



**Legislative Assembly for the
Australian Capital Territory**

Standing Committee on Justice and
Community Safety

Inquiry into Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill 2022

Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory
Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety

Approved for publication

Report 8
10th Assembly
June 2022

About the committee

Establishing resolution

The Assembly established the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety on 2 December 2020.

The Committee's areas of responsibility are:

- ACT Electoral Commission
- ACT Integrity Commission
- Gaming
- Minister of State (JACS reporting areas)
- Emergency management and the Emergency Services Agency
- Policing and ACT Policing
- ACT Ombudsman
- Corrective services
- Attorney-General
- Consumer affairs
- Human rights
- Victims of crime
- Access to justice and restorative practice
- Public Trustee and Guardian

You can read the full establishing resolution [on our website](#).

Committee members

Mr Peter Cain MLA, Chair

Dr Marisa Paterson MLA, Deputy Chair

Mr Andrew Braddock MLA

Secretariat

Ms Kathleen de Kleuver, Committee Secretary

Ms Miona Ikeda, Assistant Secretary

Ms Lydia Chung, Administrative Assistant

Contact us

Mail	Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory GPO Box 1020 CANBERRA ACT 2601
Phone	(02) 6207 0524
Email	LACommitteeJCS@parliament.act.gov.au
Website	parliament.act.gov.au/parliamentary-business/in-committees

About this inquiry

The Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill 2022 was presented in the Assembly on 5 May 2022. It was then referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety as required by clause 5 of the establishing resolution. This clause allows committees to inquire into and report on bills within two months of their presentation.

The Committee decided to inquire into the Bill on 11 May 2022.

Contents

About the committee	i
Establishing resolution	i
Committee members	i
Secretariat	i
Contact us	i
About this inquiry	ii
Acronyms	iv
Recommendations	v
1. Introduction	1
Background to the Bill	1
Statutory review 2021	2
Legislative Scrutiny	3
Conduct of the inquiry	3
Acknowledgements	4
2. Importance of undertaking an inquiry into this Bill	5
3. Are the provisions still required?	5
Ongoing terrorism threats	5
Consequences of not passing the bill	6
Learnings from other jurisdictions	7
4. Human Rights protections	7
Scrutiny report	8
International human rights obligations	8
Treatment of minors	9
Record keeping in relation to seeking legal assistance	10
Housing of detainees	10
5. Conclusion	11
Appendix A: Submissions	13
Appendix B: Witnesses	14
Monday, 6 June 2022	14
Appendix C: Questions Taken on Notice	15
Questions Taken on Notice	15

Acronyms

Acronym	Long form
ACT	Australian Capital Territory
ALHR	Australian Lawyers for Human Rights
AM	Member of the Order of Australia
AO	Order of Australia
APM	Australian Police Medal
COAG	Council of Australian Governments
JACS	Justice and Community Safety
MLA	Member of the Legislative Assembly
NSW	New South Wales
OAM	Medal of the Order of Australia
OPCAT	Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
PDO	Preventative Detention Orders
QC	Queen's Counsel
TETP	<i>Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Act 2006</i>
UN	United Nations

Recommendations

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review the application of the law in respect of minors who are exempt from the ACT legislation and whether they would instead be subject to the Commonwealth legislation which does not offer the same level of human rights protections.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the Assembly pass the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill 2022.

1. Introduction

Background to the Bill

- 1.1. The *Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Act 2006* (the TETP Act) provides for the preventative detention of persons for up to 14 days to prevent imminent terrorist acts or preserve evidence of recent terrorist acts. The Act also confers special powers to prevent or investigate terrorist acts, including through reasonable use of force by police officers, to require identification, search persons, vehicles and premises, and move vehicles and cordon off areas from entry.
- 1.2. The Act was introduced following terrorist attacks in the United States in 2001 and in the United Kingdom in 2005, when the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed to develop a national framework to combat terrorism. The Commonwealth and all States and Territories have since enacted counter-terrorism legislation allowing preventative detention orders (PDOs) in limited circumstances. In agreeing to do so in the ACT, the ACT Government committed to addressing the interactions of any legislative response with the *Human Rights Act 2004* (ACT).
- 1.3. In light of this commitment in respect of the Human Rights legislation, a number of safeguards have therefore been incorporated into the ACT legislation, including:
 - A PDO cannot be applied for or made for a child aged under 18 years old, higher than in other Australian jurisdictions;
 - A person is entitled to a copy of the PDO application, to be present at the hearing and to be represented by a lawyer of choice;
 - A copy of the PDO application must be provided to Legal Aid ACT who must appoint a person from the Public Interest Monitor who is entitled to be present at the hearing, ask questions of those giving evidence and make submissions;
 - A person detailed under a PDO must be treated with humanity and respect; and
 - Contact rights for a person detained under a PDO such as family members or an employer, the Human Rights Commissioner, the Ombudsman, the Integrity Commissioner and a lawyer.¹
- 1.4. The *Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill 2022* extends the operation of the *Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Act 2006* for another five years. This Act was introduced in 2006, and every five years it has been extended. The Act is currently due to expire on 19 November 2022.
- 1.5. The Bill will defer this expiry for a further five years, until 19 November 2027. It will be the fourth extension of the Act, with two previous five-year extensions (in 2011 and 2016) and a one-year extension in 2021 to provide for additional time to report on the Bill's operation.

¹ *Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Act 2006*, para 3.45–3.57.

- 1.6. It will also make amendments relating to:
- contact with diplomatic representatives;
 - increasing protections for people with impaired decision-making ability by extending the contact time with family and requiring police officers to take reasonable steps to assist them in exercising their contact rights;
 - allowing identification material to be taken to record any illness or injury suffered while in detention; and
 - providing for a review of the Act to be presented to the Assembly no later than 19 November 2026.

Statutory review 2021

- 1.7. Section 100 of the Act requires a statutory review of the operation and effectiveness of the Act which was to be presented to the Assembly no later than 19 May 2021.
- 1.8. The Attorney-General tabled the *Statutory [Review](#) of the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Act 2006* (the 2021 Government review) on 13 May 2021.² Key findings were:

- The National Terrorism Threat Level has remained at ‘Probable’ noting several acts of terrorism in Australia and New Zealand since the last review (paragraph 2.6).
- To date ACT Policing has not made an application for a PDO. However, in 2014 three people were held under PDOs in NSW and in 2015, one person was held under an interim PDO in Victoria. The regime has otherwise not been used in Australia (paragraph 3.13).
- ACT Policing, the ACT Human Rights Commission, Legal Aid ACT and the Security and Emergency Management Branch supported the extension in the Act (paragraph 3.77). However, Civil Liberties Australia submitted that the legislation is excessive and unnecessary, on the basis that it has not been used, and also states that terrorism can be managed under normal criminal law (paragraph 3.88).
- The 2021 Government review did not make recommendations for amendments however, it was noted that:

No specific amendments were proposed by stakeholders, though the ongoing concern by stakeholders about the importance of preventing rights intrusions was clear. Given that extension of the Act was not universally supported and noting the extraordinary nature of the powers in the Act, it is appropriate to give further consideration to opportunities for change that might enhance the right to personal liberty while still ensuring the safety and security of the community.

² ACT Legislative Assembly, *Minutes of Proceedings*, No 15, 13 May 2022, p 172.

That work will include careful consideration of any protections afforded in the legislation of other jurisdictions and be undertaken before the sunseting of the Act, later this year.³

Legislative Scrutiny

- 1.9. The Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety (Legislative Scrutiny)⁴ has brought several matters relating to human rights limitations to the attention of the ACT Legislative Assembly and is seeking a response from the Minister before the Bill is to be debated:
- The Explanatory Statement should have referenced the review conducted in 2021 that informed the extension of the Act.
 - New provisions to allow a police officer to take identification material, without the detainee's consent to record illnesses or injuries suffered while under detainment, also mean those materials can be used in further proceedings and there could be less restrictive means to achieve this objective.
 - Provisions allowing the taking of photographs and videos of detainees to record illnesses or injuries can be used in proceedings to identify the limits or absence of injuries/illnesses or to defend against potential proceedings. It was also observed that different terminology was used, making it unclear whether proceedings in which the proceedings will be the same as the relevant hearings for which the material must be preserved.
 - It is unclear how the amendments will operate in relation to section 58 of the Act which allows recordings to be made of detainees being questioned about their wellbeing and safety.
 - Policies and practices of ACT Policing to protect individuals suffering an injury or illness are not reflected in or could be inconsistent with the amendments.
 - The use of material to record injuries and illnesses of detainees should be more clearly restricted to individuals actually suffering that illness or injury while being detained.

Conduct of the inquiry

- 1.10. The Committee issued a call for submissions on 12 May 2022, which closed on 26 May 2022. A total of four submissions were received by the Committee. A list of all the submissions is provided at Appendix A.

³ Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Review of the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) ACT 2006*, May 2021, p 20.

⁴ Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety (Legislative Scrutiny), *Scrutiny Report No. 16*, 19 May 2022, pp 4–7, https://www.parliament.act.gov.au/_data/assets/word_doc/0009/2004858/Report-16-19May22.docx.

- 1.11. The Committee held a public hearing on 6 June 2022 and heard from four witnesses. A list of witnesses who appeared before the Committee is provided at Appendix B. The transcripts of proceedings are accessible at https://www.hansard.act.gov.au/hansard/2021/comms/default.htm#5_jcs.
- 1.12. The Committee met on 22 June 2022 to consider the Chair's draft report, which was adopted on the same day, for tabling.

Acknowledgements

- 1.13. The Committee thanks everyone who participated in, or otherwise assisted, this inquiry, including ACT Government Ministers, directorate officials, statutory officers, Members of the Legislative Assembly, Members' staff, and staff of the Office of the Legislative Assembly.

2. Importance of undertaking an inquiry into this Bill

- 2.1. The Committee notes that this is the fourth time that the *Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Act 2006* is to be extended for a further five years. The Committee decided that given the extraordinary nature of the powers in enabling temporary detainment without charge, it was important to undertake this inquiry which was supported by witnesses:

... it is extraordinary legislation, like it would be wonderful if we did not have to have preventative detention orders to hold someone without charge, when we are not satisfied that they have been charged with a crime. I think given the devastation that could be caused by a terrorist act, the gravity of that is what makes those restrictions proportionate under section 28 of the Human Rights Act.

... I think it has to be assessed on a regular basis... So, I think that it is appropriate that this Assembly considers whether it is necessary.⁵

- 2.2. In undertaking the inquiry, the Committee considered whether such provisions are still needed in the ACT and issues raised in respect of human rights protection. The Committee also considered the 2021 review by the ACT Government and supports further reviews prior to extending the legislation in the future.

3. Are the provisions still required?

Ongoing terrorism threats

- 3.1. The original legislation followed terrorism events occurring in September 2001 in the United States, July 2005 in London, and the subsequent agreement of the COAG to develop a national framework to combat terrorism. Since that time, while the powers have not been used in the ACT, the National Terrorism Threat remains as 'Probable'. Several terrorism acts have occurred in Australia and the ACT remains a potential target due to the presence of the Australian Parliament.⁶
- 3.2. The Committee noted that terrorism threats have transitioned from when the legislation was first introduced. The emergence of home-grown terrorism risks has become apparent from New Zealand's Christchurch massacre.⁷

⁵ Dr Helen Watchirs, Human Rights Commissioner, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, pp 5–6.

⁶ Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Review of the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) ACT 2006*, May 2021, pp 4–5.

⁷ Dr Helen Watchirs, Human Rights Commissioner, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 4.

Consequences of not passing the bill

3.3. The ACT legislation is part of a national framework of legislation both at State/Territory and Commonwealth levels. The ACT legislation has powers to detain people for up to 14 days (instead of 48 hours under Commonwealth legislation) and additional human rights protections in comparison to other jurisdictions which have been increased in the Bill. Without the ACT legislation, the Commonwealth law would apply.⁸

3.4. The ACT legislation has been described as ‘model legislation’ in comparison to other jurisdictions:

It contains more stringent requirements than do other legislative schemes for the issue of preventative detention orders. Where a person is sought to be detained it must be shown that the order is “the least restrictive way of preventing the terrorist act”. Where an order is sought to preserve evidence, it must be shown that detaining the person is the “only effective way of preserving the evidence”. In fact, the ACT legislation appears to reflect the obligation to adhere to human rights standards more rigorously than the legislation of the other States and Territories.⁹

3.5. A consideration in extending the legislation for another five years is its cross jurisdictional nature, the need for national consistency and the role it plays given its additional human rights protections compared to other jurisdictions.

As a human rights consistent model for responding to the threat of terrorism, the TETP Act can play an important role in moderating the approach taken elsewhere in Australia, including at the Commonwealth level.¹⁰

3.6. However, the Australian Lawyers for Human Rights argued that the provisions had outlived their time, lack supporting evidence for their continuation given that the provisions have not yet been used and that existing criminal laws would suffice in the absence of increased human rights protections:

We note that, as of November 2020, no applications had been made for a PDO under the TETP Act by law enforcement. The TETP Act is named the Terrorism Extraordinary Temporary Powers Act precisely because these powers were designed to be ‘extraordinary’ and ‘temporary’. Over 16 years later the TETP Act’s mandate has expired.¹¹

3.7. The Committee noted that while the powers had not been used in the ACT, there were still ongoing terrorism threats and the sunset clause in the legislation provided the right approach to manage the extraordinary nature of the powers and the extreme harm that could be caused from a potential terrorism event.

⁸ Dr Helen Watchirs, Human Rights Commissioner, *Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 1.

⁹ *COAG Review of Counter-Terrorism Legislation*, 2013, pp 7–8.

¹⁰ Human Rights Commission, *Submission 2*, p 2.

¹¹ Australian Lawyers for Human Rights, *Submission 4*, p 2.

Learnings from other jurisdictions

- 3.8. Learnings from other jurisdictions have been limited due to the low numbers of terrorism events but were considered as part of the 2021 Government review along with legislative changes made in other jurisdictions. While there have been no applications for a PDO in the ACT, PDOs (or interim PDOs) have been used in NSW in 2014 and Victoria in 2015 as noted in paragraph 1.8 above.
- 3.9. The 2021 ACT Government review noted the following reports:
- Review of police stop, search and seizure powers, the control order regime and the preventative detention order regime (Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security 2018);
 - Statutory review of the Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2002 (NSW Department of Justice 2018);
 - Expert Panel on terrorism and violent extremism prevention and response powers (Ken Lay AO APM and the Hon David Harper AM QC 2017); and
 - Review of Divisions 104 and 105 of the Criminal Code (including the interoperability of Divisions 104 and 105A): Control Orders and Preventative Detention Orders, (Independent National Security Legislation Monitor 2017).
- 3.10. Consistency in legislation across the Commonwealth and States and Territories is seen as important to protect the overall integrity of the national strategy.¹²
- 3.11. There have been recent changes to Victorian legislation based on recommendations from the *Expert Panel on terrorism and violent extremism prevention and response powers* (including extending the PDO scheme to 14- and 15-year-olds). These were reviewed but disregarded for potential adoption in the ACT observing that the amendments broaden police powers and increase human right limitations.¹³

4. Human Rights protections

- 4.1. The ACT legislation seeks to strike a balance between protecting the ACT from terrorism threats and the human rights of individuals:

It is clear that preventative detention is a very invasive erosion of human rights. And as our human rights legislation sets out, of course, human rights are not absolute and there is a weighing up process and a balancing of the various rights. One might loosely recall the right of the community to be safe, versus the right of the individuals to have their freedoms and liberties protected. What we have sought to do in this legislation is to get that balance right, and as I say, particularly in the context of the Commonwealth legislation, make sure that from an ACT

¹² Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Review of the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) ACT 2006*, May 2021, p 18, para 3.86.

¹³ Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Review of the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) ACT 2006*, May 2021, p 20.

citizen point of view, that we are doing the best job we can in this legislature to make sure that ACT citizens have those rights balanced as well as possible.¹⁴

- 4.2. Therefore, the Committee considered potential human rights issues raised during the inquiry and by the Scrutiny Committee.

Scrutiny report

- 4.3. Human rights issues were raised in Scrutiny Report No. 16¹⁵ in relation to new provisions enabling records and identification materials in relation to illnesses and injuries suffered under detainment and the Committee raised these with the Attorney-General.

- 4.4. The Committee understands that these issues are being considered by the Government:

We noted the Committee's comments and are in the process of talking with ACT Policing about whether we need to have another look at the wording, just to make sure that that intent is captured, including making sure that any such material that is taken, would not be able to be used, other than in proceedings or complaints that relate to the treatment of the person in custody. We are in the process of talking with ACT Policing about whether there is any need to have a look at the wording, just to make sure that that is achieving the intended purpose of protecting the person in custody and maintaining transparency of what occurs.¹⁶

International human rights obligations

- 4.5. Some concerns were raised in relation to the bill arguing that protections provided for in the Bill are insufficient to comply with Australia's international legal obligations in Article 9 of the UN *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*.

Of most concern to ALHR is that preventative detention orders ('PDO') expose a person who has not been charged, tried or convicted of an offence to the deprivation of their liberty. The ongoing extension of such temporary extraordinary measures risks moving the ACT perilously close to normalising a system which allows arbitrary detention. Such a regime is inconsistent with Australia's international legal obligations.¹⁷

- 4.6. The Human Rights Commissioner however, told the Committee that in her view there was consistency because there was full judicial oversight in the making of PDOs, there is a high threshold for making a PDO, an interim PDO is restricted to 24 hours, the maximum initial period of detention is only seven days followed by another seven days following full

¹⁴ Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 13.

¹⁵ Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety (Legislative Scrutiny), *Scrutiny Report No. 16*, 19 May 2022, pp 4-7, https://www.parliament.act.gov.au/_data/assets/word_doc/0009/2004858/Report-16-19May22.docx.

¹⁶ Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 13.

¹⁷ Australian Lawyers for Human Rights, *Submission 4*, p 2.

consideration of the matter, and there are review rights. It was also noted that the United Kingdom has a similar detention regime, with a maximum of 14 days detention.¹⁸

- 4.7. The Committee were also told that most stakeholders consulted for the 2021 review by the ACT Government did not raise any concerns regarding the maximum 14-day detention period. The submission in opposition to this was from one stakeholder whose expressed the view that the Act and Bill should not exist. The Government also noted in response to the concerns raised in respect of Australia's international legal obligations in Article 9 of the UN *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* that:

It is important to note that, under the Act, a preventative detention order (PDO) can only be made by the Supreme Court of the ACT. This ensures that the human rights of the individual who is suspected of planning or carrying out a terrorist act are protected and that the PDO is determined judicially to be reasonably necessary given the circumstances. Moreover, the Supreme Court must determine the actual 'end time' for each preventative detention order, which may be sooner but 'must be no later' than the maximum time periods specified in the Act.¹⁹

- 4.8. Oversight in regard to human rights protection under the *Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* (OPCAT) is provided by the Ombudsman in their Commonwealth role, the ACT Human Rights Commission and the ACT Inspector of Correctional Services.²⁰

Treatment of minors

- 4.9. The ACT legislation includes a suite of human rights protections additional to that offered in other jurisdictions including the Commonwealth legislation.
- 4.10. This includes a prohibition on the detention of children under 18 years old and other safeguards. In Victoria this threshold is 14 years, and it is 16 years in other jurisdictions.²¹ During the hearing the possibility that such children who cannot be detained under ACT legislation could be detained under Commonwealth legislation for up to two days was discussed.²²
- 4.11. The Committee was concerned that this could mean that the additional human rights protections offered under ACT law would not be available to children if they were instead detained under the Commonwealth legislation.

¹⁸ Dr Helen Watchirs, *answer to QTON: International obligations*, 6 June 2022 (received 10 June 2022), p 1.

¹⁹ Mr Shane Rattenbury, *answer to QTON: International obligations*, 6 June 2022 (received 16 June 2022), p 2.

²⁰ ACT Ombudsman, *Submission 3*, pp 3–4.

²¹ Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA, Attorney-General, *Review of the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) ACT 2006*, May 2021, p 12, para 3.45.

²² *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 12.

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government review the application of the law in respect of minors who are exempt from the ACT legislation and whether they would instead be subject to the Commonwealth legislation which does not offer the same level of human rights protections.

Record keeping in relation to seeking legal assistance

- 4.12. It was also suggested that record keeping requirements could be improved in respect of detainees with impaired decision-making ability in order to increase transparency and for better records for any complaint investigations. The provision introducing record keeping requirements could mirror section 52(11), which prescribes that police officers must make a written record when a person asks to contact a lawyer or legal aid. The provision should require the police officer to record in writing:
- a) The time, date and request of contact made by the detainee;
 - b) The reasons why such request was refused, even when such reasons were not communicated to the detainee because doing so would have disclosed information in relation to a terrorist act; and
 - c) Whether, after the refusal, the detainee was reminded of their right to nominate another person and whether they elected to do so.
- 4.13. The Committee noted that this concern was raised in two submissions.²³

Housing of detainees

- 4.14. The provisions allow an individual to be detained for up to 14 days consistent with other states and territories. However, the legislation is not clear where the person should be detained apart from in a correctional centre.²⁴
- 4.15. The need for an instrument to provide clarification was discussed at the hearing in the context of being an issue that could be worked out at the time.²⁵ It was likely an instrument could be notified potentially on the same day it is made.²⁶ The Committee noted the administrative risk associated with this position.

²³ Legal Aid ACT, *Submission 1*, p 2. Australian Lawyers for Human Rights, *Submission 4*, pp 5–6.

²⁴ ACT Ombudsman, *Submission 3*, p 2.

²⁵ Dr Helen Watchirs, Human Rights Commissioner, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 5.

²⁶ Ms Karen Greenland, Executive Branch Manager, Legislation, Policy and Programs Division, Justice and Community Safety Directorate, *Proof Committee Hansard*, 6 June 2022, p 10.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. The Committee considered that, given the extraordinary nature of the powers to be extended under the Bill, it was important to conduct this inquiry.
- 5.2. The Committee also notes the statutory review mechanism in the legislation as an important feature to ensure that the legislation strikes the right balance between managing terrorism threats in the ACT and protection of human rights as well as the need for its continuation given the extreme nature of the powers provided:
- ... the inclusion of a 5-year sunset clause and provision for a further statutory review of the Act are essential safeguards to ensure that the measures in the Act remain proportionate to their objectives. To ensure that extraordinary legislation does not become ordinary by default, we consider that it must be reviewed regularly and publicly.²⁷
- 5.3. Key reasons for supporting the extension for another five years include:
- The provisions requiring regular review prevents it from becoming ‘ordinary by default’.²⁸
 - It is necessary to ensure management of any terrorism threats in the ACT.²⁹
- 5.4. The additional human rights safeguards offered in the ACT legislation over the Commonwealth legislation should be retained.³⁰
- 5.5. The Committee recommends that the treatment of minors should be reviewed to ensure that their human rights are protected and notes the findings in Scrutiny Report 16 from the Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety (Legislative Scrutiny Role) and the following areas identified during the inquiry:
- The need for the sharing of lessons learned between jurisdictions, particularly from those who have had the need to use the legislation.
 - Record keeping in relation to seeking legal assistance.
 - The lack of clarity on the details of housing of detainees.
 - Our international obligations on human rights.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the Assembly pass the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill 2022.

²⁷ Human Rights Commission, *Submission 2*, pp 2–3.

²⁸ Human Rights Commission, *Submission 2*, p 3.

²⁹ Legal Aid ACT, *Submission 1*, p 1.

³⁰ Legal Aid ACT, *Submission 1*, p 1.

- 5.6. The Committee wishes to extend its appreciation to all those who have participated in this inquiry into the Terrorism (Extraordinary Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill 2022.

Mr Peter Cain, MLA

Chair

22 June 2022

Appendix A: Submissions

No.	Submission by	Received	Published
1	Legal Aid ACT	24/05/2022	01/06/2022
2	ACT Human Rights Commission	26/05/2022	01/06/2022
3	ACT Ombudsman	27/05/2022	01/06/2022
4	Australian Lawyers for Human Rights	03/06/2022	06/06/2022

Appendix B: Witnesses

Monday, 6 June 2022

Attorney-General

- **Mr Shane Rattenbury MLA**, Attorney-General
- **Mr Richard Glenn**, Director-General, Justice and Community Safety Directorate
- **Ms Karen Greenland**, Executive Branch Manager, Legislation, Policy and Programs Division, Justice and Community Safety Directorate

ACT Human Rights Commission

- **Dr Helen Watchirs OAM**, President and Human Rights Commissioner

Appendix C: Questions Taken on Notice

Questions Taken on Notice

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
1	06/06/2022	ACT Human Rights Commission	International human rights obligations	10/06/22
2	06/06/2022	Justice and Community Safety Directorate	International human rights obligations	16/06/22