

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Mick Gentleman MLA

Additional Comments to the Appropriation Bill 2006-07

1. Introduction

1.1 The 2006 Budget Estimates process has been established to scrutinise government and the decisions that are made during the Budget Process. This year many of the issues raised by the opposition and cross bench that appear to be out of context with the budget papers and answers provided during the Estimates hearings process. We as Government members are part of the Estimate Committee hearings and deliberation to scrutinise the Government and represent the community that has elected us.

1.2 The Estimates Committee has been established to examine the effects of the 2006-2007 budget and the process of how decisions have been made.

1.3 These additional comments have been put forward by Mr Gentleman so as to bring the actions of those on the Estimates Committee who have used the process to publicise a political agenda rather than specifically scrutinise the budget.

2. Code of Conduct

2.1 The Recommendations made by the Committee and agreed to by a majority of members have seen Mr Gentleman work to address some of the unfair comments made in the reporting process.

2.2 As a member on this Estimates Committee there was, to my knowledge, no insults or time wasting behaviour that made it difficult to scrutinise the Minister or his/her representatives.

2.3 There were many questions taken and answered by the relevant Minister or his departmental advisor. There were well over 400 questions taken on notice and answered within the allocated time. This was the highest number of questions taken on notice of any Estimates Committee in the history of the ACT Legislative Assembly.

2.4 It has been quite an interesting process being involved with Mr Smyth in the deliberations over the Estimates Committee Report. There have been recommendations about the Ministers' conduct within the Estimates Hearings. I would like to add that being in Opposition must bring with it a loss of memory. In Hansard there were many references to opposition members when in government wasting time and being deliberately facetious.

3 Staff Number Discrepancies

3.1 The Estimates Committee held many hearings in which Ministers attended with their Departmental advisors. There were questions asked by Committee members and non-Committee members in regards to the announcement of job cuts to the ACT Public sector. Many of the questions asked were answered during the hearings. The Ministers and their officials were conscious to answer all questions asked to the best of their ability and knowledge.

3.2 Questions raised by Mr Smyth in the hearings to the Chief Minister and Mr Mike Harris in regards to clarification of the processes used to determine the reductions in size of the number of staff across the ACT Public Sector were given clear answers. Mr Harris gave clear and concise answers in relation to these questions. Mr Harris responded by saying;

Thank you, Chief Minister. My understanding of the numbers in the budget papers is that the budget papers deal with budget funded staff numbers. As the Chief Minister has indicated, the changed administrative arrangements bring a number of staff, particularly in statutory authorities, which will no longer be statutory authorities, which were not in the budget context last year into the budget context. An example is ACTION. I do not have a particular breakdown in front of me, but I can certainly provide that.

Nobody has actually said exactly 500, and the answer to your question will depend upon how many actually leave. Every chief executive makes an assessment about how to manage his or her budget bottom line. One of the mechanisms available to us is staff reduction, obviously. The fewer staff we can reduce, the better off we will be in terms of delivering service. I cannot answer your question until I have been through the process and determined exactly who and where and when people leave.

3.3 There were some discrepancies in the wording of Mr Smyth's question that led to the confusion as to how Mr Harris and the Chief Minister correctly answered questions raised by Mr Smyth.

3.4 Mr Smyth phrased his questions so as to mislead and generally set out to make the Minister and Mr Harris give answers that were mixed.

3.5 Mr Smyth asked questions both in the hearing and then again as questions on notice, in relation to the Chief Minister's Department. These questions were quite clearly answered. In transcript of the Estimates hearings from 22 June 2006 Mr Harris answered that there could be around 500 jobs lost across the whole of the ACT Public Sector. The Chief Minister was then asked questions on notice in regards to the numbers of staff cuts in only the Chief Minister's Department. Chief Minister Stanhope answered these questions fully.

3.6 Mr Smyth has used the Estimates Committee hearings and meetings as a chance to mislead the other members of the committee and not always give true and accurate accounts of questions raised during hearings and Estimate meetings.

3.7 It has been apparent that the Chief Minister has provided the Estimates Committee with a full and accurate explanation of the figures for staff reductions across the Chief Minister's Department, along with the comprehensive account given by Mr Harris during the Estimates hearings of the budgetary process involved with Departmental heads and how they were given a budget bottom line to stick to and follow. It is therefore not necessary to support recommendations 7 and 8 of the Estimates Committee Report.

4. Government strategy

4.1 There were a number of issues raised during the Estimates hearings in regards to the transfer of some parts of ACT Government services to be combined with other departments. This caused some additional questions raised by all members of the Estimates Committee.

4.2 Many members of the Committee raised concerns over the shared services issues and were more than satisfied with the answers that were given to the Committee as a whole.

4.3 Many of the recommendations by the Estimates Committee included the reintroduction of boards, Committees and Programs that will attract a further cost or reduced cost saving anticipated.

4.4 As the Ministers have provided the Committee with explanations as to the cost savings of the dissolution of many Committees, Boards and Programs, there is no need for support of a recommendation for further expenditure where a financial source has not been identified.

4.5 Recommendation 10 will not be agreed to.

5 The ACTEW Corporation

5.1 During Estimates Hearings there were no questions raised in relation to the ownership and clarity about the Googong Dam. There were issues raised in relation to the supply of water to NSW settlements. There were some issues relating to the clarity of management for the Googong catchment area, these included which government department has management over the area.

5.2 Mr Smyth asked many questions in relation to water issues but I am yet to find the questions asked by Mr Smyth or other committee members in relation to Googong Dam. There were questions within the Hansard in relation to the Lower Cotter catchment, but

there were no questions in relation to Googong Dam. This is further evidence that the report that is to be tabled has gross discrepancies within it.

6 After extensive research of the footnoted transcript in regards to questions relating to water, there were questions asked about the Lower Cotter catchment and there was mention of Googong but no direct questions relating to Googong Dam;

MR GENTLEMAN: My question is for Actew but it is off the beginning of Mr Pratt's question and it goes to the second-last-dot point on the rehabilitation of the Lower Cotter. Can you tell us what work Actew has been doing down there on rehabilitation and can you address the erosion problems that have been raised?

Mr Costello: I will ask Mr Knee, who is the person responsible in Actew for dealing with the catchment remediation issues, to speak. Just quickly on the fire and the prescribed burn up there, clearly the mistakes that were made have not had an adverse impact on the water supply there yet. We test the water all the time. There is no increased turbidity there that would create a problem. It is true that if we have heavy rain up there, having had a burn there, it will probably have an impact. But the impact a heavy downpour would have in the area that has just been burnt adds nothing to the impact a heavy downpour would have as a result of what happened in the fire in 2003. I am trying to put it in context. The real dangers up there come to us from the very bad things that happened in 2003 and to some extent up in the Bendora and Corin, of course. So heavy rain—very heavy downpours—are going to have an impact regardless of whether the burn had happened. That is why we are trying to do the best we can. Ross here might tell you of some of the things we are trying to do up there to ameliorate that.

Mr Knee: A major risk we have in the Cotter catchment is from sediment movement. As Dr Cooper said, we have identified the areas of highest risk, high sediment movement, and they are mainly roads, run-off from roads, bringing the gravels on the roads into the waterways. So we are closing as many roads as we can. We are also putting in culverts—where natural stream flows across the land are crossing the roads and eroding the roads—and gabion structures, which are stabilising the landform around the roads and culverts. We are also putting in sediment basins, which collect any sediment that does run off the land, and also putting in wetlands which are basically a final filter from any water that runs off, and sediment is collected in the sediment ponds and they are filtered out through the wetlands. We are also helping Environment ACT with any vegetation of native grasses or native trees and shrubs.

DR FOSKEY: I guess in a way this issue goes to governance and management in a sense. I gather that Actew has a role in water catchment, which is to look after the water, but Environment ACT has a role, and it looks like the emergency section, whatever it is called now, has a role. I am wondering about governance in relation to the Cotter and those rivers within our system and how it works. I note that you are working on these issues across the border with the Googong and the Murrumbidgee catchment areas as well. So I would like you to address the issue of governance in those two aspects, please, and how it helps and hinders your aims.

Mr Costello: The question of governance is a matter for the government to decide, not Actew. We can play our part in it.

DR FOSKEY: But you know what goes on. You can tell me, I guess. That is what I want to know: what happens?

MR PRATT: Perhaps the Chief Minister can answer that.

Mr Costello: I think it is a more appropriate question for the government to answer. The government's arrangements are for the government; not me and not for Actew.

DR FOSKEY: But I'm addressing the issues here. It is appropriate to talk about it now, chair, because it is about Actew.

Mr Costello: I am not saying that, but the question of what governance arrangements will apply to the catchments, is by definition a matter for government.

MR PRATT: The co-ordination of four agencies is probably for Actew.

Mr Costello: It is not my decision to say how we will co-ordinate work.

MR SMYTH: Does Actew own the catchment?

Mr Costello: No.

MR SMYTH: Does Actew have direct control of the catchment?

Mr Costello: No.

Mr Stanhope: No. The land manager is the Department of Territory and Municipal Services. Until now it has been a function pursued by Environment ACT as part of the Chief Minister's Department. Over the past 18 months we have pursued the question of an ongoing or a permanent governance arrangement for the management of the Cotter and all other catchments within the territory, including the Googong catchment, which of course is in New South Wales. So, there are two parts to the question—Googong and the Googong catchment. As you are aware, we believe it was an accident at the time of self-government that the ownership of Googong was not transferred to the ACT government. We are in the process now of negotiating to a point where that particular issue will, we believe, be regularised. That of itself is not particularly relevant, but, in relation to the suite of actions that have been undertaken in Googong and the Googong catchment, it is. One of the steps that are currently being taken in relation to Googong is the transfer of ownership of the dam to the territory. We are, through the cross-border water arrangements MOU we have negotiated, entering into new management protocols with New South Wales in relation to the better management of the Googong catchment. One of the serious issues that we face in relation to that catchment—other than the fact that it has been affected by something of a rain shadow in recent years and the thing simply refuses to fill—is that the catchment is, and has been, significantly affected by rural residential development within its boundaries. It has not been, I think in the view of ACT authorities, managed as appropriately as it might. But through the cross-border negotiations and agreements we have concluded in recent times, that is an issue which we now will address with New South Wales in relation to the responsibility of New South Wales to allow the appropriate management of that catchment, which, of course, is in New South Wales, although we accept responsibility for the foreshore. Those are issues that have been pursued in relation to the Googong catchment and enhance acknowledgement of individual jurisdiction responsibilities for Googong. In relation to Cotter, I think you are aware that somewhere in the order of 18 or so months ago—Dr Cooper may be able assist me in relation to this—I appointed Professor Gary Jones of the eWater CRC to head a catchment management group which included a number of other experts, including Mr Costello, to advise on issues in relation to the management and to provide some recommendations for a permanent governance regime for our Cotter catchment. In relation to the ongoing implementation of governance arrangements, I will defer to Dr Cooper. My memory is failing a little.

Dr Cooper: Could I just put this in context. When we look at governance arrangements over catchments in jurisdictions, we look at the number of players involved. Around Googong you have a far larger number of players. Around the lower Cotter catchment, one thing the government has done is brought together the two land managers. Previously we had parks and conservation and we had forestry. Those two land managers managed the lower Cotter catchment and the entire Cotter catchment. The government brought those two land managers together. In that process we also had Professor Jones's group advising us, and some options have been put up for the government to consider. Also, in considering that, the context in which those governance arrangements now will be considered is different from when it started 18 months ago because of the merger of the parks and conservation and forestry agents. The other thing we have done, as the land manager, is work under the strategic bushfire management plan. That is also quite clear, and we now have with Actew a deed of agreement about how we go about the restoration works there. Also set up during that time has been a high-level group involving Actew, ESA and the conservation and land management group, which is now the merger of those two other land managers plus wildlife for search and monitoring. So, we have a system at the moment where communication is quite robust and integrated.

- 6.1 In light of information that has failed to deliver what has was discussed within the report it is with strong opinion that recommendation 13 is not agreed to.

6 Emergency Services communications and projects.

- 6.1 With the cessation of the Emergency Services Authority as a statutory authority and the inclusion of the administrative and financial functions to be incorporated in JACS the Estimates Committee had many questions all of which were answered by the Minister in depth.
- 6.2 With many questions raised in regards to the overrun of last years budget by \$5million the Minister was more than happy to inform the Committee as to how and where this occurred. This was also addressed in the incorporation of the administrative and financial functions to JACS.
- 6.3 Part of the deliberations produced recommendation 39, which is in relation to the communications projects since the 2003 bushfires. Mr Pratt with all his experience we would expect to have taken the lead on questions related to the findings going towards recommendation 39, but with the Hansard section below the questions asked were by that of Mr Smyth with answers given;

MR SMYTH: Commissioner, is it acceptable that a project that was started in 2003-04 still will not be fully operational in the 2006-07 bushfire season? That we are to make a decision on 1 August as to what will be the primary means of communications for volunteers in the field, I would think is absolutely unacceptable. Would you not agree?

Mr Corbell: I think what is unacceptable is having the inheritance from a previous government of a radio network that should be in a museum. That is what is unacceptable. That is what this government has provided the funding for to address. The VHF network that we have should be in a museum.

MR SMYTH: That is fine, minister, but you started a project in 2003-04—

THE CHAIR: Mr Smyth, please do not interrupt.

Mr Corbell: For the seven years that you and your predecessors were ministers for emergency services you did nothing to provide the funding to tackle this issue. In contrast, we have. It is a complex, technical exercise. Yes, it has taken longer than we anticipated for the reasons that Assistant Commissioner Ayling has outlined, but we at least have put in the money, the time and the effort to give our firefighters a radio communications system which is not a museum piece. That is the real issue.

MR SMYTH: There were significant upgrades in the late 1990s, as you know, minister.

Mr Corbell: Well, it did not work, did it, Mr Smyth?

MR SMYTH: We can argue about what we did and what she did and what was not done but the problem is that, four years after the start of this project, it is still not fully operational, is it?

Mr Corbell: Well, through our services it is. TRN is used by the fire brigade, by the ambulance service, and by the SES. It is not the main vehicle for communication for the RFS, as Assistant Commissioner Ayling has outlined, but it is used as a secondary form of communication. I am sure, as you would know, Mr Smyth, it is used quite frequently now by RFS units for particular exercises, particular activities, and even for particular fire incidents in the past fire season. So it is used, but the question that Assistant Commissioner Ayling has outlined is: when should it become the primary voice communications channel for RFS?

- 6.4 With the receipt of Hansard quoted above, the communication projects are proceeding well, with RFS coverage decisions due in August this year. This makes recommendation 39 redundant in regard to RFS, in fact the Minister advises that NSW bodies have been training on the TRN network. With this evidence, the support of this recommendation will not occur.

7 Operational Responsibilities.

- 7.1 In the Estimate Committee Report there was a section in which there were issues raised as to the protocol that clearly establishes where the lines of responsibilities fall with the respect to emergencies in the ACT.
- 7.2 In regards to the issues raised within the report there were clear and precise answers given by the Minister. These answers went to explaining and outlining where the operational responsibilities in the ESA fall. This was covered in Hansard as follows;

MR PRATT: I accept the points you have made about operational responsiveness remaining. What will be the chain of command, though, for the new ESA commissioner? Which passageway will that now follow?

Mr Corbell: On operational issues or on administrative and financial issues?

MR PRATT: Operational.

Mr Corbell: On operational issues the commissioner's statutory powers remain. The commissioner will have the role of advising me and/or the Chief Minister, as appropriate, through the territory crisis centre, on what steps we need to take to protect the community in the event of any significant incident.

MR PRATT: The existing chains of command and relationship between ESA and bushfire council reporting to the minister will remain the same?

Mr Corbell: The statutory functions of the bushfire council are unchanged. The bushfire council has a role in advising, obviously, the chief officer and staff of the rural fire service on day-to-day management and operational issues as they affect the RFS. The role is retained in relation to advising the commissioner, the role is retained in terms of advising me as the responsible

minister, and the role is retained in my capacity to seek advice from the bushfire council on issues where I think their advice would be worthwhile.

- 7.3 For the Estimates Committee to make a recommendation such as this, there is a complete neglect for any or all of the answers given by the Minister in regards to the issues raised in recommendation 39 and will therefore not be supported.

8 Planning

- 8.1 During the Estimates Committee hearings Mr Smyth asked the Minister to provide a detailed list of all employees at the Land Development Agency. This question was answered and taken on notice and answers were supplied in due course.
- 8.2 The questions were then raised again and put as recommendation 44 in the report. Although the Minister answered the question in it's entirety and provided a detailed description to the Estimates Committee a recommendation was added to this report.
- 8.3 The transcript explains the question asked by Mr Smyth and the answers given by the Minister and Ms Skewes are below

MR SMYTH: In that regard, most of the organisations actually do mention their staffing in budget paper 4. I notice the LDA do not. How many staff do they currently have?

Mr Corbell: It is in the statement of intent.

MR SMYTH: I know that it is in the statement of intent.

Mr Corbell: As of 30 June 2006, the estimated level of employment will be 58.9 full-time equivalents.

DR FOSKEY: It looks as though there will be fewer next year.

MR SMYTH: As to the drop from 58 to 52, is that because you expect approximately six staff to go to shared services or is that just an actual reduction in the number of staff?

Ms Skewes: The reduction that we are anticipating here will be inclusive of the shared services allocation, so within that six there will be staff going to shared services, but we are waiting for some further advice around what component would be required to go into shared services. The balance of that would then be those other reductions.

MR SMYTH: What do you expect the balance to be?

Ms Skewes: At this stage, we are in conversation with the government around the shared services initiative. We do not have a specific number. I do not have a view about that, apart from starting to identify that maybe in the finance area, the financial processing transaction-type arrangements, we would be expected to contribute some allocation of resources, but I just do not have a number on that. And possibly in the HR area, more recruitment-type activities. We do not have a large number of staff involved in those. Most of our staff are, in fact, project delivery staff. I do not have a particular number yet because the government is still defining for us what is expected to be the shared services allocation.

MR SMYTH: How many consultants work full time within the LDA?

Ms Skewes: I would have to take that one on notice.

MR SMYTH: I did a search this morning on the LDA in the government directory and there were actually 80 staff listed. How many of those are part time?

Ms Skewes: To be able to give you accurate numbers, I would need to take that on notice, but I will say that with our program our consultant resources do change from time to time as we bring new projects on. We are certainly in an environment now where we are getting further land ready for the marketplace. We have been talking this morning about the preparation of estate development plans, getting all that work, and that largely is work that we rely on specific expertise in the consultant sector to be able to help us with those plans, the engineering designs, the water sensitive urban design proposals and the like. I am happy to take that question on notice and give you an indication at a particular point in time as to what that resource allocation will be.

MR SMYTH: Sure. Following up on what Mr Gentlemen was saying, are many of the positions shared? Is there a large amount of job sharing going on within the LDA?

Ms Skewes: Within the FTE component I would suggest there is not a lot of job sharing going on.

MR SMYTH: If there will be 58.9 FTE at the end of this month and there are actually 80 people listed on the directory as of about 9.30 this morning, does that mean that there are up to 20 consultants working in the LDA?

Ms Skewes: I am not sure what directory is being cited.

MR SMYTH: The ACT government directory.

Mr Corbell: I don't know whether to rely on the phone directory as the best way of working out the staffing complement of a government agency, but the LDA is very happy, and I am very happy as the minister, to provide you with detailed numbers on the staffing complement.

MR SMYTH: All right. When you determine the consultants, can you determine what the annual cost of these consultants is to the LDA?

Mr Corbell: Consultancies are usually reported on in the annual report.

MR SMYTH: That's okay. They are also asked about in estimates.

Mr Corbell: You are welcome to ask the question and we will endeavour to answer the question.

MR SMYTH: So that has been taken on notice.

Mr Corbell: Yes.

MR SMYTH: The number of consultants and what they are costing the LDA.

Ms Skewes: At a particular point in time?

MR SMYTH: The end of the financial year is fine. How many consultants have you had this year and what have they cost?

Ms Skewes: Just a point of clarification in relation to those staff numbers: as the minister said, we have done this particular assessment of these staff numbers, so I suggest that the numbers here are possibly more accurate than the phone listings.

MR SMYTH: I can give you the names and positions and what they supposedly do. The difference between 58FTEs and a head count of 80 is fairly substantial.

Mr Corbell: I don't think a phone directory is an authoritative reference when it comes to the staffing complement of a government agency.

MR SMYTH: Are you suggesting that there could be more?

Mr Corbell: All I am saying, Mr Smyth, is that, rather than having a silly argument about the phone directory versus the LDA's figures, why not have the LDA provide you with a comprehensive list of their figures and then you can make those judgments about what is a reasonable level of staff?

8.4 Although Mr Smyth proceeded to continue with this line of questioning during the construction of the report there was an oversight. There were not 80 people listed on the LDA directory as stated by Mr Smyth.

8.5 As the Minister answered the questions in their entirety and also provided full copies of the information in questions taken on notice to the Estimates Committee this recommendation is unable to be supported.

9 Health Services

9.1 The Estimates Committee has been working through much of the Health portfolio during deliberations and had many recommendations. Many of these recommendations are good and scrutinise the government.

9.2 There was a recommendation in particular that has been put into the report that has yet to be supported by deliberations within Estimates Committee.

9.3 In keeping with the ability to scrutinise the government as part of this report there needs to be information provided that backs up the arguments put forward in regards to the assertion of recommendations.

9.4 In regards to recommendation 63, there was no evidence provided during deliberations to back up the insertion of this recommendation into the report. In fact according to the transcript evidence below there is only evidence in support of maintaining it as part of the department of health.

MR GENTLEMAN: Minister, I refer to page 149 of BP4, public health services. The budget papers refer to the fact that there will be an increase in spending this financial year. Will that spending include any new programs under this heading?

Ms Gallagher: You are talking about the difference of around \$2 million?

MR GENTLEMAN: Yes.

Ms Gallagher: Yes. As I understand it that is as a result of the integration of Healthpact in this area and some transfers into early intervention. That is the difference.

MR GENTLEMAN: Will that affect the grants Healthpact produced in the past?

Ms Gallagher: No, it will not. The money that is available for grants will be maintained. I think a grant is either under way or it has just been finalised. It will be adhered to and it will be paid. I think all this happened on 1 July, or when the Assembly passed the legislation. We will look at how grants are provided in future, but that money will remain.

- 9.5 It is through the support of the Minister's information that to agree to this recommendation would be against the information that was given to the Estimates Committee during hearings. To follow this recommendation could end up costing the government more than that of the savings estimated by integrating Healthpact back into the department and therefore supporting this recommendation would be detrimental to the ACT economy.

10 Education

- 10.1 In the Estimates report there is a recommendation to clarify what the Minister said in regards to the clarification of statements made on the sale of land from possible school closures.
- 10.2 The Minister made a clear statement in the Estimates hearings in regards to the sale of land from possible school closures. The statement that the Minister made in regards to this proposal has been inserted in the report and was still worded so as to not necessarily convey the Minister's statement.
- 10.3 To support this recommendation would again show that there have been too many inferences as to the portrayal of some of what Ministers have been saying. This recommendation cannot be supported.

11 Multicultural Affairs

- 11.1 The insistence of the Estimates Committee to insert recommendation 73 into the report infers many complications. During discussions in the Estimates hearings there were many question raised in regards to the scrapping of MACMA.
- 11.2 The Minister went on to discuss the ability of the ACT Government and himself, in particular, to liaise effectively with members of our multicultural communities. MACMA was always due to end on 1 July 2006 and it was not the Minister's intention to continue MACMA as it stands past that date.

- 11.3 In parts of the transcript set out below there is reference to the Minister and his recommendations on the ending of MACMA.

MR PRATT: How did disbanding MACMA or the replacement group that might have transferred across to your department enable you not to incur the adverse conditions that you described have been incurred in other jurisdictions? Where is the logic in that?

Mr Hargreaves: There was never going to be another MACMA. When I decided not to pick it up—it should be remembered that I did not discontinue that body; it was going to die as an entity on 1 July in any event—I chose not to continue down that track. It did not affect me, or the way in which we connect with multicultural communities. However, the forums affected our relationship with multicultural communities. People came into the reception room, sat around in a circle and had a cup of tea with us. That is when we started getting feedback to the effect that it was brilliant. People said, “We have never had an opportunity to see or speak to anyone in this position before.” If that process is discontinued it will be sad. I specifically warn successive ministers for multicultural affairs that if they desist from doing this and they decide to set up a little group that will advise them globally on multicultural affairs they will let down their communities. I will not do that, Mr Pratt. If we had something as significant as attacks on and vilification of people like the Muslims in this town or anywhere else, I would not put up with that. I would take advice from those who are most affected, Mr Pratt. An advisory committee advises me on the integration of Islamic people. I am confident that that is the way to go. However, we would not need such a body if we did not have racial vilification of Islamic people, or anyone else in our multicultural society.

- 11.4 As the Minister has stated in the Committee hearings, MACMA was not as supportive as it could have been, there are real problems with agreeing to a recommendation that supports the re establishment of MACMA. Therefore recommendation 73 is not supported.

12 Conclusion

- 12.1 Although there have been additional comments added to the final Estimates Committee Report the overall report is to be supported.
- 12.2 I make an additional and final recommendation that the Appropriation Bill 2006-2007 be agreed to.

Mick Gentleman

15.08.2006