



New South Wales

Legislative Assembly

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES (HANSARD)

**Fifty-Sixth Parliament
First Session**

Tuesday, 15 May 2018

Authorised by the Parliament of New South Wales

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Presiding Officers	1
Absence of the Speaker.....	1
Private Members' Statements.....	1
Epping Bulls Junior Cricket Club	1
Visitors.....	2
Visitors.....	2
Private Members' Statements.....	2
Tribute to Thomas "Tom" Shiner	2
Oxley Electorate Events.....	3
Inverell White Ribbon Community	4
Visitors.....	5
Visitors.....	5
Private Members' Statements.....	5
Member for Prospect.....	5
Make Rent Fair Campaign.....	6
Castle Hill Electorate Infrastructure	6
Kembla Grange Prison Proposal.....	7
Tribute to William Robin Galvin, OAM.....	9
Israel Independence Day Seventieth Anniversary	9
Bathurst Electorate Infrastructure	10
Child Protection	11
Kiama Electorate Anzac Day Commemorations	11
Community Recognition Statements	13
Bankstown Bulls Rugby League Club.....	13
Wingham Riverside Reserve.....	13
Riding for the Disabled Association	13
Luddenham Show	13
Fairfield High School Our Faces Our Stories	13
Homicide Victims' Support Group	14
<i>The Voice Contestant Ricky Nifo</i>	14
Ensemble Theatre Sixtieth Anniversary	14
Zonta Club of Hunter Newcastle	14
Scout Leader Bob Rosser Retirement.....	14
Wyong Electorate Performing Arts	15
Australia My Country Competition	15
Campbelltown Camden District Cricket Club	15
Seaforth Public School.....	15
Central Coast Disability Network.....	15
Manning Base Hospital Midwifery Services	16
Maitland Regional Museum.....	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS—*continuing*

Hammondville Way2live Cafe	16
Campbelltown Electorate St Vincent De Paul Nagle Centre	16
Temora Girl Guides Eightieth Anniversary	17
St Merkorious Charity Group	17
Tribute to Denise Dagen	17
Kariong Neighbourhood Centre	17
St Ives Football Club Emin Rufati Tribute Day	17
Rutherford Barber John Quinton	18
Taree Rotary Club Youth Ambassador Marylyn Sendah	18
Visitors	18
Visitors	18
Commemorations	18
Centenary of First World War	18
Governor	19
Administration of the Government	19
Administration of the Government	19
Bills	19
Road Transport Legislation Amendment (Road Safety) Bill 2018	19
Farm Debt Mediation Amendment Bill 2018	19
Assent	19
Question Time	19
Northern Beaches Tunnel	19
Electoral Funding Laws	20
Northern Beaches Tunnel	21
Drought Assistance	22
Northern Beaches Tunnel	24
Koala Habitat Protection	26
Visitors	27
Visitors	27
Question Time	27
Northern Beaches Tunnel	27
Productivity Reform	28
Sexual Assault Strategy	30
School Curriculum	31
Committees	32
Legislation Review Committee	32
Report: Legislation Review Digest No. 54/56	32
Petitions	32
Petitions Received	32
Responses to Petitions	33
Business of the House	33
Business Lapsed	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS—*continuing*

Motions Accorded Priority	33
Industrial Relations Commission Relocation.....	33
Consideration	33
Motions Accorded Priority	33
School Maintenance.....	33
Consideration	33
Industrial Relations Commission Relocation.....	35
Priority	35
Bills	39
National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 201839	
Second Reading Debate	39
Visitors	48
Visitors	48
Bills	48
National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 201848	
Second Reading Debate	48
Third Reading	66
Private Members' Statements.....	66
Bayside Council Funding.....	66
North Shore Electorate Road Safety	67
Western NSW Business Chamber Business of the Year 123 Tix.....	67
Wallsend Electorate Road Infrastructure	68
Poultry Welfare.....	69
Breast Cancer Awareness Campaigns	70
Literacy and Numeracy Teachers	71
Albury Electorate Tourism	72

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15 May 2018

Presiding Officers

ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER

The Clerk announced the absence of the Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker (The Hon. Thomas George) took the chair at 12:00.

The Deputy Speaker read the Prayer and acknowledgement of country.

[Notices of motions given.]

Private Members' Statements

EPHING BULLS JUNIOR CRICKET CLUB

Mr DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (Epping) (12:09): I take this opportunity to commend the efforts of the Epping Bulls Junior Cricket Club. Earlier this month I was invited to its presentation evening to look back on the season and to celebrate all the achievements of the boys and girls of the Mighty Epping Bulls, which were well deserved. I am always pleased to see the wealth of talent in my electorate of Epping and I am particularly passionate about advocating for local sports in our communities as they provide excellent opportunities for our children to learn the values that make Australia a great place to live and learn—mateship, hard work and, most of all, the confidence to give everything a fair go. I was delighted to discover that the Bulls had yet another outstanding year and had come through by well and truly achieving a major milestone which they had hoped to achieve—the founding of an all-girls cricket team. Not only did the club field its first team in the girls' competition; the under-15s Mighty Bullettes went on to win the title.

While I was at the presentation, the president told us that the goal for the season was to win one game. Not only did they win one game; they won the title. Congratulations to the Bullettes—Aarya, Asteria, Amy, Erin, Jade, Jemima, Kaitlyn, Kathleen, Kirsten, Lulu, Nathali and Olivia—as well as their coach, club President Derek McCarthy. It is a tremendous achievement and I know that the club is proud of this outstanding group of young women. I also congratulate the junior, intermediate, and senior cricketers of the year: James Chan from the under-12s Blues, Yudi Shipurkar from the under-13s Blues and Nathan Sequeira from the under-15/16s Chappell Red team. Their discipline, persistence and love for the sport paid great dividends and they are all deserving recipients of these awards.

The way in which sporting clubs bring people together and foster the spirit of volunteerism is important in communities. Volunteering as a coach or referee requires a lot of hard work, dedication, travel and time, but the contribution they make to the community is considerable. The difference sport can make in young people's lives is invaluable. These generous individuals are investing in the next generation just as their parents and coaches did for them. Club President Derek McCarthy and his team are certainly a great example of this as the Epping Bulls Junior Cricket Club continues to prosper and thrive.

I take this opportunity to thank and acknowledge all the amazing volunteers in my electorate who keep our local sporting clubs running. I thank the parents who get up early on a Saturday and drive their kids all over Sydney and sometimes to other parts of the State; the coaches who organise the training and development of their players and strive to get the best out of them; the referees for their patience and dedication to one of the most thankless tasks in sport; the administrators who process memberships, raise funds and spend hours keeping the books in order; and all the other volunteers, supporters and sponsors who give of their time to make sure our kids have the opportunity to be active and be part of a team.

The New South Wales Government supports local sporting clubs through initiatives like the Active Kids Rebate and the Local Sport Grants Program. The sports grants provide a great way for members to assist clubs in their electorate and I acknowledge the great work of Minister Ayres and his team in facilitating this program. Again this year I was able to support a number of local sporting clubs. The successful grants included: upgraded drainage at James Henty Drive Oval for the West Pennant Hills Cherrybrook Soccer Club; new uniforms for the Epping Bulls Football Club and Epping Bulls Junior Cricket Club; an upgrade of the female change room and toilets at Ern Holmes Oval for the Pennant Hills Demons Junior AFL team to encourage more girls in the local area to take part in AFL; the purchase of grandstand seating at Greenway Park Pennant Hills AFL Club; and an

upgrade to the croquet equipment for the members of the Cheltenham Recreation Club. It is always rewarding when I attend club presentation evenings to see these projects realised and to hear firsthand about the difference they have made to our local sporting clubs.

Mr STUART AYRES (Penrith—Minister for Western Sydney, Minister for WestConnex, and Minister for Sport) (12:16): I acknowledge the fantastic work of the member for Epping in advocating for sporting organisations across his electorate. He understands clearly the health and social benefits of participating in sport. He is also a passionate advocate of all the sporting and financial support programs that the Government offers. I have no doubt that he will work with clubs in his electorate to gain access to the Greater Sydney Sports Facility Fund with \$100 million being allocated to community sport across metropolitan Sydney. This is about making sport more accessible. However, I say to the member for Epping that as a former Penrith Rams player that the trip to Ern Holmes Oval in his electorate was always tough. One was always up for a pretty tight contest when taking on the "Penno" boys.

Visitors

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognise in the public gallery this afternoon the family of the late Tom Shiner: his wife, Mrs Fay Shiner, his son, Mr Tom Shiner Jr, and his grandson, Mr Thomas Gonzalez. Welcome to the Parliament.

Private Members' Statements

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS "TOM" SHINER

Mr ANOULACK CHANTHIVONG (Macquarie Fields) (12:17): I pay tribute to a dear friend who recently passed away, Mr Tom Shiner of Ingleburn. I do so in the presence of his wife, Fay, his son, Tom, and his grandson, Thomas, who are in the public gallery today. When Tom Shiner was farewelled recently his coffin was welcomed into the chapel to the tune of the *Internationale*, the anthem of the socialist movement. When the service concluded, it did so to *Advance Australia Fair*. The commencement and conclusion of Tom's memorial service perfectly bookend the issues and passions that meant most to him, that is, Tom was 100 per cent committed to the cause of the worker and his union movement and he was 100 per cent a proud Australian.

For as long as I can remember, and certainly for as long as I have been active in Labor Party politics, Tom Shiner was a pillar and foundation of the local party structure—the Macquarie Fields-Ingleburn branch. Indeed, up until recently Tom was the only life member of the Australian Labor Party from the Macquarie Fields-Ingleburn branch. Tom gave his life to the party. He never lost hope or wavered in his belief that the party was the agent of change for good. He was always up well before dawn on election day to set up his booths and he was always the last to leave when the polls closed at 6.00 p.m. Indeed, one of the most endearing images I have of Tom is when he handed out flyers for me at Ingleburn railway station when I was running for Macquarie Fields in the election. Despite his ill health and obvious difficulties, Tom was there supporting his candidate and his party.

Despite his relatively modest academic qualifications, Tom was very much a self-taught and widely read man. This was very evident in the frequent long and complex motions he moved at branch meetings. Hardly a meeting would go by without Tom rising to his feet saying, "Mr Chairman". Often Tom's motions would focus on matters of branch democracy and the need for rank-and-file preselections. I always sought Tom's signature on my preselection nomination form. In seeking and securing Tom's support I knew that, at least in some small way, I was keeping true to Labor values.

Apart from his activity in the ALP, Tom was also a proud unionist. At his funeral, Tim Ayres, the National Secretary of the Australian Manufacturing Workers Union [AMWU], spoke eloquently about Tom's tireless efforts on behalf of workers. Tom Shiner never took a backward step in defending the rights and conditions of workers. Indeed, in retirement Tom devoted much of his time to being the secretary of the retired members division of his union. The Granville office of the AMWU was like a second home to Tom for all those years.

Apart from Tom's union and political interests, he was a very keen sportsman. From playing rugby league in Guyra to representing the Canterbury Rugby League Football Club, Tom was known for his tenacity on the field. In fact, at the wake to celebrate his life at the Ingleburn RSL, Tom was described as being staunch on the field. Staunch is an attribute that can be applied to almost every aspect of Tom's life. You knew where you stood with Tom Shiner, and he never gave an inch in standing up for what he believed in. Apart from rugby league, Tom was also a keen golfer, cricketer and cricket umpire. Sport was certainly one of his great passions.

Tom Shiner, unionist; Tom Shiner, ALP supporter and life member; Tom Shiner, sportsman; and Tom Shiner, family man: The pillar of Tom's family life was his wife—his gal from Guyra—Fay. My respect and

admiration for Fay know no bounds. In good times and in bad, Fay never wavered—not once. Fay was always there for Tom and she was always there for their four children—Tom Jnr, Mick, Chris and Rebecca—while Tom did other things. To Fay—whose sense of loss I can only imagine—I simply state my 100 per cent respect and admiration for your commitment to Tom and to your family. With the loss of Tom Shiner, the local ALP has lost not only a life member, but also a true believer. May Tom Shiner—workers' friend, staunch trade unionist, passionate debater and proud family man—rest in peace.

OXLEY ELECTORATE EVENTS

Mrs MELINDA PAVEY (Oxley—Minister for Roads, Maritime and Freight) (12:22): I am fortunate to live on the Mid North Coast and to represent the electorate of Oxley. It has been an exciting week in Oxley with the Premier visiting. The Premier visited Kempsey for an afternoon tea, and at Urunga, during an afternoon tea, we announced \$8.25 million from the New South Wales Government to upgrade the wastewater treatment works—an enormous amount of funding—bringing the area's infrastructure, in partnership with the Kempsey Shire Council, into the twenty-first century.

I also acknowledge support from our Regional Tourism Fund for Stuarts Point and District Community Organisation. On Monday last week we went to Stuarts Point, a beautiful waterside hamlet set to be revitalised with a matching \$1.7 million grant from both the State Government and the Kempsey Shire Council to improve recreational facilities, restore the water environment and beautify the reserve. It is a very popular holiday destination and the funding, on top of the funding we announced two years ago for Stuarts Point sewerage services, will be a great boost to the area.

In the northern part of the electorate, Bellingen's agricultural show was a stunning success. The weather was perfectly behaved that weekend and record numbers of people came out to support the show. I thank everyone who volunteered at the show, especially the volunteers in the kitchen, as well as those volunteers who made sure that all the cattle were judged and that the horses performed beautifully. It was a great day and it brought together and showcased all the many elements of the interesting community of Bellingen, including art, culture and agriculture. It was a brilliant day and a great show.

I congratulate the Urunga Mylestom Chamber of Commerce, in particular Jo Brotherton, for the Urunga Day Mother's Day event held on Sunday under a beautiful autumn blue sky. Called Love Urunga, it was organised by the chamber of commerce with the help of volunteers. It was a brilliant morning and afternoon. I met with some old friends and there is nothing better than seeing old friends with whom I had been to school. We all caught up and we are all responsible mothers now with our own children. It was just wonderful.

I acknowledge Dorrigo resident, Bob Denner. I was able to visit Bob yesterday to thank and congratulate him on his Order of Australia medal. For the past 25 years, Bob has worn three hats that include the Dorrigo RSL Sub-Branch secretary, pensions and welfare officer. He has also been deeply committed to Coffs Coast Legacy club since 1992, serving as president from 2013-15 and being granted life membership in 2017. Bob was the member who took the young Mark Donaldson, VC, an Australian hero, and his brother Brent, under his wing when their mother, a Legacy widow, was killed in the most dreadful circumstances in 1996.

Bob spent two decades in the Australian Army, having joined 56 years ago on Australia Day in 1962 as a staff cadet at the Royal Military College, Duntroon. After graduating as a lieutenant, he served in several places including Vietnam in 1967-68, England and Germany. Following that, he took the rank of lieutenant colonel. Bob says one of his great pleasures has been establishing the Dorrigo Memorial RSL Club Military Museum, which contains 600 items of memorabilia, including a medal from the Siege of Lucknow during the Indian Rebellion 1857 and items from the Boer War up to Afghanistan. His wife of 30 years, Gwynneth, estimates that the time Bob dedicates to the RSL and Legacy is the equivalent of a full-time job.

Alongside his service to veterans and their families, Bob's citation also lists his work with the RSL North Coast District Council, committees for Bellingen Shire Council, the Dorrigo Youth Clinic, the Dorrigo Plateau Community Inc., the Dorrigo Seniors' Housing Action Group, the Dorrigo Multi Purpose Service and the Dorrigo Drama Club. Some years ago when he was being considered for an Order of Australia medal, the judges could not believe the amount of work he was doing and thought that he may not have been involved as deeply as he was. He certainly is involved very deeply and we are very proud of his work. I will speak more about this in the House later.

I acknowledge the work of the people involved in the Kempsey Place Plan. This incredible group is working together to create building and employment opportunities for social housing tenants. So far the success of that plan is phenomenal, with at least 78 jobs identified. This is important because the group is establishing direct links between social housing tenants and the mainstream community. It is breaking down barriers. Last Tuesday I had the pleasure of introducing the team who work at the Kempsey Place Plan to the Premier at

our afternoon tea last Tuesday in Kempsey, which was a wonderful afternoon. To see the excitement, the generosity and the spirit of these people, who are working deep in the community, breaking down silos, achieving things with the private sector as well as the government sector, is absolutely brilliant. I will talk more about it, but I am very proud of the work they are doing.

INVERELL WHITE RIBBON COMMUNITY

Mr ADAM MARSHALL (Northern Tablelands—Minister for Tourism and Major Events, and Assistant Minister for Skills) (12:27): I inform the House about an incredible community-driven project in Inverell in my electorate that has led to this regional community being named Australia's first White Ribbon Community. Never before has an entire community achieved this level of recognition from White Ribbon Australia. Earlier this month, I had the great pleasure of attending an Inverell Black and White Masquerade Ball where the Mayor, Paul Harmon, announced that Inverell had formally achieved the title after 18 months of tireless effort by the Inverell Shire Council. The Inverell Shire Council worked closely with a number of community stakeholders, such as Rural Outreach and Support Services headed by Vicki Higgins, to create actionable strategies to counter the scourge of domestic violence in their community.

Being a White Ribbon Community is in no way just symbolic for Inverell. It is something that actually matters and it is something that the community has been working on for some time. By collaborating with NSW Health, NSW Police through the local officers, the Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Department of Education and local schools, local domestic service providers, local employers and the broader community, the council has been able to develop five key pillars upon which to build a plan to make Inverell a safer place for women, for children and for families.

Over the past two years, the focus has been to create a pilot program based on raising community awareness of domestic violence through a number of measures: increasing community awareness and education; educating and empowering young people about the issue; training and mobilising men to prevent violence and attracting them to become ambassadors to stamp out the terrible practice; collaborating with groups already in the community to increase Inverell's capacity to handle domestic violence and look after victims when domestic violence occurs; and forging strong, cross-sector partnerships to tackle domestic violence. Inverell knew that in order to create a program that would work it had to reach everyone in the community, through their work or school or in their social lives, and engage all groups—men and women, young and old, employer and employee, business and at home.

It would be impossible to list every business and group that has been actively engaged over the past two years in creating Australia's first White Ribbon Community in Inverell, but I will attempt to give this House an understanding of the vast scope of this project. Major employers such as BEST Employment, Boss Engineering and TAFE Inverell are providing free information to their employees and displaying signage. Seven licensed premises are now permanently signed on to the White Ribbon awareness campaign. All nine of the local primary schools have engaged with the Breaking the Silence Program, run by White Ribbon Australia. All three local high schools have participated in the Love Bites program, designed by the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect as an early intervention program, teaching adolescents about the many forms of domestic abuse. Nine White Ribbon Ambassadors under the age of 25 have joined the movement, with more to come, and education forums have started with male-dominated groups in the area. Every public toilet in the town has up-to-date signage about domestic violence resources, and those signs are rotated on a monthly basis.

These initiatives are just a very small sample of what Inverell is doing to counter domestic violence by increasing awareness and, most importantly particularly in rural communities, starting conversations about the problem and breaking the taboo mentality that many people have when this subject is raised. The more comfortable people feel speaking about domestic violence, the more information is available to victims, perpetrators or potential perpetrators and the more chance we have of combating domestic violence in our community. I acknowledge and publicly recognise the historic efforts by Inverell Shire Council and the leadership it has shown in the Inverell community in establishing this ground-breaking pilot program in partnership with the New South Wales Government through the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

Only through this type of coordinated approach, where the entire community is involved, can domestic violence be countered on a day-to-day basis in every single workplace in every situation, and in places that are hidden from our sight and from our local police force, policymakers and support workers. Domestic violence is never okay—never, never, never—and when a community states that loud and clear and stands together in solidarity we have a chance to permanently change our culture that has historically allowed domestic violence to thrive in silence. I congratulate Inverell on this acknowledgement, and I look forward to continuing to work with all members of the community to stamp out this terrible scourge.

*Visitors***VISITORS**

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Ms Sonia Horner): I welcome all visitors in the public gallery, especially the wife of the member for Prospect, Bettina McMahon.

*Private Members' Statements***MEMBER FOR PROSPECT**

Dr HUGH McDERMOTT (Prospect) (12:33): I want to address the Parliament on a matter that has led to the past months being the most confronting and distressing period not just in my parliamentary career, but in my entire professional life. To have one's name falsely plastered on the front page as a sexual predator is not something I would wish on my worst enemy. These claims deeply affected my elderly mother, who is what is referred to as a "Forgotten Australian". She is a survivor of institutional abuse as a girl and young woman at the hands of perpetrators within State orphanages—institutions that have been exposed constantly due to testimony before the recent royal commission—and her resilience inspired me to take on the role of patron of CLAN, the Care Leavers Australasia Network.

It has affected my wife in her roles as a senior government official and board chair of a not-for-profit association that was set up to improve the lives of children. It has affected my daughters, who have endured the headlines about me via whispers in the school community. My teenage daughter read about the claims on social media. It has affected my work as chair of the Opposition Waste Watch Committee and has undermined my standing in the Prospect community that I am so proud to serve.

I will put on the record in this House a few facts: I have never indulged in conduct that constitutes sexual harassment; there was never a complaint made to me about sexual harassment by any staff member or any other person; and there has never been, to my knowledge, a complaint made to the Department of Parliamentary Services, the NSW Police Force, the relevant trade unions, or the New South Wales Labor Party. Regardless of this, these false allegations were still reported prominently in the media. In response, NSW Labor instituted an independent inquiry into these allegations by respected barrister John Whelan. He has found that there was no substance to the allegations. The assessment finds that:

- The claims of sexual harassment are not made out;
- The claims of workplace bullying and inappropriate behaviour are not made out;
- The claims of misuse of electoral allowance are not made out;

...

I do recognise the advice in the assessment to be more conscious of my own bearing in the office, and will take this on board. Throughout this process I was conscious of the risks inherent in defending myself in this matter. Women face sexual harassment too often in workplaces in Australia, and this a challenge that our society must address. Women must feel free to stand up for themselves in the workplace without fear of retribution. I do not want to add to those fears by going into detail about what I believe really motivated this attack on me. But I will make this point: It is incumbent on everyone involved in politics from all political parties not to use false sexual harassment allegations as a political weapon or for personal political advantage. It is devastating to be the target of this sort of attack—devastating to me and to my family. More fundamentally, it damages the broader mission to provide safe working environments for women.

The *#metoo* movement is extremely important and I fully support its aims. Harassment and violence against women must be fought against and never tolerated in any form. Finally, I would like to thank my parliamentary colleagues in this place from both sides of the Chamber and the hundreds of people in the electorate of Prospect and the wider community who have stood with me and my family throughout this ordeal. I would like to single out one message I received during the first days when allegations arose—a message that brought my wife and me to tears. The message reads:

Hi Hugh,

I just wanted you to know that our church prayed for you and Bettina this morning and my heart goes out to you personally. When I read the article in the newspaper yesterday I became very angry.

I want to encourage you to stick this out and don't give up. You are needed in State politics. As one wise man once said, "This too will pass."

Blessings, Ben

Now I will return to my role in this Parliament and in the NSW Labor Opposition with a renewed vigour to work for a more inclusive State, where everyone has the right to pursue their aspirations.

MAKE RENT FAIR CAMPAIGN

Ms JENNY LEONG (Newtown) (12:38): In 2004, before I was elected as a member of this place, we launched The Greens campaign to protect renters rights. For the more than 50 per cent of the households at the time who we knew were renting in the Newtown electorate, that was a high priority. We called for an end to no grounds evictions and the need to cap rent increases to once per year in line with the consumer price index [CPI]. In 2014 The Greens worked in collaboration with renters, organisations and groups to put renters rights on the agenda. Fast forward to 2018, and the Make Rent Fair campaign has grown to more than 90 organisations supporting their call to end unfair evictions that hurt us all. The Ethnic Communities' Council of NSW, Community Legal Centres NSW, the Tenants' Union, Homelessness NSW, Shelter NSW, the Uniting Church, United Voice, Newtown Neighbourhood Centre, Unions NSW, Redfern Legal Centre and Mission Australia—I could go on and on—are among the 90 organisations that support the Make Rent Fair campaign.

We have seen the momentum grow to end unfair evictions in which people are kicked out of their home as a result of greedy or dodgy landlords wanting to put up the rent or avoid their obligations to do basic maintenance on their properties. The time to end no grounds evictions is now. We need to provide security to the 826,922 households renting in New South Wales—that is, 31.8 per cent of households—that need to be provided with protection. In the electorate of Newtown 60 per cent of households are renting. But the issue is not limited to the inner city and the inner west: In the Premier's electorate of Willoughby rental households now outnumber households that have mortgages or own their home outright. It is similar in Lane Cove—the electorate of the Minister for Planning, and Minister for Housing—with renters outnumbering people who have mortgages. The Deputy Premier, and Leader of The Nationals should also be paying attention, because in the town of Queanbeyan a massive 46.9 per cent of people live with rental insecurity and in his electorate of Monaro 27 per cent of households rent.

It is time to change the laws to end unfair, no grounds evictions. After years of campaigning, The Greens know that much more needs to be done to protect the rights of renters. Today I will tell the House about The Greens plan to address the rental crisis and provide renters with more security. We have set out a 10-point plan that will show the people of New South Wales how committed The Greens are to change for and genuine protection of renters. We want to see an end to no grounds evictions, cap rent by limiting rent increases to once per year and regulate to prevent rent increases beyond CPI. We want to improve the flexibility for tenants in cases of domestic and family violence. We want to ensure transparency, through the creation of a publicly available maintenance log and maintenance reports, for people seeking repairs from their landlords.

The Greens want to establish rental housing standards for safety and sustainability issues. We want to allow tenants to make minor changes more easily, and we want to remove the no pets clause. Having a pet is a personal choice and personal responsibility. It is not okay to make renters second-class citizens when it comes to having a pet. We want to improve the management of tenant bonds and interest. Our final commitment is to make sure that people living in shared houses are offered the necessary protections.

One of the biggest issues in the State is that the legislation, protections and focus of the Liberal Party and The Nationals have not caught up with the reality of the number of people living as renters. It is high time that we take a stand, put renters rights on the agenda and make a commitment to tip the balance—to take the power from greedy and dodgy landlords and return it to the families, communities and households who rent in New South Wales. The Greens are committed to protecting renters rights. We will continue, proudly and strongly, to be the voice for renters in this Parliament until we achieve that change.

CASTLE HILL ELECTORATE INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr RAY WILLIAMS (Castle Hill—Minister for Multiculturalism, and Minister for Disability Services) (12:44): The NSW Government has been cutting the costs of living, building infrastructure and supporting our local communities, and my electorate has certainly been the beneficiary of significant investment across all these areas. In this last year alone \$345,000 has been directed to local community groups and sporting clubs for projects that will help benefit the residents of Castle Hill. The 1st Castle Hill Scouts completed the new wing of the scout hall, including flooring, gyprocking the ceiling, and installing security windows, storage lockers and wiring with \$12,000 of funding. The 1st Kellyville Scout Group was able to install indoor toilets and a modern shower facility inside the scout hall that will also have disabled access, creating an inclusive environment for all to enjoy, with \$40,000.

A grant of \$33,589 to Baulkham Hills Shire Netball Association enabled the purchase of an automatic game timer, amplifier, outdoor speakers, internal speakers, antennas and new microphones, which will support

the many thousands of young ladies who play netball in my electorate. The Castle Glen Community Centre required various upgrades, including making the existing toilet accessible from outside the centre, replacing a septic tank and upgrading floodlighting on the field, which were made possible with \$30,000. Castle Hill Knights Baseball Club, a proactive and successful club which is growing very quickly, was able to purchase four new pitching machines at a cost of \$5,000 which will continue to support the growth of baseball in my area. Castle Hill BMX Club will hold the New South Wales State titles in the next few months and is now able to expand the roof over "start hill", which will provide protected areas for large volumes of riders, and an all-weather training area through the provision of \$20,000 in funding. Castle Hill Community Church was able to install air conditioning in the hall at a cost of \$15,946. The hall is used by the church and local community groups.

Castle Hill United Football Club received \$5,000 for the upgrade of new equipment. Emmanuel Anglican Church at Glenhaven was able to build a fantastic multi-use children's playground with soft-fall and shade cover with \$20,000 of funding. Glenhaven Public School rejuvenated its playground, which included returfing and resurfacing of playground areas of the school, with \$30,000. Hills Basketball Association is now able to provide high-level and capacity coaching seminars and courses due to \$2,000 in funding. Hills Basketball Association has installed new security cameras at the Hills Sports Stadium, which is now the largest basketball facility in NSW, with a grant of \$7,500. The Hills Football association now has \$5,000 funding to commence a fantastic female participation campaign. Hills United soccer club purchased some great new club uniforms with \$5,000.

As the Minister for Disability Services I was proud to support Inala, a local disability provider in my electorate, to upgrade its facility by purchasing two Kensington Adult Change tables and a Roze Lifter, which will improve the personal care, safety and dignity for individuals with a disability, at a cost of \$10,465. Kellyville Public School is one of the most vibrant schools in my area, and it has now built a modern outdoor adventure playground, to Australian safety standards, with a grant of \$25,000. Kellyville United Football Club has been able to purchase new uniforms and provide a registration subsidy as well as purchase stackable bench seats and a line marker, with \$5,000. My old church—Rouse Hill Anglican Church—has had its main foyer refurbished to provide an easily accessible meeting space for newly arrived or vulnerable members of the community with \$33,000. Rouse Hill Rangers Football Club was able to purchase new uniforms and provide equipment subsidies for players with \$5,000. St Bernadette's Football Club was also able to purchase club uniforms and sporting equipment with \$5,000. Summit Disability Network has been able to purchase a bus to transport its disabled clients to various venues with \$30,000.

Castle Hill has also benefited from the Before and After School Care grants, with \$30,000 going to St Bernadette's Primary School in Castle Hill, and a fantastic defibrillator grant of \$1,250 to Castle Hill Knights Baseball Club. The Castle Hill community has also benefited from other initiatives such as Return and Earn. On average, my local constituents are returning around 20,000 containers each day—which equates to 3.32 million containers—meaning \$332,000 to the constituents of Castle Hill. Through the compulsory third party green slip refunds scheme, \$351,125.73 has been returned to vehicle owners in my electorate. Castle Hill has the greatest proportion of households with two or more motor vehicles, and the lowered green slip premiums will mean that 72.7 per cent of households in Castle Hill will save more than \$314 this year on a new premium. Hundreds of local families have taken up the Active Kids rebate, saving families money and getting more kids onto playing fields. Castle Hill also received \$567,478 worth of maintenance over the summer holiday period across our schools, with an additional \$25 million now allocated for the upgrade of Samuel Gilbert Public School and \$40 million being directed towards a new public school in North Kellyville to cater for our growing community.

After decades of neglect by the former Labor Government, this New South Wales Liberal and National Government is delivering a strong economy and providing opportunities for families and small businesses to get ahead. We are creating more local jobs, building new infrastructure and, very importantly, decreasing the cost of living for hardworking families through wonderful grants. Whether it is through sporting endeavours or other initiatives such as the Community Building Partnerships, we are doing everything we can to decrease the cost of living and provide greater benefits to our electorates across New South Wales.

KEMBLA GRANGE PRISON PROPOSAL

Ms ANNA WATSON (Shellharbour) (12:49): More than a month ago, members opposite announced that they may build a prison at a site in Kemplar Grange, across the road from new housing developments in West Dapto. Unsurprisingly, local residents are very worried about that. As such, I called on the Government to fast-track community consultation, come to the Illawarra and organise to speak to the community before the end of May. Instead, those opposite announced a few "drop-in centres" near local shops where residents could view the plans in late June. This obviously is not good enough. The planned consultation is a sham. Two weeks ago in this House I voiced my disgust. I said:

Every stakeholder and resident needs to be in the same room at the same time to voice their opinions. It is the only way to ensure the entire community is on the same page.

I am pleased that the member for Kiama is in the Chamber today. Sadly, it seems that those opposite were not listening when I gave that statement. Luckily, I took matters into my own hands. At 2 o'clock this Saturday afternoon in the Sinclair Room at Dapto Leagues Club, I will hold a public meeting to ensure that the entire community is able to express its opinion about the Government's proposal. Unlike the member for Kiama, I will be there listening to the people who I have been elected to represent. Anyone and everyone is welcome to attend the meeting. I invited the member for Kiama; I hope that he changes his mind and comes along on Saturday. I want to give everyone with a stake in the project a space to discuss the proposal. Whether they are for or against the project, everyone needs to be in the same room to reach a consensus and know that they are being listened to.

After the initial announcement, my office was overwhelmed with emails from local residents, people from surrounding suburbs and even Sydneysiders who have bought land in the area. So far, my community has overwhelmingly told me that it is not against jobs or a prison in the region, but it is against a prison in that location. That said, I still want to meet with every stakeholder so that I can have a fully informed position on the project and our community can reach a consensus. I have personally invited the Minister for Corrections, the Parliamentary Secretary for the Illawarra and South Coast, landowners of the site, and representatives from Corrective Services NSW, Wollongong City Council, the local business chamber and local Aboriginal Land Council.

Sadly, not everyone responded to their invitation with a basic level of respect. Yesterday, the member for Kiama publicly refused to attend the event and even had the gall to call it a political stunt. Am I surprised? No. I am disappointed and disgusted by the way the member for Kiama chooses to carry himself. Unfortunately, of course, this probably will never change. The member for Kiama had an opportunity to turn up and listen to his community—to do what he has been elected to do. We in this House have been elected to serve our constituents, yet the parliamentary secretary cannot be bothered to give up a couple of hours on a Saturday afternoon to speak with the community.

I ask the member for Kiama to put himself in the shoes of a young family or first home buyer who has done everything right—worked hard, scrimped and saved for years to pull together a deposit for his first home, just to have his dream come crashing down. I ask him to imagine that the person who has been elected to represent him tells him to stop complaining because a different development could be "far more intrusive" than this proposal. What a kick in the guts. His comments were a tasteless, childish outburst at best and a blatant threat to local residents at worst.

There is a right way and a wrong way to make an announcement such as this. The Government chose the wrong way. It has openly threatened local residents, who have every right to voice their concerns. This community's representative has publicly refused to meet with the community and ease the tension the Government's own rushed proposal has created. Finally, those opposite have blatantly spat in the face of the people they are supposed to represent, all the while turning the issue into a political battlefield with childish digs and insults.

To the member for Kiama, I have said it once and I will say it again: I will not stoop to his level. The member should get a grip and get on with his job. He does not have to spin every conversation for his own political gain; sometimes he just has to listen. His comments yesterday in *The Mercury* were nothing but cheap, rubbish political point-scoring, and no-one is buying what he is selling. Whether the member is there or not, the meeting will go ahead. The community will come together to discuss the proposal and anything or anyone to do with it as it sees fit. I will be there listening, as I have been elected to do.

Mr GARETH WARD (Kiama) (12:54): Do you know what was missing from that statement? A position on the prison. Not once did that weathervane, the member for Shellharbour, indicate which particular way she is going, because she is spinning to the left, she is spinning to the right and she does not know where she is going. Let me correct the record. I had a meeting in this place with the member for Shellharbour and her Labor colleagues. She agreed to the consultation outline. Let us contrast her behaviour with that of the member for Wollongong, who asked me for an additional meeting that I facilitated—professional to the letter. I suggest that has something to do with the fact that Gino Mandarino is working for him and not you these days. Regarding your call, I am happy to meet people, as I did yesterday. Yesterday I met constituents about this proposal, and I will meet anybody. The meeting that you say is about extra information will not provide any because you did not consult with me as I consulted with you.

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Ms Sonia Hornery): The Parliamentary Secretary will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr GARETH WARD: I gave you the credit and the opportunity to meet with me and to sort out the consultation dates. You did not do the same. You have no courtesy or tact.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM ROBIN GALVIN, OAM

Mr ANTHONY ROBERTS (Lane Cove—Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing, and Special Minister of State) (12:55): I pay tribute to a gentleman who achieved great things, but has now moved to a greater place. We too often use honorifics such as hero, champion, legendary, et cetera, for people but William—or Bill—Galvin was each of these and more. William Robin Galvin, OAM, was a hero to many, a champion in many circles and is now legendary within the community, and more specifically the hospitality industry. He was a good friend, a great champion and always a loyal servant of the Crown. Bill used to say that life goes on and no-one is indispensable. He was a no fuss man who, late last month, accepted God's invitation to take his skills and knowledge to a more heavenly venue. Sadly, but in his fabled and favourite manner, he went quickly, quietly and without fanfare.

Bill's last achievement was as Chief Executive Officer of Tourism Training Australia. In 1982 Bill established Tourism Training Australia to develop a flexible and effective training system for the tourism and hospitality industry. He came to that role eminently well qualified and credentialed. Bill commenced his career in commercial catering, and food and beverage management with Federal Hotels Australia. His career changed direction when he joined the Hilton International chain of hotels by accepting appointments in Vancouver and Montreal where he completed management training. In 1970 he accepted further positions in London and later France and Holland. By that stage Bill was well travelled, well credentialed and well respected. Returning to Australia in 1972 he joined TAFE as a full-time teacher where he served in a number of executive positions. By 1988 Bill was head of TAFE NSW Tourism and Hospitality Training with headquarters at the Ryde College of Hotel Administration.

In between all of that Bill completed a Churchill Fellowship in the United States and Europe, where he studied hospitality training. He also took up fellowships in Europe and China where he furthered his knowledge of the developing tourism industries in those diverse countries. A workaholic—some would say a glutton for punishment—his curriculum vitae showed he was President of the Tourism Hospitality & Catering Institute of Australia, a member of the Tourism Taskforce, between 1995 and 2000 a foundation member of the organising committee for the Sydney Olympic Games bid, and chaired industry groups in preparation for and during the Games. Indeed, if one speaks to colleagues from that time they say that Bill played a huge role in ensuring Sydney won the bid for the 2000 Olympic Games. He also served on the advisory board for Kenvale College of Tourism & Hospitality Management.

Upon meeting the delightful Miss Elizabeth Pritchard, Bill made it his mission to marry her. They did marry, and that partnership lasted a happy, contented 50-plus years. But it was Bill and Elizabeth's wedding day that left the future OAM recipient a little cut up. On the day he was to be wed he failed to see the closed glass door and crashed through it. That walk-through saw the tip of his nose cut off. But that was not going to stop him from marrying Elizabeth. Ever patient, Liz was left to kill a bit of time while the groom-to-be was taken to hospital where understanding surgeons reattached the tip of his nose. Three hours later and late, bandaged Bill and Elizabeth finally exchanged their vows.

When times got tough for others, Bill was the first to call by. When friends were faced with sickness, depression or even public ridicule Bill would call to make sure they were okay. Bill worked hand in hand with Tony Abbott helping to stage the former Prime Minister's annual Pollie Pedal dinner. These two seasoned campaigners raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for Tony's very deserving charities. This month, on a sad day, I was honoured to stand alongside Tony Abbot and former State and Federal Minister Bruce Baird as pallbearers at Bill's funeral. It is hard to believe, but I would say that the catering and hospitality in heaven has probably gone up a notch since Bill's arrival. Rest in eternal peace William Robin Galvin, OAM. Again, I offer the sincere sympathy of the members of this House and my own to Elizabeth, his wife. Vale Bill Galvin.

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON (Vaucluse—Minister for the Environment, Minister for Local Government, and Minister for Heritage) (12:59): It has been five years since my last visit to Israel. I was lucky enough to arrive on the seventieth anniversary of Israel's independence, Yom Ha'Atzmaut. It was a hard-fought struggle for independence that requires eternal vigilance. It is certainly not taken for granted by friends of Israel, such as Australia and New South Wales. To be in Israel for such a significant anniversary was a true honour. In Jerusalem it was a beautiful, warm day, the national flag was fluttering everywhere, people were promenading in the streets, noisy jets streaked overhead and the air was thick with the smell of family barbeques. The celebration had taken over the city and I could not help but be affected by the city's optimism and pride in what was achieved against all odds in May 1948.

Unlike my last visit some years ago, I did not arrive expecting to find potential solutions to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. I was more realistic. I wanted a few more insights into this amazing nation and its

resilient people. I also expected to learn more about its fantastic, now world famous, innovative spirit—and indeed I did. The Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce trade missions, as with the Women's Leadership mission I was on two weeks ago, deliver understanding. Not only did the meetings and visits provide that, but the amazingly talented women on the mission also added to my rich learnings. A major highlight for me was our visit to Masada. What an extraordinary journey it was weaving up in the cable car—the dusty, barren landscape was overwhelming in its scale and sense of isolation. Ingenuity in that land started early. Herod's fortress and the Jews who lived there showed how such a hostile natural environment engendered both creativity and doggedness those many years ago.

Our visits to Hebrew University, the Israel Innovation Authority and the Bank of Israel revealed it is not enough to rely simply on ingenuity. The right plans and incentives have converted many a start-up dream to the international stage as a success story. Ahead of Anzac Day, I laid a wreath on behalf of the Vaucluse electorate at the Mount Scopus Commonwealth War Graves. A panoramic view of Jerusalem lay behind me as I reflected on the sacrifices that our service men and women made and continue to make. It was another reminder of the strong ties that bind Israel and Australia. Former Australian Friends of Magen David Adom Chair Roland Nagel hosted me for a morning at Magen David Adom [MDA] in Jerusalem. It is such an essential non-government service in Israel. I saw the extraordinary generosity of the New South Wales community expressed through the donation of emergency vehicles crucial to the efforts of MDA. These yellow and white bikes and trucks are able to nimbly dodge through the streets helping to save lives in record time.

And, yes, visiting Yad Vashem was just as gut wrenching on this occasion as last time. From a sunny day outside the group entered a void of reflection on evil. It remains sickening to me that the Shoah could ever have happened. No matter your colour, creed or country, it is your duty to remember the evil and to fight against it. We must never forget or minimise it as something that happened last century. That is why I was so honoured at the end of the visit to take part in a moving ceremony where we laid a wreath and kindled the flame of remembrance. What did I take away from that brief trip? A renewed sense of vigilance. We must be vigilant for the sake of humanity. Hateful violence cannot be ignored, it cannot be minimised and it cannot be put in the too-hard basket. Standing back from the individual parts of this extraordinary mission, what did I actually take away? In addition to my reflection on hateful violence, I delighted in watching my fellow "missionaries" take in Israel for the first time.

I got to see Israel through their eyes, as well as my own. Maybe it was the tone set by Yom Ha'Atzmaut the day I arrived, but I did feel that there was a new sense of confidence from within Israel. Is it positively affected by a friendly White House? Possibly, yes. Is it positively affected by the shifts in power in the Middle East? Possibly, yes. But Israel, so used to being under siege, needs little to spur such optimism. It is an admirable quality that everyone should learn from. I commend my private member's statement to the House.

BATHURST ELECTORATE INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr PAUL TOOLE (Bathurst—Minister for Lands and Forestry, and Minister for Racing) (13:04):

I am pleased to talk about a number of significant projects in my electorate that are continuing to support the community and to make a difference to the lives of people living in those areas—whether they be community services, health facilities or growing tourism. I shall refer to some of the highlights announced during the past couple of weeks in the Bathurst electorate. This is a significant investment by the New South Wales Government in improving the lives of people in those communities.

Yesterday I went to Rylstone, which is a smaller community on the outskirts of my electorate. Whilst there I announced that under the New South Wales Government's Public Library Infrastructure Grants program the community would receive a grant of \$72,400. That significant investment will give the Mid-Western Regional Council the opportunity to renovate and refurbish the existing council building and transform that premises into a space that will be utilised for a library. This will make a big difference in that community because people will no longer have to travel five or six kilometres up the road to use the library at Kandos. Rylstone will have its own standalone library where people will be able to borrow resources—whether that be books, magazines or ebooks. They will be able to use technology that is available. Libraries play an important role in our communities—they are at the heart of the community and are transforming the way in which the digital age is dealt with. Elderly people and families in the Rylstone community will no longer have to travel to Kandos to access a library. Instead, they can use the resources at Rylstone.

Last week it was announced that \$800,000 will be invested in creating an additional 77 car parking spaces at the Bathurst Hospital campus. The number of car parking spaces will increase from 283 to 360, which will make a significant difference to my community. When one looks at the number of services that have grown and are provided at Bathurst Hospital, one sees that more people are attending the hospital and there is a need for more parking spaces. I thank those residents who approached me more than 12 months ago on this issue. We walked around the hospital grounds and were able to identify an area where those additional 77 car parking spaces could

be accommodated. That work will commence in early June. I look forward to the difference that that will make for all the users of the Bathurst Hospital. It will make a big difference to people with families, the elderly and people with a disability. They will no longer have to park blocks away from the hospital and be completely exhausted by the time they reach the hospital doors. This is about providing greater health services and greater facilities to support the Bathurst community and surrounding area.

The New South Wales Government has invested strongly in tourism. On the weekend I attended the official opening of the Lithgow Blast Furnace, which has received approximately \$1.5 million in funding from the State Government and Commonwealth Government. The local council has also contributed funds towards the \$2 million project. The blast furnace was the first iron and steel works in New South Wales. Steel from that blast furnace was used to build the Sydney Harbour Bridge and other key monuments in New South Wales. The \$1.5 million in funding has enabled the construction of walkways, the erection of interpretive signage and lighting and reinforcement of the structure. The blast furnace, which has been officially opened, will bring more visitors to the area. This initiative, which is located in a tourist precinct that includes the Lake Pillans wetlands, Eskbank railway station and Eskbank House, will grow tourism and drive the economy within the Lithgow local government area.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr RYAN PARK (Keira) (13:09): I speak today about a case of severe childhood neglect heard recently in the Wollongong Local Court that has horrified members of my community. Young children were left in squalid conditions for a sustained period. The house—which had defecation on the walls and in the cots and mattresses soaked with urine—was described as a hellhole. The children had been exposed to these living conditions for some time. The magistrate who presided over the case said that he was restricted to the imposition of a fine penalty for offences under sections 227 (c) and 228 of the New South Wales Children and Young Persons (Care and Protection) Act. For this serious case of child neglect, the woman was fined \$25,000. He said had animals been neglected in the same way that these children had been neglected, under animal cruelty legislation, he would have been able to impose a range of penalties up to and including full-time jail. He went on to say that judicial officers wanted tougher sentencing options.

As lawmakers, we need to do better. In discussion this morning with an officer of the NSW Police Force, I was informed that the police had discussed this issue and had written a submission following a similar case in my electorate. In that case, a father of a six-month-old baby had left the baby at the top of a set of stairs at a train station while he king hit another person. The father was so intoxicated he did not know where he was. Following that case, the police raised the issue of changes to legislation because they had had trouble charging the father with neglect under existing legislation. There is no-one in our community more vulnerable or more deserving of our protection than innocent, young children.

People in my community and across New South Wales may say that the woman I referred to earlier was obviously dealing with difficult circumstances. That may be the case, but that does not mean that this Parliament should hesitate from protecting young, innocent children who do not have the ability to defend themselves. We must do more to protect these young children, who rely on the State and the Legislature to protect them when their parents are not able to. The imposition of a fine for an offence of severe child neglect is sending the wrong signal. This is a criminal offence at the most serious level. It is perpetrated on young people who are unable to defend themselves and are unable to leave the environment into which they are born. Before we start on a politically correct discussion about the support that should have been provided to the woman, let us stop and think about the young children.

Political correctness will not protect them. It will not protect a baby who is sleeping in a cot soaked in urine and covered in its own excrement. It will not protect a young child who does not eat for days. I say to all members that we can and must do better in this area. Having spoken to police, it is evident that cases similar to the one I have raised will become more prevalent. As lawmakers, we must send a clear message that we will not condone the neglect of children and that we will ensure that the perpetrators of this offence, which is among the worst of crimes, will be brought before the law and punished accordingly.

KIAMA ELECTORATE ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATIONS

Mr GARETH WARD (Kiama) (13:14): Before I commence my contribution, I acknowledge in the gallery Kerry Doyle, Chief Executive Officer of the Heart Foundation and, from my electorate, Andy Mark, Regional Health Promotion Coordinator of the Heart Foundation. Throughout April this year, I had the honour to attend several ceremonies to commemorate the sacrifices and service of the men and women of the Australian Defence Force. On 21 April I attended the Kiama-Jamberoo RSL Sub-Branch service at the Darcy King Memorial Garden. I congratulate my friend Lindsay Delamont on all his good work and also acknowledge the good work of the sub-branch members and the many volunteers. On 25 April I attended several services, including services at

Gerroa and Gerringong. I extend my sincere thanks to the Gerringong RSL Sub-Branch for its work, particularly my friends Glenn Kolomeitz, Mike O'Leary and John Kaehler. I make special mention of Glenn Kolomeitz and Adrian Bishop for their outstanding commemorative addresses on the day.

At the Albion Park RSL Sub-Branch Anzac Day dawn service, I was afforded the enormous privilege to deliver the commemoration address. In attendance were President of the Albion Park RSL Sub-Branch, Mr Oliver Staggs; the Honorary Secretary, Mr Peter Ellis; the Honorary Treasurer, Mr Beau Byers; the Anzac Commemoration Coordinator, Ms Robyn Hanckel, who has invested so much of her time to the dawn service; the Federal member for Whitlam, Mr Stephen Jones; the member for Shellharbour, Ms Anna Watson; the Mayor of Shellharbour, Marianne Saliba; and local student representatives from Albion Park High School, Oak Flats High School, Mount Terry Public School, Tullimbar Public School, St Paul's Catholic Primary School, Calderwood Christian School, and Balarang Public School. In my address, I reflected on two people who are commemorated in this Chamber: George Braund and Teddy Larkin. I will reflect on them again today.

In 1911 Teddy Larkin, a keen student of social problems and passionate about politics, became a justice of the peace. A policeman and a keen sportsperson, Larkin played football at State, national and international levels and was an able cricketer, swimmer and boxer. As a ready and eloquent speaker, he was a member of St Joseph's Literary and Debating Society. On 13 December 1913, Teddy Larkin won the seat of Willoughby in the Legislative Assembly for the Labor Party. This was an extraordinary feat, given the strong conservative history of the electoral district. On 17 August 1914, he enlisted in the 1st Battalion, Australian Imperial Force, and was made a sergeant. After showing conspicuous gallantry, Larkin was killed in action at Pine Ridge, Gallipoli, on the first day of hostilities, 25 April 1915. Having been shot, he was offered a stretcher. He is reported to have replied, "There are plenty worse than me."

In May 1893 George Braund was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Armidale company, 4th Australian Infantry Regiment. He was promoted to lieutenant in 1898, captain in 1899 and major in 1912, and was a company commander from 1899 to 1912. Braund took a continuing interest in local affairs and by the First World War was Armidale's most prominent citizen. He was a magistrate, president of the Armidale Chamber of Commerce, a member of the public school board, and a director of the New England Building Society and various local business concerns. In 1910, the Liberal Party invited him to contest the Federal seat of New England. He declined because of family commitments, but in 1913 he became the Liberal member for Armidale in the Legislative Assembly.

On the morning of 25 April 1915, the 2nd Battalion landed at Gallipoli. Two of its companies were assigned to the 3rd Brigade, which was engaged in fierce fighting at the Nek. B Company and C Company were held in reserve until 1.30 p.m. Under harassing fire, Braund led them up steep goat tracks to the junction of Walker's Ridge and Russell's Top. There, in a vital but isolated position, they dug in and held on for two days against a sustained Turkish attack. Casualties were high, but Braund's tenacious leadership held his seriously weakened force together. On 27 April, when reinforcements from Lieutenant-Colonel W. G. Malone's Wellington Battalion arrived, Braund led the combined force in a steady bayonet charge through the scrub to the crest of Russell's Top. Forced to withdraw before a strong enemy counterattack, his men resumed their original positions and retained them until the morning of 28 April. By then, Braund's exhausted battalion had withstood the main Turkish advance for three days and nights without rest. They withdrew to the beach, leaving Malone's men in control of the sector.

On 2 May 1915 Braund was ordered from the beach, where his battalion was held in reserve, to Victoria Gully. After midnight on 4 May he was asked to send part of his unit to reinforce the 3rd Battalion in the line. After dispatching C Company, he set out for brigade headquarters and, instead of using the normal track, he took a shortcut through the scrub. Slightly deaf, Braund failed to hear the challenge of a sentry, who shot and killed him. He was buried in Beach cemetery, Gallipoli, and was survived by his wife, two sons and a daughter. He was mentioned posthumously in dispatches. Braund was the first Australian legislator to enlist for World War I and the second to die.

Today in the Legislative Assembly stands a memorial to these two brave men from both sides of politics; it is a reminder that war does not discriminate. Every time I walk onto the floor of Parliament, I am reminded that the people who gave their lives came from all walks of life. They came from factories, farms, shops, offices and businesses, from the cities and the regions. No matter their origins, behind each uniformed man was a brave Australian with a unique story. I thank them for their service.

*Community Recognition Statements***BANKSTOWN BULLS RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB**

Ms TANIA MIHAILUK (Bankstown) (13:20): Last Saturday I was pleased to attend Bankstown Bulls Gala weekend at Ruse Park in Bankstown, which is where their club is based. Bankstown Bulls are a junior rugby league club that take part in the Canterbury-Bankstown Junior Rugby League and Sydney Combined Competition. I am delighted to be the club's patron. The club fields 21 teams and has more than 450 registered players and volunteers in the junior rugby league competition starting from under-5s. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the new executive: President Michael Rodrigues; Secretary Lawrence Karam; Assistant Secretary Matthew O'Neill; Senior Vice-President Stan Hetaraka; and Treasurer Anthony Samuel. I wish all the players a great season. Despite the rain I had a wonderful weekend and enjoyed handing out the player awards.

WINGHAM RIVERSIDE RESERVE

Mr STEPHEN BROMHEAD (Myall Lakes) (13:21): Recently I had the pleasure of visiting the Wingham Riverside Reserve to announce more than \$102,000 in Stronger Country Communities funding. It is a beautiful location in my electorate nestled on the bank of the mighty Manning River and adjacent to the Wingham Brush National Reserve. This area has become a hotspot for grey nomads and backpackers who are discovering our great State. The Wingham Advancement Group, working with Wingham Rotary Club, make this location such a great place. Their volunteers meet and greet visitors and provide tourism information, advising which places to visit during the day, thus improving the local economy. The group assists in cleaning and maintaining the reserve's toilets, picnic tables, electric barbecues and fish-cleaning tables. I especially thank Bill Kneipp, Brian Leggett, Dennis Jenkins, Ron Sky, Les Brauer, Allen Valentine, Alistair Webber, Lyn McKinlay, John Dorington and Bob Clarke for their time and effort, Wingham Rotary Club members, and Ken Patterson.

RIDING FOR THE DISABLED ASSOCIATION

Ms KATE WASHINGTON (Port Stephens) (13:22): The Riding for the Disabled Association at Raymond Terrace enables young people with a disability to experience the joy of horseriding. When I visited last week it was obvious to me that the experience is not only about riding a horse but also about the confidence that comes with it, the physical and emotional wellbeing, and the social benefit of a regular shared experience with friends. The service started in 1979 and, despite many challenges, the volunteers have developed the site and expanded the services that now support 180 children each week. I recognise President Janet Hudson and her committee. I give special thanks to Carol Brown for taking the time to show me around. Carol has volunteered at Riding for the Disabled for the past 23 years. The huge smiles on the children's faces would not be possible without the hard work that many volunteers have put into the service over decades. I thank them all for their contribution to the lives of children whose paths are not always filled with the joy I saw on their faces last week.

LUDDENHAM SHOW

Ms TANYA DAVIES (Mulgoa—Minister for Mental Health, Minister for Women, and Minister for Ageing) (13:23): On Saturday 17 February 2018 I was honoured to join June Elizabeth Roots at the annual Luddenham Show. June has volunteered for more than 60 years for the show society. At the beginning of her volunteering years June faced many challenges; society's views of a woman's place were different then. Although women worked hard in many roles at the show—including the pavilions, horse arena, cleaning and general maintenance—whenever they made a suggestion regarding improvements, the male members deemed the suggestion unnecessary.

Not to be deterred, June and her friends started the Ladies Auxiliary. Funds were raised from selling thousands of cups of tea, sandwiches and soft drinks. Their work enabled the Ladies Auxiliary to build a brick toilet block with flushing toilets. The Ladies Auxiliary was also responsible for paying for concreting and lighting at the pavilion. The Ladies Auxiliary was able to make so many improvements to the showgrounds that the Luddenham Society Show merged with the Ladies Auxiliary. June was a past president of the Luddenham Primary School Parents and Citizens Association during the 1960s and 1970s and is still a current member. I thank her for her lifetime of service to the people of Luddenham.

FAIRFIELD HIGH SCHOOL OUR FACES OUR STORIES

Mr GUY ZANGARI (Fairfield) (13:24): I congratulate Fairfield High School on the publication of *Our Faces Our Stories* 2017. The 2017 edition tells the personal stories of 14 students who now call Australia and Fairfield home. *Our Faces Our Stories* shares the experiences of the students who faced adversity fleeing persecution from war-torn countries, the brutality of regimes and life in refugee camps. The contributing students give the reader insight into their lives from birth and their upbringing to the events that led them and their families to flee their homeland. Common to all stories are resilience and determination to make the best of new

opportunities in an adopted country. The book provides the writers with the chance to express their thoughts and feeling through creative writing and artwork. I congratulate the principal, Mr Charles Borg; 2017 program coordinator, Sascha Ogilvy; teacher mentors; the visual arts department; and of course the students who shared their personal stories with us.

HOMICIDE VICTIMS' SUPPORT GROUP

Mr MARK TAYLOR (Seven Hills) (13:25): Recently I met with representatives of the Homicide Victims' Support Group to talk about the construction of Grace's Place in Doonside. Grace's Place is named after Grace Lynch, a founding member of the Homicide Victims' Support Group. The late Mrs Lynch helped to establish the support group following the kidnapping, sexual assault and murder in 1986 of her oldest daughter, Anita Cobby, who was aged 26 at the time. The centre was named in Mrs Lynch's honour and will provide a unique place of healing and restoration for children traumatised by homicide. The centre will act as the organisation's new head office, relocating from Parramatta, and aims to include 12 bedrooms to house children and their adult carers. When Grace's Place is completed it will conduct counselling and therapeutic services over 10-week programs. The existence of the centre will only be made possible through many donations and pro bono work by many organisations in Western Sydney—and, importantly, by the support of all members of this Parliament. I therefore urge all members of this House to support this fantastic initiative in any capacity they can.

THE VOICE CONTESTANT RICKY NIFO

Mr EDMOND ATALLA (Mount Druitt) (13:26): I congratulate Ricky Nifo of Mount Druitt on his recent performance on the Australian television show *The Voice*. Ricky performed during the blind auditions on 23 April 2018. His soulful voice had all four judges turn their chairs. Ricky chose to join Kelly Rowland's team. I take this opportunity to recognise Ricky not just for his performance but also for his attitude and pride at representing his hometown of Mount Druitt. Ricky has stated that he wanted to give Mount Druitt a voice and to show there is more to Mount Druitt than struggle street. He is a fantastic role model for the youth of Mount Druitt. Unfortunately Ricky was unsuccessful during the knockout rounds of *The Voice*. However, he is a winner to the community of Mount Druitt and a fantastic advocate for Western Sydney. Ricky is a gifted singer and I am certain we will be hearing much more from him in the future.

ENSEMBLE THEATRE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Ms FELICITY WILSON (North Shore) (13:27): I congratulate the Ensemble Theatre in Kirribilli on its sixtieth anniversary and note the theatre's outstanding commitment to our community. Founded on 11 May 1958, the Ensemble Theatre has gone through many iterations and is considered to be the longest continuously running professional theatre in Australia. In 1960 it moved to its current premises in the old boatshed at Careening Cove, which was converted by its members into a theatre in the round. Over the years the Ensemble Theatre has showcased Australian theatrical legends including but not limited to Reg Livermore, Lorraine Bayly, John Howard, Georgie Parker, Andrew McFarlane, Noeline Brown and Kate Fischer. It has presented serious plays including those by Arthur Miller, David Williamson, Shakespeare and Tennessee Williams. Most recently it opened its season of *Shirley Valentine*, which I was happy to attend, and delivered the first global English interpretation of the French play *Diplomacy*. The Ensemble Theatre has been and continues to be the cultural centre and heart of the North Shore electorate.

ZONTA CLUB OF HUNTER NEWCASTLE

Ms JODIE HARRISON (Charlestown) (13:28): I commend the Zonta Club of Hunter Newcastle for conducting the birthing kit assembly day on 5 May on behalf of the Birthing Kit Foundation Australia. At the event Zonta volunteers assembled kits to improve conditions for women who give birth at home in developing countries. This year Zonta will contribute 1,600 birthing kits to the Birthing Kit Foundation. Those kits contain items essential to support healthy, hygienic birth in developing countries, such as plastic sheets, soap, gloves, a scalpel, gauze and string. The Zonta Club of Hunter Newcastle is focused on helping to empower women locally and internationally through the Zonta goals of advocacy and service. The club aims not only to enable women in developing countries but also to support local women's refugees through regular donations of much-needed household and school items. I am a proud member of the Zonta Club of Hunter Newcastle. I encourage other women to join this dynamic and diverse group.

SCOUT LEADER BOB ROSSER RETIREMENT

Mr GREG APLIN (Albury) (13:29): After 46 years of service to the 2nd Albury Scout Group, Scout leader Bob Rosser, of Corowa, is retiring. Bob became a cub scout when he was nine and in 1972, when his son became a cub, Bob joined the 2nd Albury Scout Group. He then became leader and group leader. Over four and a half decades Bob has seen a lot of children progress through the cub and scout ranks, with some of those children returning as leaders and bringing their own children and grandchildren into the scouting movement. Bob has also

been an active participant in the Albury Gang Show, which I have had the pleasure of promoting and attending over the years. He has also been involved in 11 jamborees, three jamborettes and two cuborees. What a wonderful achievement. Bob will be sorely missed by the scouting organisation. We thank him for his dedication to our young people and wish him well in his retirement.

WYONG ELECTORATE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr DAVID HARRIS (Wyang) (13:30): Jopuka Productions is a Central Coast-based, independent, not-for-profit theatre company with a focus on young people. Jopuka was established to fill a clear need on the Central Coast for the professional training and development of our youth in the performing arts. Jopuka Productions aims to empower the emerging artists of the Central Coast to pursue, create and develop their talent and original ideas for the stage. They currently perform at the Grove Theatre, Wyong. Its founding members are: Joshua Maxwell, Danielle Brame Whiting, Jessica Pascuzzo and Rebecca Roth. Jopuka Productions will be hosting its second kindergarten to year 6 holiday performing arts camp in the upcoming July school holidays. This five-day theatre camp will involve classes in singing, dancing, acting and the putting together of a fabulous musical show. I have enjoyed watching several of the shows. I am impressed by their creative vitality; it is an inspiration. I wish them well for their future productions.

AUSTRALIA MY COUNTRY COMPETITION

Mr JONATHAN O'DEA (Davidson) (13:31): On Saturday 5 May I attended the awards ceremony for the "Australia My Country" 2018 competition, which is run annually at the Forestville RSL Club by its sub-branch. Students from year 3 to year 10 are encouraged to enter an art work, poem or essay and the entries reflect the Anzac sacrifice: Loyalty, history, service and pride in being an Australian. The competition is a wonderful opportunity for students to engage with our Australian history in a creative and diverse way, and to pay respect to the Anzac memory. The standard of entries was outstanding. I congratulate the students who participated in the competition this year and commend Forestville sub-branch President John Scifleet and his team for another successful year in running the event for the local community.

CAMPBELLTOWN CAMDEN DISTRICT CRICKET CLUB

Mr GREG WARREN (Campbelltown) (13:31): I take this opportunity to congratulate the Campbelltown Camden District Cricket Club, the Ghosts, first grade cricket team on winning the minor premiership in the 2017-18 New South Wales Premier Cricket First Grade Competition. They have had a fantastic season. I congratulate the club on its huge improvement from last season and on its tremendous support of women's cricket, which is going ahead in leaps and bounds. Indeed, the dedication of this young team to the sport and its pursuit of excellence places it in a sound position to excel well into the future. I am sure I speak on behalf of the entire vibrant sporting community in Campbelltown and all members in this place in wishing the mighty Ghosts all the best for many more seasons to come. I thank in particular the club executive: Morris Iemma, Chris Patterson, Allan Connolly and Jason Elsmore, as well as the volunteers who put in so much effort to make this the great cricket club it is today.

SEAFORTH PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr JAMES GRIFFIN (Manly) (13:32): I thank the staff and students at the Seaforth Public School who welcomed me last week to the opening of four new classrooms. In September 2015 a fire broke out on the Seaforth campus. The fire destroyed classrooms, books and many personal items of staff and students. This was a testing time for the students at Seaforth and their families. I recognise Mr Jeremy Donovan for the heartfelt piece of Aboriginal artwork he presented to the school, as well as Indigenous dance group Tribal Warriors who, together with the students, celebrated local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture. I am grateful for their support of the Seaforth Public School. I thank also relieving principal Trudy Alcorn and staff for their steadfast support of the project and for their students during the construction period. They are all now enjoying four excellent new classrooms.

CENTRAL COAST DISABILITY NETWORK

Ms LIESL TESCH (Gosford) (13:33): Last week it was great to meet with Jenny and some of the fabulous team at Central Coast Disability Network and I thank them for taking the time to share with me the great work they are doing in our community and beyond. The Central Coast Disability Network has been a part of our community for 39 years. It works to create opportunities for people with disabilities to be supported and fully included in community life. It has a strong, passionate team of staff, who support people with a disability and their carers in the delivery of a wide range of services, including direct support, assisted living, counselling, information and referral, multicultural access and equity, and individual advocacy—they are even leading the way in disability support in Tennant Creek. They are about to open a new office in Woy Woy and are kicking goals with the newly implemented Community Before Corrections program. It has also been recently announced that they will continue

to offer individual advocacy services until 2020—hooray! I congratulate the Central Coast Disability Network on its successful application to provide disability employment services in Gosford and Woy Woy from July this year. I am beside them every inch of the way in the fight for full inclusion of people with disabilities across New South Wales.

MANNING BASE HOSPITAL MIDWIFERY SERVICES

Mr STEPHEN BROMHEAD (Myall Lakes) (13:34): Today I recognise International Day of the Midwife and an event which was held on Saturday 5 May. In particular, I pay tribute to the amazing team of midwives at the Manning Base Hospital. Unit manager, Robyn Bourke, leads a team of 42 midwives and 15 midwifery students, but I must mention Manning Base Hospital's midwifery pin-up boy, Paul Sandilands. Paul has been a midwife for more than 35 years and is one of only four male midwives who work across the Hunter New England Health district.

Paul has delivered many babies at the hospital and is now delivering his second generation of babies. His colleagues describe him as passionate, dedicated and outright hilarious. He is one of those who make up the fabric of the Manning Base Hospital. Midwives are amazing people, who help couples create a family and who turn houses into homes. They provide comfort, care and support. This year, the Manning Base Hospital has delivered 107 babies. On behalf of all the mothers in the Myall Lakes electorate who have yelled and screamed at the midwife, I say: Thank you.

MAITLAND REGIONAL MUSEUM

Ms JENNY AITCHISON (Maitland) (13:35): I recognise the commitment and ingenuity of Maitland resident Helen Hopcroft, who spent the previous 12 months dressed as Marie Antoinette to lobby for the long-overdue Maitland Regional Museum. Ms Hopcroft's year-long dedication to her task was a highlight of the school run, supermarket visits and gym sessions for many Maitland residents. Dressing up as Marie Antoinette showed Ms Hopcroft's real commitment to the history of our community. However, her efforts were not just fun and games: She had an important message to convey. Spending 12 months dressed in eighteenth-century garb meant that for Ms Hopcroft, the long, hot summer days were hard to endure. But her message was that the widening wealth gap between city and country people could cause creative hubs like Maitland to fall behind. Ms Hopcroft is now the acting president of the Maitland Regional Museum committee and has applied for a dedicated museum space. Once again I offer my congratulations to Ms Hopcroft and I am eager to see the creation of a regional museum in Maitland.

HAMMONDVILLE WAY2LIVE CAFE

Ms MELANIE GIBBONS (Holsworthy) (13:36): I recognise and welcome Way2Live cafe and pantry, a new local business that is now located behind my electoral office in Hammondville. The family-run business of two sisters, Hana Kosikova and Iva Kafkova, previously operated in Voyager Point for several years. Together they created Way2Live because of their personal experiences of feeling healthier as a result of eating plant-based foods. The café and pantry serves nutritious meals, coffee, tea and tasty sweets that I recently had the pleasure of trying. They are healthy! The sisters also recognised that while there may be more demand for their food in Sydney's eastern suburbs, where they held markets, they want to stay in the Hammondville area to help the community thrive. This small business aims to be a community hub where people can meet, learn and pass on their experiences. Once again, I welcome and wish the new café, Way2Live, and its owners all the best on their journey with their new store.

CAMPBELLTOWN ELECTORATE ST VINCENT DE PAUL NAGLE CENTRE

Mr GREG WARREN (Campbelltown) (13:37): I thank and congratulate St Vincent de Paul's Nagle Centre for its 25 years of service to the Campbelltown-MacArthur community. Opening in 1993, the Nagle Centre was established to provide assistance and support to the people of Campbelltown and MacArthur who were finding times tough. Today the Nagle Centre provides services to those in the MacArthur region who are experiencing hardship, struggling with disadvantage or simply are in need of a helping hand.

Examples of the services include, but are not limited to, the Clemente program, which is a free tertiary course that works in conjunction with the Australian Catholic University, the Open Door Community Kitchen, which provides breakfasts and lunches five days a week, and the No Interest Loans Scheme, which is otherwise known as NILS. I ask the House to join me in recognising the fantastic job done by the staff and volunteers at the Nagle Centre, and wish them all the best in continuing their great legacy that has been established during their 25 years of service.

TEMORA GIRL GUIDES EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Ms STEPH COOKE (Cootamundra) (13:38): I extend congratulations to the Temora Girl Guides, who recently celebrated their eightieth anniversary and 55 years in their wonderful hall. Guiding started in Temora on 22 April 1938 with 1st Temora Guide Company. Eight leaders kicked off the first meeting, followed by 28 girls interested in becoming guides. It was such an honour to dust off my old uniform and pay tribute to this group in my hometown, where I was once a Brownie in 1B Temora. I extend congratulations to 2017 Queen's Guide recipients Shania Corby and Jill Mawbey on their phenomenal achievement, shared with a host of wonderful guides, leaders and award winners past and present. I was humbled to share the afternoon with Doreen Wiencke, Mrs Dorothy Fellows and many other guides as they talked about their wonderful memories of guiding and mentoring the first four Queen's Guide recipients.

ST MERKORIOUS CHARITY GROUP

Mr GUY ZANGARI (Fairfield) (13:39): On Monday 14 May 2018 I had the pleasure of visiting volunteers from St Merkorious Charity at Fairfield Community Centre. It was a great turnout at its weekly Monday luncheon. However, this particular gathering was an extra special one as it was dedicated to mothers in the local community. I congratulate St Merkorious Charity and commend it for its ongoing dedication and commitment to our local community and for providing a safe place for locals to congregate and socialise. I extend a special thankyou to all mothers for their love and support for the children and their families.

TRIBUTE TO DENISE DAGEN

Mr MATT KEAN (Hornsby—Minister for Innovation and Better Regulation) (13:40): Today it is with a heavy heart that I pay tribute to a very special lady, Denise Dagen. Denise passed away last Saturday surrounded by family and friends. She was dearly loved by everyone who had the privilege to know her. Denise was a local icon in the Berowra area, having started work at the Berowra *Bush Telegraph Weekly* as the Office Manager in September 1992. Originally employed to do the books for the small business, her skills shone and she soon took over the role of running the office. Denise was the face of the *Bush Telegraph Weekly*. She was kind and sympathetic and always willing to help members of the community who came into the office. Denise always had time, a kind word and an enormous smile for everyone she met. She could light up a room just by walking into it, and always made everyone feel so special.

Family was everything to Denise. She was a devoted single mum to Peter, who was always her top priority. She was so proud of Pete and the impressive young man he has become. She came from a loving, close-knit family—her beautiful mum, Win, her dad, Denis, and her twin sister, Carolynne, and sister Robyn. Meeting her family helps people to understand why Denise was so special. Denise, everyone who was lucky enough to be showered with your love and friendship is a little bigger, better and stronger because of it. You have no idea of the hole you have left, but it is one that will never be filled. You will be forever missed but always in our hearts. Rest in peace, my friend.

KARIONG NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRE

Ms LIESL TESCH (Gosford) (13:42): Wowee! There are just not enough minutes in the day for all the great work that Fiona and her team of staff and volunteers at Kariong Neighbourhood Centre need to do. They are amazing contributors to the community, providing a full, wraparound service to many families who are stretched to the limit. From the moment people walk through the doors, they are welcomed into a safe and friendly environment that promotes a sense of connected belonging. I was thrilled to see the very detailed 3D map of the whole community in the foyer. The team at Kariong Neighbourhood Centre provides an active playgroup, craft and chat group, Pilates for seniors, an over-50s friendship group, tai chi, yoga—the list goes on—as well as massively successful out-of-school-hours care, supporting many Kariong families who spend long days commuting to jobs in Sydney. It would be even better if community organisations could provide still more services to support people in Kariong that the community centre identifies have needs beyond its abilities. I thank those at the Kariong Neighbourhood Centre for all the love and positive energy they deliver to the community.

ST IVES FOOTBALL CLUB EMIN RUFATI TRIBUTE DAY

Mr JONATHAN O'DEA (Davidson) (13:43): St Ives Football Club recently held its third Emin Rufati Tribute Day, on 24 February 2018, at Charles Bean Oval. Emin Rufati was a local over-35s competition player who tragically passed away on the pitch after suffering a heart attack, leaving behind his wife and two children. The annual tribute match is now played in his honour between St Ives Football Club and Emin's former employer, 3M. This year the club also organised a gala day for the over-35s and over-45s teams. The day was a great success, with the club, 3M and Northern Suburbs Football Association raising a total of \$6,000 to purchase life-saving defibrillators for two clubs within the association. The club has also received funding from the New South Wales Government's Local Sport Defibrillator Grant Program to enable the purchase of a new defibrillator at Toolang

Oval, St Ives. Over the last month two players were successfully resuscitated using defibrillators at local matches. I thank Club President Lyle Hudson, Vice President Penny Howell and all those involved in this vital community initiative.

RUTHERFORD BARBER JOHN QUINTON

Ms JENNY AITCHISON (Maitland) (13:44): I recognise Mr John Quinton, who this year celebrates half a century in business at his barber shop in Rutherford. Mr Quinton began his career in Maitland as an apprentice, at the tender age of 21, before opening his own shop in Rutherford in 1968. Now a local fixture, Mr Quinton has groomed three generations of the same families—the sons and grandsons of his original clients. As shadow Minister for Small Business, I know that independent, small businesses such as Mr Quinton's are the lifeblood of regional communities going into the future.

These businesses have created jobs and fostered local camaraderie. Mr Quinton's business has given men in our community the much-needed opportunity to have a chat and a shave at the same time. It is precisely this community spirit that has kept the clippers in his hand and other people's secrets behind his teeth for 50 years, as Mr Quinton loves nothing more than a chat with strangers and neighbours alike. I congratulate Mr Quinton on five decades in business, and I thank him for breathing life and humour into Rutherford.

TAREE ROTARY CLUB YOUTH AMBASSADOR MARYLYN SENDAH

Mr STEPHEN BROMHEAD (Myall Lakes) (13:45): Today I recognise a remarkable young lady, Marylyn Sendah, who attends Chatham High School. Marylyn is the 2018 Rotary Club of Taree Youth Ambassador and recently took part in the YMCA Youth Parliament camp with other youth leaders from across the State. In March, Marylyn won the public speaking section of the Lions Youth of the Year in Region 3, and she is also actively involved in advocating for youth programs with the Manning Youth Action Team and the police citizens youth club. With young women of Marylyn's calibre, I am pleased to report that our community has a bright future ahead.

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Ms Sonia Hornery): I shall now leave the chair. The House will resume at 2.15 p.m.

Visitors

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I welcome to the gallery Samuel Evans, Gunilla Burrowes, Michelle O'Toole, Sahil Harriram, Chad Ramage and Siobhan Curran who represent a range of some of the top start-up companies from across the Hunter, the Central Coast and Sydney, guests of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Regional New South Wales, Minister for Skills, Minister for Small Business and the member for Monaro.

I also welcome to the gallery the students and teachers from Abbotsleigh girls school, guests of the Parliamentary Secretary for Finance, Services and Property, and member for Ku-ring-gai.

I welcome Kerry Doyle, Chief Executive Officer of the Heart Foundation, guest of the Parliamentary Secretary for Education, Parliamentary Secretary for the Illawarra and South Coast, and member for Kiama.

I acknowledge Andrew Schier, Chairman of the Western Racing Association and The Nationals candidate for Barwon, guest of the member for Barwon.

I acknowledge Mr Digby Hildreth, guest of the member for Ballina.

I also welcome Ivory Iru-Ha-A from the National Parliament of Solomon Island as part of our Twinning Program. She is visiting the New South Wales Parliament on a professional development placement.

Commemorations

CENTENARY OF FIRST WORLD WAR

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (14:20): At 2.00 a.m. on 19 May 1918, the 6th Infantry Brigade launched attacks on German positions in and around the northern French town of Ville-sur-Ancre. As part of this assault the 22nd Battalion advanced on two heavily defended roads known as Big Caterpillar and Little Caterpillar because of the markings used to show them on the maps. When his company commander was severely wounded, Sergeant William Ruthven, a timber worker from Melbourne, quickly assumed command. With great courage he rushed a machine-gun post, killed one of the crew and captured the gun. When surprised German soldiers emerged from a nearby shelter, he wounded two and captured a further six.

The machine-gun position secure, Ruthven hastily reorganised his men. Observing enemy movement near the second-sunken road, without hesitation and armed only with a revolver, he crossed open land alone and

rushed the position killing two German soldiers and single handedly capturing another 32. During the day that followed, with their positions under sustained fire, Ruthven moved constantly along the line supervising and encouraging his men. For his actions Ruthven was awarded the Victoria Cross for most conspicuous bravery and initiative in action. The citation read in part:

Throughout the whole operation he showed the most magnificent courage and determination, inspiring everyone by his fine fighting spirit, his remarkable courage, and his dashing action.

Ruthven returned to a hero's welcome in Melbourne after he was later wounded in action. In 1945 he was elected Mayor of Collingwood. William Ruthven was one of 64 Australian soldiers awarded the Victoria Cross during World War I, each for extraordinary acts of bravery and heroism. Lest we forget.

Governor

ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I report receipt of the following message from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
Sydney, 5 May 2018

T F BATHURST

Lieutenant-Governor

The Honourable Thomas Frederick Bathurst, AC, Lieutenant-Governor of the State of New South Wales, has the honour to inform the Legislative Assembly that, consequent on the Governor of New South Wales, His Excellency General The Honourable David Hurley, AC, DSC (Ret'd), being absent from the State, he has assumed the administration of the Government of the State.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I report receipt of the following message from His Excellency, the Governor:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
Sydney, 7 May 2018

DAVID HURLEY

Governor

General David Hurley, AC, DSC (Ret'd), Governor of New South Wales has the honour to inform the Legislative Assembly that he has re-assumed the administration of the Government of the State.

Bills

ROAD TRANSPORT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT (ROAD SAFETY) BILL 2018

FARM DEBT MEDIATION AMENDMENT BILL 2018

Assent

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I report receipt of messages from the Governor notifying His Excellency's assent to the abovementioned bills.

Question Time

NORTHERN BEACHES TUNNEL

Mr LUKE FOLEY (Auburn) (14:26): My question is directed to the Premier. On 4 April 2017 the Premier signed a pledge to the Sensible Traffic Action Group guaranteeing that construction on the Northern Beaches Tunnel would commence by 2019. Does the Premier stand by that pledge?

Mr Ryan Park: Lock it in the forwards, if you don't mind.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Do you even know what that is?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Keira to order for the first time. The Premier has the call. I call the member for Kiama to order for the first time.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN (Willoughby—Premier) (14:26): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that Dorothy Dixier. Labor has announced a number of transport policies: One is to axe the Northern Beaches link, another is to axe the Bankstown metro, and yet another is to axe the Powerhouse Museum moving to Parramatta, and the list goes on. When we came into government we inherited a transport infrastructure wasteland—a mess.

Mr Luke Foley: Back to the future in the DeLorean.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No, this is the truth. He asked the question.

Mr Ryan Park: Have you been to George Street lately?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will be there shortly.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The shadow Treasurer, the member for Keira, interjects, but let us not forget how the Labor Party works and why its transport projects did not get off the ground. Labor parachuted the member for Keira from the Minister's office to second in charge of the Department of Transport. That is the disrespect—

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order: It is taken under Standing Order 129. The question was about the Northern Beaches Tunnel—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not been able to hear the Premier over all the interjections.

Ms Jodi McKay: —and whether she stands by her pledge.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear more of the answer.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: This is an opportune time to talk about the Government's absolute commitment to the Northern Beaches Tunnel. Unlike those opposite, we build projects where they are needed. Those opposite do not build them anywhere.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk will stop the clock. We will take all day, if we have to. I call the member for Cessnock to order for the first time. The Premier has the call.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Since we have been in government we have spent \$111 billion on infrastructure and there is another \$80 billion to come. Guess what? When the Government put out its transport master plan in 2012 it identified 700 projects—430 of those projects have been delivered already, 200 are under construction and guess what? The Government is delivering all the projects those opposite wanted to deliver, but could not. The Government is delivering all of the projects that those opposite could not, including the M4 widening, the M5 widening, and linking the M4 and the M5.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Newtown to order for the first time.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The infrastructure record of those opposite is appalling and the only policy they will ever come up with is ripping up contracts. That is all the Leader of the Opposition wants to do. I say to all the people out there who are in any doubt about the policies of those opposite: Look at their record and look at what they are saying in Opposition. If they are cancelling projects while in opposition, guess what they will do in government? It will be even worse. Those opposite should be ashamed of themselves. They promised and announced 12 rail lines, but delivered none of them. What have we done so far? The Government has delivered the South West Rail Link, the North West Rail Link and the inner west light rail, and the projects continue. Those opposite said they would widen the M4—no. They said they would widen the M5—no. How many times did Carl Scully support the Northern Beaches link, yet those opposite never delivered it? Where is it? It is in his book, which is upstairs in my office. Those opposite had it in his book.

Ms Jodie Harrison: Point of order: My point of order is taken under Standing Order 129. It is very interesting that the Premier has a copy of Carl Scully's book in her office, but the question—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: When an Independent member held the electorate of Manly those opposite promised the link, but they never delivered it. They will say what they want to anybody, but they do not deliver a single thing.

ELECTORAL FUNDING LAWS

Mr JAI ROWELL (Wollondilly) (14:33): My question is addressed to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the House on the progress of the Government's review of the State's electoral funding laws?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure everyone would love to hear this answer.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN (Willoughby—Premier) (14:33): I thank the member for Wollondilly for his important question. We are very proud of the fact that New South Wales has the toughest political donation laws in the nation. Under the Liberal-Nationals Government we will ensure that that is the case. Today I confirm that we are delivering on our commitment to review and reform the State's electoral funding laws, and are also increasing the integrity, transparency and accountability of political donations in New South Wales. In May 2014

we appointed an independent panel of experts, chaired by Dr Kerry Schott, to consider and report on options for the long-term reforms of the State's electoral funding laws.

The Government is proud of the fact that in response to the panel's interim report it has already increased penalties for breaching electoral funding laws, introduced a new anti-avoidance offence and extended the limitation period for offences from three years to 10 years. In March 2015 the Government accepted 49 of the panel's 50 recommendations in principle, subject to a further review by the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters. In turn, the committee supported 44 of panel's 50 recommendations in principle, including its key recommendation that the current Act be comprehensively reviewed and rewritten. With the exception of a limited number of proposals in relation to chapter 7 of the report, the committee was unanimous in its findings. I note that the only difference between the committee was in relation to third-party contributions; that is, trade union contributions.

In December 2016 the Government accepted all the committee's recommendations in principle. In that context, I thank the member for Wollondilly for his work as chair of the committee during the inquiry. I acknowledge all members of the committee. Its work has paved the way for the landmark electoral funding reforms in the Electoral Funding Bill 2018, of which the Government gave notice in this House earlier today. I also thank the members for Terrigal, Oxley, Seven Hills and Shellharbour, and members of the other place: the Hon. Dr Peter Phelps, the Hon. Ben Franklin, the Hon. Robert Borsak, the Hon. Courtney Houssos and the Hon. Peter Primrose. I thank all the members for their largely bipartisan work, which is fundamental to our healthy democracy.

The Electoral Funding Bill 2018 is the culmination of that work. It will implement the vast majority of the reform recommendations made by the expert panel and the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters. Those reforms include changes to apply expenditure caps to local government elections, to require political donations of \$1,000 or more to be disclosed within 14 days during the six months before a general election, to require parties to identify expenditure aimed at influencing voting in a specific electorate, to require political parties to disclose their senior officeholders to the Electoral Commission, to require senior officeholders to report breaches of electoral funding laws to the Electoral Commission, to subject associated entities to the same rigorous disclosure obligations as those that apply to political parties, to reinstate the dollar-per-vote for entitlements from the Election Campaigns Fund that applied at the 2015 State election, to cap electoral funding expenditure by third-party campaigners in line with the independent expert panel recommendations and to prohibit third-party campaigners from acting in concert with others to exceed the cap.

These are significant and important reforms. Of course, the key pillars of the current electoral funding regime—disclosure, caps on donations and expenditure, and public funding—remain in place. The reforms announced today will further increase the integrity, transparency and accountability of political donations in New South Wales. The community can be assured, and must be assured, that under a New South Wales Liberal-Nationals Government this State will continue to have the toughest political donations laws in the country. I call on all members to support these comprehensive landmark reforms, which are integral to the future operation of donations in laws in New South Wales.

[Interruption]

Have members opposite paid back the murder money? I do not think they have. Do they know whether the donor was a developer? It has been three weeks. [Extension of time]

I feel strongly about the Government's obligation to ensure that this State has the toughest donation laws in the nation and that we provide the openness and transparency required for political donations. I commend the Electoral Funding Bill 2018 to the Parliament and look forward to a constructive debate on the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was about to compliment every member on their behaviour during the Premier's response, but she then asked a question, which mucked that up. All members did very well listening to the Premier's answer up until that point.

NORTHERN BEACHES TUNNEL

Mr MICHAEL DALEY (Maroubra) (14:37): I direct my question to the Premier. On 6 April it was reported in the *Manly Daily* that the Premier pledged to futureproof the Northern Beaches Tunnel by locking in contracts for the project prior to the 2019 State election. Does the Premier stand by that commitment?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN (Willoughby—Premier) (14:35): I still cannot understand why the Labor Party does not support infrastructure projects. Its members fail to understand that we can build a number of projects at the same time. Members opposite want to cancel everything. They do not support WestConnex,

they do not support the F6, they do not support the Northern Beaches Tunnel, they do not support the M4 and they do not support the M5.

Mr Ryan Park: You forgot the light rail.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No, on a good day members opposite support light rail; it depends on the day. It is curious that when there was an Independent member for Manly the Labor Party promised to build the Northern Beaches Tunnel.

Mr Michael Daley: Not true.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: It is true and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows it. The Labor Party made that promise. Members will remember the issue between Mr Scully and Mr Roozendaal about the Spit Bridge.

Mr Michael Daley: The Premier has that well-known book in her office.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I have a few books and that is one of them. I have Frank Sartor's *Light on the Hill* and Carl Scully's book. They are good reading. Members opposite promised so much for the Northern Beaches and every other region of New South Wales, but they never delivered.

Mr Rob Stokes: The truth hurts.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes, the truth hurts. The Northern Beaches Hospital is being built—

Mr Michael Daley: Point of order: My point of order relates to Standing Order 129. I simply want to know whether the Premier intends to lock in those contracts before the election. Yes or no?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member has asked the question and the Premier is answering it.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Obviously members opposite are not interested in the infrastructure projects this Government is building across the State. They do not understand. I know how much our communities appreciate the infrastructure projects this Government is building for them and how much the Northern Beaches community appreciates the tunnel. If the communities that have been awaiting those projects for decades want them built, they should vote for the Liberal-Nationals Government. If they want contracts ripped up and nothing built in New South Wales, they should vote for members opposite. I am pleased to talk about progress on the Northern Beaches Tunnel project because obviously members opposite do not notice everything this Government is doing. Geotech studies have been done and properties have been acquired in preparation for the next stage of the project, which is critical because it will enable the community to have a conversation with the Government about the construction phase. I look forward to providing details of that soon.

Mr Michael Daley: Point of order: It sounds as though there is a Northern Beaches—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I call the member for Maroubra to order for the first time.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I will not be lectured by those opposite on how to build projects or on how to treat the community. We are a government that does our homework and consults and we ensure that we build those projects.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr MICHAEL JOHNSEN (Upper Hunter) (14:46): My question is addressed to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on drought conditions in regional New South Wales?

Ms Jodi McKay: How did that visit go for you?

Mr JOHN BARILARO (Monaro—Deputy Premier, Minister for Regional New South Wales, Minister for Skills, and Minister for Small Business) (14:47): When was the last time the member for Strathfield visited farmers and talked about drought? It is typical of Labor. They want to play in this space and pretend they have the answer but they do not. I thank the member for Upper Hunter for his question on a very serious issue, especially in the Upper Hunter where places like Scone are going through a tough period. The farmers and landholders are being impacted by a drought that has been compared to the 1982 millennium drought. As a government, we are committed to making sure we put in place support for those landholders. I thank again the member for his question.

This is not an issue where we should play politics or make jokes. It is a serious issue. Nearly 30 per cent of the State is heading into or is in drought. It is not only affecting farmers and their families and their stock; it is

also affecting regional communities. It is about the commodity and it is about people and communities. Those opposite want to play politics and use throwaway lines. It clearly shows they have no understanding and, more importantly, do not care about regional New South Wales. We are passionate about the families and the communities in regional New South Wales.

Over the past couple of weeks, the Minister for Primary Industries, the member for Bathurst, the Premier, the member for Dubbo and I have met with farmers and announced support for the farmers who are doing it tough. The Minister for Primary Industries recently announced a new addition to the Government's drought package, a \$20,000 interest-free loan. For the first two years the loan will have zero interest with no repayments. People will be able to pay back the loan in two years and there will be no cost. Beyond that, it goes to a low-interest, five-year repayment and loan period. This will assist farmers when it comes to freight with fodder and getting their stock to agistment or to an abattoir. The Government is putting in place the resources and tools to support our farmers. Unfortunately, one thing we cannot do is make it rain. I wish we could.

When we were in Orange on Friday it snowed and it rained, but it was not enough. We are responsible leaders of a responsible government. As the Minister for Regional New South Wales and the leader of The Nationals, together with the responsible leaders of the Government, I am travelling the State to talk to farmers and landholders. I have been to Tamworth and Armidale. I spent three days at Broken Hill at AgFair talking to farmers and landholders. I spoke to Lachie from the pastoral association of western districts and listened to the concerns of many people. Depending where people live in the State, the impact of the drought is different for our landholders and farmers. Yesterday the Premier, together with the Minister for Primary Industries and the member for Dubbo, announced Pip Job as the drought coordinator. We want someone on the ground working with communities and landholders and farmers and for that entity, which has the ear of the Government, to then come back to Government and make sure we continue to respond.

The package of a \$20,000 subsidy low-interest loan which we announced recently is only one part of our \$300 million New South Wales drought strategy. It is a \$300 million investment in rural resilience programs, which will provide farmers with expert advice from a team of experts. The Farm Innovation Fund is an important part of the Government's aims, that is, building resilience and droughtproofing the landholders and farmers for the future. Since 2012, the Farm Innovation Fund has invested \$208 million. In recent months, approximately \$3 million a week has gone to support farmers and to put infrastructure in place to droughtproof as best possible against Mother Nature. Farmers have made clear to us that they are sick and tired of people talking down the impact of drought on our farmers. Over the years farmers have invested in their land, their farming practices and their infrastructure to carry them through difficult times, such as drought.

The difference between the drought in 1982 and the drought today are the low interest rates and the strong commodity price. Farmers have come off two seasons with high commodity prices and farm income is quite high, so there is still money around. The farmers are paying for feed but they will get a return on investment, so they can get through this drought period. But no-one knows what is on the horizon. Pip Job will engage with our farmers and the Government will continue to engage and continue to respond. The misleading and deceptive statements from the Shooters party, particularly the member for Orange, do not help farmers. The fake representation by the Shooters party does not help farmers. The Shooters party inciting anger, hype and hate does not help farmers. [*Extension of time*]

Mr Philip Donato: Point of order: I refer to Standing Order 75. The full party name is the Shooters, Fishers and Farmers Party because Mr Barilaro knows that we are the party that supports farmers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What did the member call the Minister?

Mr Philip Donato: Mr Barilaro.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member will resume his seat. Members will refer to other members by their correct title. The member for Orange took a point of order about the Minister not using the correct title and then did not use the Minister's correct title.

Mr JOHN BARILARO: The member for Orange hates being called out. He posted a photograph on Facebook of a farmer shooting a cow, implying that the drought in New South Wales is causing farmers to shoot their stock. In fact, if a farmer ever gets to a point where he has to destroy stock, there are subsidies and resources in place. The photo the member for Orange used had been posted by a 21-year-old girl in Queensland showing what the Labor Government was doing there. He chose to use the photo to incite anger and to mislead.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk will stop the clock.

Mr Philip Donato: Point of order: I refer to Standing Order 129. The Minister is not being relevant to the question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I place the member for Orange on three calls to order. The member will resume his seat.

Mr JOHN BARILARO: The member for Orange hates being called out. He used a photo in a deceitful way to incite anger and hatred, and it does not stop there.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Kogarah to order for the first time. I will not tolerate those type of comments from the member for Fairfield.

Mr JOHN BARILARO: The member has refused to take down the photo and has refused to acknowledge that he stole the photo which relates to an issue that had nothing to do with the drought in New South Wales.

Mr PHILIP DONATO: Point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not hear any more points of order from the member for Orange. The member will resume his seat.

Mr JOHN BARILARO: Today in the *Central Western Daily* there is an article about a farmer who opposes statements that were made by the member for Orange on farming. It was a critical assessment of the member for Orange and the Shooters, Fishers and so-called Farmers Party, representing the people of Orange. The member for Orange posted that article on his Facebook page, made no comment and then allowed his shooter trolls to attack this farmer with their grubby posts. The member for Orange talks to trolls. He is controlled by his puppet-masters in the upper House. He pretends to represent the people of Orange in this Parliament but he goes into hiding.

Mr Michael Daley: Point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will resume his seat. There is no point of order. Some members do not understand the impact of drought in a large part of this State. If those members were part of the farming community they would understand—

[*Interruption*]

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Kogarah to order for the second time.

Mr Andrew Constance: He's shaved his beard. He must be running for leader.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure to order for the first time.

Mr Luke Foley: You just keep running for leader, Andrew.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order for the first time. I call the member for Newcastle to order for the first time. I call the member for Newcastle to order for the second time. The Deputy Premier's time has expired.

NORTHERN BEACHES TUNNEL

Ms JODI McKAY (Strathfield) (14:56): My question is directed to the Premier. The State Infrastructure Strategy warns that expenditure on a northern beaches tunnel may mean more important projects in Western Sydney are deferred. How does prioritising a tunnel to the northern beaches align with the very clear statement from Infrastructure NSW that "investment needs to shift westwards"?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I had trouble hearing the question because of the level of noise in the Chamber.

Ms JODI McKAY: I am happy to repeat it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. The noise was coming from Opposition members.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN (Willoughby—Premier) (14:56): The member for Strathfield is the biggest hypocrite in this place because she convinced her leader not to support the south-east metro to Bankstown, she refuses to support WestConnex, and she refuses to support the Powerhouse moving to Parramatta. When it comes to all the infrastructure projects—

Mr Michael Daley: Don't forget the light rail.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Do you support the Parramatta Light Rail? You said you didn't.

Mr Michael Daley: It won't happen because you can't build a light rail.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Does the Opposition support the Parramatta Light Rail? Yes or no?

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order—

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I am on topic.

Ms Jodi McKay: I refer to Standing Order 129. The question is specifically about the Northern Beaches Tunnel.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: No, the member for Strathfield said "Western Sydney projects".

Ms Jodi McKay: It is about the Northern Beaches Tunnel and Infrastructure NSW and projects westward.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Premier has the call.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The member asked why the Government is not prioritising Western Sydney projects. Why does the Opposition not support all the projects we are building? There is the M4, the M5, and WestConnex. Westmead Hospital, you never supported us. Campbelltown Hospital, you never did. Liverpool and Bankstown hospitals, you never did. The list goes on. Why does the Opposition not support Western Sydney? We do. We are building all the projects they never did.

Mr Guy Zangari: Point of order: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to Speaker Murray's ruling on 9 September 1999 that all speakers must address their comments through the Chair. The Premier is addressing her comments across the table to the member for Strathfield. I ask that the Premier address her comments through the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. I was in the Chamber that day and clearly remember the ruling. I ask the Premier to direct her comments through the Chair.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I say through you, why does the Labor Party not support Western Sydney infrastructure projects?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Premier should ask the Opposition, not me.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I say through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, why do those opposite not support the Parramatta Light Rail? Why do they not support WestConnex? Why do they not support the infrastructure improvements in health? We are building Nepean Hospital, Westmead Hospital and Campbelltown Hospital—all the hospitals they said they would build and they never got around to it. We on this side do not apologise for building infrastructure across the breadth and width of New South Wales. Wherever there is a community, we will build a project. Those opposite can say thank you for the school upgrades in their electorates and for the koala hospital we are building in Port Stephens. Just say thank you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will direct her comments through the Chair.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I say through you, they never built anything in their lives. If they tried, they failed. They ripped up contracts and wasted millions of dollars.

Mr Jihad Dib: Say thank you for what? What did I get? I got nothing.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Yes, you did, all the school and road upgrades.

Mr Jihad Dib: Just because you say it doesn't make it true.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Lakemba to order for the first time.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: The member can ask me a question and I will tell him all the things we are doing in his electorate. Mr Deputy Speaker, this week something interesting was brought to my attention. It did not fall off the back of a truck; it was accidentally put on a website and then was pulled down. It is all of the Labor Party's policies. It said, "A Fairer NSW." Interestingly, that is the same slogan as The Greens'. When we look down the list—

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order: I refer to Standing Order 129. My question was about the Northern Beaches Tunnel and whether that falls within Infrastructure NSW—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was not about infrastructure as well. I indicated earlier that I could not hear the question.

Ms Jodi McKay: The document the Premier is holding is not about infrastructure. She is using a prop in this House, which is not allowed.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, through you, the member for Strathfield has just answered her own question. This document, which was accidentally uploaded, talks about all Labor's policies. It does not contain a single transport policy or a single infrastructure policy—not a single one.

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order: I refer to Standing Order 129. I want my question answered, if possible. It is about the Northern Beaches Tunnel and how that complies with Infrastructure NSW's finding about projects moving westward.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Strathfield will resume her seat.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Suffice it to say, there will be plenty of time for us to prosecute the couple of things those opposite put on their website. But I can say that there is not a single infrastructure project within their policies. [*Time expired.*]

KOALA HABITAT PROTECTION

Mrs LESLIE WILLIAMS (Port Macquarie) (15:02): My question is addressed to the Minister for the Environment, Minister for Local Government, and Minister for Heritage. What is the New South Wales Government doing to secure a bright future for our koalas along the length and breadth of New South Wales?

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON (Vaucluse—Minister for the Environment, Minister for Local Government, and Minister for Heritage) (15:02): I thank the member for Port Macquarie, a fine member of this Parliament who does great things for that part of the State where, indeed, there is a koala hospital—and a very good one at that. The volunteers at that wonderful koala hospital are doing what we on this side are now doing: stepping up. We are doing our bit—

[*Interruption*]

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON: Are the members opposite listening and taking this seriously? Do you like koalas? You do not care about koalas. If you listen you will learn about what this Government is doing about that iconic species, the koala. We all love the koala.

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Clerk will stop the clock.

Ms Jodi McKay: My point of order is that Ministers continue to disrespect you, Mr Deputy Speaker, by not directing their comments through the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I appreciate the member's concern. There is no point of order.

Ms Jodi McKay: I am happy to stand up for you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Would you please ask them to direct their comments through the Chair?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Strathfield will resume her seat. In the first 10 seconds of the Minister's answer, I think I was referred to about 10 times.

Mr John Sidoti: They're disrespecting the koalas.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Drummoyne to order for the first time.

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, if only the Opposition would listen to what this Government is doing to secure the future of the iconic species, the koala. The member for Port Stephens should listen to what I have to say because this is good news for her electorate. Did the member realise that the koala population has reduced by more than 22 per cent in the last 20 years? That is why last week the Premier and I made an announcement to secure the future of koalas. The member for Port Stephens should listen. It is the biggest commitment by any State government to secure their future in the wild across the length and breadth of this State. We are proud of this strategic policy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Port Stephens to order for the first time.

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON: It builds on the fine work already underway in Pottsville, saving 100 hectares of habitat from housing development. I commend the strong advocacy of the member for Tweed, who pushed for that outcome. We want more koalas in the wild; we want them in the Pilliga, in the Southern Highlands, on the North Coast and in the Blue Mountains. This is a truly statewide package. Those opposite should listen. The package is fully funded—which is something this Government can do—it is smart, it is scientific, it will provide more natural habitat for koalas, it will tackle diseases, it will improve our research and it will fix our roadkill hotspots.

This package responds to the recommendations of the NSW Chief Scientist & Engineer who asked us to do what we are doing today, which is committing to a comprehensive statewide strategy that is fully funded at \$45 million over three years. Initially, 24,000 hectares of unproductive State forest will be dedicated to our national parks and national reserves. Those opposite do not want to listen to this strategy, which is going to secure the future of koalas. The Government will provide \$3 million to fix roadkill hotspots and to erect fences across those places where we know we need to take care of koalas.

I thank the member for Wollondilly, who has been a strong advocate for his area. He has argued tirelessly to make sure that we have the right protections on Picton Road in Wollondilly. That is an outcome of his strong advocacy. The Government has provided \$5 million to plant trees for water sources, to get rid of weeds and to boost koala numbers across the State. Our local communities will be able to use an app to provide information from their experiences to build our knowledge base about koalas. There is so much knowledge about koalas that we will gain through the smart use of technology.

The Government has provided \$4.5 million to train specialist vets and nurses to help in our koala hospitals. The world-famous Taronga Zoo will roll out that training across the State. Some of the populations of our koalas across the State have been faced with the threat of chlamydia. We will run a trial of vaccinations to ensure that that particular population builds its resilience. We will make the Australian Museum a buyer bank for genetic material for koalas. We will boost research, as there is so much more to learn about this iconic species. This major package of \$45 million will cover the State from the top to the bottom and will secure the future of our koalas. The member for Port Stephens has received a dedication of \$3 million to secure a koala hospital close to her home. That is for her community, not her. They deserve better than her.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members will come to order. I call the member for Port Stephens to order for the second time.

[Extension of time]

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON: In summary, this is a comprehensive package with \$45 million funding. It addresses many threats and risks to koalas and delivers across the State. There are more national parks estate and reserves, vaccines and research, and koala hospitals, even for the member for Port Stephens, whose community deserves that dedication to their koala population. The Port Stephens community deserves better than the local member and they will get a great boost to their koala hospital. There is \$20 million for more strategic purposes across the State and there will be \$240 million to help landowners under the Biodiversity Conservation Fund.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I direct the Clerk to stop the clock. I call the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure to order for the second time.

Mr Tim Crakanthorp: Point of order: My point of order is under Standing Order 73. The Minister is making personal reflections against the member for Port Stephens.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister has the call.

Ms GABRIELLE UPTON: This Government will support koalas across our State and we will secure their future. This Government has the will, the money and the aptitude to deliver a great outcome for koalas in New South Wales.

Visitors

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I recognise in the gallery the Federal member for Macarthur and guest of the member for Campbelltown, Dr Michael Freeland.

Question Time

NORTHERN BEACHES TUNNEL

Mr RYAN PARK (Keira) (15:10): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that she has been advised that the estimated cost of the Northern Beaches Tunnel has blown out to \$8 billion?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN (Willoughby—Premier) (15:11): I am thinking about the 10 different ways in which I can answer this question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Opposition has asked the question. They will listen to the answer being provided by the Premier.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: For there to be a blowout a project cost has to be announced and contracts have to be signed. The Opposition would not understand any of that because they have never built anything. I shoot this across the bow: Last week the Labor Party made some interesting comments about infrastructure. I gave them a few warnings about commenting on public discussion. All I can say is watch this space about projects and project costs. Does the shadow Treasurer know that the tunnel project is capital?

Mr Ryan Park: Oh, hang on. Yes.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Fantastic.

Mr Ryan Park: Next question? So far I am following.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I might lose you after here, so don't worry about asking any more questions.

Mr Ryan Park: Take your time. I am not in The Nationals—I do not need pictures—but just slow it up a bit.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: I note that the Opposition has taken a sudden interest in a part of New South Wales that they normally do not care about.

Mr Ryan Park: You should see our polling.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Just like their man on the northern beaches, they did not even have a candidate stand in the by-election. James Griffin did not have a Labor candidate stand against him in the by-election. Where was Labor? Nowhere to be seen. We are pleased with the progress we are making on all of our projects. It is important to note where we are up to with the Beaches Link and I reiterate part of an answer I gave earlier today. We are pleased with the geotechnical work that is being done. Anyone living in and around Seaforth or Middle Harbour would have noticed the drilling that is taking place to ensure our understanding of what is below the surface. If anyone has property in parts of Seaforth or in the Artarmon industrial reserve they may have noticed that the Government has acquired some property in order to contain the geotechnical work.

Of course, our detailed design work is ongoing. I thank all the residents from northern Sydney, not just the northern beaches, who have shown interest in this project. We look forward to providing a further update in the very near future. I again remind the House that those opposite do not want to build infrastructure projects. I just had the member for Maroubra confirm that they do not support the Parramatta light rail—shame on them. During the last answer he yelled out that the Opposition does not support the Parramatta light rail. Let us add that to the list of projects Labor members do not support. Of course it was again confirmed when their policies were uploaded and, lo and behold, there was nothing there on infrastructure and nothing there on transport.

Ms Trish Doyle: Point of order: My point of order is tedious repetition under Standing Order 59.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Blue Mountains will resume her seat.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: Maybe you should tell your leadership team to ask me different questions. They have asked me the same question four times. Don't you have a say in what they decide in leadership strategy meetings?

Mr Guy Zangari: Point of order: I refer to the ruling from Speaker Murray.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Premier will direct her comments through the Chair.

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: As I said in a previous answer in question time today, there is not a corner of New South Wales where we will not improve infrastructure services, where we will not improve services to the community.

Ms Liesl Tesch: Excellent—the Woy Woy underpass?

Ms GLADYS BEREJIKLIAN: What about the Gosford Hospital? The member for Gosford says we are not building anything in her electorate. What about the \$600 million Gosford Hospital? There is a long list of things we are doing in her electorate and the electorates of Labor members, but I will save that for another day.

PRODUCTIVITY REFORM

Mr JOHN SIDOTI (Drummoyne) (15:16): My question is addressed to the Treasurer, and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Government delivering productivity reforms, and are there any alternative approaches?

Mr DOMINIC PERROTTET (Hawkesbury—Treasurer, and Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:17): I thank the member for Drummoyne for his question, his interest in productivity and the great work he is

doing locally. In the last budget, one year down, \$341 million was allocated to upgrade the Concord hospital after 16 years of Labor neglect. This great member is delivering for his community. New South Wales has been powering the nation's economy with record jobs growth and record economic growth. Labor members do not like it but we have the lowest unemployment rate in the nation, the strongest finances and record investments in schools, hospitals, road and rail, and I have just heard now the best koalas in the entire country. There is nothing we cannot do.

No matter where people go, it is clear that this State has been transformed for the better. It is important to note that the Government is not resting on its laurels. We want to take New South Wales from good to great, ensuring that we are the best State in the nation for years to come. We will do this by creating more opportunity and more prosperity for the people of our great State. Since the global financial crisis productivity gains around the world have been sluggish and wages have grown slower than we would like. It is clear that in order to arrest this trend, governments must act.

In a recent report called *Shifting the Dial*, the Commonwealth Productivity Commission said State governments have greatest responsibility in tackling the productivity challenge. Following that report New South Wales is the only State in the nation that has taken the initiative to establish our first ever Productivity Commission. The NSW Productivity Commission will focus on four core themes: making it easier to do business; lowering the cost of living; making housing more affordable; and making New South Wales the easiest place to move to. Yesterday I was pleased to appoint the former New South Wales Auditor-General, Peter Achterstraat, as the NSW Productivity Commissioner. With an excellent track record of service in government and in the private sector, Peter will help direct a coordinated productivity agenda across the whole of government. For this initiative to succeed we must recognise that government is part of the solution but in many instances government can also be part of the problem.

The NSW Business Chamber has estimated businesses spend more than \$10 billion each year complying with regulations across all levels of government. The NSW Productivity Commission, housed within Treasury, will be an advocate for microeconomic reform and will identify regulations that are currently holding back our State. History can teach us a lot. The Commonwealth Productivity Commission was established back in 1998 by former Prime Minister John Howard. I assumed wrongly that boosting productivity would be a bipartisan issue. Who would be opposed to reducing regulation, cutting red tape, reducing taxes, improving living standards and improving prosperity? One would be surprised because when the Howard Government introduced this, what did Labor members do? They opposed it. I repeat: Labor opposed productivity. They opposed projects and policies that were for the common good because, as we know, Labor members put politics before people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Cessnock to order for the second time.

Mr DOMINIC PERROTTET: They would rather have a world of high taxes, high regulation and less prosperity in which it is harder for people across the State to get a job, harder to run a business and harder to get ahead. There is one area of productivity that I am very concerned about and that is the front bench of the Labor Party. There is no conviction, there are no policies and there is no consistent approach to anything they do. All they talk about is cancelling projects, never delivering anything. [*Extension of time*]

We all know—and it has been pointed out in this place—there is currently a cold war on the Labor side of the House when it comes to the fight for the soul of the Labor Party. The member for Liverpool is excited but it is a metaphoric cold war. In the left corner we have the Leader of the Opposition and in the right corner we have the General Secretary of the New South Wales Labor Party, Kaila Murnain, who calls herself the Boss Lady of Fortress NSW.

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order: My point of order is Standing Order 129. There is no way this is relevant to the question being asked.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was related matters. I will listen and determine whether the Treasurer relates this to the question.

Mr DOMINIC PERROTTET: It is relevant because it is a fight for productivity within the Labor Party. It is a celebrity death match made in heaven—low energy Luke versus Boss Lady—and they are not in a fight for the people of New South Wales.

Mr Michael Daley: Point of order: This sort of lowbrow undergraduate nonsense is offensive to two or three standing orders, Mr Deputy Speaker, so pick one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure the Treasurer is just about to tell the House how this is relevant.

Mr DOMINIC PERROTTET: Lazy Daley has woken up. This is a fight and the winner goes home with \$260,000 in blood money. But as we know, as the good book tells us—

Ms Jodi McKay: Point of order: Mr Deputy Speaker, I know that you have given him some leniency—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time has expired.

SEXUAL ASSAULT STRATEGY

Mr ALEX GREENWICH (Sydney) (15:23): My question is directed to the Minister for Family and Community Services, Minister for Social Housing, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault. With significant numbers of survivors of institutional child sex abuse suffering mental illness, addiction, self-harm and other factors that can lead to homelessness, will the Minister ensure that survivors of institutional child sex abuse who need access to social housing will get priority housing?

Ms PRU GOWARD (Goulburn—Minister for Family and Community Services, Minister for Social Housing, and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault) (15:24): I thank the member for Sydney for his question and for his strong support for child sexual abuse survivors. The member has previously written to me on this issue and I acknowledge his strong commitment to working with the Government to make the lives of the most vulnerable people in his electorate that much better.

As the member for Sydney knows, survivors of child sexual abuse can often face an array of complex issues—some of which have been mentioned—that makes it difficult to find safe and secure housing for themselves. Whilst those complexities often will mean that these survivors already will be approved for priority housing on other grounds, the Government recognises that there may be occasions when a child sexual abuse survivor may not be eligible for public housing due to their age, circumstance and capacity. That is why I advise the House that the Government's upcoming Sexual Assault Strategy will include the creation of a priority housing category for victims of child sexual abuse. All applicants would still be required to meet other existing priority housing eligibility criteria.

This change will mean that child sexual abuse survivors will be better able to secure affordable housing, so they can work on getting their lives back on track and fully participate in the community. The new priority housing category builds on the significant progress that New South Wales already has made on the recommendations and findings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, and highlights the importance that the Government places on this matter. In April, the Government announced that offenders convicted of persistent child sex abuse will face a maximum penalty of life in jail under extensive reforms implementing the criminal justice recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sex Abuse.

I am proud that the Government has accepted the overwhelming majority of the royal commission's criminal justice recommendations. Some of the key changes the Government will make include: introducing new offences for failure to report and failure to protect against child abuse; requiring courts sentencing historic child sexual assault offences to apply current sentencing standards and the present understanding about the lifelong effects of sexual abuse on children; requiring courts not to take into account an offender's good character when sentencing for historic offences when their reputation facilitated the offending; and introducing a new offence of grooming an adult to access a child and strengthening the grooming offence to include providing a child with gifts or money. Legislation implementing these changes will be introduced to Parliament in the coming months.

While I am on my feet I will update the House on what the Government is doing more broadly to tackle sexual assault. The Sexual Assault Strategy, a first for New South Wales, has taken time to develop. Broad consultation has been undertaken and local and international evidence has been considered. A strategy is needed that is holistic and responsive. Fundamental to any Sexual Assault Strategy must be an understanding of the importance of consent—and that will certainly be a focus of our strategy. Last week the Attorney-General and I announced that the NSW Law Reform Commission will review the current laws around consent in sexual assault trials. The review is the first priority action of the Sexual Assault Strategy. It is vital survivors feel confident that the justice system is working effectively to keep them safe.

The Government has invested \$50 million in 2017-18 for sexual assault responses across the family and community services, health and justice clusters. The investment includes: \$10 million in new funding for NSW Health to strengthen responses for adult and child victims of sexual assault and other violence, abuse and neglect; \$20 million to continue 55 NSW Health sexual assault services providing integrated psychosocial, medical and forensic services; \$7.4 million for the NSW Department of Justice child sexual offences evidence pilot; \$5 million for New Street therapeutic services for children and young people aged 10-17 years with sexually harmful behaviours; \$1.8 million for rural and remote local health districts, and \$1.6 million for non-government organisations delivering child and adolescent assault counselling services. That funding is in addition to the Government's ongoing investment in other services, such as NSW Police, child protection, the Joint Investigative

Response Teams and Victims Services. I am proud that this Government is delivering better lives for the most vulnerable people in this State.

SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Mr ALISTER HENSKENS (Ku-ring-gai) (15:29): My question is addressed to the Minister for Education. What is the Government doing to ensure that the school curriculum gives New South Wales' students the best opportunity for success?

Mr ROB STOKES (Pittwater—Minister for Education) (15:29): I thank the member for Ku-ring-gai for his question, his strong advocacy on behalf of the schools in his community and also for parents, students and teachers in his part of the world. Recently I accompanied the member for Ku-ring-gai to Killara Public School where renovation works are currently underway. Education is a matter of concern to members of his community, as it is for all communities across New South Wales.

I am reminded in his question that it was a former member for Ku-ring-gai, the Hon. Nick Greiner, who was Premier the last time the New South Wales school curriculum was subjected to review. I attended the teachers of ancient history conference this morning. In pedagogical terms, 1989 was a lifetime ago when one looks at the progress that has been made, the knowledge of educational processes and what was considered of importance then to be included in the curriculum compared to today—some items that were not even anticipated at that time. If we cast our minds back to 1989, the member for Lakemba, shadow Minister for Education, I imagine would have been in Year 10 or maybe Year 9.

Mr Jihad Dib: I was in Year 10.

Mr ROB STOKES: The member for Kogarah was in utero and I understand the member for Liverpool was contracting for the East German Government.

Mr Paul Lynch: Point of order: Clearly this is a breach of standing orders. In 1989 I was in the Supreme Court fighting a Liverpool pre-selection ballot.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Being my age, I sympathise with the member for Liverpool.

Mr ROB STOKES: Erich Honecker has a different account. He says hi, by the way. In 1989 the member for Wakehurst was a successful, relaxed, wealthy, respected senior member of a major suburban law firm. Look at the members now. Much has changed and in the educational firmament there have been countless reviews, particularly over recent months that have been engaged in by respected experts that has been funded by a large of money from the Federal Government and the Education Council. Whether it is the Pascoe review into early childhood education, the Finkel review into science, technology, engineering, and mathematics [STEM] education, the Halsey review into rural, remote and indigenous education, or the granddaddy of them all, the Gonski report into educational excellence in New South Wales's schools.

All these reviews and reports have made recommendations with an impact upon curriculum development and delivery. The Government does not believe in leaving those reports sitting dusty and unread on a shelf, but would rather translate those outputs into outcomes that will benefit schools. That is why the Government is engaging Professor Geoff Masters, the head for 20 years of the Australian Council for Educational Research and a former teacher, to undertake the review of the school curriculum. The purpose of the review is to respond to a large number of recommendations generally and recommendations 5, 6 and 7 in the Gonski review. Those recommendations talk about the need to look at the linkages between the subjects, disciplines, learning areas that are taught and the general capabilities that are forged at the same time—not just what is learnt, but why it is learnt. It is not the knowledge itself, which obviously is crucial, but the way in which this knowledge can be applied to the development of ideas and the testing of those ideas, or to develop solutions to current or emerging problems. It is that linkage between the learning areas and general capability. [*Extension of time*]

We also need to shape them into learning progressions over time, which is one of the key findings of Gonski. Those who are involved with schools will be familiar with this. Our own children might have experienced it or we may know it through our parents or others in the community. We all know there are gaps in parts of the foundational knowledge, particularly in literacy and numeracy. It is almost impossible—although nothing is impossible—to make up those gaps in knowledge later in life. A key finding of the Gonski review and recommendations was the need to focus the curriculum delivery on literacy and numeracy outcomes in the early years of school. The magic age is eight years. That is quite sobering for the community. By fourth grade it is already starting to become too late to fill those gaps. We need to make sure that our curriculum responds to the needs of the children.

We also need to make sure that we engage our teachers at the front and centre of this review process. We all know that we have magnificent teachers here in New South Wales, the best in the country. We know that

the greatest determinant of in-school student success is the quality and dedication of teachers. They have the answers to these problems. I know, from talking to the teachers in our schools, that they have the ideas about how to fix some of the challenges in our curriculum, such as the perennial concerns in relation to overcrowding, the manner in which the curriculum is understood and interpreted, and the way in which it links into all the other things that are required of schools these days. That is why this Government is doing the review. That is why teachers are at the heart of the review, and that is why we are focused on educational excellence in New South Wales.

Committees

LEGISLATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Report: Legislation Review Digest No. 54/56

Mr JAMES GRIFFIN: As Chair: I table the report of the Legislation Review Committee, entitled "Legislation Review Digest No. 54/56", dated 15 May, 2018.

I move:

That the report be printed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr JAMES GRIFFIN: I also table the minutes of the committee meeting regarding Legislation Review Digest No. 53/56

Petitions

PETITIONS RECEIVED

The CLERK: I announce that the following petitions signed by fewer than 500 persons have been lodged for presentation:

Pet Shops

Petition opposing the sale of animals in pet shops, received from **Mr Alex Greenwich**.

Short-term Holiday Letting

Petition calling on the Government to ban the conversion of entire homes into short-term holiday lets and to introduce appropriate controls including a short-term letting registration system, received from **Mr Alex Greenwich**.

Inner West Bus Services

Petition opposing the privatisation of inner west bus services, received from **Ms Jo Haylen**.

Anti-Discrimination Act 1977

Petition calling on the Government to recognise bisexual, gender diverse and intersex people in the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Act 1977 and to address clauses in the Act that unfairly penalise gay, lesbian and transgender citizens, received from **Ms Jo Haylen**.

Anti-discrimination Guidelines

Petition calling on the Government to adopt Commonwealth Government guidelines that protect citizens from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status, received from **Ms Jo Haylen**.

Inner-city Social Housing

Petition opposing the sale of public housing in Millers Point, Dawes Point and The Rocks, received from **Mr Alex Greenwich**.

McNeilly Park

Petition opposing the closure of McNeilly Park, received from **Ms Jo Haylen**.

Sydney Football Stadium

Petition requesting that the Government upgrade rather than rebuild the Sydney Football Stadium and invest the money saved into health, education and community sports facilities, received from **Mr Alex Greenwich**.

RESPONSES TO PETITIONS

The CLERK: I announce that the following Ministers have lodged responses to petitions signed by more than 500 persons:

The Hon. Anthony Roberts—Bundanoon Residential Developments—lodged 11 April 2018 (Ms Pru Goward)

The Hon. Melinda Pavey—Glebe Island Multi-User Facility—lodged 11 April 2018 (Mr Alex Greenwich)

Business of the House

BUSINESS LAPSED

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I advise the House that in accordance with standing order 105 (3), General Business Order of the Day (for Bills) No. 1 (Privacy and Personal Information Protection Amendment (Notification of Serious Violations of Privacy by Public Sector Agencies) Bill) and No. 2 (Civil Liability Amendment (Institutional Child Abuse) Bill), and General Business Notices of Motions (General Notices) No. 2578 and Nos 2580 to 2598, have lapsed.

Motions Accorded Priority

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION RELOCATION

Consideration

Dr GEOFF LEE (Parramatta) (15:40): This motion should be accorded priority because it is great news that the Industrial Relations Commission [IRC] is moving to Western Sydney. This demonstrates a Government commitment to a decade of decentralisation, which is a key strategy of this Government's policy. This motion should be accorded priority because Western Sydney deserves its fair share of jobs, whether government or private. It is not fair that 200,000 people wake up in Western Sydney and need to travel outside the area to get to work every day. People in Western Sydney deserve these jobs. The Government is committed to decentralisation of jobs from the Sydney central business district [CBD] to Western Sydney. Western Sydney welcomes any and all jobs, and it is great to see another government department, the Industrial Relations Commission, moving west. Nearly 1,400 jobs already have moved to Western Sydney.

This motion deserves priority because relocating the IRC will add to the 1,000 government jobs already moved. Parramatta is ideally located geographically as a central city. In 20 years, another one million people will move west of Parramatta. It is an economic hub for Western Sydney and will grow Parramatta's workforce from 50,000 to another 100,000 over the next 20 years. This motion deserves priority because the Government will deliver the right fit-for-purpose facilities for the IRC and will give the IRC the state-of-the-art technology that allows people to communicate remotely. We welcome the IRC to Parramatta, and we know that the staff will really enjoy the excellent transport links, including the upcoming light rail. I am sure the IRC staff will enjoy a visit to our brand-new stadium—the Western Sydney Stadium. By 2023, they will be able to visit the new Parramatta Powerhouse Museum. It is very exciting. If people get sick—and the Government does not want anybody to get sick—they will be able to visit the billion-dollar Westmead Hospital redevelopment.

Mr John Barilaro: And a big statue of a wooden spoon for the Parramatta Eels!

Dr GEOFF LEE: Parramatta Eels may not be doing so well, so we will not encourage those games. The Wanderers are going to win some games. We welcome the staff of the IRC to Parramatta. We know they will enjoy excellent transport, excellent entertainment and excellent facilities. I commend this motion to the House.

Motions Accorded Priority

SCHOOL MAINTENANCE

Consideration

Mr JIHAD DIB (Lakemba) (15:43): "Every parent knows that the demountable classrooms are a poor alternative to learning in a real classroom. They are tucked away, down the back. They grow mould in winter. They leak with rain and are flimsy in construction." Guess who said that? The person who said that in 2010 was the then Opposition's spokesperson on education. That is typical of those on the Government side of the Chamber. They talked it up but the very first thing they did when they got into government was to cut the demountable

replacement program. They axed the program because it was not a policy they believed in. Those on the other side of the House say one thing, and then, when they get into government, do the opposite. Why did that happen? It happened because the Government does not believe in such a policy. What have we seen as a result of that? We have seen a huge increase in the number of demountable classrooms.

Since 2015—one term of government—almost 1,000 additional demountables have been moved into New South Wales public schools. And the situation is getting worse. I want Government members to tell the students at Carlingford West Public School, which has 34 demountables; Kirrawee Public School, which has 33 demountables; and Westmead Public School, which has 24 demountables, why they are prioritising stadiums over resolving the demountables issue.

The ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Rockdale to order for the first time.

Mr JIHAD DIB: Why does this Government insist on retaining 80 per cent of demountables that are more than 20 years old? The Government prioritises a 19-year-old stadium and is happy to have 100,000 kids sitting in demountables that are more than 20 years old. It will always prioritise stadiums. The member for Riverstone—fire up—there are 168 demountables in your electorate.

The ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lakemba will direct his comments through the Chair.

Mr JIHAD DIB: I want the member for Riverstone to tell his community how he can possibly believe it is alright to prioritise stadiums over replacing 168 demountables. It is all about priorities. The Government talks the talk but when it is given the option to prioritise schools over stadiums, it will always prioritise stadiums. It talks it up but it cannot deliver. There are 6,000 demountables in our schools—168 in Riverstone alone. A 19-year-old stadium is making way for something new while more than 80 per cent of demountables in New-South Wales public schools are more than 20 years old. I repeat: There are 20-year-old demountables and a 19-year-old stadium. I know what I would be changing. The Government has the wrong priorities. [*Time expired.*]

The ASSISTANT SPEAKER: The question is that the motion of the member for Parramatta be accorded priority.

The House divided.

Ayes49
Noes37
Majority.....12

AYES

Anderson, Mr K
Barilaro, Mr J
Conolly, Mr K
Coure, Mr M
Dominello, Mr V
Evans, Mr L
Grant, Mr T
Hazzard, Mr B
Johnsen, Mr M
Maguire, Mr D
O'Dea, Mr J
Perrottet, Mr D
Roberts, Mr A
Speakman, Mr M
Toole, Mr P
Ward, Mr G
Wilson, Ms F

Aplin, Mr G
Bromhead, Mr S (teller)
Constance, Mr A
Crouch, Mr A
Elliott, Mr D
Gibbons, Ms M
Griffin, Mr J
Henskens, Mr A
Kean, Mr M
Marshall, Mr A
Patterson, Mr C (teller)
Petinos, Ms E
Rowell, Mr J
Stokes, Mr R
Tudehope, Mr D
Williams, Mr R

Ayres, Mr S
Brookes, Mr G
Cooke, Ms S
Davies, Mrs T
Evans, Mr A
Goward, Ms P
Gulaptis, Mr C
Humphries, Mr K
Lee, Dr G
Notley-Smith, Mr B
Pavey, Mrs M
Provest, Mr G
Sidoti, Mr J
Taylor, Mr M
Upton, Ms G
Williams, Mrs L

NOES

Aitchison, Ms J
Barr, Mr C
Chanthivong, Mr A
Dib, Mr J

Atalla, Mr E
Car, Ms P
Crakanthorp, Mr T
Donato, Mr P

Bali, Mr S
Catley, Ms Y
Daley, Mr M
Doyle, Ms T

NOES

Finn, Ms J
Harris, Mr D
Hornery, Ms S
Lynch, Mr P
Mehan, Mr D
Park, Mr R
Scully, Mr P
Warren, Mr G
Zangari, Mr G

Foley, Mr L
Harrison, Ms J
Kamper, Mr S
McDermott, Dr H
Mihailuk, Ms T
Parker, Mr J
Smith, Ms T F
Washington, Ms K

Greenwich, Mr A
Hoenig, Mr R
Leong, Ms J
McKay, Ms J
Minns, Mr C
Piper, Mr G
Tesch, Ms L (teller)
Watson, Ms A (teller)

PAIRS

Berejiklian, Ms G
George, Mr T
Hancock, Mrs S

Lalich, Mr N
Haylen, Ms J
Cotsis, Ms S

Motion agreed to.**INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION RELOCATION****Priority****Dr GEOFF LEE (Parramatta) (15:52):** I move:

That this House supports the relocation of the Industrial Relations Commission to Western Sydney. The relocation of the Industrial Relations Commission [IRC] is part of the Government's strategy of a decade of decentralisation, which aims to move 100,000 square metres of office space out of the Sydney central business district [CBD] to suburban and regional locations by 2021. I bring great news to the House that so far some 2,958 jobs have been relocated from the Sydney CBD to metropolitan areas, including Western Sydney and regional New South Wales. Based on current projects, the Government expects to relocate 160,000 square metres by 2021, which exceeds its target by 60,000 square metres. The relocation of agencies will ensure that public servants are located close to their customers, with the aim of improving overall service delivery, and will create more opportunities for public servants who want to work closer to where they live. A considerable reduction in congestion is expected as a result of relocations outside the Sydney CBD. They are expected to encourage economic development by supporting local businesses and creating jobs in Western Sydney during the construction of new offices.

I have great news that some 1,400 staff have already moved from the CBD to Western Sydney. We certainly welcome those jobs in the Department of Education, which has moved 1,400 full-time staff; the Department of Family and Community Services, which has moved 70 staff; the Department of Justice, which has moved 294 staff; the Department of Industry, which has moved 139 staff; Transport NSW, which has moved 369 staff, and the list goes on. This is a demonstration of the great commitment this Government has made to the Decade of Decentralisation. The relocation of government jobs to Parramatta is exciting for not only the people of Parramatta but also the new staff. Parramatta was once seen as the home of Sydney's second central business district. That is no longer true; it is now a cosmopolitan city in its own right. We have the central area and now the new western city of Badgerys Creek. This Government is building not only a big city but also a great city. Parramatta has a unique identity and is a wonderful cosmopolitan city that is the economic hub of Western Sydney.

Members opposite laugh and giggle. This Government is very proud of Parramatta. The member for Blacktown wishes his electorate could have what Parramatta has. It is disappointing that he has Parramatta envy. The Greater Sydney Commission agrees that Parramatta is a cradle city and sees it playing a very important role in the development of Western Sydney. By 2036, about three million people will call Western Sydney home. I always say that Parramatta is the capital of Western Sydney. It is the eastern suburbs of Western Sydney. It is geographically located at the centre of greater Sydney and is enjoying a fantastic rate of growth in terms of not only homes but also jobs. The staff of the Industrial Relations Commission will be able to enjoy the infrastructure that this Government is delivering to Western Sydney. It is investing record amounts in infrastructure projects such as WestConnex, NorthConnex, Parramatta Light Rail, and Sydney Metro West.

The new workers will also be able to visit the Parramatta Powerhouse. It is sad that members opposite are disadvantaging the children and families of Western Sydney by refusing to support the relocation of the Powerhouse Museum to Parramatta. This Government has also announced the largest-ever government agency leasing program in the heart of Parramatta Square, with contracts covering 62,000 square metres of A-grade office space built by Walker Corporation Pty Limited, which will accommodate some 40,000 public service roles. It is a great pleasure to commend this motion to the House because we know that Western Sydney is the place of the future.

Mr RON HOENIG (Heffron) (15:57): I sat for five minutes listening to the member for Parramatta, waiting to see whether he could indicate to the House exactly how Parramatta will benefit from the relocation of the Industrial Relations Commission. I thought he would tell us about millions of dollars being added to the Parramatta economy or how the workers might benefit. I am talking about the people the Industrial Relations Commission is charged with protecting by ensuring that they work in safe and healthy environments. This Government is destroying that role by not replacing one judge who has left. The commission now has only three commissioners.

As a result of this relocation, the poor workers who desperately need the help of those commissioners will have to pay a toll on the M4 and the M5 to access them. The Government is effectively taxing workers who are trying to access the commission. The member for Epping will make a contribution to this debate, and in so doing will confirm that this is a North Shore Tory government. The poor member for Parramatta has been dished up to prove that the Government really does care about the Howard battlers. I foreshadow that I will move an amendment to the motion to protect the workers that this Government has abandoned. I move:

That the motion be amended by adding "and supports the retention of the former seat of the Colonial Government, the Chief Secretary's building, by reason of its historic, social, architectural, aesthetic and scientific value in public ownership".

This motion is a stalking horse for the Tories' sell-off of one of Australia's most historic buildings. The Chief Secretary's building is the seat of colonial government in New South Wales. This magnificent structure was built in the nineteenth century and was home to every Premier until the middle of the twentieth century. This motion is all about doing what the Tories have been doing since coming to government—that is, flogging historic buildings. Since 1856, this building has housed government offices and facilities. It is a valuable historic building not only for Sydney but also for Australia. Members opposite intend to flog it off just as they have flogged off \$9 billion worth of other government buildings. That is what this motion is about. Those opposite are not concerned about providing economic investment in Western Sydney or the three commissioners moving from 47 Bridge Street to somewhere in Parramatta. Their only concern is flogging this historic building.

The ASSISTANT SPEAKER: Order! The member for Epping will come to order. He will have an opportunity to contribute to the debate.

Mr RON HOENIG: The Government has not indicated how the building will be used or how it will enhance the Industrial Relations Commission's ability to provide better occupational safety and health conditions for the workers of New South Wales. It also has not indicated how many employees will be moved to Parramatta or how that will benefit the local economy. Why must the Industrial Relations Commission move to Parramatta? What about South Western Sydney? The member for Campbelltown asked why this Tory Government always forgets Campbelltown. It is the epicentre of south-western Sydney and has a population of 500,000 people. Why is it always left out of the equation? Why are the three commissioners not providing an economic boost for Campbelltown?

This Government says it is moving things on the basis of enhancing the Western Sydney economy. That is a myth. The establishment of the Sydney West Trial Courts resulted in the closure of courts at Campbelltown. The poor of south-western Sydney now have to find their way to Parramatta to get to the District Court. The Government also promised to move the Ambulance Service of NSW to Parramatta. Has that happened? No, it has not. This motion is nothing but a smokescreen to hide the sale of one of Australia's most historic buildings. My amendment gives Tory members the opportunity to support retaining the Chief Secretary's building in public ownership.

Mr DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (Epping) (16:02): It is pleasure to support the motion moved by the member for Parramatta. The motion was well argued by him but appallingly contradicted by the member for Heffron, who was not able once to articulate the benefits for the workers that this move represents. The relocation of the Industrial Relations Commission to Parramatta is a fundamental piece of the Government's hugely successful policy of decentralising government. This move is part of a policy that will see more than 4,000 public sector jobs relocate to Western Sydney by 2019. That is because this Government is focused on ensuring the public sector works for the people, and not the other way around.

Parramatta is an increasingly important business hub for Sydney, yet critical public services remain vastly over-represented in our CBD. The Liberals and The Nationals have helped transform Western Sydney into the economic powerhouse we see today. There is no better example of this than Western Sydney's record low unemployment rate of 5.1 per cent under this Government. Although unsurprising, it is still disappointing that the Labor Party continues to oppose the Government and the steps we have taken to turn around the fortunes of Western Sydney. Members of the once proud Labor Party—the self-proclaimed champion of the working class—now come into this Chamber and vote against motions to support jobs growth in Parramatta. It is clear that Labor no longer stands with the working families of Western Sydney, but we should not be surprised.

For years, the Labor Party has paid lip service to the aspirations of workers across this State. It uses them as pawns in its political games. Labor shackles their ambitions through the politics of envy and manipulates their aspirations by stoking the fires of class warfare. Let this House be under no illusions. The real reason Labor is voting against relocating the IRC to Parramatta is that it is prioritising the demands of inner-city elites over the needs of aspirational Western Sydney workers. Labor now preferences the latte-sippers of Leichhardt, the basketweavers of Balmain and the chardonnay-sipping socialists over the hardworking men and women of the west. The writing is on the wall. Labor has abandoned the people of Western Sydney. It has abandoned Western Sydney in a desperate attempt to save its metropolitan seats. It has abandoned the workers in pursuit of political power.

Mr STEPHEN BALI (Blacktown) (16:06): I thought it was against standing orders to mislead the Parliament. I have never heard such interesting arguments as those just presented by the member for Epping. We should look at the issues before us, starting with the claim from the member for Epping that Labor is supposedly shackling the workers. But let us consider the Government's position on the Fair Work Act and its review. The Government put forward that the minimum standards provided to employees by both the National Employment Standards and the modern awards and the lack of access to meaningful flexibility to deal with the rigidities of those minimum standards create a serious cost consideration for businesses. The Government wants to get rid of minimum standards.

What will the Industrial Relations Commission consider and discuss? The member for Heffron talked about staffing. In 2016, 22 people worked at the Industrial Relations Commission. I am unsure how many staff worked there in 2017 or today because the annual reports are not on the website. The 2017 report is missing. Perhaps the entire Industrial Relations Commission has disappeared. In 2016 the number of staff was reduced by 12, to 22. I wonder how many staff the commission has got rid of since then. It will be interesting to know who will leave and how many staff will remain—it will be a handful of jobs. The member for Parramatta talked about the wonderful growth rates across Western Sydney, which we all encourage and support as much as possible. We on the Labor side agree that jobs should be relocated from the CBD to Western Sydney.

But if we compare growth rates, we see that money the Government pumped into Parramatta in 2016 resulted in 3 per cent growth. That figure should be compared with Blacktown. The Government has taken positions from Blacktown and yet it grew by 7.2 per cent. In 2015 there was 1.1 per cent growth in Parramatta and 4.8 per cent growth in Blacktown. I can see why the Government is trying to push forward with this policy. To a large extent we support Western Sydney, but the member for Parramatta is going against Government policy because Parramatta is not part of Western Sydney. The Western Sydney City Deal excludes Parramatta, Blacktown, the Hills and Cumberland, which are not part of the new definition of "Western Sydney". If the commission is to be moved to Western Sydney, Penrith will welcome it. Government members talk continually about locating different agencies to Western Sydney yet the Government has split Western Sydney in half and divided it. [*Time expired.*]

Dr GEOFF LEE (Parramatta) (16:09): In reply: I thank members representing the electorates of Heffron, Epping and Blacktown for their contributions to the debate. They presented some passionate ideas, and I will reflect on a couple of them. The member for Heffron clearly does not understand the link between decentralising jobs from the CBD and the effect upon city centres such as Parramatta in terms of economic contribution and development. Parramatta is the geographic heart of Western Sydney; indeed, it is the geographic heart of the whole of Sydney. The member is correct: This is about not just Western Sydney but the whole of Sydney. I remind those workers who are currently based in the Sydney CBD that it is less than 30 minutes by train to Parramatta. Unfortunately, the member for Heffron seems to be pandering to his eastern suburbs lawyer mates rather than encouraging them to realise that the real workers are in Western Sydney.

This Government is committed to the future of Western Sydney, which is why we are moving the Industrial Relations Commission [IRC] to Parramatta. We are proud of the Sydney West Trial Courts that were mentioned earlier, but we would love to give some of those courts to Penrith, Liverpool or wherever else they are required. The member for Epping made a most sensible speech. I am sure members will agree that his words were insightful, eloquent and passionate. The member knows that the Decade of Decentralisation is a key plank in this Government's agenda for delivering the jobs that Western Sydney deserves. It is about creating jobs where people are located, close to where they live so they do not have to spend time commuting. The member pointed out that the 5.1 per cent unemployment rate in Western Sydney is the lowest it has been for quite some time. We are proud of that but we have more to do, which is why the relocation of the IRC is so important. I thank the member for Epping, who is clearly a passionate person, a man of the people and a man who cares about the workers. He is apparently one of the two smartest people in our party room.

Mr Jamie Parker: Who says that?

Dr GEOFF LEE: I am not sure. The member for Epping knows the difference between the Government and Labor, which has abandoned the people of Western Sydney and the workers. I commend the member for Epping for his eloquent, passionate and insightful speech. My final words must relate to the member for Blacktown, who holds another elected position. It is said that he does not support moving jobs to Western Sydney. Most of the time he says some very sensible things but on this occasion he is wrong. Spending and delivering infrastructure to Western Sydney is important. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr Jamie Parker: Who is the smartest?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! In answer to the interjection from the member for Balmain, I trust it is the Premier. If it is not, I think a couple of people will be in trouble. The question is that the amendment of the member for Heffron be agreed to.

The House divided.

Ayes35
Noes49
Majority..... 14

AYES

Aitchison, Ms J
Barr, Mr C
Chanthivong, Mr A
Dib, Mr J
Finn, Ms J
Harrison, Ms J
Kamper, Mr S
McKay, Ms J
Minns, Mr C
Piper, Mr G
Tesch, Ms L (teller)
Watson, Ms A (teller)

Atalla, Mr E
Car, Ms P
Crakanthorp, Mr T
Donato, Mr P
Greenwich, Mr A
Hoenig, Mr R
Lynch, Mr P
Mehan, Mr D
Park, Mr R
Scully, Mr P
Warren, Mr G
Zangari, Mr G

Bali, Mr S
Catley, Ms Y
Daley, Mr M
Doyle, Ms T
Harris, Mr D
Hornery, Ms S
McDermott, Dr H
Mihailuk, Ms T
Parker, Mr J
Smith, Ms T F
Washington, Ms K

NOES

Anderson, Mr K
Bromhead, Mr S (teller)
Constance, Mr A
Crouch, Mr A
Elliott, Mr D
George, Mr T
Grant, Mr T
Hazzard, Mr B
Johnsen, Mr M
Maguire, Mr D
O'Dea, Mr J
Perrottet, Mr D
Roberts, Mr A
Speakman, Mr M
Toole, Mr P
Ward, Mr G
Wilson, Ms F

Aplin, Mr G
Brookes, Mr G
Cooke, Ms S
Davies, Mrs T
Evans, Mr A
Gibbons, Ms M
Griffin, Mr J
Henskens, Mr A
Kean, Mr M
Marshall, Mr A
Patterson, Mr C (teller)
Petinos, Ms E
Rowell, Mr J
Stokes, Mr R
Tudehope, Mr D
Williams, Mr R

Ayres, Mr S
Conolly, Mr K
Coure, Mr M
Dominello, Mr V
Evans, Mr L
Goward, Ms P
Gulaptis, Mr C
Humphries, Mr K
Lee, Dr G
Notley-Smith, Mr B
Pavey, Mrs M
Provest, Mr G
Sidoti, Mr J
Taylor, Mr M
Upton, Ms G
Williams, Mrs L

PAIRS

Foley, Mr L
Haylen, Ms J
Lalich, Mr N

Barilaro, Mr J
Berejiklian, Ms G
Hancock, Mrs S

Amendment negatived.

The ASSISTANT SPEAKER: The question is that the motion as moved by the member for Parramatta be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Bills

**NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE
(COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL 2018**

Second Reading Debate

Debate resumed from 1 May 2018.

Mr PAUL LYNCH (Liverpool) (16:22): I lead for the Labor Opposition on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. The Opposition does not oppose the bill. The object of the bill is to refer various matters to the Commonwealth Parliament to enable that Parliament to legislate on matters concerning them. Specifically that will allow the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate for the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse. The Commonwealth Constitution does not allow the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate validly for these matters without a referral by the State Parliament under placitum xxxvii of section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

The bill refers two things in particular. First, it refers a text reference annexed as Schedule 1 to the bill—the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Bill 2018—which is proposed to be the Commonwealth Act. The second item is an amendment reference that provides for the enactment of amendments to the scheme. The bill is a response to recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Whilst the scheme and the Commonwealth bill are broadly consistent with the royal commission recommendation, there are significant differences. This is the first referral bill to be introduced to a State or Territory legislature and the scheme is proposed, according to public announcements, to commence by 1 July. To date Victoria has agreed to participate, followed by the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and Queensland, according to public report.

Without referral bills such as this, the scheme cannot operate. The scheme is proposed to operate for 10 years. The constitution of the national redress scheme is set out in the Commonwealth bill annexed as schedule 1 to the bill. A convenient summary of the scheme is set out in clause 4 of the Commonwealth bill. Redress is provided for abuse that occurred when the person was a child and consists of these components: a redress payment of up to \$150,000, a counselling and psychological component, and a direct personal response from the institution. For an entitlement to redress a person had to be sexually abused, the abuse must be within the scheme and a participating institution must be responsible for the abuse. At the time of application the applicant must be an Australian citizen or permanent resident. The responsibility of an institution is based upon whether the institution is primarily or equally responsible for the abuser having contact with the applicant.

If the scheme operator considers there is a reasonable likelihood that the person is eligible for redress, the operator must approve the application and make a redress offer to the person. That offer may be accepted or declined. If the offer is accepted then the person must release the institution and officials from liability, although the abuser is not released from liability. Participating institutions that the operator determines responsible for the abuse are liable for the costs of providing redress. They are also liable to contribute to the costs of the scheme. The bill mandates that redress under the scheme should be survivor focused. The scheme's operator is the secretary of the Commonwealth department. The operator must be satisfied there is a reasonable likelihood that the person is entitled to redress. This of course is not the traditional burden of proof in civil proceedings.

Clause 15 of the Commonwealth bill sets out relevant circumstances for determining responsibility for institutions. The operator must make a determination on an application as soon as practicable. A person can only make one application for redress under the scheme. A person cannot make an application while they are in jail, although this can be waived in exceptional circumstances. Clause 63 provides a person is not entitled to redress if they have been sentenced to a period of imprisonment of five years or more unless the operator is satisfied providing redress will not bring the scheme into disrepute, or adversely affect public confidence or support for the scheme. I must say that seems extraordinarily uncertain, and thus wrong in principle. It seems as though redress is available only when the nebulous concept of public opinion as mediated by a public servant is interpreted in a particular way. Likewise a person is not entitled to redress while a security notice is in force.

I note that in his second reading speech the Attorney did not touch on some of the controversial aspects of the national scheme, such as the one I just mentioned. Certainly the establishment of a national scheme is to be welcomed. It is common ground amongst almost everyone who has turned their mind to these issues that the existing common law system has not served all survivors well. The establishment of a comparatively simple

scheme, certainly simpler than common law avenues, is to be welcomed, especially in a non-confrontational structure. That was the recommendation of the royal commission.

There are, however, divergences from the royal commission recommendation in the scheme in this legislation. The most obvious relates to the quantum of redress payments. The royal commission redress and civil litigation report recommended monetary payments to provide tangible recognition of the seriousness of the hurt and injury suffered by a survivor. Recommendation 19 of that report provided that the maximum payment be of \$200,000. This was one of the figures canvassed in the consultation papers of the commission. The royal commission noted that that amount and the other amounts in their papers did not exceed common law damages for non-economic loss, referenced at page 247 of the report. There were differing views in response to the consultation. The Truth, Justice and Healing Council, for example, had argued for a maximum payment of \$150,000. The Uniting Church, on the other hand, supported a maximum payment of \$200,000. At page 252, the royal commission concluded:

We are satisfied that the appropriate level of monetary payments under redress is a maximum payment of \$200,000 and an average payment of \$65,000. We consider that the higher maximum payment is appropriate to allow recognition of the most severe cases, taking account of both the severity of the abuse and the severity of the impact of the abuse.

This conclusion and recommendation was reached after considerable thought and consideration by the royal commission and after significant consultation. In my view there is a substantial onus on those who would come to a different conclusion. In my view those advocating for this bill have not discharged this onus. As well as choosing a different maximum, the bill does not refer to an average amount in contradistinction to the royal commission report. Likewise differing from the royal commission recommendation, there is no minimum set in this bill. I would draw the attention of the House to comments from the Australian Lawyers Alliance [ALA] on quantum. The ALA said:

The ALA believes that maximum amounts in line with those recommended by the Royal Commission, indexed for CPI over the lifetime of the Scheme, are appropriate. As the Royal Commission noted, a maximum amount of \$200,000 'is appropriate to allow recognition of the most severe cases, taking account both of the severity of the abuse and the severity of the impact of the abuse'.

It also said:

It is important that the amount of redress paid adequately reflects the seriousness of the survivor's experiences and the impact of the abuse on their lives. Particularly in the most serious cases, some survivors might not feel that what they are offered adequately reflects the impact of the abuse on their lives if the maximum redress payment is restricted to \$150,000.

The ALA also argued:

While the Scheme is not intended to offer the level of payment that might be available through civil litigation, applicants will compare what is available through each route. While many will be happy to accept a lower payment to avoid the stress of litigation, the greater the gap between the two potential amounts, the less attractive the Scheme will be to survivors.

If maximum redress payments are so significantly below what might be achievable through civil litigation, some survivors might feel forced to pursue civil litigation even though they would prefer not to. In turn, this will mean that fewer institutions will benefit from the still dramatically lower redress payments available under the Scheme, as well as accruing significant legal fees that will arise should survivors choose to pursue litigation.

The basis for the lower maximum figure of \$150,000 seems, as best I can determine, based upon maintaining the financial viability of various institutions. This is, in my view, an entirely wrong and perverse way of looking at the issue. Redress payments are to recognise the seriousness of the pain inflicted and the seriousness of the consequences of that pain. They are not to limit the degree of pain felt by institutions providing redress. That is an entirely wrong way of looking at it. The maximum should not be \$150,000 but \$200,000, as recommended by the royal commission.

The problem, of course, is even more acute when it is remembered that a significant number of institutions involved are government owned and run. By limiting the maximum payment to \$150,000 rather than \$200,000, governments are limiting how much they have to pay. They are clearly judges in their own cause on this point. It is to the Government's benefit to limit these payments. There is also an element of unfairness as well. If a redress payment is accepted, the survivor ends their common law rights. If successful in a common law action, a victim may well recover vastly more than \$200,000.

If, as the royal commission suggests, this amount of \$200,000 is below the non-economic common law damages then obviously a successful common law claim will result in much more than \$200,000. Indeed, the available evidence of cases on this point supports that argument. This seems not just wrong in principle, but could have counterproductive consequences in practice. That is, if the maximum payment is set too low it may well encourage survivors to pursue common law claims. NSW Labor welcomes the national scheme, but unequivocally feels that the royal commission recommendation of \$200,000 as a maximum cap should have been adopted. I note that on this we are in agreement with the position of the Federal Labor parliamentary party. In my view,

this scheme on that point short-changes survivors. There are other differences between the scheme and the royal commission recommendation. Page 347 of the royal commission report says:

We see no need for any citizenship, residency or other requirements, whether at the time of the abuse or at the time of application for redress.

That is not what is contained in the draft bill annexed to schedule 1 to the bill before the House. I have heard no credible argument in support of this variation. This also raises particularly asylum seekers, refugees and stateless persons who have suffered abuse in immigration centres. They are particular issues for jurisdictions other than the New South Wales Parliament, but I note my personal disquiet at these provisions and their implications. The bill also has restrictions on claimants based upon imprisonment or conviction of a crime. These proposals were not contained within the royal commission report. Early media reports suggested individuals convicted of sex offences and anyone convicted of crimes for which there was a maximum sentence of five or more years in prison would be automatically barred from redress payments. That is not quite what happens in this scheme, as I indicated earlier. There is a discretionary element in this bill that makes it less onerous, but, it seems to me, must dramatically increase the uncertainty surrounding this aspect of the scheme. The ALA's submission on the original reports said:

For many, the sexual abuse that they suffered as children will have contributed to the life of crime they later embarked on, or the single criminal offence (which could be relatively minor, with no sentence imposed, if the maximum possible was five years). In relation to drug crimes, for example, the Royal Commission heard time and again evidence from survivors who explained that they were driven to drug and alcohol misuse as a means of blocking out memories of the abuse that they suffered. A blanket ban on sex offenders will also capture some people who have engaged in low-level offending ... The nonsensical outcome, of course, is that people in these categories will be forced to litigate at common law, potentially obtaining significantly greater monetary recompense than they would have under the redress scheme. While touching on perverse outcomes, I should also draw the invidious contrast between the national redress scheme endorsed in this bill and what is left of State-based victims compensation in New South Wales after its evisceration several years ago by the Coalition Government. The maximum lump sum payment under the State-based system is dramatically less than provided for in this bill. The result of this Coalition Government's changes a number of years ago is that the amount of money survivors receive in this roulette system is determined not by the type of injury sustained or its impact on the survivor, but rather by whether or not an institution was involved. As I have said, Labor thinks that the bill should provide a higher maximum monetary payment under the national redress scheme, but the figures in the bill demonstrate just how hopelessly inadequate the current New South Wales compensation system is. Having said that and made those points, the Opposition does not oppose the bill.

Mr GARETH WARD (Kiama) (16:34): I speak to the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I am sure that people who know someone who has been the subject of child sexual abuse would know how disturbing, harrowing and sickening these crimes are. Nothing in this legislation can take away the pain. Nothing in this law can take away the memories and replace the days, hours and minutes that were lost and the suffering that will continue. A very good friend of mine is in exactly this position. This experience changes a person's life. One feels totally inadequate standing in this place speaking to this legislation knowing that the pain is ongoing and there on a daily basis, and that survivors are forever reminded of their experiences by things that trigger their memories. I hope that in some way this redress scheme will assist survivors to move on.

Why is this redress scheme required, and can courts consider some of the matters that are outlined here today? Of course the findings of the royal commission must be examined. The royal commission was very clear about why a redress scheme was needed. It found that civil litigation does not provide an effective avenue for all survivors to obtain adequate redress to deal with or alleviate the impact of institutional child abuse. The royal commission found that a factor that contributes to the difficulties survivors encounter using civil avenues stems from their experience in significant and continuing power imbalances between themselves and those institutions.

Long-term impacts leave many survivors less able to confront institutions as they remain at significant risk of being re-traumatised, reliving those events that they went through some years before. It also found that it may take survivors years to establish the connection between the abuse they suffered and its psychological impacts. For these reasons the redress scheme is not legalistic in either its nature or its construct. There is a lower evidentiary burden to be satisfied, that there is a reasonable likelihood that the person suffered institutional sexual abuse as a child. I am sure members would appreciate that this could have been approached in many other ways. I think that is a sensible threshold to consider.

In addition, the scheme generally will not require further supporting evidence in recognition that many survivors will not have such evidence and to make the redress scheme as accessible as possible to all the victims of this abhorrent and disgusting crime. Consistent with the recommendations of the royal commission, applications instead will be verified by statutory declaration. At its core the scheme has the needs of survivors to avoid them becoming re-traumatised and to provide an alternative to civil litigation consistent with the royal commission's recommendations and findings. The scheme is set to start on 18 July 2018 and will run for 10 years. It is designed to ensure that relevant organisations take responsibility to make amends for sexual abuse perpetrated

on the children they were looking after. People who had the responsibility to care for and look after these children chronically abused the trust and confidence invested in them by the State and by the children.

The Australian Government created the scheme, which is why we are vesting powers to make it work. It has promised to provide redress to people who were abused in places that were run by the Commonwealth, such as the Australian Defence Force and the cadet schools, and onshore immigration detention centres. To provide redress to as many people as possible, other State and Territory governments and organisations must join the scheme. That is why we are doing debating this bill today. The Australian Government is pushing for all States, Territories churches, charities and other non-government organisations to opt in. That is the process this House is going through now. As members would be aware, on 9 March 2018 this Government, as well as the Victorian Government, announced that it will join the scheme and provide redress to children who were sexually abused in in places such as State-operated schools and out-of-home care.

On 19 March 2018 the Australian Capital Territory announced it would join the scheme. On 30 April 2018 the Northern Territory and Queensland governments announced that they would join the scheme. This will enable non-government institutions such as churches and charities in New South Wales, Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and Queensland to join the scheme. The Australian Government is negotiating with the governments of South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia. I hope that they also join the scheme. When each State government and institution joins the scheme it promises to pay for redress to people who were abused in their care. The redress scheme can provide a number of things such as access to psychological counselling, a direct personal response, an apology for the reputation of the institution and the people who are in it, or a monetary payment. Payments will be assessed on a case-by-case basis reflecting the severity and impact of the abuse and the person's experience.

Redress is not compensation. It is about acknowledging the harm caused to people who experienced child sexual abuse in an institution and supporting them to move forward positively in a way that best suits them. Everyone will have a different journey, everyone will have a different path. The redress scheme is an alternative to getting compensation through the courts. People can take one course, or the other, or both. The royal commission made a number of recommendations. I remain firmly of the view that section 127 of the Evidence Act, which affords clergy the right to not disclose offences against children, to hide from the law and to not speak up when people have been abused, should be removed. So many parts of society have lost their moral authority to these protections. The sooner the Parliament does something about it the better off our community will be. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr JAMIE PARKER (Balmain) (16:41): On behalf of The Greens I speak in debate on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018, which is part of New South Wales role to implement the redress scheme recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The scheme requires State level legislation and then the Commonwealth Parliament will make further laws to implement this scheme. I understand the scheme is anticipated to commence on 1 July 2018. I do not propose to go through all the technical and mechanical matters of the bill but to talk broadly about what we feel is the role of this bill and how it could be strengthened.

The Greens support the bill in this House, as we should and as we supported the establishment of the royal commission. I acknowledge all of those survivors and the many victims of abuse who lobbied, campaigned, pushed, cajoled, wrote letters and used their voices to ensure that governments took notice and that action was taken. Many people who lived in institutions in which they were abused have worked hard to change the laws that were blocking them from justice. We are pleased to be working in this place today to pass this law. The scheme will enable survivors of abuse to make applications for compensation. They will be eligible for payments up to \$150,000, depending on the abuse suffered, access to counselling and direct personal response from responsible institutions.

The Minister was correct in his second reading speech when he said that many of the survivors that I have spoken with find that the apology, the recognition, the admission of wrong is very important and powerful, and goes some way towards acknowledging the pain that those institutions and the people working in them inflicted on the survivors. The scheme will run for 10 years and apply to instances of abuse that occurred before the commencement of the scheme. Once a person has accepted the offer to redress they then release the institution from further civil liability. I note some of the comments made by previous speakers, in particular the member for Liverpool, who outlined in great detail the recommendations from the royal commission as opposed to the bill before us. The Greens also support the position of many institutions and the recommendation of the royal commission that the payments should be up to \$200,000.

The objects of the Commonwealth Act that the scheme will implement are to recognise the impact of institutional child sexual abuse and to provide justice for that abuse. We know from the royal commission that financial compensation can be an important part of the recovery. The establishment of this scheme will mean that

individuals will have an option if they do not choose to seek a civil claim against the institution where they were abused. Indeed, criminal matters can be very difficult. Recently, I was called to be a witness in a criminal matter against a former Baptist Church minister from my school. When I was about 16 years old one of my school friends was sexually assaulted by that person. It was an interesting process for me to be part of that case as I was told almost contemporaneously about the assault. My mother had written a letter to the school but of course nothing happened. She lived with that burden for many decades until finally she decided to speak up, so I thank her, in particular, and the police and detectives who took this matter forward.

The structure of the bill is important and it should be acknowledged that criminal proceedings are very challenging for all involved, particularly those seeking redress. I am pleased to say that in the case in which I was a witness, the jury unanimously found the accused guilty of the assault and that person will be sentenced shortly. Structures must be developed, especially for criminal matters, to show compassion and improve the processes to enable survivors of sexual assault and abuse to come forward more easily—whether it is the courts, the police or giving evidence. Some positive measures have been taken already and victim support organisations have made recommendations that I encourage the Government to examine.

People have the choice to go through the redress process because the institution either no longer exists or the assets are protected. This is particularly the case with the Catholic Church, which has a disgraceful history. The royal commission report was scathing about the role of the Catholic Church, in particular, and that has rocked people's faith in the church, yet the church is getting away with not paying compensation. The church is using a whole range of fancy lawyers, legal arguments and dancing around the fact but basically it is not paying. Assets can be protected by legal constructions such as the Ellis defence and that should be addressed. Many of these institutions should hang their heads in shame over their treatment of these survivors. Many people may choose to proceed through the scheme as a less adversarial way to seek a measure of justice and financial compensation. I am glad that the Government is giving people that opportunity.

The Greens have a number of concerns with the proposed scheme, which we do support. Some of those concerns are the subject of a proposed referral to the Standing Committee on Law and Justice for review. We note that the scheme limits eligibility to the scheme for those who are Australian citizens or permanent residents. It is offensive that those who were abused in Australian institutions by Australian perpetrators would not be able to seek support under the scheme. We see no compelling argument why those who are not Australian citizens or permanent residents should be excluded from the redress scheme. The scheme also excludes from its application people who are in jail or who have been convicted of an offence with more than five years imprisonment. This is despite the fact that we know from evidence in the royal commission that some survivors of abuse are so impacted by the offending against them that their lives go off the rails and they can be caught up in the criminal justice system. They can, in a sense, self-medicate their pain through drug and alcohol abuse.

This limitation further victimises these people and should not be imposed in this matter. We note also that it was not a recommendation of the royal commission. The scheme also excludes from the scheme children who will not turn 18 before the sunset clause, which seems likely to exclude some young and vulnerable people who really should have access to it. The Greens will seek further consideration of these exclusions. In conclusion, I thank the Minister, the Government, all the survivors who came forward and put their cases, and in particular the royal commission. Many people thought the royal commission was political stunt, a joke, but in fact it was very important. The Greens support the bill.

Mr TROY GRANT (Dubbo—Minister for Police, and Minister for Emergency Services) (16:49):

I make a brief contribution in support of the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I acknowledge those who have helped us reach this point. The object of the bill is to refer certain matters relating to the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse to the Commonwealth Parliament so as to enable the Parliament to make laws about those matters. I was one of the protagonists in establishing the royal commission as it is well known in the Parliament that over a number of years I brought to justice members of the Roman Catholic Church in the Maitland-Newcastle diocese, representing some 30 victims in my time. Through my investigation known as Operation Sentol, this opened a Pandora's box involving cover-up and collusion amongst leaders of the church in that diocese and many communities.

That was representative of what we found across many other institutions through the establishment of the royal commission. I acknowledge former Prime Minister Gillard for establishing the royal commission. This has been a long journey involving many advocates of all political persuasions and one that has achieved historical significance in this country. Most importantly, the royal commission has given a voice to those who previously had been forced to remain silent or had no avenue to make this country aware of the significant harm of child sexual assault that had been inflicted on them. This Government and this Parliament have led significant reforms and I was proud to be Chair of the Joint Select Committee on Sentencing of Child Sexual Assault Offenders to

improve sentences and accountability of those perpetrators. This has led to further reform of the criminal justice system to hold perpetrators to account for their actions.

This legislation is yet another step in the journey and should be supported by all members. We should all support those brave men and women who are victims but who are better described as survivors of this horrendous crime. The conscience of everyone in this nation would be that those institutions should all be held to account and it should be the voice of this Parliament in supporting the bill. I sincerely thank the Attorney General for his well-considered crafting of the bill, in consultation with other jurisdictions, which I hope follow New South Wales lead. I repeat what I have stated previously: There is nothing that I would not do to protect children from the hideous incidence of child sexual assault and there is nothing I would not do to make sure that those who are victims receive the redress they truly deserve. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms JODIE HARRISON (Charlestown) (16:53): I am pleased to make a contribution to the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I am pleased to do this because I have great concern for the needs of children and young people, as do most members. I am also a member of the New South Wales Committee on Children and Young People and, above all, I am a parent. It is my firm belief that we need to actively work to acknowledge and help people who are victims of child sexual abuse. Along with all members in this place, I am committed to ensuring that past wrongs committed upon children receive proper redress at all levels of the law. This bill seeks to refer certain matters relating to the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse to the Parliament of the Commonwealth for the purposes of section 51 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth, and for other purposes.

The main objects of the bill are to recognise and alleviate the impact of past institutional child sexual abuse and related abuse and to provide justice for the survivors of that abuse. For the purposes of achieving those aims, it is an object of the bill to establish the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse. That scheme will consist of a monetary payment to survivors as a tangible means of recognising the wrong that survivors have suffered, and a counselling and psychological component which, depending on where the survivor lives, consists of access to counselling and psychological services or a monetary payment and a direct personal response to survivors from the participating institutions responsible. A further object is to enable institutions that were responsible for the abuse of survivors to participate in the scheme to provide that redress to those survivors, and to implement the joint response of the Commonwealth Government, the States and the Territories to the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in relation to redress.

In response to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, the National Redress Scheme aims to provide support to people who were sexually abused as children while in the care of an institution. If the bill passes—and I hope that it will—the scheme will start on 1 July 2018 and will run for 10 years. It is designed so that relevant organisations as well as the offender are required to take responsibility and make amends for sexual abuse that happened to children in their care. The constitutional power to legislate for these issues lies largely with State parliaments rather than the Commonwealth. To establish a national scheme, steps need to be taken to deal with the constitutional position. That is achieved in the bill by referring the State's powers in this field to the Commonwealth Parliament.

So that redress can be provided to as many people as possible, other governments and organisations need to opt in to join the scheme. Like Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and Queensland, New South Wales is opting in to join the scheme and provide redress to people who were sexually abused as children in places such as State-operated schools and out-of-home care. This will also allow non-government institutions like churches and charities in New South Wales to join the scheme. For too long in this country, and particularly this State, children in the care of institutions were subjected to appalling sexual abuse and terrible violence. No country, State or organisation should stand by and let this happen. No country, State or organisation should stand by and let perpetrators get away with these crimes. Most importantly, no country, State or organisation should stand by and do nothing to help with the healing of survivors, many of whom are now adults who live lives filled with anxiety and distress as a result of ongoing institutional child abuse.

I have read the submissions to the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse from my constituents. One survivor stated that he witnessed both physical and sexual abuse at least once every day at his school for many years. The statement that resonated with me on reading his submission was, "The teachers could do whatever they wanted with us with impunity." This constituent felt that no matter what he did, his abusers were part of an institution that would not have any liability. This cannot be allowed to happen again. Institutions must be held accountable. This was not an isolated incident within my electorate. The royal commission heard that a wide range of institutions had turned a blind eye to, mishandled complaints about and even refuted allegations of abuse of children by people associated with them. Action must be taken and amends made.

I spoke about some of these victims in the last sitting week in this place and of the terrible impacts on them and their families. The establishment of a National Redress Scheme is a key recommendation of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. It is a critical part of the process of healing. As I said last week in my contribution to the Civil Liability Amendment (Institutional Child Abuse) Bill 2017, which was introduced by the shadow Attorney General and member for Liverpool, it is important that we act on the key recommendations of the royal commission. Like the rest of us, victims of abuse are ageing. Every legislative delay makes survivors wait longer.

In its final report on redress and civil litigation, the royal commission determined that about 60,000 survivors of child sexual abuse should be given access to redress. Labor is committed to ensuring those survivors get the redress they deserve. The Labor Party has committed to the redress scheme, which will provide support for victims regardless of whether or not the institution still exists. In line with the royal commission's recommendations, Labor believes the cost of redress must be met by the institutions responsible for the perpetrators of the abuse. Unfortunately, the Government has failed to act on a number of the report's recommendations.

First, redress payments are capped at \$150,000 rather than the royal commission's recommendation of \$200,000. Secondly, receiving redress will prevent a claimant from pursuing their common law rights, which may well be substantially more in a successful claim against the institution or its official. Thirdly, redress will not be made if the institution has ceased to exist. This means there are profound loopholes in the scheme, which clearly confirm the Federal and State governments' reluctance to place this financial burden on institutions. This is known because, in a number of debates in this place, the Attorney General has made several references to the viability of institutions to pay.

The National Redress Scheme does not provide for all victims of institutional abuse but it is certainly an improvement over what is currently available in New South Wales. It is worth noting that \$150,000 is far greater than that allowed under the current New South Wales' victims of crime system. I support Federal Labor in seeking to amend the scheme in order to increase the cap from \$150,000 to \$200,000, as per the recommendations of the royal commission. However, I would like to see equity through the victims of crime system and the bill. I again thank former Prime Minister Julia Gillard for pioneering the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, without which no-one would not be standing here today. Labor established the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse to give the thousands of people affected by these evil crimes an opportunity to finally be heard. The extent of the damage of child sexual abuse cannot be underestimated. I also commend journalist Joanne McCarthy for her efforts in bringing these issues to light.

Labor has carefully considered the recommendations of the royal commission with a full heart and open mind, knowing how important this issue of redress is to survivors. With this in mind, the scheme will only work if as many institutions and governments join in as possible. In the spirit of acting now, I encourage non-government institutions, including churches and charities, to make amends and participate in the National Redress Scheme. We can and should go further than this bill does, specifically in relation to the total amount that can be claimed and not allowing civil claims to be pursued by successful claimants under the scheme. I also believe equity of payments to victims of crime generally should be looked at, whether or not abuse has occurred in the context of an institution. The bill is better than legislation that is currently in place in relation to redress for victims of institutional child sexual abuse. I support the bill in its current form.

Mr GEOFF PROVEST (Tweed) (16:59): I support the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers Bill) 2018. The purpose of the bill is to refer matters relating to the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse to the Commonwealth Parliament in order to legislate on those matters. This is required for New South Wales to participate in the National Redress Scheme. By way of background, on 9 March 2018 the Government committed in principle to opting in to the National Redress Scheme. The establishment of a redress scheme was recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The scheme was due to commence on 1 July 2018, subject to the passage of legislation through Commonwealth and State parliaments.

The scheme will apply to any institution, including any non-government institution, that elects to participate in the scheme. Currently, New South Wales, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory have announced that they will be joining the scheme, and I encourage the other States and Territories to follow. We on both sides of the House hang our heads in shame over the ordeal of victims and survivors when they were children. It is safe to say that everyone here acknowledges the terrible crimes that were committed against innocent young children who were put into the institutions, both government and non-government. We acknowledge the fear and trepidation and the physical and mental abuse. A lot of the survivors, even with compensation, will carry that all their lives. They are scarred for life.

I note that some of the compensation will go to counselling, but deep down one can never erase what happened. I mention also those who gave evidence to the royal commission, such as the Minister for Police, the Hon. Troy Grant, and particularly the victims and survivors. It would have taken great courage to relive the terrible events that occurred in their younger times, to be cross-examined time and again within the legal system and to speak of the damage that was caused. I think that they also would have felt that the wider community forgot them and did nothing. For so many years the crimes went unpunished and the scars were left unhealed. In some small way, we are moving in the right direction.

The scheme, which will provide support and recognition to the survivors of institutional child sexual abuse, will run for 10 years. Redress will be available to individuals who have suffered sexual abuse and any other abuse that occurred in a participating State or Territory when the person was a child and prior to the scheme's commencement. Eligible survivors will be offered a payment of up to \$150,000, access to counselling and psychological services, and a direct personal response from the responsible institution. The royal commission heard from many survivors about the significance of a genuine apology from the institution where they were abused. The royal commission reported that this should include an acknowledgement of the abuse and its impacts. It is important also that the institutions explain what steps they are taking to ensure that the abuse never happens again. I think that is very valid.

The royal commission also heard that some survivors may not want any further contact with the institution. The redress scheme has taken these findings into account and recognises the individual preferences of survivors. Their rights are important. A key element of redress under the National Redress Scheme will be the direct personal response from responsible institution, if requested by the survivor. The inclusion of direct personal responses under the scheme recognises the benefit that can be gained for a survivor in being genuinely and respectfully heard and receiving a meaningful apology from the institution that harmed them. Direct personal responses will be provided after the survivor accepts the offer of redress. A survivor or their support person will be provided with the details of the relevant institution to contact when and if they feel ready to begin this process.

The delivery of a direct personal response will be guided by the direct personal response framework, which sets out the principles and arrangements for participating institutions to consider to ensure that the process is as accessible, consistent and effective as possible for the survivors. Under this framework, the direct personal response may be delivered through a range of mechanisms, including an apology, an opportunity to meet with the appropriate senior person from the relevant responsible institution, and an assurance of the steps that the institution has taken to protect children in its care against further abuse.

Schedule 1 to the bill is the exposure draft National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Bill 2018. This is the enabling legislation for the National Redress Scheme and provides the legislative basis for eligibility, offers and acceptance, release of further civil liability and access to redress. The Commonwealth bill also outlines the arrangements for government and non-government institutions regarding their participation, funding liability, reporting obligations, disclosure and use of protected information and other administrative matters. This is a very important step in a long journey. Will this take away the scars? No. Anyone here would understand that. Will this go some way on that long journey of healing? Yes. I feel very proud to be part of this Parliament speaking on this important issue and supporting this important bill. Once again, I send my deepest apologies and sincerest support to all victims of child sexual and emotional abuse. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr GREG PIPER (Lake Macquarie) (17:10): I support the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I note that members have taken a bipartisan approach to this bill, and it is important that we have broad support for such an important measure. The bill reflects the commitment made by the State Government in March to participate in the National Redress Scheme for survivors of child sexual abuse. All members should thank the Attorney General, the Premier and the Government for stepping up to the plate so quickly and making it clear that New South Wales would take up its rightful position in the Australian Federation as a leader in addressing this issue.

The national scheme was recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse and will be introduced on 1 July 1 this year if approved by New South Wales and the other States. I mean this as no criticism, but members of the Opposition raised apparent conflicts between the royal commission recommendations and this bill. I note that a number of States must agree and that means there are practical reasons for this drafting of the bill. I thank the Attorney General and his staff for allowing me to access information about the drafting of the bill because it provided me with more information than I would normally get.

As we know, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual abuse was the result of a concerted campaign in the Hunter Region that shone an intense light on the historic abuse and cover-ups within churches and other institutions, mainly in the Newcastle, Lake Macquarie and Maitland areas. The issue was largely brought to light in articles by courageous *Newcastle Herald* journalist Joanne McCarthy. Her then editor gave her the power to pursue an extremely difficult issue involving a strict taboo. Despite that, she persisted in

investigating the protection provided to sexual abuse perpetrators and the institutions that protected them. There appeared to be a nod-and-a-wink club which protected people or institutions and which ensured that they were not brought to account. Joanne McCarthy and the *Newcastle Herald* gave the victims a voice.

I acknowledge Joanne McCarthy and the other people who have done fantastic work in this area, including former Superintendent Peter Fox. Peter has been a courageous campaigner and has stared down a great deal of hostility aimed at him. I also acknowledge the member for Dubbo and Minister for Police, Troy Grant. I respect the Minister. I have always said that regardless of anything else I will have an abiding regard for him because of his dogged and unrelenting pursuit of one of the most terrible perpetrators of sexual abuse in the Catholic Church; that is, Father Vince Ryan. The Minister did a fantastic job in that regard in his role as a police officer.

I took a personal interest in this issue because it would be fair to say that the Hunter was the epicentre of institutional sexual abuse, particularly in the Catholic Church and at St Pius X High School at Adamstown. I attended that school for my entire high school education and I knew many of the perpetrators. However, more importantly, I knew many of the victims. Unfortunately, I did not know that they were victims at the time. It is not necessarily easy to tell, but hindsight allows us to recognise a range of identifiable behaviours. Of course, we cannot ignore the other cruelty perpetrated by that school and the Catholic education system at the time. They were cruel institutions that would delight in the use of corporal punishment and I am extremely pleased to see them brought to account. I am sad for the good Catholics, those people of true faith who would have stood up if they had known what was happening. However, too many of them probably knew or suspected it was happening but failed to do anything. To use a phrase often used by people of faith, "There is a special place in hell for them."

Unfortunately, there were many hundreds of victims in the Hunter. Among them was John Pirona, whose parents live in my electorate and whom I have had the good fortune of getting to know. John's suicide in July 2012 was a tipping point in the minds of many in our community. Indeed, it was one of the main catalysts for the royal commission. It certainly attracted the attention of the *Newcastle Herald* and Joanne McCarthy. Along with too many others, John was sexually abused as a child by a Catholic priest, John Denham, while at St Pius X High School in Adamstown. Father Denham's name has become synonymous with evil. After many years of internal conflict and private despair, John Pirona left a note for his wife that simply read, "Too much pain." [*Extension of time*]

I imagine that many who went before John felt that very same sentiment, and many would still feel it today. His death, while tragic in itself, came to represent the loss of many. At John's funeral, his father Lou said, "No person or organisation should be above or outside the law." The former Prime Minister, Julia Gillard, was in Newcastle at the time. She announced the establishment of the royal commission three months later. Having discussed this issue with Joanne McCarthy, I asked a former Premier, Barry O'Farrell, whether he would trigger a royal commission. He took advice and declined to do so. However, he did establish a commission of inquiry headed by Margaret Cunneen into the abuses perpetrated by the Catholic Church in the Hunter. I believe that that, too, was a step towards the establishment of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. I therefore acknowledge that the current Government has played a positive role in addressing this issue.

I acknowledge the people who had the courage to appear before the commission of inquiry and who told their stories. The inquiry provided them with the platform they needed. I also acknowledge those who heard the stories: the commissioners, the supporting solicitors and the staff. It would have been a traumatic experience listening to people talk about heinous crimes committed against them when they were so young by institutions in whom we placed blind trust and faith over many years. The inquiry heard from thousands of sexual abuse survivors throughout Australia. They are survivors, but unfortunately too many people did not survive. Like John Pirona's story, every story is tragic.

This bill is another important step in the healing process for victims of such abuse. However, it is also an important step in our society becoming what it should be. It is important that we maintain vigilance and that we continue to improve. The Government already has implemented other royal commission recommendations, including the removal of limitation periods on the capacity of victims to come forward. This is a vital issue. We are talking about children who repressed the violence and terrible acts committed against them and who often lived troubled lives because they did not know how to deal with their pain. By the way, they were not supported by many institutions at the time. It is a huge advance that the barrier of the statute of limitations will be removed. The Government has assured me that more than 50 of the royal commission's recommendations will be in place by the end of this year. That is great.

This bill will enable the Federal Government to establish the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, which will put the needs and rights of victims first. I again acknowledge the Attorney General and his staff, who have prepared this bill and who have taken the time to answer questions about the implications of its implementation. I note specifically that the scheme will fund support services for all applicants with special

needs of some sort, be that a disability or a language or cultural issue. That is extremely important. I also note that it will allow for urgent cases to be expedited, and that payments to survivors will not be regarded as income for the purposes of taxation, social security or other entitlements.

Sadly, history now records the extent of abuse within a number of churches and organisations. It was a time when fears and taboos existed and justice was not easy. As I said, the institutions that we trusted protected and gave power to the perpetrators. That should never be allowed to happen again. We no longer treat victims like criminals. That is how they felt; they believed that the abuse happened because of something they did or some failing in their character. That is so wrong.

I acknowledge all survivors of sexual abuse and hope they are beginning to see a new life in a society that supports them and stands by them. I applaud their resilience, courage and bravery. The healing process is a long one and, dare I say, may never end. This bill is not only about holding perpetrators and their protectors to account; it goes to the next step. It is about supporting victims or survivors of awful, unhinged lust. I again acknowledge those who have not been able to stay the course because they did not have the support they needed. We have lost too many good people. I acknowledge those who have stepped up and the champions, such as Peter Fox, Joanne McCarthy and others, including Troy Grant, who have ensured that this legislation has been introduced. I obviously strongly support this bill.

Visitors

VISITORS

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Mr Geoff Provest): I acknowledge in our public gallery those who are attending A Little Night Sitting, which is a program conducted by our Parliamentary Education Department staff member, Danielle Georgia. I am sure you will find it interesting. This House is where the real work is done, as opposed to the other place. Currently we are debating a very important part of legislation called the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. It follows the royal commission into child abuse and will offer certain levels of support to victims or those whom we call survivors. Members will contribute to the debate. You will note it is a very emotional subject and often emotions flow freely here, particularly when we are talking about children and the terrible crimes committed against them.

Bills

NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL 2018

Second Reading Debate

Ms MELANIE GIBBONS (Holsworthy) (17:25): I support the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I have served on several committees in this place and strangely enough many of them seem to centre around child sexual abuse and children who go through all too much at all too young an age. I wanted to speak on this bill because I know it will make a difference to helping many of those people take the next step in their lives. I commend this bill. The bill displays the commitment of the New South Wales Government to participate in the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse put forward by the Commonwealth Government.

I am proud that New South Wales is the first State to bring forth a referral bill on 9 March 2018. This scheme is scheduled to start on 1 July this year. The formation of a redress scheme was recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The royal commission heard from thousands of survivors of sexual abuse all across the nation. The stories heard from these individuals started a closer look into the prevalence of institutional child sexual abuse and the failure of addressing the lifelong implications and impacts that it brings to survivors. Over the years the New South Wales Government has reacted to many recommendations made by the royal commission's Redress and Civil Litigation Report. Some measures include introducing guiding principles for civil child abuse claims made against the New South Wales Government agencies to provide a less traumatic experience for victims. This approach will give a more consistent and compassionate experience.

We know that there are harmful impacts resulting from child sexual abuse including negative body image, mental health issues, reproductive health issues and sexual violence. Child abuse also is linked to a higher rate of suicidal behaviour and increases the likelihood of smoking, substance abuse and physical inactivity. A high rate of broken relationships and lower rates of marriages occur and it can even cause social disconnection and isolation with the risk of living alone also increasing. All of those problems reflect the need for the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. This bill will ensure victims gain a consistent and empathetic approach.

The Government has accepted many of the recommendations of the royal commission. There are more than 50 recommendations being introduced before the end of 2018. Some of those actions include failure to protect children from abuse, failure to report, strengthening existing criminal offences, and sentencing changes including applying current sentencing standards for historic child sex offences. On average, individuals who sat through the private interviews of the royal commission took 23.9 years to confront their abuse and hurt. It is an extremely difficult task addressing institutions that were involved in child sexual abuse as it can involve further traumatisation. It took a friend of mine about that length of time to confront sexual abuse he experienced as a child. Unfortunately, he eventually took his own life. As I said earlier, I can only hope that a bill such as this helps others to avoid going through that and feeling such isolation.

This scheme is strongly survivor focused and it will be operated by the Commonwealth Government. It will highlight the wrongdoings of institutions involved in child sexual abuse related issues. Currently New South Wales, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory have opted into the scheme, with Queensland and the Northern Territory announcing their intention to join. I hope that other jurisdictions will follow the lead of New South Wales to ensure that Australia has a consistent scheme for survivors across the nation. The redress scheme consists of three core elements that were introduced after recommendations made by the royal commission. The first element is a tangible way of recognising the suffering of survivors. Under the scheme victims will be eligible to receive up to \$150,000, which will go some way to recognising the wrongdoings.

The second element of the scheme is access to counselling and psychological support, which I would like to focus on today. The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Abuse learned an enormous amount about the impacts of child sexual abuse on the mental health and wellbeing of victims and survivors over the course of their lives. The stories of individuals who came forward to the royal commission demonstrate that those impacts can vary between individuals and they also vary at different stages of a victim's life. The need for counselling and psychological care for survivors was made very clear. The royal commission also heard that there was overwhelming support for the idea that funding for counselling and psychological services should be provided through redress.

The royal commission recommended that a key element of redress should be the provision of counselling and psychological care and the National Redress Scheme implements that recommendation. Under the redress scheme States and Territories will elect to provide survivors with access to counselling services from either of two methods. Firstly, the jurisdiction can provide survivors with a tiered lump sum based on the severity of the abuse of up to \$5,000 or, alternatively, the jurisdiction can provide survivors with State-based counselling services according to agreed national service standards for the provision of State and Territory based counselling and psychological care. New South Wales survivors who accept redress under the scheme and who reside in the State will be provided with State-based counselling services through New South Wales Victims Services. Victims Services is well placed to deliver counselling to New South Wales survivors in accordance with the national standards by drawing on its existing pool of trauma specialist counsellors through its approved counselling service.

In electing to deliver State-based counselling services, New South Wales has committed to the national service standards for the provision of State and Territory based counselling and psychological care. Under those national standards the counselling service is required to make the first point of contact with referred survivors, providing them with information in a non-intrusive and compassionate manner. Accordingly, once a survivor has been referred, Victims Services will initiate contact and arrange access to an approved counsellor. Approved counsellors will meet the national standards set for the requisite qualifications and skills. They will all be trauma informed and have expertise needed to address the more complex needs that might arise among survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. Victims Services counsellors will continue to refer survivors and other appropriate services when the need arises.

Secondly, and also consistent with national standards, Victims Services will ensure that survivors have access to a minimum of 20 hours of counselling at their election over the course of their lifetime. To meet the national standard of ensuring access to survivors in regional and remote areas, counselling may be delivered flexibly through a range of mediums including telephone or Skype. Victims Services delivery of counselling services will also account for a variety of survivor needs including those related to disability, gender, sexuality, language and culture. Access to counselling and psychological service is a key element of redress under the scheme. The provision of counselling in New South Wales in accordance with the national service standards will ensure that survivors are provided with services that are collaborative, accessible, available, high quality and inclusive of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander healing approaches.

The third element of the scheme includes participating in institution or institutions where abuse took place to give a direct personal response. This response includes an apology, an acknowledgment that the abuse took place and actions to stop it from occurring again. The third element of the scheme is dependent on whether

the survivor does want further engagement with the institution involved. It can be an extremely confronting action to engage with the institutional. [*Extension of time*]

The scheme will recognise and support survivors of child sexual abuse and run for the next 10 years. Schedule 1 includes the text of the bill of the proposed national redress scheme for institutional child sexual abuse 2018. Through careful planning, consultations and negotiations, the bill was able to be developed. It would not have been brought to the House without the advocacy groups and experts contributing to this carefully planned approach. This scheme makes it necessary to request relevant information from any institution involved, or when the operator of the scheme has reasonable grounds to suspect the involvement of the institution in child abuse.

This element has been included so that institutions have a chance to provide information towards the determination. As New South Wales has opted into this scheme, it enables institutions, including independent schools, charities, churches and other private organisations to also join the scheme. To include everyone who has been involved in child sexual abuse by institutions, the bill provides a defunct option that enables institutions that no longer exist to participate provided that there is a representative acting on the institution's behalf. In the scheme, the institution can be deemed to be responsible for the abuse if the incident happened under circumstances in which the institution is equally or primarily responsible for the abuser having contact with the victim.

This can be noted if the institution had day-to-day care or if it was an official institution where the abuse occurred. Institutions that are deemed to be responsible will have to pay for the cost of providing the redress and contributing to any administration of the scheme. The national redress scheme is an important program that will come into effect once the New South Wales bill passes through Parliament. This bill is a very important step in acknowledging survivors of child sexual abuse. Many individuals involved in this abuse never disclose details of their abuse or take longer than 20 years to address the abuse. This bill will encourage survivors to bring their abuse to the forefront to help with the hurt and to prevent any further abuse from happening to others in the future.

Thousands of victims will benefit from this scheme. It will address the suffering caused by institutions that should have been supportive of the individuals. I thank the Attorney General and his staff for preparation of this bill. I also mention an organisation called Survivors & Mates Support Network [SAMSUN], particularly Craig Hughes-Cashmore and Shane McNamar—two phenomenal men who brought my attention to the issue of sexual abuse and child sexual abuse in particular. Theirs is a worthy organisation and I suggest that all members look out for the work that the organisation does in their electorates. We should support and promote it because it is there for the victims of sexual abuse. It does phenomenal work. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr TIM CRAKANTHORP (Newcastle) (17:36): I support the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. The intention of the bill is to allow New South Wales to participate in the national statutory redress scheme that was proposed by the Commonwealth in response to recommendations by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. As the member for Lake Macquarie said earlier, it was abuse that occurred in the Hunter that was the catalyst for establishment of the royal commission.

I pay tribute to Walkley Award winning journalist Joanne McCarthy, from the *Newcastle Herald*, who continued to pursue this issue doggedly, month after month, year after year. She is thoroughly deserving of that Walkley Award. The *Newcastle Herald* also deserves tributes for running its Shine the Light campaign, which had an effect in the establishment of this royal commission so that it could investigate those heinous crimes. When Julia Gillard visited Newcastle, she spoke to people and listened to them. She also communicated with Joanne McCarthy after that visit, saying that her writing and her correspondence had an effect on Ms Gillard's decision to recommend establishment of a royal commission.

I have spent a very long time with two very close friends who were sexually abused when they were young. That abuse changed their lives forever. Now this legislation has been introduced into the Parliament. I will give the House some background to the legislation. The constitutional power to legislate for these issues lies largely with State Parliaments rather than with the Commonwealth Parliament. To establish a national scheme therefore requires steps to deal with the constitutional position. That is achieved in this bill by referring the State's powers in this field to the Commonwealth Parliament. This is the first referral bill. The mechanism adopted is to annex to this bill as schedule 1 a copy of the Commonwealth National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Bill 2018. This restricts, appropriately, the matters being referred—that is, the matters in the Commonwealth bill. Also referred is a mechanism for the Commonwealth to amend the bill, but that also with restrictions.

A national redress scheme is undoubtedly a good thing. New South Wales Labor should support this, as does the Federal Labor Opposition. However, I make the following points. First, the royal commission recommended a cap of \$200,000, which is what the cap should be—not \$150,000. The Attorney General's reference during several debates to the ability of institutions to pay suggests that he is concerned about the

financial impact on institutions, and that would include government bodies. Secondly, granted that common law verdicts potentially can be far in excess of \$200,000, it seems unreasonable not to support the royal commission recommendation on quantum.

Thirdly, the amount even of \$150,000 is vastly greater than that allowed under the current New South Wales victims of crime system. The amount of compensation to victims will now be determined by whether the perpetrator was at an institution or not. If the institution has ceased to exist and there is no State institution involvement, redress will not be made. Certainly, this is a step in the right direction and I will support the bill. Child sexual abuse has affected so many people in such a devastating way. The bill is a positive move towards some form of redress for the catastrophic effects that sexual abuse has every day on the lives of victims.

Ms FELICITY WILSON (North Shore) (17:41): At the outset of my contribution to debate on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018, I acknowledge the work of the Attorney General and the staff of his office in the preparation of this bill and, in particular, responding so promptly to the recommendations. Members of all parties of this Parliament can be very proud of the decision taken for New South Wales to play such a significant, prompt and active role in the redress scheme. I will discuss further what the New South Wales Government has done in responding to the royal commission's recommendations.

We all know that the legislation that we are discussing today is a scheme that will provide support and recognition to survivors of institutional child sexual abuse and will run for 10 years. It will be available to individuals who have suffered sexual abuse and any related non-sexual abuse that occurred in a participating State or Territory when that person was a child and prior to the scheme's commencement. It will provide a payment of up to \$150,000, access to counselling and psychological services and a direct personal response from the responsible institution, when requested.

The New South Wales Government recognises that victims' innocence was stolen by those they should have been able to trust. People's childhoods were taken away by acts of what can only be described as appalling depravity. For a very long time their pain was denied by institutions, who did little—or even nothing—to keep those children safe. In many instances, we heard through the royal commission that often there were cover-ups and frequently children were prevented from being protected. Those wrongs can never be completely put right. The lifelong impacts cannot be erased.

But the wrongs can and should be recognised, and that was a significant part of the royal commission's processes. That is why the National Redress Scheme is so important, and it is why New South Wales is leading the way to ensure that the scheme starts on 1 July 2018. The New South Wales Government is involved because it is the right thing to do. The Government is involved because—to paraphrase the royal commission—the problems faced by abuse survivors are our nation's problems because the mechanisms that should have kept them safe did not.

Earlier this year New South Wales announced in principle to opt in to the redress scheme, and two weeks ago the Attorney General introduced the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. Schedule 1 to the bill provides a text reference enabling the Commonwealth Parliament to enact the legislation establishing the National Redress Scheme—the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Act 2018. No amount of money can bring back stolen innocence, or press the rewind button on a life impacted by abuse. But we can, as a nation, recognise the harm done and that is what this National Redress Scheme aims to do.

Redress is not just about monetary recognition. The scheme will allow survivors to access emotional and mental support through specialist counselling. In New South Wales, survivors can access unlimited counselling—something we on this side think other States should consider emulating. Redress shows survivors they are believed, that we and the entire community accept they were betrayed and let down. The scheme will be, as the royal commission recommended, survivor focused, with a standard of proof significantly less onerous than that required in a civil legal action. Redress includes the three core elements recommended by the royal commission. The first is a monetary payment of up to \$150,000. As recommended by the royal commission in this case, this is a tangible means of recognising the wrongs that survivors have suffered.

The second element is access to counselling and psychological support, depending on where the person lives. The royal commission learned a great deal about the long-term psychological and mental health impacts of child sexual abuse on survivors. It highlighted that many survivors will need counselling and psychological care from time to time throughout their lives. It was made clear that those who made submissions and spoke at public hearings overwhelmingly supported the proposal that counselling and psychological care should be provided through redress. The third element is a direct personal response from the participating institution or institutions responsible. The royal commission explained that many survivors described the importance of receiving

an apology from the institution responsible for their abuse. Such an apology includes acknowledgement of the abuse, its impacts and the steps taken to prevent it from happening again.

Having said this, the royal commission also pointed out that some survivors may not want further contact or engagement with the institution. For this reason, the principles guiding the provision of direct personal responses state that engagement between a survivor and a participating institution should only occur only if, and to the extent that, the survivor wishes it. New South Wales' participation in this scheme shows what can be achieved when Australia's States and Territories work cooperatively with the Commonwealth to address big national problems such as the aftermath of the institutional child sex abuse uncovered in recent years. I acknowledge that a number of other States and Territories have gotten on board; I recommend that the rest join them. That said, none of this would be possible without the long and arduous work of the royal commission; its commissioner, Justice Peter McClellan, as he then was; his counsel assisting, Gail Furness; and all the commission's staff.

I must acknowledge the establishment of the royal commission by then Prime Minister Julia Gillard. The establishment of the National Redress Scheme will be the result of the bravery of survivors, whose courage in telling their stories is helping to create an environment where the safety of children is paramount. New South Wales has acted. We now encourage the remaining States and Territories and the institutions in which abuse occurred to join the National Redress Scheme so that survivors across Australia can have the certainty they need and the recognition they deserve. I commend the bill to the House.

Dr HUGH McDERMOTT (Prospect) (17:48): I speak in support of the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I speak today not only as the member for Prospect but also as the son of a care leaver and a nephew of care leavers. Many of my uncles and aunts were put into institutional care and abused. Their lives and their family were ripped apart not only by the actions of the perpetrators of sexual, physical and emotional abuse but also by a State system that when they were taken into care split up the entire family, putting each of the eight children into different homes, refusing to let them know any information about each other—including where they were—and then systematically destroying their young lives.

I also speak as patron of the Care Leavers Australasia Network—CLAN—a position that I take very seriously. I am honoured that tens of thousands of care leavers, survivors of institutional abuse, trusted in me and asked me to be their patron. I remember very vividly when, on 16 November 2009, the Federal Parliament invited every care leaver, every person whom it called "Forgotten Australians"—because the institutions, the churches and the charities had forgotten them—to Canberra for a national apology in the Great Hall of Parliament House. That day, in an act of bipartisanship, then Prime Minister Kevin Rudd and then Leader of the Opposition Malcolm Turnbull made a national apology to every care leaver in this country—the Forgotten Australians. Many thousands of people were there with their families, including my brothers, my uncle, my mother and I, and other family members from my mother's side whom we were able to find. Because the family was split up all those years ago, it took us more than a decade to find all my mother's brothers and sisters, and some we did not locate until after their death.

Those thousands of care leavers and their families gathered to receive an apology on behalf of the Federal and State governments for what had happened to them over many decades. It brought tears to everybody's eyes when the then Prime Minister said, "We believe you," because for decades, as small children and later as adults, no-one believed the stories that were told about the children's homes. No-one cared what had happened to those children; they were thrown on the trash heap. A second moving moment was when then Leader of the Opposition Malcolm Turnbull said, "And we love you," because those children, who are now adults, had never really known love. All they knew was abuse—sexual, physical and emotional—not only in the institutions but also for the rest of their lives because many were incarcerated and many went on to have mental health issues. This was a turning point in their lives, and in the lives of their families, and also in Australia's consciousness of the Forgotten Australians.

This redress scheme goes part of the way to fighting the battle for those survivors. The royal commission—Justice McClellan and his cohort who listened to testimony, helped and fought for survivors—did an amazing job. It took years of fighting different governments and groups to establish the royal commission. It was only when what went on was put before the public and reported in the media that the Government was prepared to establish it. Care leavers had been pushing for an inquiry for well over a decade. This redress scheme legislation, and that of other States, was not introduced immediately after the royal commission recommendations; it has taken some time. Throughout the process, the care leavers—who should be the beneficiaries of this sexual abuse redress scheme—have gotten older or died. It is vital that other States accept their responsibilities and opt in to the redress scheme to assist care leavers, many of whom are very elderly. My mother is 85, and she has been fighting for redress for 50 years. She is just one of many.

This scheme and the royal commission would not have existed without care leavers coming together in organisations such as the Care Leavers Australasia Network to lobby, fight and push politicians. Leonie Sheedy has led this fight over many decades, and I acknowledge her especially today. If it were not for Leonie, I do not think the royal commission or this redress scheme would have happened. She has never once swayed under the burden of making this happen, and every care leaver in this country knows it. As I said before, the redress scheme legislation goes part of the way. It is wonderful that it deals with child sexual abuse. However, it does not meet all the requirements of the royal commission—for example, the scheme caps payment at \$150,000 rather than \$200,000. It also does not deal with those people who have been incarcerated or with child migrants who are not yet Australian citizens. Thousands of child migrants, many of who had been taken from their families, were sent to this country.

The biggest fault with the scheme—and I do not blame the Government because it has followed the recommendations of the royal commission, which inquired into sexual abuse—is that it addresses only one element of abuse. Children were not just abused sexually; many were abused physically and emotionally. Those survivors are not dealt with this legislation, and that fight will continue for me and for every other care leaver and their family. We need a redress scheme for all care leavers, for all victims of institutional abuse, not just those who were subject to child sexual abuse. That is the next campaign, the next step, to make sure that all children who are now adult survivors are supported and helped.

I thank the State Government for this legislation. I am pleased that it has stepped up, and I look forward to every other State stepping up also. I also thank the institutions—the Catholic Church and others—that have decided to step up as well, because not to do so would be a crime in itself. We owe a damn sight more to our children; we must also commit to ensuring that institutional abuse is not repeated in other ways. Today there are perpetrators who attack children not in institutions such as orphanages but in foster care and in other ways. I commend the bill to the House. It is the first step in a longer journey to look after all children who were abused and who are now adults. I thank the House for its indulgence.

Mr JONATHAN O'DEA (Davidson) (17:58): I speak in debate on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. As we have heard, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse was established by the Commonwealth Government to investigate recurring allegations of sexual abuse in institutional contexts throughout Australia over many years and the reluctance of institutions to address this emotionally and legally difficult issue. The royal commission was established in 2013 and ran for five years. It reported that over the course of its life it was contacted by 16,953 people who were within the terms of reference, 8,013 private sessions were held with survivors of child sexual abuse and 57 public hearings were conducted. The royal commission was told about 3,489 institutions where child sexual abuse had occurred.

While the scale of the problem revealed by the royal commission is shocking, it is the survivors' stories that are impossible to forget. I thank the member for Prospect for sharing part of his family's story. For five years, Australians learnt about children in every corner of this country who over the decades were sexually abused while in the care of institutions that should have been keeping these vulnerable children safe. Astoundingly, we were also told about the abject failure of these institutions, as well as the broader community, to respond to reports of abuse occurring in them. In response to the commission's recommendation, and subject to the passage of legislation, the Commonwealth Government will establish the National Redress Scheme—the scheme—to enable survivors to access psychological counselling, receive direct personal responses from responsible institutions and receive a monetary payment of up to \$150,000.

The scheme should help survivors move forward in their lives after experiencing traumatic childhood sexual assaults in institutions and help atone for unlawful acts committed against them. Redress is not compensation; it is an alternative to getting financial compensation through the court system, with survivors able to choose one pathway or the other, but not both. In May this year the New South Wales Government became the first State Government to opt in to the proposed scheme. By opting in, the New South Wales Government will legislate so that people who experienced institutional child sexual abuse while in the care of New South Wales Government institutions are able to apply for redress offered through the scheme. Since the royal commission commenced in 2013, the New South Wales Government has quickly responded to its findings. It made sweeping changes to out-of-home care and improved access to justice for survivors, while continuing to work closely with the Federal Government in seeking the best outcomes for vulnerable children and young people. The Office of the Children's Guardian continues to accredit out-of-home care providers and helps to make New South Wales Government run institutions as safe as possible.

But we must remain vigilant. In April this year the New South Wales Government announced that it had accepted the majority of the recommendations from the royal commission's criminal justice report, and more than 50 recommendations will be introduced by the end of this year. These will include: making changes to our criminal

justice system so that there are harsher sentences for people who perpetrate child sexual abuse; introducing guiding principles for civil child abuse claims made against New South Wales Government agencies so that litigation is less traumatic for victims; and removing limitation periods so that survivors of child abuse can claim for damages irrespective of when the abuse happened. The New South Wales Government also established a task force to respond to the royal commission's final report and is committed to formally responding to the recommendations in June this year.

This Government does not want history repeating itself and is responding as quickly as possible to the findings of the royal commission. It is adamant that it will be part of this process to provide redress to all survivors across Australia. As other speakers have also indicated, for this scheme to work really well it must be transparent in process, equitable and inclusive. To achieve that it needs all State governments and institutions to opt in. The National Redress Scheme should play an important part in legislating for greater consistency, clarity and certainty of process for all survivors, not just in New South Wales but across Australia. By opting in to the scheme, the New South Wales Government will ensure all child survivors of sexual assault or any related non-sexual abuse in institutions that were, or still are, the responsibility of the New South Wales Government can seek redress for 10 years. As previously mentioned, redress will include being able to apply for payments of up to \$150,000, access to counselling and psychological services, and a direct personal response from the responsible institution.

The Australian Government is pushing for all State governments, churches, charities and other non-government organisations to join up. By the New South Wales Government setting an example and opting in to this process quickly, we hope that other institutions in New South Wales and Australia will promptly follow suit. The Federal Government stated earlier this year that if the New South Wales Government signs up to the scheme it will enable at least 9,000 people who were sexually abused in New South Wales government institutions to potentially access redress. If churches, charities and other institutions in New South Wales opt in, the Federal Government says that another 11,000 people will potentially be covered.

I understand that many religious organisations are currently considering opting in. The *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that the Secretary of the Rabbinical Council of New South Wales released a statement saying the council was ready and willing to sign up to the scheme and urged all Jewish synagogal, communal and roof bodies to do likewise. Other reports indicate that the Catholic Church will definitely opt in and that the Anglican, Presbyterian, Baptist, Salvation Army, Uniting and Australian Christian Churches-Pentecostal churches all support the scheme in principle at this stage. If and when these church organisations opt in, it will provide a more consistent approach with the same framework.

There have been cases of multiple survivors who were abused in institutions run by the same church but where the compensation caps were different depending on which State they lived in. If churches and others opt in, this scheme should be able to bring clarity and fairness to all survivors across all States. To enable the New South Wales Government to participate in the scheme it requires the introduction of this bill to allow certain matters relating to the scheme to be referred to the Commonwealth Parliament for laws to be made about these matters. The enactment of this bill, along with the enactment of the bills that have been foreshadowed by the Victorian, Australian Capital Territory and Commonwealth parliaments, should help move others to act so it will become a truly national scheme.

The royal commission's recommendations recognise that governments, institutions and the broader community share an ongoing and important responsibility for keeping all children safe. This new scheme aims to recognise and alleviate the impact of past sexual assault and related abuse in institutions, and by introducing the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018 the New South Wales Government is acknowledging its own role and responsibility in protecting some of the most vulnerable children in our community from sexual assault.

This bill will help to atone for past sexual assault experiences in State-run children's institutions while highlighting the continued importance of caring for our most vulnerable children living in out-of-home care. At least 20,000 people have been sexually abused in New South Wales institutions. The extent of this tragedy should never be repeated. I deeply hope that access to psychological and financial support helps ease the intense pain and suffering felt by these survivors and allows them to follow a path to healing. In closing, I thank the Attorney General and his staff for their role in bringing this bill to the House and I am pleased that it has received broad support.

Mr ALEX GREENWICH (Sydney) (18:08): The National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018 will give survivors of institutional sex abuse a pathway to receive compensation for their suffering, counselling and psychological support and a personal response from the institution responsible for their abuse, through the National Redress Scheme. In its five-year inquiry, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse uncovered serious ongoing and systemic abuse of children associated with institutional care, including at school, in out-of-home care and at church. It found poor

responses from institutions to reported abuse, which at best treated perpetrators leniently and at worst allowed abuse to continue or put other children at risk.

The royal commission identified failures over generations that have far-reaching and ongoing impacts on survivors. These impacts have significant implications for physical and mental health that can result in serious difficulties for survivors. They can prevent survivors from forming positive relationships, developing literacy and numeracy skills and gaining employment, which can prevent them from participating fully in the community. Surviving this abuse shows a high correlation with mental illness, addiction, self-harm and other destructive behaviours, leading to long-term and serious impacts. A number of survivors have told me about the extent and overwhelming nature of this abuse on their lives.

While survivors come from all walks of life, it was very sad to read about the high representation of the Stolen Generation, former child migrants and Forgotten Australians. One in five survivors of abuse in residential institutions managed by religious organisations before 1990 were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people. This highlights the extent to which heartless past State policies ruined people's lives. While some people have been able to get back on their feet after their harrowing experiences, many have not and have struggled in life. There is a strong cohort of survivors whose experiences have led to a significant distrust of government and authorities, and the redress scheme will deliver justice to them only if they have access to advocacy services to help them navigate through the scheme.

The National Disability Insurance Scheme provides an example of an important national scheme that risks failing those who need it because they cannot navigate the system and State-funded disability advocacy services may not retain their existing funding levels as services transfer to the Federal system. I welcome the Government's decision to withdraw plans to cut advocacy funding but I understand that funding is being reduced if organisations receive Federal grants for non-advocacy activities. When it comes to the redress scheme, the Government must engage with non-government organisations and community legal centres to ensure that they are adequately equipped to help survivors access the scheme. While the scheme includes counselling and psychological support as a part of redress, it is important that applicants have access to counselling during the application process, as many survivors will be reliving their experiences and could become retraumatised.

I am concerned that people in jail will not have access to redress under this scheme and will have to wait until they are released. While there will be a discretionary power that could enable prisoners to access their rightful compensation, it is easy to see how this could be politicised. We all know that some aspects of the media love to target offenders who get money. As I said earlier, many survivors have struggled with life and have significant challenges directly as a result of their experiences in institutional care. These factors can result in some survivors ending up in jail for various reasons. If people have been victims of institutionalised child sexual abuse they should be entitled to justice for their lost childhood and the long-term damage this has caused them, regardless of what has happened since.

A number of survivors of child sexual abuse have told me about the extent and overwhelming nature of abuse on their lives and how this has led to them having no money, no home and no support. A survivor who sleeps rough in my electorate has been on the social housing waiting list for years and his experience led me to call for priority housing for survivors. Government programs and services should acknowledge the serious impacts of child sexual abuse and the role that governments played in allowing it to happen in institutional care when assessing people for help. I welcome the Minister's commitment today in response to my question that survivors will be given priority housing if they need it. This will go a long way to helping people to heal.

The success of the redress scheme will rely on institutions opting to partake, and I encourage all institutions that played a role in children in their care experiencing sexual abuse to sign up and help with the healing process so that both survivors and institutions can move forward. While it is clear from the commission's report that sexual abuse occurred in a broad range of institutions and contexts, it is worth noting that the commission also reported hearing allegations of child sexual abuse associated with religious institutions more than any other type of institution.

These institutions sanctioned, facilitated and covered up the torture of young vulnerable children. The commission found that sexual abuse occurred in religious schools, orphanages, missions, churches, confessionals and various other settings, and that in many cases religious leaders knew of the allegations but failed to take effective action, often opting for in-house responses. It is time to acknowledge the dangers in allowing religious institutions to be treated above the law by granting them exemptions to treat people differently. In the past, churches have used their political influence to cover up horrific abuse and the torture of children, yet these same churches continue to have massive influence on decision-makers despite the rapid growth in Australia of those who identify as having no religion.

With advocacy groups and those who have been campaigning for justice, I have had some exposure to the challenges of dealing with those religious organisations. It is telling that at the time of the royal commission when this horrific treatment came to light, many churches spent their public energy trying to stop laws preventing two people in love from being able to marry. Indeed, religious organisations spent millions of parishioner's dollars in campaigns to target young trans children and the children of same-sex parents. We must question how much religious organisations have learnt. They have gone from the physical, the emotional and the sexual abuse to what we saw them engage in last year that can only be described as the emotional torture of vulnerable young people.

It is worth reminding the House that many of the survivors the commission heard from were children from families that churches worried about and sought to remove just because they were of mixed race or single parented. Churches that were busy stopping a loving person from being able to marry their partner before they died would have been better off spending their time, energy and money dealing with the long-term hurt they caused people over decades. The Catholic Church continues to fight for exemptions to reporting information about risks to children heard in confession.

I commend the commission for its outstanding work. Implementing its recommendations will help survivors heal and improve safety in institutions. I congratulate the New South Wales Government on signing up early to the National Redress Scheme and committing to most recommendations for legal system improvements. I look forward to its response to the other recommendations. Most importantly, I praise the amazing advocacy and work of the many survivors who pushed hard for a royal commission so that people who had been silenced for decades were finally given the opportunity to be heard. Their fight for justice is truly inspiring and has been integral in making Australia a safer place for children. I commend the bill.

Mr DAMIEN TUDEHOPE (Epping) (18:17): I support the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. Every member who spoke before me has addressed the awful consequences and its impact on the victims. If I were to reiterate those horrendous consequences I would be merely repeating what others have said before me. I welcome the commitment of the New South Wales Government—the first Government to sign up for and commit to the National Redress Scheme. This shows an amazing ability on the part of the Attorney General and his staff to get across the material and to understand the implications of what New South Wales was signing up for and taking the lead in Australia, which is now being followed by other States, to refer the redress scheme to the Commonwealth so that victims can be compensated adequately. The important part of that process is: What are we signing up for? We can identify all of the issues in the world, but the scheme will be administered by the Commonwealth.

An issue that always arises when powers are referred to the Commonwealth is: What are we actually referring to the Commonwealth? What is the scheme that we are signing up for on behalf of the people of New South Wales? Is it the sort of scheme that delivers the results that the Government says is in the best interests of the people of New South Wales? The National Redress Scheme will be administered by the Department of Social Services. The operator must take into account general guiding principles when taking action under the scheme. This is in line with the royal commission recommendations. For example, one of the principles is that redress must be assessed and provided to avoid further harming or traumatising the person. What does that mean? A person seeking redress should not be made to repeat and meet an unduly high bar to ensure that a claim is determined expeditiously on the evidence.

What is the process? Applications for redress must be verified by a statutory declaration, which was recommended by the royal commission. Generally speaking, the scheme will not require further supporting evidence, which recognises that many survivors will not have such evidence and to make the scheme as accessible as possible. The scheme may request further information from an applicant if it is required to make a determination on the application. What information will be sought from institutions? If an application for redress identifies a participating institution as being involved in the abuse or if the scheme operator has reasonable grounds to believe a participating institution may be responsible, the scheme operator must request that the institution provide any information that may be relevant. This will ensure that institutions are contacted and given the opportunity to provide information to inform the determination.

Other speakers have identified that not only is the Government signing up for this redress scheme but also many institutions that were identified during the course of the royal commission have also signed up for the redress scheme and will be subject to exactly the same applications and processes to determine applications. By virtue of the fact that the institution has signed up for it, applications may be made that identify that institution and the claim will then be paid out by the institution that has signed up for the redress scheme.

The next important question to be answered is: What is the standard of proof that will be required by the operator in determining the application? If the operator considers that there is a reasonable likelihood that the person is eligible for redress, the operator must approve the application and make an offer of redress to the person. Reasonable likelihood is defined as "the chance of the person being eligible is real and not fanciful or remote".

That is a much lower test than beyond reasonable doubt and on the balance of probabilities. It is yet to be determined how that will be interpreted. However, The operator is certainly putting in place a low bar to determine whether an application will be successful.

How is the amount of redress to be determined? After approving an application, the operator must determine the amount of the redress payment and the share of the costs attributed to each liable institution. An assessment framework sets out the method and matters to take into account for working out redress payments. The Australian Government has developed the assessment framework in consultation with stakeholders, including government institutions and survivor groups. The scheme operator will apply the assessment framework to work out the maximum amount of redress payment that could be payable to the person by adding together the amounts of each responsible institution's share of the costs of the redress payment. The maximum amount payable under the redress scheme is up to \$150,000.

Who will make the decisions? Independent decision-makers will be responsible for assessing applications for redress and providing advice to the Australian Department of Social Services as the scheme operator. What does a decision about redress mean? A determination made by the redress scheme operator is an administrative decision, not a finding of law or fact, which means that persons who make applications are not put through a court-style system during which they would be cross-examined as to the veracity or otherwise of the facts and circumstances contained in their statutory declaration. The scheme is administered by the operator, who will make findings relating to the amount that is due to the person who is making the claim.

One of the important aspects of this scheme is that it does not preclude any applicant from not making a claim under the scheme, but retains their rights at common law to take proceedings against the institution or the government body for the abuse to which they have been subject. In those circumstances, the scheme operates as a one level redress scheme, but the rights of persons are not diminished if they have made a claim under the redress scheme. Is there a right of review of the decision of the operator? In line with the royal commission's recommendations, applicants for redress will be able to request the review of the determination. Internal reviews will be conducted by an independent decision-maker who was not involved in the initial decision. The National Redress Scheme has been carefully designed to have a simple and user-friendly application process.

The New South Wales Government is satisfied on the basis of the material available to it that it is an appropriate redress scheme. It will be a significant tool to ensure that those who have suffered from sexual abuse at the hands of institutions receive redress. The New South Wales Government is also satisfied that it has been developed to be fair and accessible to provide recognition and support to thousands of survivors across Australia. Counselling and psychological services are uncapped for survivors. Not only is a redress compensation amount available to an applicant, but unlimited psychological and counselling services also will be available to those same persons. This is a serious improvement on the circumstances of sexual abuse victims. The Government ought to be praised for the action it has taken. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms TANIA MIHAILUK (Bankstown) (18:27): I support the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018, which will seek to commence the healing process for those who have suffered historic institutional child sexual abuse. In November 2012 Minister Julia Gillard announced her intent to recommend to the Governor-General a Royal Commission into the Institutional Response to Child Sexual Abuse. It lasted for five years, during which time 42,000 calls were handled, close to 26,000 letters and emails were received, more than 8,000 private sessions were held and 2,500 referrals were made to authorities, in addition to countless interviews with institutions, agencies and many survivors.

The royal commission dealt with such a huge number of submissions that Federal Parliament amended the Royal Commissions Act 1902 to create a process called a private session, in which victims were able to address a smaller panel of one or two commissioners in a more comfortable and supportive environment. Written accounts from victims unable to attend hearings in person were also shared with the royal commission. The impact of the royal commission cannot be understated. It has enabled voices that were silenced to no longer be silenced, to no longer be ignored and to no longer be disregarded; finally to be heard and heeded. It has provided victims, survivors and their loved ones with hope. It is the first step in the healing process.

I acknowledge that the New South Wales Government is one of the first governments in Australia to introduce the National Redress Scheme. I acknowledge that in October 2015 NSW Labor made it very clear through a public statement issued by Leader of the Opposition Luke Foley, shadow Attorney General Paul Lynch that we supported Federal Labor's announcement to establish a redress scheme. That is how long the Labor Party has supported the establishment of a redress scheme in Australia. The royal commission presented many horrific statistics to the public. The royal commission provided countless numbers of volumes of documents that detail not only the experiences and the horrific stories, but also provided an opportunity for many of the institutions and agencies to explain their procedures, or lack of procedures. On many occasions they conceded some of the past and continued errors.

The royal commission heard evidence relating to 3,489 institutions and agencies. One in three survivors said that they were sexually abused in and out-of-home care, primarily residential institutions such as children's homes. One-third were abused in school and 14.6 per cent were abused while involved in religious activities, such as attending a church or a seminary. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders represented 14.9 per cent of survivors. More than one in five survivors were sexually abused in more than one institution. More than one in 10 of the survivors who gave evidence were in prison at the time of their private session. I concur with the shadow Attorney General's concerns that those who are in prison will not be able to access the redress scheme. I encourage the Government to revisit that aspect of the scheme. I understand that for the next 10 years an annual report will be provided as a result of this redress scheme. It is important to ensure that those incarcerated are not denied the opportunity to access the scheme, given that a large number of them were in prison when they gave their evidence to the royal commission.

There is no question that the impact of this type of abuse has a lifelong and profound effect on individuals. It is no surprise that many of those individuals find themselves incarcerated later in life, or suffer from a variety of mental conditions and everlasting side effects. I share the concerns of the shadow Attorney General relating to the capping of the amount payable at \$150,000. I note there is no minimum capping. The royal commission suggested a \$10,000 minimum cap and a \$200,000 maximum cap. The Government is making an odd decision to cap payments at \$150,000. Perhaps the Government is concerned that the institutions may not be able to deal with the redress scheme financially. I encourage the Government to review that decision. The Federal Labor Party will make amendments at the Senate level to ensure that the cap is \$200,000, as recommended by the royal commission.

Obviously, we should not short-change any of the survivors. It is disappointing that the Government has capped the payment at \$150,000 when the royal commission suggested a cap of \$200,000. I acknowledge Leonie Sheedy from the Care Leavers Australasia Network [CLAN]. The member for Prospect also acknowledged her. CLAN is based in Bankstown and Leonie is a resident of Georges Hall. I acknowledge her work and CLAN's work in ensuring the establishment of the redress scheme. I thank the member for Prospect for noting the work CLAN undertook with the Gillard Government to establish the royal commission and ensure that a proper redress scheme was established in Australia.

I note, as I mentioned earlier, that a large number of the survivors were in out-of-home care. It is always important to remember that although we are redressing the wrongs of the past, we must look constantly at the work that we are undertaking now to ensure that none of these horrors are ever repeated. Statistics, for example the latest Dashboard statistics, often reveal that even today when people report child abuse and neglect, a large number of children do not receive face-to-face assessments, despite reports of them potentially being at risk of significant harm. For example, two-thirds of children are not visited by a caseworker, despite concerns by doctors, teachers and other practitioners who are mandated to report any risk that they see that should be addressed by Family and Community Services [FACS]. It concerns me and many in this Chamber that that statistic is incredibly high.

Although we are looking at supporting redress schemes for historical child sexual abuse, it is critical to do everything we can to ensure that these types of abuses are never repeated by any institution. I note that we have raised different concerns in residential care. We often see and hear of horrible stories come from some of the residential care providers. It is critical that we look at schemes to ensure that mechanisms are in place to provide proper oversight of the non-government sector. For some time, the New South Wales Labor Party has sought to ensure that we establish proper oversight procedures as we continue to transfer children from FACS in out-of-home care to a non-government organisation. The Attorney General raised a concern about institutions that choose not to participate and encouraged them to do so. [*Extension of time*]

I appreciate that at this stage we can only expect some of the institutions to opt in. But whether it is through the annual review into the performance of the scheme over the next 10 years or the media naming and shaming any institution that chooses not to opt in for a variety of reasons we must do everything we can to make it very clear that there will be ramifications for those that choose not to opt in. It is absolutely critical that all survivors are permitted to make an application for redress. If institutions choose to not opt in, that must be made public. I appreciate that there might not be any legal redress in the bill, but there may be ways of looking at it in the future. This is an administrative scheme.

The test is different from the normal civil tests that are required by law, but it is abundantly clear to all members of this Chamber that we must ensure that all institutions opt into the scheme, particularly given that the scheme is capped. It is important to remember that most of these institutions are the beneficiaries of public money and it should be made particularly clear that they opt in to this particular scheme. I thank the Attorney General for introducing the bill. I also thank the shadow Attorney General, the member for Liverpool, for his work over a number of years in ensuring that NSW Labor has supported and continues to support the redress scheme.

Mr STEPHEN BROMHEAD (Myall Lakes) (18:39): I speak in support of the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. I thank the Attorney General, the Hon. Mark Speakman, for introducing the bill and I congratulate him and his staff. I also congratulate Troy Grant, The Nationals member for Dubbo, and Minister for Police, and Minister for Emergency Services, on the work that he did as a detective investigating priests in the Hunter area, for his advocacy from the time we came to government in 2011, and for the advice he gave to then Premier Barry O'Farrell on this issue.

The object of the bill is to refer certain matters relating to the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse to the Commonwealth Parliament so as to enable it to make laws about those matters. The proposed Act is for the purposes of section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which enables State parliaments to refer matters to the Commonwealth Parliament. The bill refers matters relating to institutional child sexual abuse as follows. First, the "text reference" provides for the enactment by the Commonwealth Parliament of the bill for a proposed Commonwealth Act, as set out in schedule 1. The proposed Commonwealth Act is the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Act 2018. Secondly, the "amendment reference" provides for the enactment of express amendments to the National Redress Act relating to redress for institutional child sexual abuse.

The bill has been introduced to facilitate the participation of New South Wales in the National Redress Scheme, which was recommended by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Subject to the passage of legislation, it is intended to commence on 1 July 2018 and to run for 10 years. According to the Minister's second reading speech, the royal commission found that civil litigation is not effective in providing adequate redress for many survivors. This led to a recommendation that the National Redress Scheme be developed. This involves three elements: a monetary payment of up to \$150,000; access to counselling and psychological support; and an apology from the responsible institution.

In his second reading speech, the Attorney General stated that the bill has three key features. First, it contains a text reference that enables the Commonwealth Parliament to enact the legislation establishing the National Redress Scheme. Secondly, it contains an amendment reference to enable the Commonwealth Parliament to make amendments to the National Redress Act. Thirdly, schedule 1 to the bill contains the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse Act 2018. An intergovernmental agreement has been signed by the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria setting out the governance arrangements for the National Redress Scheme. The terms of reference for the National Redress Scheme board include the voting process for changes to the scheme. According the second reading speech, any key change will require agreement from New South Wales.

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse had a profound impact on our country. For five years we learned about the thousands of children who have been sexually abused in institutions throughout the decades. We heard about the abuse of power by perpetrators and the abrogation of responsibility by institutions. The royal commission went far beyond bearing witness to the stories of survivors. It made many significant recommendations as to what governments and institutions must do to protect children and to deliver justice and support for survivors. The royal commission's work is done. It is now up to us to make the changes needed to address past wrongs and to create a society where the voices of children are heard and believed.

The New South Wales Government will formally respond to the royal commission's recommendations in June. It has already taken a number of significant steps in response to the recommendations made by the royal commission. It made 15 recommendations for reform to civil litigation systems to make access to justice easier for survivors. The Government has already implemented many of these recommendations. In 2016, it removed limitation periods so that survivors of child abuse can claim for damages irrespective of when the abuse happened. It has also adopted and improved the Model Litigant Policy to ensure a more compassionate approach to managing civil child abuse claims made against government agencies. Work is already well underway to respond properly and comprehensively to the remaining civil litigation recommendations.

New South Wales was the first State in Australia to introduce trained witness intermediaries to help child victims and witnesses of sexual abuse to understand questions and to convey their answers effectively in criminal proceedings. The introduction of witness intermediaries is part of a three-year child sexual offence pilot program that has been operating in Sydney and Newcastle since 2016. Under the pilot, child victims of sexual abuse pre-record their evidence so that they do not have to endure the stress and trauma of facing their alleged attacker in court. The royal commission has recommended this reform be introduced nationwide.

In April, the New South Wales Government announced that it had accepted the overwhelming majority of recommendations in the royal commission's Criminal Justice Report. As a result, a number of changes will be made to our criminal justice system: first, introducing new criminal offences, including offences of failure to report and failure to protect children from abuse; secondly, strengthening existing criminal offences, including

increasing the maximum penalty for persistent child sexual abuse to life imprisonment; thirdly, changes to sentencing, including requiring courts to apply current sentencing standards for historic child sex offences; and, fourthly, changes to procedure, such as retrospectively repealing an old limitation period that is preventing some survivors from accessing justice today. Together, these reforms will go a long way towards holding perpetrators to account and making the justice system accessible for victims and survivors of child sexual abuse. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms JENNY AITCHISON (Maitland) (18:47): I speak on the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2018. During the five-year inquiry by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, nearly 17,000 people have contacted the inquiry with issues that fall within the terms of reference. The inquiry heard from nearly 8,000 survivors of child sexual abuse in private sessions. It also received nearly 1,500 written accounts and has referred more than 2,500 matters to the police for follow-up and investigation. So many people across this nation have been impacted or hurt by child sexual abuse. Many thousands more would never have been able to give their evidence to the royal commission. In 1997, as a young idealistic public servant in the Department of Immigration, I was tasked with drafting the Commonwealth Government's submission to the Western Australian inquiry into that State's Child Migration Scheme, which involved British children.

In preparing that response I researched the issue of institutional child sexual and other abuse in great detail. It was appalling, harrowing and horrifying to hear the stories of child after child who had experienced sexual and other abuse at the hands of those in power, in the very institutions that we, as a society, had trusted with their care. Those children cowered in their beds in absolute terror during the middle of the night, knowing that there was no way to escape the perpetrators who came to abuse them. I cannot imagine the fear that those children experienced when they heard footsteps in the hall, doors opening, and shadows lingering over them.

The first experience of an adult for those children was not one of a loving and warm nurturing parent, who supported and cared and nourished them, but rather a cruel paedophile who used and abused them sexually causing mental, emotional and physical pain and harm, with lifelong consequences. The anger and hurt that those victims and survivors have carried throughout their lives is without any boundary. None of us can truly comprehend the terrible toll that abuse has had on them. We see the broken lives, the drug and alcohol addiction, the intergenerational family breakdown, domestic violence, and even incarceration that are a legacy for many who have had a childhood ruined by sexual assault and abuse. Only those children, who are now adults themselves, truly understand what happened to them. Lela and Lisa Michelle, who are two survivors directly quoted in the report, summed it up:

We were sad lonely kids torn away from our family and did no-one any harm. We should have been cared for and shown compassion for whatever reason we were unable to stay safe with our family. We had no safety net and would have been terrified to tell anyone.

...

Every person, from family, from relatives, to professionals that I went and asked for help not only didn't give me the help, they put me in a worse situation ... How can a child be protected if the adults and the professionals choose to ignore the abuse?

The sense of betrayal and hurt is evident in those two small quotes. They are just two small examples from the many thousands of children who spoke to the commission, and the many tens of thousands who were impacted by this abuse. It sends shivers down my spine. It must engender in all of us an obligation to do more and to do better. During my investigations in the late 1990s in relation to migrant children in institutions I sought legal opinions on the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946 under which the Minister for Immigration delegated his guardianship of those children to the many church and community organisations that, in the name of caring for them, took them in.

As part of my brief I wanted to know who was responsible, who their guardian was and if that could be put forward. Despite obstruction by former governments of both sides of politics and the bureaucrats that seek to protect governments and the taxpayer from litigation and costly compensation, we have come to the realisation that we are all responsible: We all owe these children a debt. That is one of the best things to come out of the royal commission—and not just this royal commission but the inquiry into the stolen generation and other work that has been done for children who were institutionalised.

Ten years after I started working on my research, we witnessed the Apology to the stolen generation and in 2009 the apology to the forgotten Australians and former child migrants. In this place we made our own apology to children from many institutions. I talk about this history of looking into this issue personally because it is important to know the impact that the stories from these children have on all of us. That is why we need to make sure that the legislation, the policies and procedures that are put in place and the redress scheme are all correct and that they achieve the aims and recommendations of the inquiry.

I pay tribute to the courage of all those victims and survivors who spoke out and sought justice in the face of such ignorance—and wilful ignorance—over so many years. I pay tribute to their families of origin, their partners, their children and their other descendants who have fought for this reform for so long. I pay tribute to journalists but particularly to Joanne McCarthy and the *Newcastle Herald* for shining the light into the very darkest corners of the treatment of our most vulnerable children. Joanne is like our very own Margaret Humphreys, CBE, OAM, who in the 1980s and the 1990s drew attention and sought justice for some 7,000 British child migrants who were sent to Australia. I also pay tribute to the work of Leonie Sheedy of Care Leavers Australasia Network [CLAN] and to Julia Gillard, the former Prime Minister, for recommending the royal commission. The work of those brave people has led us to this bill, which is intended to allow New South Wales to participate in the scheme proposed by the Commonwealth. [*Extension of time*]

I now turn to examine the bill in more detail. The national redress scheme provides three elements of redress: a monetary redress payment, counselling and psychological support, and a direct personal response from the institution, if it is sought. The scheme provides for an administrative rather than a judicial mechanism for redress. That is important because many of the victims—as we heard from what I was reading in their responses—have been hurt so many times. Many times the onus of proof has been on them. They have been disbelieved, ignored and let down for far too long by systems, organisations and institutions that should have helped them. It is right that whatever scheme is in place has a less complex way of operating. The test is the reasonable likelihood that a person is eligible for redress, rather than the alternate current civil standard of proof, which is a very good reform.

However, I and Labor have an issue with the inability of the Government to agree to pay \$200,000 in compensation or redress payments as recommended by the royal commission. The Government has capped the payments at \$150,000. I note that the Attorney General spoke about the capacity of organisations to pay. I note that many of those organisations are government organisations and that the victims are taxpayers and are part of our community. We should not decide compensation on the basis of what the perpetrator or the institution which supported that perpetrator can pay. We also need to look at the enormous saving to those institutions from what might have been achieved through common law verdicts in those cases.

I also mention that a person cannot apply if they are in jail unless there are exceptional circumstances or if they are sentenced to imprisonment for five years, and unless the payment does not bring the scheme into disrepute or affect the public confidence. That is a strange addition to the bill. If anyone in this place has any understanding of the impact of trauma and sexual abuse, they would understand that most of our jails are filled with people who have suffered some level of sexual abuse at some stage. We understand it is a causative issue so to preclude those, who by the nature of their incarceration have shown that they are so terribly impacted by what happened to them, I believe is misguided and unfair. That national redress scheme is undoubtedly a good thing. However, we should examine and compare this scheme to the New South Wales victims of crimes scheme. By doing so we will see the amount of compensation awarded to victims who have not subjected to crimes committed within an institution. If someone has become a victim of crime, the amount of redress that could be made to them should not depend on where that crime happened. That is a real concern.

On a procedural note, I would like to understand how the Government will build the capacity within the system to provide the counselling that will be needed because, as shadow Minister for the Prevention of Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, many people come into my office and tell me that the amount of support and counselling, particularly trauma-informed counselling, that is available to them under the New South Wales Victims Compensation Scheme is woefully inadequate and that they have trouble accessing appropriately trained trauma counsellors. The Attorney General needs to turn his mind to the practical capacity to deliver what is promised. We do not want this watered down or not delivered because we have not thought about the consequences of all those people seeking counselling. I can tell the Attorney General now that there are people in my community who cannot access those services.

Turning to the present and the future, as the member for Bankstown said in her speech, out-of-home care is a huge issue. There are more children in out-of-home care now than there have ever been in this State's history. For us not to think about this in the context of the royal commission would be a mistake, and we must make sure that we have appropriate safeguards in place. The sexual assault strategy for this State is more than two years overdue. Only now, in 2018, are we trying to address and redress the hurts that have happened to children who have been sexually assaulted and abused in institutions up until the last century, but we also need to pay close attention to what is happening to children in the twenty-first century, right here and right now, and to what will happen to those children. For that reason, I urge the Attorney General to apply as much pressure as possible. I have been told by the Attorney General and by the Minister for the Prevention of the Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault that the sexual assault strategy is coming, but I would like it to be delivered. It needs to be completed.

We need to look at the experience of people who have experienced sexual assault. They do not need announcements made on an ad hoc basis about programs. There needs to be a clear way for them to engage not only with all the services that will help them in recovering but also with those that will help them in seeking justice from the perpetrators. I commend the bill to the House. Labor does not want to stand in the way of sexual assault and abuse survivors getting appropriate redress, but I urge the Attorney General to think about those issues in the implementation of this legislation.

Mr MARK SPEAKMAN (Cronulla—Attorney General) (19:02): In reply: I thank the following members for their constructive, thoughtful and often passionate contributions to this debate: the members for Liverpool, Kiama, Dubbo, Balmain, Tweed, Charlestown, Lake Macquarie, Holsworthy, Newcastle, North Shore, Prospect, Davidson, Sydney, Epping, Bankstown, Myall Lakes and Maitland. I will address some of the matters that have been raised in this debate. First, there is the question of the maximum payment under the redress scheme. I note the comments made by the members for Liverpool, Balmain, Charlestown, Prospect, Bankstown, Newcastle and Maitland in relation to that maximum payment.

The Commonwealth Government has determined that monetary payments of up to \$150,000 will be provided to eligible survivors. I note that this cap has been accepted by all jurisdictions that are opting into this scheme, which include not only New South Wales but also the Labor jurisdictions of Victoria, Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. It is important to note that although this is less than the maximum recommended by the royal commission, the average payment to survivors is expected to be about \$76,000, which is \$11,000 more than the average of \$65,000 recommended by the royal commission. In other words, on average, people who receive redress under this scheme will be receiving \$11,000 more than the royal commission recommended.

A higher average payment, even with a lower cap, will ensure more consistent and equitable financial compensation for survivors as part of the redress scheme. The scheme is not just about providing survivors with monetary recognition. Of equal importance is the access to counselling and support. New South Wales has committed to delivering counselling and psychological care services directly to survivors who accept redress under the scheme and are residing in the State. Nationally, counselling and psychological support will be provided by all participating States and Territories in accordance with the national service standards for the provision of State- and/or Territory-based counselling and psychological care.

The second topic was that of incarcerated survivors. I note the comments made by the members representing the electorates of Liverpool, Sydney, Bankstown, Charlestown and Maitland on this topic. If a person is in jail, they are not able to make an application for redress under the scheme. This was accepted by all participating jurisdictions, including Labor jurisdictions. The reason for this policy is that it would be difficult to provide appropriate redress support services to people in jail and there are confidentiality risks in closed institutional environments. However, once released from jail, a person is able to apply for redress. In addition, the scheme operator may allow a person who is in jail to apply for redress if there are exceptional circumstances justifying the application being made. The Commonwealth bill includes a rule-making power to prescribe requirements for determining that there are exceptional circumstances justifying an application being made.

The third topic or comment was that of survivors with criminal convictions. I note the comments made by the members for the electorates of Liverpool, Prospect and Charlestown. If an applicant has been convicted of an offence and sentenced to imprisonment for five years or longer, they are not entitled to redress, although they will be able to apply to the operator for an exemption. To determine whether to provide an exemption, the operator must write to the attorney general of the State or Territory where the relevant abuse occurred and to the attorney general of the State or Territory where the offence was against a law of that jurisdiction.

The operator will take into account the advice of the relevant attorneys general and other matters, including the nature of the offence, the length of time since the offence was committed and any rehabilitation of the person. The advice of the attorney general of the jurisdiction where the abuse occurred carries greater weight than other factors in the operator's decision-making. Taking these matters into account, the operator may determine that a person is entitled to redress if satisfied this would not adversely affect public confidence in the scheme or bring it into disrepute. This eligibility exclusion was made in the interests of maintaining public confidence in the scheme by ensuring that redress payments are not paid to those whose actions may not meet prevailing community standards.

The fourth topic that was raised in members' speeches was that of citizenship. The members for the electorates of Liverpool, Prospect and Balmain raised matters in relation to the requirement under the redress scheme that a person is an Australian citizen or a permanent resident. Specifically, I note the member for Prospect's comments in relation to child migrants. This eligibility requirement was necessary to mitigate the risk of fraudulent claims and to maintain the integrity of the scheme, particularly given the comparative size of payments under the scheme, and the lower evidentiary burden that will be required of survivors making applications. Opening

eligibility to non-citizens and non-permanent residents would significantly increase the difficulty of verifying the identity of applicants and would likely result in a large number of fraudulent claims. This would require primary documentation and verification from foreign governments and Australian embassies and would increase overall processing times of legitimate applications by diverting the scheme's resources.

The fifth area of comment was about the Victims Compensation Scheme and the Victims Support Scheme in New South Wales. I note the comments of members representing the electorates of Liverpool, Charlestown, Newcastle and Maitland. The Victims Support Scheme replaced the Victims Compensation Scheme, which had been established under the now repealed Victims Support and Rehabilitation Act 1996. The old scheme involved victims receiving one lump sum compensation payment for their injuries. Victims would then need to pay their various expenses out of that one lump sum. Due to the overwhelming growth in demand, the Victims Compensation Scheme was characterised by protracted delays for victims in receiving their compensation, with victims waiting an average of more than two years before receiving their payment.

Under the old scheme, victims waited on average around 31 months to receive their payment—long after the bills for medical treatment, funeral expenses and the costs of relocating out of harm's way had been met. Having to wait such a long time undermined the very spirit of the scheme, which was designed to help rehabilitate victims of violent crime in a timely manner. Victims need to be supported while they recover and come to terms with what has happened to them, not wait years for a handout that they hope will cover all those unexpected medical bills and relocation costs while worrying how they will manage in the meantime. The transition from the Victims Compensation Scheme to the Victims Support Scheme involved a deliberate policy shift away from lump sum compensation payments to an immediate, flexible and responsive scheme that is able to meet the needs of victims in a timely manner.

During 2015-16, on average, determination of financial assistance for a victim of crime took 26 days. This is a huge improvement from the protracted delays that victims experienced under the previous scheme. The Victims Support Scheme provides a package of support individually tailored to meet victims' needs, including counselling and financial assistance for both immediate needs and longer-term economic loss. In addition, victims are eligible for a lump sum "recognition payment" in recognition of their pain and trauma. An increasing number of victims have been accessing the Victims Support Scheme since it commenced in 2013. Awareness of the scheme has been growing among the community and among victim advocates, meaning that more victims are engaging with Victims Services at an earlier stage and receiving tailored, appropriate support to meet their immediate financial needs and receive professional counselling.

In 2015-2016, the Victims Access Line telephone service received a record 102,291 calls and 16,821 applications were made for support. This was an increase of more than 28 per cent on applications lodged in the 2014-15 financial year. In 2015-16, 9,204 applications were lodged for recognition payments, 12,176 applications were lodged for counselling and 5,325 applications were lodged for financial support. These figures illustrate that the Victims Support Scheme is meeting the policy objective of providing support to victims of violent crime. The Victims Support Scheme also sits within broader government initiatives to assist victims.

For example, the Government's commitment to reduce domestic violence is reflected in our investment of more than \$350 million over four years in the 2017-18 budget to address domestic violence through the Domestic and Family Violence Blueprint for Reform. The blueprint will provide a whole-of-government policy framework to respond to domestic violence. In addition, Safer Pathway continues to provide a coordinated and proactive service delivery response to domestic violence victims, including a risk assessment tool for police and automated referrals of all victims to local services for support and urgent action to prevent further harm. In 2015, a Premier's priority was announced to reduce domestic violence reoffending. This is one of the New South Wales Government's highest priorities.

A sixth topic that emerged from the contributions of members was that of children. In particular, the member for Balmain mentioned that children are able to apply to the scheme if they will reach 18 years of age during the life of the scheme. The scheme operator will hold these applications until the child turns 18, at which point an assessment will be made on their eligibility for redress. This is intended to provide the fairest outcome for the child as the lifelong impact of the abuse they have suffered may not yet have fully manifested or cannot yet be articulated by the child. Children who will not reach 18 during the life of the scheme may still be able to pursue other avenues because of the New South Wales Government civil litigation reforms—for example, the introduction of guiding principles for civil child abuse claims made against New South Wales Government agencies to make litigation a less traumatic experience for victims and to ensure a compassionate and consistent approach.

The seventh topic raised was that of the Ellis defence, which was mentioned by the member for Balmain. The Government is committed to responding to the royal commission's redress and civil litigations recommendations and has already taken extensive steps to act on the vast majority of the 99 recommendations

that the royal commission has made in this area. The Government has already implemented two of the 14 recommendations concerning civil litigation by, first, legislating to remove limitation periods to allow survivors to bring claims, regardless of when the abuse occurred; and, secondly, introducing the guiding principles for government agencies responding to civil claims for child abuse to assist New South Wales Government agencies to be model litigants in civil claims for child abuse. I have asked the Department of Justice to provide options addressing all of the remaining civil litigation recommendations in a connected and consolidated manner.

The remaining recommendations concern expanding the duties and liabilities of institutions to prevent child abuse, and ensuring survivors of abuse can identify a proper defendant to sue and to access the assets of institutions in civil claims in response to the Ellis defence. The Government intends to announce a consolidated package of reforms that addresses each of these areas by the middle of this year. The Government's principle goal in implementing the royal commission's recommendations is to protect our children from future harm and to support those who have been abused in their pursuit of justice. Civil litigation reforms can contribute to this by enhancing accountability and deterrence mechanisms with a focus on the institutions implicated in abuse. In holding these organisations accountable for abuse, we are rightly enforcing the community's view and expectation that the care and protection of our children cannot be compromised.

The eighth topic raised was that of funders of last resort and institutions that cease to exist. I note the contributions by the member for Charlestown and the member for Newcastle. I make it clear that, under the scheme, participating government institutions may be the funder of last resort for a defunct non-government institution when the government institution is equally responsible for the abuse and has agreed to be the funder of last resort. The government institution will therefore pay the non-government institution's share of redress. If a survivor is abused in an institution that exists but has simply chosen not to participate in the scheme, governments will not be funders of last resort.

This ensures that non-government institutions, where they have the capacity to participate in the scheme, are not given disincentives to do so. The scheme allows non-government institutions to be the funder of last resort with their agreement. This should be done where the non-government institution would reasonably be expected to assume liability for the non-existent responsible non-government institution. For example, where the institution that no longer exists would have fallen under a national body that still exists, that national body would be expected to assume liability for the defunct institution rather than a government stepping in as funder of last resort.

The ninth topic raised was loss of the common law right to sue and deeds of release. I note the comments of the member for Charlestown about the common law rights of survivors. As the member mentioned, if a person accepts an offer of redress they must release the particular institutions from all civil liability for the abuse. The abuser, though, is not released from liability. The release is executed by the survivor signing a deed of release on the acceptance of their redress offer. This requirement is consistent with the royal commission's recommendation that a survivor be required to release the responsible participating institutions from any further future liability for institutional child sexual abuse. The royal commission explained that this is justified due to the nature of the scheme it proposed. This reasoning applies to the National Redress Scheme.

Applicants are not required to deal directly with institutions and can seek an internal review of a determination of redress. Importantly, the scheme will provide survivors with free legal advice prior to them signing the deed of release so that they fully understand the legal implications of signing the deed. A person who is offered redress under the scheme is completely within his or her right not to accept that offer and instead to pursue civil litigation avenues.

The tenth topic raised was that of support services during the application process. The member for Sydney said he would like applicants to be supported during the application process. In response, I highlight that Commonwealth Government funded redress support services will be available to all applicants, including specialised support for Indigenous people, people with disabilities and people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Legal support services will also be made available. The local service provider for the national redress scheme will be Knowmore, the service used by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The scheme will also support referrals for survivors to access existing Commonwealth funded financial counsellors.

The eleventh topic raised was the question of survivors of physical abuse alone, not just sexual abuse. I acknowledge and thank the member for Prospect for his comments and observations regarding the various forms of abuse suffered by care leavers. Last week I was fortunate enough to visit the orphanage museum run by the Care Leavers Australasia Network [CLAN]—I understand the member is a patron—to hear firsthand about the experience of care leavers. I thank the member and CLAN for their continued advocacy and support for care leavers who have suffered abuse. Again, this is a national scheme and the parameters have been set by the Commonwealth and agreed to by all participating jurisdictions so far, including Labor jurisdictions.

The twelfth topic raised was out-of-home care. I note the concerns that the member for Bankstown and the member for Maitland raised. Those matters fall within the portfolio responsibility of the Minister for Family and Community Services and I will leave her to respond in due course. The thirteenth topic, raised by the member for Maitland was counselling. The royal commission learnt an enormous amount about the impacts of child sexual abuse on the mental health and wellbeing of victims and survivors over the course of their lives. The need for counselling and psychological care for survivors was made very clear. The royal commission heard there was overwhelming support for the idea that funding for counselling and psychological care should be provided through redress and thus the royal commission recommended that that provision be a key element of redress. The National Redress Scheme implements that recommendation.

Under the redress scheme States and Territories will elect to provide survivors with access to counselling services from either of two methods. The first method is that the jurisdiction can provide survivors with a tiered, lump sum payment of up to \$5,000 based on the severity of abuse suffered. The second is that the jurisdiction can provide survivors with State-based counselling services according to agreed national service standards for the provision of State- and Territory-based counselling and psychological care. New South Wales survivors who accept redress under the scheme and are residing in New South Wales will be provided with what we consider to be the more generous of those two alternatives—State-based counselling services through New South Wales Victim Services. Victims Services is well placed to deliver counselling to New South Wales survivors by drawing on its existing pool of trauma specialist counsellors through its approved counselling service.

In addition, New South Wales is committed to the national service standards for the provision of State- and Territory-based counselling and psychological care. Under these standards the counselling service is required to make the first point of contact with referred survivors to provide them with information in a non-obtrusive and compassionate manner. Once a survivor has been referred, Victims Services will initiate contact and arrange access to an approved counsellor. Approved counsellors will meet the national standard set for the requisite qualifications and skills as they will all be trauma informed and have the expertise needed to address the more complex needs that might arise amongst survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. Victims Services counsellors will also continue to refer survivors to other appropriate services when the need arises. Victims Services delivery of counselling services will take account of a variety of survivor needs, including those related to disability, gender, sexuality, language and culture.

To summarise, the New South Wales Government has already taken a number of steps in response to the recommendations in the royal commission's redress and civil litigation report. As I mentioned earlier, in 2016 the Government removed the limitation periods from child abuse claims for survivors to launch civil claims for compensation. The New South Wales Government also adopted and improved the Model Litigant Policy to ensure a more compassionate approach to how civil child abuse claims made against government agencies are managed. New South Wales was also the first State in Australia to introduce trained witness intermediaries to help child victims and witnesses of sexual abuse understand questions and convey their answers effectively in criminal proceedings.

The introduction of witness intermediaries is part of a three-year child sexual offence pilot that has been operating in Sydney and Newcastle since 2016. Under the pilot, child victims of sexual abuse pre-record their evidence so that they do not have to endure the stress and trauma of facing their alleged attacker in court. The royal commission has recommended that this reform be introduced nationwide. The New South Wales Government recently announced a criminal justice reform package that will deliver tough laws that reflect the nature of child sexual abuse and the harm it causes. A bill implementing the new laws will be introduced to the Parliament in the coming months.

The reform package includes: introducing new criminal offences, including offences of failure to report and failure to protect children from abuse; strengthening existing criminal offences, including increasing the maximum penalty for persistent child sexual abuse to life imprisonment; changes to sentencing, including requiring courts to apply current sentencing standards for historic child sex offences; and changes to procedure, such as retrospectively repealing an old limitation period that is preventing some survivors from accessing justice today.

These reforms will provide more survivors with the opportunity to seek the justice they deserve and will enable the NSW Police Force to improve its responses and allow police to investigate a broader range of child sexual abuse. The New South Wales Government has accepted in principle the overwhelming majority of the royal commission's criminal justice recommendations. The New South Wales Government has committed to responding to the royal commission's final report in June 2018 as per the commission's recommendation.

The bill before the House will enable New South Wales to fulfil the commitment to participate in the National Redress Scheme for Survivors of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, as recommended by the royal commission. This will ensure that through the National Redress Scheme, survivors of child sexual abuse in

New South Wales government and participating non-government institutions receive the support and recognition they have been denied for far too long. I encourage other States, Territories and institutions that have not yet indicated that they opting in to come to the table and opt in to the scheme to ensure that survivors are provided with redress.

Finally, I take this opportunity to thank those in the Department of Justice and my office, who are too numerous to name—they know who they are and some of them are sitting in the Chamber today—for their diligence and attention to detail in this matter, and for putting up with my foibles, interventions and interference from time to time. I thank and acknowledge the survivors of institutional child sexual abuse, their families and the organisations that work so hard in representing them. Whether those survivors are children or adults, the reality is that for many years they were not acknowledged, were not listened to, or were not believed.

On behalf of the Government, and I think everyone in this Chamber, I thank all survivors for their resilience and determination. We will all continue to work to ensure that we learn from the mistakes of the past. We all acknowledge the harm and suffering experienced by the many thousands of children who have been sexually abused in institutions where they should have been safe. The New South Wales Government will continue to work for them. Their stories have been heard and will not be forgotten. I commend the bill to the House.

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Mr Greg Aplin): The question is that this bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Third Reading

Mr MARK SPEAKMAN: I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Private Members' Statements

BAYSIDE COUNCIL FUNDING

Mr STEPHEN KAMPER (Rockdale) (19:29): I once again highlight the desperate need for additional funding for Bayside Council to compensate our community for the outrageously corrupt behaviour that was allowed to occur at the former City of Botany Bay. When the Government announced the forced amalgamation of councils it promised that it would bear the cost of the mergers and that the projected benefits would go to the local communities affected. In Bayside the ratepayers have been left with the burden of cleaning up a mess that was not detected for years by the Department of Local Government. It will cost local residents upwards of \$17 million to clean up, including the cost of implementing systems and practices so that this can never be allowed to happen again, to cover the ongoing legal and audit burden, and to compensate the ratepayers for the grossly corrupt conduct of the late Gary Goodman and his associates.

Almost three months ago Bayside Council unanimously agreed to write to the Minister for Local Government to request the Government make good on its commitment to fund the merger process and to provide additional funding to meet this unforeseen shortfall. Disappointingly, Bayside Council is yet to receive a response from the Minister or any other representative of the Government. This is yet another example of those opposite woefully mismanaging council mergers and its lack of respect for local communities. Now that the Government has abandoned many of its originally proposed council mergers—following political pressure—I understand that a significant amount of money that was budgeted for council merger packages and the Stronger Communities Fund remains unspent. This money was previously allocated in the State budget to compensate merged councils. The Government should stay true to its word and provide additional funding to communities such as Bayside that have demonstrable costs above and beyond their initial allocation.

The residents of Bayside were the victims of daylight robbery by a group of corrupt officers and their accomplices. It would go a good way to rebuilding trust in the community if this Government were to take a fair approach and recognise that its department should have implemented better controls to stop this sort of fraudulent behaviour. In addition to the money Gary Goodman and his associates directly stole, *Channel 7 News* recently reported that a long-term contract was signed to provide services to the airport, which is operating at a significant loss every year to ratepayers. That represents a substantial ongoing burden for the council for several years to come. During Operation Ricco it was also revealed that in the past few years of the former Botany Bay Council the Airport Business Unit was being run by Mr Goodman's brother. In fact, its operations were at the heart of the gross corruption brought to light by the Independent Commission Against Corruption [ICAC].

In his end of term report, Mr Greg Wright, the Government's appointed administrator of Bayside Council, acknowledged that the loss from fraud and corruption was well above that reported by ICAC and that the true

extent of the costs to the community may never be known. Mayor Bill Saravinovski and the Bayside councillors are doing their best to deal with these problems, but the time has come for the Government to deliver on its promised benefits of the amalgamation process. We know that money has already been allocated; it is time for the Premier and the Minister for Local Government to do the right thing and deliver for these ratepayers who have been so betrayed by their public officials.

NORTH SHORE ELECTORATE ROAD SAFETY

Ms FELICITY WILSON (North Shore) (19:33): Traffic congestion, transport and road safety are repeatedly raised with me in my electorate. I inform the House about our efforts to improve road safety both in my electorate and across the State. The Government is undertaking significant steps, under the leadership of the Minister for Roads, Maritime and Freight to ensure that road safety is improved. Many people do not realise the frequency with which road accidents occur in New South Wales. Statistics show that on our roads someone is killed or hospitalised in this State every 41 minutes because of a motor accident and that approximately one in three road users report they or someone close to them have been in a serious accident.

In the North Shore community in the five-year period between 2012 and 2016, 255 people have been either killed or seriously injured on our roads. To put this into context, 255 people account for about one-third of the number of pupils enrolled at Mosman High School. The cost of 255 serious casualties to the North Shore community is estimated to be \$122 million. Crashes at intersections contributed to 20.2 per cent of the road toll over a five-year period. Many people think that serious road accidents do not happen in communities such as mine because of the heavy traffic, slow average speeds and long commute times, something that the Government is trying to address. One of the biggest concerns is the impact on pedestrians and in that regard I acknowledge the work of constituent Harold Scruby and the Pedestrian Council of Australia in trying to address this significant concern.

It is vitally important that we take steps to resolve these issues, and to reduce the tragic toll and human impact of these types of accidents. Today I talk about funding recently allocated to three critical road safety projects on the North Shore. First, \$300 000 has been allocated to fund safety improvements at the intersection of Falcon Street and West Street in Crows Nest. This intersection connects the North Shore and Willoughby electorates. Between July 2011 and June 2016, 13 people were taken to hospital after being involved in an accident at this intersection. Situated at this crucial intersection is North Sydney Boys High School, Marist College North Shore and a number of other schools, so it is very important to invest in safety measures at the intersection.

Secondly, \$250,000 has been allocated to fund safety improvements to the Pacific Highway, Falcon Street and Shirley Road intersection at Crows Nest. North Sydney Girls High School, a number of childcare centres and the Mater Hospital are all close to this intersection. Indeed, the intersection is the heart of Crows Nest, a vibrant pedestrian hub. Between July 2011 and June 2016, 14 people involved in an accident at this intersection were taken to hospital. Thirdly, \$350 000 will be spent to improve safety at the intersection of Military Road, Winnie and Murdoch streets, Cremorne. This intersection is very close to another one of my local schools, SCECGS Redlands, which has a junior and a senior campus that straddles Military Road. Many pedestrians use the area, as McDonald's is situated nearby. Between July 2011 and June 2016 where 10 people were taken to hospital as a result of accidents at this intersection. These projects are scheduled to start and to be completed in the financial year 2018-19.

I thank the Berejiklian Government, under the stewardship of Minister Pavey, for taking targeted and proactive steps to improve road safety in New South Wales. I acknowledge her work to address drug-driving, particularly cocaine, and the increased distraction of mobile phone use. I commend her measures to seek to alleviate road accidents because of those misuses. All members would acknowledge the importance of the Road Safety Plan 2021 and legislation to ensure to try to reduce the loss of life of both drivers and pedestrians. Last year 74 people lost their lives in crashes in which a driver or rider had an illicit drug in their system so I congratulate the Government on its legislation. This issue is important to me. I receive a lot of correspondence from constituents concerned about pedestrian safety in particular and I commend the Government for these investments.

WESTERN NSW BUSINESS CHAMBER BUSINESS OF THE YEAR 123 TIX

Mr TROY GRANT (Dubbo—Minister for Police, and Minister for Emergency Services) (19:38): It is with pride that I pay tribute to Mr Terry Wilcher and 123 Tix, an online event ticketing business that has operated from Terry Wilcher's home since 2014. The business was officially launched in 2015 and since that time Terry has run 1,400 events, the majority in the first six months of the 2017-2018 financial year. This new, innovative business, runs events from all over New South Wales, and occasionally interstate. It is generally supported by regional organisations, events and the tourism sector. On Friday 11 May, Terry's business, 123 Tix, was named the Western NSW Business Chamber's 2018 Business of the Year at a ceremony held at Rydges Mount

Panorama in Bathurst. On the night, Terry and the team from 123 Tix also won the Excellence in Small Business award. The judges found that the business had significantly exceeded the annual estimated growth of the industry and that its implementation of sound financial practices, cutting-edge technology and exceptional customer service had assisted it in ensuring triple bottom line sustainability.

The Western NSW Business Chamber covers a large geographical area, representing local chambers of commerce including Dubbo, Lithgow, Bathurst, Orange, Cowra, Parkes, Oberon, Mudgee, Gulgong, Forbes, Canowindra, Grenfell, Condobolin, Coonabarabran, Wellington and Broken Hill. The business environment is extremely competitive in that part of the world. Terry and his team from 123 Tix will now proceed to represent the Western NSW Business Chamber at the New South Wales State finals to be held in November. This is an accomplishment of some magnitude that the entire Dubbo community is very, very proud of. On the night, Terry was one of five winners from the Dubbo Chamber of Commerce. In addition to congratulating Terry and the team from 123 Tix, I congratulate Matt Wright and all involved in the Dubbo Chamber of Commerce, which runs the annual Rhino Awards. The Westhaven Association is our Gold Rhino winner and it was also successful on the night.

This is a demonstration that new, innovative technology, new businesses, and new start-ups do not all happen in the city; many of them emanate from the bush and can operate from anywhere in New South Wales. We are enormously proud of Terry. He is a man who could pretty much talk under water with a mouthful of marbles, but he was so humbled by the acknowledgement on the night that he was speechless. I caught up with him at the Dubbo Show and he was carrying around the trophies with him, such was his pride. I am very proud of Terry and all his team, and I wish them good luck at the State finals.

Mr ADAM MARSHALL (Northern Tablelands—Minister for Tourism and Major Events, and Assistant Minister for Skills) (19:41): I thank the member for Dubbo for bringing to the attention of the House the wonderful work done by Terry Wilcher and the award that he has won for his business, 123 Tix. As the Minister for Tourism, I must admit that I have not heard of the business. But when I am in the Minister's electorate very soon I look forward to catching up with Terry. He deserved to receive the award from the Western NSW Business Chamber. On behalf of the Parliament, I wish him, his business and his team all the very best at the NSW Business Chamber awards in November this year. It is great to see another wonderful innovator in regional New South Wales being highlighted in this place, particularly one who does a great job running, promoting and ensuring that people have enjoyable experiences at many of the wonderful small, medium and large events throughout regional New South Wales in the tourism space. I congratulate Terry and wish him good luck in the State finals.

WALLSEND ELECTORATE ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms SONIA HORNER (Wallsend) (19:42): Congestion in Wallsend has reached crisis levels. Travelling down Newcastle Road during business hours is taking longer and longer, and traffic in the lane to turn right towards Shortland at the Jesmond roundabout often reaches to the crest of the hill at Jesmond. So frequent were the accidents caused by congestion that the speed limit on the main road connecting Wallsend and Newcastle was reduced by Roads and Maritime Services in March from 70 kilometres an hour to 60 kilometres an hour. Our western suburbs population is booming but the traffic infrastructure is not meeting the community's needs.

On 18 April, after the speed limit had been reduced, an accident involving two cars and a garbage truck at Jesmond threatened to cut off Newcastle Road. That would have forced traffic heading from Wallsend to Newcastle to travel through Shortland or Elmore Vale, taking suburban routes ill equipped to deal with that sort of traffic. Those cars would have added to the traffic problems on Croudace Road and University Drive, which are already overburdened. Getting off the John Hunter Hospital campus at peak hour can take up to an hour, and parking around the University of Newcastle is next to impossible at the best of times.

I was contacted several weeks ago by a long-time resident of Shortland whose formerly quiet street is now frequently travelled by trucks wanting to avoid the Jesmond traffic snarl. He said, "I'm worried about having my grandkids around it all. We raised our kids in this area and it has always been sociable and quiet. Now it feels like we're being swamped in traffic. Even trying to drive to the Jesmond shops is getting harder and harder." A woman who has lived on University Drive for 50 years, since it was a no through road, has expressed similar concerns. She said, "My grandkids can't even come over for a visit anymore because there's just no parking. It's gotten worse and worse over time as the university has grown, but this year it has just become staggering."

Stage five of the Newcastle Inner City Bypass will alleviate some of the pressure, but more needs to be done. Vital infrastructure projects, including the transport interchange at Glendale, are urgently needed to help alleviate the traffic problems. Once again, the Federal Government has failed to allocate any funding for this worthy project. The Glendale interchange, which has been acknowledged by Hunter mayors as the most important

infrastructure project in the region, would serve to greatly enhance transport efficiency throughout the western suburbs. Unfortunately, getting it done has been like pulling teeth.

Physical infrastructure is only part of the solution. The changes that have been made to bus routes and timetables in the Newcastle region have been disastrous for commuters, leaving the network completely unworkable for many. Commuters who used to take public transport so they did not have to struggle to find a parking spot are being forced back into their cars. The review into bus services and timetables announced by private operator Keolis Downer must take this into account. In the meantime, the congestion is putting the squeeze on productivity in the local area, with countless hours being lost waiting in traffic. In terms of accessibility for emergency services vehicles, the danger is very real.

In lowering the speed limit on the drive from Wallsend to Newcastle, the Roads and Maritime Services noted that there were more accidents along that stretch than on comparable arterial roads throughout the State. Most of these accidents are a result of congestion. Lowering the speed limit might make it easier for drivers to slam on the brakes and avoid an accident but it does not stop the congestion. The western suburbs transport is failing. We need a comprehensive strategy involving a varied transport mix to address this issue.

POULTRY WELFARE

Mr ALEX GREENWICH (Sydney) (19:47): The Sydney electorate has many strong advocates for animals. Like many members of this House, I have been contacted by a large number of constituents asking me to support a ban on caged eggs. I strongly oppose factory farming, including battery egg production. Caged egg production is incredibly cruel. Layer hens are crammed in cages so small they cannot stretch their wings or perform natural instincts like scratching the ground, perching, dust bathing, roosting, socialising, rearing their young or nesting. They never go outside, exercise, breathe fresh air or see sunlight. Artificial light is used to increase their production of eggs.

They experience intense ongoing mental and physical suffering for their entire life. There is an opportunity to put an end to this cruel and unnecessary form of farming with the code that sets the standards for how commercially farmed chickens are treated: the Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines for Poultry. These guidelines are under review for the first time in 15 years. More than 150,000 people lodged submissions calling for the new standards to ban battery hen cages, reflecting the growing community view that factory farming is inhumane and unacceptable. But there is community concern that industry will trump the process to maintain the status quo.

The New South Wales Department of Primary Industries is running the national review, which is being funded by industry. A number of accusations have been made that the department is working too closely with industry in support of its position to keep battery cage farming. New South Wales is the largest producer of caged eggs in the country and it has been argued that the department has an interest in protecting this cruel farming practice. The process did not include an independent review of the scientific literature on hen welfare and instead relied heavily on industry papers.

Supporting documentation for the review included claims that extra cage space does not guarantee better welfare and that battery cages allow for better inspection, and reduce biosecurity risks as well as environmental impacts. There was no acknowledgement of the mental suffering battery hens experience from not being able to act out their natural behaviours. Recommendations put forward did not include a ban, although the department has said that this will be considered. Governments of Western Australia, the Australian Capital Territory and Victoria have raised concerns about the process and Victoria is doing its own review of the literature.

Consultation has closed and final recommendations will soon be put to Australian agricultural Ministers. I hope that the accusations are unfounded and that the review, under the lead of this Government, will put an end to the cruel era of battery cage farming. Other jurisdictions are taking the lead. Battery hen farming is banned in Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. New Zealand will phase out battery hen eggs by 2022 and Canada will do so by 2032. In the United States of America, Ohio has imposed a moratorium on battery hen farming and battery hen cages are illegal in Michigan. In the United States Walmart and McDonald's have committed to phasing out the use of cage eggs, which will result in a significant increase in the welfare of layer hens in that country. Businesses here are making similar moves. Coles commenced a phase-out in 2013 and Woolworths and Aldi are committed to banning the sale of all caged eggs by 2025. This represents a growing consumer trend towards free range and organic farming.

The standards review is examining all forms of poultry farming, not just battery egg farming. Farming standards for broiler chickens, turkeys and ducks also are under review. Those animals endure appalling suffering under existing standards that do not let them act out their natural behaviours. They are crammed into dirty, dark and poorly ventilated sheds covered in faeces. They are pumped with antibiotics to ward off disease and

infection—a problem that is also contributing to antibiotic resistance and superbugs. Selective breeding to speed up growth means some birds cannot hold their weight, let alone walk to feed or hydrate themselves. Ducks are not given a body of water even though they naturally need to spend time in water.

I hope that the review takes a humane approach and results in Australia stamping out all cruel poultry factory farming. Factory farming is sanctioned animal torture in the name of profit. Live sentient beings should not be subject to such extensive and intense misery. With such a groundswell in community support for a ban on the battery cage eggs, leadership of the major supermarket chains and the nationwide process that involves governments from both major parties, there is an opportunity to ban battery hen cages with minimal adverse political consequence. I call on the Government to ban cage egg farming as well as other cruel poultry farming and make the State's agricultural industry more humane.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS

Mr JOHN SIDOTI (Drummoyne) (19:52): I take this opportunity to talk about the 10,000 Italian Roses Project and the Mammone for Mother's Day social marketing campaigns. These campaigns are being led by the NSW Multicultural Health Communication Service in partnership with Co.As.It., BreastScreen NSW and the University of Technology Sydney [UTS]. I formally recognise in this House the contribution that these campaigns are making towards raising awareness about health and wellbeing in multicultural communities. The 10,000 roses campaign aims to raise awareness about breast screening among the Italian community in New South Wales. My very own electorate of Drummoyne is home to many constituents of Italian heritage—in fact, it has one of the highest number of Italians in the State. That is why I wholeheartedly support this cause. Currently, just over 10,000 women of Italian background between the ages of 50 to 74 years old have not had a mammogram.

I would like to discuss some facts about breast cancer. One out of eight women will develop breast cancer in their lifetime. It is a myth that only women with a family history of the disease will develop breast cancer. Nine out of 10 women who develop breast cancer do not have a family history of breast cancer. Breast screening through mammograms can detect cancer before it can be seen or felt and 20 minutes every two years could save a woman's life. For women between the ages of 50 and 74, BreastScreen NSW encourages mammograms by offering them for free. There are two mobile locations in the electorate of Drummoyne where women can go to have a mammogram: one in Rhodes during November and one in Concord in December. There are 10 mobile locations throughout metropolitan Sydney this year and three fixed locations for breast screening appointments at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital and in Croydon and Campsie.

Getting a mammogram is now more accessible. Finding breast cancer early improves survival rates. Italian women aged 50 to 74 in New South Wales have one of the lowest rates of participation in the BreastScreen NSW program. That is why the 10,000 Italian Roses project is important. It is an initiative that brings together community leaders, media, stakeholder organisation, survivors, and family and friends interested in promoting breast screening in the Italian community in New South Wales. On Mother's Day, the program launched a special initiative called "Mammoni for Mammograms". "Mammone" means "mamma's boy" and this program encourages all Italian mamma's boys to encourage their mothers to have a mammogram.

Ms Trish Doyle: Are you a mummy's boy?

Mr JOHN SIDOTI: I am a mummy's boy. I took part in this campaign and joined celebrity chef Josh Sama, comedian James Liotta and Cosima DeVito to be "Mammoni for Mother's Day". We all joined forces to produce a YouTube video, which has been posted to Facebook and has gained a lot of traction. This initiative was also endorsed by SBS *World News*, which televised a story on the issue on Sunday night. Whether one is a mamma's boy or a mamma's girl, I put the call out to everyone in the community to encourage their mother to book an appointment for a mammogram. Today I am wearing the 10,000 Italian Roses badge on my suit with pride. I have distributed the badges to my colleagues in Parliament. It is important that we support our multicultural community and break through cultural and language barriers.

The community plays a major part in the running of this project. This is a grassroots campaign that asks members of the family unit to participate and bring together friends to support a common cause—increasing breast screening and breast cancer survival rates in Italian women. The reality is that in some way or another, cancer has affected all of us, and breast cancer is no different. Breast cancer does not discriminate between cultures and that is why it is vital to encourage preventative action. Today in this House I affirm my commitment to the 10,000 Italian Roses project. Many members in this House will have Italian constituents living in their electorates. I encourage these members to become involved and help to raise awareness about breast cancer in their community. Together we can address the alarming statistic of over 10,000 women of Italian background aged between 50 to 74 who have not had a mammogram.

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Mr Lee Evans): Before I call the member for Blue Mountains, I commend the member for Drummoyne for his speech. BreastScreen NSW does a fantastic job. There is one at Erina. Many people do not realise that they can have a free breast screen that could literally save their lives.

LITERACY AND NUMERACY TEACHERS

Ms TRISH DOYLE (Blue Mountains) (19:57): I wish to discuss the workload and its impacts on the lives of our hardworking teachers. It is timely to do so today because students in every school began sitting National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy [NAPLAN] tests to assess their literacy and numeracy. The results will be extrapolated to develop league tables that pit schools, teachers and students against one another. NAPLAN, it is almost universally agreed, is a flawed assessment tool and its statistics are unhelpful in tracking and even measuring students' learning and the quality of teaching in our schools. The only thing NAPLAN does well is pit student against student, teacher against teacher and school against school. Labor has been on the record for over 18 months explaining the problems with NAPLAN and was steadfastly opposed to the attempt by the Government to tie NAPLAN results to the eligibility of students to sit the Higher School Certificate [HSC].

Year 9 students were required to achieve minimum NAPLAN band 8 in literacy and numeracy in order to "prequalify" for the HSC that they would sit in another four years. As predicted, more than half of year 9 students failed to meet the minimum standards in 2017. Thank goodness this Government listened to the Labor Opposition—and in particular our shadow Minister, Jihad Dib—and dumped the policy. The teaching profession has been in the news lately because of fairly ignorant and unhelpful comments by Federal Liberal member of Parliament Andrew Laming.

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Mr Adam Crouch): Order! I remind the member for Blue Mountains that private members' statements must be about members' electorates. I have been listening to the member and she has not mentioned her electorate once.

Ms TRISH DOYLE: Mr Laming wondered aloud on his Facebook page where all the teachers were in January, when students were away for the summer holiday. The implication seemed to be that they were off bludging and not working. Many teachers in the Blue Mountains were upset by the statement. This breathtaking ignorance would be funny if it were not so fundamentally disrespectful. It is an oft-repeated claim that the best thing about teaching is the holidays. The only people who make such a claim are those who have not set foot in a classroom or a schoolyard since the last day of their own schooling.

Teachers are at work before most parents have left the house. That means they have to get their own kids ready and out the door early as well. Most teachers work through their lunch break and every teacher must do hours upon hours of unpaid lesson planning, marking, excursions and after-school activities. On top of that, a teacher must be expert in their subject matter, act as an accidental counsellor of distressed or unhappy students—and often their parents—who bring with them to school the baggage of their home lives. Teachers also work as unofficial bureaucrats on behalf of the Department of Education, doing usually unpaid, busy work and administrivia that falls well outside their remit as educators.

A recent University of Sydney study of 18,000 public school teachers and principals across New South Wales found that 97.3 per cent reported an increase in administration duties over the past five years and that more than 95 per cent were spending more time on analysing and reporting data. That goes back to the pointlessness and, in fact, the counterproductivity of NAPLAN. Instead of educating students, teachers are enslaved to a bureaucracy that prioritises everything other than students' learning. A Blue Mountains constituent, himself a teaching veteran of some 34 years, contacted me recently to express his frustration at the workload that he and his son, who is also a teacher, face. He said:

I have been a teacher for 34 years and I have never thought of resigning until now. The workload, stress and hours I am doing is taking a huge toll on my health and my relationship with my family. However, I feel trapped. Who is going to employ a 56-year-old teacher who wants a career change?

He goes on to say:

My son is a young high school teacher who is four years out of university. He said to me that he doesn't know how long he can sustain the stress of his job. He is considering an exit from teaching after four years. The education system will lose him. It's a real shame to see many young and talented teachers leave the profession because of intense workloads. The real core of teaching is being overrun by useless paperwork that does not improve the outcomes for students. The pressure placed on us by our principals has now become a real work health and safety issue. The stress is literally unbearable for most of us, as you are well aware.

Tonight I give voice to my teaching colleagues' concerns and angst. [*Time expired.*]

Mr ADAM MARSHALL (Northern Tablelands—Minister for Tourism and Major Events, and Assistant Minister for Skills) (20:02): I thank the member for Blue Mountains for acknowledging the work of the thousands of wonderful teachers across our public, independent and Catholic systems and their commitment

to bettering the lives of students through educating them in the classroom and developing them as young people who can find their niche and contribute to society.

Ms Anna Watson: Say it like you mean it.

TEMPORARY SPEAKER (Mr Adam Crouch): Order! The member for Shellharbour will cease interjecting.

Mr ADAM MARSHALL: Say it like I mean it? My partner is a public school principal—my goodness. I was trying to say something complimentary about the member for Blue Mountains because she made a very important point that I endorse. I thank her for her contribution because it is important to acknowledge the role that teachers play not just in our schools but also in our communities.

ALBURY ELECTORATE TOURISM

Mr GREG APLIN (Albury) (20:04): To an audience that lives in the crowded city of Sydney, where almost all features of natural beauty are accessible—indeed, swamped by people seeking active recreation—it can come as a surprise to hear that much of the Murray River, even where it passes through towns and regional cities, is effectively out of bounds. For decades, there has not been the money to push through to the riverfront and develop the necessary parks and facilities. Now we have a government in New South Wales which is pouring funding into the regions. On 4 April 2018, I was pleased to announce that more than \$11 million in funding from the New South Wales Government will be used to create new tourism precincts stretching from Albury to Tocumwal along one of the State's most iconic river systems—the Murray River.

Along the border, three councils are working with the New South Wales Government to develop a brand-new tourism corridor named the Murray River Regional Experiences. Each council has put forward its own major suite of connected projects. In Albury, the Riverside Precinct with Parks and Wetlands Redevelopment will provide an all-access boardwalk along the Murray, better access to the playground at Oddies Creek, revamped parking infrastructure, viewing platforms, erosion protection, more pathways along the Wagirra Trail and an Education and Experience Centre for Wonga Wetlands. Walking and cycling trails will link the elements.

The Berrigan Shire Council's Tocumwal Foreshore Activation and Economic Revitalisation project will reconnect the town of Tocumwal to the river. Eagerly awaited are the splash park project, a second-storey addition to the Tocumwal Visitor Information Centre, and funding for streetscape works near the Deniliquin Street roundabout. Federation Council will develop its Corowa-Mulwala trail and Foreshore Project with a new 43-kilometre walking trail along the Murray River. A boardwalk and riverside walking track in Corowa will join a cafe in Rowers Park, an adventure playground at Bangerang Park—including an accessible amenities block—a boat ramp at Lions Park and surrounding landscaping and river regeneration.

Together, these projects create what we expect will be the ultimate river tourism experience in New South Wales. They will open the river, the riverside, and various wetlands and parks to become one of the State's must-see river tourism trails. There will be a major expansion of ways in which locals, tourists, and those engaging in regional or national sports events will incorporate the Murray River into their tournaments or recreation. From boardwalks and walking and cycling trails, to places to park the car: Landscape will be shaped for man-made lagoons, billabongs and picnic facilities.

These projects will generate a huge return on investment, attracting an estimated additional 365,000 tourists to the region each year. It is not hard to see the line from this carrying on right through local regional economies, directly creating new local jobs in the tourism, hospitality and sports industries. There will be more for people to see when they come to the river, more to do and more reasons to stay longer—sampling regional foods and wines, shopping and so on. The \$11 million is coming to the border from the Regional Growth—Environment and Tourism Fund. Participating councils are contributing a further \$9 million to make this a \$20 million project. I am sure that will be only the start.

This is one of those serious plans that has the capacity to stimulate private investment in hospitality, retail and sports facilities that will spring up or expand in the adjoining regional communities, towns and cities. The whole project ties in with the New South Wales Government's Sport and Recreation Plan for the Riverina Murray, 2018 to 2023. The aim is to promote "a vibrant and valued sport and active recreation sector that enhances the lives of the people of NSW".

The starting point for the plan is the shift of regional sport and recreation from a classic "one size fits all" approach to one that is more place-based: Look first at the assets, the geography and the people, before determining where to spend these large sums of money. Outcomes are clearly delineated: increased participation, improved access, integrated performance pathways, fit-for-purpose facilities, effective collaboration across the sports and active recreation sectors and, to a degree, the promotion of valued regional sports events. All of these

outcomes, I believe, are writ large in the Murray River experience. What we are seeing on the border is cooperation between councils. Some might say this should always be happening, of course.

Today we are seeing how the New South Wales Government can support, through its strong economic growth, a plan that transcends boundaries and makes sense. There is no doubt the Murray River Experience will, when developed, attract tourists and travellers from across the three council areas. There is no doubt it will lure travellers from Sydney. And there is no doubt it will bring economic benefit to regional New South Wales and to north-east Victoria. We are not being selfish or parochial. The New South Wales Government, through the Regional Growth Fund, is in the process of transforming the possibilities for living and working in Albury and along the shared border. Whether it is the Active Kids program and vouchers, or grants for the Murray River Experience, New South Wales is the place to be.

Mr ADAM MARSHALL (Northern Tablelands—Minister for Tourism and Major Events, and Assistant Minister for Skills) (20:09): I thank the member for Albury for his contribution and for drawing the attention of the House to the wonderful investment being made by the State Government through the \$300 million Regional Growth – Environment and Tourism Fund. As members have heard tonight, the fund is unlocking the potential of communities in the member's electorate to attract thousands of extra visitors from our wonderful southern neighbours and from Sydney and other parts of the State. Having toured that area a number of times with the member for Albury, I know he is very proud of his region—and rightly so. Having seen the offerings to which he referred, I have no doubt that those investments by communities, councils and the State Government will be hugely successful and will certainly attract thousands of extra tourists and millions of extra dollars to the region.

**The House adjourned, pursuant to standing and sessional orders, at 20:10
until Wednesday 16 May 2018 at 10:00.**