



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

2012–2013–2014–2015–2016

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

No. 146

WEDNESDAY, 10 AUGUST 2016

1 The Assembly met at 10 a.m., pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker (Mrs Dunne) took the Chair and asked Members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

2 **JUSTICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY—STANDING COMMITTEE (LEGISLATIVE SCRUTINY ROLE)—ELECTION COMMITMENTS COSTING AMENDMENT BILL 2016—STATEMENT BY CHAIR**

Mr Doszpot (Chair), pursuant to standing order 246A, informed the Assembly that the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety (Legislative Scrutiny Role) had examined the Election Commitments Costing Amendment Bill 2016 and had no comment to make on it.

3 **LIGHT RAIL NETWORK PROJECT—PROPOSED TERMINATION OF CONTRACT**

Mr Hanson (Leader of the Opposition), pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly supports calls to cancel the \$1.78 billion tram and instead invest in better hospitals, better schools and better local services.

Debate ensued.

Ms Fitzharris (Minister for Transport Canberra and City Services), who had already spoken, by leave, moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

“(1) notes:

- (a) calculations show the compensation of terminating the light rail contract is estimated to be between \$220-\$280 million;
- (b) the Territory would forgo \$67 million in asset recycling initiative funding to the Commonwealth if light rail is not delivered;



- (c) cancelling light rail will create a minimum \$300 million deterioration in the forward estimates;
 - (d) industry has condemned tearing up the contract, which damages not only the ACT's, but Australia's reputation as a place to invest;
 - (e) Infrastructure Partnerships Australia, the Australian Industry Group and the Business Council of Australia have all called on the Canberra Liberals to change their position to avoid sovereign risk;
 - (f) the Federal Liberals have described the Canberra Liberals' position as economic lunacy;
 - (g) the Canberra Liberals' plan to tear up the light rail contract means there will be less money available for hospitals, schools and local services over the forward estimates, unlike the financing of light rail which provides for the cost to be shared across generations that use it;
 - (h) the 2016-17 ACT Budget includes a record investment in schools and hospitals; and
 - (i) EY estimates that 3500 direct and indirect jobs will be supported during the construction phase of Canberra Light Rail Stage 1, and these jobs are under threat if the Canberra Liberals tear up the contract; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to:
- (a) reject calls to tear up contracts;
 - (b) continue to deliver an integrated transport network; and
 - (c) continue to ensure Canberrans have access to high quality education, health care and local services.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the amendment agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 7		NOES, 6	
Mr Barr	Ms Fitzharris	Mr Doszpot	Ms Lawder
Ms Berry	Mr Gentleman	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	
Mr Corbell		Mrs Jones	

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
 - (a) calculations show the compensation of terminating the light rail contract is estimated to be between \$220-\$280 million;
 - (b) the Territory would forgo \$67 million in asset recycling initiative funding to the Commonwealth if light rail is not delivered;
 - (c) cancelling light rail will create a minimum \$300 million deterioration in the forward estimates;

- (d) industry has condemned tearing up the contract, which damages not only the ACT's, but Australia's reputation as a place to invest;
 - (e) Infrastructure Partnerships Australia, the Australian Industry Group and the Business Council of Australia have all called on the Canberra Liberals to change their position to avoid sovereign risk;
 - (f) the Federal Liberals have described the Canberra Liberals' position as economic lunacy;
 - (g) the Canberra Liberals' plan to tear up the light rail contract means there will be less money available for hospitals, schools and local services over the forward estimates, unlike the financing of light rail which provides for the cost to be shared across generations that use it;
 - (h) the 2016-17 ACT Budget includes a record investment in schools and hospitals; and
 - (i) EY estimates that 3500 direct and indirect jobs will be supported during the construction phase of Canberra Light Rail Stage 1, and these jobs are under threat if the Canberra Liberals tear up the contract; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to:
- (a) reject calls to tear up contracts;
 - (b) continue to deliver an integrated transport network; and
 - (c) continue to ensure Canberrans have access to high quality education, health care and local services.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

4 GLEBE PARK LAND ACQUISITION

Mr Coe, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
- (a) regarding a block of land adjacent to Glebe Park (City Block 24, Section 65), that:
 - (i) in response to a question by then MLA, Ms Le Couteur, on 22 June 2011, the then Minister for Planning, Mr Corbell, said “It is not permitted to be used for residential development. The government does not support its use for residential development. The government will not consider any change to the Territory Plan that permits residential development or indeed any other development beyond that which has already been granted under the lease ... The lease sets out very clearly what can and cannot occur on that land. The fact is that, in relation to this particular site, there are very limited uses available for the leaseholder. They were aware of that when they purchased the lease, and they now have obligations under that lease to maintain the land in such a way, including in relation to its landscape, so it can continue to be enjoyed by those who also enjoy the formal designated Glebe Park area”;

- (ii) the previous leaseholders had a development condition (Clause 3a) within the Crown Lease requiring commencement of the erection of a parkland within the lease at a cost of not less than the sum of one million dollars within 12 months of the lease commencement and completion of the said development within 36 months of lease commencement;
- (iii) Mr Barr signed the Planning and Development (Land Acquisition Policy Framework) Direction 2014 (No. 1) on 14 June 2014 which stated “The Land Acquisition Policy Framework provides the principles that are to govern the exercise of the Land Development Agency (LDA) functions under the *Planning and Development Act 1997* ... The framework is to enable the LDA to pursue business opportunities for the acquisition of land available on the market ... All proposed acquisitions are to be assessed against the principles and associated tests provided in this Land Acquisition Policy Framework. All tests must be followed for an acquisition ... [acquisitions] below \$5 million – agreement by the LDA Board with advice to the Minister for Economic Development or the Minister responsible for administering Chapter 4 of the *Planning and Development Act 1997*”;
- (iv) the ACT Government received an “Amended Valuation Report”, dated August 2014, that valued the block at \$950 000 to \$1 050 000;
- (v) the ACT Government subsequently received a “Valuation Advice”, dated May 2015, that gave a valuation recommendation of \$3 600 000 to \$3 800 000;
- (vi) the LDA Board meeting of 27 August 2015 had an agenda item “Land Acquisition Policy Framework Interpretation” and resolved that “Land acquisitions constituting new land development opportunities outside the LDA’s core business of delivering the Indicative Land Release Program to be subject to the Land Acquisition Policy Framework”;
- (vii) the ACT Government acquired the 12 335m² block in September 2015;
- (viii) the Chief Minister, Mr Barr, told the Assembly on 24 September 2015 that “My understanding is that the Land Development Agency, through its strategic acquisitions capability, has entered into negotiations. I am not certain yet as to whether those have been finalised; I will take that part of the question on notice”;
- (ix) an LDA official told a committee hearing on 5 November 2015 regarding property acquisitions “With Glebe Park, again, that was classified as a strategic acquisition for a number of different reasons”;
- (x) later in the same hearing, an LDA official stated that rather than being a strategic acquisition, the Glebe Park purchase was a project based acquisition;

- (xi) in a response to a question on notice to the Standing Committee on Planning, Environment and Territory and Municipal Services (Question No. 1), Mr Barr said on 23 November 2015 that the purchase was a “business as usual” purchase;
 - (xii) on 4 August 2016, Mr Barr said regarding the authority for the purchase “The board provided a delegation to the Chief Executive Officer of the Land Development Agency in relation to the city to the lake project”;
 - (xiii) on 3 August 2016, Mr Barr said that he is not aware of Aquis having any rights or options to City Block 24, Section 65;
 - (xiv) on 4 August 2016, Mr Barr said “No, the government purchased the block primarily for the purpose of stormwater management”;
 - (xv) the price paid for the block was \$4 180 235.31 and was calculated on the basis that 122 units would be built; and
 - (xvi) the Government has stated that the LDA Board was only informed of the purchase after the purchase was made;
- (2) further notes:
- (a) the Land Acquisition Policy Framework makes no mention of any other provision to purchase land;
 - (b) until the LDA Board Meeting of 27 August 2015, it appears that the only document governing acquisitions was the Land Acquisition Policy Framework; and
 - (c) it appears the LDA has developed their own mechanism to purchase land without adhering to the Land Acquisition Policy Framework direction; and
- (3) calls on the Government to provide to the Assembly by the last sitting day of this Assembly:
- (a) the reason the higher of the two valuations was accepted;
 - (b) the reason why a third valuation was not sought, given the large variance in the first two valuations;
 - (c) the reason why a valuation based on residential development was accepted despite the fact that the Government has stated that the site would not be used for such a purpose;
 - (d) the reason why the Government did not pursue a compulsory acquisition through the *Lands Acquisition Act 1994*;
 - (e) the details of the stated delegation allowing for the acquisition;
 - (f) whether the former leaseholder had complied with their previous investment requirements;
 - (g) the date the Minister or his office was first informed of the intention to purchase the block and the date the Minister or his office was advised that the purchase had been made;
 - (h) the rights or options that Aquis have on the block;

- (i) the meeting dates where Aquis and the ACT Government or their representatives discussed development potential on this block;
- (j) the current policy document which is being used to determine when the Land Acquisition Policy Framework applies and when business as usual acquisitions can be made;
- (k) the policy document in place at the time of the acquisition used to determine when the Land Acquisition Policy Framework applies and when business as usual acquisitions can be made;
- (l) the dates the LDA Board approved the policies listed in parts (3)(j) and (k);
- (m) the evidence to support that the LDA can purchase land separate to the Land Acquisition Policy Framework;
- (n) the plans or concept design for the stormwater infrastructure;
- (o) the intended date to start construction of the stormwater infrastructure;
- (p) the original City to the Lake Project Plan and the date it was approved by the LDA Board;
- (q) the original or revised City to the Lake Project Plan which included City Block 24, Section 65 and the date it was approved by the LDA Board;
- (r) was a probity adviser used in conjunction to purchase of the acquisition;
- (s) were there any conflicts of interest perceived or real by staff or board members relating to the acquisition that were declared or undeclared;
- (t) the date the LDA Board was presented with the two valuations for the block;
- (u) when did the Chief Financial Officer sign off on the purchase; and
- (v) information detailing the alignment of the purchase with ACT Planning Strategy or any other relevant Government strategic spatial planning documents.

Mr Barr (Chief Minister) moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

- (1) notes that:
 - (a) the Land Development Agency (LDA) purchased Block 24 Section 65 City to relocate the Coranderrk Street water control pond as part of the City to the Lake project;
 - (b) improvements to stormwater capacity in the inner north are crucial as population in the catchment grows;
 - (c) early studies informing the City to the Lake project first identified Glebe Park as the preferred option for a relocated pond in 2013;
 - (d) the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the LDA authorised payment for the land on 5 September 2015;
 - (e) the CEO of the LDA authorised this payment under the financial delegations delegated to the CEO by the LDA Board under the *Financial Management Act 1996*;

- (f) this delegation was established by the LDA Board on 4 July 2003 under the then *Planning and Land Act 2002*;
 - (g) under these delegations, the Chief Financial Officer is not required to sign off on transactions;
 - (h) the CEO of the LDA has assured the Government and the Assembly this transaction was conducted in accordance with his financial delegation, which requires LDA funds to be used efficiently, ethically and effectively;
 - (i) the LDA acts commercially and negotiates on a commercial basis, using valuations as a guide to inform negotiations;
 - (j) the CEO of the LDA judged two valuations on the land were sufficient as the negotiated price for the land fell within the range of the valuations;
 - (k) where possible, the LDA pursues commercial negotiations in good faith before exploring compulsory acquisition, reducing legal risks and keeping legal costs low;
 - (l) no other entity, including the casino operator, has any right or option over this land, and the LDA has made no offer to sell the land to any party;
 - (m) none of the LDA Board members nor any LDA staff have declared a conflict of interest over this transaction;
 - (n) the Project Control Board—made up of the Directors-General from Transport Canberra and City Services, Economic Development, and the Environment and Planning Directorate, the Deputy Chief Executive of the LDA, the Under Treasurer, an LDA Board representative, and an external specialist on development and project finance, James Cain—and the Government Solicitor provide advice on probity for the project;
 - (o) the City to the Lake project has been subject to scrutiny and oversight by the Assembly and its committees; and
 - (p) the Auditor-General has informed the Assembly she is conducting a performance audit on this transaction, and will report her findings to the Assembly; and
- (2) looks forward to receiving the Auditor-General’s performance audit of this transaction in due course.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 8		NOES, 7	
Mr Barr	Ms Fitzharris	Mr Coe	Mrs Jones
Ms Berry	Mr Gentleman	Mr Doszpot	Ms Lawder
Ms Burch	Mr Hinder	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Mr Corbell	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) notes that:

- (a) the Land Development Agency (LDA) purchased Block 24 Section 65 City to relocate the Coranderrk Street water control pond as part of the City to the Lake project;
 - (b) improvements to stormwater capacity in the inner north are crucial as population in the catchment grows;
 - (c) early studies informing the City to the Lake project first identified Glebe Park as the preferred option for a relocated pond in 2013;
 - (d) the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the LDA authorised payment for the land on 5 September 2015;
 - (e) the CEO of the LDA authorised this payment under the financial delegations delegated to the CEO by the LDA Board under the *Financial Management Act 1996*;
 - (f) this delegation was established by the LDA Board on 4 July 2003 under the then *Planning and Land Act 2002*;
 - (g) under these delegations, the Chief Financial Officer is not required to sign off on transactions;
 - (h) the CEO of the LDA has assured the Government and the Assembly this transaction was conducted in accordance with his financial delegation, which requires LDA funds to be used efficiently, ethically and effectively;
 - (i) the LDA acts commercially and negotiates on a commercial basis, using valuations as a guide to inform negotiations;
 - (j) the CEO of the LDA judged two valuations on the land were sufficient as the negotiated price for the land fell within the range of the valuations;
 - (k) where possible, the LDA pursues commercial negotiations in good faith before exploring compulsory acquisition, reducing legal risks and keeping legal costs low;
 - (l) no other entity, including the casino operator, has any right or option over this land, and the LDA has made no offer to sell the land to any party;
 - (m) none of the LDA Board members nor any LDA staff have declared a conflict of interest over this transaction;
 - (n) the Project Control Board—made up of the Directors-General from Transport Canberra and City Services, Economic Development, and the Environment and Planning Directorate, the Deputy Chief Executive of the LDA, the Under Treasurer, an LDA Board representative, and an external specialist on development and project finance, James Cain—and the Government Solicitor provide advice on probity for the project;
 - (o) the City to the Lake project has been subject to scrutiny and oversight by the Assembly and its committees; and
 - (p) the Auditor-General has informed the Assembly she is conducting a performance audit on this transaction, and will report her findings to the Assembly; and
- (2) looks forward to receiving the Auditor-General’s performance audit of this transaction in due course.”—

be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 8		NOES, 7	
Mr Barr	Ms Fitzharris	Mr Coe	Mrs Jones
Ms Berry	Mr Gentleman	Mr Doszpot	Ms Lawder
Ms Burch	Mr Hinder	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Mr Corbell	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

5 EMERGENCY SERVICES AGENCY

Mrs Jones, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
 - (a) the importance of the emergency services to the ACT;
 - (b) importance of the reliability of the 000 call centre and the importance of public confidence in the service;
 - (c) the importance of staff morale in these life-saving fields;
 - (d) the importance of local knowledge in bushfire preparedness and capability planning; and
 - (e) the importance of the Government having the confidence of employees in this vital service; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to:
 - (a) create a culture of confidence in the Emergency Services Agency (ESA);
 - (b) take action to ensure ESA employees know they are equipped to undertake their role; and
 - (c) ensure ESA employees feel fully supported by the Government.

Mr Corbell (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) moved the following amendment: Omit paragraph (2), substitute:

- “(2) calls on the ACT Government to continue to:
- (a) create a culture of confidence in the Emergency Services Agency (ESA);
 - (b) take action to ensure ESA employees know they are equipped to undertake their role; and
 - (c) ensure ESA employees feel fully supported by the Government.”.

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

6 QUESTIONS

Questions without notice were asked.

7 EMERGENCY SERVICES AGENCY

The order of the day having been read for the resumption of the debate on the motion of Mrs Jones, and on the amendment moved by Mr Corbell (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (*see* entry 5)—

Debate resumed.

Question—That the amendment agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 8		NOES, 7	
Mr Barr	Mr Corbell	Mr Coe	Mrs Jones
Ms Berry	Mr Gentleman	Mr Doszpot	Ms Lawder
Dr Bourke	Mr Hinder	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
 - (a) the importance of the emergency services to the ACT;
 - (b) importance of the reliability of the 000 call centre and the importance of public confidence in the service;
 - (c) the importance of staff morale in these life-saving fields;
 - (d) the importance of local knowledge in bushfire preparedness and capability planning; and
 - (e) the importance of the Government having the confidence of employees in this vital service; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to continue to:
 - (a) create a culture of confidence in the Emergency Services Agency (ESA);
 - (b) take action to ensure ESA employees know they are equipped to undertake their role; and
 - (c) ensure ESA employees feel fully supported by the Government.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

8 MARRIAGE EQUALITY

Ms Burch, pursuant to notice, moved—That:

- (1) this Assembly:
 - (a) reaffirms its support for marriage equality;
 - (b) supports a free, positive and respectful discussion on marriage equality in the Canberra community;
 - (c) confirms its position that marriage equality is best achieved through a free vote of all Federal members and senators; and
 - (d) notes that a national plebiscite on marriage equality remains the current policy of the Liberal National Party Coalition, and consequently may be the only way to achieve marriage equality in this Federal parliamentary term;
- (2) this Assembly further calls on the Australian Parliament to:
 - (a) consider the issue of marriage equality as a priority when sittings resume; and

- (b) resolve the issue through a free vote of all Members of Parliament; and
- (3) if the Federal Parliament determines to hold a marriage equality plebiscite, the Assembly calls on the ACT Government to:
 - (a) demonstrate that the ACT is Australia’s most lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and questioning (LGBTIQ) friendly jurisdiction by supporting the case for marriage equality;
 - (b) actively engage in the local and national plebiscite debate;
 - (c) support ACT Government employees participating in constructive, respectful and informed discussions on the issue; and
 - (d) support local LGBTIQ communities throughout the plebiscite process, particularly during the SpringOut Pride Festival in October and November 2016.

Mr Hanson (Leader of the Opposition) moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

- “(1) notes that a national plebiscite on same sex marriage is due to be conducted by the Federal Government later this year or in early 2017;
- (2) supports a free and respectful discussion on marriage in the Canberra community; and
- (3) respects that all individuals, including MLAs and ACT Government employees, should be free to exercise their own free vote in the plebiscite.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 7		NOES, 8	
Mr Coe	Mrs Jones	Mr Barr	Mr Corbell
Mr Doszpot	Ms Lawder	Ms Berry	Mr Gentleman
Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall	Dr Bourke	Mr Hinder
Mr Hanson		Ms Burch	Mr Rattenbury

And so it was negatived.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put and passed.

9 HEARING AWARENESS WEEK

Ms Lawder, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes that:
 - (a) Hearing Awareness Week is hosted by the members of the Deafness Forum of Australia and is an annual event to raise awareness in the community of hearing impairment and how to protect our hearing;
 - (b) Hearing Awareness Week runs each year in the last full week of August and it runs this year from 20 to 27 August;
 - (c) one in six Australians have a hearing health issue;
 - (d) hearing loss is projected to increase to one in every four Australians by 2050 with an ageing population; and

- (e) people over the age of 65 do not have access to the National Disability Insurance Scheme; and
- (2) calls on the ACT Government to:
 - (a) improve communication accessibility for Canberrans especially with respect to ACT Government material;
 - (b) improve employment opportunities for people with disability in the ACT Public Service, including those who are deaf or hard of hearing or have a chronic disorder of the ear; and
 - (c) consider methods to raise community awareness of hearing loss and ways to avoid it.

Debate ensued.

Question—put and passed.

10 SPORTING AND RECREATION FACILITIES—MAINTENANCE

Mr Doszpot, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
 - (a) the 2016-2017 Budget shows that funding for sport and recreation continues to decline in real terms; and
 - (b) that this is in spite of ground hire charges being increased significantly, the condition of ovals deteriorating and grounds often closed at critical times of the season; and
- (2) calls on the Government to:
 - (a) address the deteriorating conditions at a number of our local ovals;
 - (b) work with local sporting clubs to better understand their needs including timing of grounds shutdowns and playing surfaces; and
 - (c) commit to delivering real support to local clubs and local teams.

Ms Berry (Minister for Sport and Recreation) moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

- “(1) notes:
- (a) the ongoing investments of the ACT Government to support sport and recreation in Canberra, including operational and infrastructure funding for community sporting organisations;
 - (b) the specific investments in the 2016-2017 Budget of \$1.8 million for a sportsground irrigation and maintenance funding boost and \$1.1 million for community sporting infrastructure and asset maintenance;
 - (c) that the ACT Government currently subsidises community use of government-owned sportsgrounds at the rate of 84 per cent and that 16 per cent cost recovery is significantly below the 20 per cent benchmark generally applied in other jurisdictions; and
 - (d) the challenges for sportsground maintenance presented by climatic conditions in the ACT; and
- (2) calls on the Government to:

- (a) continue to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the current approach to sportsground bookings and maintenance; and
- (b) work actively with local sporting clubs around awareness and planning for scheduled ground closures.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

AYES, 8		NOES, 7	
Ms Berry	Ms Fitzharris	Mr Coe	Mrs Jones
Dr Bourke	Mr Gentleman	Mr Dospot	Ms Lawder
Ms Burch	Mr Hinder	Mrs Dunne	Mr Wall
Mr Corbell	Mr Rattenbury	Mr Hanson	

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

- (1) notes:
 - (a) the ongoing investments of the ACT Government to support sport and recreation in Canberra, including operational and infrastructure funding for community sporting organisations;
 - (b) the specific investments in the 2016-2017 Budget of \$1.8 million for a sportsground irrigation and maintenance funding boost and \$1.1 million for community sporting infrastructure and asset maintenance;
 - (c) that the ACT Government currently subsidises community use of government-owned sportsgrounds at the rate of 84 per cent and that 16 per cent cost recovery is significantly below the 20 per cent benchmark generally applied in other jurisdictions; and
 - (d) the challenges for sportsground maintenance presented by climatic conditions in the ACT; and
- (2) calls on the Government to:
 - (a) continue to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the current approach to sportsground bookings and maintenance; and
 - (b) work actively with local sporting clubs around awareness and planning for scheduled ground closures.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

11 ADJOURNMENT NEGATIVED

It being approximately 6 p.m.—The question was proposed—That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mr Gentleman (Manager of Government Business) requiring the question to be put forthwith without debate—

Question—put and negatived.

12 EXECUTIVE BUSINESS—PRECEDENCE

Ordered—That Executive business be called on forthwith.

13 APPROPRIATION BILL 2016-2017

The Assembly resumed further consideration at the detail stage.

Detail Stage

Schedule 1—Appropriations—Proposed expenditure—

Consideration resumed on Part 1.9—Environment and Planning Directorate—
Debate continued.

Proposed expenditure agreed to.

Part 1.10—Health Directorate—debated and agreed to.

Part 1.11—Housing ACT—debated and agreed to.

Part 1.12—Icon Water Limited—debated and agreed to.

Part 1.13—Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission—debated and agreed to.

Part 1.14—Justice and Community Safety Directorate—debated.

Debate adjourned (Mr Rattenbury—Minister for Justice and Consumer Affairs) and the resumption of the debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.

13 ADJOURNMENT

Mr Gentleman (Manager of Government Business) moved—That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Debate ensued.

Mr Gentleman, by leave, was granted an extension of time.

Question—put and passed.

And then the Assembly, at 10:21 p.m., adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

MEMBERS' ATTENDANCE: All Members were present at some time during the sitting.

Tom Duncan
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly