Ombudsman—Community Services Directorate—Freedom of Information requests—Decisions not made in time—

CYF-19/15, dated 15 May 2019.

CYF-19/18, dated 24 May 2019.

CYF-18/36, dated 15 May 2019.

ACT Place Names Committee and guidelines review

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries) (3.46): Pursuant to standing order 211, I move:

That the Assembly take note of the following paper:

ACT Place Names Committee and Guidelines Review, dated June 2019.

I am disappointed to see, when we are considering such a serious matter, that only a few Canberra Liberals are in the chamber. I wish to acknowledge those in the gallery whose lives will be made better because of these changes in place names. I am pleased to table the ACT Place Names Committee and guidelines review that has been undertaken by the ACT government in response to the motion moved by Ms Cody on 28 November 2018 and passed by the Assembly. I would like to thank Ms Cody for bringing these matters to the attention of the Assembly and for her advocacy on behalf of the community.

As I spoke about in the debate on Ms Cody's motion, place naming was a responsibility of the Australian government prior to self-government coming to the territory. Since self-government the naming of public places has been undertaken by the responsible minister or delegate under the Public Place Names Act 1989, with support and advice from the non-statutory ACT Place Names Committee since 1999. The resolution passed by the Assembly was the result of community and media interest in existing place names in the territory, and the potential for public places to be named after persons who have since suffered a fall from grace.

The resolution called on the government to review the ACT Place Names Committee, the public place names guidelines and associated processes. The review also called on the ACT Place Names Committee to review the naming of two public places—Haig Park and William Slim Drive.

The review has been undertaken by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate, with input received from the Place Names Committee and other relevant stakeholders. The review assessed the Place Names Committee membership and terms of reference, the place names guidelines and the ability to consider community proposals against ACT government benchmarks and best practice examples. The review also undertook a jurisdictional analysis to compare place naming and community input processes in the territory with other jurisdictions. A significant component of the review focused on the existing complaints process for members of the community to raise concerns over place names that they feel do not meet community standards.

Today I am tabling the findings of the final review report as well as providing the government's response to the recommendations of the review. I would now like to address the outcomes and recommendations of the review and announce that the ACT government will be accepting and implementing all of those recommendations.

Generally, the review found that the current system and processes for naming public places in the ACT are robust and thorough. The review recognises that the ACT Place Names Committee performs an important research and advisory role in the naming of public places. The review recognises that the work of the committee has been well received by the community and that current naming procedures have not resulted in any place names that do not meet with community standards of a modern, inclusive and progressive Canberra.

However, the final review report identifies a number of options and opportunities to improve the processes for naming public places in the territory. The review also identifies opportunities to increase community input and involvement in the place naming process. The review identifies ways to make it easier and clearer for members of the community to raise concerns with the committee to identify instances where the naming of a place has caused hurt or distress to our community.

There are some key recommendations from the review that I would like to highlight, and ask that these be implemented as a matter of priority by the Place Names Committee and the place names unit within EPSDD. First, the public place names guidelines will be updated to require the committee to consider current community standards before naming a place after a person. It is important that the commemoration of people who have made a strong contribution to the territory is consistent with our values and community standards of conduct.

I request that the committee implements the recommendations to increase community input opportunities in the place naming process from the selection of themes for new divisions to inviting community feedback on proposed names. I will also be asking the committee and the directorate to improve the place names website to make it easier for the community to provide feedback in relation to proposed and existing names.

I will also be implementing the recommendation to update the terms of reference of the committee to establish a clear mandate and responsibility for the committee to advise me on contentious names and places that are issued, including where commemoration of particular names may no longer represent community standards.

Specifically, the committee will develop a feedback and complaints process and publish it on the place names website. The process will detail how a member of the community can provide feedback and provide an easy-to-use online portal. Where feedback relates to an existing name, I have asked the committee and the directorate to update the existing renaming policy to provide further criteria to assist the community in providing relevant information for the committee's consideration and providing the criteria against which the committee will assess community proposals.

On this point I note that the review process provides a relevant example from Yale University in the United States. There, a special committee was tasked with developing a set of principles for considering renaming proposals based on the values of the university. This provides a helpful point of reference for the committee to develop our own set of principles to assist both the committee and the community in assessing proposals and providing relevant information.

As I mentioned earlier, the Place Names Committee performs an admirable service for the ACT community, and the implementation of these recommendations will further strengthen their important role as a community representative.

Finally, I would like to address the particular place names raised in the motion. The review reports on two names which have been the subject of significant community disquiet, being Haig Park and William Slim Drive. The review report provides background information on the naming of these places and summarises the information currently before government.

In relation to Haig Park, the review presents three options for consideration. After considering these three options, and the recommendations from the Place Names Committee, I have decided to keep the name of Haig Park and to install new signage to tell the contested history of Field Marshal Haig's wartime legacy. I believe that this recognises that there are differing views on Haig's military legacy, and the new signage will provide an opportunity to further inform discussion and debate around Australia's experience in the First World War.

In relation to William Slim Drive, the review presents two options: to keep the name or to change the name. I note that, with respect to William Slim Drive, the Place Names Committee was not able to provide a recommendation on the renaming decision. I have carefully considered all of the information before me, including the information put forward in the review, the allegations made to the ACT government and the submission made by the Slim family to the review. I have also considered the outcome of the recent Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, which delivered a recommendation that institutions should review their existing institutional honours, dedications and memorials to make sure that they do not honour perpetrators of child sex abuse.

Child sexual abuse is an abhorrent legacy and is not consistent with the values of the ACT or the nation, both now and in the past. It is important that we as a community make decisions in accordance with our values as a modern, inclusive and progressive city, and that commemoration and public place naming do not cause ongoing hurt to our citizens.

The naming of William Slim Drive has an association and a legacy that contravenes our values as a territory; therefore, I intend to change the name of the road. I will now undertake a process under the legislation to consider relevant matters and to consult with relevant parties before proceeding to a formal decision.

I have recently written to the Place Names Committee to ask them to consider options for the renaming of the road and to provide recommendations back to me. I expect that I will be in a position to formally rename the road following the conclusion of the duplication of the road which has been announced by government to improve connections between Belconnen and Gungahlin.

In concluding, I would like to thank the directorate and the committee for their work in undertaking this review and I appreciate their ongoing attention in implementing all recommendations of the review within the next 12 months.

MS ORR (Yerrabi) (3.56): When Ms Cody first moved the motion I spoke about a particular road in my electorate of Yerrabi. I am very encouraged today to hear Minister Gentleman's remark that that particular road between Gungahlin and Belconnen will be renamed.

As members of this place are quite aware, I grew up in Giralang and I have travelled along this road for as long as I can remember, sometimes on a daily basis. I am quite confident that everyone in the Belconnen parts of Yerrabi who would be using this road on a regular basis would support the changing of the name, knowing that it removes the trauma of victims who also have to use this road.

I am making a conscious choice not to refer to it because I am quite glad that we are moving on and we are going to change that name. It is no longer going to cause trauma to people. I am confident that people in Yerrabi—in Giralang and McKellar, the people who use this road every day—will embrace this change, knowing that it is the right thing to do, knowing that it recognises the full history of the person who was first given this honour, and knowing that, with the evidence now at hand, and the consciousness we have, particularly around victims of sexual trauma, sexual violence and the trauma they face, it is not the right thing to bestow the honour on this person of naming a road after them.

I am glad it is changing. I thank the minister for his direction on this, and I thank Ms Cody for first bringing the issue to the Assembly.

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (3.58): I cannot believe that I am actually emotional about this, when I have not been through the trauma that many others have. I would like to thank Mr Gentleman and his directorate for their good work on this issue. I would especially like to acknowledge the work of any public servants who have been exposed to the shouty and abusive behaviour that this debate has brought out in some people. One of the best points Mr Gentleman made is the importance of respecting victims and having a respectful debate. These are difficult topics.

For many Australians, their sense of identity is drawn from Australian history. They seek to be proud of their forebears, without accepting the responsibility for the bad along with the glory of the good. As a city, our place names reflect a version of history that often does just that—trumpeting the glory of the good deeds whilst ignoring the crimes and misdeeds of the past; telling only half the story; condemning our grandchildren to repeat the mistakes of our grandparents.

In the case of Haig Park, the merits of Field Marshal Haig were debated at the time of the naming of the park. The name itself was part of the argument and, from the number of people still engaged in that argument, the rights and wrongs of the First World War are far from settled. Taking this opportunity to include more people in that conversation seems very wise.

In the case of William Slim Drive, I believe Mr Gentleman has made the right call. The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse emphasised that redress should accept a reasonable likelihood test rather than a higher standard of proof when assessing allegations of historic abuse. That means we should believe survivors and not put them on trial when trying to right the wrongs of the past.

While Slim will never face the trial he deserved, we should not be running a protection racket for his legacy. We cannot honestly claim to be engaged in redress and healing whilst continuing to commemorate the perpetrator.

I believe the third part of Mr Gentleman's decision, that of opening a proper process to respond to other problematic place names, will be the most important—a process of listening and considering, a process without the histrionics and carrying on that we have seen in the last few months.

As a politician I am perfectly comfortable with weeks of letters to the editor slagging me off. But the idea that a victim of child sexual abuse would be exposed to the same makes me sick. The mob should not be allowed to bully the victims of anything. Intimidation by those whose identity politics is threatened by the truthful telling of Australian history should never be allowed to prevent victims from coming forward. I thank Mr Gentleman and his directorate for the hard work they have done, and I look forward to the renaming.

MR PETTERSSON (Yerrabi) (4.02): I also rise to put on the record my support for this decision. As I do that I want to note the very sombre mood that has taken over this place. It is often very hard to confront our history. For far too long we have not confronted the immoral, unfair and terrible actions that took place, often in the shadows. But in coming forward and renaming this road we are confronting that past, and speaking truth to that silencing culture.

I want to cast back very briefly to when Ms Cody first raised this, and the vitriol that we saw in our community about this discussion. A terrible conversation took place. Ms Cody was attacked for raising this. I am very glad to see in this decision today an acknowledgement that Ms Cody was correct and brave in bringing it forward, and I thank her for doing it.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Auditor-General's report No 2 of 2019—government response

Motion (by **Mr Gentleman**) agreed to:

That the Assembly take note of the following paper:

Auditor-General Act, pursuant to subsection 21(2)—Auditor-General's Report No 2/2019—Recognition and implementation of obligations under the *Human Rights Act 2004*—Government response.

Bimberi Youth Justice Centre report—government response

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries) (4.05): Pursuant to standing order 211, I move:

That the Assembly take note of the following paper:

ACT Human Rights Commission—Commission Initiated Review of Allegations regarding Bimberi Youth Justice Centre Report—Government response, dated June 2019.

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) (4.05): I am pleased to speak briefly to the ACT government response to the recent ACT Human Rights Commission report *Commission Initiated Review of Allegations Regarding Bimberi Youth Justice Centre*. As members of this Assembly would be aware, I am committed to transparency and accountability in youth justice in the ACT and to ensuring that all young people have access to crucial rehabilitative services to turn their lives around.

The safety of young people and staff at Bimberi is our main priority. Bimberi is a highly regulated environment with strict protocols and procedures in place to ensure the safety and wellbeing of young people.

I welcomed the commission's review when it was announced and similarly welcomed the review report and the commission's recommendations. Reviews such as this one give us the opportunity to reflect on our practice and demonstrate our commitment to the best possible outcomes for young people within the youth justice system.

The Human Rights Commission interviewed 39 individuals, including young people who had been at Bimberi in the review period, family members, youth workers, managers and health and education staff. They reviewed extensive information obtained from the Community Services Directorate and other stakeholders, conducted physical inspections of the facility, reviewed and analysed data from registers of searches, use of force, segregation and complaints, and viewed CCTV footage and reports of several incidents. The review was significant and comprehensive.

The recommendations provided by the commission build on the already robust focus on human rights within the centre and will further cement the Human Rights Act 2004 in Bimberi operations. Importantly, the commission's investigations did not reveal an entrenched culture of violence or disregard for the human rights of young people at Bimberi. In our response, the government has either agreed or agreed in principle to

all 15 recommendations of the commission and work is already underway to implement this response.

The government has also agreed to provide six-monthly reports on the progress of each recommendation. Tuesday's budget included \$907,000 in capital funding over four years to strengthen security and CCTV facilities at Bimberi Youth Justice Centre, in line with the first recommendation of the report. The expansion of CCTV coverage will continue to ensure there is an appropriate balance between the privacy of young people and the safety and security of the centre and staff.

I note that several recommendations of the commission's review align with key focus areas of the recent final report from the blueprint on youth justice task force. These relate to areas that focus on improving drug and alcohol services at Bimberi, enhancing through-care for young people who leave Bimberi and exploring therapeutic options for young people aged under 14 who engage in harmful conduct and come into contact with the youth justice system.

In closing, I thank all the people who work tirelessly to support some of our most vulnerable children and young people, both in Bimberi and in the community. Significantly, in the report the commission noted that most young people spoke highly of staff at Bimberi and acknowledged the sensitivity, care and commitment demonstrated by staff who work with young people within the centre. This has also been my observation in my regular visits to Bimberi. Again I thank those staff on behalf of the government and the ACT community.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—annual report

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries) (4.08): Pursuant to standing order 211, I move:

That the Assembly take note of the following paper:

Children and Young People Act, pursuant to subsection 727S(5)—ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee—Annual Report 2018, dated 30 April 2019.

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) (4.08): The ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee annual report provides the community with information each year on the deaths of children and young people that occur in the ACT as well as those deaths of ACT children and young people that occur outside the ACT. This annual report covers the period from 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2018.

The committee, which was established in 2012, has a number of functions, including maintaining a register of deaths of children and young people in the ACT, identifying patterns and trends in relation to the deaths of children and young people and determining research that would be valuable in this area. As members would be aware, the committee is able to make recommendations about legislation, policies, practices and services for implementation by government and non-government bodies, with the aim of preventing avoidable deaths, reducing the number of deaths of children and young people in the ACT and improving services.

The annual report tabled today provides an analysis of data on the deaths of ACT children and young people occurring in 2018 and over a five-year period from 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2018. The report comprises a number of specific cohorts, including all children and young people who died in the ACT in the 12-month period of the report or who normally resided in the ACT but died outside the ACT during this period, ACT residents only over the five-year period and two chapters on specific populations: neonates and infants, and vulnerable young people.

Tragically, children under one year of age comprise the largest number of deaths across age groups, accounting for 68 per cent of all deaths of children and young people for the five-year period. The leading causes of death for infants are medically related and include certain conditions originating in the perinatal period and chromosomal or congenital anomalies.

Suicide is the leading cause of death for young people aged 15 to 17 years. Deaths by suicide remain a concern for the committee, with intentional self-harm resulting in, on average, two deaths a year in the ACT. The committee chair, Ms Margaret Carmody PSM, notes in her foreword to the report that the committee will be conducting a more in-depth review of children and young people who died as a result of intentional self-harm. This is an important piece of work which I have discussed directly with the committee chair and deputy chair.

This year the committee has also included a chapter on the progress of recommendations made by the committee since its establishment. The recommendations made by the committee have an important role to play in helping improve service systems and service delivery through what is learnt from the tragic events associated with the death of a child or young person. The committee notes that they will continue to monitor changes to policy and practice which aim to achieve better outcomes for children and young people.

The death of any child or young person is devastating and I take this opportunity again to extend my condolences and, I am sure, the condolences of this Assembly to all families and friends affected by the death of a child or young person. I commend the ACT Children and Young People Death Review Committee annual report 2018 to the Assembly and thank the committee for its work over the last year.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Auditor-General's report No 2 of 2019—government response

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) (4.12), by leave: I am pleased to speak to the government response to the Auditor-General's report No 2 of 2019, *Recognition and implementation of obligations under the Human Rights Act 2004*.

The ACT has a proud record as the first state or territory in Australia to introduce a legislative bill of rights, our Human Rights Act 2004, which protects the rights of all Canberrans. Our Human Rights Act inspired Victoria to enact its own Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities in 2006, and just this year Queensland has enacted a Human Rights Act. While a national bill of rights remains elusive, this growing consensus of states and territories that recognise the importance of human rights is powerful and is already having an impact on the kinds of nationally consistent laws that are negotiated with the commonwealth.

Within the ACT, our Human Rights Act works to protect and promote human rights in a number of ways. One of these is to impose obligations on all public authorities to respect human rights in decision-making. The endgame is to enshrine a culture which prioritises the protection of human rights in the ACT public sector. Human rights considerations should be part of our everyday business and at the forefront of our minds when we make decisions that affect the people in our community.

To keep building that culture of human rights, we need to remain vigilant about our statutory obligations and the frameworks we have for meeting these requirements. To that end, I welcome the report of the Auditor-General on the recognition and implementation of our human rights obligations.

The report examines the way human rights considerations are reflected in the day-to-day operations of three areas of government. The audit focused on community corrections and the human rights unit, both within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, and the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre within the Community Services Directorate.

The report recognises a range of positive steps already taken by these agencies to implement human rights obligations. It acknowledges that both directorates have taken steps to build a human rights culture through whole-of-directorate strategic and organisational policies and documents, and that policies and documents in each directorate implicitly, and in some instances explicitly, recognise and articulate the importance of human rights to the activities of the directorate. The report also found that the human rights unit provides effective advice and support to ACT government agencies to consider and recognise in their obligations as public authorities, by reviewing all proposed government bills and providing advice to agencies on human rights compatibility.

The report makes five constructive recommendations regarding further actions that can be taken to strengthen a culture of human rights in the ACT. The government

welcomes these recommendations. As set out in the government response, we agree with four recommendations and agree in principle with one recommendation.

Two of the auditor's recommendations directly relate to the Bimberi Youth Justice Centre: that key decision-making documents used by Bimberi should include explicit human rights references; and that the Community Services Directorate should develop an ongoing human rights training program for Bimberi staff in the context of the youth justice environment.

I am pleased to advise the Assembly that all operational staff at Bimberi have now completed the human rights training, except for staff who are away from work on long-term leave. Staff who are on leave will complete the training within a week of their next shift at Bimberi. The Community Services Directorate has committed to updating all key decision-making documents at Bimberi to clearly document the consideration of human rights in making those decisions. The key decision-making documents that will be updated relate to decisions that have significant engagement with a young person's human rights.

The Auditor-General recommends that the Justice and Community Safety Directorate review and include specific human rights references and considerations in community corrections policies and procedures. We agree with this recommendation. While consideration of human rights is already an important part of the policy development process, ACT Corrective Services will include specific references to human rights considerations in community corrections policies and documents where relevant and appropriate, to provide additional guidance to officers in their day-to-day work.

The Justice and Community Safety Directorate has also agreed to develop and roll out a human rights toolkit for public authorities by June 2020. The toolkit will guide ACT public servants to meet their human rights obligations in decision-making and help them to thoroughly consider human rights when developing laws and policies so that they are compatible with the Human Rights Act. The toolkit will be not only useful for public agencies but also a great resource for anyone who is interested in human rights in the ACT. In rolling out this toolkit, JACS will also assist agencies to improve the documentation of human rights considerations in decision-making.

The ACT government welcomes the recommendation to enhance our annual reporting regarding activities undertaken by agencies to meet human rights obligations. Better reporting will help us continue to measure and monitor our progress in developing a robust human rights culture. I am pleased to inform the Assembly that the changes recommended by the Auditor-General with respect to annual reporting have already been adopted and implemented for the coming annual reporting year.

The government response demonstrates the ongoing commitment of this government to leading the way in protecting and upholding human rights. I thank the Auditor-General for his report and commend the government response to the Assembly.

Sentencing (Drug and Alcohol Treatment Orders) 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) (4.18): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am delighted to present the Sentencing (Drug and Alcohol Treatment Orders) Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 to the Assembly. From the beginning of this term, we have been getting down to business delivering on our commitments, and I am proud to have led this government's work in this particular area.

This bill meets one of those important commitments by laying the foundation for a drug and alcohol court for Canberra. We committed to delivering a drug court in the parliamentary agreement. This reform is a key part of our broader strategy to reduce recidivism in Canberra, reduce incarceration rates and promote restorative practices across our justice system.

Throughout this term we have invested in consultation, research and planning to deliver a first-rate drug court. Corrective Services, the Director of Public Prosecutions, Legal Aid ACT and ACT Policing will all have a role to play. I would like to make particular mention of Chief Justice Murrell, who was the first drug court judge in New South Wales, and Justice Burns for their very strong support in this process.

The government believes that a justice system can be and should be restorative and rehabilitative. This means that our court system should support people to repair the harm that they have caused through offending and restore their relationships with the community. When it comes to addressing the impacts of drug and alcohol abuse, harm minimisation is our number one priority. Treating addiction in order to prevent people from falling into a cycle of crime is an important way to minimise the harm of substance abuse to individuals and to families.

Restorative approaches help us make our community whole again after conflict, crime or loss. Holding people responsible for crime can happen while simultaneously addressing the underlying causes of their behaviour.

The ACT drug and alcohol court will engage with people whose crimes are primarily the result of drug addiction. It is a form of therapeutic justice. Therapeutic justice is focused on how to help people live better lives as fully participating members of society. This means having a criminal process that is solutions focused and that is measured by how it changes future behaviour.

This legislation will focus on a select cohort of people who face sentencing in the ACT Supreme Court. These are people whose addictions have resulted in serious consequences for them, for their families and for the whole community. The drug and alcohol court will offer them a pathway away from certain incarceration. Addressing their dependencies will break a cycle of dependence and break a cycle of offending that causes harm to our whole community.

To be eligible, a person will need to take responsibility by pleading guilty. Only certain criminal matters are eligible—namely, indictable crimes for which the Supreme Court will impose a sentence of at least one year but not more than four. Serious crimes of violence like murder or manslaughter, sexual offences and cases where the sentence will be longer than four years are excluded.

The bill provides for a solution-focused process which draws on the lessons learned across Australia about how to deliver a successful drug court. The way it will work is by fostering a relationship between the person who committed a crime, the presiding judge, and health and social service providers. That relationship will, in turn, support offenders to overcome dependency and to leave the justice system with a better set of tools to participate in society.

Each participant will have an individualised treatment and sentence management plan that includes intensive supervision, frequent urine and breath testing, and regular and ongoing contact with health and corrections staff. A scheme of rewards and sanctions will support compliance. Progress will be rewarded, and breaches will be sanctioned through a system of swift, certain and proportionate consequences. This sends a strong message about the consequences of continued criminal or antisocial conduct.

The program will be intensive, and it will run in most cases for between 12 months and two years. People who complete the program successfully will have their original sentences of imprisonment replaced with a good behaviour order. People who do not complete the program will have their drug and alcohol treatment order cancelled and will have to serve the remainder of their sentence in custody.

The evidence is strong that if we provide the right support services to people with drug and alcohol problems at the right point in their contact with the judicial system, we can address these dependencies and, in turn, build more resilient families, people and communities.

While this legislation was being developed, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and I had the privilege of joining Judge Roger Dive in the Parramatta Drug Court. We saw firsthand what a harm minimisation focus can achieve. We saw that, through building relationships and surrounding vulnerable people with support, new beginnings are possible and the root cause of offending can be addressed.

The statistics behind this model are compelling. A 2008 study of the New South Wales Drug Court found that people who completed the program were 37 per cent less likely to be re-convicted of an offence than people who never entered the program. A 2014 evaluation of the Dandenong program in Victoria showed that the

reduction in sentences of imprisonment over a two-year period generated savings of \$1.2 million compared with traditional sentencing courts.

It is important to understand that this initiative is not about diminishing responsibility for crimes. People who seek this program will have to take responsibility for their crime and work very hard to address the dependencies that cause their offending. The goal is to both hold individuals accountable for their crimes and also serve the interests of the whole community by reducing recidivism. The evidence is clear that a well-developed drug and alcohol sentencing program will protect our community while strengthening individual people and families in the process.

This bill sets out a framework that ultimately will be implemented by the dedicated people who staff our courts, our criminal justice and corrective systems, and our government and community health services. That work is ongoing, and the text of this legislation is being matched by the funding and support that those services need to achieve a successful drug and alcohol court. The government will keep working collaboratively with everyone involved to ensure that by the end of this year we have a functioning court that delivers tangible results for this community.

This government has ambitious commitments to reduce recidivism, to improve our justice system and to help make Canberra even safer. As Attorney-General I have a responsibility to ensure that our courts are working in concert with the rest of our community to achieve our shared goals. This bill represents a foundation for collaborating across justice, health and community services to restore the ability of people with addictions to participate in society and to protect Canberra by reducing crime. In creating this new drug and alcohol court, and across the diverse range of services that we deliver, this government is and will remain people focused and progressive.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

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

Road Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

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

Title read by Clerk.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong—Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety and Minister for Mental Health) (4.28): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to introduce the Road Transport Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. The bill makes a number of minor amendments to the territory's road transport legislation to improve road safety and the administration and enforcement of the legislation.

This government is committed through the territory's road safety strategy 2011-20 to the safe system approach, which acknowledges that human error occurs but relies on responsible road user behaviour. This requires efforts to educate and encourage road users to obey the road transport laws and to be unimpaired and alert when sharing the road with others. It also requires the use of enforcement and penalties to deter road transport users from breaking the law, including removing the privilege of road use from those who do not comply.

Among the changes proposed, this bill introduces new minimum automatic disqualification periods for drivers who repeatedly drive while suspended. Strong signals for repeat offenders reflect the government's commitment to a lifetime learning approach to road safety, which reinforces and rewards safe behaviours and encourages the adoption of safe behaviours on our roads. Appropriate enforcement actions are essential to providing a safe road environment for the community.

An important part of improving road safety is targeting impaired drivers. Impaired driving is a significant contributing factor in road trauma. This bill includes a number of minor amendments to the territory's regulatory scheme for detecting and prosecuting offences relating to driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Detection and enforcement of impaired driving offences is a matter of high importance to the community, given the risks of death and injury associated with drink and drug driving.

The provisions being amended are in the existing legislation and have been replicated with minor modifications to ensure the effectiveness of the scheme and consistency with other jurisdictions, and to limit the impact on individual rights.

The bill also amends the offences of driving an unregistered or uninsured motor vehicle. It extends the application of these offences to a person who permits or allows an unregistered or uninsured motor vehicle to be driven. This amendment brings the ACT in line with other jurisdictions and ensures the enforceability of these offences.

This bill also includes a number of minor amendments to improve the efficiency and administration of the road transport infringement notice scheme. The amendments clarify that family violence, whether current or past, is a relevant circumstance for the purposes of determining a person's application to participate in an approved community work or social development program as an alternative method of paying an infringement notice penalty or an application for waiver of an infringement notice penalty. These amendments are supported by updates to existing processes around the withdrawal and waiver of infringement notice penalties and access to approved community work or social development programs.

This bill also makes a number of minor amendments to the road transport legislation to remove administratively burdensome processes, improve the efficiency of the road transport infringement notice management scheme and provide authorised persons and police officers with the powers they need to undertake effective enforcement of the road transport legislation. These changes help to ensure that the ACT has a strong regulatory framework that provides an efficient, effective and fair system for managing compliance with the territory's road transport laws.

The bill makes a minor amendment by moving the definition of “personal mobility device” from the act into regulation. This allows flexibility for future regulation of these devices, which include transport modes such as e-scooters. These are an emerging form of personal transportation which I think have great potential in the ACT for offering last-mile solutions, in combination with public transport, as well as displacing short car trips. They can be zero emission when recharged with 100 per cent renewable electricity, which the ACT will have by 2020. I expect to soon announce further work in this space.

I commend this bill to the Assembly.

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

Litter Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

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

Title read by Clerk.

MR STEEL (Murrumbidgee—Minister for City Services, Minister for Community Services and Facilities, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Roads) (4.33):

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I am pleased to introduce the Litter Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 to the Assembly today. The bill will support a cleaner Canberra, making the ACT an even better place to live by reducing the amount of litter in our streets, landscapes and waterways. It provides a strong, contemporary and best practice legislative framework for preventing, deterring and responding to littering and illegal dumping in the ACT.

Waste and the cleanliness of our suburbs is an important issue to the people of Canberra. This was made clear through the better suburbs statement 2030, where a citizens forum ranked waste as their third and fourth priorities for our suburbs moving forward, including addressing illegal dumping.

Littering cost the ACT government over \$2 million last financial year, resulting from cleaning up litter from our parks and roadsides, and removing and disposing of illegally dumped items. This is a significant cost to both government and the people of the ACT. We know that it is an issue Canberrans care about, as there are more requests being made to Access Canberra about littering and the overall cleanliness and amenity of our suburbs each year. To ensure that we are able to meet the expectations of Canberrans, our regulatory framework needs to be able to respond effectively and efficiently.

We also know that littering and illegal dumping has impacts on the environment and the health of our community. Having clean and unpolluted parks, waterways and

suburbs is essential for Canberrans to be able to enjoy our beautiful open space safely. Our community should be proud of this city. When the amenity of our open space is impacted by littering or dumping, the value that our community places on our surroundings is reduced, and this can have flow-on impacts on local residents and the broader community. Similarly, littering on private property can have serious impacts on property owners and the surrounding community, from someone throwing food packaging into someone else's yard to keeping large amounts of rubbish on a private block.

The bill I am presenting today will address the key issues that Canberrans have raised about littering and improve the overall livability of the territory in three key ways. It will work to protect the environment and the amenity of the territory through an effective compliance and enforcement framework that allows the legislation to be easily enforced where a person chooses to ignore the rules and litter in our beautiful city.

The bill will establish a new escalating framework for littering offences where the penalties are proportionate to the amount and the type of litter dumped. This means that someone dumping a small bag of household rubbish will receive a different penalty to someone dumping a carload or a truckload of rubbish. This is considered best practice and is an important deterrence mechanism which is already taking place in other Australian jurisdictions. This escalating framework is accompanied by a new fine framework which complements the escalation model and enables officers on the ground to take effective action.

The bill recognises that a number of littering offences take place in, near or around a vehicle and ensures that fines can be issued for littering offences where a vehicle is involved. Currently an infringement notice cannot be issued where a person is seen littering from their car or dumps a large amount of rubbish and gets into their car and drives off. I am pleased that the bill rectifies this issue, which will dramatically improve enforcement capabilities and sends a message to offenders that polluting our suburbs with litter will not be tolerated and that effective investigative and compliance action can and will be taken. The change will be further supported by increased use of CCTV footage around the territory and a new dedicated compliance team that will target littering and illegal dumping as well as enforcing other laws.

This bill will further protect the amenity of Canberra into the future by allowing for regulations to be developed to support dockless bikes, scooters and other modes of shared transport in the ACT when the need arises, which will be similar to the current shopping trolley framework in the existing act. This recognises that dumping of these items has both amenity and environmental impacts on our city, and that the suppliers of these items have a role to play in keeping the city clean from dumping.

I am pleased that this bill protects the environment and the amenity of our suburbs by ensuring that littering and dumping can be policed effectively not only in our public spaces but also in open private places such as building sites and schools and also in recycling drop-off centres. We have seen an increasing number of cases where building materials have ended up in our environment and our waterways, particularly in our new suburbs that are under construction, and where some people are dumping rubbish in recycling drop-off centres and at schools. This is not acceptable.

The bill includes provisions to capture building waste and materials which can escape a worksite and ensure that loose construction materials on private sites are properly secured. There are more options to take action against people who illegally dump items at schools, at recycling centres and in other people's yards.

Another key feature of this bill is a new and streamlined framework for managing abandoned vehicles, which are too often seen littering roadsides and reserves. I know this is an issue of concern for many Canberrans. Quick and efficient removal of abandoned motor vehicles from our streets is important not only for how our city looks and feels but also for the safety of our roads for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.

The bill expands the areas from which abandoned vehicles can be removed to include all places open to the public, not just vehicles abandoned on public unleased land, and by reducing the holding times required before vehicles are disposed of. This will mean that if a vehicle is dumped on school grounds the government can take quick action to identify the last registered owner and, where appropriate, remove the vehicle and dispose of it quickly and efficiently. This is not possible under the current framework. This bill will reduce the time abandoned vehicles are left in public and open spaces and reduce holding times and costs to taxpayers associated with vehicles that are clearly abandoned.

The second way that this bill improves the livability of the ACT is by protecting the health and safety of Canberrans. This bill protects the safety of Canberrans by introducing a new framework for aggravated littering, including depositing of dangerous items such as a syringe, which is a serious offence with potentially serious public health consequences.

This bill will protect the safety of Canberrans by ensuring that we can issue effective fines for people who litter cigarette butts. This new legislation will treat all deposited cigarettes as a form of aggravated littering as it is difficult to establish if a cigarette has been properly extinguished, and there is the potential for an apparently extinguished cigarette to rekindle in windy conditions. Data from ACT emergency services indicate that 13 per cent of all recent grass and bushfires have been caused by discarded cigarettes.

Under the bill, depositing a syringe or cigarette butt will incur an on-the-spot fine of \$500. This amendment will have considerable benefits for the safety of the community and our wildlife and natural assets.

This bill will also lead to safer and cleaner roadways, as the offence of moving a vehicle with an uncovered load has been included as a vehicle-related offence. This means vehicles with uncovered loads will not need to be stopped to issue fines and fines can simply be issued by using the registration details of the vehicle. Operating a vehicle with an uncovered load will now attract a larger penalty and act as a greater deterrent to people considering not covering or tying down their loads. This amendment is of particular importance when considering road safety, as uncovered loads are a major safety risk to all road users in our community.

The third way that this bill improves the livability of the ACT is by protecting the wellbeing of Canberrans. Hoarding of litter on private property is a serious issue in the ACT and can have a significant impact on the lives of people living in these situations and for those in surrounding properties. This bill provides an escalating framework for addressing and remedying hoarding issues involving litter, when they occur, in a way that achieves the best possible outcomes for the resident and neighbouring property owners.

These provisions aim to identify and implement social solutions where possible. However, as a last resort they can include a court-issued abatement order to clean up a property where initial strategies have proven unsuccessful. Importantly, the provisions do not criminalise hoarding behaviour but provide a framework based on helping affected parties achieve the best possible outcomes.

In summary, this bill proposes a way forward for managing litter and illegal dumping in the ACT, allowing for a more streamlined and efficient approach to deterring and handling cases of littering and illegal dumping. The bill uses a strategic and best practice approach to reducing pollution and improving the amenity and safety of our community through deterrence, tougher penalties, an escalating fine framework and improved collaboration with stakeholders.

The bill will also be supported by a new targeted compliance team with the resources to proactively support the new laws. An education and awareness campaign will also be delivered to give visibility to these changes, ensuring that the ACT community are aware of their responsibilities in keeping our city safe, attractive and easy to move around.

These amendments will have positive environmental impacts for our bush capital and will significantly improve the safety, amenity and livability of our city and our suburbs in line with community expectations. Littering and illegal dumping are behaviours that should not be tolerated in our city, and this bill will take a proactive and preventative approach to ensuring this is the case. I commend this bill to the Assembly.

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

Republic of Kiribati—40th anniversary

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (4.44): I move:

That, it being 40 years since the sovereign democratic Republic of Kiribati was declared and its independence constitution promulgated on 12 July 1979, this Assembly:

- (1) expresses its congratulations and friendship to: the people of Kiribati; the Kiribati Parliament, the *Maneaba ni Maungatabu*; the Speaker, the Hon Tebuai Uaai; and the President of Kiribati, the Hon Taneti Maamau, on this most significant milestone;

- (2) acknowledges the value of constitutional parliamentary democracy in providing for representative, responsible government and the rule of law;
- (3) places enormous value in the deep and abiding ties between the Legislative Assembly for the ACT and the Kiribati Parliament, the *Maneaba ni Maungatabu*, that have been established through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's twinning program; and
- (4) wishes the people of Kiribati a bright and prosperous future in which its democratic institutions continue to flourish.

I am very pleased to move this motion to mark the 40th anniversary of the independence of Kiribati. It was on 12 July 1979 that the independent Republic of Kiribati was formed, becoming the 41st member of the commonwealth. This followed an order of Queen Elizabeth II providing for the constitution of Kiribati, which includes provisions for free elections, the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms, the establishment of three distinct and separate branches of government, and the rule of law.

Kiribati occupies a special place in the hearts and minds of members of this place, arising from the Assembly having been paired with the Parliament of Kiribati since 2007 under the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association twinning program. Members will be aware that the twinning arrangement has been valuable. We have developed a shared understanding of each other's parliamentary practices, constitutional arrangements, political cultures and history. The aims of the CPA twinning program are to promote cooperation and support between developed and developing branches of the association by creating links across the regions and continents within the commonwealth. The program also provides an opportunity to forge ongoing relationships between branches and work towards achievement of the MDGs. All Australian states and the Northern Territory are similarly twinned with other parliaments across the Pacific.

In 2008 then Speaker Wayne Berry and Deputy Speaker Steve Pratt, together with the Clerk of the Assembly, visited Kiribati and discussed with their Speaker and Clerk how we could further progress the twinning arrangements, how they could be used for the mutual benefit of the ACT and Kiribati, and how knowledge and information might best be shared.

Since that time, the relationship between the Legislative Assembly and the Kiribati parliament has flourished, with a range of activities and visits. These included a visit to Kiribati by the Deputy Speaker, Mrs Dunne, and Ms Le Couteur; a visit by the Deputy Clerk in 2011 as part of the twinning arrangements; a visit by the Clerk Assistant and the justice and community safety legal adviser in 2012 to assist new members with an education program; and a visit by a former Clerk of the Assembly, Mark McRae OAM, for six weeks in October 2009 to assist with a review of the Kiribati standing orders. We all know what fun a review of standing orders is, members! They also included the then Speaker of the Assembly, Shane Rattenbury, attending the 2009 Presiding Officers and Clerks Conference; a visit to Kiribati by Ms Lawder and, as I recall, Mr Wall and the Clerk Assistant in August 2014, again as

part of the twinning arrangements; and last year a visit by the Assembly's former Deputy Clerk, again in a review of their standing orders.

We can see that there has been a long history of a significant number of members of this place visiting Kiribati and creating that relationship, to the benefit of both our parliaments.

The Assembly has also hosted a number of visits by members and officers of the Kiribati parliament. There was an attachment of two members from the Kiribati parliament here in 2011; the Kiribati Deputy Clerk undertook an attachment here in November 2011; two IT staff visited the Assembly in 2009; the Kiribati public accounts committee undertook a two-day program here in the Assembly in February 2010; and the Hansard staff undertook an attachment in 2017.

Another link with Kiribati has been formed with the Office of the Legislative Assembly social club, which has donated to a Kiribati charity on several occasions.

As an enduring symbol of the relationship, in June of 2012 the then Speaker, Shane Rattenbury, officially opened the Kiribati room here in the Assembly building. It serves as a venue for various committee meetings and proceedings. The room is decorated with a range of culturally significant artworks gifted to the Assembly by the Kiribati parliament.

Like all strong relationships, twinning is a long-term partnership built on collaboration and understanding, one that puts people first. In the last 12 years, the program has introduced our members and staff to new experiences and new friends. It has been underscored by the shared value of democratic practice and the parliamentary form of government.

Against this brief background on the special significance of the Assembly's relationship with both the parliament and the people of Kiribati, I wish to congratulate the President and the Speaker of the Parliament of Kiribati on reaching this significant milestone in the democratic history of their very young nation. I look forward to continuing to build on this strong foundation and friendship and to a time when I myself have my first visit to Kiribati. I will join my colleague Mrs Kikkert and our Deputy Clerk on that visit. I commend this motion to the Assembly.

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) (4.50): I thank the Speaker for moving this motion today. On 12 July 1979, nearly 40 years ago, the Republic of Kiribati achieved independence from the United Kingdom and became a parliamentary democracy. Today, on behalf of the territory government, I extend my deepest congratulations and friendship to the people of Kiribati and the Kiribati parliament in achieving this significant milestone. In particular, I extend my best wishes to the Speaker of the parliament, the Hon Tebuai Uai, and the President of Kiribati, the Hon Taneti Maamau. On behalf of all members in this place, I congratulate them on this significant achievement.

As we have heard, we have a shared experience, a shared parliamentary partnership, and we have developed a deep and abiding relationship with Kiribati. We have been twinned since 2007 through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We have been able to exchange knowledge and ideas and share our experiences in operating relatively young parliamentary democracies. Since the program has begun, as we have heard, we have sent a number of delegations and likewise received inbound delegations of members and staff of the Kiribati parliament here in Canberra. The Clerk has visited three times, I am informed, and describes the relationship as a very beneficial way to build connections that are mutually beneficial for both parliaments. As we have heard, a number of current MLAs have visited Kiribati, and there is another delegation going this year. I wish the delegation all the best for this important visit.

An exchange of ideas and knowledge between our two parliaments ensures that we continue to have a strong connection with our regional neighbours. Clearly this is an important mechanism for fostering strong, democratic processes and institutions in the Pacific. I note that there is now an Australia-wide effort to engage more with the Pacific. We have an important role to play in that. I look forward to continuing to do so through the parliamentary relationship that we are discussing today and also through our friendship city relationship with Dili and our relationship with our sister city, Wellington, in the Pacific.

Before I conclude my remarks, I would like to briefly note the significant impacts of climate change for Kiribati. It is not an academic debate for people there; it is a very real threat to their future. Kiribati is internationally recognised as one of the world's most vulnerable countries when it comes to climate change. A majority of the islands there are less than two metres above sea level; they are highly vulnerable to rising sea levels, storms and high tides. There is already evidence of incremental salinisation of freshwater aquifers.

I am pleased to report that the commonwealth government is providing climate change support through a number of bilateral, regional and global programs. With our friendship with Kiribati comes a constant reminder that we have a responsibility to do our best to limit the impacts of climate change. That is the action of a good friend. I thank the Speaker for bringing this motion before the Assembly.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (4.53): Like the Chief Minister, I want to thank the Speaker for bringing forward this important motion today, to mark the 40th anniversary of the independence of Kiribati, and for us to convey our best wishes to the people of Kiribati on this auspicious anniversary.

The Kiribati parliament, the Maneaba ni Maungatabu, and the ACT Legislative Assembly have developed a special relationship through the twinning arrangements auspiced under the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I have spoken on a number of occasions about how this is actually the real heart of the important work that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association does. Parliament-to-parliament cooperation is for the benefit of both parliaments, and it has clearly been the case with the twinning arrangement between Kiribati and the ACT Legislative Assembly.

I want to pay tribute to the many staff who have spent time over the years helping to build the strength of the Kiribati parliament. Through the work of the public accounts committee and the redevelopment of standing orders, a number of pieces of work have been undertaken by staff and former staff of this Assembly to help strengthen parliamentary democracy in the public of Kiribati.

As the Speaker alluded to, I have had the opportunity to visit Kiribati and I can recommend it to her. We did receive an extraordinarily warm reception and wonderful hospitality from the people. I think that these are valuable ties. As the Chief Minister said, these valuable ties are important in enhancing and strengthening Australia's role in the Pacific with our nearest and closest neighbours. Kiribati is an amazingly diverse and complex country, when you think that it has a geographic spread which is somewhat larger than Australia. The distance from Tarawa to their Christmas Island is as far as it is from Perth to Cairns.

In that great geographic expanse there are a series of tiny flecks where people live, sometimes in precarious circumstances. The thing is that the Kiribatis are rightly concerned about the possibility of rising sea levels, when most of their land mass is less than 10 metres above sea level. The people of Kiribati have been resourceful, innovative and have planned for the future. While we differ in size, although our geographic spread is large, our population is larger and our land mass is larger, and we have many more resources. The great resources of the sea and the seamanship of the people of Kiribati stand them in great stead.

I want to pay particular tribute to the exchanges of gifts that we have received over time, which have led, very appropriately, to the actions of the former Speaker, Mr Rattenbury, in creating the Kiribati room, which is the repository of many of those gifts, a fine display of the Kiribati culture and a fitting testament to that twinning arrangement. I would like to extend my congratulations to the President of Kiribati, the Hon Taneti Maamau; the Speaker, the Hon Tebuai Uaai; the parliament and the people of Kiribati on this significant occasion. I wish them well. I also hope that the work that we have done in twinning will continue, to the benefit of both Kiribati and the ACT.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (4.58): I am pleased to rise on behalf of the ACT Greens to express my sincere congratulations to the parliament and people of Kiribati on the significant milestone of 40 years as a sovereign independent republic.

The ACT Legislative Assembly has a special and close relationship with the parliament of Kiribati, formalised through a twinning arrangement through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Since the establishment of this special partnership in 2007, many members of this place have benefited from exchange visits and other opportunities to engage with our colleagues in the Kiribati parliament. I hope that the relationship has been of benefit to both sides, with both parliaments learning from each other.

While we are rightly very proud of our Assembly and the strong democracy that we have here in the ACT, there is also much that we can learn from others. We share with

Kiribati a commitment to an open, transparent and democratic parliament, bound by the principles of good governance and accountability. The vision statement of the Kiribati parliament is “to be an effective and transparent parliament that ensures respect for human rights, democracy and good governance under a regime of the rule of law”. Those are principles that everyone in this place would agree with as well.

Of course, our parliaments do have different practices. The Kiribati parliamentary system is unique in that it is a blend of both the British and American systems, with 44 elected members, one nominated member and one ex-officio member. In contrast, we have a 25-member Assembly, with members elected using the Hare-Clark electoral system. These are interesting features of our parliamentary democracy, but overall we have more similarities than differences.

As the Speaker noted in her motion, we share some important values with the people and the parliament of Kiribati. We all value the system of constitutional parliamentary democracy, and the important role it plays in providing for representative, responsible government and the rule of law. We also share a commitment to honest and dedicated service to our communities in order to make our regions better for our constituents.

I have twice been to Tarawa, the capital of Kiribati, once in a life before politics and once to attend a presiding officers conference as the Speaker of the ACT Assembly. I know my colleague Ms Le Couteur has also been, as have other members of this place. For me, those visits are indelibly etched in my memory—the thin strip of land in a vast blue ocean, the wonderful culture and hospitality of our hosts, and the contrast between the idyllic appearance of the islands and the very real challenges facing them.

Kiribati’s modern history includes Japanese occupation during World War II and the ensuing Battle of Tarawa to eject them—one of the bloodiest battles in US Marine Corps history, and of which the remnants remain visible to this day. Christmas Island was subsequently used by the US and UK governments for nuclear weapons testing in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

To stand in the middle of a low-lying atoll nation and look across the vast ocean is to truly understand the potential consequences of sea level rise, and that is why I particularly want to take a moment today to recognise that, in addition to its parliamentary responsibilities, the parliament of Kiribati faces some particular environmental challenges. As the governing parliament for a nation spread across 33 atolls and islands, climate change represents a dire and immediate threat due to sea level rise. It is important that we stand with the people of Kiribati in responding to this challenge.

We have seen so many reports warning of the dire consequences to our planet if we cannot contain a global temperature rise to two degrees above pre-industrial levels, and preferably to 1.5 degrees or less. While an additional half a degree of warming may not sound like much, for the people of Kiribati these figures are a matter of life and death. When your whole nation sits just two metres above sea level, every centimetre of sea level rise makes a huge difference.

At the same time, Kiribati is also experiencing other effects of climate change. Increasingly frequent king tides, storm surges, floods and longer droughts are all now part of the daily reality for the people of Kiribati. Sea level rise is also turning freshwater reserves salty, and rendering land unusable for growing crops. The people of Kiribati are now seriously having to consider leaving their homes in order to keep their families safe.

Here in Canberra, it is hard to imagine facing such a heartbreaking situation, but the reality is that without drastic action we all face increasingly dire consequences from climate change. Our friends in Kiribati are already facing the situation where their homes and the actual land on which they live are at risk of being drowned. Here in Australia, in the ACT, one of the most privileged places in the world, we have a responsibility to take serious and urgent action on climate change, not just for ourselves but for others like our friends in Kiribati who cannot afford to wait any longer.

Today's motion is one of celebration, and I join with Madam Speaker in sending the parliament and the people of Kiribati heartfelt congratulations on reaching this significant milestone. While I join Madam Speaker in wishing our friends in Kiribati a bright and prosperous future, I cannot stand here today and ignore the imminent threat posed to Kiribati by climate change and by the inaction of Australia and other developed countries.

It is clear that Kiribati has strong democratic institutions and a parliament that operates with integrity and dedication. Through the relationship that our two parliaments have developed since 2007, we have created deep and enduring bonds of friendship. Because I value those ties, I feel it is important to raise the issue of climate change as part of today's debate. When our friends are facing a crisis, we must be there for them and do what we can to assist.

On behalf of the ACT Greens, I send my best wishes and congratulations to the Speaker of the Maneaba ni Maungatabu, the Hon Tebuai Uaai, and the President of Kiribati, the Hon Taneti Maamau, on this most significant milestone. We look forward to continuing to work with you and sharing our experiences of building strong and healthy democracies through our communities. Just as we celebrate with you today, we also stand with you in challenging times and reaffirm that you will always have friends and allies here in the ACT.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (5.05): On behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and all of the Canberra Liberals, I would like to add a few words to what has already been expressed so well in this place. We would like to add our congratulations and best wishes to the people of Kiribati on the 40th anniversary of their independence.

The Kiribati parliament, the Maneaba ni Maungatabu, and the ACT Legislative Assembly have developed a special relationship through the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's twinning program. Many members of this Assembly have been lucky enough to travel to the Republic of Kiribati as part of this initiative and have spoken about the warm hospitality that was shown and the valuable ties that

we share with the Kiribati parliament. As someone who has been there myself, I can vouch for the warmth and hospitality of our hosts on the occasion of a visit. I must also put on record our appreciation of the generous artistic gifts that the Assembly has received over the years and that are displayed in this place.

Throughout its independence the Republic of Kiribati has been resourceful and innovative. They have planned for the future. While we may differ in size, many of our challenges remain the same—diversifying our economies, increasing employment and ensuring that our communities are well looked after through social services. I believe there is potential to further deepen our ties and provide more practical assistance through the sharing of expertise across our parliamentary functions.

I would again like to express our congratulations to the President of Kiribati, the Hon Taneti Maamau; the Speaker, the Hon Tebuai Uaai; the Kiribati parliament; and all the people of Kiribati on this significant occasion of the 40th anniversary of their independence.

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (5.07), in reply: I want to thank members for their contributions. I have heard acknowledgement of the great value of the twinning arrangements between Kiribati and us. Certainly, very strong mention was made of the friendships between the two parliaments that have developed over time.

I think there was reference to it by Mr Rattenbury, but I want to read from their vision statement:

To be an effective and transparent Parliament that ensures respect for human rights, democracy, and good governance under a regime of the Rule of Law.

Over their 40 years, and whilst still developing, like many parliaments are, they have certainly come a long way from their independence in providing good governance and respect for human rights. With that, I wish them well—all the people of Kiribati, individual members of the parliament, those present and those that have been there over the 40 years, in recognition of their 40 years, and may they enjoy their celebrations.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Public Accounts—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (5.08): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. At its meeting of 29 May 2019 the Standing Committee on Public Accounts agreed to note and not inquire further into the following Auditor-General's reports:

1/2018—Acceptance of Stormwater Assets.

2/2018—ACT Government strategic and accountability indicators.

4/2018—2016-17 Financial Audits—Computer Information Systems.

6/2018—Physical Security.

9/2018—ACT Health's management of allegations of misconduct and complaints about inappropriate workplace behaviour.

10/2018—2017-18 Financial Audits—Overview.

11/2018—Financial Audits—Financial Results and Audit Findings.

1/2019—Total Facilities Management Procurement.

2/2019—Recognition and implementation of obligations under the *Human Rights Act 2004*.

3/2019—Access Canberra Business Planning and Monitoring.

4/2019—2017-18 Financial Audits—Computer Information Systems.

The Auditor-General has briefed the committee on all these reports. The decision not to inquire further in these instances will allow the committee to focus on current substantial inquiries into other matters.

The committee also advises the Assembly that it will soon be writing to agencies that have been the subject of Auditor-General's performance audit reports in the Ninth Assembly, asking them to advise the committee as to their progress in implementing the recommendations made in those reports.

Executive business—precedence

Ordered that executive business be called on.

Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2019

Debate resumed from 16 May 2019, on motion by **Mr Barr**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (5.11): The opposition will be supporting this bill and the amendment proposed by Ms J Burch today. We are very keen for the integrity commission to get underway. However, we recognise that a short delay in commencement is necessary to allow the commission to fully prepare to receive complaints later this year. I understand that some recruitment and other practical works are ongoing and will require the commissioner's approval or involvement. There are also several complex policies and procedures that the commission will have to develop before they begin their investigative processes.

The Canberra Liberals have been pushing for an integrity commission in the ACT and we want it to be well prepared and established when the floodgates open. We do not want to put the commissioner in a situation where he does not feel he has either adequate time or resources to fulfil his role. I note that the amendment allows the minister to set an earlier commencement date. I hope that the commissioner will receive enough support from the government to start investigating complaints prior to 1 December 2019. As I said, we will be supporting the bill and the amendment today.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (5.13): The ACT Greens will be supporting this bill today. In similar terms to what Ms Lawder outlined, this is a practical revision of the bill in order to facilitate the feedback that we received. The Speaker has made available the letter from the appointee to the position. I appreciate her circulating that. I think it is very clear that the practicalities of getting the operation up and running are such that we need to allow more time. We think this is a very sensible and practical bill to support.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Detail stage

Bill, by leave, taken as a whole.

MS J BURCH (Brindabella) (5.14): I seek leave to move an amendment to this bill that has not been considered and reported on by the scrutiny committee.

Leave granted.

MS J BURCH: I move amendment No 1 circulated in my name [*see schedule 1 at page 2287*]. I am moving this amendment to provide an additional period of time before the remaining provisions mentioned in clause 4, page 3, line 6, of the bill are to commence. On being made aware of the Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2019, the incoming commissioner, Mr Dennis Cowdroy QC, OAM, wrote to me, party leaders and the Select Committee on an Independent Integrity Commission requesting that this course be considered in light of the various establishment tasks that await him upon appointment. I seek leave to table a copy of that letter.

Leave granted.

MS J BURCH: I present the following paper:

Commencement of relevant provisions of the *Integrity Commission Act*—Copy of letter from Dennis Cowdroy OAM, QC, dated 1 June 2019.

The amendment provides that the remaining provisions mentioned in clause 4 will commence on either 1 December this year or upon written notice by the minister, whichever comes first. This will allow the commission an additional period of time to attend to the relevant establishment tasks that are required. In the event that the relevant establishment tasks are completed prior to 1 December—and I think it is the wish of all in this place and the commissioner himself that that indeed happens—the commissioner would then write to the minister advising that the commission is ready to receive complaints and the minister would commence the remaining provisions shortly thereafter. I commend this sensible amendment to the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

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

Bill, as amended, agreed to.

Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Renewable Electricity Target) Amendment Bill 2019

Debate resumed from 16 May 2019, on motion by **Mr Rattenbury**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (5.17): The Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction (Renewable Electricity Target) Amendment Bill 2019 seeks to extend the ACT's ambitious target of 100 per cent renewable electricity beyond 2020. In doing so, the government is building on its efforts in the renewable energy space thus far. The ACT is currently on track to be 100 per cent renewable energy by the end of this year as the third stage of the Hornsdale wind farm comes online in October.

The Canberra Liberals will be supporting this bill today as we recognise that the ACT is already on its way to achieving 100 per cent by 2020. We do, however, want to ensure that our electricity supply is also reliable, affordable, and that we ultimately meet our targets going forward. A question that many in Canberra have asked is: what is the government doing after 2020? I am pleased that the government is responding to the concerns of residents. It is excellent that we have come together to discuss this issue today, and I know that many Canberrans will be pleased.

The bill seeks to solidify the ongoing 100 per cent renewable electricity target by moving the commitment into primary legislation. The target is currently a disallowable instrument set by the minister. This is welcome, as the government's emissions reduction target is already in legislation. Given renewable electricity and emissions reduction are inherently linked, it is good to see this link reflected in legislation.

The ACT has a commendable record in energy use. A report on electricity and natural gas consumption trends in the ACT for 2009-13 showed that, once weather factors had been accounted for, there had been a strong and consistent trend of decline in per capita aggregate electricity and gas consumption since 2009. The report went on to say that this was possibly due to building energy efficiency regulations and tighter appliance energy efficiency standards. There was also strong evidence of widespread energy efficiency improvements by households and small businesses. These have all contributed to making the 100 per cent target easier to achieve.

However, it does seem unlikely that the ACT will ever have the capacity to generate that amount of electricity within the ACT itself. I note the legislation clarifies that the electricity does not need to be located in the ACT but does need to connect to the ACT's local electricity network via the national electricity market. I think that is a sensible inclusion and removes any ambiguity in the minds of Canberrans. While our

energy consumption to date has been manageable, it is important that beyond 2020 we closely monitor how much electricity is being consumed in the ACT.

During a briefing on this bill, directorate officials suggested that the demand for electricity would be flat over the next decade. That is something that will need to be monitored closely. The government has emissions reduction ambitions which will likely result in greater demands on the electricity grid, whether that be the uptake of electric vehicles or light rail running on electricity.

Future governments will also need to factor in that the ACT is a fast growing jurisdiction, notwithstanding our excellent record on uptake of efficient energy use. However, with our typically hot summers and cold winters we rely more heavily on heating and cooling systems than many other cities. Even with increased efficiency in how we use electricity there will undoubtedly be increases in total electricity consumption in the territory. It is crucial that the government be adequately prepared for this. The Canberra Liberals acknowledge this risk and expect that future governments will closely follow this issue.

I thank the minister for the briefing that was provided to the shadow minister, Ms Lee, and her staff last week, and close by saying that the Canberra Liberals support this bill. By doing so, we confirm our commitment to responsible renewable electricity use in the ACT.

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) (5.22): I am pleased to rise in support of this bill, which reaffirms the government's commitment to using 100 per cent renewable electricity in the ACT by 2020 and in each and every year after that. This target has previously been set by a disallowable instrument, but with the passage of this bill today we will enshrine our commitment in legislation.

In less than two years from today we will be 100 per cent powered by renewable electricity, and this is a great achievement for our city. It is possible because since 2016 we have brought on line nine new wind and solar facilities which provide 620 megawatts of renewable power. We have also supported nearly 300 low income households to install their own rooftop solar, supported more than 1,000 smart battery systems in Canberra households and helped more than 27,000 households and businesses to use energy more efficiently through programs like the home energy advice service and the energy efficiency improvement scheme.

We will be the first jurisdiction in Australia, and one of the first cities of our size around the world, to achieve this milestone. When it comes to creating a renewable energy future we are a national and international leader. We have set this goal, and we have stuck to it despite there being some very strong pushback from forces outside the ACT.

We did this because we know that it is the right thing to do. It is the right thing for every future Canberran. Whilst the federal government has spent the last six years studiously avoiding action on climate change, we have spent that time getting on with

the job of transitioning Canberra to a cleaner and more sustainable future, and that is what we will continue to do whilst we sit on this side of the chamber. I commend this legislation to the Assembly.

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) (5.24), in reply: I thank members for their support for the bill. The bill will establish an ongoing target of 100 per cent renewable electricity for the territory from 2020. This will provide the Canberra community with an assurance that their electricity will remain zero emission and renewable and will contribute towards the delivery of the government's ongoing emissions reduction targets.

The bill establishes clear reporting requirements under the act in order to provide transparency on the delivery of the renewable electricity target. It will provide certainty to the renewable energy industry that the ACT government intends to continue its strong support for renewables despite the prospect of ongoing national policy uncertainty.

As members know, our Assembly passed a motion on May 16 this year acknowledging that we are in a state of climate emergency that requires urgent actions across all levels of government. We have taken important steps already. This is shown through the government's targets to reach 100 per cent renewable electricity by 2020 and net zero emissions from 2045. The government has also recently set interim targets for emissions reductions.

We have had four renewable electricity auctions for 640 megawatts of renewable electricity capacity from 10 large generators and a community solar project, which provide the ACT with the renewable electricity certificates produced on 20-year terms. Nine of the 10 large generators have commenced delivery of generation to the ACT, with the final generator and community solar farm to commence ACT supported generation this year.

The government is proud to represent one of the first jurisdictions in the world to reach the milestone of being completely powered by renewable electricity, which we expect to reach next year. However, addressing the climate emergency requires a long-term approach. We cannot rest on our achievements when we deliver 100 per cent renewable electricity. We must continue to take further action to decarbonise the ACT.

This bill is one action in what need to be a whole range of actions in the coming years. It commits the government to maintain the 100 per cent renewable electricity target on an ongoing basis from 2020. Ongoing delivery against this target is needed, regardless of the passage of this bill, in order to meet our existing emissions reduction targets. Electricity was previously the largest single source of emissions in the ACT, and the renewable electricity delivered for the 100 per cent target is a significant portion of the decarbonisation required for the interim 40 per cent emissions reduction target by 2020. The government's emissions reduction targets for 2025 onwards are increasingly ambitious. It will not be possible to meet these targets if we allow electricity sector emissions to increase again from zero post 2020.

The government is currently investigating policy options to decarbonise transport and natural gas consumption, which are the two largest sources of ACT emissions, once our electricity emissions reach zero in 2020. There are a variety of ways in which this decarbonisation can take place, including the use of alternative fuel sources such as hydrogen or biogas and direct electric alternatives such as electric vehicles and heat pumps. But we need to ensure that, if the decarbonisation of transport and gas does occur through electrification, this does not result in an increase in electricity sector emissions.

This bill will provide certainty to Canberrans that if they buy an electric vehicle or replace gas appliances in their home their actions will result in a reduction in carbon emissions as their electric alternative will be clean and green and produce no emissions when it is used. As these can be very long-lived assets, the community needs to be able to know what their emissions will be for years and decades to come. The bill also provides certainty to ACT consumers that their electricity will continue to be renewable after the ACT's current deeds with large renewable electricity generators expire in the mid to late 2030s.

This bill does not commit the ACT government to any specific approach to deliver any additional renewable electricity demand required to meet the target on an ongoing basis. The renewable electricity target is met through a variety of renewable electricity sources for which the ACT community is financially responsible. This includes ACT rooftop solar, our share of the large-scale renewable energy target established under commonwealth legislation, and contracts established with 10 large electricity generators.

The government is currently delivering significant improvements in energy efficiency through the energy efficiency improvement scheme which help to put downward pressure on electricity demand and will make it easier for the target to be met on an ongoing basis. The ACT community and local businesses are installing solar to reduce their power bills and to deliver energy independence. This, too, is helping to deliver against the target. With the passage of this bill, the government will continue to monitor renewable electricity supply against ACT electricity consumption and will undertake any further large-scale renewable electricity procurement as necessary.

With renewable electricity generation costs rapidly declining and the price of electricity heading up, any further renewable electricity procurement presents Canberrans with an opportunity to again source electricity that is renewable and also affordable.

The bill further strengthens the government's commitment to renewable electricity by setting the commitment in primary legislation rather than in an instrument. This will provide a clearer signal of the importance of the target and help to provide certainty about policy direction to the renewable electricity industry in the context of ongoing national policy uncertainty.

The bill will help provide the ACT community with clear and concise information that will allow people to observe progress towards the targets. The bill will provide more

consistent treatment of the renewable energy and greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets in terms of how the targets are set and reported on.

The bill establishes provisions for clear reporting on progress against the renewable energy targets under the Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Act 2010. The act as it currently stands provides specific reporting requirements; however, these are tailored around the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and so are less suitable for reporting on the renewable energy target. We will address this by introducing a requirement for the minister to determine a method for measuring progress towards the renewable electricity target. Following the passage of this bill, I will publish a methodology which will clarify how ACT energy consumption will be measured, what sources of renewable electricity will be included in meeting the target and how these sources are to be measured.

The bill will also introduce a requirement to report on possible reasons for changes in the amount or percentage of renewable energy used in or generated for the ACT from previous years. This is similar to the existing requirement that applies to the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets. This will add an additional level of accountability and provide the ACT community with the information required to observe progress towards the target. The government will report on progress every year in the minister's annual climate change report, distinct from reporting on the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

The bill also amends the act to use clearer language around the distinction between a renewable energy target and a renewable electricity target. This improves the readability of the act and does not reflect any policy or substantive legislative change.

Currently the act refers in some cases to generation in the ACT. The ACT is part of the national electricity market. We secure renewable electricity generation within the NEM for the ACT, although only a fraction of this energy is generated within the ACT's borders. This has helped to minimise the costs of renewable electricity generation and allows the market to decide on the most appropriate location for new renewable electricity generation. The bill aligns the act with the ACT government policy of sourcing renewable electricity generation for, rather than in, the ACT.

In summary, the bill establishes a target for the ACT to continue to deliver 100 per cent renewable electricity on an ongoing basis from 2020, a vital part of meeting the government's emissions reduction targets through to 2045. It will provide additional certainty for industry and consumers by setting this target directly within the act and will also improve reporting and accountability to the target to ensure that ACT consumers are given the information required to observe progress towards the targets under the act.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Adjournment

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mental health—R U OK

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (5.33): Every person has struggles, whether financial or emotional, related to health or to relationships et cetera. Sometimes these struggles are obvious and many times they can be virtually invisible, especially if no-one is looking. That is one more reason why we need to be actively looking out for and checking on each other. We need to sincerely ask, “Are you okay?” and then be prepared to listen to and support the other person whenever the answer is no or not really. The alternative is to allow the people around us to suffer in silence, and the outcome of that in far too many cases is tragedy of some kind.

The R U OK campaign was launched in 2009 by Gavin Larkin. Fourteen years earlier, Gavin had lost his father to suicide. This is a far too common occurrence. Suicide is the leading cause of death for Australians between the ages of 15 and 44, with more than eight deaths by suicide occurring each day, on average. Men are three times more likely than women to take their own lives, and the suicide rate among Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders is almost three times the national rate.

Death by suicide often takes family and friends by surprise, especially when they had no idea that a loved one was even hurting. Hence the need to inspire and empower people to meaningfully connect with others around them by sincerely asking them how they are going. Last Friday, Anytime Fitness here the city participated in the Tread as One initiative, a 24-hour treadmill challenge in support of the national R U OK campaign. The purpose of the event was to raise much-needed awareness of suicide, along with raising funds to aid its prevention.

I thank Anytime Fitness for sponsoring this event. I also thank my Canberra Liberals colleague Ms Elizabeth Lee for inviting me, Miss Candice Burch and Mr Alistair Coe to join her in taking our turns on the treadmills on Friday morning. I also thank all the Canberrans who participated in this great cause, including those who generously gave a donation towards Anytime Fitness’s goal of raising \$4,000 for the R U OK campaign.

I encourage all Canberrans to learn more about the steps they can take to help those around them who may be struggling with hidden depression. The steps are simple. Ask: “Are you okay?” Listen, encourage action, then check back in on them. In a world where people increasingly feel socially isolated, let us all do better to have real

connections with our family members, our friends, our co-workers, our neighbours and others around us. In small and simple ways we can be the cheer and comfort someone needs.

Budget—Kurrajong electorate

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) (5.37): I rise to speak about the 2019-20 ACT budget's investment in my electorate of Kurrajong. This year's budget makes the investment we need to keep Canberra livable and protect our city's unique character. This budget invests in Kurrajong's unique character and ensures that current and future generations get to experience and celebrate it.

The Manuka Pool has been at the centre of summers in Canberra since 1931. Generations of Canberrans have sought relief from our hot, dry summers in the iconic Art Deco pool. Manuka Pool also brings together families and groups of friends to catch up on the pool's shady lawns. Recognising the importance of the pool to the inner south community, the ACT government will upgrade Manuka Pool through the 2019-20 budget. This \$800,000 investment will increase accessibility and safety while protecting the heritage character of our oldest community pool. While the buildings and infrastructure are wonderful examples of past architecture and building styles, they were not really built with accessibility in mind. I am looking forward to a Manuka Pool with its heritage intact, where more people can enjoy it in the summers ahead.

The inner south is a great place to raise a family and to be a kid. Recognising the need to refresh and upgrade playgrounds and play spaces in the inner south, the budget also invests in an upgraded playground for Narrabundah. The budget invests in improvements to dog parks and local ovals, with Yarralumla and Narrabundah to receive upgrades through the better infrastructure fund. This means local parks and playgrounds will continue to be important meeting spaces for locals and continue to build the strong community Canberrans know and love.

The budget is also making the inner south safer for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. The budget invests particularly in improvements to the Kent Street and Novar Street intersection, which will benefit the residents of Yarralumla and Deakin. This is something that they have advocated for for some time, and I commend the Yarralumla Residents Association on its strong advocacy on this matter.

Scoping work will also be undertaken on improving the Hume Circle roundabout in Narrabundah. If people are not familiar with the name, that is the roundabout where Canberra Avenue, Wentworth Avenue and Sturt Avenue come together. It has a very high crash rate, I understand.

Older suburbs were built to the standards of their time. This means footpaths and other pedestrian infrastructure are not always up to the same standards we see in newer suburbs or town centres. The ACT government is investing in upgrades to

footpaths in Narrabundah to make its streets more accessible and age friendly. This will encourage more people to be active or choose active travel to get around.

Madam Speaker, as you know, the ACT government's commitment to public TAFEs, public vocational education, is second to none. In this budget we are building on that commitment by constructing an additional 1,450 square metres of new workshop space at CIT in Fyshwick.

We are also investing in a new cultural hub for Canberra, with the creation of the Kingston arts precinct. The precinct will further add to the vibrancy of the Kingston Foreshore and the character of Kingston more broadly. It will become Canberra's premier arts and cultural precinct, home to some of Canberra's leading arts organisations, with some organisations to enjoy purpose-built facilities for the first time, sitting alongside the glassworks and the Megalo print studio.

The major investment in the Kingston arts precinct does not, however, come at the expense of existing arts and cultural centres in Kurrajong. The ACT government will also deliver upgrades at Ainslie and Gorman Arts Centres ahead of its 50th anniversary as one of Canberra's arts hubs.

Like the inner south, the inner north also receives the investment it needs to enhance and protect its character and heritage. Haig Park is an important part of the inner north's tree canopy and our heritage but it has not always been a user-friendly space. As more Canberrans choose to move into apartments nearby, it is important that we protect what is great about Haig Park while making it safe and usable with modern and high quality facilities. The ACT government will also invest in further revitalisation works for the Sydney and Melbourne buildings, to protect and enhance our heritage gateway.

Residents of the inner north will benefit from improvements to local schools, with added capacity and new facilities at Lyneham High School and pedestrian infrastructure around Campbell to ensure that, like Narrabundah, it is easy to get around. There will be heating system upgrades at Lyneham, Forrest, Red Hill and Telopea schools, and we will commence work on the second Common Ground at section 72 in Dickson. We are investing in high quality and free health care for residents in the inner north, with the first walk-in centre at Dickson group centre providing fast and free access to care for minor injuries and illnesses.

Mr Frank Armstrong—tribute

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister assisting the Chief Minister on Advanced Technology and Space Industries) (5.42): I have a remarkable story of longevity to share with the Assembly. Yesterday the parks and conservation service paused to recognise 50 years of service from their longest serving employee. That employee is Mr Frank Armstrong, who I recently had the pleasure of meeting at the Chief Minister's gold awards.

Frank's remarkable story started on 2 June 1969, when the current director of the parks service was but one year old and still in nappies. Back then Canberra, and indeed the world, was a very different place. Eighteen-year-old Frank lived in a city of 130,000 people. John Gorton was Prime Minister, Neil Armstrong was not yet a household name. Lake Burley Griffin was only a couple of years old. The townships at Belconnen and Woden had only just been established and Tuggeranong was only a glimmer in the eyes of the planners of the National Capital Development Commission.

Little did Frank know on that fateful day 50 years ago that his entire working life would be devoted to the protection of the natural areas of the ACT. Based out of the now defunct O'Connor depot, Frank developed expertise in operating plant and machinery, including bulldozers. This was put to good use assisting with the repair of eroded gullies and delivering other soil conservation works. Frank worked on projects as diverse as the pipeline bringing water from Bendora Dam, the establishment of the koala sanctuary at Tidbinbilla nature reserve, the establishment of the visitors facilities at Googong foreshores and Jervis Bay, and the upkeep of ACT lakes.

For the last 15 years Frank has worked out of the Mitchell depot, where he has turned his hand to creating some interesting natural artworks for the depot grounds from all matter of discarded junk. Almost as notorious as his artwork is Frank's love of the depot trail bike, which he maintains in impeccable order and uses to access the remote parts of our nature reserves, where he has single-handedly controlled almost 3,000 outbreaks of the noxious weed scotch broom.

The list of work achievements is a long one, but his workmates told me that it is Frank's character that leaves a lasting impression. Frank has always been a highly valued team member and he is well loved by the parks team. I am reliably advised that he is an encyclopaedia of strange and somewhat useless facts, which he has shared with many a wide-eyed ranger recruit. While Frank's uniform has changed over time as our parks service has evolved, his outlook has not. He has always been positive and enthusiastic, setting an example for the service and its new staff.

Frank, I am well advised by your colleagues that retirement is on the horizon. When that day comes, you can be rightly proud of the high esteem in which you are held and the many friends you have made over so many years in the parks service. Thank you for your commitment to and length of service with the ACT government. I am sure your family will find plenty for you to do, as you have 10 children and two grandchildren. You may even find more time for your quirky hobbies, including gravestone rehabilitation and fossicking for discarded treasures.

Australian Broadcasting Corporation police raid

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) (5.45), by leave: I have just been reading through some of the stories regarding the police raid of the ABC and some of the comments of the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance in response, defending its members.

As a politician, sometimes with journos and the media it may feel when you are in the line of fire that you are not getting a fair go, but they really are the only organisations that hold politicians to account through their reporting of the work that governments do. I want to put on the record my concern about the raid of the ABC, following the raid of journalist Annika Smethurst. This seems to be a kind of attack on the public's right to know about what is going on with our governments. Police raiding journalists seems to be becoming a bit more normalised. I am personally not very comfortable with that.

So I want to lend my support to the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance and their members. I encourage other members in this place to see what is going on, sign up to the petition that the MEAA are asking people to sign, and support action that calls for the opportunity for journalists and media organisations like the ABC to continue to do their job, to allow the public to know what is going on with governments in this country.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.48 pm until Tuesday, 30 July 2019, at 10 am.

Schedule of amendments

Schedule 1

Integrity Commission Amendment Bill 2019

Amendment moved by the Speaker

1

Clause 4

Proposed new section 2 (2)

Page 3, line 6—

omit proposed new section 2 (2), substitute

(2) The remaining provisions commence on—

(a) 1 December 2019; or

(b) if, before 1 December 2019, the Minister fixes another day by written notice—the day fixed.

Note A single day or time may be fixed, or different days or times may be fixed, for the commencement of different provisions (see Legislation Act, s 77 (1)).

Answers to questions

Canberra Hospital—radiology department (Question No 2140)

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 1909, how many interventional procedures were performed in the medical imaging department in (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17 and (e) 2017-18.
- (2) On how many anticipated interventional procedures were the expenditure budgets based for each year listed in part (1).
- (3) What was the (a) budgeted and (b) actual, cost per interventional procedure, including corresponding consumables, for each year listed in part (1).
- (4) How many hours of unplanned leave had to be covered by unbudgeted costs in each month from 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2018.
- (5) Was there a substantial increase in unplanned leave during the two years 2016-17 and 2017-18 compared to 2013-14 to 2015-16; if so, what were the factors contributing to unplanned leave being taken.
- (6) What administrative changes have been implemented to manage staff leave better in the future.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The number of interventional procedures performed during each of the periods was:

Financial Year	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Procedure Count	2774	2724	2602	2839	2848

- (2) Canberra Health Services does not budget or capture actual expenditure by procedure. Where possible, the impact on budgets and expenditure of increases and decreases in activity is taken into account in planning and decision making. Most operating expense budgets have been indexed year on year.
- (3) Each interventional procedure differs according to individual patient needs, so it is not possible to provide a cost per interventional procedure.
- (4) The number of unplanned hours of leave was:

Financial Year	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
2016-17	1188.8	1834.3	960.7	1324.4	1249.2	916.2	903.1	1103.8	1247.2	706.6	1511.6	1368.2
2017-18	1366.6	1808.4	1426.7	1414.3	1312.0	1235.2	998.0	1201.8	1308.5	1097.2	1398.0	1510.7

The number of unplanned hours of leave for 2018/2019 (up to 31 March 2019)

Financial Year	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
2018-19	1517.3	1603.7	1514.5	1312.5	1697.8	1131.7	1317.2	1043.9	556.6

It is worth noting that the leave for March is based on leave processed by Shared Services, at the time of the data being sought, therefore may not include all leave for March 2019.

(5) No.

(6) Changes have been made to nursing and allied health rosters in order to better manage leave, including fatigue and unplanned leave. Active recruitment is being undertaken to bring more radiologists on staff.

Canberra Hospital—operating theatres (Question No 2312)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 February 2019:

- (1) By what month and year is it anticipated that the operating suites at the Canberra Hospital (TCH) will reach full capacity.
- (2) How many operating suites were available at TCH as at the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper.
- (3) How many of those operating suites were unavailable for use.
- (4) For each unavailable operating suite (a) why was it unavailable and (b) when will it be re-opened for use.
- (5) Is the Government planning to increase the number of theatres available at the current location over the next five years; if so (a) how many theatres will be added and (b) at what cost.
- (6) What was the ratio of surgical beds to operating theatres at (a) TCH and (b) Calvary Public Hospital, as at the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper.
- (7) How many operating theatres are currently planned to be part of the Surgical Procedures, Interventional Radiology and Emergency (SPIRE) project.
- (8) In what year will the operating theatres in the SPIRE project be available for clinical use.
- (9) How many (a) medical, (b) surgical and (c) emergency department, beds are planned to be available as part of the SPIRE project.
- (10) When will the beds referred to in part (9) be available for clinical use.
- (11) What is the planned ratio of surgical beds to operating theatres in the SPIRE project; if this ratio is different to the ratio given in the answer to part (6)(a), why.
- (12) What is the projected demand for operating theatres and surgical beds in the ACT over the next (a) five, (b) 10, (c) 15, and (d) 20 years.

- (13) How many staff will be working in the (a) Emergency Department, (b) operating theatres, (c) surgical beds, (d) interventional radiation department and (e) general wards of the SPIRE project.
- (14) For each category in part (13), how many staff will be in addition to staff currently working in those areas of TCH.
- (15) Where will neonatal intensive care be located when the SPIRE project is commissioned to service.
- (16) What provision has been made for car parking in, or associated with, the SPIRE project.
- (17) What is the anticipated cost of car parking in, or associated with, the SPIRE project.
- (18) Is this cost for car parking part of the \$500 million envelope allocated to the SPIRE project; if not, how will it be funded.
- (19) Will the new pathology centre be part of the SPIRE project; if not, where will be located.
- (20) How much will the new pathology centre cost.
- (21) Is the cost for the new pathology centre part of the \$500 million envelope allocated to the SPIRE project; if not, how will it be funded.
- (22) When will the new pathology centre open.
- (23) What elements of the SPIRE project will displace or replace existing elements at TCH, and what use will be made of displaced or replaced existing elements.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Theatre demand across the Territory is not anticipated to exceed theatre capacity ahead of SPIRE which will add capacity at the Canberra Hospital.
- (2) 13.
- (3) None.
- (4) Not applicable.
- (5) (a) The Government has committed to increase the number of theatres at the Canberra Hospital Campus from 13 to 20 as part of the SPIRE development. Noting the answer to question (1), there are no current plans to increase the physical capacity of operating theatres at the Canberra Hospital ahead of the SPIRE project. (b) As there is no increase in theatres at the current location, there is no associated infrastructure costs.
- (6) (a) At Canberra Hospital, there were 14 same day beds and 155 overnight beds, which equates to 13 beds per theatre (noting Canberra Hospital is a tertiary level regional trauma hospital). (b) At Calvary Public Hospital Bruce there were 17 same day beds and 29 overnight beds. Furthermore, there were 4.5 theatres operational, which equates to approximately 10 beds per theatre.

- (7) The Government has committed to increase the number of theatres at the Canberra Hospital Campus from 13 to 20 as part of the SPIRE development. SPIRE is currently in early design development stage.
- (8) The new theatres will be available from 2024
- (9) Final numbers of surgical, medical and emergency department beds are dependent on the early design development stage and will be considered by government over coming months.
- (10) The new beds will be available from 2024.
- (11) Please see answer to question 9.
- (12) Demand is currently not projected out to 15 or 20 years as assumptions will be too far in the future. Please note these projections reflect current best available data and projections and will be reviewed over time.

Territory-Wide Demand	Current	2023-24 (5 years)	2028-29 (10 years)
Theatres	17	19	21
Surgical Inpatient Beds	193	223	249

- (13) Given that the SPIRE project is still in the early design phase, total staff numbers are not yet identified.
- (14) Please see answer to question 13.
- (15) Neonatal intensive care will remain in the Centenary Hospital for Women and Children.
- (16) Total car parking provision, related to the SPIRE development, will be identified as part of the early design process and will comply with relevant planning regulations.
- (17) Costs will be subject to the outcomes of the early design process.
- (18) Please see answer to question 17.
- (19) A new pathology centre is not part of the SPIRE development.
- (20) Please see answer to question 19.
- (21) Please see answer to question 19.
- (22) Please see answer to question 19.
- (23) Staging and decanting for the SPIRE project is subject to the current early design processes for the development, and future campus masterplanning.
-

**Health—ophthalmology services
(Question No 2349)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) What specialist ophthalmic services are available directly from Canberra Health Services for the (a) treatment and (b) management, of glaucoma for ACT-resident public patients.
- (2) What specific categories of glaucoma are Canberra Health Services able to (a) treat and (b) manage, for ACT-resident public patients.
- (3) What specific categories of glaucoma are Canberra Health Services unable to (a) treat or (b) manage, for ACT-resident public patients and (c) why.
- (4) What specific categories of glaucoma are ACT-resident private specialist practitioners unable to (a) treat, or (b) manage, for ACT-resident public patients under the ACT public health system and (c) why.
- (5) In what circumstances would Canberra Health Services refer an ACT-resident public patient suffering glaucoma to a private specialist, practising in the ACT, to (a) treat and (b) manage, the patient's condition under the ACT public health system.
- (6) What formal or informal arrangements does Canberra Health Services have with private specialists in the ACT to treat and manage ACT-resident public patients suffering glaucoma; if none, why.
- (7) In what circumstances would Canberra Health Services refer an ACT-resident public patient suffering glaucoma to the Sydney Eye Hospital for (a) treatment and (b) management, of the patient's condition in the public health system.
- (8) What formal arrangements does Canberra Health Services have with the Sydney Eye Hospital to treat and manage ACT-resident public patients suffering glaucoma; if none, why.
- (9) Before referring an ACT-resident public patient to the Sydney Eye Hospital, what (a) consideration is given and (b) enquiries are made, of ACT-resident private specialists as to their capacity to take on the patient under the ACT public health system; if none, why.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) Glaucoma is a common condition normally treated on a community basis. The current model of care provided by the Eye Clinic at Canberra Health Services (CHS) is in line with the Royal Australia and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists (RANZCO) Principles for Collaborative Care of Glaucoma Patients and the Referral Pathway for Glaucoma Management. Glaucoma is a chronic condition that is managed in the community with occasional referrals to an acute service for management of acute or tertiary issues.

The CHS Eye Clinic uses a co-shared patient model, whereby Optometrists refer patients in with high or unstable pressures, and the Eye Clinic assesses the patients. Dependent on the underlying cause of the glaucoma, a management plan is put in place. This may involve drops, laser trabeculoplasty, laser iridotomy, cyclodiode laser, ciliary body ablation, Baeveldt implant or surgical trabeculectomy. Where surgery is deemed complex a referral is made to the Sydney Eye Hospital. Patients who fail to respond to CHS Glaucoma management plan and the Glaucoma remains unstable also are referred to Sydney Eye Hospital.

- (b) See response to question 1(a).
- (2) (a) Open angle and closed angle Glaucoma where community services are unable to deal with the issue, the condition is acute, or requires Tertiary level care.
 - (b) See response to question 2(a).
- (3) (a) Patients with complex eye problems, multiple previous surgeries on the eye, concurrent medical conditions involving the eye with Glaucoma and Glaucoma patients who have failed treatment measures within the Eye clinic's scope of practice.
 - (b) See response to question 3(a).
 - (c) Some patients with Glaucoma are very difficult to stabilise, especially if there are other issues with the eye in question. The Sydney Eye Hospital, which has a much larger service and experience of Glaucoma, is the best place for such patients to achieve the optimum outcome. CHS is a tertiary service, but not an organ specific hospital. There will always be patients that need to be referred to an organ specific hospital to maximise treatment outcomes.
- (4) (a) Very few private eye specialists without a public contract would take on surgical treatment of Glaucoma. They would treat patients with drops, and possibly laser trabeculoplasty or laser iridotomy. This relates to lack of specific Glaucoma training, and that these patients require multiple re-visits often to stabilise. In addition some of these patients have very complicated outcomes, which is difficult to manage in a private setting.
 - (b) See response to question 4(a).
 - (c) See response to question 4(a).
- (5) (a) and (b) The only circumstance where this would occur would be a referral from an ACT public ophthalmology specialist to the single ACT contracted VMO ophthalmologist with subspecialty interest in glaucoma surgery for the conditions of acute glaucoma and glaucoma associated with other significant eye conditions. The patient would be treated and managed through the private rooms or as an inpatient at CHS or receive a surgical procedure at Calvary Public Hospital Bruce.
- (6) See answer to 5(a).
- (7) See response to question 3.
 - (a) The Sydney Eye Hospital are the specialist referral centre for ACT residents who suffer from complex glaucoma, not treatable by our specialists.
 - (b) See response to question 7(a).
- (8) The cross border funding arrangements and National Health Agreement (NHA) cover referral between hospitals in different jurisdictions. No specific agreement is

necessary. Many ACT residents access NSW services and vice versa, which is allowed under Medicare and the NHA. Therefore no specific agreement is necessary with Sydney Eye Hospital for ACT residents to access services.

Normally a referral would be made in writing and a phone call to the appropriate medical unit if the case was deemed urgent.

(9) Response from Canberra Health Services

(a) See answer to questions 3 and 5.

(b) Public patients in the ACT can only be treated by Specialists contracted by ACT Health. See response to questions 3 and 5.

Response from Calvary Public Hospital

(9) (a) Considerations are not made as to the referring on of patients to the Sydney Eye Hospital. Patients who undergo elective operations at Calvary Public are placed upon the public waiting list either by clinicians at Canberra Hospital or by specialists in their private rooms.

(b) Calvary does not make enquiries about referring on of patients to ACT private specialists and their capacity to take on patients under the ACT public system, however patients may be placed on the public waiting list.

Hospitals—cleaning procedures (Question No 2352)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) When was the last time the policies and procedures relating to (a) cleaning and (b) infection control, at the ACT's public hospitals were reviewed.
- (2) Who is the service provider at each hospital for cleaning services and when (a) was the contract awarded and (b) does the contract expire.
- (3) Who, independently of the contractors, monitors or inspects the standard of cleaning services being provided.
- (4) How often are monitoring or inspections undertaken.
- (5) What is the average response time to deal with non-routine cleaning issues after they are reported.
- (6) What specific cleaning tasks are undertaken for routine cleaning of a typical medical ward and how often are they undertaken.
- (7) Are cleaning staff expected to complete tasks within a specified timeframe; if so, what analysis has been made as to whether the timeframe allows for adequate cleaning to be done.
- (8) Who monitors adherence to standards and procedures for infection control; and how frequently is this monitoring undertaken.

- (9) What training on infection control standards and procedures is provided to hospital staff.
- (10) Are all hospital staff, including contractors, required to undertake infection control training; if not, why.
- (11) Are all hospital staff, including contractors, required to undertake “refresher” training on infection control; if yes, how often; if no, why.
- (12) How many infection control training courses are offered each year.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

For Canberra Health Services:

- (1) Cleaning tasks and frequencies at ACT public hospitals are derived from the *Cleaning Standards for Victorian Healthcare Facilities 2011*.
 - a. At Canberra Hospital contractor procedures that support the maintenance of these standards are reviewed every three years. All procedures were reviewed between 2016-18, with the last review completed on 6 June 2018. The next reviews occur in 2019-21.
At the University of Canberra Hospital (UCH) procedures are reviewed and updated annually at a minimum.
 - b. Infection Control Procedures are based on the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care guidelines, are constantly under review, and are modified according to current best practice. The Canberra Health Services (CHS) Healthcare Associated Infection Procedure was issued in 2017 and is due for review in 2022.
- (2) At Canberra Hospital, ISS Health Services provide services under the Domestic and Environmental Services contract which was executed on 10 January 2017. The initial term of the contract expires on 10 February 2022.
At UCH, the contract for cleaning services is provided by subcontractor Compass-Medirest through the head contractor BGIS. The contract commenced 19 November 2015 and expires 19 November 2040, with a review option every five years.
- (3) CHS staff from the Infection Control and Prevention Unit, Domestic and Environmental Services (at Canberra Hospital) and UCH Facilities Management monitor and inspect cleaning and infection control standards.
- (4) At Canberra Hospital, inspections are ongoing. The number of inspections conducted per week (contractor and CHS staff) is a minimum of 10 (on average).
At UCH, a minimum of seven scheduled cleaning audits per month, as well as two scheduled environmental inspections per month.
- (5) At CHS, in February 2019, the average response time across all urgency categories is six minutes for non-routine cleaning.
At the UCH, in February 2019, the average response time across all urgency categories was 10 minutes and forty-five seconds. The average response time for urgent requests was one minute and 15 seconds.
- (6) At Canberra Hospital:
 - Clinical ward areas are cleaned daily at a minimum and high-risk areas receive additional cleaning services.

- Routine cleaning is undertaken in patient rooms, bathrooms, public areas, offices, store rooms and utility rooms, and encompasses the cleaning of all horizontal surfaces, furniture and fittings.
- Terminal cleaning is also undertaken following patient discharge and/or as required.

At UCH:

- Single patient rooms and ensuites are cleaned daily and more frequently if required.
- Ensuites in shared rooms are cleaned three times each 24 hours and more frequently if required.
- Ward offices and meeting rooms are cleaned once every 24 hours and more frequently if required.
- Ward shared facilities and corridors are cleaned once every 24 hours and more frequently if required.

(7) Yes. Performance and resourcing is monitored as part of service delivery.

(8) At CHS, Cleaning Services Standards are aligned with the *Cleaning Standards for Victorian Healthcare Facilities 2011*. All areas have oversight for infection control standards in their specific area. However, the Infection Control and Prevention Unit monitors and administers the governance framework across Canberra Health Services that mandates CHS compliance requirements regarding standards and procedures for infection control. Compliance for all areas of CHS is reported to the Healthcare Associated Infections Standard 3 Committee, which meets monthly.

In addition, the Infection Control and Prevention Unit monitor adherence and compliance continuously through hand hygiene auditing, infection surveillance programs, ward inspections and cleaning inspections (as mentioned above).

Infection control, including cleaning, at CHS is audited every three years against Standard 3 of the National Safety and Quality Health Service accreditation program, accreditation was most recently achieved in 2018.

(9) Staff are offered face to face and online (e-learning) infection control training.

(10) Yes.

(11) The requirement for regular refresher training in infection control is determined by role and risk. Contractors, clinical and cleaning staff are required to undertake yearly refresher training. All other staff attend refresher training on a needs basis, in consultation with their management.

(12) Face to face infection control training is offered six times a month at a minimum, and staff can also access online training as often as they want. Infection control staff provide additional education to all staff upon request.

For Calvary Public Hospital Bruce:

(1) The policies relating to cleaning and infection control undergo the normal continuous review and renewal process that apply to all Calvary policies and procedures. Specifically, cleaning of patient's room procedure was last reviewed in March 2017 with the next review to occur in March 2020. The cleaning procedure to prevent the spread of hospital acquired infections was last reviewed in March 2017 with the next review to occur in March 2020.

- (2) Calvary contractor: Compass Group Healthcare Hospitality Services P/L, contract expiry date is December 2020.
- (3) The Domestic Services Manager (CPHB employee), Infection Prevention and Control Department Staff in clinical and non-clinical areas.
- (4) On-site monitoring and inspections are undertaken daily by the Contractor. This is documented and accessible to all key stakeholders. Additional comprehensive internal auditing process is in place, and conducted annually. The site is also externally audited, by Healthcare Infection Control Management Resources and Government Health Protection Services. The Corporate Administration Services Manager conducts an Environmental Cleaning Inspection every two weeks. The findings and rectification actions are recorded. Infection Prevention and Control conducts an Environmental Cleaning Inspection every two weeks. The findings and rectification actions are recorded.
- (5) It is not possible to calculate an average response time for non-routine cleaning issues. Issues are prioritised using a number of criteria, and critically important issues receive immediate rectification actions.
- (6) Daily cleaning as stipulated in the following two CPHB Procedures: Cleaning of Patient Rooms Procedure and Cleaning procedures to prevent the spread of Hospital Acquired Infections.
- (7) Cleaning staff contracted to CPHB are expected to complete tasks within a specified timeframe. Time in motion studies have been conducted to ensure adequate time is allocated to each specific cleaning requirement.
- (8) The Infection Prevention and Control Department staff monitor adherence to standards and procedures for infection control. Compliance monitoring occurs daily during ward rounds and also through multiple formal scheduled auditing processes including hand hygiene compliance auditing and Aseptic Non-Touch Technique compliance auditing. The Infection Prevention and Control Program is also subjected to an external review every second year. This review is conducted by Healthcare Infection Control Management Resources who, during the review, assess and measure compliance with relevant current Standards and Infection Prevention AND Control Guidelines and Policies.
- (9) Infection Prevention and Control section included in the monthly hospital orientation/induction program for new employees. The Infection Prevention and Control team develops an in-service schedule annually, which aims to provide a face-to-face in-service session to all clinical areas twice a year. Multiple Infection Prevention and Control e-learning modules available to all staff and completion of some of these are mandatory. The Infection Prevention and Control team annually arrange educational focus weeks (e.g. Antibiotic Awareness Week in November each year and Hand Hygiene Awareness week in May each year).
- (10) Yes. Noting Contractors whose engagement is episodic do not require training, however they are briefed as part of their sign-in and site orientation process.
- (11) Yes, see response to question 9.

- (12) Infection Prevention and Control In-service sessions are scheduled monthly with the aim to cover each clinical area twice a year. Multiple Infection Prevention and Control related e-learning modules available to all staff.
-

Hospitals—pharmacy dispensing arrangements (Question No 2372)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) In relation to the answer given to question on notice No 2083 about the Public Hospital Pharmaceutical Reform Agreement (PHPRA), why is the ACT not a signatory to the PHPRA.
- (2) For how long has the ACT been considering the PHPRA.
- (3) What are the impediments to the ACT signing the PHPRA.
- (4) When will the ACT reach a decision.
- (5) What benefits is the ACT missing out on by not being a signatory to the PHPRA.
- (6) Is the ACT disadvantaged in any way by not being a signatory to the PHPRA.
- (7) If the ACT is disadvantaged, what are those disadvantages.
- (8) What are the financial implications for the ACT by (a) being a signatory; and (b) not being a signatory, to the PHPRA.
- (9) What are health implications for individual Canberrans by the ACT (a) being a signatory and (b) not being a signatory, to the PHPRA.
- (10) What are the financial implications for individual Canberrans by the ACT (a) being a signatory and (b) not being a signatory, to the PHPRA.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) In 2014, the Commonwealth approached the ACT following the revision of the 2011 *Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme's (PBS) Efficient Funding of Chemotherapy* arrangements. This included an offer to sign onto the PHPRA. The ACT Government took many factors into account and concluded that the ACT would not sign the PHPRA.

The ACT is open to further discussions on a new offer when it is presented and I will be raising this with the federal Minister for Health, following the 2019 Federal Election.

- (2) There is currently no offer with the ACT.
- (3) Please see response to question (2).

- (4) Please see response to question (2).
 - (5) Like NSW, the ACT, is not a signatory of the PHPRA and have alternative arrangements in place, to ensure ACT public hospital patients have access to medicines listed on the PBS. The ACT's alternative arrangement ensures that patients' access to PBS medications is not limited.
 - (6) No.
 - (7) Not applicable.
 - (8) The financial implications of any new offer, including any multi-lateral agreement proposed by the Commonwealth, will be assessed when the offer is made.
 - (9) There are no health implications for individual Canberrans. Alternative arrangements ensure individual Canberrans have access to medicines under the PBS.
 - (10) Canberrans, and patients in other states, are prescribed and supplied a course of free medications at discharge. The length of time of the course of discharge medications is determined by clinical need. If required they would then access further PBS medication through community pharmacies, with a prescription from a General Practitioner.
-

Hospitals—staff stress leave (Question No 2373)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) In relation to the answer given on 25 January 2019 to a question without notice taken on notice about staff mental stress at Canberra's public hospitals, for The Canberra Hospital, how many cases were reported during 2018 of staff suffering mental stress in (a) mental health, justice health, alcohol and drug services, (b) medicine, (c) surgery and oral health and (d) other divisions.
- (2) For each division as referred to in part (1), (a) what were primary causes for mental stress, (b) how many cases remained open as at 31 December 2018 and (c) how much stress leave, in FTE hours, was taken by staff during 2018.
- (3) How many cases for Calvary Public Hospital were reported during 2018 of staff suffering mental stress in (a) mental health, justice health, alcohol and drug services, (b) medicine, (c) surgery and oral health and (d) other divisions.
- (4) For each division as referred to in part (3), (a) what were the primary causes of mental stress, (b) how many cases remained open as at 31 December 2018 and (c) how much stress leave, in FTE hours, was taken by staff during 2018.
- (5) What treatment or counselling services are provided to ACT public hospitals staff suffering mental stress.
- (6) What is done to back-fill positions and duties when staff are on stress leave.

- (7) Does this back-filling involve any staff being rostered for more than their normal shifts; if so, by what margin on average.
- (8) What was the cost of mental stress during 2018 for (a) sick leave, (b) back-filling, (c) treatment and counselling services, (d) return to work and (e) other (specify).

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1 and 2)
 - (a) *(A copy of the answer is available at the Chamber Support Office).*
- (2) (b) 10 cases remain open from 2018.
- (2) (c) Employees of the ACT Public Service (ACTPS) who are unwell are covered by personal leave entitlements. An employee, when submitting an application for personal leave, due to them being unwell, does not have to submit a reason for leave. They may discuss this with their manager if they choose but it does not have to be noted on their application form. When a medical certificate is provided by a qualified medical practitioner, they only certify that an employee is suffering from a medical condition and is unfit for work as they do not release private medical information of their patient.
- (3) In 2018 nine matters were reported by Calvary Public Hospital Bruce (CPHB)
 - (a) nil
 - (b) three
 - (c) nil
 - (d) six.
- (4) (a) Primary causes of reported psychological/mental health incidents, ranged from workers being performance managed to other matters that were not disclosed to CPHB.
- (b) Three cases remain open from 2018.
- (c) Stress Leave is not a separately recorded leave type and therefore further detail cannot be provided. Also refer to response (2) (c).
- (5) Staff are encouraged to seek support early if they are experiencing issues in their personal or professional life. A variety of 24-hour support services are offered including the Employee Assistance Program, Doctors Health Advisory Service, Nursing and Midwifery Support Service and the ACT Health Spiritual Support Service. Staff are also encouraged to see their GP or access any of the relevant emergency/crisis supports available to the public including Lifeline, Domestic Violence Crisis Service or the Mental Health Crisis Assessment and Treatment Team.

Furthermore, CPHB has a proactive Pastoral Care team, who provide significant informal support to employees. CPHB has also implemented a Respect Equity Diversity Contact Officer network to assist workers.
- (6) Back-fill arrangements for staff on stress leave are no different than for staff on any form of unplanned leave. Arrangements for filling unplanned leave vary according to the function of the staff and the operational area, and can include using locum or agency staff, and by mutual agreement, placing staff on higher grade duties or additional shifts, within the limits of their scope of practice and safe working hours.

(7) Staff may work additional shifts by mutual agreement, within the limits of their scope of practice and safe working hours.

(8) For Canberra Health Services refer to response to Question 2 (c).

Three of the nine CPHB incidents reported under Question (3) were accepted as workers compensation claims. For the three accepted claims:

- (a) nil
- (b) nil
- (c) \$27,515.10
- (d) \$7,722.72
- (e) total incapacity costs \$49,380.69.

Government—working groups (Question No 2382)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) Is the Caravans and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group still active, or has it been disbanded.
- (2) When did the Caravans and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group last meet.
- (3) How many times has the Caravans and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group met since it formed, and when were these meetings.
- (4) What information has the Caravans and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group been provided with, such as background papers, position papers, or draft legislation.
- (5) When does the ACT Government expect the Caravans and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group to be wound up.
- (6) What is the expected timeframe for the tabling and commencement of the new occupancy agreement legislative amendments for caravan and manufactured home park residents.
- (7) Is the Student Accommodation Agreement Working Group still active, or has it been disbanded.
- (8) When did the Student Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group last meet.
- (9) How many times has the Student Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group met since it formed, and when were these meetings.
- (10) What information has the Student Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group been provided with, such as background papers, position papers, or draft legislation.

- (11) When does the ACT Government expect the Student Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group to be wound up.
- (12) What is the expected timeframe for the tabling and commencement of the new occupancy agreement legislative amendments for student accommodation.
- (13) Is the Crisis Accommodation Agreement Working Group still active, or has it been disbanded.
- (14) When did the Crisis Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group last meet.
- (15) How many times has the Crisis Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group met since it formed, and when were these meetings.
- (16) What is the expected timeframe for the tabling and commencement of the new occupancy agreement legislative amendments for crisis accommodation.
- (17) What information has the Crisis Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group been provided with, such as background papers, position papers, or draft legislation.
- (18) When does the ACT Government expect the Crisis Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group to be wound up.

Mr Ramsay: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The issues raised in your question are relevant to each of the working groups you described and I will answer accordingly, as well as providing specific dates for the meetings of each group.

The Working Groups have not been disbanded. They were convened to inform a detailed and complex policy process, and that process is ongoing. Members were advised on 12 October 2018 that the Justice and Community Safety Directorate develop further policy and draft legislation about occupancy agreements in 2019, and the group will be consulted on those developments. The Government is developing that legislation with a view to improving fairness, security, and liveability for people who live under the diverse range of circumstances covered by occupancy agreements.

Throughout consultation, the working groups have been provided with information including sample drafting instructions; meeting papers (e.g. agendas and minutes); papers on research conducted by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate about key issues that particularly impact these groups; and draft standard terms for occupancy agreements.

The people who have worked to contribute to this project as members of the working groups will remain important and be consulted throughout the development of draft legislation, introduction, and debate. I do not anticipate formal winding up or decisions, but rather a formal thanks for their contributions and a recognition of the ongoing importance of their views and experiences.

I plan to introduce legislation about occupancy agreements in late 2019. Timeframes for commencement will be explored with working group members as the legislation is developed.

Details of meetings of each working group are as follows:

- The Caravan Parks and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group last met on 31 July 2018. The Caravan Parks and Manufactured Homes Occupancy Agreement Working Group has met seven times, on 18 October 2017, 20 November 2017, 13 December 2017, 28 February 2018, 21 June 2018 and 31 July 2018.
- The Student Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group last met on 22 March 2018. The Student Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group has met twice, on 27 October 2017 and 22 March 2018.
- The Crisis Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group last met on 29 June 2018. The Crisis Accommodation Occupancy Agreement Working Group has met five times, on 13 October 2017, 13 November 2017, 4 December 2017, 21 March 2018 and 29 June 2018.

Municipal services—littering and dumping (Question No 2391)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 22 March 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for City Services*):

- (1) What was the total number of complaints about littering and illegal dumping broken down by (a) general type of litter or dumping, such as aggravated littering, and (b) suburb, for each financial year since 2007-08 to date.
- (2) What was the total cost of clearing illegal (i) littering, (ii) aggravated littering, (iii) dumping and (iv) commercial waste, broken down by suburb for each financial year from 2007-08.
- (3) What was the (a) total number, (b) average value and (c) total value of penalties or infringements issued under the Litter Act 2004 (ACT) broken down by (i) type of offence and (ii) suburb, during each financial year since 2007-08 to date.
- (4) In relation to part (3), what was (a) total number, (b) average value and (c) total value of contested penalties or infringements broken down by (i) type of offence and (ii) suburb, during each financial year since 2007-08.
- (5) In relation to part (4), what was the (a) total number, (b) average value and (c) total value of withdrawn penalties or infringements broken down by (i) type of offence and (ii) suburb, during each financial year since 2007-08.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Since 2007 to date, TCCS has received a total of 9,682 requests for service in relation to illegal dumping. A breakdown by type and suburb is not available.
- (2) The total cost incurred to TCCS for the removal of illegal dumped material is shown in the table below.

2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
(\$000's)	(\$000's)	(\$000's)	(\$000's)
1,972	2,494	2,704	2,793

Further breakdown of costs is not available nor is the data prior to 2015-16 financial year. The 2018-19 financial year figures reflects the forecasted expenditure for this activity.

(3a,b,c) Please refer to the table below for warnings and infringements under the *Litter Act 2004*. The table gives as much information as is available. Prior to 2017-18, the data and associated systems make it difficult to extract the data without requiring considerable resources

Data is also not available for contested penalties or by suburb.

Year	Warnings	Infringements	Amount
2015-2016	12 11 x Section 10 (1) Commercial litter	10 1 x section 10 (2) Commercial litter	\$1000.00
		3 x section 8 (1) Deposit litter	\$200.00
	1 x section 8 (1) Deposit litter	6 x section 8(b) Deposit litter small item	\$60.00
2016-2017	1 Section 13 (2) Advertising leaflet	Unable to source this information due to implementation issues associated with introduction of new system.	Unable to source this information due to implementation issues associated with introduction of new system.
2017-2018	Section 10 (1) Commercial litter	Unable to source this information due to implementation issues associated with introduction of new system.	Unable to source this information due to implementation issues associated with introduction of new system.
2018-2019	2 section 9 (B) Dumps litter public place	10 1 x section 13(2) 8 x section 10 (2) Commercial litter 1 x section 9(B) Dumping litter in Public Place	\$100.00 \$5000.00 per infringement \$1000.00

(4) and (5) Due to historic data being captured manually, no data is available to answer the Member's question.

Animals—animal welfare complaints (Question No 2393)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) What is the process of managing or handling animal welfare complaints once they have been received by the (i) ACT Government, (ii) ACT Policing or (iii) other authorised animal welfare entity.
- (2) In relation to part (1), what was the (a) minimum, (b) median, (c) average and (d) maximum amount of time animal welfare complaints took to be finalised each year since 2007-08.
- (3) How many individuals were prosecuted for animal welfare offences each year since 2007-08 to date broken down by (a) type of offence and (b) suburb where offence occurred.
- (4) In relation to part (3), how many individuals were convicted of animal welfare offences each year since 2007-08 to date broken down by (a) type of offence and (b) suburb where offence occurred.
- (5) In relation to part (4), how many individuals were disqualified from keeping animals for each year since 2007-08 to date broken down by (a) type of offence and (b) suburb where offence occurred.
- (6) How many complaints have been received regarding the disqualified individuals keeping animals for each financial year since 2007-08 to date broken down by (a) type of offence or disqualification and (b) suburb.
- (7) In relation to part (6), how many animals have been removed from disqualified individuals each financial year since 2007-08 broken down by (a) type of animal, (b) suburb and (c) the outcome for animals, such as sold, destroyed or other disposed of.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Animal welfare complaints are managed through processes established under the *Animal Welfare Act 1992* which is administered by Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS). TCCS has a Service Funding Agreement with the RSPCA ACT. Under this agreement RSPCA ACT provides animal welfare inspectorate services for the ACT Government. Currently, two RSPCA Inspectors are appointed under the legislative provisions in the Act.

ACT Policing refers Animal Welfare complaints primarily to the RSPCA to investigate and manage. Where an animal welfare issue is identified outside business hours, ACT Policing refer the matter to Domestic Animal Services (DAS) for investigation and action.

- (2-7) Please find in the tables below the responses to some of the questions. Some of the information sought is not in an easily retrievable form and to collect and assemble the information sought solely for the purpose of answering the question would require considerable resources. As such, in this instance, I do not believe that it would be appropriate to divert resources from other priority activities for the purposes of answering all of the Member's questions.

Table 1 - Animal Welfare Investigations, Prosecutions and Outcomes

	Jan – June 2015	July – Dec 2015	Jan – June 2016	July – Dec 2016	Jan – June 2017	July – Dec 2017	Jan – June 2018	July – Dec 2018
Number of Prosecutions	9	6	11	16	4	11	10	2
Number of People Convicted	9	6	11	13	4	5	7	1
Number of Animal bans Issued	5	4	10	6	Unavailable (independent provider not able to provide)	3	3	0
Number of complaints re. Breach of Animal ban	0	0	9	6	9	3	12	1

Sport—ground hire (Question No 2397)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) Can the Minister provide a list of (a) all enclosed sportsgrounds in the ACT, (b) all sportsgrounds that are locked and not accessible to the public without a booking and (c) the fees for all sportsgrounds that are locked and not accessible to the public without a booking.
- (2) Can the Minister confirm how many sportsground booking requests have been received during the closure period of 18 to 31 March 2019 for an exemption or special consideration.
- (3) Which clubs made the requests referred to in part (2), and can the Minister confirm if they were granted.
- (4) What alternative sportsgrounds were offered to the clubs and associations referred to in part (3).

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) Ainslie 2 (Keith Tournier Memorial Oval), Greenway, Gungahlin Enclosed, Holt, Kaleen, Macquarie (Jamison), Narrabundah, Nicholls, O'Connor, Phillip 1, Phillip 3 (athletics track), Stirling 1 and Boomanulla. (b) All of the above.
(c) Fees can be found at <https://actsportsgrounds.act.gov.au/home>
- (2) 37 requests were received during the closure period as listed in (3), there were no exemptions given during the shutdown period.

- (3) 17 Groups were assisted with bookings on the ovals that are not subject to shut down including Woden Weston Football Club, Woden Rams, Weston Molonglo Football Club, Brindabella Blues Football Club, Gundaroo Bullocks, Grasshopper Soccer, Gungahlin United Football Club, Gungahlin Bulls, Gungahlin Eagles, Gungahlin Jets, Capital Football, ANU Quid ditch, Canberra Region Rugby League, ACT Athletics, Capital Football Referees, Canberra Malayalee Association, Tuggeranong Hawks all had requests granted to use the available sportsgrounds during the shutdown.

Approximately 20 other requests for bookings during the shutdown could not be accommodated, from Majura FC, Woden Weston FC, Marist AFL club, ACT Softball Association, ACT Ultimate, ACT Junior Rugby Union, Independence Day Cup, Belconnen Magpies, AFL NSW/ACT, O'Connor Knights, Narrabundah FC, Belconnen United FC, Planet Football Coaching, Calwell Swans, Tigers FC and Tuggeranong Lions juniors.

- (4) Hirers are advised that the following external venues may be available (the contacts for each club are bracketed):
- Hawker Football Centre (Capital Football)
 - AIS Synthetic (AIS)
 - AIS Grass fields (AIS)
 - Private School grounds (Radford/Daramalan/Marist/Grammar)
 - University of Canberra (Uni of Canberra)
 - Willows Synthetics (ANU)
 - ANU Turf fields (ANU)
 - ADFA turf fields (ADFA)
 - QBN-Palerang Council grounds (QBN-Palerang Council)
 - ACT Government informal (non-irrigated) ovals (TCCS)

Bimberi Youth Justice Centre—staffing (Question No 2399)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 22 March 2019:

- (1) What is the number of staff currently employed at Bimberi Youth Justice Centre.
- (2) How many staff at Bimberi have completed human rights training.
- (3) For each current staff member, what is (a) their current work designation i.e. full time, part time, casual, contract etc., (b) their current work classification, (c) the length of time they have worked at Bimberi to date and (d) current status in regards to human rights training i.e. completed, not completed, in progress etc.
- (4) What date is anticipated for all staff at Bimberi to have completed human rights training.

Ms Stephen-Smith: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As at 22 March 2019, there were 73 staff members, including casual staff employed at Bimberi.

- (2) All staff who commence at Bimberi undertake a seven-week induction program. The Public Advocate and Children and Young People Commissioner provides a session during the induction program on the role of the Human Rights Commission, specifically tailored to Bimberi, including in relation to the *Human Rights Act 2004*. All staff must complete the induction program to be found suitable for appointment. In the last 12 months 18 new staff members have completed this induction process.

Additionally, 65 of the current Bimberi staff have completed the Human Rights Act Introduction: e-learning module. This module provides information on the history of Human Rights in Australia, an overview of the Human Rights Act, and the way in which rights may be balanced against other rights.

- (3) Of the 73 staff currently employed at Bimberi:
- a) 1 staff member is employed under an Executive Contract;
 - 54 staff are permanent full time;
 - 1 staff member is permanent part time;
 - 3 staff are on full time temporary contracts;
 - 1 staff member is on a part time temporary contract; and
 - 13 staff are casual.
 - b) 1 x Director;
 - 1x Deputy Senior Manager;
 - 1 x Operations Manager;
 - 4 x Unit Managers;
 - 8 x Team Leaders;
 - 47 x Youth Workers;
 - 1 x Sport and Recreation officer;
 - 1 x Program and Services manager;
 - 1 x Family Engagement Officer;
 - 1 x Facilities and Services Manager;
 - 2 x Grounds/Maintenance officers;
 - 2 x Cooks; and
 - 3 x Administration staff.
 - c) After careful consideration of the question, and advice provided by my Directorate, I have determined that the information sought is not in an easily retrievable form and may identify individual staff, and that to collect and assemble the information sought solely for the purpose of answering the question would be a major task, requiring a considerable diversion of resources. In this instance, I do not believe that it would be appropriate to divert resources from the provision of direct services to clients for the purposes of answering the Member's question.
 - d) 56 permanent and executive contract staff have completed the human rights e-learning and 9 casual staff have completed the human rights e-learning.
- (4) All staff currently available for shifts at Bimberi have completed the Human Rights Act Introduction: e-learning module, with the remaining staff to complete the training within a week of their next shift within the workplace.
-

Education—staff behaviour (Question No 2404)

Ms Lee asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Does a framework exist for the assessment and review of allegations or complaints of impropriety, poor conduct or other behaviour that undermines the integrity of a principal or deputy principal; if so, can the Minister provide a copy of the framework and advise (a) when it was approved, (b) when it was last reviewed, (c) who was consulted as part of the development of the framework, (d) when is it scheduled to be reviewed and (e) where the framework is publicly published and the publication date.
- (2) In relation to part (1), since 31 October 2016 how many allegations or complaints have been (a) received regarding impropriety, poor conduct or other behaviour that undermines the integrity of a principal or deputy principal, (b) investigated using the framework and (c) what was the outcome or status of each allegation or complaint.
- (3) In relation to part (1), is this framework adapted or altered in any way when the principal or deputy principal is, at the time of investigation, injured or impaired as a result of work related injury, harassment or intimidation; if so, how and who makes the determination.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) When a complaint about the conduct of a principal or deputy principal is received it is assessed in line with the provisions set out in the ACT Public Sector Education and Training Directorate (Teaching Staff) Enterprise Agreement 2014-2018 (Enterprise Agreement). The provisions provide for an initial preliminary assessment to be conducted to determine what, if any, further action is required, which could include resolution through counselling or other remedial action or if the matter requires investigation. Where a preliminary assessment determines that investigation is required the allegations are referred to the Professional Standards Unit (PSU) for investigation.
 - (a) The Enterprise Agreement commenced operation on 18 September 2014. Changes to the Enterprise Agreement were communicated to all staff during the voting period and on implementation.
 - (b) The Enterprise Agreement expired on 30 September 2018 and is currently in negotiation.
 - (c) The Australian Education Union (AEU) is party to the agreement with all employees provided an opportunity to vote on the agreement.
 - (d) The Enterprise Agreement is available on the Education website as follows:
https://www.education.act.gov.au/working-with-us/benefits-and-support/employment_agreements
- 2) In the period of 1 January 2017 to 23 April 2019:
 - (a) 11 complaints relating to the alleged conduct of principals and deputy principals were received by the Education Directorate

- (b) the complaints were assessed through a preliminary assessment process with ten complaints resolved at this stage or required no further action. One complaint was referred to the Professional Standards Unit for investigation.
 - (c) The matter referred to the Professional Standards Unit is ongoing.
- 3) During a preliminary assessment or investigation process, staff are provided with access to supports based on their individual needs. Supports that are put in place include free and confidential counselling through the Employee Assistance Program as well as an opportunity to have a support person at all meetings. If staff are certified as medically unfit for work they are not required to participate in an investigation until such time that they are fit to participate.
-

Light rail—tree planting (Question No 2405)

Ms Lee asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Did the Directorate receive advice regarding the tree planting along the light rail corridor, including which species, planting advice, and watering advice; if so, can the Minister provide a copy of that advice; if not, why not.
- (2) Was an acceptable threshold for premature tree death set; if so, what is that number or proportion.
- (3) Will the trees which have been replanted along the light rail corridor and have died be replaced; if so, (a) what is the replacement species and (b) when will they be planted; if not, why not.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Government has already publicly released the *Capital Metro Tree Selection Memorandum* (2015). This document presents the extensive advice provided to the then Capital Metro Agency on tree selection and planting, including assessments of the localised soil properties indicating the suitability of *Eucalyptus mannifera*.

Canberra Metro has engaged further advisors and practitioners as part of undertaking landscape design and planting for the light rail project and to satisfy requirements of the Project Agreement.

- (2) In the arboreal industry a failure rate of around 5% is normally anticipated. The responsibility for a successful landscape outcome rests with Canberra Metro and the Project Agreement includes requirements for maintaining all planted landscape and that plantings in irreversible decline are replaced with the same species.
 - (3) All trees that have died will be replaced with contingency stock of the same species by Canberra Metro, currently being maintained at Yarralumla Nursery. Additional stock of the same species will be available for replacement throughout the duration of the project as required.
-

**ACTION bus service—animals
(Question No 2411)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Does any data exist for the number of animals that have been permitted by drivers to travel on buses; if so, can the Minister provide data on the number and type of animals that have been permitted to travel on buses for each of the last three years.
- (2) Have any bus drivers made reports relating to the carriage of animals in buses over the last three years; if so, (a) how many reports have been made and (b) can the Minister provide details of the reports.
- (3) Have any bus patrons made complaints relating to the carriage of animals in buses over the last three years; if so, (a) how many complaints have been made and (b) can the Minister provide details of the complaints.
- (4) Have any bus patrons been penalised for taking an animal onto a bus without the driver's permission; if so, can the Minister provide information about the number of such incidents and the circumstances, for each of the last three years.
- (5) How does Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate define assistance animals.
- (6) Have there been any incidences of disability assistance animals not being permitted on a bus; if so, how many such incidents have there been in each of the last three years and can the Minister detail any action that was taken to reduce likelihood of such incidents recurring.
- (7) Have there been any incidences of disability assistance animals in training that have not been permitted on a bus; if so, how many such incidents have there been in each of the last three years and can the Minister detail any action that was taken to reduce likelihood of such incidents recurring.
- (8) Are there any plans to exempt therapy animals from the travelling on buses without the driver's permission; if not, why.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No.
- (2) Transport Canberra's risk management system has a record of one incident during this period, which occurred in December 2016. I am advised that a gentleman without a shirt and accompanied by a dog was refused travel by a bus driver. As the gentlemen became abusive, Transport Officers attended the scene and the situation was resolved. The gentleman was not permitted to travel with his dog on board the bus.
- (3) This information is not recorded in a manner which would allow a response to this question.
- (4) No.

- (5) The *Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Regulation 2002* specifies that arrangements restricting the carriage of animals on buses and light rail do not apply to “a guide-dog or other animal assisting a person with disability” or an animal “being trained to assist a person with disability”. This is consistent with Territory and Commonwealth disability discrimination legislation. Transport Canberra’s operational procedures regarding assistance animals are based on this definition.
 - (6) This information is not recorded in a manner which would allow a response to this question.
 - (7) This information is not recorded in a manner which would allow a response to this question.
 - (8) Where a therapy animal is assisting a person with disability or being trained to assist a person with disability, it would be permitted to travel on Transport Canberra buses on a consistent basis with other assistance animals, in accordance with the *Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Regulation 2002*.
-

Animals—breeders (Question No 2417)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) How many breeders’ premises have been inspected since the Domestic Animals (Breeding) Legislation Amendment Act 2015 has been in effect; of these, were any breeders found to be conducting intensive breeding.
- (2) Have any individual breeders been penalized; if so, (a) how many, (b) what type of penalties were given and (c) if the penalties were fines, were they the same amount each time or did this vary; if it varied, what was the maximum, minimum and average fines.
- (3) Have any breeding companies been penalized; if so, (a) how many, (b) what type of penalties were given and (c) if the penalties were fines, were they the same amount each time, or did this vary; if it varied, what was the maximum, minimum and average fines.
- (4) Have any dog breeders been found to have bred dogs outside of the allowable breeding age range (18 months to 6 years); if so, how many such instances have there been.
- (5) Have any dog breeders been found to have bred dogs resulting in more than one litter within an 18-month period; if so, how many such instances have there been.
- (6) Have any cat breeders been found to have bred cats outside of the allowable breeding age range (12 months to 7 years); if so, how many of such instances have there been.
- (7) Have any cat breeders been found to have bred cats resulting in more than three litters within a 2 year period; if so, how many of such instances have there been.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) All premises are inspected before a breeding licence is granted. 40 breeding licences have been issued to date with a number currently being assessed.
 - (2) No fines have been issued. DAS has identified several illegal breeders. These cases have been actioned, the dogs seized and de-sexed and returned to the owner or surrendered.
 - (3) No.
 - (4) No.
 - (5) No.
 - (6) No.
 - (7) No.
-

**Budget—health
(Question No 2422)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) How much has been provided in the budget for ACT health to cover (a) population growth, (b) the aging population, (c) improvements in technology, (d) increases in staff costs and (e) increases in other costs, for the financial years (i) 2012-13, (ii) 2013-14, (iii) 2014-15, (iv) 2015-16, (v) 2016-17 and (vi) 2017-18.
- (2) What was the actual increase in expenditure in the health budget attributed to (a) population growth, (b) the aging population, (c) improvements in technology, (d) increases in staff costs and (e) increases in other costs, for the financial years (i) 2012-13, (ii) 2013-14, (iii) 2014-15, (iv) 2015-16, (v) 2016-17 and (vi) 2017-18.
- (3) Are the calculations correct in the newspaper article in the Canberra Times by Khalid Ahmed and Jon Stanhope on 30 April 2019 that health funding in the ACT is going backward by 1 percent a year after taking into account population growth, the aging population and improvements in technology; if not, (a) why and (b) to what extent are they incorrect.
- (4) Is health funding in the ACT keeping pace with population growth, the aging population and improvements in technology, wages costs and other costs; if not, what is the extent of the shortfall.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1 & 2) The ACT Budget for health funding does not provide explicitly for growth on the basis of population growth (a), the aging population (b) or improvements in technology (c). Budget allocations for health are based on system-wide data and monitoring of changes in demand over time, ensuring funding grows as demand grows.

The ACT Budget does indicate total budgeted (1) and actual expenses (2) for staff costs (d) and other costs (e) for the ACT Health Directorate.

- (3 & 4) Treasury have advised it is difficult to reengineer the analysis quoted in the article in order to assess the claims made. Nominal growth rates in health funding of 10 per cent per year are not sustainable. For the ACT to maintain nominal growth in health funding at 10 per cent would require lower levels of investment in other services to the ACT community.

The latest Report on Government Services shows that 2016-17 recurrent expenditure per person on public hospital services in the ACT was \$3,702, well above the national average of \$2,606. In the recent AIHW Health expenditure Australia 2016-17 report, recurrent health expenditure per person (i.e. public and private sectors) in the ACT in 2016-17 was \$7,998 which was above the national average of \$6,888 per person.

ACT Health—non-ACT patients (Question No 2424)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) How many claims under the Interstate Patient Travel Assistance Scheme (IPTAS) were submitted to ACT Health during each of the years (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17, (e) 2017-18 and (f) 2018-19 (to the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper).
- (2) For each of the years referred to in part (1), (a) how many claims were approved, (b) what was the total of payments made for approved claims, (c) what was IPTAS' total administration cost (excluding payments made for approved claims, (d) what was IPTAS' administrative staffing profile and (e) was any review of the IPTAS undertaken; if yes, for each review (i) what elements were reviewed, (ii) what recommendations were made and (iii) what changes were made to the IPTAS.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The IPTAS office only tracks the number of accepted claims. The number of claims submitted but not approved is not available.
- (2) a) 2013-14 – 2049
 2014-15 - 1848
 2015-16 – 2211
 2016-17 – 2305
 2017-18 – 2414
 2018-19 – 1757 as at 31 March 2018
- b) 2013-14 – \$657,307
 2014-15 – \$561,866
 2015-16 – \$619,582
 2016-17 – \$627,634
 2017-18 – \$658,514
 2018-19 – \$524,795 as at 31 March 2018

- c) 2013-14 – \$59,290
 2014-15 – \$62,252
 2015-16 – \$68,381
 2016-17 – \$88,625
 2017-18 – \$88,188
 2018-19 – \$63,308 as at 31 March
- d) The admin staffing profile has increased from 0.81 in 2013-14 to 1.0 FTE during 2015-16. This is for the processing officer and does not include the supervisor (SOGB) who spends approximately 0.1 FTE per week approving all the payments and responding to other IPTAS related queries.
- e) Yes
 - (i) The IPTAS guidelines and maximum payment amounts are reviewed internally.
 - (ii) The guidelines have had minor wording changes to enhance clarity for users. The maximum payment amounts were indexed until the 2017-18 year.
 - (iii) From 2017-18 year private accommodation ceased to be supported and the maximum reimbursement for fuel costs reduced slightly. The review looked at a cents per kilometre cost instead of the cost reimbursement however, this was deemed to not be financially feasible. The average cost of fuel, for return trips to Sydney by car, based on the claims paid in 2018-19 as at 31 March was \$71.62. The current maximum amount available for reimbursement for fuel costs for a return car trip to Sydney is \$110.

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—remandees
(Question No 2429)**

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Does the Minister agree with the Inspector's view that current practice inside the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) is in contravention of section 44 of the Corrections Management Act 2007 in relation to the report by ACT Inspector of Correctional Services titled The care and management of remandees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre 2018; if not, why not.
- (2) On how many occasions have remandees been detained in the same cell as sentenced inmates in (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (3) How many remandees were detained in the same cell as a sentenced inmate on at least one occasion in (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.

Mr Rattenbury: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- 1) The Government Response to the *Report of a Review of a Correctional Service by the ACT Inspector of Correctional Services: The care and management of remandees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) 2018* which will be tabled during the June 2019 sitting period.

The separation of remanded and sentenced detainees remains a challenge for ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS), due to the high numbers of remand detainees, and the complexities of managing a range of detainee cohorts in the one facility. Because of this, ACTCS relies on the application of section 44(4) of the *Corrections Management Act 2007* to address separation arrangements at the AMC. Sub-section (4) provides that, “...the director-general may give directions for different accommodation of a non-convicted detainee if the director-general suspects, on reasonable grounds, that it is necessary to ensure the safety of the detainee or anyone else”.

- 2) The format of data and the analysis required to provide the information requested, would take substantial time and resources to produce. In order to give an indication of statistics a random data sample has been examined.

On 15 April 2019, there were 79 occasions where a remanded detainee and sentenced detainee shared the same cell.

- 3) On each occasion referred to in my answer to Question 2, there was one remandee in the cell at the time.

Emergency services—communications (Question No 2433)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) How many priority one cases were generated by COMCEN in 2016-17 and (a) how many of these cases were removed from the data for the Report on Government Services reporting and (b) what is the rationale and/or the caveats for removing these cases.
- (2) How many priority one cases were generated by COMCEN in 2017-18 and (a) how many of these cases were removed from the data for the Report on Government Services reporting and (b) what is the rationale and/or the caveats for removing these cases.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) There were 17,471 priority one cases generated by COMCEN in 2016-17.
 - a. The total number of priority one cases removed from the data for the 2016-17 year is 2,085.
 - b. Cases are graded on the information available at the time. These may be re graded as further information on the case becomes available. If this process of re-grading is not undertaken, it will have a false impact (both positive and negative) on response times. The re-grading process is consistent with how cases are recorded in all jurisdictions nationally. Examples on the types of occurrences where cases are re-graded include:
 - Incident grade is not A1 (i.e. is not a priority one case)
 - Incident type is “Stand-by”, “Vehicle Movement”, “Southcare” or “000”
 - Resource Call sign is not Ambulance resource
 - Difference between arrived time and left scene time is under 5 minutes
 - Left scene time or on scene time is NULL

- Suburb is not a Canberra suburb
 - Incident grade was changed after incident was assigned.
- (2) There were 20,463 priority one cases generated by COMCEN in 2017-18.
- a. The total number of priority one cases removed from the data in the 2017-18 year is 2,401.
 - b. See response to 1b.
-

Emergency services—minimum crewing (Question No 2434)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What is the minimum number of ACT Fire & Rescue (ACTF&R) crews that are rostered at any given time during the bushfire season.
- (2) Does the level of crewing change depending on the level of fire danger rating; if so, how.
- (3) Are there any plans to reduce the number of crews ACTF&R rostering during periods of increases fire danger.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Nine.
 - (2) Yes, on days with a Fire Danger Rating (FDR) of Very High or higher additional crews are placed on stand by for prescribed blocks of time during that day. As the FDR increases, the length of time the crews are on duty also increases.
 - (3) The Bushfire and Storm Enhanced Crewing policy is currently under review. Data analysis for the past five years is currently being undertaken to establish the optimal crewing arrangements on days with a heightened FDR.
-

Bushfires—management (Question No 2435)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) For the fight against the Corin Dam fire in January 2019, which firefighting appliances were utilised.
- (2) Of the firefighting helicopters used, what was the (a) total cost of use and (b) number of hours of use.

Mr Gentleman: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A total of 27 firefighting appliances were utilised at the Corin Dam fire. A breakdown of the types of appliances are as follows:
- four aircraft
 - two Remote Area Fire Teams
 - one bulk water carrier
 - seven command units
 - six light units
 - three medium tankers
 - four heavy tankers
- (2a) As indicated in Question on Notice number 2310, this information cannot be provided as these contracts are strictly commercial-in-confidence, and the ACT Government is not able to release any information on the value/cost of each contract.
- (2b) The total number of aircraft time at the Corin Dam fire was 64.3 hours. This was divided between the four aircraft.
-

**Roads—William Slim Drive
(Question No 2436)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) As the Federal budget for this year includes \$20 million to upgrade William Slim Drive to a dual carriageway between Barton Highway and Ginninderra Drive, how much funding is the ACT Government contributing to upgrades for William Slim Drive, and what will the works comprise of.
- (2) When will the tender process commence and what will tendering be anticipated to be completed.
- (3) What is the expected timeframe for construction to commence, and what is the projected completion time.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The amount of funding that the ACT Government is providing for upgrades to William Slim Drive can be found in the ACT Budget Papers.
- (2) The timing of procurement and construction is subject to a number of factors including planning approvals, the profile of funding from the Commonwealth Government and finalisation of the scope of works associated with the adjacent CSIRO development.
- (3) Construction commencement is subject to the factors outlined above.
-

**Roads—resurfacing
(Question No 2437)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

Answer to question on notice No 2339 provided a map of the distribution of 59 sites in the Ginninderra electorate identified for inclusion in heavy patching (using asphalt applied hot) programs that are not yet recorded as completed in the Transport Canberra and City Services Integrated Asset Management System, can a list detailing the street names of each site be provided as an attachment.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The total number of asphalt repairs for the Ginninderra Electorate is now 53, as at 11 April 2019. Some repairs have been completed and several added to the list.

The list of addresses below contain the current defects:

- 3 Fullagar Crescent, Higgins
- 1 Fullagar Crescent, Higgins
- Tillyard Drive, Flynn - at bridge 1013 (near Covington Crescent)
- Ginninderra Drive Charnwood at bridge 1015 (near fire station)
- Ginninderra Drive Charnwood adjacent fire station driveway
- Lhotsky Street at Townson Street roundabout, Charnwood
- Donnison Place, Charnwood
- 17 Donnison Place, Charnwood
- Tillyard Drive near Sadleir Place, Charnwood
- Britten-Jones Drive/Stockdill Drive Intersection, Holt
- Stockdill Drive Holt adjacent watering station
- Intersection of Stockdill Dr and Britten-Jones Dr, Holt
- 22 Postle Circuit, Holt
- Hardwick Crescent-in front of dry cleaner, Holt
- Bridge over old bus lane - 96 Totterdell Street, Belconnen
- Belconnen way off ramp (south bound), Belconnen
- 55 Lathlain Street, Belconnen
- Coulter Drive, Belconnen
- Benjamin Way, Belconnen (northbound lane near 81 Condell Street)
- Oatley Court (east) Carpark, Belconnen
- Corner Tillyard Drive and Kuringa Drive, Fraser
- 5 Waylen Place, Macgregor
- Carpark opposite 94 Macrossan Crescent, Latham
- North East corner Coulter Drive and Lachlan Street, Macquarie
- Stockdill Drive, Coree - approximately 2.9km from Drake Brockman Drive
- 21 Clark Close, Spence
- 9 Broadby Close, Spence
- Coulter Drive - slip lane onto William Hovell Drive, Cook
- Loading dock rear 28 Cook Place, Cook
- Lyttleton Crescent Cook
- 16 Morton Street Weetangera
- 65 Shumack Street, Weetangera
- 1 Brash Place, Melba
- Corner of Spalding/ Flierl Place, Melba
- 73 Alfred Hill Drive, Melba
- 15 Copland Drive, Melba (BMX track entry)
- 11 Gundara Street, Aranda

- Bandjalong Crescent, Aranda
- 40 Gingana Street, Aranda
- 26 Kesteven Street, Florey
- Coulter Drive (behind 9 Gatliff Place), Florey
- William Hovell Drive at turn into Kama Nature Reserve, Molonglo Valley
- William Hovell Drive South of Drake Brockman Dr, Hawker
- 21 - 25 Earle Place, Page
- 25 Earle Place, Page
- Coulter Drive intersection at 2 Ogilby Crescent, Page
- Spalding Street, Flynn (at 2 Flierl Place)
- Kingsford Smith Drive - opposite bus stop 4570, Flynn
- 13 Fitzherbert Place, Bruce
- Braybrooke Street, Bruce
- Haydon Drive, Bruce - adjacent bus stop 4803 (opposite Calvary Hospital)
- Coulter Drive, Hawker - southbound just before William Hovell Drive
- William Hovell Drive, Hawker - behind 13 Florina Place

Roads—resurfacing (Question No 2438)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) How long do cold mix asphalt road repairs typically last as an interim repair before a more permanent repair needs to be made.
- (2) What is the average cost of a cold mix asphalt road repair.
- (3) How many cold mix asphalt interim road repairs are currently in place in the Ginninderra electorate and where are they located.
- (4) Are there any detailed policies or guidelines in place for determining the most suitable repair (i.e. weighing of specific timeframes/cost/treatment performance/location and traffic etc.), or is the determination made by the contracted repairers; if the former, can the policy or guidelines be submitted as an attachment; if the latter, what is the process of obtaining Government approval for a particular road repair.

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The durability of cold mix repair depends on a range of factors including the condition of the underlying pavement
- (2) The cost of each pothole repair is approximately \$60.
- (3) The total number of sites currently identified for asphalt structural repair for the Ginninderra Electorate is 53 as at 11 April 2019. The locations are at Attachment A.
- (4) Road inspections are undertaken using Pavement Visual Inspection Manual. The documents are at Attachment B.

Attachment A

The list of addresses below are the current defects.

- 3 Fullagar Crescent, Higgins
- 1 Fullagar Crescent, Higgins
- Tillyard Drive, Flynn - at bridge 1013 (near Covington Crescent)
- Ginniderra Drive Charnwood at bridge 1015 (near fire station)
- Ginniderra Drive Charnwood adjacent fire station driveway
- Lhotsky Street at Townson Street roundabout, Charnwood
- Donnison Place, Charnwood
- 17 Donnison Place, Charnwood
- Tillyard Drive near Sadleir Place, Charnwood
- Britten-Jones Drive/Stockdill Drive Intersection, Holt
- Stockdill Drive Holt adjacent watering station
- Intersection of Stockdill Dr and Britten-Jones Dr, Holt
- 22 Postle Circuit, Holt
- Hardwick Crescent-in front of dry cleaner, Holt
- Bridge over old bus lane - 96 Totterdell Street, Belconnen
- Belconnen way off ramp (south bound), Belconnen
- 55 Lathlain Street, Belconnen
- Coulter Drive, Belconnen
- Benjamin Way, Belconnen (northbound lane near 81 Condell Street)
- Oatley Court (east) Carpark, Belconnen
- Corner Tillyard Drive and Kuringa Drive, Fraser
- 5 Waylen Place, Macgregor
- Carpark opposite 94 Macrossan Crescent, Latham
- North East corner Coulter Drive and Lachlan Street, Macquarie
- Stockdill Drive, Coree - approximately 2.9km from Drake Brockman Drive
- 21 Clark Close, Spence
- 9 Broadby Close, Spence
- Coulter Drive - slip lane onto William Hovell Drive, Cook
- Loading dock rear 28 Cook Place, Cook
- Lyttleton Crescent Cook
- 16 Morton Street Weetangera
- 65 Shumack Street, Weetangera
- 1 Brash Place, Melba
- Corner of Spalding/ Flierl Place, Melba
- 73 Alfred Hill Drive, Melba
- 15 Copland Drive, Melba (BMX track entry)
- 11 Gundara Street, Aranda
- Bandjalong Crescent, Aranda
- 40 Gingana Street, Aranda
- 26 Kesteven Street, Florey
- Coulter Drive (behind 9 Gatliff Place), Florey
- William Hovell Drive at turn into Kama Nature Reserve, Molonglo Valley
- William Hovell Drive South of Drake Brockman Dr, Hawker
- 21 - 25 Earle Place, Page
- 25 Earle Place, Page
- Coulter Drive intersection at 2 Ogilby Crescent, Page

- Spalding Street, Flynn (at 2 Flierl Place)
- Kingsford Smith Drive - opposite bus stop 4570, Flynn
- 13 Fitzherbert Place, Bruce
- Braybrooke Street, Bruce
- Haydon Drive, Bruce - adjacent bus stop 4803 (opposite Calvary Hospital)
- Coulter Drive, Hawker - southbound just before William Hovell Drive
- William Hovell Drive, Hawker - behind 13 Florina Place

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

ACTION bus service—route alterations (Question No 2439)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) On average, how many passengers board the route 40 bus during peak hours each day of the week for (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-2019 (to the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper).
- (2) On average, how many passengers board the route 40 bus during off peak hours each day of the week for (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-2019 (to the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper).
- (3) On average, how many student/concessions board the route 40 bus during peak hours each day of the week for (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-2019 (to the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper).
- (4) What is the reason for reduced services during peak hours for Route 40, commencing 29 April 2019.
- (5) What alternatives do residents in Aranda have in being able to commute to work and/or school via public transport in a timely manner, in light of the reduced services.
- (6) Will the Government consider increasing services for this bus route during peak hours; if yes, will services during off peak hours be further reduced; if no, what measures will the Government take to ensure Aranda residents receive at least equal (if not improved) public transport services from 29 April 2019, in comparison to the current services being provided.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Average number of customers boarding route 40 services before 9am and between 4.30pm and 6pm each weekday:

	2016-17 financial year	2017-18 financial year	2018-19 financial year to 5 April 2019
Monday	769	753	733
Tuesday	800	758	765
Wednesday	768	749	748
Thursday	758	738	726
Friday	713	663	670

These figures do not include weekdays which are public holidays (as the route 40 does not operate on public holidays), and includes customers travelling in both directions on route 40.

- (2) Average number of customers boarding route 40 services between 9am and 4.30pm and after 6pm each weekday:

	2016-17 financial year	2017-18 financial year	2018-19 financial year to 5 April 2019
Monday	808	819	839
Tuesday	869	881	907
Wednesday	817	851	851
Thursday	866	860	888
Friday	884	873	889

These figures do not include weekdays which are public holidays (as the route 40 does not operate on public holidays), and includes customers travelling in both directions on route 40.

- (3) Average number of customers using a MyWay Student card or MyWay Concession card boarding route 40 services before 9am and between 4.30pm and 6pm each weekday:

	2016-17 financial year	2017-18 financial year	2018-19 financial year to 5 April 2019
Monday	302	293	292
Tuesday	324	306	316
Wednesday	308	298	298
Thursday	306	297	293
Friday	297	278	283

These figures do not include weekdays which are public holidays (as the route 40 does not operate on public holidays), and includes customers travelling in both directions on route 40.

- (4) The frequency of route 32 services in the new network is designed to meet the expected demand from customers served by the route. To provide additional capacity, 2 of the 6 route 32 services from Aranda to the City between 7am and 9am on weekdays will be operated with articulated buses. Articulated buses have a capacity of 107 passengers, significantly more than a standard bus capacity of approximately 67 passengers.
- (5) Customers in Aranda can choose to either catch a route 32 service to the City or to Belconnen. For customers travelling elsewhere, connections are available at both the City Interchange and Belconnen Interchanges to a range of other public transport services, including Rapid buses and light rail, local bus services and dedicated school bus services.
- (6) The performance of the public transport network is regularly monitored and evaluated by Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, particularly after significant changes are made to services. The Government will consider when and where

additional services are required to meet demand and encourage more Canberrans to use public transport in the future, based on how customers are using the new integrated public transport network.

**ACT Health—domestic violence training
(Question No 2440)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Are there any Capabiliti training courses that train ACT Health staff in being able to detect a potential victim of domestic violence; if not, why not.
- (2) Are there any other training courses besides Capabiliti that train ACT Health staff to better be able to detect a potential victim of domestic violence.
- (3) Are there any existing measures, protocols or employees that exist within ACT Health that assist staff with identifying potential victims of domestic violence.
- (4) What measures are undertaken by ACT Health staff to help raise awareness for domestic violence to clients.
- (5) Upon identifying a potential victim of domestic violence, how are ACT Health staff trained to respond i.e. what plans and strategies are used, what help and support is offered; if there are any staff policies or guidelines concerning response to suspected or identified victims of domestic violence, can the Minister provide them as an attachment.
- (6) When ACT health staff identify a victim of domestic violence, are there mandatory reporting policies they must follow; if so, what are they.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes. E Learning modules were launched on 27 March 2019. These courses cover:
 - Domestic and Family Violence
 - Foundation – A Shared Understanding of Family Violence
 - Broset Violence Checklist
 - Static 99 and Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol (RSVP).

The aim of these online training modules is to ensure that Canberra Health Services and Health Directorate staff have a shared understanding of family and domestic violence.

- (2) Yes. Canberra Health Services (CHS) is implementing the Strengthening Hospital Responses to Family Violence program, an evidenced based family violence initiative developed by the Royal Women's Hospital and implemented throughout Victorian Health services. This program provides a whole of organisation framework for embedding a culture for safe disclosure which involves raising awareness and capacity to enable health professionals to early identify and respond to disclosure of family violence.

In addition, Relationship Australia delivers a training program to Child and Adolescent Mental Health staff on domestic and family violence, called AVERT, which is an innovative, multi-disciplinary training package to assist staff in responding effectively to family violence.

- (3) Yes. CHS has a comprehensive Family Violence (Adults and Children) guideline which informs health professionals on conducting family violence risk assessment and interventions. See Attachment A.
- (4) The training, programs and guideline outlined in the previous answers address this question.
- (5) When staff suspect or identify family violence, with the consumer's consent a comprehensive risk assessment and intervention is conducted by a clinician. Alternatively a referral may be made to an external agency such as the Domestic Violence Crisis Service or the Women's Health Service.

In 2019 a new Health Justice Partnership has been established between CHS and Legal Aid ACT, to embed a solicitor at Canberra Hospital to provide timely response to referrals for people seeking legal advice on family violence or related matters.

Please refer to the Family Violence guideline at Attachment A for further details on the strategies and referral pathways available to consumers.

- (6) CHS staff are mandated under the *Children and Young People Act 2008* to report concerns around any child at risk to the Community Services Directorate. In addition, all staff are mandated to report concerns about suspected institutional abuse of children to the Ombudsman under the Reportable Conduct Scheme. CHS staff are not mandated to report concerns about suspected abuse of competent adults.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

ACT Health—child protection (Question No 2441)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

How many child protection reports were submitted by ACT Health staff to Children and Youth Protection Services in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-19 (to the date on which this question was published in the questions on notice paper).

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The below figures were sourced from the Community Services Directorate. The reporting data cannot be distinguished between ACT Health staff and other health professionals as a whole.

The total number of reports submitted to Children and Youth Protection Services from Health Personnel (Other), Hospital/Health Centre Personnel, Medical Practitioner and Non Medical Hospital/Health Centre Personnel is:

Financial Year	Number of Child Concern Reports Received
(a) 2016-17	2,700
(b) 2017-18 and	2,627
(c) 2018-19 (to 5 April 2019)	2,564

**ACTION bus service—school services
(Question No 2442)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Will the ACT Government consider running the upcoming school bus 1043 to arrive at St Francis Xavier College 10 minutes earlier so that students have enough time to disembark the bus and get ready for school; if yes, when will students and their families be able to see this change in operation; if not, why not.
- (2) Will the afternoon school bus and the alternate public bus route 42 soon require a 30 minute wait after school; if so, will the ACT Government consider running an afternoon bus 15 minutes earlier as is the case currently, to better support students and their families; if not, what measures will be taken to ensure students get to and from school safely and in a more timely manner.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The morning bell at St Francis Xavier College is at 8.30am. The route 1043 school bus is timetabled to arrive at St Francis Xavier College at 8.21am.

This allows 9 minutes for students to walk from the bus stop on Barnard Circuit, directly outside the school, and be ready for class.

- (2) No. The route 1043 is scheduled to depart from St Francis Xavier College at 3.20pm, 20 minutes after classes end for most students at 3pm. A service 15 minutes earlier may not allow sufficient time for students to gather their belongings and make their way to the bus stop.

Some students may prefer to use a route 42 service the towards Belconnen Interchange, which departs at 3.32pm, depending on what trip they are making. This service will also cater to senior students at the school, who finish class at 3.25pm.

**ACTION bus service—school services
(Question No 2443)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) On average and for each bus route, how many students board the 846 and the 818 bus each school day in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-19 (to date).
- (2) What public transport alternatives exist for families living in the Ginninderra Electorate who attend the schools that were previously serviced by the 846 and 818, that do not include up to an extra hour (one-way) commute to school.

- (3) Will the Government consider the continuation of bus routes 846 and 818 to better support families in the Ginninderra Electorate who choose to send their children to independent schools in South Canberra.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Average daily boardings for routes 846 and 818 are provided in the table below:

	Route 846 (morning)	Route 818 (afternoon)
2016-17	25	34
2017-18	24	30
2018-19 (partial to 5 April 2019)	24	28

- (2) Routes 846 and 818 provided a connection between the Belconnen Town Centre and Canberra Grammar School, Canberra Girls Grammar School, St Edmund's College and St Clare's College. Route 846 operated from Belconnen to these schools in the morning, while route 818 operated from the schools to Belconnen in the afternoon.

Over 75% of students that used route 846 boarded the service at the Cohen Street Interchange during the 2018 school year. Additionally, some students in Macquarie, Cook and Aranda used these routes, with others boarding outside the Ginninderra electorate, in suburbs such as Red Hill.

From the Cohen Street Interchange, students can now catch the Rapid 2, Rapid 3 or Rapid 4 to the City, and change to route 1015 school bus to all four Canberra Grammar and Canberra Girls Grammar campuses. The travel time for this journey is between 48 and 60 minutes, depending on which school students are travelling to, compared with between 32 and 40 minutes for route 846.

If students are travelling from Aranda, Cook or Macquarie, they could catch route 32 service to the City to catch route 1015 school bus.

From the Cohen Street Interchange, students can catch the Rapid 2 service directly to St Edmund's College and St Clare's College. Two Rapid 2 trips each morning and two Rapid 2 trips each afternoon on school days divert close to St Edmund's College and St Clare's College, stopping outside the schools on MacMillan Crescent. The travel time for these services is 50 minutes in the morning and 59 minutes in the afternoon between Cohen Street Interchange and MacMillan Crescent, compared with 45 minutes in the morning for route 846 and 47 minutes in the afternoon for route 818.

If students are travelling from Aranda, Cook or Macquarie, they could catch route 32 service to the City and change to the Rapid 2 service that diverts to the school.

- (3) The Government has no plans to make major network changes at this time. The new integrated public transport network commenced on 29 April 2019. Minor services adjustments, particularly relating to route capacity issues, have been made in the network based on initial operational experience. The Government has committed to an annual review of services for school students, in consultation with schools and in the context of its Provision of Dedicated School Bus Services Policy. The first review is expected to commence in 2020.

ACTION bus service—school services (Question No 2444)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) On average and for each school bus route 431, 414, 624, 566, 570, 577 and 684 that services suburbs in the Ginninderra electorate, how many students board each school bus each school day in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18 and (c) 2018-19 (to date).
- (2) What public transport alternatives exist for families living in the Ginninderra electorate who attend the schools that were previously serviced by the school buses, that do not include significantly more time (one-way) when commuting to school.
- (3) Will the Government consider the continuation of school bus routes to better support families in the Ginninderra electorate who choose to send their children to Daramalan and Merici College.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Average daily boardings for routes 846 and 818 – the requested are provided in the below table:

	Route 414	Route 431	Route 566	Route 570	Route 577	Route 624	Route 684
2016-17	18	54	29	33	37	53	51
2017-18	19	63	29	34	37	58	45
2018-19 (partial to 5 April 2019)	18	57	28	27	33	51	40

- (2) Routes 414, 431, 566, 570, 577, 624 and 684 collectively serve the following schools:
 - a. Brindabella Christian College Lyneham;
 - b. Daramalan College;
 - c. Emmaus Christian School;
 - d. Lyneham Primary School;
 - e. Majura Primary School;
 - f. Merici College;
 - g. North Ainslie Primary School;
 - h. Rosary Primary School; and
 - i. St Joseph's Primary School.

Students travelling to these schools from Belconnen suburbs are able to use a range of different services, depending on the specific journey they are making. For example, route 414 currently takes 35 minutes to travel from Cohen Street Interchange to Daramalan College. In the new network, students will be able to use Rapid 9, which runs frequently at peak times and takes only 29 minutes to travel from Cohen Street Interchange to the Dickson Interchange, a short walk from the school.

Families, students and parents can plan their specific journeys to school using:

- the improved Transport Canberra journey at www.transport.act.gov.au; and
- bespoke school packs that were provided to each school in the ACT showing route and timetable information for all services stopping at or near the school.

- (3) The Government has no plans to make major network changes at this time. The new integrated public transport network commenced on 29 April 2019. Minor services adjustments, particularly relating to route capacity issues, have been made in the network based on initial operational experience. The Government has committed to an annual review of services for school students, in consultation with schools and in the context of its Provision of Dedicated School Bus Services Policy. The first review is expected to commence in 2020.

**ACT Health—child protection
(Question No 2445)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Besides Capabiliti training modules, what sort of child protection training is available to ACT Health staff.
- (2) How many people can participate in the course at any one time.
- (3) Is the attendance at one child protection course enough to be considered compliant.
- (4) Are there any testing mechanisms for child protection that someone must pass in order to be considered compliant.
- (5) Is this course mandatory for all ACT Health Staff; if not, why not; if it is mandatory for only a portion of ACT Health Staff, what kind of workers is it mandatory for.
- (6) Were there any child protection training courses held in (a) October 2018, (b) November 2018, (c) December 2018, (d) January 2019, (e) February 2019 and (f) March 2019; if so, how many attended each course.
- (7) How often are staff required to attend a child protection course in order to remain compliant and once compliant, how often do staff need to take child protection refresher courses.
- (8) At what levels are child protection courses taught at beyond level 2 and 3.
- (9) What is the difference between child protection level 2 courses, and child protection level 3 courses.
- (10) How many ACT Health staff are currently not compliant in their child protection essential training as reported on the performance information portal.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) All training for Canberra Health Services and ACT Health Directorate staff is available on the Learning Management System, Capabiliti. They are:

Child protection Level 1 - eLearning

Child protection Training level 1 - is required by all ACT Health Directorate and Canberra Health Services staff that have NO contact with children, young people and

their families in the course of their work such as administration, records management, and policy staff.

This is delivered as an eLearning package through Capabiliti and E3 learning available at Calvary Health Care ACT.

Child Protection Level 2 - face to face

Child Protection Level 2 Refresher – eLearning

Child Protection Level 3 - face to face

Child Protection Level 3 Refresher – eLearning

Child protection training for Volunteers

- (2) Up to 20 for face to face training.
- (3) The Essential Education Policy mandates all staff to complete the **Child Protection Level 1** eLearning course. Completion of this course by all staff is considered compliant with the organisations Essential Education Policy.
- Child Protection Level 2** - Three years after attending initial level 2 child protection training (and every three years after that) staff are required to complete a refresher. This refresher training is an eLearning package available via Capabiliti or through the E3 learning at Calvary Health Care ACT.
- Child Protection Level 3** - Three years after attending an initial level 3 child protection training (and every three years after that) staff are required to attend a refresher. This is a two hour face to face session and booked via Capabiliti.
- (4) Program assessment is a quiz at the end of the face to face sessions and completion of a course questionnaire.
- (5) Yes, level 1 training is Mandatory for all staff. As per the essential education policy, the level 2 and 3 training is required dependent on role and their level of contact with children, young people and their families as part of their work.

(6)

	<i>Child Protection Level 1 eLearning</i>	<i>Child Protection Level 2 face-to-face</i>	<i>Child Protection Level 2 Refresher - eLearning</i>	<i>Child Protection Level 3 face-to-face</i>	<i>Child Protection Level 3 Refresher face-to-face</i>
October 2018	62 completions	4 sessions, 52 participants	40	49	2 sessions, 22 participants
November 2018	78 completions	4 sessions, 41 participants	11	15	2 sessions, 29 participants
December 2018	59 completions	2 sessions, 25 participants	17	0	1 session, 19 participants
January 2019	81 completions	1 session, 9 participants	32	96	1 session, 2 participants

February 2019	144 completions	3 sessions, 42 participants	36	49	3 sessions, 28 participants
March 2019	52 completions	3 sessions, 44 participants	41	80	2 sessions, 16 participants

- (7) **Child Protection Level 1** – All staff must complete this course, even if they do complete levels 2 or 3. The level 1 is to be completed once only.

Child Protection Level 2 - Three years after attending initial level 2 child protection training (and every three years after that) staff are required to attend a refresher. This refresher training is an eLearning package available via Capabiliti or through the E3 learning at Calvary Health Care ACT.

Child Protection Level 3 - Three years after attending an initial level 3 child protection training (and every three years after that) staff are required to attend a refresher. The refresher course is a two hour face to face session and booked via Capabiliti.

- (8) Canberra Health Services and ACT Health Directorate are provided levels 1, 2 and 3 training courses, please see question 9 for detailed explanations.

(9) **Child protection Level 2**

In addition to completion of Child Protection Training level 1, this is for ACT Health Directorate and Canberra Health Services staff that come into contact with children, young people and their families, but where this contact is not part of their core service activity. This includes but is not limited to nursing, medical, medical imaging, allied health, and some administration staff, managers, and supervisors who do not work directly with children and young people. The initial course is a two hour face-to-face session.

Child protection Level 3

In addition to completion of Child Protection Training level 1, this is for ACT Health Directorate and Canberra Health Services staff who work in direct contact with children, young people and their families as part of their core service activity, such as Medical, Nursing and Health Professional staff who work in Emergency Department, Dental Health, Mental Health (Adult, Children and Adolescent), Alcohol and Drug Program, Maternity, Paediatrics, Community Health and Directors and Managers responsible for these staff. The initial course is a full day, face-to-face session.

- (10) The performance management portal is not currently being utilised, however from the statistics produced as at 12 April 2019, eight per cent (638) of staff have not completed their Child Protection level 1 training.

The majority of the 638 identified staff will be new starters to both organisations, some may have left the organisations without completing their training. This training is part of the Essential Training Policy and is mandatory for all staff to complete. Currently, Staff Development Unit (SDU) provide advice to supervisors of any non-compliant staff. Supervisors are then responsible to ensure their staff have undertaken this training. SDU are working towards providing a regular report to all supervisors to help assist in the completion of all mandatory training.

ACT Health—cultural competency training (Question No 2446)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:—

- (1) Besides Capabiliti training modules, what sort of cultural competency training is available to ACT Health staff.
- (2) How many people can participate in the course at any one time.
- (3) Is the attendance of one cultural competence course enough to be considered compliant.
- (4) Are there any testing mechanisms for cultural competence that someone must pass in order to be considered compliant.
- (5) Is this course mandatory for all ACT Health Staff; if not, why not.
- (6) Are other ACT Government departments able to participate in the ACT Health Cultural Competence courses.
- (7) Were there any Cultural Competence courses held in (a) October 2018, (b) November 2018, (c) December 2018, (d) January 2019, (e) February 2019 and (f) March 2019; if so, how many attended each course.
- (8) How often are staff required to attend the cultural competency course in order to remain compliant and once compliant, how often do staff need to take Cultural Competence refresher courses.
- (9) How many ACT Health staff are currently not compliant in their essential training as reported on the performance information portal.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) All training for Canberra Health Services and ACT Health Directorate staff is available on the Learning Management System, Capabiliti. They are:

The ***Cultural Competence eLearning*** course learning outcomes are to:

- Identify reasons why Canberra Health Services staff need to be culturally competent;
- Identify your own culture, values and beliefs;
- Describe how culture may influence the way you interact with consumers and other staff; and
- Describe how culture may impact on health outcomes.

The ***Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients eLearning*** learning outcomes are to:

- Respond to Canberra Health Services/ACT Health Directorate commitment to improve the health status of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples;
- Identify the impact of the past on the health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples today;

- List ways to improve the patient experience for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples; and
- How to apply the learnings in the workplace.

Cultural Competence face-to-face

Central to developing cultural competence is fostering cultural awareness. The face to face and E-Learning Diversity training group offers an opportunity for ACT Health employees to reflect on their values and beliefs, fundamental steps in developing cultural awareness. The training also provides an opportunity for participants to further develop their communication skills and manage their own prejudices when caring for or working with an individual from a CALD background.

The Cultural Competence has been recognised as a driving influence towards CALD services within ACT Health noted by item 4.2 of the Towards Culturally Appropriate and Inclusive Services - A Coordinating Framework ACT Health 2014-2018 the ACT Health meeting the requirement.

An additional 60 minute face to face education session is provided within the Clinical Support and Supervision Essential training program.

- (2) As an average per course, approximately 40 staff members could complete the face-to-face course at one session.

The eLearning courses can be accessed by staff members at any time by using the organisations Learning Management System, Capabiliti.

- (3) The face-to-face and eLearning Cultural Competence courses are considered 'highly recommended' for all staff to complete. Completion of this course for individuals is determined by their manager/supervisor/executive director as per the CHS Essential Training Policy.

The Essential Education Policy mandates all staff to complete the Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients eLearning course. Completion of this course by all staff is considered compliant with the organisations Essential Education Policy.

- (4) The face-to-face Cultural Competence course requires staff to complete an evaluation at the end of the course.

The eLearning Cultural Competence course requires staff to complete quiz/assessment at the end of the eLearning in order to complete in the training course.

The Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients eLearning has quizzes/assessments throughout eLearning in order to be deemed competent/compliant/ complete in the training course.

- (5) The face-to-face and eLearning Cultural Competence course is considered 'highly recommended' for all staff to complete. Completion of this course for individuals is determined by their manager/supervisor/executive director.

The Essential Education Policy has mandated all staff to complete the Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients eLearning course. Completion of this course by all staff is considered compliant with the organisations Essential Education Policy.

- (6) All Cultural Competence training courses are provided to Canberra Health Services / ACT Health Directorate staff and Calvary Hospital.

(7)

	<i>Cultural Competence face-to-face</i>	<i>Cultural Competence eLearning</i>	<i>Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients eLearning</i>	<i>Clinical Support and Supervision Education</i>
October 2018	1 course, 6 participants	25 completions	113 completions	15
November 2018	Nil	16 completions	107 completions	11
December 2018	1 course, 5 participants	11 completions	79 completions	5
January 2019	Nil	17 completions	201 completions	Nil program
February 2019	Nil	20 completions	188 completions	Nil program
March 2019	Nil	27 completions	88 completions	19

- (8) The *Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients eLearning* is a completion of once only.

- (9) The performance management portal is not currently being utilised, however from the statistics produced as at 11 April 2019 12 per cent (969 staff) of Canberra Health Services and ACT Health Directorate staff have not completed their *Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander patients and clients* mandatory training.

The total current completion rate for CHS is 88 per cent.

Child and youth protection services—review (Question No 2447)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

The Glanfield inquiry states that “a review should be undertaken of what decisions made by CYPS should be subject to either internal or external merits review”, has the report of this review been completed; if yes, can a copy of the report for the review be provided as an attachment, and when can the implementations of any changes recommended in this report be expected to take place; if no, what is the cause of the delay in completing the review, which was recommended 3 years ago, and when will the review be completed and made available.

Ms Stephen-Smith: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

The review of child protection decisions in the ACT has not been completed. A discussion paper has now been finalised by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate in

consultation with the Community Services Directorate (CSD). The discussion paper will soon be publicly available. The consultation process will involve direct engagement with identified stakeholders as well as an opportunity for any ACT community member to make a submission.

As I acknowledged in the Legislative Assembly recently, this timeline does represent a delay. This is due in part to the complex nature of the work, and in part to the recent workload across both Directorates' policy areas, including that associated with responding to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

**ACT public service—workers compensation
(Question Nos 2448-2485)**

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 5 April 2019 (*redirected to the Chief Minister*):

- (1) In relation to questions on notice Nos 2200-2237, what is the total number of occupational violence incidents reported in each area for which the Minister is responsible for 2018-19 to date.
- (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) In relation to questions on notice Nos 2200-2237, what is the total number of bullying and harassment incidents reported in each area for which the Minister is responsible for 2018-19 to date.

- (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) In relation to questions on notice Nos 2200-2237, what is the total number of mental stress incidents reported in each area for which the Minister is responsible for 2018-19 to date.
- (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 attached document provides information about reports of occupational violence, bullying and harassment and mental injury incidents from the ACT Public Sector during the 2018-19 year to date.

It should be noted that a single hazardous event may result in multiple reports, where the event described is witnessed by, or otherwise affects, multiple employees.

Workers' compensation data, and in particular mental injury claim data, is subject to lag. This may arise from time elapsed between when an incident occurs and an associated claim for workers' compensation is made and time required to investigate and determine claims.

Claim data for 2018-19 is incomplete and not yet mature enough for reporting purposes. This information is expected to be available in July 2019.

Occupational violence incident report numbers have increased significantly in recent years. This trend is primarily attributable to the development and implementation of occupational violence management plans designed to increase awareness and reporting, particularly within the Education Directorate.

These measures are helping the government to identify where support is needed to protect health and safety.

The number of work related injuries attributed to occupational violence has not increased proportionately to incident reports. This suggests that there has been a positive change in the reporting culture.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

Government—visa applications (Question No 2486)

Mr Coe asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

What is the total number of applications that have been (a) received and (b) rejected for (i) Skilled Nominated (subclass 190) visas, (ii) Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme

(subclass 187) visas and (iii) any other visas which the ACT Government has involvement in or contributes to in some way; during each financial year since 2013-14 to date have been broken down by stream.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The total number of applications that have been (a) received and (b) rejected for (i) skilled nominated (subclass 190) visas, (ii) regional sponsored migration scheme (subclass 187) visas and (iii) business investment (subclass 188) visas is summarised in the below three tables.

Table 1: Skilled Nominated (190) applications

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018 to 18/04/19
Received	1031	506	641	945	1372	886*
Rejected	147	69	118	177	190	228

* Since the program reopened on 29 November 2018, nearly 2,000 candidates have received an invitation to lodge an application, with approximately 750 lodging a formal application as at 18 April 2019.

Table 2: Regional Sponsored Migration Scheme (subclass 187) applications

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018 to 18/04/19
Received	398	397	406	439	605	105
Rejected	40	48	58	54	81	20

Table 3: Business innovation and Investment (subclass 188) applications

	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018 to 18/04/19
Received	7	10	6	9	19	11
Rejected	0	1	1	1	2	1

Light rail—launch (Question No 2488)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) In relation to the Light Rail Stage 1 community launch party planned for Saturday 20 April 2019, what date invitations (a) were or (b) will be sent to (i) Ministers, (ii) Members of the Legislative Assembly, (iii) public servants, (iv) businesses, (v) unions, (vi) community organisations, (vii) media entities and (viii) any other relevant category of attendee.
- (2) In relation to part (1), can the Minister advise for those (a) invited and (b) attending (i) names of Ministers, (ii) Names of Members of the Legislative Assembly, (iii) number of ACT Government public servants and the name of the directorate or agency to which they are attached, (iv) names of business, unions, community organisations, media entities, or other groups in attendance and number of attendees per entity and (v) any other relevant categories of attendees, and include (A) the name of the organisation or business and (B) the number of attendees per organisation or business.
- (3) In relation to the Light Rail Stage 1 community launch party planned for Saturday 20 April 2019, what is the nature or structure of the launch, including (a) what activities will be on offer, (b) the location of the event, (c) the expected number of attendees, (d) whether any entertainment will be provided or entertainers will perform; if so, the

nature of the entertainment and who will be performing, (e) whether any paid speakers will be in attendance; if so, who, (f) whether the event will feature live music, (g) what hospitality, such as food and drinks, will be offered at the event and whether alcohol will be offered at the event, either free or for a charge and (h) any other relevant information relating to the nature, activities or structure of the event.

- (4) Further to part (3), what is the breakdown of the cost of the event, including (a) promotional or advertising costs, (b) promotional material costs, (c) entertainment fees, (d) speaking fees, (e) travel costs, (f) accommodation costs, (g) event space hire, (h) equipment hire, (i) security costs, (j) hospitality costs, (k) staff or contractor costs and (l) any other relevant category of costs.
- (5) In relation to part (4), what is the breakdown of the promotional materials produced or purchased for the launch, and for each item advise (a) any design costs, (b) the number of items purchased, (c) the total cost of the items, (d) how the supplied was selected, (e) the dates the items were ordered and supplied, (f) where the items were manufactured and (g) the proposed distribution method.
- (6) In relation to part (4), if Saturday 20 April 2019 is a Public Holiday as gazetted by ACT Government website, will all staff and contractors be paid a loading, and how will this affect the cost of the launch party.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The light rail community event on 20 April is a public event. No invitations were issued. Everyone was welcome.
- (2) As above. It was a public event.
- (3)
 - a. Activities included the opportunity to ride light rail for free, children's entertainment and live music.
 - b. The events were held near the City and Gungahlin Termini of light rail.
 - c. Between 10,000 and 40,000 passenger journeys on the day were expected. Actual journeys were around 29,000. The ACT Government is delighted with the significant community interest shown in light rail on its first day of operations.
 - d. Bands and street performers.
 - e. No.
 - f. Yes, as above.
 - g. There was a charity sausage sizzle and food trucks at the City hub. No alcohol was served.
 - h. Regardless of entertainment activities, it was prudent and necessary in any event to ensure appropriate traffic and crowd management activities were in place across the breadth of the 12km alignment to keep the large numbers of people safe when they came out to ride light rail for the first time.
- (4)
 - a. Any such costs were met out of the existing appropriation to communicate changes to the transport network.

- b. As above.
 - c. \$35,000 was allocated to entertainment.
 - d. \$0
 - e. \$0
 - f. \$0
 - g. \$0
 - h. Up to \$200,000 was allocated to event equipment.
 - i. Security costs are related to safe queuing not the launch event.
 - j. \$0
 - k. \$110,000, although some of this figure is allocated to safe queuing and not associated community event activities
 - l. Total costs associated with community event activities are not expected to exceed \$300,000. Crowd safety, queue management and traffic management activities are not expected to exceed \$300,000.
- (5) Promotional items were sourced from within existing TCCS communication and engagement resources.
- (6) Everyone working on 20 April will be paid in line with the relevant award or agreement. Meeting public holiday pay obligations will impact the cost of the launch and Transport Canberra and City Services will manage this prudently. ACT Government volunteers will be treated in line with their Enterprise Agreement.
-

Government—taxes and charges (Question No 2489)

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) For (a) land tax, (b) rates and (c) unimproved value, what is the suburb breakdown of the total number of (i) objections received by the ACT Revenue Office by property type, such as commercial, residential houses, residential units and the (ii) appeals lodged by type, during each financial year from 2007-08 to date.
- (2) What is the number of the objections lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), broken down by the (a) type of objection and (b) property type that were (i) allowed or part allowed, (ii) disallowed, (iii) withdrawn, (iv) outstanding or (v) any other relevant category.
- (3) What is the number the appeals lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), broken down by (a) type of appeal and (b) property type that were (i) allowed or part allowed, (ii) settled, (iii) dismissed, (iv) outstanding or (v) any other relevant category.
- (4) For (a) land tax, (b) rates and (c) unimproved value, what is the suburb breakdown of the total value of (i) objections received by the ACT Revenue Office by property type, such as commercial, residential houses, residential units; and the (ii) appeals lodged by type, during each financial year from 2007-08 to date.

- (5) What is the value of the objections lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), broken down by the (a) type of objection and (b) property type that were (i) allowed or part allowed, (ii) disallowed, (iii) withdrawn, (iv) outstanding or (v) any other relevant category.
- (6) What is the value of the appeals lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), broken down by (a) type of appeal and (b) property type that were (i) allowed or part allowed, (ii) settled, (iii) dismissed, (iv) outstanding or (v) any other relevant category.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Answers to questions (5) and (6) are partially responded to in the answer to Question on Notice 2490.

The number of objections and appeals from the 2007-08 to 2016-17 financial years were previously provided in response to Question on Notice 1118 of 23 March 2018. The number of appeals for 2017-18 to 2018-19 (to 22 February 2019) were previously provided in response to Question on Notice 2330 of 22 February 2019.

I have been advised by the ACT Revenue office that the remaining information sought is not in an easily retrievable form, and that to collect and assemble the information sought solely for the purpose of answering the question would require a considerable diversion of resources. Further, I may not be able to provide the level of breakdown sought by the Member as it could disclose taxpayer information in breach of the secrecy provisions of the *Taxation Administration Act 1999*.

In this instance, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to divert resources from other priority activities for the purposes of answering the Member's question.

Government—taxes and charges (Question No 2490)

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What is the total value 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 financial year from 2007-08 to date.
- (2) What is the value of the objections lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), broken down by the type of objections that were (a) allowed or part allowed, (b) disallowed, (c) withdrawn, (d) outstanding or (e) any other relevant category.
- (3) What is the value the appeals lodged in each financial year referred to in part (1), broken down by the type of appeals that were (a) allowed or part allowed, (b) settled, (c) dismissed, (d) outstanding or (e) any other relevant category.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1)(a) Value of objections by tax type received and the outcome between 2007-08 and 1 April 2019

The answers to question (1)(a) are included with the response to Question (2) below.

(1)(b) Value of appeals lodged by type from 2007-08 to 1 April 2019

The answers to question (1)(b) are set out in the table at Attachment A.

Values of appeals from ACT Revenue Office systems are based on the determined disputed amount of an appeal at time of lodgement, and may not reflect the final outcome. Figures may overlap across tax types due to related factors (such as, unimproved values relationship to rates and land tax) and between appeals and objections, as these are recorded separately but appeals relate to matters considered by objections.

Duty and Home Buyer Concession values are not available in a form that is readily retrievable from ACT Revenue Office systems without a significant diversion of resources.

(2) Value of objections from 2007-08 to 1 April 2019 and the objection outcome

The answers to questions (2) and (1)(a) are included in the table at Attachment B.

Data is unavailable for 2007-08 to 2009-10 as values were not systematically recorded on ACT Revenue Office systems before 1 July 2010. Duty and Home Buyer Concession values are not available in a form that is readily retrievable from ACT Revenue Office systems without a significant diversion of resources.

Values of objections from ACT Revenue Office systems are based on the determined disputed amount of an objection at time of lodgement, and may not reflect the final outcome. Figures may overlap across tax types due to related factors (such as, unimproved values relationship to rates and land tax) and between appeals and objections, as these are recorded separately but appeals relate to matters considered by objections.

(3) Value of appeals lodged from 2007-08 broken down by appeal outcome

Given the limited number of appeals by type and year, taxpayer information may be disclosed in responding to this question which would contravene obligations under Division 9.4 of the *Tax Administration Act 1999*.

(Copies of the attachments are available at the Chamber Support Office).

**Sport—ice rink
(Question No 2494)**

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) Was a report for a new ice-rink for Canberra release in December 2018; if so, when will construction commence and what is the expected completion date.
- (2) Will the Minister follow through on the 2016 election promise that construction will commence in this term of Government.

- (3) What communication has the Minister had with the current Phillip ice rink about their future and options for the site moving forward.
- (4) What communication activities are planned for the numerous competitors in ice sports

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Ice Sports Facility Options Analysis Report was released on 19 December 2018. The next step will involve an Expression of Interest process being undertaken by the ACT Government seeking interest from suitably qualified and experienced parties to design, construct, operate and maintain a new ice sports facility in the ACT.
- (2) The ACT Government has committed to undertake the proposed Expression of Interest (EOI) process in 2019.
- (3) The Minister has no direct contact. A central contact point has been established within Sport and Recreation in Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate to deal with any enquiries in relation to the proposed EOI process.
- (4) All communication regarding the ACT Ice Sports Facility Options Analysis Report has been channelled through the ACT Ice Sports Federation, which represents local ice sports organisations. Following completion of the Report, it was made publicly available on the Sport and Recreation website (www.sport.act.gov.au). The ACT Government will continue to engage with the ACT Ice Sports Federation throughout the Expression of Interest process.

Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders—housing (Question No 2496)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, upon notice, on 5 April 2019 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide an update on the status of the new housing complex for older Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders announced in the 2019-20 Budget.
- (2) Can the Minister provide an outline of the current usage rates and maintenance costs for the Mura Gunya complex.

Ms Berry: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Housing ACT submitted a Development Application for its second complex for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Older Persons in December 2018. This proposal is located in Ulverstone Street, Lyons and contains five units.

The original budget commitment was for \$4.488 million for up to 10 units. As such, Housing ACT has worked with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body to identify another site on which to construct a further five units. A site has been identified in Dickson, and a Development Application is likely to be submitted before the end of the financial year.

- (2) Mura Gunya has five units and as of 12 April 2019, four are tenanted. One has become vacant and will be reallocated to an applicant off the housing register. As per normal practice, the vacant property is currently with Programmed FM. When returned to Housing ACT, it will be allocated to an Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander applicant, aged 50 plus, from the priority housing register.

Since Mura Gunya site was built, Housing ACT have spent approximately \$45,900 on a range of services including cyclical common area horticulture and cleaning services, fire servicing, pest control and maintenance to units as required.

Transport Canberra—staffing (Question No 2497)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What is the breakdown of total approved leave by formal classification for all Transport Canberra employees by (a) Transport Canberra operations, (b) Transport Canberra Commercial, (c) Light Rail Stage 1 operations, (d) Light Rail Stage 1 construction and (e) Light Rail Stage 1 engineering.
- (2) Of the approved personal leave in relation to part (1), what percentage of personal leave can be attributed to stress.
- (3) What are the total costs that can be attributed to approved leave.
- (4) For leave as a percentage of total attendance hours.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) I have been advised by my Directorate that the information sought is not in an easily retrievable form, and that to collect and assemble the information sought solely for the purpose of answering the question would require considerable resources.
- (2) It is not mandatory to complete a reason for leave when recording personal leave. We are unable to answer this question.
- (3) There are 31 leave types that an employee may access, including annual, personal, long service leave and maternity leave. For the period 4 April 2018 to 3 April 2019, the total cost of approved leave was \$14,617,718.51.
- (4) For the period 4 April 2018 to 3 April 2019, leave (including annual, personal, long service leave and maternity leave) as a percentage of total attendance hours for all Transport Canberra staff was 17.92%. There were 1,824,218 total attendance hours during this period.

The 17.92% includes: annual leave 7.6% (approximately 2.58 weeks a year per employee); personal leave 5.44% (approximately 1.84 weeks per year per employee); and all other forms of leave 4.86% (equivalent to approximately 1.64 weeks per year per employee).

**ACTION bus service—patronage
(Question No 2498)**

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What was the average number of passenger arrivals (MyWay tap-ons) per week for the route 200 bus from Gungahlin to City, broken down by off-peak and peak times for (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (2) What was the average number of passenger arrivals (MyWay tap-ons) per month for the route 200 bus from Gungahlin to City, broken down by off-peak and peak times for (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (3) What was the average number of passenger departures (MyWay tap-ons) per week for the route 200 bus from Gungahlin to City for (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (4) How many student passenger departures (Student MyWay tap-ons) on average for the route 200 bus from Gungahlin to City, occurred per month broken down by hours between (a) 7 am-9 am and (b) 3 pm-5 pm for (i) 2017-18 and (ii) 2018-19 to date.
- (5) How many buses per month servicing route 200 were at full capacity (both standing and sitting) broken down by off-peak and peak times for (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (6) How many passengers were refused service per week due to the buses along the route 200 bus from Gungahlin to City being at or over capacity, broken down by off-peak and peak times for (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1-5) I have been advised by my directorate that the information sought would require us to divert resources from other priority activities required by government for the purpose of answering the question. To answer these questions would take in excess of 40 hours for one FTE.
- (6) This information is not recorded in a manner which would allow a response to this question.

**Access Canberra—working with vulnerable people check
(Question No 2499)**

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What was the average number of business days a working with vulnerable people card application took to process in (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (2) What is the number of times a working with vulnerable people card application was processed (a) in fewer business days than the average, (b) the average number of business days and (c) in more business days than the average, in (i) 2017-18 and (ii) 2018-19 to date.

- (3) What is the total number of (a) applications for working with vulnerable people cards and (b) working with vulnerable people cards issued, in (i) 2017-18 and (ii) 2018-19 to date.

Mr Ramsay: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1)
- a. 17 business days – (16.58 without rounding)
 - b. 13 business days – (12.70 without rounding)
- (2)
- a.
 - i. 19,263 (< 17 business days)
 - ii. 22,716 (< 13 business days)
 - b.
 - i. 696 (= 17 business days)
 - ii. 1,339 (= 13 business days)
 - c.
 - i. 8,587 (> 17 business days)
 - ii. 11,820 (> 13 business days)
- (3)
- a.
 - i. 42,159
 - ii. 34,984
 - b.
 - i. 29,189
 - ii. 31,738 (as at end of March 2019)

Vehicles—registration (Question No 2500)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

How many (a) trailers and (b) caravans were registered in the ACT in (i) 2016-17, (ii) 2017-18 and (iii) 2018-19 to date, broken down by weight category.

Mr Ramsay: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(a) Light Trailers (up to 4500kg):-

Weight Category	(i) 2016-17	(ii) 2017-18	(iii) 2018-to date (as at 11 April 2019)
Trailer registration fee, tare not exceeding 250 kg	27,322	26,804	26,446
Trailer registration fee, tare between 251 and 764 kg	7,751	7,918	8,175
Trailer registration fee, tare between 765 and 975 kg	703	762	825
Trailer registration fee, tare between 976 and 1154 kg	313	359	408
Trailer registration fee, tare between 1155 and 1504 kg	247	318	380
Trailer registration fee, tare between 1505 and 2499 kg	141	206	252
Trailer registration fee, tare between 2500 and 2504 kg	1	1	1
Trailer registration fee, tare between 2505 and 2794 kg	5	5	6

Weight Category	(i) 2016-17	(ii) 2017-18	(iii) 2018-to date (as at 11 April 2019)
Trailer registration fee, tare between 2795 and 3054 kg	1	3	4
Trailer registration fee, tare between 3055 and 3304 kg	3	3	3
Trailer registration fee, tare between 3305 and 3564 kg	0	0	2
Trailer registration fee, tare between 3565 and 3814 kg	2	1	0
Trailer registration fee, tare between 3815 and 4064 kg	2	2	2
Trailer registration fee, tare between 4065 and 4324 kg	3	3	3
Trailer registration fee, tare exceeding 4324 kg	2	2	2
Total	36,496	36,387	36,509

Heavy Trailers (more than 4500kg):-

Weight Category	(i) 2016-17	(ii) 2017-18	(iii) 2018-to date (as at 11 April 2019)
Registration fee – Dog Trailer – 2 axles	20	20	19
Registration fee – Dog Trailer – 3 axles	93	97	101
Registration fee – Dog Trailer – 3 axles	2	20	23
Registration fee – Dog Trailer – 4 axles	12	3	3
Registration fee – Lead Trailer – 2 axle	3	25	26
Registration fee – Lead Trailer – 3 axle	25	1	1
Registration fee – Lead Trailer – 3 axle	1	13	12
Registration fee – Pig Trailer – 1 axle	14	21	16
Registration fee – Pig Trailer – 2 axles	22	5	6
Registration fee – Pig Trailer – 3 axles	7	3	4
Registration fee – Semi Trailer – 1 axle	1	1	1
Registration fee – Semi Trailer – 2 axles	57	56	55
Registration fee – Semi Trailer – 2 axles	2	1	1
Registration fee – Semi Trailer – 3 axles	163	173	177
Registration fee – Semi Trailer – 3 axles	6	3	2
Registration fee – Semi Trailer – 4 axles	3	5	5
Registration fee – Converter/Low Loader Dolly – 2 axles	1	1	1
Total	432	448	453

(b) Caravans

Weight Category	(i) 2016-17	(ii) 2017-18	(iii) 2018-to date (as at 11 April 2019)
Trailer registration fee, tare not exceeding 250 kg	41	44	39
Trailer registration fee, tare between 251 and 764 kg	388	401	390
Trailer registration fee, tare between 765 and 975 kg	400	412	428
Trailer registration fee, tare between 976 and 1154 kg	370	379	402
Trailer registration fee, tare between 1155 and 1504 kg	529	581	585
Trailer registration fee, tare between 1505 and 2499 kg	901	974	1,036
Trailer registration fee, tare between 2500 and 2504 kg	1	2	2
Trailer registration fee, tare between 2505 and 2794 kg	60	88	90
Trailer registration fee, tare between 2795 and 3054 kg	16	25	27
Trailer registration fee, tare between 3055 and 3304 kg	4	3	6
Trailer registration fee, tare between 3305 and 3564 kg	0	1	0
Total	2,710	2,910	3,005

ACTION bus service—staffing (Question No 2501)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What is the number of staff employed under the ACTION Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017, as at 4 April 2019.
- (2) In relation to the staff identified in part (1), what is the number of staff employed by ACTION on a continuous basis for the timeframes of (a) 1 day to 1 year and 364 days, (b) 2 years to 4 years and 364 days, (c) 5 years to 9 years and 364 days, (d) 10 years to 14 years and 364 days, (e) 15 years to 19 years and 364 days, (f) 20 years to 24 years and 364 days, (g) 25 years to 29 years and 364 days, (h) 30 years to 34 years and 364 days, (i) 35 years to 39 years and 364 days, (j) 40 years to 44 years and 364 days, (k) 45 years to 49 years and 364 days and (l) 50 years and over.
- (3) In relation to the staff identified in part (1), what is the number of staff broken down by the grades of (a) administration services officer class, (b) senior officer (technical), (c) ACTION Transport officer, (d) bus operator (training), (e) bus operator, (f) APS store staff, (g) GSO workshop staff, (h) workshop staff (TO), (i) workshop apprentice, (j) special needs service, (j) GSO stores staff and (k) graduate administrative assistant.
- (4) Of those employed as bus operators as identified in part (3), how many have agreed to do weekend shifts following the commencement of Network 19.
- (5) Of the percentage of those who have agreed to do weekend shifts in relation to part (4), who are employed on a casual basis.
- (6) Of the number of those who have agreed to do weekend shifts in relation to part (4), what is the proportion of total bus operators.

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As of 4 April 2019, there are 1,032 (headcount) staff employed under the ACTION Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017.
- (2) The total length of service of staff in ACTION is listed below:

(a) 1 day to 1 year and 364 days	245
(b) 2 years to 4 years and 364 days	167
(c) 5 years to 9 years and 364 days	238
(d) 10 years to 14 years and 364 days	155
(e) 15 years to 19 years and 364 days	86
(f) 20 years to 24 years and 364 days	25
(g) 25 years to 29 years and 364 days	26
(h) 30 years to 34 years and 364 days	53
(i) 35 years to 39 years and 364 days	20
(j) 40 years to 44 years and 364 days	13
(k) 45 years to 49 years and 364 days	3
(l) 50 years and over	1

- (3) The total number of staff in this tables differs from Question 1, as it does not include staff on unpaid leave:

Q3 Staff Numbers by Grade	
Classification Category	Number of Staff
(a)-Administrative Services Officer Class	0
(b)-Senior Officers	0
(c)-General Service Officer	0
(d)-Technical Services Officer	0
(e)-Senior Officer (Technical)	4
(f)-ACTION Transport Officer	37
(g)-Bus Operator (Training)	66
(h)-Bus Operator	708
(i)-APS Store Staff	2
(j)-GSO Workshop Staff	101
(k)-Workshop Staff (TO)	6
(l)-Workshop Apprentice	10
(m)-Special Needs Service	38
(n)-GSO Stores Staff	5
(o)-Graduate Administrative Assistant	0
Grand Total	977

- (4), (5), (6) Transport Canberra is continuing to work with the bus drivers and the unions to ensure that there is adequate coverage to deliver weekend services.

In the first two weekends of the new network:

	Number of drivers volunteering to work	% of these drivers who were casuals
Saturday 4 May 2019	186	10.75%
Sunday 5 May 2019	208	9.62%
Saturday 11 May 2019	230	8.69%
Sunday 12 May 2019	186	10.75%

ACTION bus service—data (Question No 2502)

Miss C Burch asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 April 2019:

- (1) What is the total number of kilometres travelled by the entire bus fleet without carrying fare-paying passengers from (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (2) Of the total at part (1), what is the total number of kilometres travelled by the entire bus fleet that can be attributed to “dead running” from (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date.
- (3) What are the total costs attributed to “dead running” of the bus fleet from (a) 2017-18 and (b) 2018-19 to date

Ms Fitzharris: The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1-3) I have been advised by my directorate that the information sought would require us to divert resources from other priority activities required by government for the purpose of answering the question. To answer these questions would take in excess of 40 hours for one FTE.

Canberra—events
(Question No 2524)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Tourism and Special Events, upon notice, on 17 May 2019:

- (1) In relation to organic waste disposal at major events, and noting that the event held in Civic Square for the Comedy Festival was able to provide organic waste disposal bins, however, the majority of major events, such as the Multicultural Festival, Floriade and Enlighten do not provide these services, what is the reason that these events do not have organic waste recycling facilities available.
- (2) Can this service be available at future events.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The 2019 National Multicultural Festival offered stallholders the opportunity to opt in to a trial of organic waste disposal, however there was no take up of the trial by stall holders.

Events ACT places a large focus on minimising waste generation and maximising waste diversion. Organic waste bins are provided to all food vendors at Floriade and Enlighten. In 2018, over 8.4 tonnes of organic waste was collected at Floriade alone.

2. There are plans to expand the collection of organic waste at Floriade 2019 to include collection bins for front of house for patrons as well as food vendors. The 2020 National Multicultural Festival and Enlighten Festival will also offer organic waste collection for front and back of house.

National Multicultural Festival—funding
(Question No 2547)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 17 May 2019:

- (1) In relation to the 2019 Multicultural Festival grants for the Pacific Islander communities in the ACT, what was the reported detailed breakdown of expenditures from the \$4 000 grants funding received by the Pacific Island Showcase Association.
- (2) What was the reported detailed breakdown of expenditures from the \$4 000 grants funding received by the ACT Pacific Islands United Council?

Mr Steel: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Pacific Island Showcase Association applied for \$8000.00 in the 2018/19 National Multicultural Festival Grants and was granted \$4000.00 towards the cost to participate at the 2019 National Multicultural Festival.

- (2) The ACT Pacific Islands United Council applied for \$8000.00 in the 2018/19 National Multicultural Festival Grants and was granted \$4000.00 towards the cost to participate at the 2019 National Multicultural Festival.

The reported detailed breakdown of expenditures has not yet been submitted for either organisations. The acquittal for the 2019 Multicultural Festival grants is not due until 30 June 2019.

Questions without notice taken on notice

Disability services—specialist accommodation

Ms Stephen-Smith (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Ms Lawder on Tuesday, 2 April 2019*):

In response to the Member's questions, I can inform the Assembly:

- 1) The National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) has advised that six National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) participants in the ACT have Specialist Disability Accommodation (SDA) incorporated into their NDIS plans.

SDA funding is only provided to a small proportion of NDIS participants with extreme functional impairment or very high support needs who meet specific eligibility criteria. SDA funding under the NDIS is intended to stimulate investment in the development of new high-quality dwellings for use by eligible NDIS participants. It does not refer to the support services, but instead to the homes in which these services are delivered.

- 2) The NDIA has advised there are five dwellings enrolled as SDA in the ACT to date.

Canberra Health Services—unauthorised examinations

Ms Fitzharris (*in reply to a question by Mrs Kikkert on Tuesday, 2 April 2019*):

On 12 March 2019 the CEO Canberra Health Services, Women, Youth and Children Executive Director and Clinical Director met with staff to discuss their concerns. The CEO indicated that her expectation is that all staff report any concerns either via Riskman (ACT Health's incident notification and reporting system), with their manager or independently through the Health Service Commissioner.

Staff were asked during the forum if they had any specific issues or concerns they wished to raise.

Centenary Hospital for Women and Children—examinations policy

Ms Fitzharris (*in reply to a question by Mr Milligan on Wednesday, 3 April 2018*):

Having a midwife or chaperone present during vaginal examinations represents good practice. When patients/clients are being cared for in the health system they are often

at their most vulnerable. The *Intimate Body Care and or Examination of Patients or Clients by Health Care Workers Clinical Procedure 2017* references that healthcare workers should ensure they are aware of any cultural, religious beliefs or restrictions the patient/client may have which prohibits the intimate body care and/or examination being undertaken by a member of the opposite sex.

Canberra Health Services—consent for procedures

Ms Fitzharris (*in reply to a question by Mr Coe on Wednesday, 3 April 2019*):

Canberra Health Services Consent and Treatment Policy outlines staff obligations. There are three levels of consent outlined as the level of consent differs dependent on the procedure. All interventions, including vaginal examinations require written or verbal consent, depending on the clinical situation.

Canberra Health Services—unauthorised examinations

Ms Fitzharris (*in reply to supplementary questions by Mrs Jones and Mrs Dunne on Wednesday, 3 April 2019*):

- (1) The initial advice was received verbally, and the CEO advised me that at that time she was unaware of any complaints of this nature, however a review of complaints would be undertaken.
- (2) On 7 February 2019 in accordance with normal procedure, the Consumer Feedback and Engagement Team, forwarded this feedback to the:
 - Clinical Midwife Manager of the Birthing Suite;
 - Executive Officer;
 - Director of Nursing and Midwifery;
 - Assistant Director of Nursing and Midwifery; and
 - Clinical Director within the Division of Women, Youth and Children.

The Clinical Midwife Manager forwarded the feedback to all regular midwifery staff working in the Birthing unit at the time the email was sent.

I discussed this matter with the CEO of Canberra Health Services at an Executive briefing and she advised me that at that time she was unaware of any complaints of this nature. Following a review into Consumer Feedback, I was formally advised of five unsubstantiated complaints of this nature.

Parking—Palmerston

Mr Gentleman (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Mr Milligan on Thursday, 4 April 2019*):

The ACT Government is aware of the importance of adequate parking provision for the economic viability of popular local centres, such as Palmerston. The government is continuing to monitor parking supply and demand in this location. Upgrades to the car park at Palmerston shops, like all capital works projects, will be considered and prioritised against other funding priorities for Government.