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**1** The Assembly met at 10 a.m., pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker (Ms Burch) 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 LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MEMBER

Mr Wall moved—That leave of absence be granted to Mrs Dunne for 23 and 24 August 2017 for personal reasons.

Question—put and passed.

3 Participatory budgeting

Ms Le Couteur, pursuant to notice, moved—That this Assembly:

1. notes that successful participatory budgeting exercises have been established nationally and internationally, providing a wealth of well-studied and effective processes for the ACT to draw upon, including:
   1. in 2014, the City of Melbourne used participatory budgeting to create its first ever 10-Year Financial Plan, worth $5 billion;
   2. in 2013-14, the City of Greater Geraldton conducted a successful Community Summit to prioritise 99 non-mandatory services worth over $8.5 million within budget constraints of $6 million; and
   3. since 1989, citizens of Porto Alegre in Brazil have decided how to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on capital projects through participatory budgeting, establishing a model process which has spread over two hundred Brazilian cities;
2. acknowledges that:
   1. the ACT’s $5.5 billion annual budget is unique within Australia, and unusual internationally, in combining both local and state government service delivery functions;
   2. the ACT Government has existing budget consultation processes, which include considering submissions from peak bodies and community stakeholders;
   3. the Parliamentary Agreement commits the Government to:
      1. “Strengthen community consultation processes, including through the use of deliberative democracy strategies, so that diverse views are taken into account in major project proposals”; and
      2. “Conduct a review in 2017 of the Budget process, to improve community input to Budget decision-making in future years”;
   4. new approaches to community consultation are needed in the ACT and the Government has made some progress on its Parliamentary Agreement commitments by funding a citizens’ jury pilot, community engagement training for Government staff and recruiting a participatory democracy expert; and
   5. Chief Minister Barr stated in *The Canberra Times* on 20 May 2017 “The silent majority was heard loud and clear in the 2016 election. It needs to be heard in between elections, too. I want more Canberrans to be able to play a role in shaping their city every day. …Lack of consultation is not the problem, but the way we consult needs to change”;
3. asserts that as a well-studied community engagement method with proven effectiveness, participatory budgeting can:
   1. better incorporate citizens’ needs and preferences into government deliberations, and improve transparency in resource allocation and service delivery;
   2. offer citizens at large an opportunity to learn about government operations, and to deliberate, debate and influence the allocation of public resources; and
   3. educate, engage and empower citizens and strengthen inclusive governance by giving marginalised groups more opportunities to have their voices heard and influence public decision making; and
4. calls on the ACT Government to:
   1. as part of its Budget Review to “improve community input”, to conduct a participatory budgeting pilot for the 2018-19 ACT Budget which:
      1. commits the discretionary portion of the City Services budget, anticipated to be in the order of 20 percent of the total City Services budget, to allocation through a participatory budgeting process;
      2. is designed by an advisory group with relevant expertise in deliberative democracy processes, including practitioners, academics and the community sector, to be convened by the Government;
      3. is informed by the set of principles developed by ACTCOSS and CAPAD to ensure that deliberative mechanisms are trialled in a robust, respectful and informed way;
      4. uses a randomly selected panel as a representative cross-section of the Canberra community and provides the panel with all relevant information; and
      5. is subject to independent post-implementation analysis, which will be made public and used to inform the model for an expanded participatory budgeting process in the ACT; and
   2. commit to using participatory budgeting processes to inform the priorities of the entire ACT Budget by the conclusion of 9th Assembly in 2020, applying lessons learned during the pilot.

Mr Barr (Treasurer) moved the following amendment: Omit paragraph (4), substitute:

“(4) notes that the Government will:

(a) as part of its Budget Review to ‘improve community input’, conduct a participatory budgeting pilot no later than the 2019-20 Budget cycle, which:

(i) asks citizens to consider and make clear recommendations on how a discretionary portion of the City Services budget could be allocated to best reflect community priorities;

(ii) is designed by an advisory group with relevant expertise in deliberative democracy processes, including practitioners, academics and the community sector, to be convened by the Government;

(iii) is informed by the set of principles developed by ACTCOSS and CAPAD to ensure that deliberative mechanisms are trialled in a robust, respectful and informed way; and

(iv) uses a randomly selected citizen panel as a representative cross-section of the Canberra community and provides the panel with all relevant information;

(b) commit to transparently considering and publicly responding to the pilot panel’s recommendations; and

(c) commission and make public an independent post-implementation analysis of the pilot, identifying which components of the Budget and budget process would benefit from greater community input and possible models for future participatory budgeting processes in the ACT.”.

Debate continued.

Amendment agreed to.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

1. notes that successful participatory budgeting exercises have been established nationally and internationally, providing a wealth of well-studied and effective processes for the ACT to draw upon, including:
   1. in 2014, the City of Melbourne used participatory budgeting to create its first ever 10-Year Financial Plan, worth $5 billion;
   2. in 2013-14, the City of Greater Geraldton conducted a successful Community Summit to prioritise 99 non-mandatory services worth over $8.5 million within budget constraints of $6 million; and
   3. since 1989, citizens of Porto Alegre in Brazil have decided how to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on capital projects through participatory budgeting, establishing a model process which has spread over two hundred Brazilian cities;
2. acknowledges that:
   1. the ACT’s $5.5 billion annual budget is unique within Australia, and unusual internationally, in combining both local and state government service delivery functions;
   2. the ACT Government has existing budget consultation processes, which include considering submissions from peak bodies and community stakeholders;
   3. the Parliamentary Agreement commits the Government to:
      1. ‘Strengthen community consultation processes, including through the use of deliberative democracy strategies, so that diverse views are taken into account in major project proposals’; and
      2. ‘Conduct a review in 2017 of the Budget process, to improve community input to Budget decision-making in future years’;
   4. new approaches to community consultation are needed in the ACT and the Government has made some progress on its Parliamentary Agreement commitments by funding a citizens’ jury pilot, community engagement training for Government staff and recruiting a participatory democracy expert; and
   5. Chief Minister Barr stated in *The Canberra Times* on 20 May 2017 ‘The silent majority was heard loud and clear in the 2016 election. It needs to be heard in between elections, too. I want more Canberrans to be able to play a role in shaping their city every day. …Lack of consultation is not the problem, but the way we consult needs to change’;
3. asserts that as a well-studied community engagement method with proven effectiveness, participatory budgeting can:
   1. better incorporate citizens’ needs and preferences into government deliberations, and improve transparency in resource allocation and service delivery;
   2. offer citizens at large an opportunity to learn about government operations, and to deliberate, debate and influence the allocation of public resources; and
   3. educate, engage and empower citizens and strengthen inclusive governance by giving marginalised groups more opportunities to have their voices heard and influence public decision making; and
4. notes that the Government will:
   1. as part of its Budget Review to ‘improve community input’, conduct a participatory budgeting pilot no later than the 2019-20 Budget cycle, which:
      1. asks citizens to consider and make clear recommendations on how a discretionary portion of the City Services budget could be allocated to best reflect community priorities;
      2. is designed by an advisory group with relevant expertise in deliberative democracy processes, including practitioners, academics and the community sector, to be convened by the Government;
      3. is informed by the set of principles developed by ACTCOSS and CAPAD to ensure that deliberative mechanisms are trialled in a robust, respectful and informed way; and
      4. uses a randomly selected citizen panel as a representative cross-section of the Canberra community and provides the panel with all relevant information;
   2. commit to transparently considering and publicly responding to the pilot panel’s recommendations; and
   3. commission and make public an independent post-implementation analysis of the pilot, identifying which components of the Budget and budget process would benefit from greater community input and possible models for future participatory budgeting processes in the ACT.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

4 Sub Judice Convention AND CONTINUING RESOLUTION 10—STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

The Speaker made a statement concerning the application of the sub judice convention and Continuing Resolution 10.

The Speaker asked Members, when addressing notice No 2, Private Members’ business, to avoid canvassing issues that may affect a matter that is currently the subject of a court case.

5 A.C.T. Government and UnionsACT—Relationship

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

1. notes:
   1. the unwavering political affiliation between ACT Labor and the Union movement;
   2. the financial contribution made by various Unions in the ACT to the ACT Labor Party and individual Labor MLAs;
   3. the influence UnionsACT have over ACT Government procurement for goods and services as prescribed by the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the ACT Government and UnionsACT;
   4. the influence that UnionsACT have over which organisations Labor MLAs can and can’t meet with;
   5. in 2016, the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption found evidence of union bullying, intimidation and exclusion on worksites across Australia and in the ACT;
   6. the multiple funding arms of the CFMEU that have been uncovered as a result of the Royal Commission;
   7. the number of special land deals struck between the ACT Government and CFMEU affiliated entities; and
   8. the ACT Government’s plans to enshrine the MOU between UnionsACT and the ACT Government in legislation; and
2. calls on the ACT Government to:
   1. cease any plans to legislate for any function relating to the procurement of goods and services that is currently performed by the MOU between UnionsACT and the ACT Government; and
   2. assure the community that all members of the ACT Labor/Greens Government are acting free from undue external influence in accordance with the Ministerial Code of Conduct and/or Members Code of Conduct.

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

“(1) notes:

(a) the Australian Labor Party is Australia’s oldest political party, and that its history is intertwined with the history of Australia’s democracy and labour movement;

(b) Labor’s commitment to fairness at work;

(c) the importance of public information sharing and feedback from stakeholders and the community as part of the overall evaluation process on government tenders; and

(d) the need to ensure ACT Government procurement activity includes fair consideration of the rights of workers, in addition to ensuring providers:

(i) are accountable to the public;

(ii) promote quality; and

(iii) promote local employment; and

(2) further notes that the Government:

(a) remains committed to these principles of protecting the health and safety of Canberra workers, and ensuring government procurement is conducted in an accountable manner; and

(b) will bring forward legislation to establish a Local Jobs Code within 12 months, which will ensure procurement decisions deliver better outcomes for Canberra workers by requiring employers to adopt the highest ethical, safety and labour standards.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the amendment agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AYES, 13 | |  | NOES, 9 | |
| Mr Barr | Ms Le Couteur |  | Mr Coe | Mr Parton |
| Ms Berry | Ms Orr |  | Mr Hanson | Mr Wall |
| Ms Burch | Mr Pettersson |  | Mrs Jones |  |
| Ms Cheyne | Mr Ramsay |  | Mrs Kikkert |  |
| Ms Cody | Mr Rattenbury |  | Ms Lawder |  |
| Ms Fitzharris | Mr Steel |  | Ms Lee |  |
| Mr Gentleman |  |  | Mr Milligan |  |

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

(1) notes:

(a) the Australian Labor Party is Australia’s oldest political party, and that its history is intertwined with the history of Australia’s democracy and labour movement;

(b) Labor’s commitment to fairness at work;

(c) the importance of public information sharing and feedback from stakeholders and the community as part of the overall evaluation process on government tenders; and

(d) the need to ensure ACT Government procurement activity includes fair consideration of the rights of workers, in addition to ensuring providers:

(i) are accountable to the public;

(ii) promote quality; and

(iii) promote local employment; and

(2) further notes that the Government:

(a) remains committed to these principles of protecting the health and safety of Canberra workers, and ensuring government procurement is conducted in an accountable manner; and

(b) will bring forward legislation to establish a Local Jobs Code within 12 months, which will ensure procurement decisions deliver better outcomes for Canberra workers by requiring employers to adopt the highest ethical, safety and labour standards.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

6 Population growth

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

1. notes that:
   1. the ACT has seen a population increase from 356 586 people in 2011 to 406 403 people by the end of 2016, equating to growth of more than 11 percent in this period, the fastest growth rate of any State or Territory;
   2. in the same period the number of families in the ACT has risen from 93 397 to 102 036;
   3. Canberra’s population grew by 7000 people in 2016 alone, and is projected to continue at 1.5 percent per year into the 2020s; and
   4. much of this growth has been in Canberra’s north, with the Gungahlin region growing by almost 24 000 people in the past five years;
2. also notes that the ACT Government has, and continues to, enact forward thinking policy to accommodate this population growth, as evidenced by the $2.8 billion infrastructure investment program delivered in the 2017 Budget which includes:
   1. building Light Rail and investing $54 million on upgrading the Territory’s roads;
   2. investing an additional $210 million in our education system to upgrade and expand the capacity of ACT schools;
   3. delivering $443 million for better health infrastructure for Canberra, including the construction of new Walk-in Centres in Gungahlin, the Weston Creek region and the Inner North; and
   4. investing in renewable energy which will assist with the transition towards a low-emission energy future and provide stability to energy prices; and
3. calls on the ACT Government to:
   1. continue to invest in vital infrastructure, such as Light Rail, so as to ensure that Canberra can continue to accommodate this population growth; and
   2. support investment in health and education to ensure that Canberrans continue to receive world class services.

Debate ensued.

Ms Le Couteur, by leave, moved the following amendments together:

(1) After paragraph (1)(d), insert:

“(e) economic growth driven by population growth and consumption is unsustainable, and alternative approaches to prosperity must be sought;

(f) the ACT’s ecological footprint is determined by the number of people in the ACT, their per capita consumption of resources and energy, and factors such as urban design, transport and food production;

(g) population growth can therefore have large negative impacts on the environment, including increased greenhouse gas emissions, higher demand for water, loss of farmland to housing and higher production of waste; and

(h) population growth also places increasing pressure on infrastructure, including driving up demand for hospitals and schools and increasing traffic congestion, and that this puts a large financial burden on the ACT Government to fund both infrastructure expansion and rising operating costs;”.

(2) After paragraph (3)(b), add:

“(c) take strong action to reduce the ACT’s overall ecological footprint despite the pressures of a rising population; and

(d) continue to take action to reduce the ACT’s greenhouse gas emissions and implement the necessary policy measures to achieve the target of zero net emissions by 2050 at the latest.”.

Debate continued.

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.

7 MINISTERIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Mr Barr (Chief Minister) informed the Assembly of the absence of Minister Stephen‑Smith today and tomorrow and advised the Assembly of the following ministerial arrangements:

Questions without notice normally directed to the Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion; the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth; the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; and the Minister for Multicultural Affairs could be directed to Minister Berry. Questions without notice normally directed to the Minister for Workplace Safety and Industrial Relations could be directed to Minister Gentleman.

8 LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MEMBER

Mr Gentleman (Manager of Government Business) moved—That leave of absence be granted to Ms Stephen-Smith for today and tomorrow for official business.

Question—put and passed.

9 QUESTIONS

Questions without notice were asked.

10 PAPER

Ms Lawder, having made a personal explanation under standing order 46, by leave, presented the following paper:

Aluminium cladding safety in ACT—Email correspondence between Ms Lawder and Mr Gentleman’s office, dated 12, 21 and 24 July 2017.

11 Population growth

The order of the day having been read for the resumption of the debate on the motion of Mr Pettersson, and on the amendments moved by Ms Le Couteur (*see* [entry 6](#entry6)):

Debate resumed.

Question—That the amendments be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AYES, 2 | |  | NOES, 20 | |
| Ms Le Couteur |  |  | Mr Barr | Mrs Kikkert |
| Mr Rattenbury |  |  | Ms Berry | Ms Lawder |
|  |  |  | Ms Burch | Ms Lee |
|  |  |  | Ms Cheyne | Mr Milligan |
|  |  |  | Ms Cody | Ms Orr |
|  |  |  | Mr Coe | Mr Parton |
|  |  |  | Ms Fitzharris | Mr Pettersson |
|  |  |  | Mr Gentleman | Mr Ramsay |
|  |  |  | Mr Hanson | Mr Steel |
|  |  |  | Mrs Jones | Mr Wall |

And so it was negatived.

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

12 Director of Public Prosecutions—Funding

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

1. notes:
   1. the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) noted in the agency’s 2016‑2017 annual report that funding for the DPP was “at a critical level”;
   2. at the hearing of 23 June 2017, the Select Committee on Estimates 2017‑2018 heard that funding for the DPP “goes nowhere near meeting the needs of the office, particularly in the context of continuing efficiency measures”;
   3. the Committee also heard “the DPP must make compromises including selection of cases as well as compromises to the level of preparation and degree of expertise brought to cases”;
   4. the Committee stated “there is a valid argument for ensuring the DPP’s funding enables it to meet increasing prosecution service requirements to a high standard”; and
   5. the Justice and Community Safety Directorate is facing efficiency measures of $4.9 million, which includes the DPP as shown in the table provided to the Committee by the Directorate on notice; and
2. calls on the Government to implement the Select Committee’s recommendation that the:
   1. Office of the ACT Director of Public Prosecutions be excluded from the application of the efficiency dividend, and that all programs in this area be maintained or expanded as required to achieve the stated policy outcome;
   2. ACT Government seek submissions from the ACT Director of Public Prosecutions as to the funding required to attract and retain senior prosecutors and special provisions be applied to achieve this aim; and
   3. Office of the ACT Director of Public Prosecutions be authorised to prepare and present its own budget submissions, independent of the Justice and Community Safety Directorate.

Mr Ramsay (Attorney-General) moved the following amendment: Omit all words after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

“(1) notes:

(a) the recommendations of the Select Committee on Estimates 2016-2017 regarding funding of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP);

(b) a recurrent increase in base funding was provided to DPP of $3.028 million over four years in the 2017-18 Budget to fund the additional resources relating to the retrial of Mr David Eastman, plus a new Grade 4 Prosecutor;

(c) the DPP is not subject to an efficiency dividend in 2017-18 but will absorb a small share of the broader Justice and Community Safety Directorate (JACS) savings;

(d) the savings contributed by DPP amount to 0.53 per cent of its 2017-18 budget appropriation; and

(e) the DPP and JACS have recently completed a review of DPP resourcing, which is currently under consideration by Government; and

(2) calls on the Government to:

(a) continue working closely with the DPP to consider its future funding model in light of the recommendations of the review and the funding of the justice system more broadly; and

(b) update the Assembly on this work by the last sitting day of this calendar year.”.

Debate continued.

Question—That the amendment be agreed to—put.

The Assembly voted—

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AYES, 13 | |  | NOES, 9 | |
| Mr Barr | Ms Le Couteur |  | Mr Coe | Mr Parton |
| Ms Berry | Ms Orr |  | Mr Hanson | Mr Wall |
| Ms Burch | Mr Pettersson |  | Mrs Jones |  |
| Ms Cheyne | Mr Ramsay |  | Mrs Kikkert |  |
| Ms Cody | Mr Rattenbury |  | Ms Lawder |  |
| Ms Fitzharris | Mr Steel |  | Ms Lee |  |
| Mr Gentleman |  |  | Mr Milligan |  |

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

(1) notes:

(a) the recommendations of the Select Committee on Estimates 2016-2017 regarding funding of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP);

(b) a recurrent increase in base funding was provided to DPP of $3.028 million over four years in the 2017-18 Budget to fund the additional resources relating to the retrial of Mr David Eastman, plus a new Grade 4 Prosecutor;

(c) the DPP is not subject to an efficiency dividend in 2017-18 but will absorb a small share of the broader Justice and Community Safety Directorate (JACS) savings;

(d) the savings contributed by DPP amount to 0.53 per cent of its 2017-18 budget appropriation; and

(e) the DPP and JACS have recently completed a review of DPP resourcing, which is currently under consideration by Government; and

(2) calls on the Government to:

(a) continue working closely with the DPP to consider its future funding model in light of the recommendations of the review and the funding of the justice system more broadly; and

(b) update the Assembly on this work by the last sitting day of this calendar year.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

13 Ministerial travel

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

1. notes:
   1. the role of the Ministerial Code of Conduct in upholding the integrity of all Ministers in the ACT Legislative Assembly;
   2. that according to the Ministerial Code of Conduct item 3. a., Ministers must act according to the highest standards of personal integrity and probity, and uphold the ACT’s system of responsible government;
   3. that according to the Ministerial Code of Conduct item 5.d., Ministers must use administrative resources appropriately. Ministers must not permit public resources to be wasted or used in an improper manner;
   4. the number of overseas trips taken by ACT Labor and Green Ministers taken since the beginning of the 9th Assembly; and
   5. the lack of transparency around the use of ACT taxpayer funds during Ministerial overseas travel; and
2. calls on the ACT Government to:
   1. uphold the principles of the ACT Ministerial Code of Conduct; and
   2. make public within three months of return of travel, a reconciliation of all expenses incurred and activities undertaken by the ACT Government for ministerial travel, including all expenses for staff, public servants or any other person accompanying a Minister during any official travel.

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

“(1) notes:

(a) the Ministerial Code of Conduct;

(b) that, according to the Ministerial Code of Conduct item 3. a., Ministers must act according to the highest standards of personal integrity and probity, and uphold the ACT’s system of responsible government; and

(c) that, according to the Ministerial Code of Conduct item 5. d., Ministers must use administrative resources appropriately. Ministers must not permit public resources to be wasted or used in an improper manner; and

(2) further notes that:

(a) official travel to further the interests of the Australian Capital Territory is a component of ministerial duties;

(b) overseas travel by Ministers is undertaken in accordance with the International Engagement Strategy which provides a clear commitment to building enduring international relationships for the economic, cultural and social benefit of the ACT;

(c) Ministers regularly report to the Assembly on official international travel including key objectives, outcomes and benefits to the ACT;

(d) twice yearly, ministerial travel reports are provided to the Office of the Legislative Assembly by the Executive for publication on the Assembly website; and

(e) study travel allowance for non-Executive Members was abolished by the Remuneration Tribunal in 2014 following inconsistencies in usage and reporting by Members on international travel.”.

Debate continued.

Amendment agreed to.

Question—That the motion, as amended, viz:

“That this Assembly:

(1) notes:

(a) the Ministerial Code of Conduct;

(b) that, according to the Ministerial Code of Conduct item 3. a., Ministers must act according to the highest standards of personal integrity and probity, and uphold the ACT’s system of responsible government; and

(c) that, according to the Ministerial Code of Conduct item 5. d., Ministers must use administrative resources appropriately. Ministers must not permit public resources to be wasted or used in an improper manner; and

(2) further notes that:

(a) official travel to further the interests of the Australian Capital Territory is a component of ministerial duties;

(b) overseas travel by Ministers is undertaken in accordance with the International Engagement Strategy which provides a clear commitment to building enduring international relationships for the economic, cultural and social benefit of the ACT;

(c) Ministers regularly report to the Assembly on official international travel including key objectives, outcomes and benefits to the ACT;

(d) twice yearly, ministerial travel reports are provided to the Office of the Legislative Assembly by the Executive for publication on the Assembly website; and

(e) study travel allowance for non-Executive Members was abolished by the Remuneration Tribunal in 2014 following inconsistencies in usage and reporting by Members on international travel.”—

be agreed to—put and passed.

14 Ecotourism

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

1. notes:
   1. our natural environment is a diverse and dynamic system of finite elements which people are both a part of and a significant player within;
   2. we gain much from our environment;
   3. human activity can and has in many instances impacted adversely on our natural environment; and
   4. our unique relationship with the environment means we have a responsibility to rejuvenate landscapes that have been adversely impacted by human activity where possible;
2. acknowledges the:
   1. ACT Government’s continued support of and partnership with the Woodland and Wetlands Trust;
   2. remarkable work the Woodland and Wetlands Trust undertakes at Mulligans Flat and Jerrabomberra Wetlands including the reintroduction of Eastern Quolls and Bettongs; and
   3. recognition Mulligans Flat is receiving for their conservation and biodiversity research; and
3. calls on the Government to:
   1. continue its good work in nature conservation and scientific research;
   2. complete the promised design of the Mulligans Flat Eco Tourism Visitor Centre; and
   3. develop an ecotourism policy to support greater access, understanding and appreciation of Canberra’s natural environment.

Debate ensued.

Mr Wall addressing the Assembly—

*Adjournment negatived:* It being 6 pm—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.

Debate continued.

Question—put and passed.

15 Executive business—precedence

Ordered—That Executive business be called on forthwith.

16 Appropriation Bill 2017-2018

The Assembly, according to order, resumed further consideration at the detail stage.

*Detail Stage*

Schedule 1—Appropriations—Proposed expenditure—

Consideration resumed on Part 1.15—Justice and Community Safety Directorate—

Debate continued.

Debate adjourned (Mr Gentleman—Manager of Government Business) and the resumption of the debate made an order of the day for the next sitting.

17 ADJOURNMENT

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

Debate ensued.

Question—put and passed.

And then the Assembly, at 6.45 pm, adjourned until tomorrow at 10 am.

**MEMBERS’ ATTENDANCE:** All Members were present at some time during the sitting, except Mr Doszpot\*, Mrs Dunne\* and Ms Stephen-Smith\*.

\*on leave

Tom Duncan

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly