



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

29 May 1991

Wednesday, 29 May 1991

Alliance Government : Special adjournment (Ministerial statement)	2125
Chief Minister	2153
Alliance Government : Special adjournment	2154

Wednesday, 29 May 1991

MR SPEAKER (Mr Prowse) took the chair at 10.30 am and read the prayer.

ALLIANCE GOVERNMENT : SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT
Ministerial Statement

MR KAINE (Chief Minister): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a statement on the future of the Government.

Leave granted.

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, for a year and a half there has been in place an Alliance Government governed under the terms of an accord which originally 10 members of this Assembly signed and agreed to. In recent months there have been increasing tensions within the Alliance in that some members of it have found difficulty holding to the Government's policy line on some issues. I think some of those have become obvious - the school sites issue, the casino, the lease tenure problems, and matters of that kind.

This morning the non-Residents Rally members of the Government met and passed a resolution to the effect that, in their opinion, they could no longer work in government with the members of the Residents Rally because members of that party have chosen to take a different track in terms of government policy and have declined to accept the normal impositions of being in government and holding to the policy line of the government. The resolution also concludes that the accord is now terminated and the Alliance is therefore also terminated.

An incident occurring in the gallery -

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, there seems to be a misapprehension that because of that there will no longer be an Alliance Government in some other form. That is quite wrong. All that it means, Mr Speaker, is that the remaining two members of the Residents Rally, of the four original members of this Assembly, are no longer a part of the Government.

29 May 1991

Mr Speaker, I think that raises the issue of whether or not this Assembly should continue to meet today. I, of course, now have to reconsider the executive arrangements of the Government. I think that it would be unwise and, indeed, almost impossible for the Assembly to continue to meet today, and accordingly I move:

That the Assembly, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday, 4 June 1991.

Mr Speaker, I move:

That the question be now put.

Mr Moore: I take a point of order. Under the standing order providing for the motion that the question be put, you have the prerogative to deny that when it is inappropriate. I consider that this is certainly a most inappropriate time. It is a matter that ought to be debated. I would suggest that you use your prerogative as Speaker under that standing order to consider that motion now out of order.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you for your observation on that, Mr Moore. I overrule you.

Question put:

That the question be now put.

The bells being rung -

MR SPEAKER: Order, members! I believe that Mr Duby is at a court hearing this morning; so perhaps we could dispense with the bells.

The Assembly voted -

AYES, 6

Mr Humphries
Mr Kaine
Ms Maher
Mrs Nolan
Mr Prowse
Mr Stefaniak

NOES, 10

Mr Berry
Mr Collaery
Mr Connolly
Ms Follett
Mrs Grassby
Mr Jensen
Dr Kinloch
Mr Moore
Mr Stevenson
Mr Wood

Question so resolved in the negative.

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (10.39): We have come to the end of what I have considered to be an extraordinarily shameful era in ACT self-government. We have seen the end of a shameful government in a shameful manner - in an attempt to deny members of this Assembly the right even to debate the issue of government. As I say, it is a shameful end. I think that Mr Kaine - and I believe it is uncharacteristic - has behaved in a shameful manner in this matter.

I am prepared to support him in his bid to adjourn the Assembly until next Tuesday. I think it is appropriate that he should have time to make other arrangements in all of the circumstances. But it is a disgrace to deny members of this chamber an opportunity to debate the fall of the Government. It is ridiculous and it is outrageous, like so much that has been attempted under the Alliance.

The arrangement that we have seen with the Alliance Government has wrought more destruction on the ACT community than I would have believed possible in the 18 months or so of its existence. The most notable destruction has been of confidence in the democratic system. Under this Alliance politicians and political parties have come merely to represent broken promises. The very confidence of people in the members that they elected has been eroded to a point where I do not believe, for some members opposite, it is retrievable; and that is shameful. That has been brought about by the actions of this Alliance Government.

If we look at some of the destructive actions that they have taken in the ACT community, we really need look no further than their devastation of the education system in our community. Under this alliance we have seen schools closed, quite clearly against the wishes of the community. We have seen protesters, legitimate protesters, arrested because they objected to that action. We have seen virtually the entire ministry out of Canberra at a vital time in that process and just abandoning their responsibilities.

We have seen indecent haste in this Alliance's attempt to sell off and redevelop those school sites for the profit of developers, with no regard whatsoever for the education of the children affected, no regard whatsoever for the community's legitimate interest in those facilities and, of course, no regard whatsoever for their own mandate as a government. They never had a mandate to do that, and it is disgraceful that they attempted for so long to carry out their own wishes in that regard.

In the health area, also, we have seen a disgraceful erosion of the standard of health service and facilities that Canberra has enjoyed. Under this Government we have seen the Royal Canberra Hospital run down and closed in a way that has totally failed to protect the health interests of our Canberra community. We have seen, in this chamber,

29 May 1991

time and time again, the Minister unable to answer questions on the Ambulance Service, on the number of beds available, on what services are available; and unable and unwilling to assist when constituents have raised legitimate problems with the health service. Instead, he has chosen to criticise those very constituents.

We have seen the health budget blow out to an extent that the Chief Minister, the Treasurer, acknowledged yesterday as being \$17m on the recurrent budget, with no attempt by the Minister or the Treasurer to take control of that situation. We have seen the hospitals redevelopment project proceed, again with indecent haste, and again without the best interests of the Canberra community in mind.

Nowhere have they considered the people who might need to use that service, the people who might need emergency services through the night, the people who might need ambulances. They are at the bottom of the heap as far as this Alliance has been concerned. They have bored on with their own agenda, their own Liberal agenda, for the privatisation of the ACT health service. That agenda has been what has driven the Health Minister and the Treasurer, not the interests of the ACT community.

Most recently, of course, we have seen the Alliance attempt to destroy the very basis of our leasehold system in the ACT. I want to be quite clear; the ACT land is a community asset. It does not belong to the Liberal Party, to the Alliance Government, to any of the developers around town, or to anybody other than the ACT community. Their interests must be paramount.

What we have seen under this shameful Alliance is an attempt to, in effect, give away the farm - not even to sell it off, but to give it away to the developers. They have given an undertaking and announced an undertaking to renew commercial leases without a premium. Not only does that cost us money now, not only does that mean that we, in effect, lose control of our leasehold system to the whim of the developers; what that means is that future generations of Canberrans will be doing without the premiums that would otherwise have been paid on the renewal of those leases. It is a shameful decision, not just for the present, not just because it compromises the interests of the community at the moment, but because of its total lack of vision. It compromises well into the future the revenue base of this Territory and the community's interest in its major asset, namely, its land.

What we have seen, Mr Speaker, is a government hell-bent on implementing those sorts of policies - policies aimed at the destruction of our community - and what we have seen is a willing and cooperative partner in that Alliance - namely, the Residents Rally - seeking to wriggle out of their own policy obligations in respect of all of those matters. Their members have chosen policy directions for

the Rally, as is the legitimate way to develop policy. It is the way that my party does it. Their elected representatives time and time again have sought to deny that policy, have sought to prop up the Liberal agenda. That is exactly what they have done.

Mr Speaker, we have come to the point this morning where Mr Kaine has sacked his Rally comrades, and I say: It is about time; it is not before time. Under this destructive Alliance, which the Rally has been a willing partner in up until this point, we have seen the Canberra community, our facilities, our assets, eroded and degraded.

Mr Collaery: How many schools did you reopen in your seven months, Rosemary? How many of Ros Kelly's closures did you reopen? Not one. You are a hypocrite.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr Collaery, please!

MS FOLLETT: Mr Speaker, I ask that that be withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, I would ask you to withdraw that, Mr Collaery. We do not want the debate degenerating, please.

Mr Collaery: Certainly, Mr Speaker; but I thought we had allowed that term.

Mr Berry: Just withdraw it and sit down.

MR SPEAKER: Let us keep it calm, please.

Mr Collaery: Well, we have allowed it on the record in the past.

MR SPEAKER: I recognise that in the past, but today is - - -

Mr Collaery: There should not be an exception, Mr Speaker. I seek your ruling, consistent with your previous rulings. I have been called a hypocrite and you have allowed that on the record. I ask you to allow that word to remain on the record. It is on the record throughout *Hansard* in the last year.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Collaery, I do not wish to debate this with you. I will review the *Hansard* for previous occasions on which I allowed it. Please allow the debate to go on without the acrimony. Please proceed, Ms Follett.

MS FOLLETT: Has he withdrawn, Mr Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: He has not. I will review the *Hansard*.

MS FOLLETT: Thank you. Well, if we have raised the question of hypocrisy, I think that the reason why Mr Collaery is obviously so touchy on the point of hypocrisy is that he has constantly, throughout the past 18 months, throughout the duration of the Alliance, been called a

29 May 1991

hypocrite. He and his Rally colleagues have been accused of hypocrisy over the school closure debate, of hypocrisy over the commercial lease renewal matter and, of course, of hypocrisy, gross hypocrisy, over the closure of Royal Canberra Hospital.

Who does not remember, who could have forgotten, the stance of the Residents Rally during the election period on issues like that? Who could have forgotten their attempting to take the high moral ground, their attempting to persuade the Canberra community that they would protect us from that sort of thing? That was the very basis of their standing for election, particularly on the land and planning matters. The hypocrisy, I am afraid, has been glaring on the part of Rally members.

Mr Speaker, as far as the Labor Party goes, as I say, I am delighted to see the end of this Alliance. It has been a shameful era in ACT self-government. It has been an era directly attributable to the actions of the Residents Rally. I know that they are going to try to say now that they did this to save us all. Rubbish! They could have saved those schools from closing a year ago. They could have saved Royal Canberra Hospital from closing if they had only stuck to their policy. They did not. They chose instead to go into government; to take the perks of office; to deny the Canberra community any sort of access to this decision making and to go along, at every point, with the agenda of the Liberal Party.

The Residents Rally stand condemned for having brought ACT self-government to this parlous state of affairs. They have now been sacked by Mr Kaine. I applaud his sacking of them. I wish he had done it a year and a half ago. They did not deserve that much of a run in government. They were not worthy of it. They made no attempt to protect the Canberra community at any point in their period in government. They have been sacked now, and I am glad.

MR KAINE (Chief Minister) (10.49): Mr Speaker, I had not intended to debate this motion and I think that - - -

Mr Moore: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the Chief Minister moved the motion and his speaking now would close the debate. I am happy to grant him leave to speak now without closing the debate.

MR KAINE: If there is any doubt, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to speak to my motion.

Leave granted.

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, I had not intended to speak to it and I think, from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in opening her speech, that obviously she misunderstood. This is a procedural motion and following it there will be an adjournment motion which I expect everybody to debate. I did not expect the debate to take

place on this motion, which is merely a procedural motion. However, since the Opposition has chosen to debate it, I am quite happy to do that and to take up some of the points that the Leader of the Opposition has made.

I think it is fair to say that 18 months ago the members of the Alliance went into government with good intentions, with high ideals and with a series of policies which I firmly believe were for the good of this community. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition would take this opportunity to vent her spleen, having been removed from office and having spent 18 months in opposition. This is an opportunity for her to do that and I am quite happy for her to do so. It is not the first time that the same tirade has been presented to the Assembly.

The fact is, however, that the Opposition, both when they were in government and in opposition, have refused bluntly to face up to the economic and financial realities that confront the Territory. It simply is not true that we can maintain the old education system, the old health system and all of the other systems that were in place when we were granted self-government at those levels of expenditure, because the money simply is not there. That is a matter of fact, a matter of reality.

In two days' time there is to be the second meeting of the Premiers Conference since I became Chief Minister, and the Commonwealth made it quite clear that it was reducing the amount of money that it was prepared to put into the Territory. That meant that we had to reduce our expenditures. As Treasurer, I made an adjustment, a responsible adjustment, in this year's budget of \$80m. That consisted partly of putting up the revenue that we were receiving and partly reducing the expenditure side of the budget. I believe that they were responsible decisions, and they were decisions that were made in the interests of this community. Mr Keating talks about pain and he is talking about the economy at large in Australia. We are very much a part of that economy and we have the added burden of a reduction in Commonwealth money to be spent in this Territory. You cannot make change without some pain.

I know that there has been a resentment against closing the schools. I know that there is a resentment against closing the Royal Canberra Hospital. But the fact is that we could never afford three hospitals in Canberra, even when the third hospital was built. The Commonwealth knew that. Anybody who sits down and examines the health delivery system in Canberra today must acknowledge that we cannot afford and we do not need three hospitals.

Now, you can take a different view. I accept that you have a different view, and I respect your right to express it. But I happen to be the Treasurer and I have had to make what I believe were the necessary decisions to get our financial house in order. I did it with schools; I did it

29 May 1991

with the health system. Unfortunately, after next Friday, when the Premiers Conference makes their second determination about funding of the ACT, we have then to produce another budget for 1991-92 and the difficulties are going to be just as great. They are not going to go away. It is all very well when you are in opposition to say, "We will leave the schools open; we will close no hospitals; we will maintain the existing expenditures". The fact is that that cannot be done. It is like your own domestic budget. If you are earning only \$1,000 a year, you cannot spend \$1,500 unless you go and borrow it, and that gives you a debt that you must repay in the future.

If you think that is the way to go, look at Victoria, look at Tasmania, look at Western Australia. They are in ruin financially because they took that option. They maintained expenditure which they could not afford. They went and borrowed; they created enormous public debt which they are now being held to account for. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that is the responsible way to go, and if the people in the visitors gallery, who are here obviously because they support the Labor Party, think that that is the reasonable and responsible way to go - - -

Mr Wood: They support their schools.

Mr Moore: They support their schools and the hospital. The schools, the hospital and the leasehold system.

Mr Wood: And their community.

Mr Moore: That is what you do not understand.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR KAINE: I will rephrase it. If they believe that what the Labor Party is promising can be presented in due course, they are wrong. It cannot. You, in opposition, if you become the Government, cannot maintain the school system at past levels of expenditure; you cannot maintain the hospital system and the health system at past levels of expenditure, because the money is not there. That is the bottom line.

Mr Connolly: You just watch.

MR KAINE: We will watch all right, with great interest. You cannot wave a wand and produce money. We know what our revenue is. The Commonwealth Grants Commission has acknowledged that our revenue now is similar to that raised everywhere else in Australia. We are not being subsidised on the revenue side of our budget. There is no further possibility of a significant increase in taxes and charges in the ACT. If Rosemary Follett, as Treasurer, attempts to do that she will be told by the community, "That is not acceptable. That is an unacceptably high level of taxation compared to what everybody else in Australia pays".

So, you cannot increase your revenue and you have a reduced expectation of money from the Commonwealth. The conclusion is that you have to reduce the expenditure side of your budget. If you are not going to close a hospital that you do not need and cannot afford, and if you are not going to attack the education budget - you cannot achieve the order of magnitude of savings that are required by just looking at the administrative elements of the education system; there is simply not enough money in that category to do it - you have to start looking at and making the hard decisions.

That is what this Government has done, and while I am Treasurer and Chief Minister I will continue to take that responsible view. I know that it is unpopular in some quarters, but I am prepared to make those hard decisions and I am prepared to take the criticism of the people who suffer from them. I have done it already for a year and a half and I will continue to do that. I will remain responsible and I will not put this Territory into the financial pit that Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia are in.

I believe that that is responsible. I believe that it is prudent. I believe that if anybody really analyses the facts they cannot criticise that view. I restate that the view put forward by the Labor Party in opposition, that they are simply going to restore what was in place two years ago, is a pipedream. They cannot deliver on that promise. I think that if the electorate believes that they can they are going to be sadly disappointed.

The fact is, Mr Speaker - and we can debate this for days on end, I am sure - that within the Alliance there were, right from the beginning, different views about what should be done and how it should be done. I think that for 18 months we have provided stable government. We have provided good government. We have made responsible decisions. The time has come when some members of the Alliance find that they can no longer work within the constraints of government, that they cannot agree with the rest of the members of the Government on what should be done. When we come to that point you must accept that we have come to the parting of the ways.

The members of the Rally have now to determine how they are responsibly going to approach the business of being members of this Assembly while not being members of the Government. I have no hard feelings about the Rally. They have different views from mine, just as the Labor Party does. I respect the Labor Party's views. I respect the views of the members of the Rally, but we simply cannot work together any more. What we have done this morning is simply a recognition of that fact. The remaining members of the Alliance will continue to govern as long as we have the confidence of this house.

29 May 1991

It is always open to the members of this house to remove me as Chief Minister, in the next five minutes or the next week or the next month, if that is their wish. I have no great desire to stand here and be the whipping boy for this house or for this electorate for another eight months. If it is the wish of this Assembly and of the electorate that I do so, I will continue to do the job that I was elected to do. I take no great pleasure in it. I take no great pleasure in closing a school or closing a hospital, and, if anybody thinks that, then they do not know me. But I will continue to provide responsible, prudent government in the interests of this community so long as it is the wish of this community that I do so.

I think that we can get into a political fight here. We can rip each other to shreds. We can destroy each other's integrity and character and honour. If that is the wish of this Assembly, then I am prepared to sit here and listen to it; but I will be greatly disappointed if the debate degenerates into that kind of a debate.

MR COLLAERY (11.00): I stand as a normal member of this Assembly again. I am relieved to be standing where I am. I am pleased that I can now move to the cross benches and move on those issues that have so interested us. I am sure that the Labor Party will have an interest in this in a legitimate political opportunistic way, but they also will stand on their future performance, and their past performance. I am not going to dwell on it, because we have an informed public and they will make their own decisions.

I want to take this opportunity to look back over the last 18 months. I want to take the opportunity to particularly thank the public servants, the many loyal, devoted, hardworking public servants of our ACT Administration who have assisted me with our reform program. I am very pleased to say that the Government has made significant progress in many areas of social justice, social equity and programming in this Territory. If you do not believe me, you only need to go down to the Griffin Centre or to other places, such as disability hostels, to know how the advisings of those public servants and the work we have done together in a collegiate manner are regarded.

I am honoured to have led those people, particularly the dedicated staff in the Community Services Bureau. I never ceased to marvel at the time that hardworking public servants spent in the evenings and on weekends accompanying me to endless meetings and to trouble spots. They assisted me in guiding through legislative reforms such as the rental bond legislation, which was a Rally commitment. Later in the day we will produce a list of those commitments the Rally met. It is quite impressive when you look at it. We will certainly provide that. We have done great things - -

Mrs Grassby: What about the Human Rights Bill?

MR COLLAERY: The Human Rights Bill is on my former ministerial desk right now. It was ready to be introduced. Mr Speaker, I do not want to be diverted from giving thanks where they are due. They are due to a great number of advisers in government; to junior public servants, middle range public servants and senior advisers who stuck through the very strong pressures I put on them. I have been a very demanding Minister. I have wanted performance. I have always got performance. In terms of the Government Law Office, its officers, adjusting to self-government, have had to provide advisings left, right and centre. They have given great support to other Ministers, and they have certainly supported the people of this Territory in any number of ways. We have never had, in my experience, leaks, disaffection or any hallmark of an unhappy department.

I move now to the statutory authorities and the independent agencies, such as the Housing Trust. We have done a lot of work there. There have been a lot of reforms done. There is more to be done, and a great challenge lies there for my successor. I wish him or her well. We took community policing initiatives. The Community Policing Committee is up and running, and we have a responsive and respected police force in the Territory close to the community. Those things were done and I thank those who worked with me doing them.

Sadly, we have come to a parting of the ways with the Liberal Party and the Independents. So be it. Let history judge the bases behind it and the reasons for it. But you can be assured, you can be absolutely assured, that there will be no development of Cook, section 13, blocks 1, 6, 7 and 8; there will be no development of Lyons, section 41, block 1; there will be no development of that beautiful Holder site; there will be no development at Hackett and none at Curtin. The community should understand the very high price the Residents Rally has paid to protect those sites.

Mr Connolly: You got the sack. You did not resign.

MR COLLAERY: Yes, I got the sack for saving their schools, but I am not ashamed of it. I am not ashamed of that; I am proud of it. I do regret that the Community Advocate Bill, which I have been very excited about for the last few months and which was due to be introduced in the next fortnight - it will set up a mental health advocate, a guardianship role for our many elderly people in hostels and our youth advocate role - is now on the table and unsure of its direction. There are many other Bills that are just about ready. There was a harvest to be reaped. There is the adoption Bill, which we just got through; the Discrimination Bill, which is on my desk upstairs; the fair trading legislation and the legislation on wills. Many Bills have been drafted and my successor will reap that harvest. I trust that whoever that is will in good conscience introduce those necessary social reforms.

29 May 1991

Finally, Mr Speaker, it is a difficult task being a community based party.

Mr Moore: And you failed.

MR COLLAERY: Mr Moore can well laugh. It has been a very difficult and arduous time for my colleagues, Dr Kinloch and Norm Jensen - my brothers, my comrades; the people who stuck with me right through everything we have had to go through. I am very proud to have worked with those two. I am very pleased that Dr Kinloch has announced his intention to rerun for politics.

Mr Berry: A trail of damage and destruction.

MR COLLAERY: Mr Speaker, the Labor Party denies me the courtesy and the dignity of making this speech. Well, that is their style. They want to take their pound of flesh now because they have a dismissed Minister before them. So be it. It is not the first knock that any of us have got in life. Never forget that those who work for you can always end up being your boss. I have never forgotten that in life. That is the way I approached those subordinates that I have directed in the last 18 months.

Mr Speaker, the role of a community party is very awkward. I recall saying to Janine Haines on a flight to Adelaide, before she went to Kingston and her nemesis, that she should not give preferences to either of the major parties. The Democrats in Western Australia wanted to give their preferences to Liberals, because of WA Inc., and Janine was trying to win the Labor seat from Gordon Bilney. They had a cross.

The fact of the matter is that the Rally did not give preferences in the last election. We stayed and supported Rosemary Follett's minority Government for seven months and none of our reforms were introduced; nothing was done. The Page school, which lies in rubble today, was not reopened by Rosemary Follett. None of the things we dearly hoped for were done. When we finally went into government to try to get some of our program through - later, when we list it, you will see what we have achieved - we had to make some compromise. That is a fact of life. But compromise does not stretch to destroying those school sites. It does not stretch to bulldozing those beautiful sites and it will not stretch to it now. They are guaranteed. But I trust the school groups know what a huge price it has been in terms of reform, because we have not seen those reforms from the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. There, Mr Speaker, lies the problem of government.

We also went into government with the Liberals in the knowledge that they had a track record, for better or worse, of economic management. We heard a good explanation of that from the Chief Minister a few moments ago and I will not dwell on it. The fact of the matter was that we

had a \$7m deficit in the hospital budget from Mr Berry at the time the crucial decisions on moving a motion of no confidence in Ms Follett were made. That is on the record. For better or worse, we took good advice and, after arduous debate, made decisions which will now stand and for which we will be accountable. I am not ashamed to stand with my two colleagues and be accountable for those things.

I do, finally, make one last point. The cupboard in this Territory is not bare. We have a fairly good capital budget. It is the recurrent budget that has a problem. We have not achieved the recurrent savings we wanted. I have done my best to support, as leader of the Rally, stable economic government in the Territory. I accept the Chief Minister's prerogative to dismiss me this morning. That was not without considered debate through to midnight last night. I was aware overnight that I would be dismissed and I have had the support of those around me.

Mr Speaker, the other point that should be observed at this stage is that the Rally will be up there and running at the next election. We have experience in government - something which no other community party has in this country. I have had the honour to be at many ministerial fora - Attorneys, welfare, national child-care strategy meetings, and many others - where I have bargained and fought for the Territory. I am honoured to have worked with all those Ministers around Australia, those good politicians. There are some around the place that are crook and they bring a bad name on all of us.

I do trust that the experience that I have had will aid and assist the Rally in its resurgence, which was noted at our last annual general meeting. We will bounce back. We have had this experience. We now look forward to strong work on the cross benches, snipping off the various agendas and ideological extremities of the major parties.

MR WOOD (11.10): Mr Speaker, let us be quite clear about today's events. Mr Collaery was sacked. How else may I put it? He was fired; he was booted out; he was dismissed. Mr Collaery did not go voluntarily. He did not, on a matter of principle, resign. At no time did Mr Collaery say to himself, "I can no longer support the policies of this Government. I must, in conscience, go". At no time did that happen. He hung onto that position desperately.

There is no respect accruing to Mr Collaery in this event; there is no glory for him, and he is not a hero. I know that he tries to portray that, as we have seen already, when he speaks to the gallery and turns and smiles at the applause. I doubt that it is for him. Mr Collaery stuck in there long past the time when, on any adherence to principles, he should have gone. He wanted to stay, and the same can be said about the Rally. There is no question about that; the Rally wanted in, and they supported the Government's policies over and over again.

29 May 1991

If you wanted any demonstration of my point you had only to hear the Residents Rally president, David Read, on the radio this morning when he was supporting the Government and the Rally's stand within the Government. They were certainly not going to support our proposals this morning, so both Mr Collaery and the Rally wanted to be part of this Government. He did not resign; they did not resign. They did not stand up on their principles. None of them did the decent thing.

Mr Moore: Except Trevor Kaine.

MR WOOD: Except Trevor Kaine who, according to his principles - and I respect those - said, "I can no longer tolerate this man in my ministry. We have come to a parting of the ways". Mr Kaine has stuck to the principles of the Westminster system and political processes; Mr Collaery did not. Mr Collaery did not sever the link. He did not say, "I can no longer continue"; let me emphasise that.

Mr Collaery: He did, Bill.

MR WOOD: You will now go out and try to portray to the community that you are a hero, that you have now come to the stage where you must stand on your principles. After 18 months of repudiation you will now try to portray it in that way. You cannot succeed because a firing is a firing. You were dumped; so do not try to pretend otherwise. The Alliance has no claim to leadership on the issues that it has espoused, because it has repudiated them repeatedly.

Mr Collaery has no claim to a new, reinvigorated, Rally leadership, because that does not exist. The Rally is thoroughly discredited, and it and its leader have been booted out of the Government. Let me say that so that you understand it - I know that you do understand it - so that you do not now go out into the community and try to portray otherwise. There are no principles in what you have done. There is no integrity and no decency. The Rally is quite discredited. Do not forget that - the community will not - so do not try to maintain any other argument. You have been sacked, and you are thoroughly discredited.

MR JENSEN (11.14): Mr Speaker, today we see a Liberal leader who, unfortunately, was not prepared to consider rationally and discuss the issues relating to some very important factors reflecting the wishes of the people of the ACT.

Mr Wood: So he booted you out.

MR JENSEN: Yes, Mr Wood; Mr Collaery was sacked. But why?

Mr Wood: Because he would not resign; that is why.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr Wood! You have had your turn.

MR JENSEN: No. He was not asked to resign. He was sacked, Mr Speaker, because the Chief Minister decided that the point of view that the Rally was taking in relation to some very important community issues was not in accordance with their philosophies. I seek leave, Mr Speaker, to table a letter from Mr Collaery to the Chief Minister on the issues related to the draft variations to the Territory Plan, which were proposed to be tabled in this house today - a letter in which the comments that were made by the Rally on those variations were provided to the Chief Minister last evening.

Members interjected.

MR JENSEN: Is leave granted, Mr Speaker?

Leave granted.

MR JENSEN: I present the following paper:

Territory Plan - Draft variations - Copy of letter from Mr B. Collaery, MLA, Deputy Chief Minister, to Mr T. Kaine, MLA, Chief Minister, dated 28 May 1991.

Mr Kaine: You also ought to see the date and time stamp that is on it, to see when it was received.

MR JENSEN: I note, Mr Speaker, that the Chief Minister has just indicated that you ought to see the date and time stamp on it, to see when it was received. It would be very interesting, Mr Speaker, because it is up to the Chief Minister to decide how his office operates. That letter was passed into the Chief Minister's office at 3.40 yesterday afternoon. The Chief Minister can sit there and say what stamp was put on it; but I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that that letter was passed to the Chief Minister's office at 3.40 yesterday afternoon - not 9.15, as the date stamp indicates. The Chief Minister, not the Residents Rally, will have to live with that one; there is no doubt about that.

Mr Kaine: That is a good try, Norm.

MR JENSEN: Trevor, you know very well the truth of the matter.

Mr Kaine: Yes, I do.

MR JENSEN: Mr Speaker, the Chief Minister knows very well when that letter was passed to his office. It is a very important letter, and it is interesting that it was not passed immediately to the Chief Minister; but that is something that he has to sort out.

29 May 1991

On Monday evening I listened very carefully to about a 5- to 10-minute wrap-up of the election in New South Wales and the reason why the Greiner Government went from a position of being almost a sure thing to it being close, with the votes still being counted almost a week after the election. As I see it, it was because those members of the Liberal Government in New South Wales failed to listen to the message that was being sent to them by the people of New South Wales. They failed to understand that attacks on the fabric of their society were biting hard and deep. A lot of people in New South Wales kept their powder dry until Saturday when they eventually cast their votes. There was a grave miscalculation, Mr Speaker.

I suspect that, when the chickens come home to roost in February next year, the same thing will be found in relation to the Liberal members of this Government. They were given a clear opportunity, as they were throughout the debates and discussions within government in relation to the schools issue and the hospital issue, to consider alternative proposals. But, Mr Speaker, they chose to ignore them; they chose not to listen to the views of a group within that Government that was clearly in contact with the community. They failed to listen to the views and suggestions that there should be a proper period of consultation in relation to these things. I sent a letter to the Chief Minister - - -

Mr Moore: You voted against it. It is recorded in the minutes.

MR JENSEN: Will you let me finish. Mr Speaker, in relation to the period for consultation, I sent a letter to the Chief Minister advising him that, as a member of his Government, as his Executive Deputy at the time, I considered that he should provide no more and no less than the period allowed for the consultation process in relation to the schools that were closed by the Federal Labor Government. Unfortunately, once again, the Liberal Party has chosen to ignore the advice that came from me. So, be it on its head.

Mr Speaker, I joined the Alliance Government because I felt that it was important, under our Westminster system, to be able to participate fully in that Government. One has to ask Mr Moore how many policies of the Residents Rally he has been able to achieve during his period on the cross bench. I suggest that when his report card is marked he will not be able to point to too many policies.

However, I think we will find that it is quite clear that during the period that the Rally has been part of an executive government, with the Deputy Chief Minister responsible for many very important social justice and social equity policies within the ACT, there has been a major contribution on the part of the Rally leader to the good government of the ACT.

Mr Speaker, during my period as Executive Deputy, I took the opportunity of the availability of and direct access to the members of the bureaucracy to make sure that the community views, concerns and worries about planning and environment issues were directly considered by me. Many round table discussions were held between officials of the ACT Administration, community groups and organisations and me. The Chief Minister knows full well that those sorts of things went on because he was very busy being the Chief Minister; that is what Chief Ministers have to do. It was my role to ensure that the community had direct access to the bureaucracy.

Mr Speaker, I have here a minute which, before I run out of time, I would like to read into the *Hansard* transcript in case there is any doubt as to the delivery of the letter to the Chief Minister's office. It is signed by Joan Hogan, personal assistant to the Deputy Chief Minister, and dated 29 May. It is headed "Delivery of Letter to Chief Minister" and is addressed to Bernard Collaery, Deputy Chief Minister. Attached to it is a note stating, "Chief Minister for information", signed by Bernard and dated 29 May 1991. The minute states:

I refer to the letter dated 28 May 1991 from yourself to the Chief Minister entitled "Draft Variations to Territory Plan".

I placed this letter in the "In" tray at the desk of the Secretary to the Chief Minister at approximately 3.30 pm yesterday, Tuesday 28 May 1991, at which time the Secretary, Sandie Brooke, was sitting at her desk and the Senior Private Secretary, Nia Stavropoulos, was standing beside the desk. I left the Legislative Assembly at 3.40 pm yesterday and did not return until 8.40 am today, Wednesday 29 May 1991.

That letter, Mr Speaker, was delivered to the office of the Chief Minister at that time, as I have indicated. Let the record show that all the Chief Minister had to do was discuss with those members of the Alliance Government who are in the Residents Rally the very well argued points of view and considerations in relation to the draft variations. Comments were made not only about the school sites but about other sites as well. I think the time will come when the Residents Rally position will be fully vindicated.

MR MOORE (11.25): Mr Speaker, Mr Jensen asked a rhetorical question of me, and I shall answer it through you. It was: How many policies have I implemented? I think it would be much better to ask: How many principles have I broken? How many of my policies have I sold out? How many times have I sold out?

29 May 1991

If you want to ask me how many policies I could have achieved from the cross bench with my colleagues had they not sold out, I could answer this way: A hell of a lot more than you were able to achieve within government. At the same time I did not have to undermine, nor did you have to undermine, the trust of the people of Canberra.

Mr Collaery: If you had not quit the Rally, no school would have closed. It was your vote that we missed. Do not forget that, Michael.

MR MOORE: Mr Collaery interjects and blames me for selling out on the people of Canberra. It is certainly not worth a reply because Mr Collaery has simply become an amusement, not even a joke. Had he resigned on principle at any stage, which he ought to have done, there may have been some reason to respect him; but instead he has been fired. The only one who gets any stature out of it is the Chief Minister because he finally could not stand the double-dealing - saying one thing but doing the other, the sort of thing that might well be described as hypocrisy.

The Chief Minister argues about the good decisions and stable government, but it seems to me that we do not necessarily have to have a majority government for stable government. This is the sort of argument that Mr Collaery loves to put, and Mr Read repeated it this morning on the radio when he told the people of Canberra that the Residents Rally would be voting against the motion to withdraw the variations on the schools. At 10.10 this morning that is what the president of the Residents Rally indicated to the people of Canberra; yet we have Mr Jensen and Mr Collaery arguing in this house that, because of their action to protect the schools, they have resigned in some way.

They did not resign; they were fired because of their incompetence and because they have sold out on the people of Canberra. The reality of it is that they are not to be trusted. Whilst I might disagree with Trevor Kaine on many, many things, when it comes to who is to be believed, he is the person who will have the credibility over any member of the Residents Rally. However, I disagree with some things as far as Trevor Kaine goes.

Mr Kaine: You were going well, Michael. What do you have to do that for?

MR MOORE: I have to have a go at anybody when I can. The reality is that the hard decisions that Trevor Kaine talks about making have not been made. It is not a hard decision to sell off the leasehold of the commercial leases, take them away from the community and hand them over to your mates. It is not a hard decision; it is a stupid and bad decision.

The hard part is to say, "Those leases are to be renewed at full premium; but, in order to protect the businesses, we are going to put the leasehold matter back on its appropriate footing and charge rent from that time. We will change it to a rental footing and we could even earmark 50 per cent, for example, of that rental to productivity, not to land speculation". Then you would be making a hard and good decision.

When you are looking at your budget, instead of making what you call hard decisions and attacking the public school system, you ought to be looking at the relationship between capital and recurrent expenditure. Anybody in Canberra who has eyes can see that, as far as welfare goes, we are quite well off from a capital perspective. We have problems with our recurrent budget. A minor adjustment between capital and recurrent expenditure is one method of resolving the problems, but that requires hard decisions. You can certainly do that. It is a possibility, but it is something about which you have given no message.

I know that we are going to disagree on that because it provides advantage to business to continue spending money on the capital budget. There is absolutely no reason why the capital budget cannot be reduced a little and the recurrent budget increased, which would resolve this whole problem of school closures, hospital closures and so forth; but you do not have the guts to make that sort of hard decision.

The decisions that you have made have been possible only because the Residents Rally has been in league with you. But they have finally been booted out and now stand up and say, "Well, we have decided that it was time we went, and we did it only because we stood up". They got caught out trying to grandstand once again. They were caught out trying to grandstand, to see whether they could slowly separate themselves from the Liberals because they realise that they are doing so badly in all the opinion polls, that the people of Canberra are fed up.

Mr DUBY: One per cent.

MR MOORE: Mr One per cent Collaery talks about - - -

Mr DUBY: No, One per cent Moore.

MR MOORE: Mr One per cent Moore? That is not me. I am quite happy to go to an election. Mr DUBY, if you try to picture in your mind the front page of the *Canberra Times* and look at the stature of those people, you, as you sit down, are about right. So, Mr DUBY, I would hardly take any joy in that as far as you are concerned.

Mr DUBY: I am ahead of Dennis.

MR MOORE: Mr DUBY, claiming that you are ahead of Dennis is hardly some cop - and, anyway, I do not think it is true. I do not know how you made that interpretation.

29 May 1991

The reality of the situation is that there were certain principles in the formation of the Residents Rally, the most basic of which, and the first one to be written down, was open and accountable government. When the Residents Rally members went into a coalition - Mr Collaery said that it was not a coalition, that it was an alliance, and nobody was ever able to work out the difference - they made their decisions behind closed doors in the joint party room. Now Mr Jensen seeks to say, "But we did something; we voted in the joint party room". It was behind closed doors; it does not count.

What does count is for the people to read back over the *Minutes of Proceedings* of this Assembly when members of the Residents Rally voted again and again to take away the rights and the valued possessions, amenities and privileges of the people of Canberra. They include the schools, the hospital and the Ainslie Transfer Station. On and on it goes.

Mr Duby: That was my idea.

MR MOORE: It happened time after time. I know that it was Mr Duby's idea; I know that he is proud of the Ainslie Transfer Station decision. But, without the support of Mr Collaery, Dr Kinloch and Mr Jensen, he simply could not have done it. It required their tacit support, and it required the breaking of the principles upon which the Residents Rally was founded and upon which its members were elected. They have failed again and again to understand that there is a major difference between policies and principles; they have never been able to work that out. Because of that, the people of Canberra scoff at them and will continue to scoff at them, particularly over the fact that they did not even have the guts to resign; they had to be fired.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts) (11.33): Mr Speaker, this is an interesting and eventful day in the history of ACT self-government - one which I think will prove to be a very major pivot in the history of self-government, but one which I do not think will necessarily be seen in the same way as some opposite have described it today.

First of all, I want to make it clear that this Government will attempt to continue to govern for as long as it has the support - at least the tacit support, or support by omission - of this Assembly. Mr Kaine has indicated very clearly that he finds no joy, any more than any of the rest of us have found any joy, in making difficult decisions for the people of the ACT, and I do not think there will be any joy in the coming months either. But he, I am sure, understands that the ACT needs to be provided with, if at all possible, stable government over the coming months. It will therefore be our duty and our responsibility to provide that government, if that is physically possible.

That is a matter that ultimately rests in the hands of members of this Assembly. If they decide that this Government should go, it is up to the Assembly to make that decision, and nobody in this part of the Assembly chamber will be surprised at that. But I have to say that, if the stage is reached at some point down the track - some time in the next eight months - where the Assembly decides that it no longer wishes this Government to remain in office, it will be, it seems to me, incumbent on whoever brings that position forward to this Assembly to explain clearly and concisely what the alternatives are.

I have to say, as I have said many times in the past and as I will keep saying until I am blue in the face, that there are no alternatives. There are no alternatives to the forces that are at work on the ACT at the present point in time. I have read the report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and I have been very saddened by it because I know what it means for the ACT.

In the last 18 months I have not enjoyed going to school meetings and being heavily abused at them. I have not enjoyed facing demonstrations and being shouted down at them. I have not enjoyed having to write back to people and say that I cannot take on board their concerns about schools or the hospitals or whatever else. It has not been a pleasure, I can assure you.

However, I do not know what else I can do and remain a responsible Minister of this Territory. I do not see what the alternatives are. Any government with a majority in this chamber would have had to respond to the forces to which this Government has responded. Anything less would have been irresponsible and detracting from the responsibilities that pertain to us when we take up office.

I think we have to ask two questions of those who would call for other governments in the Territory, or those who purport to be the next government of the Territory - and I am looking opposite particularly at this time. We have to ask: What are the alternatives that they propose? How will they deal with the problems that the Territory is currently facing? I do not know the answer, and I expect an answer before those people face the community at the next ACT election, whenever that might be.

It is not enough to say that you oppose school closures; it is not enough to say that we should keep a decrepit and decaying Royal Canberra Hospital North; it is not enough to say that all these community services should remain untouched. You have to spell out how you are going to pay for them, particularly in the environment in which the ACT's funding base has been cut dramatically by a Commonwealth government that is determined to do just that. A clear spelling out of the alternatives is nothing less than the ACT community deserves.

29 May 1991

If those opposite want to take government, even in the next day, they can do so - it is within their power to do so - but they had better explain to the community and to this Assembly how they propose to do so and how they will face the problems that the Territory is currently addressing. I have not seen any indication, particularly on the part of the Labor Party, of what they will do to face these same problems. Where are their alternatives? Where is their plan? We have not seen a breath of it in this place. They are hypocrites to come into this place and pretend that they can solve the problems that we have been tackling for some time.

Mr Speaker, I think we could say many things about the Residents Rally over the last 18 months. I have experienced particularly sharply what I would consider to be actions by members of the Residents Rally that I have regretted. On occasions I certainly have found it very difficult to work with the Residents Rally. I think I should be more entitled than anybody else in this chamber to get up and make very clear how low I feel some actions have been by members of the Residents Rally. Interference in other members' portfolios, for example, has been, I think, quite unacceptable on occasions under the Alliance Government. However, I am not going to do that.

I want to say very simply in finishing, Mr Speaker, that I think what will harm the Residents Rally ultimately will be their perceived lack of consistency. I believe that the Liberal Party's strong stand, its strong maintenance of a position which it has consistently taken and explained to the people of Canberra, which has not wavered - - -

Mr Doby: And the Independents.

MR HUMPHRIES: And the Independents, in fairness. That clear position will stand us in good stead. I believe that at the next election the Liberal Party will increase the number of seats that it currently holds in this Assembly, and I am quite certain, as night follows day, that the Residents Rally will lose seats that it currently holds.

MR STEVENSON (11.40): Rosemary Follett said that the shameful act in this time was the formation of the Alliance Government. That is not correct. The shameful act was - - -

Mr Berry: Here we go. It was on a video.

MR STEVENSON: Indeed, here we go. What we will do, Mr Berry, is go again and again and again and again on the most shameful act, and that was the formation of self-government against the will of the people. Let us look at who did that. The Federal Labor Government and the Federal Liberal politicians - Labor and Liberal politicians - made the decision to ignore the 1978 referendum when 70 per cent of people in Canberra indicated that they did not want this thing called self-government.

Mrs Grassby: What are you doing here then? Why did you not resign?

MR STEVENSON: That was ignored, and 10 years later it was forced on the people of Canberra. In this Assembly on 4 July 1989 I introduced a motion to refer the constitutional legality of this Assembly to a committee of this Assembly so that we could all resign, Mrs Grassby. What happened with that motion to simply look at the constitutional legality, not to decide that it was unconstitutional? I agree that there are people with an understanding of law who say that it is not unconstitutional, but then again there are many people with an understanding of constitutional law who indicate that it is unconstitutional.

What should be done is that the matter should be looked at. What I referred to this house was that this matter should be looked at. This house voted 16 to one that the matter should not be looked at. There was no desire whatsoever by any other member in this house even to allow the matter to be referred to a committee.

Mr Duby: This house also voted 16 to one to inquire into self-government.

MR STEVENSON: But missed the major point of the - - -

Mr Duby: Remember that you were opposed to that. You voted against that.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr Duby!

MR STEVENSON: Indeed; and the reason I voted against the self-government committee was that I thought at the time - I continue to do so - that it was a farce because the vote refused to allow a term of reference to look at the constitutional legality, the very thing that this unconstitutional parliament was based on. Not only did it ignore the constitutional law; it also ignored the will of the people.

At the time, 70 per cent of people said that they did not want it. Our recent polls - the most recent one being of over 1,000 people - showed that 79 per cent of people in Canberra want self-government abolished now. Politicians can run power plays in this Assembly about who gets the numbers to make the decisions that Canberrans do not want, but this will never take away the fact that the vast majority of people in Canberra do not want self-government at all.

29 May 1991

What do the people want? One of the things that we have surveyed is that they want representation. They want members of parliament to represent the majority expressed will of the people. They do not want members of parties to be dictated to by the party or by the Alliance. They feel that elected members, if they have to have any in any parliament, should do the will of the people. And so do I.

The idea of the will of the people, citizens referenda, was one that was held by the Labor Party. It was agreed to by the Federal Liberal Party a couple of years back. It was a major objective of the Labor Party, but it was disregarded in 1963. Since then the Labor Party members in Australia do not represent the majority expressed will of the people. They represent the majority expressed will of the controllers of the Labor Party. Unfortunately, the same thing can be said of the Liberal Party. It is only with the election to parliaments in Australia of members who indicate that they represent and will follow the majority expressed will of the people who hire and pay them that we will get any sanity whatsoever back into parliament.

The idea that there should be a government in the ACT, first of all controlled by the Labor Party and then controlled by the Liberal Party and the ex-No Self Government members and the Residents Rally, is an abhorrence. In any parliament it should be the duty, and it is the duty and obligation, of any member to look at the issue and represent the people, not the party.

What should happen in Canberra? Obviously the people know what should happen. Seventy-five per cent of them think the Legislative Assembly should be abolished. That is what should happen to self-government. The Alliance Government should be abolished. It looks like it is just about to be. The Labor Government, if there were one, should also be abolished. What should happen is that this Assembly should be upgraded to a municipal council. That would make the people happy. We need an upgrade of this Assembly. It should be a municipal council. You could get rid of all the cars, you could get rid of a lot of the consultants, and you could get rid of a lot of the trips.

Mr Berry: We could have the Abolish Dennis Stevenson Party.

MR STEVENSON: You could, indeed, get rid of me. I would suggest that what the recent poll in the *Canberra Times* shows - provided it is legitimate - is that we are a bunch of mediocrities. I agree with it entirely. The Canberra people should get rid of the lot of us, and the sooner the better.

MR STEFANIAK (11.47): Mr Speaker, I suppose there was a certain inevitability in something like this happening. I am not going to go over the issues in relation to the sacking of Mr Collaery and the remaining Residents Rally members of the Alliance Government. Suffice to say that that has occurred.

I was heartened to hear the Leader of the Opposition indicate that her party, the Labor Party, will be supporting the motion of the Chief Minister to adjourn this Assembly so that the necessary arrangements can be made. There are a number of things that she said, however, that I am somewhat concerned about. They were said in the presence of a lot of people, I understand, from some of the school sites. I think a couple of things need to be reinforced in relation to the issue of running this Territory, especially the issue of paying our own way.

I think the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts raised a very valid point in his excellent speech when he indicated just how hard the decisions were in relation to closing those schools and how hard the decision was in relation to Royal Canberra Hospital.

Mr Berry: I saw him smiling. They could not have been too hard.

MR STEFANIAK: I do not think he was smiling, Wayne. I have lived in Canberra all my life. A lot of people saw me, too, in relation to the issue of closing the schools. I saw the trauma some people faced in relation to that. I was born in Royal Canberra Hospital, Wayne. Indeed, a number of people in the gallery might have been, too. A number of people have had members of their family born there. That is a quite sentimental issue. However, the fact is that the Federal Government put the ACT on an independent financial footing, I think, as early as about 1986.

Let us not kid ourselves about self-government either. One of the major reasons, I am sure, why the ACT was given self-government was funding; that the Federal Government was not prepared to continue to support the Territory to the same extent as it had in the past. Rightly or wrongly, that occurred. We were given self-government as of May 1989. The Federal Government should have upgraded the Royal Canberra Hospital back in the early 1980s. It did not do so. The Federal Government is not going to come to our rescue, as Gary Humphries has quite clearly indicated from reading the Grants Commission report. We are still, in many areas, overfunded compared with other States. We simply have to cut costs. There is really no other alternative.

We simply cannot borrow our way out of it. Successive governments around Australia have tried that. Look at Victoria. What an absolute disgrace. Look at Western Australia, South Australia and, indeed, Tasmania as well. All of those States have Labor governments. And what about the Federal Government? What about the national debt? That has risen from some \$33 billion back in 1983 when Mr Hawke took over to about \$170 billion now. Really, it is

29 May 1991

very much like a family budget. If you have an income of \$30,000 a year you cannot have a \$50,000 a year lifestyle. If you do, you borrow money and you just go into more and more hock, and that is simply not a way to run a responsible government.

One thing that I think this Alliance Government has done and one thing the remaining members of the Government, the remaining seven of us, will continue to do, in the interests of the Territory, is exercise financial responsibility. At last count I think the Federal Government owed us about \$800m - money which they promised just before self-government. I do not think we will ever see that. They still have \$50m of our money in a trust account. There are people here today who are blaming this Government for some of the hard decisions it has had to make. I think more properly the blame should be laid at the door of the Federal Government because we are in hard economic times. All of Australia is in hard economic times.

Significantly, this community in the ACT is somewhat better off than the rest of Australia. I think that says something for the economic management of the Chief Minister, the Liberal and No Self Government parties and, formerly, the Alliance Government. Indeed, that is something which we would seek to continue. Of course, as other members have said, it is up to this Assembly whether, in fact, we continue as a minority government. I would be somewhat surprised if the situation was, in fact, different.

Mr Speaker, perhaps it is regrettable that an event like this has to occur. I do not think it will turn out to be so dreadfully significant. It is something that probably was coming for some time, given the differences of views amongst the then Alliance. Rest assured that the seven members of the Government, the Liberal Party members and the others - I am sure I can speak for my colleagues Craig DUBY and Carmel MAHER - will continue to do the job and exercise financial responsibility so that this Territory remains on a stable footing. The Labor Party, in their smugness, think they will take over at the next election, in February 1992. If they do, in fact, take over they will inherit a very financially stable Territory. I think it would have been somewhat different had they continued in power in 1989 when the Alliance Government took over in December.

MR BERRY (11.52): I rise to speak on this issue with some joy because I think it is about time. In fact, it is past the time it should have been done. I just touch for a few moments on what the Minister for Health said, because I think he typifies all of the problems with the Alliance Government. Most of them go back to bad management. He has today persisted with the illusion - I suggest, Mr Speaker, that it is a self-illusion - that everything is all right with what they have done in our hospital and education systems.

The Government's actions have been wrong. They have been crowded with mismanagement. It was very interesting to hear the Minister talk about budget blow-outs and financial responsibility. This Minister has had in his hand for 18 months the formula to fix the budgetary situation in our hospitals, and he has done nothing. In fact, the problem has doubled since he became Minister. Moreover, Mr Speaker, since Mr Humphries became Minister we have had a hospital redevelopment program aimed at taking public hospital services away from the people of the ACT. At the same time we have been given bodgie figures, because we now see that there is \$35m worth of add-ons as well as a \$17.5m budget blow-out. Mr Speaker, that is unforgivable, and he will be remembered, along with his Liberal colleagues, when we get to the next election. There is no doubt about that.

The Alliance Government has to be seen as a cynical political exercise. It was concocted by the Liberals. Under Chief Minister Kaine the unholy alliance was stitched together so that he could deliver his political agenda for his constituency, the business sector. Now, of course, he has milked the Residents Rally cow dry. It is milk dry. It was a cynical move and it has been contrary to the wishes of the people of the Australian Capital Territory. There has been no concern by the Chief Minister about the views of the community. Take, for example, the mismanagement I refer to by Mr Humphries. The Chief Minister never once had the guts to do anything about that mismanagement. Meanwhile, our hospital systems were on the slippery dip, as well as the education system. The Chief Minister has to wear the responsibility for that.

When Mr Collaery spoke on this issue I thought to myself, "What on earth is he doing?". But then it came to me that this is the beginning of a pitiful struggle to regain credibility in the community. It is pitiful because it seems that Mr Collaery is so hypocritical on this issue that he is prepared to do a 180 degrees turnabout on those actions that he took whilst a party to the conservative Alliance Government. He and his Residents Rally colleagues, Norm Jensen and Hector Kinloch, joined with the Liberals and allowed themselves to be milked dry and to deliver Liberal philosophy.

Mr Speaker, they would have got away with it, except that the issue over the leasehold system broke out. You see, Mr Speaker, any house that is built on disloyalty will collapse. That is what this Alliance Government was based on, because each of the parties was disloyal to the other. We had many outbursts of disloyalty from the Residents Rally members. We saw Dr Kinloch being disloyal to the Alliance Government to which he had given his commitment. We saw Mr Collaery disloyal to the Alliance Government to which he had given his commitment. We saw acts of disloyalty from Mr Jensen against the Alliance Government

29 May 1991

to which he had given his commitment. We have also seen acts of disloyalty from the Liberal side of the Alliance Government. Mr Duby, of course, has been mostly concerned about himself and has not had much time to do anything else.

Mr Duby: I have been very busy.

MR BERRY: Very busy looking after yourself, and I think you have done a good job. I think most people in the community would say that you have looked after yourself very well, thank you very much.

A few weeks ago we saw the beginning of a pincer movement when Dr Kinloch left the Alliance Government. I said, "Oh, what are they up to now? Another bit of grandstanding methinks". I was right. But it did not work. Somebody had to make a decision about when the Alliance Government would fall apart. Mr Collaery wanted to make the decision because he wanted to get the electoral credibility out of it. Mr Kaine wanted to make the decision because he wanted to be seen as a strong leader. As it turns out, Mr Kaine has taken the cake. He has milked the cow dry and booted them out.

Well, he will not get much credibility for that, because the people of the ACT know who is responsible for the mismanagement in the Territory. It is Mr Kaine and the Liberal factor within the Alliance. They know that what Mr Kaine set out to do was to produce the goods for his constituency, the business sector. There is no question about that. They have demonstrated that there is no concern for the community of the ACT. They have demonstrated that there is no concern for those people who want a quality education system. They have demonstrated that they have a lack of concern for the massive youth unemployment in the Australian Capital Territory. They have demonstrated that they are prepared to accept as proper a hospital system that turns away the sick. That is just not good enough in the Australian Capital Territory. The Alliance Government deserves to fall apart.

Mr Speaker, this Alliance has been one of political expediency, but it has been the Liberal political agenda that has won the day. The shame of it all is that the Residents Rally have participated in that. They have been willing participants, not reluctant ones. They have played the game all the way down the line.

Let us look at the litany of policies that they have ratted on. The list is too long to talk about in the brief time that I have available to me, Mr Speaker. We just have to look at schools and hospitals and the number of people in the community who are so angry about this shameful Alliance. I think the mismanagement of the hospitals and the education system is probably the peak of the inefficiencies which have been portrayed by this Government.

I heard Mr Kaine say, and I must say that I was amazed, that we could not afford the third hospital. What a joke. Who does he think is going to pay for the third hospital that will be built under their plan? Does he think that the developers are going to build it here just for fun? Does he think that the developers like the people of Canberra so much that they are going to provide the hospital for free? What does he think this is? This is about a private hospital being imposed on the people of Canberra which the people of Canberra will have to pay for. They are the ones who are going to have to generate the profits. It is not being given to us as a free grant. This is about somebody coming here to make a profit out of the people of Canberra. They are the ones who will have to pay for this expensive private hospital.

No more charades; the game is up. The game is up and it is about time that we returned to this place a decent government which will deliver services for the people of the ACT. The Residents Rally party will not have anything to do with that. They have been shown to be dishonourable and they will be discharged from their duty of representing the people of the ACT. There is no doubt about that. They will be discharged for good reason - because they have been seen to be dishonourable. Their recognition factor is high because the people always wake up to the dishonourable ones. They are gone, and for good reasons.

Mr Kaine cannot take too much credit from all of this, because he is the captain of the ship, as it slowly sinks, and he is the one who has administered the Liberal philosophy on the people of Canberra, and all of the mismanagement that goes with it.

Mr Speaker, this is the end of a shameful era. Labor will be working hard to make sure that we return some honour to this Assembly. That is why, Mr Speaker, there is a notice to ensure that this Chief Minister falls at the first opportunity. We can no longer stand in this community a Chief Minister at the head of a government which has done so much damage and which has a commitment to do more damage.

Debate interrupted.

CHIEF MINISTER
Notice of Motion of Want of Confidence

The Clerk: Notice has been received from Ms Follett in the following terms:

I give notice that on Thursday, 6 June 1991, I shall move the following motion: That this Assembly has no confidence in the Chief Minister, Mr Kaine, and his minority Government.

29 May 1991

ALLIANCE GOVERNMENT : SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT
Ministerial Statement

Debate resumed.

DR KINLOCH (12.02): Most of my comments will be about the issue which, as I see it, has precipitated the events which we are witnessing today, and that is the matter of the five school sites in Cook, Holder, Hackett, Lyons and Curtin. I want to talk about the sequence, because false statements have been made. We have been working towards saving those sites for many weeks.

Mr Moore: You voted to close them. It is in the minutes.

DR KINLOCH: We have been working towards saving those sites for many weeks.

Mr Moore: Weeks! We have been working for years.

DR KINLOCH: Does Mr Moore wish to have a speech? Is it my speech or Mr Moore's?

MR SPEAKER: Order! Proceed, Dr Kinloch.

DR KINLOCH: We have been working towards saving those sites for many weeks, and I will now go through the sequence. We have Residents Rally members, including executive members, who have been working for the withdrawal of those school site plans.

Mr Moore: They will resign now because they do not need to be there any more.

DR KINLOCH: I am happy that *Hansard* will be recording this entire speech and I ask *Hansard* to ignore the interruptions. Secondly, the Standing Committee on Conservation, Heritage and Environment took on the task of looking at the school sites. That is another process, and I wish to pay tribute to Mr Moore for his initiative in that matter. I am glad that the Residents Rally, the Labor Party and Mr Moore joined together in order to do that. That is another area in which we contributed towards saving the school sites.

Thirdly, we have been in direct contact with members of those communities. Fourthly, our annual general meeting passed a motion which asked us to work for the withdrawal of those school site proposals, and I very much respect Mr Connolly's motion on that matter. Fifthly, Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen have done much homework on those school sites. I wish to acknowledge that and I wish to report on what I know, at first hand, about the Rally MLAs in this matter.

On Tuesday morning the three of us met for a very long, sometimes interrupted meeting, looking one by one at the proposed variations. Norm Jensen, in particular, had extremely detailed notes and comments about all sorts of things - drainage, townhouses, forests. He had a very careful analysis of each of those sites. At that time, on Tuesday morning, we agreed to disagree with every one of the five school site proposals.

What has led to the action of today is that we have said to the Liberal Party, "You are developers incorporated, ACT incorporated, and we are standing against that".

Mr Moore: What about the schools that have actually closed, Hector?

DR KINLOCH: Mr Collaery immediately prepared his long, detailed letter to the Chief Minister.

Mr Moore: Hector, you still voted to close those schools.

DR KINLOCH: Michael, did I interrupt you once during your speech?

Mr Moore: It is healthy parliamentary debate.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

DR KINLOCH: Mr Speaker, I now ask for standing order 61 to be applied.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you, Dr Kinloch. Please proceed.

DR KINLOCH: I will repeat some of the things I have already said in case people, through their interjections, were not getting the full flavour of it. Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen have done much homework on those school sites and I wish to report on what I know, at first hand, about the Rally in this matter. On Tuesday morning the three of us met for a very long, sometimes interrupted meeting, looking one by one at the proposed variations, and we had from Norm Jensen very detailed comments - proposals about drainage, townhouses, and a whole range of things - which clearly showed that the instructions or whatever that had been received by the Planning Authority had, unfortunately, overlooked many matters. At that time, at that meeting, we agreed to disagree with every one of the five school site proposals.

Mr Collaery immediately prepared his long, detailed letter to the Chief Minister, point by point by point. I do not know the final length of that letter, but we had many, many points on each of those sites demonstrating the folly of those planning proposals.

Seventhly, I arrived here today assuming that the Alliance Government, by majority vote in their joint party room - I obviously was not knowledgeable about that - would be

29 May 1991

tabling those proposals, with every intention myself of voting against them, and knowing that Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen would vote against them. All three of us knew that that would mean the end of the Rally relationship with the Alliance Government. That we had already determined on Tuesday.

Mr Collaery, Mr Jensen and I, had we been given an opportunity to do so, would have voted to disallow those plans, had they been tabled. Indeed, I was looking forward to doing so. So, do not try to tell us that we were not in the business of saving the school sites. I assure you that we were. I have no doubt whatever about it. I certainly do not welcome or accept the term "dishonourable" that has been used. It is absolute nonsense. I have no hesitation at all, no qualms whatsoever, in welcoming the situation in which it is now clear that there is a viable future for the five schools and school sites. That gives me very great joy.

I can assure you that Bernard Collaery has the support of Norm Jensen and me. He has been through a very difficult time. We are now relieved that we are on the cross benches together. From there we will continue to do our duty honourably by the people of the ACT.

I want to say this with no sense at all of recrimination about remarks made around the house, whether by the Liberal Party or by the ALP. I would say to the Liberal Party that the biggest crunch time today is for them. There was a time when I thought the Liberal Party represented a range of people in the ACT, all kinds of people. Increasingly, and I only have to look at the recent election of their office bearers, it seems to me that they now represent a very narrow group. That narrow group is what drives them in matter after matter.

I do not believe that the five elected here all believe that. I think there may even be a coming majority which will oppose the direction of the Liberal Party executive. I hope that will be true. I do ask that they see that this is a crunch time for them. Are they going to be a party that represents the narrow interests of the developers or are they going to be the broad party that they once were, the party that certainly I honoured when Mr Menzies was the head of it?

The three of us, then, will support what should be supported; we will oppose what should be opposed; and we will act independently.

MR CONNOLLY (12.10): This morning has seen an historic event in this Assembly, an event that we welcome - the collapse of this ramshackle Alliance Government, the collapse of this coalition of ambition and arrogance and intolerance for community discussion. The result of that is that the five school sites are safe, and we welcome that. We have been fighting that - certainly since I came into this place, but before that - for the full two years of self-government, not just the 18 months that this lot have been in office.

When my colleagues in the Labor Party were in government under Rosemary Follett they were fighting equally hard; fighting bureaucratic advice that maybe suggests the same as the bureaucratic advice given to this Government; fighting this nonsense that Mr Humphries comes up with, that it is inevitable that you must shut schools and shut hospitals. When Labor was in government they said, "It is not inevitable". They said, "We will set the agenda and we will preserve services". They fought that fight and, under Ms Follett's leadership, they won that fight. Nothing closed when Labor was in government. As soon as this lot assumed power, they started the wind-down.

We hear this morning this mealy-mouthed nonsense from Residents Rally members suggesting that they are responsible for saving the school sites. Mr Speaker, that could have been the case. Today could have been the day when the Residents Rally took back some pride and could have gone out to the community in Canberra and said, "We are honourable people. We are the watchdogs of community interests, not the lap-dogs of the Liberals". I say that because item one on the notice paper this morning is my motion which reads:

That this Assembly directs the Executive to withdraw the proposed variations to the Territory Plan relating to Cook, North Curtin, Holder, Hackett and Lyons Primary Schools ...

That motion was precisely on all fours with the terms of the motion passed by the Residents Rally annual general meeting a week ago, which I will read into *Hansard*. It says:

That the Rally MLAs and Executive take whatever action is available -

I repeat "whatever action is available" -

to withdraw current draft policy plans which seek to vary the land use of school sites at Lyons, Cook, Holder, Hackett and North Curtin.

This morning was their opportunity to be honourable men, to stand up for their policies and abandon the Liberals. And what did they do? Well, we heard from David Read on the radio at 10.10 am. They were going to vote with the Libs. They were going to vote with the Liberals, Mr Duby and Ms

29 May 1991

Maier. They were going to hang onto power, to hang onto the ministerial car, to hang onto the Alliance; to sell out everything. That was the clear view of the president of their party not 10 minutes before it became apparent that Trevor Kaine had finally sacked them.

If they had resigned with honour they could have gone out into the community and said, "We are the watchdogs of the community interests. We have forsaken ministerial office on a principle". Instead, but 10 minutes before they were sacked, they were the lap-dogs of the Liberals, preparing to hang onto office and sell out the schools community. I spoke to the schools community who were here this morning, shortly after David Read, and we all expressed amazement that that was the position of the Residents Rally. Then, 10 minutes later, you were sacked by the Chief Minister. So, you are not only attempting to be the lap-dogs of the Chief Minister, the lap-dogs of the Libs. The Libs did not want you. They just pointed to the door and threw you out like the curs that you are.

Mr Speaker, the Residents Rally has forsaken any position of honour in this debate, and that must not be forgotten. Had they taken the honourable course, had they stood up to the Liberal Party, they would have some respect in the Canberra community. Instead, they have been sacked, because the Chief Minister could no longer take the constant disunity within the party.

But let us not think that all the blame is on the Residents Rally in this ramshackle Government. Let us not get conned into the situation that the Liberal Party is acting honourably in this debate. The instability in the Government was prompted some weeks ago when the Chief Minister got up and announced a significant change in policy, contrary to Residents Rally policy, which is usually the way - but no-one pays any attention to the Residents Rally in government. He announced that at a CARD meeting, contrary to a decision of his Cabinet, which was that it should not be announced. So, where is the honour here? This whole ramshackle Government, which is clinging desperately to power and which has been inflicting damage on the community now for 18 months, is coming to an end, and we welcome that. We hope that the status quo at least can be preserved until the next election when the people of Canberra will make the decisions on these issues.

We are going to debate leasehold next week, but we should have been debating it this morning. Dr Kinloch was going to introduce a Bill to preserve the Residents Rally position on leasehold, which is a position that we share. What happened to it? He changed his mind and withdrew the Bill. To the bitter end, until 10 minutes before you were sacked, 10 minutes before this house sat, the president of your party was meekly saying, "Well, we agree with the Labor motion, but we cannot go along with it because it is too important that we keep stable government". Dr Kinloch has withdrawn a motion that was going to test this outrageous decision on leaseholds.

Mr Deputy Speaker, the Rally leaves this Government as dishonourably as it entered it. We hope that the community of Canberra gets the opportunity to judge who should be governing this Territory as soon as possible. This lot have lost all claims to govern in the interests of the community, and they should go.

MR DUBY (Minister for Finance and Urban Services) (12.16): I have heard some venom in the debate this morning. Most of it has been directed, of course, towards the Residents Rally, in particular towards Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen and, for that matter, Dr Kinloch as well. I think it behoves us at this stage to recognise just what the Residents Rally, as a member of the Alliance Government, has been able to achieve in the time it has been in government, in power - in other words, since December 1989.

I think it needs to be pointed out to those opposite, because they cannot comprehend this, that the first thing that the Residents Rally achieved, as did the other members of the Alliance Government, was a balanced budget, which the Labor Party was incapable of doing. The simple fact is, and the records will show, that when we took over government the ACT budget was heading for a \$40m deficit under the former fabulous Treasurer Follett. The figure was \$40m in the red.

Mr Moore: You said last year that you actually had a surplus from the Follett budget. You claimed a surplus last year. What are you talking about? You are going round in circles. You got a surplus out of the Follett budget.

MR DUBY: As a result of that, upon taking power, in February 1990, as Mr Moore well knows, we took action, which at the time he bitterly opposed, imposing, for example, a 4 per cent reduction in expenditure across all areas of the budget. Do you remember that, Mr Moore? Perhaps you remember that. Actions like that enabled us to bring in a balanced budget. I think that indicates the responsible action that members of the Residents Rally have taken in the time they have been in government.

I think it is also worthwhile pointing out some of the other things that the Residents Rally, as part of the Alliance Government, has been able to achieve. Many, many reforms have been initiated through this Government and, in particular, in some cases through the direct action of Mr Collaery and his fellow members of the Rally. In the social justice area there have been many reforms. We have domestic violence reform. We have gun law reforms; we now have the best gun laws in Australia. He has brought in anti-discrimination Bills. He has achieved adoption reforms. He has achieved human rights reforms, such as the rights of the child.

Ms Follett: Not yet.

29 May 1991

MR DUBY: Those Bills will undoubtedly come before this Assembly, and undoubtedly the Residents Rally members will support them. For all intents and purposes, they will be Mr Collaery's Bills. The Youth Advocate has been established.

In areas of law he has achieved many areas of reform. There has been landlord and tenant legislation. He has restructured the courts. He has looked at reform of the defamation area. He is in the process of establishing the equivalent of an ICAC in the ACT.

In areas of health he has been involved in mental health reform; he has established a crisis service; he has established halfway houses for disabled persons; he has initiated reforms in the Belconnen remand area; and he has provided support for AIDS sufferers.

In housing, he has taken many initiatives. He has brought in the tenants purchase scheme. Under Mr Collaery's management of the housing portfolio there has been the vast expansion of the number of aged persons units in the Territory. He has also been involved with joint initiatives between the Housing Trust and developers to enable more public housing to be provided to those in need. By the way, he has also been involved very much in fixing up the Bruce Stadium mess which he inherited from you lot over there.

So, let us not put the boot into Mr Collaery, and let us not put the boot into the Rally members in terms of what they may or may not have done. Many positive things have occurred under Mr Collaery's management as a Minister and under the support and, indeed, initiative on many occasions of the other members of the Rally. It is unfortunate, and I am sorry the situation has now arrived, that those members of the Rally are now unable to be members of the Alliance Government, for whatever reason. I frankly will be sorry to see them go. I certainly liked and enjoyed the relationship that I had established with Mr Collaery, in particular, and with the other members of the Rally.

Much has been made of this issue that "He was sacked" and therefore that is somehow dramatically different from him having taken the noble course and resigned. Let us make one thing perfectly clear: Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen, in particular, and undoubtedly I would say Dr Kinloch, from his statement today - he said that he was aware of what was happening on Tuesday - took a view about a particular issue which they knew would be at odds with the majority of the rest of the members of the Government, and they stuck to their guns. They knew what it would lead to; they knew that perfectly well.

So, any suggestion that Mr Collaery somehow did not do the honourable thing and should have resigned is frankly a load of piffle. The simple fact is that they knew what their actions would lead to. They took the action that they felt, for whatever reason - I do not agree with their action - they needed to take and, as a result, they are no longer members of the Government.

Mr Moore: David Read put the lie to that on radio this morning.

MR DUBY: Mr Read is not a member of this Assembly or this Government, and that is neither here nor there. We all know that on many occasions what the executive of the Rally says is different from what the members of the Rally do.

Let us keep that in perspective. The simple fact is that the members of the Rally took a position; they knew what it would lead to, and they knew what the outcome would be. As a result of that, we now have a minority government instead of a majority government, and that is the thing to remember. I am sorry to see the Rally depart from the benches of government. But I am sure those opposite will find to their dismay that, as things eventuate, the Rally members have not joined the Opposition; they will fulfil the true role of what people on the cross bench should do, Mr Moore. Your voting record indicates quite dramatically that for all intents and purposes you are an ex officio member of the Labor Party.

Mr Moore: You can try that on as much as you like, Craig.

MR DUBY: It is a simple fact.

Mr Moore: You look at the voting, and you will find my vote an equal number of times with the Liberals.

MR DUBY: It is a simple fact. The only matters on which you vote with this Government are procedural votes. When it comes to matters of issue, at all times you support the Opposition. You are, in effect, the sixth member of the Labor Party. Unfortunately, you left your run too late. You should have joined the unaligned movement, led by Mr Wood, at the voting on Saturday. You may well have had a seat on the ticket. Given the numbers position that was demonstrated on Saturday, you may well have had a seat on the ticket ahead of Mr Connolly if you had played your cards right; but you blew it.

As I said, this is made out to be a matter of great rancour, distaste and bitter feeling between members and former members of this Alliance Government. Such is not the case, and I want to stress that from my point of view. Mr Collaery and the Residents Rally will now fulfil the role to which I think they have always been naturally attuned - that of being proper cross bench members of this Assembly.

29 May 1991

MRS GRASSBY (12.24): Mr Speaker, now we know the truth. Now the truth has come out. The Residents Rally really has not left the Government at all. It has taken us all this time to find this out. They have not really left the Government at all. They have just been caught out over the school sites, because they know how unhappy the people of Canberra are with them. Unfortunately, 41,000 people signed a petition to keep Royal Canberra Hospital open, but we are not going to have the opportunity to have that.

At least we know where the Liberals are coming from. We know their policies - their development policies and their big business policies. They have never tried to pull the wool over the eyes of the people in Canberra. Those are their policies. But the Residents Rally has done that and it is doing it again. They are walking out on this, but they are still with the Government. So it has all come out. We have been waiting to find this out all morning, but now we know that they are going to be voting with the Government.

The best way to convince fools that they are wrong is to let them go their own way. They will go their own way, and the people of Canberra will tell them. Words are so cheap in terms of what came from Mr Collaery's mouth. They remind me of the statement in *Alice in Wonderland* that words can mean anything you want them to mean. So he is telling you. On Monday we were worded up that Trevor had had just about as much of Bernard as he could take. On Monday we were told that things were really bad on the fifth floor and that Trevor had just about had it. Obviously I believe him. I think he has sacked them. Whether they were sacked or they walked, I think it is important that it be said that they were sacked.

Bernard and the rest of the Residents Rally are no martyrs. Let us not be fooled by the fact that they are playing the great martyr and saying, "We walked". Why did they not do something about this before all the schools were closed? Why did they not do something then? Why did they not stop Royal Canberra Hospital from being closed? Why did they wait till now when, in the case of Royal Canberra Hospital, it is going to be too late? Why did they wait to do it?

As for balancing the budget, our leader, who was Chief Minister, balanced a very good budget - and balanced it perfectly. But a \$17m overrun is quite all right! It is great housekeeping, is it not? Imagine the housekeeper who goes to her husband and says, "Look, dear, you told me that we had to live on \$20,000 a year, but I have just overrun the budget by another \$15,000. Can you organise it for me?". Here it is, "I have just overrun the budget by \$17m. It does not really matter". They may think they have pulled the wool over the eyes of the people of Canberra, but they have not. They have not pulled any wool over anybody, believe you me.

There is a saying: The fool and his money are soon parted. Believe you me, they are fools because they will be parted from the voters. The voters will not support them on polling day on this. But we know, of course, that we are not going to get that chance, because they are going to stay with the Government; they are going to be there. And we hear this nonsense of sitting on cross benches. Why did they not sit on the cross benches from the very beginning and vote against these sorts of policies that we have had to put up with in Canberra?

These policies have destroyed a city that people love and have enjoyed living in - because they decided that they could not balance the budget. That is the whole truth about it - they could not balance the budget, whereas the Chief Minister at the time, Rosemary Follett, could. We put the burglars in charge of the budget, and now we do not know where the money has gone, except that it has overrun in the hospitals by \$17m.

We know that there is a \$600,000 overrun in ACTION. Of course, we are told that it is petrol and tyres. Yet they could waste money on things like destroying Casuarina Sands - the things that people wanted to keep in Canberra. That is only a small thing. It is nowhere near as important as hospitals and schools, but it was a place to which people went to enjoy it and that had been in Canberra for a long time. But the Government says, "Oh, no, we can waste \$66,000 on that; it does not matter". There is also the fact that they gave contracts to companies that were in trouble. They did not check them out. We now have workers who do not have jobs and have lost out on their holiday pay and long service pay. Did they care about that? Did they check any of this out? No, they did not.

They have now told us that they are going to sit on the cross benches but they are going to vote with the Government. So, they have let us know that the Chief Minister is going to get a vote of confidence in him. Is that not great! And they are going to go out and play the martyrs. I understand that when Mr Collaery walked out of the house there were people who gave him white feathers. People may not remember what they were during the war, but I remember my mother telling me that people gave out white feathers in the First World War to people who stayed home and did not go out and support their country. Well, the Residents Rally did not support us.

Mr Humphries: Like in the Gulf war?

MRS GRASSBY: Look, Mr Humphries, we do not blame you; those are your policies - sell out to the big people; sell out to the developers. At least we know where you are coming from; you are honest. But that is not the case for these other people. As for Mr Stevenson sitting down there and saying that he did not want self-government, why did he not resign? Why did he stay here and take his salary - and sleep in the house, drive without a licence and all these

29 May 1991

things? When you are supposed to be the lawmakers, you are supposed to keep the laws - and that is why we are here. So why are you still here, Mr Stevenson? Why get up and make this great speech about getting rid of it? Oh, what absolute hypocrisy!

Mr Stevenson: Ellnor, I will be happy to go hand and hand with you and everybody any time you like.

MRS GRASSBY: I always love that statement. I always remember a friend who talked about how we should be giving more to humanity and more to the poor people of Ethiopia. This person happened to have about \$10m, and I said, "Why don't you?". And he said to me, "Ellnor, I will give when you give and everybody else gives". What a wonderful statement - "I will go when you go"! I believe in self-government. I believe that there should be no taxation without representation, and that is what we have here. I believe in it. But from you we hear such hypocrisy. The Residents Rally at least did not make that statement. I can give them one tick or one gold star. But you sat here and took it. As for Mr Duby laughing over there, the same thing applies. He sat there and took it.

Mr Duby: I am just thinking how good you are when you have not got notes.

MRS GRASSBY: Listen, Mr Duby, why do you not get lost where they do not have a found department. It would help us all here.

I think that everything we have seen played out today is a charade. They could have stopped this a year ago. But they have gone along saying "Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea culpa". Well, forget it. Believe you me, the people outside will remember at election time. We are not going to get the chance before, obviously. We are going to have to wait till February 1992. They will realise what they have done, and they will then tell them exactly. They will give them their marching orders. They will tell them to pack their bags and go. Unfortunately, the damage they will have done is just too serious.

MS MAHER (12.31): Mr Speaker, I rise mainly to endorse the comments of Mr Duby in that the Rally has had a positive input into and influence on the Alliance Government. I agree with many of the policies and ideas that they have had. The Alliance Government has worked for the last 18 months to provide a good and stable government to the community, and we will continue to do so. The members of the Alliance joined with the knowledge that we all were coming from different views, and we have respected each one's views.

The time has come for a parting of the ways, and I feel it is very regrettable. I have enjoyed working with the members of the Rally and I think it is sad.

MR SPEAKER: The question before the chamber is on the date of the next meeting. I will just take advice. Before we take the vote on it, there has been a call from the Chief Minister to amend the date. Chief Minister, you need leave to amend that.

MR KAINE (Chief Minister): Mr Speaker, I will seek leave to speak if that is the desire of the Assembly.

Leave granted.

MR KAINE: Thank you. Mr Speaker, I understand that during the debate the Leader of the Opposition has lodged a notice of motion of no confidence. Since that cannot be debated for seven days, I see little sense in the Assembly trying to function on Tuesday and Wednesday with that motion on the table. I would like, with the indulgence of the Assembly, to amend my adjournment motion to say that the Assembly adjourns until 2.30 pm tomorrow week - not Tuesday.

Leave granted.

MR KAINE: I move:

Omit "Tuesday, 4 June 1991", insert "Thursday, 6 June 1991 at 2.30 p.m.".

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion (by **Mr Duby**) agreed to:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Assembly adjourned at 12.34 pm until Thursday, 6 June 1991, at 2.30 pm