



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

16 April 1991

Tuesday, 16 April 1991

Authority to record and broadcast proceedings	1253
Statement by Speaker	1253
Questions without notice:	
School sites - Territory Plan variations	1253
Labour force statistics	1254
Executive Deputies	1256
Pizza Hut reading scheme	1257
Seminar leaflet	1258
Stromlo Forest - trail bike	1258
Government vehicles	1259
Ambulance Service	1260
Alleged violence against gay community	1261
Immunisation	1262
School principals - appeals	1263
Vehicle inspections - waiting times	1264
Hospital system	1266
Hospitals - waiting lists	1267
Hospitals - waiting lists	1269
Domestic violence	1270
Department of Justice and Community Services - equal employment opportunity plan	1271
Personal explanation	1272
Auditor-General - Report No 2 of 1991	1275
Subordinate legislation and commencement provisions	1276
Commonwealth Grants Commission (Ministerial statement).....	1277
Blueprint for the Ageing - progress report (Ministerial statement)	1281
Sell-off of school sites (Matter of public importance).....	1283
Seminar pamphlet (Motion of censure)	1304
Scrutiny of Bills and Subordinate Legislation - standing committee	1312
Unlawful Games (Amendment) Bill 1991	1312
Pornography industry and organised crime	1313
Criminal Injuries Compensation (Amendment) Bill 1991	1323
Pornography industry and organised crime	1330
Inebriates (Amendment) Bill 1991	1330
Planning Development and Infrastructure - standing committee	1334
Conservation Heritage and Environment - standing committee	1345
Adjournment:	
Hospital system	1347
Assembly proceedings	1349
Hospital system	1349

Answers to questions:

Supported accommodation assistance program client statistics (Question No 328)	1353
Gaming and Liquor Authority funding (Question No 334)	1355
Ministerial travel (Question No 335)	1356
Consultants - Finance and Urban Services (Question No 338)	1359
Public relations staff - Finance and Urban Services (Question No 343)	1389
Personal staff - Chief Minister (Question No 345)	1391
Personal staff - Minister for Finance and Urban Services (Question No 347)	1392
Public relations consultants - Finance and Urban Services (Question No 351)	1393
Canberra Harness Racing Club (Question No 355)	1394
School closures - traffic safety works (Question No 357)	1396
School closures - bus services (Question No 359)	1399
Gaming and Liquor Authority reserves (Question No 366)	1400
Public area paving (Question No 367)	1401
Fishing legislation (Question No 368)	1404
Litter legislation (Question No 369)	1405
Protection of lands legislation (Question No 370)	1406
Road safety - milk delivery vehicles and personnel (Question No 371)	1407
Bus services - Fadden area (Question No 372)	1408
Valley View Court Retirement Village - grassfire risk (Question No 373)	1409
Road upgrading - Sulwood Drive (Question No 374)	1410
Trucks parked in streets (Question No 379)	1411
Street lighting - Tennant Street Fyshwick (Question No 380)	1412
Bus services - Theodore area (Question No 381)	1413
Road safety - Kitchener and Kent Streets Hughes (Question No 382)	1414
Road upgrading - Kathleen Drive (Question No 383)	1415
Natural gas - pricing policy (Question No 384)	1417
Electrical regulation and inspections (Question No 385)	1418

16 April 1991

Tuesday, 16 April 1991

MR SPEAKER (Mr Prowse) took the chair at 2.30 pm and read the prayer.

AUTHORITY TO RECORD AND BROADCAST PROCEEDINGS

Motion (by **Mr Collaery**), by leave, agreed to:

That the Assembly authorises:

- (1) the recording on video tape without sound by Prime Television of proceedings during question time today, Tuesday, 16 April 1991; and
- (2) the use by any television station of any part of the recorded proceedings in subsequent news, current affairs and documentary programs and not for the purposes of satire or ridicule.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

MR SPEAKER: On Thursday, 21 March, towards the conclusion of a debate which contained some acrimony, upon an interjection from Mrs Grassby, in the heat of the moment, I asked Mrs Grassby to please wake up. I admit that Mrs Grassby was fully awake at the time. I immediately apologised to Mrs Grassby by way of a note, and for the *Hansard* record I hereby withdraw that comment.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

School Sites - Territory Plan Variations

MS FOLLETT: My question is to Mr Kaine, as the Minister for planning. I refer you, Mr Kaine, to the Territory Planning Authority's decision to commence proceedings to vary the Territory Plan to allow the five schools closed by your Government to be sold. I ask you, Mr Kaine, as Minister for planning: What instructions or directions to initiate this action were given by you to the Planning Authority?

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, my instructions to the Planning Authority on this issue have been quite specific. The schools have been closed, and it is the Government's intention that the property inherent in those schools be

turned to other uses. Some of those schools will be used for community purposes. With the others, where the property is not required for further government use the land will be used for other purposes. Of course, before that can be done, it is necessary that we go through a process of varying the land use purpose and the Territory Planning Authority has been instructed - in fact, I have instructed it - to process the normal variation proposals. In contradistinction to the hares that have been set running by the Opposition, there is no fast tracking; these variation proposals are being processed in the normal way and in the normal time frame, and when that process has been completed the land will be turned to other uses in accordance with the Government's proposals.

Mr Speaker, I would just like to note that the Opposition seems very interested in this. I might make the point that the properties of the schools that were disposed of by the Commonwealth before self-government remained there untouched and undisturbed during the Labor Government's office here. It did nothing either to reopen them or to use the land and the buildings for other purposes. In fact, it was left to this Government to turn those vacant and vandalised properties to good use. So, I think that the members opposite ought to be very careful before they start throwing stones when they live in glass houses.

Labour Force Statistics

MRS NOLAN: Mr Speaker, my question is also to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, what are the major developments in the ACT labour market as shown in the March 1991 labour force statistics, and how does the ACT compare with the national trends?

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, I am pleased that the member has sought to get some information and some clarification of the figures that have been released, because the labour force statistics that were released last week show unequivocally that the unemployment rate for the ACT continues to fall. This compares favourably, of course, with the national situation where the rate continues to rise. The unemployment rate in the ACT fell to 5.7 per cent in March. It was 7.7 per cent in February and 8.1 per cent in January. This contrasts with the national situation where the unemployment rates increased during that same period. They were 9.6 per cent in March, 9.5 per cent in February and 9.1 per cent in January. So, unemployment in the ACT continues to be much lower than in every other State or Territory in Australia.

Most importantly, Mr Speaker, although it is good to see the unemployment figures reducing, it is worth noting that employment continues to grow in the ACT as well. Already in the first three quarters of this financial year, 3,700 new jobs have been created and it is worth noting, I think,

16 April 1991

that these are mostly in the private sector. So, the private sector is beginning to generate the jobs and that, in the end, is what the policies of this Government are seeking to achieve - to stimulate the private sector. This again compares with the national situation where employment is decreasing.

I think the other significant factor, Mr Speaker, is that the teenage unemployment rate in the ACT has fallen dramatically. It was only 18.3 per cent in March, and that has dropped from the seasonal figure of 35.7 per cent in January and 23.5 per cent in February. I am pleased to say that this is now lower than the national figure of 25.2 per cent. It is the lowest rate for any State or Territory in Australia. This is in line with a trend which I foreshadowed when the Leader of the Opposition cynically attempted to secure a few cheap political points by raising youth unemployment as a matter of public importance in February when she knew that the figures were at a seasonal high. That was cynical, and a cheap trick.

The March figures again demonstrate that the Opposition does not understand either the causes or the circumstances of unemployment in the ACT, and its members had better learn, if they ever hope to aspire to government, that an understanding of seasonality is fundamental to the understanding of the ACT labour market - something that they have demonstrated that they do not understand. They demonstrated that quite adequately when it was debated in February.

Mr Speaker, I would like to make three points in respect of the efforts of this Government to reduce youth unemployment and unemployment generally. Firstly, despite the quick-fix options of the Labor Opposition, there are no quick fixes to this problem. Job creation programs of the past, such as the RED scheme, the community employment program and the community youth support scheme did not work, and they will not work, and they are not a solution. Secondly, this Government has focused on creating the right environment for the growth and diversification of the local economy when faced with the static, if not declining, presence of the Federal Government in Canberra - - -

Mr Berry: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I think the Chief Minister is testing the standing orders, because they ask for a concise answer and, of course, they ask for the matter not to be debated. I suggest - - -

MR SPEAKER: Mr Berry, under the circumstances of today's filming, I am sure that the Chief Minister will allow sufficient question time so that everyone gets a question. I do not believe that that is a problem. Chief Minister, would you please continue.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I must persist with my point of order. The issue is whether or not the standing orders are being breached, not whether we are having our photos taken.

MR SPEAKER: The standing orders are not being breached at the moment.

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, there is clearly no breach, and when issues as important as unemployment and youth unemployment are raised I think it is a matter of judgment about what is short and concise. The Assembly either wants to know the facts, or it does not. I can well understand that the Labor Opposition does not want to know, because the indications are good and its members would hate them. They hate that. They wish that the figures were bad. They are not, and I am quite happy - in fact, more than happy - to answer Mrs Nolan's question and put the facts on the table. I know that the Opposition does not like that; but you are going to have to wear it, I am afraid.

Mr Speaker, the Alliance Government is committed to creating a better commercial environment in which businesses can operate and develop the necessary competitive edge needed to win new markets and to diversify their operations. That is, in fact, exactly what is happening. That is why jobs in the private sector are now beginning to grow.

The third point that I wanted to make briefly is that a critical element in getting the environment right is balancing our own books. This Government has taken the right steps in ensuring that we can manage the process of transitional funding and, as the Grants Commission has shown, we must not be complacent. We have further hard decisions to take in the context of next year's budget in terms of fiscal management. This Government is committed to programs which will sustain and generate real job growth, which reflect sound management of our resources and our economy and which will, within the constraints imposed by Keating and the Federal Labor Government, lead to a dynamic and equitable ACT which will be the envy of the other States.

Executive Deputies

MR CONNOLLY: My question is to Mr Jensen, as chair of the planning committee. I refer to Mr Jensen's reported statement on ABC radio yesterday that he would not debate me on the decision to vary the Territory Plan to allow school sites to be flogged off because of a potential conflict between his role as Executive Deputy for planning and as chair of the planning committee. I ask Mr Jensen: Firstly, was this the real reason for declining debate, or was he merely ducking for cover; and, secondly, does this confirm the Opposition's longstanding argument that Executive Deputies should not chair committees within their portfolios because of the obvious potential conflict of interest?

16 April 1991

MR JENSEN: Mr Speaker, I am not aware that I said on ABC radio that I was not prepared to debate Mr Connolly on that particular issue. In fact, Mr Speaker, for the information and edification of members opposite, my colleagues and I will, in fact, be discussing those issues on Friday morning.

Pizza Hut Reading Scheme

MR STEFANIAK: My question is to the Minister for Health, Mr Humphries. The Pizza Hut group announced yesterday in Victoria that it would offer free pizzas to primary school children of that State as a reward for increasing their reading skills outside school. Are you aware of the proposed scheme, and do you propose to support the introduction of such a scheme in the ACT?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, I thank Mr Stefaniak for that question. I certainly know that he is a great supporter of both literacy and pizza, so I am sure that he is well qualified to ask the question. I am aware of the proposed scheme that Pizza Hut is introducing in Victoria as an incentive for increased reading outside school, and I have to say that the objective of that scheme is very laudable.

In the ACT the boards of government schools determine whether schools will participate in such schemes. Many schools benefit from association with commercial firms such as banks and computer companies, and such support by the private sector is very welcome to schools in the ACT. However, as Minister for Health, I have to say that I am a little bit concerned by the prospect of linking better reading and further reading in our schools with the consumption of pizza or other fast foods as a reward. The proposed scheme uses as a reward a food which does not comply with Australian dietary guidelines. This conflicts with the Australian Health and Medical Research Council's recommendations to support an environment conducive to healthy food choices. I think using food as a reward can certainly lead to overeating, and childhood obesity is an increasing problem in our community and one which we have to not overlook.

I do think Pizza Hut deserves commendation for the objective of its project, and in other health related areas it has done very well. Their restaurants were some of the first in the ACT to introduce smoke-free zones, and they deserve our commendation for that. However, I think we have to be very careful about launching into a scheme such as this. I would rather see some alternative explored which would provide equally attractive but not unhealthy alternatives to children as an incentive to read outside school.

Seminar Leaflet

MR BERRY: My question is directed to the Chief Minister. I refer the Chief Minister to a leaflet advertising a seminar which is to be conducted by Mr Stevenson in Chinchilla, Queensland, later this month. I seek leave to table a copy of that leaflet.

Leave granted.

MR BERRY: I present the following paper:

Positive Result Seminar, 27 and 28 April 1991 - Invitation.

Mr Speaker, in the leaflet Mr Stevenson is claimed to have:

... knocked back a proposed Ministerial package of \$84,000 a year salary plus a car.

Given that the Labor Party has never offered Mr Stevenson a ministry, I ask the Chief Minister: When and why did you offer him a ministry? Or was it Bernard?

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, I did not, ever.

MR BERRY: Mr Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Then, is the statement that an offer has been made a lie?

MR SPEAKER: That is not a valid question, I believe.

MR KAINE: The only comment that I could make on that, Mr Speaker, is that I certainly have made no such proposal to Mr Stevenson; nor would I. He is, you will note, not even one of the government members of this Assembly. I have certainly made no proposal and I did not even offer him \$84,000.

Stromlo Forest - Trail Bikes

MR JENSEN: Mr Speaker, my question without notice is to the Minister for Finance and Urban Services, Mr Duby. Is the Minister aware of the objections raised by community groups to trail bike use of the Stromlo Forest trail bike area, and what action does the Minister propose to take to address these concerns?

MR DUBY: Yes, I am aware of the objections raised by community groups to the trail bike use of the Stromlo Forest area, and I would like to go over some of the points that are pertinent to this. The Stromlo trail bike area was originally established to provide an area for off-road use by trail bikes. Since then there has been a marked reduction in the illegal use of other areas for trail bike riding, and that was a problem which was faced by those within the Government responsible for park management.

16 April 1991

The concern regarding trail bike riding has been identified as a result of community consultation undertaken as part of the management planning process for Stromlo Forest. A draft management plan for Stromlo Forest is currently being written by my department. Given the concerns raised and the supporting information now available, my department has requested the ACT Territory Planning Authority to identify an alternative site for trail bike riding within the general area involved.

The ACT forests section of my department will assist in the identification of possible alternative sites by providing advice on both rider needs and site requirements. An information strategy will be developed to ensure that trail bike riders are fully informed about the proposed new site when it is identified, and that riders do not return to the practice they have had in the past of illegal use of public forest and bushland. That is a resource which is used and appreciated by many members of the population, and I think that we want to ensure that a small percentage of the population - namely, trail bike riders - do not inconvenience the vast majority of folk who appreciate our natural outdoor settings here in the ACT.

Government Vehicles

MR STEVENSON: My question is to the Chief Minister. It is not about whether one can have a ministry with a balance of power in this Assembly. It is about motor vehicles, although not the one I did not take. It is on behalf of a constituent, and he asks the Chief Minister: What is the policy for local administration vehicles to be used for personal shopping and other uses; and, also, who in the ACT is able to have the government plates changed on their vehicles?

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, I can only speak for the ACT Government, of course; I cannot speak for the Commonwealth. So far as the ACT Government is concerned, the policy is quite clear. Publicly owned vehicles may be used for private purposes only if they are made available to senior executives who are entitled to them under the terms and conditions of their employment and if they pay their contribution towards the private running costs of that vehicle. I know of no other circumstances in which a publicly owned vehicle may be used for private purposes.

I understand that an Auditor-General's report covering the whole issue of the operation of the fleet is to be tabled today. Members will know that the first inquiry I set in place when I moved to the fifth floor 18 months ago was an inquiry into that very issue. I will be most interested in the Auditor-General's comments, as, I am sure, will you.

Ambulance Service

MRS GRASSBY: My question is to Mr Humphries, the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts. On the weekend, a young person with possible spinal injury had to wait 40 minutes for an ambulance. I am informed that the agreed number of ambulances - four - were on duty, but were otherwise occupied. Will the Minister agree to a full and open inquiry to determine the proper level of ambulance services for the ACT?

MR HUMPHRIES: The answer to the second part of that question, Mr Speaker, is no, I will not agree to such an inquiry, because I am yet to be convinced that any of the so-called facts raised by the Opposition in this place, or by members of other organisations, such as the TWU, are well founded. Some of the things that have been raised by those opposite in this regard, some of the so-called allegations of poor performance on the part of our Ambulance Service, have not been based in fact.

Members may recall that an allegation was made about a person having to travel to Sydney in the back of a station wagon because an air ambulance was not available. In fact, that person had declined the alternatives offered by the Ambulance Service. It had explained to them that air ambulances are available only in limited circumstances, irrespective of what government policy is about the number of ambulance stations in the ACT or the number of ambulance officers in the ACT.

I am frankly sick of the accusations that come from those opposite. I want them to substantiate and prove what they say about the Ambulance Service in the ACT. When they do, then I will sit up and pay attention. In the last few weeks I have spoken with officers of the Ambulance Service who are concerned and distressed at the claims being made by members of the Opposition and members of the Transport Workers Union about the state of our ambulance services. I saw five officers of the Ambulance Service, who came to me and said, "We want you to understand that what is being said is, in many cases, a misrepresentation".

Mr Berry: Five out of 70.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, I wonder just how many people there are in the Ambulance Service who see things the same way. I would ask Mr Berry, for example: Does he know how many officers of the Ambulance Service actually complied with bans imposed by the Transport Workers Union some weeks ago, in their ongoing dispute with the Government? The fact is that almost nobody complied with those bans. They had to be lifted, because nobody even noticed that there were bans on in the Ambulance Service. There was such little response on the part of ambulance officers towards those bans.

16 April 1991

Mr DUBY: Like the secret bans in the hospital.

MR HUMPHRIES: The secret bans in the hospital are a good analogy. Mr Speaker, I do not take these claims seriously. If Mrs Grassby has some things to show me that are facts, then I will listen, but not before.

Alleged Violence against Gay Community

DR KINLOCH: My question is to Mr Collaery in his role as Attorney-General, and the subject matter is the alleged violence against the gay community in the ACT. Could the Attorney-General say whether the Australian Federal Police has received any reports of alleged violence against members of the gay community in the ACT? And, to add to that, what action has been taken by the police to curb such violence?

MR COLLAERY: I thank Dr Kinloch for the question. My advice today from the police is that, of the 10 attacks referred to in the media, only one attack has been reported to the police. I think it is important to point out to the gay community that the police are unable to keep statistics or to understand patterns of violence affecting the gay community if the offences are not reported. And, if they are reported, it depends on whether they are reported in the context of attacks on them that may be related to their sexual preferences.

So, I accept that there is a double challenge facing the community, and that is that the gay community will have enough confidence in our community policing force to reveal their sexual preferences, in the context of why they believe they were attacked. I believe that that is an area that we need to work on with the community policing liaison branch, who are responsible, in fact, for conducting the liaison with the gay community. There has been contact in the past, and I am advised that effort has been given to working with it. I am sure that members, and particularly Mr Moore, understand the concern that we all have in the community for the current spate of violence.

A constituent telephoned me early this morning and he informed me that commercially made bumper stickers were now appearing, with messages that tended to incite discrimination and violence against gays. I have not had the opportunity yet to refer that to the police. I will do that later today. I believe that we need to determine authorship of that material, if it exists. I have been informed of the location of some of the material and where it appears in Haig Park. I wish to ensure that we can determine whether there is an organised front to this activity, and whether it emanates from within this city, or from some other place, perhaps further north.

An incident occurring in the gallery -

Sitting suspended from 2.57 to 2.58 pm

MR SPEAKER: I would like to thank the staff for the efficient manner in which they handled that occurrence.

Immunisation

MR WOOD: Mr Speaker, I direct a question to Mr Humphries, the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts. Mr Humphries, today's *Canberra Times* carries the views of the Speaker of this Assembly on immunisation. The Canberra President of the AMA has responded:

What he is saying is just the modern form of witch-doctoring - it flies in the face of all accepted learning and knowledge.

Is Mr Prowse speaking for the Liberal Party and the Government on this issue, or does the Minister support the AMA view?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, unfortunately Mr Wood raises a policy which is presently in the process of being developed by the Government. At present the Government has no policy on the question of extending the opportunities or requirements for immunisation in the ACT. At present there is no requirement that individuals be immunised before they attend school in the ACT. There is a broad national proposal to do just that - to require people to have their children immunised before they come to school or at least to have proof of immunisation provided by parents so that the level of immunisation can be accurately monitored.

I understand that the view that was expressed by you, Mr Speaker, in the paper today was a personal view. It was not necessarily the policy of the Liberal Party. I have to say that at this stage both matters, as far as the Government's policy is concerned and as far as the Liberal Party's policy is concerned, are being developed by those bodies. I would therefore expect to be able to advise Mr Wood at some point in the future as to what the position of those respective parties might be.

MR WOOD: I have a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Is the Minister saying that he has not a policy about immunisation, this vitally important issue?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, no, I am not saying that the Government has no policy on immunisation. The Government encourages immunisation as much as possible. It conducts immunisation clinics in the ACT and it has a policy of encouraging all children in the ACT to be immunised. That is government policy.

16 April 1991

The issue that has been raised, I understand, more recently, is the question of whether children should be immunised as a precondition of their attending schools in the ACT. That is a question on which the Government has yet to form a policy. It may be that in due course we should have a view that children at least prove a certain level of immunisation before attending school, or that some other requirement with respect to immunisation occurs before a child attends school. That is a question which is still being explored, and rightly so, given that there is no nationally agreed position on what should happen in that regard. I would rather act in concert with my colleagues, the Ministers for Health and Education in other States. When I have a position which is nationally agreed, I would be much happier to implement that in the ACT.

School Principals - Appeals

MR MOORE: Mr Speaker, my question is also directed to Mr Humphries, and refers to an article in this morning's *Canberra Times* as well. A recent round of appeals in the education system in the Tuggeranong Valley in relation to principals' positions has resulted in at least two selection panels' decisions being overturned, with consequent distress and disruption to at least four school communities. Does the Minister accept that there is something inherently wrong with an education system that allows appeals against principals' promotions to be heard after the promoted applicants have started in their positions? A school has a say in the selection of its principal through the presence of the school board chair on the selection panel. The school community has no such input into the appeal process, and therefore no guarantee that its selection criteria are being considered. What action does the Minister propose to take to rectify this situation?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, joint selection panels for principals' appointments are currently a matter of industrial dispute between the ACT Teachers Federation and the ministry. The latest round of appointments of principals was not processed, in fact, by joint selection panels. In accordance with the provisions of the ACT Teaching Service Act, all promotions to the position of principal are subject to appeal at this time. That body is, of course, as Mr Moore has indicated, an independent body. Its majority decisions are binding on the ministry and its delegate who makes the initial decisions, and I think Mr Moore will find that that policy is one of some standing in the ACT. Mr Moore suggested to me that, in effect, we should change that policy. I think that is what he is saying to me - that we should consider changing the policy under which appeals are conducted and the time at which they are conducted. There is also the question of whether appeals might be done in some way so as to involve people at the school level.

I have to say that those are issues which have not previously been matters brought to my attention; they are not matters that I have had people ask me to review. Mr Moore is the first person to have done that, apart from a letter that I have seen today that has been sent to the *Canberra Times*, and it may be that we should consider that there should be some change of policy in this matter. But the present position is not to do that. I will consider whether there should be changes in the appeal structure, but I cannot promise that any particular development would occur along the lines that Mr Moore has suggested. It may be that we should, in fact, adopt some different approach to appeals, but I cannot say that I have any personal inclination towards putting, for example, parents or school board chairs or whatever onto appeal processes. That might not be appropriate.

Vehicle Inspections - Waiting Times

MR PROWSE: My question without notice is to the Minister for Finance and Urban Services, Mr DUBY. Would the Minister please advise the Assembly of the measures he is implementing to reduce the waiting times for vehicle inspections at the ACT vehicle registries?

MR DUBY: Thank you, Mr Prowse, for the question. In recent times there has been, as members are well aware, an increase in the waiting time taken for vehicles, particularly at the Dickson motor testing station, to go through their registration check. Indeed, the time taken for some vehicles has been up to two hours on some days.

There have been a number of factors which have been instrumental in that time delay slowly being increased from what is the normal average, I believe, of something less than 30 minutes to something over two hours. One of the major factors has been, of course, that whilst the requirement for vehicles to be registered goes on on a 365-day basis - in other words, as their anniversaries arrive the cars are due to be inspected and tested - in recent times, particularly around this time of year, there are quite a number of four-day working weeks. For a period of almost a month there were four-working-day weeks - - -

Mr Kaine: And another one next week.

MR DUBY: And another one, of course, next week, as the Chief Minister says. That means that, for that period of time, in four days the inspectors have to go through a period of inspecting 20 per cent more vehicles. As a result of that, the Government has decided to introduce procedures to, first of all, introduce a random inspection system for vehicles - including all private cars, motor cycles and commercial vehicles under two tonnes tare - which are less than six years old. One in every 20 of

16 April 1991

those vehicles manufactured since April 1985 will be selected for inspection, with all other vehicles exempt. Those vehicles will be randomly selected for inspection as their registrations become due. It certainly will not be, as has been indicated in some areas, a random inspection technique where owners will be required to present themselves at the testing stations on a one-off basis. What will happen is that, as vehicles within that class are due for registration, depending on the ebbs and flows of the testing times required at the station, approximately one in 20 of those vehicles will be required to be put over the pits when applying for re-registration.

The changes take into account statistical evidence which indicates that major wear and tear defects come into play after the sixth year of vehicle life. In addition, some 40 per cent of faults found at the testing stations concern tyres, lights and windscreens which are easily checked without any mechanical expertise. The changes also recognise that the responsibility for the condition of the car rests clearly with the owner and driver for 365 days of a year, and not just on the one day in the year that the car goes through a test station. These changes will, therefore, reduce waiting times at test stations without compromising vehicle safety.

Mr Berry: With the same amount of staff?

MR DUBY: I have heard the question being asked, "With the same amount of staff?". The answer to that, of course, is quite categorically yes. Indeed, I believe that within the testing area we actually have a staff shortage at the moment. As a further measure to reduce waiting times for members of the public, we may be required to put on additional staff.

It should be pointed out, of course, that the vehicle population of the ACT is growing at a standard rate. What this new measure will do is complement the measures that have been in place for some time, where vehicles of the ages of one, three and five years, are exempt from going through the testing station and exempt from going over the pits. The statistics indicate that this should remove some 15,000 vehicles per annum from the current number of vehicles being tested which, I might add, is in the order of some 100,000 vehicles annually. What this should do is bring back into place the testing of, perhaps, 85,000 vehicles.

The computer requires a four-week break to put it on the notices that go out to the public. We have implemented the computer process with effect from 1 June. In the meantime, to further assist Canberra motorists who perhaps are not aware of the current situation, as people roll up at the testing stations staff are going down the lists and identifying those vehicles which fall within the new guidelines for exempt vehicles and they are advising customers that they no longer need to queue and wait; they can simply go and pay their registration at that time.

So, all in all, I think there have been a number of good decisions made by the Government about this, and I am sure that the Canberra population generally will endorse the actions being taken to further improve the service by the Government to the people.

Mr Berry: Does that mean that children over six years will get a bed in the hospital?

MR DUBY: Not necessarily so and, as I said, I am confident that the - - -

Mr Berry: There has to be a lottery system before you can get a bed. Is that the way you are going to run the whole Government?

MR DUBY: The situation, as I said, exists where at the moment vehicles of the ages of one, three and five years are exempt. This simply further reduces, on statistical evidence, the requirement for inspection. I know for a fact, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the members of the population accept it wholeheartedly.

Hospital System

MS MAHER: My question is to the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts. Has the Minister seen a press release from Mr Berry which calls on the Minister to provide the Opposition with "a priority briefing on the state of our hospital system"? Will he agree to this request?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, I thank Ms Maher for that question. Mr Berry's office did contact me earlier this month to ask whether a briefing could be arranged on the state of the hospital system or, more specifically, on the hospital redevelopment. I know, because I took that call myself. I informed Mr Berry's office that a briefing would be arranged. I asked the ministry to organise this. I also asked the member of staff from Mr Berry's office when they would like the briefing to take place. That staff member told me that any time in the next month would be fine. Seven working days later, while I was attending the Education Ministers meeting in Adelaide - it is funny how the Opposition always decides to make these little surprise attacks when Ministers are away - Mr Berry issued a press release in which he called on me to provide the Opposition with a "priority briefing" on the hospitals.

I cannot understand what Mr Berry is on about. He wants a priority briefing, but any time in the next month will do. I do not understand what a priority briefing in those terms actually means. I would like him to explain that to me some time. I think it is hard to believe, Mr Speaker, that Mr Berry is genuinely interested in the management of our

16 April 1991

hospital system. It certainly appears to me that he is far more concerned with cheap political stunts, as usual. However, I will say that he will get his briefing, notwithstanding his behaviour, because this Government is not afraid to make the facts known and available.

Hospitals - Waiting Lists

MS FOLLETT: I am delighted to know that we might get that appointment, because my attempt to get an appointment with Mr Collaery has not succeeded.

I have a question for Mr Humphries, as Minister for Health. I ask Mr Humphries: What will the Government do to prevent the massive blow-out in waiting time which will result from your proposed reduction of orthopaedic surgery beds from 36 beds to 21 beds, given that the waiting lists for orthopaedic surgery are already long?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, I have to say, as I have said about other claims and allegations made in this place, that I do not accept the assertions that emanate from the opposition benches that any cuts are proposed to particular areas, until I check them for myself. It may be that there are reductions - - -

Ms Follett: You do not know? Ask any nurse or doctor.

MR HUMPHRIES: I do not know, off the top of my head, what is going on in the orthopaedic section. I do not know whether the beds Ms Follett is talking about are beds only in the principal hospital or whether they take into account beds also in the Calvary Hospital. I do not know. Ms Follett is shaking her head. I assume that she does not know either.

The fact is, Mr Speaker, that we have to be very careful before we make accusations of this kind. I do not expect massive blow-outs, as Ms Follett puts it. I see every reason for us to be able to manage the changes in our hospital system very well. And I would point out, in fact, that there is - -
-

Mr Berry: There are 1,500 waiting for a bed. You are managing it very well?

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, Mr Berry has not had the benefit of talking to other Ministers for Health about problems in other places in Australia. If he had, he would probably realise that, in fact, the problems facing the ACT public hospital system are very similar to those being faced by other systems elsewhere in this country. I think, in fact, that our position is actually much better than has been alleged by those opposite. I have information about the admission numbers in our hospital system, which are a more accurate way, I suspect, of assessing the throughput in our

hospitals and beds. Obviously, one bed might be occupied by one person for a whole month, or be occupied by several people during that month. And that, of course, is no reflection on the bed. It is a reflection on the number of people who are going through the hospital system.

Mr Duby: It might be that they want to get out of it.

MR HUMPHRIES: It could be. Mr Speaker, the point is that a better assessment of the performance of our hospital system, I think, is in the admission rates. The admission rate in July last year for our three public hospitals stood at about 2,500 for that month. It declined to about 2,200 in January of this year. Naturally, that is a period - - -

Mr Berry: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The Minister has got off the subject of the question. The question was about waiting lists, resulting from his proposed reduction in orthopaedic beds from 36 to 21. He took it on notice, and now we are getting a rambling reply about something which seems to be irrelevant.

Mr Humphries: On the point of order, Mr Speaker: I am addressing the question of waiting lists and admission rates in our public hospital system. That directly relates to the question Ms Follett asked.

Mr Berry: If the Minister really wants to direct his attention to waiting lists, he could answer the questions I have on notice. This issue is about orthopaedic beds.

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Mr Berry is debating the issue; he is not making a point of order.

MR SPEAKER: One at a time, please, Chief Minister. Continue, Mr Berry.

Mr Berry: Thank you, Chief Minister, for sitting down. The question was specifically about the proposed reduction in orthopaedic surgery beds from 36 to 21; nothing more than that. The Minister took it on notice. I think he ought to leave it there.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you for your observation, Mr Berry.

Mr Kaine: The point of order that I was making, Mr Speaker, is simply that Mr Berry was debating the issue. He was not raising a point of order at all. I think, Mr Speaker, you should control him in future.

MR SPEAKER: Please proceed, Mr Humphries.

MR HUMPHRIES: I can understand why the Opposition is sensitive about these facts; they are quite telling about the efficiency and effectiveness of our hospital system.

Mr Berry: You have to rule on the point of order.

16 April 1991

MR HUMPHRIES: He has already. You have not been paying attention.

Mr Speaker, there were 2,500 admissions in July last year, declining to about 2,200 in January this year. That, of course, is the low period for the hospital system. We have, in fact, had a very marked pick-up since that time. There were nearly 3,200 in February this year; and 3,300, going on for 3,400, in March of this year. That indicates, much more effectively than bed numbers, how many people are actually being treated in our hospital system. That is a far more effective way, in this context, of looking at the effectiveness of our hospital system.

Those opposite might not like that fact. They might not like to hear facts which go against their version of events, which is that our hospital system is crumbling into ruins. The fact is that it is not crumbling into ruins. We are getting a system which is effectively increasing its throughput. I think Mr Berry should be very careful to assimilate those facts before he next goes out and makes another false accusation about the lack of effectiveness in our public hospital system.

MS FOLLETT: I have a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. May I ask whether Mr Humphries has taken the question on notice or not?

MR HUMPHRIES: You have asserted that I have. Mr Speaker, Ms Follett has already told you - and through Mr Berry - that I have taken it on notice, so I assume that she does not wish to retrace the issue. I think Ms Follett is a bit confused today. It is obviously a big day, with all the cameras and everything in here. But, to make it perfectly clear to Ms Follett, I will certainly take her question on notice and get back to her.

Hospitals - Waiting Lists

MRS NOLAN: Mr Speaker, my question is also to Mr Humphries in his capacity as Minister for Health. I would like to ask the Minister whether, in fact, he is aware of the opposition health spokesman making an allegation this morning on ABC radio that he was not supplied with the November-December 1990 hospital booking list figures, after requesting those details in February this year.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, I thank Mrs Nolan for that question. It would seem that some local Labor politicians, like their Federal colleagues, have some trouble in remembering what was said when. On ABC radio this morning Mr Berry was quoted as saying that he was still waiting for a reply to his request in February for the November and December waiting list figures for surgery.

I would like to table in the Assembly, Mr Speaker, a copy of a letter dated 4 February this year, which was sent by Mr Craig Duby, who was then the Acting Health Minister, to Mr Berry. It detailed the breakdown of surgical booking lists by specialty in Royal Canberra Hospitals North and South, and Calvary Hospital, for the September and December quarters 1990. I present the following paper:

Surgical booking lists statistics - Copy of letter from Mr C. Duby, MLA, acting Minister for Health, Education and the Arts to Mr W. Berry, MLA, dated 4 February 1991.

A day later a news release was sent out from my office identifying a slight rise in the figures from the September quarter. This information was used at the time by the Opposition for a number of media stories that totally distorted the facts, as usual. I find it amazing that Mr Berry fails to recall his rambling rhetoric of just two short months ago.

Domestic Violence

MR JENSEN: Mr Speaker, my question is addressed to Mr Collaery, in his capacity as Attorney-General. Mr Collaery, are you in a position to advise the Assembly of the state of progress on the review of domestic violence issues within the community?

MR COLLAERY: I thank Mr Jensen for the question. It is a most appropriate question, considering the incident in the chamber earlier. Before I come to that incident, Mr Speaker, I think the Assembly is well aware that this issue is of great concern to our community. It is of such concern that a reference group involving most of the interested parties has been formed. It is being assisted by my colleague Carmel Maher, and as well there is an interdepartmental working group also looking at domestic violence issues, procedures and legislation. Members will recall that we are about to introduce legislation into the Assembly to extend the jurisdiction of domestic violence orders issued from our courts to interstate parts, so that protection can be secured by complainants whilst they are interstate.

Mr Speaker, the issues of domestic violence were graphically demonstrated in this chamber earlier in question time. I am sure members realise why we need to tackle without fear or favour the concerns affecting - - -

Ms Follett: Not a good word, Bernard.

MR COLLAERY: Ms Follett finds this frivolous apparently, Mr Speaker - the concerns affecting men in this equation. There have been some negative comments on my suggestions that we need to look towards counselling and crisis

16 April 1991

services for men, in some form approved and supported hopefully by a wide cross-section of the community. The person who interrupted the chamber proceedings graphically demonstrated his emotional concern. I am familiar with that person. Members may not be aware, but he has spent long periods in this chamber at other times sitting over there in the corner watching me, and at the moment his interest also extends, regrettably, to Ms Maher.

The outcome of the concerns that are being raised by another group, who use the title "The Lone Parents", is that a number of negative comments are being made about this Government's approach to men's concerns in this issue. In fact, some quite inflammatory comments have been made recently about the fact that the Government and, in particular, I am pursuing only the concerns of the so-called or alleged feminists in this debate.

I think this is an appropriate time for me to indicate to that association, in particular, their spokesperson, Mr Barry Williams, that the outcome at times of those statements is to focus resentment, threaten violence - and I will not go into those details - and raise other concerns by the people who take up the alleged preoccupation of this Government with feminist concerns in the domestic violence debate.

Mr Speaker, this particular person who interrupted the chamber proceedings to my knowledge has involved - and I will not go into detail - an allocation of protection resources to this Assembly.

Mr Berry: Dirt throwing and conspiracy theories again.

MR COLLAERY: Mr Berry does not appreciate the topic that I have raised, Mr Speaker. The Government is currently looking in the budget context at the services that we can offer to men who exhibit the symptoms which we saw in this chamber today. Mr Speaker, I am hopeful that we can, with the support of the community, deal with that aspect of this very great concern in the community.

Mr Kaine: Mr Speaker, I request that any further questions be placed on the notice paper.

Department of Justice and Community Services - Equal Employment Opportunity Plan

MR Kaine: On 21 March the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question that had to do with the status within the Department of Justice and Community Services of equal employment opportunity plans, and when the plans for that agency would be available to the Assembly. I took that question on notice because at that time I did not know what the situation was.

Mr Speaker, the need for a separate equal employment opportunity program for the Department of Justice and Community Services arose when that department was formally created only in last July. Before that the constituent parts of the Deputy Chief Minister's portfolio were covered by various equal employment opportunity programs. The department's draft equal employment opportunity program was forwarded to the ACT Trades and Labour Council in November last year as a basis for consultation, and was subsequently circulated to specific unions involved in this department seeking their comments. In addition, comment has been sought from the Public Service Commission and its reply is expected by the 26th of this month.

Pending finalisation of the program, which will occur as soon as the Public Service Commission and final union comments are received, a number of procedural steps have been taken in that department. They include the appointment of a full-time equal employment opportunity coordinator for the department, and the creation of an equal employment opportunity subcommittee of the departmental consultative council. That subcommittee held its first meeting last week. This program was, in fact, one of the matters that they discussed. Distributions of all equal employment opportunity policy statements have been made to all staff.

Mr Speaker, it has taken a little time in this case to get a program into place; but, as I pointed out, we are waiting on comment from concerned and involved people. In the meantime, we have taken what steps are necessary to make sure that the objectives of our equal opportunity program are being put into place.

MR SPEAKER: I would like to bring filming to a close. The sitting will be suspended until such time as the cameras are removed. At the same time, I would like to state that I believe it would be inappropriate for the filming crews to use that footage of the disturbance in the chamber, and I would like to put that embargo on that filming.

Sitting suspended from 3.26 to 3.34 pm

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

MR BERRY: I seek leave to make a statement pursuant to standing order 46.

MR SPEAKER: Do you claim to have been misrepresented?

MR BERRY: I do, sir. Mr Speaker, during his speech in relation to ambulances, Mr Humphries imputed that I had in some way - either by my actions outside of this Assembly or by my statements herein - reflected badly on the professional attitude of ambulance officers. I find that imputation offensive and, of course, untrue. It has been

16 April 1991

clear from the outset that the Labor Party, and in particular I, have the highest regard for the professional attitude of the ambulance officers. Indeed, the ambulance officers have been very patient with the Government throughout the crisis in ambulance services in the ACT. It is, after all, those ambulance officers who have had to report late to incidents as a result of the staff shortages which have arisen because of the bungling of the Government over its management of - - -

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: If Mr Berry wants to make the point about being misrepresented, that is one thing; but to again debate the issue, as he did before, on taking a point of order is going too far.

MR SPEAKER: Yes. I uphold the Chief Minister's objection, Mr Berry. I believe that, if you have claimed to have been misrepresented, sticking to that point at issue would be the way to go.

MR BERRY: I have said enough on the matter. But I will say that Mr Humphries inappropriately asked me to answer a question during question time. I would have been, in the normal course of events, quite happy to answer questions if it had been in accordance with standing orders, but I could not. He asked me did I know how many ambulance officers had not observed some sort of industrial dispute within the Ambulance Service. I have no way of knowing that. It is not within my field of operations to be able to count those sorts of numbers.

All I know is that there was concern in the service because of the Government's bungling of the Ambulance Service. There were industrial disputes. I have to say that the industrial disputes and the campaign run by the Labor Party have brought the point home to the Government. At last they are starting to do something.

Mr Humphries: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Mr Berry is abusing the privilege of a standing order 46 statement and is making, obviously, what is a new speech on this whole matter.

MR SPEAKER: Yes. Mr Berry, I would ask you to conclude your comment there. You are bringing in another argument to do with a question asked, not where you had been misrepresented.

MR BERRY: There was a misrepresentation in the fact that in some way I should be able to answer the question, and that I was in some way inadequate because I had not answered the question, which I was unable to do within the standing orders of the Assembly.

MR SPEAKER: I believe that you have made that point, Mr Berry.

MR BERRY: He also raised the issue of - - -

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Mr Berry, in seeking to make a personal explanation, said that he had been misrepresented in terms of a comment that he had made about the ambulance drivers. All that he is now talking about is totally irrelevant to that point. I again request that he be confined to the matter on which he has sought to make a statement.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you, Chief Minister. I uphold your objection.

MR BERRY: I will not confine myself to the ambulance officers because there are other issues as well on which I was misrepresented in question time.

Mr Kaine: That is not what he sought to do. He asked to make a statement under section 46 on a specific matter that he identified. We did not identify the subject matter; he did. He should confine himself to it.

MR SPEAKER: I am under the impression that he sought leave to make a personal explanation because he had been misrepresented.

Mr Kaine: In connection with a particular matter that *Hansard* will show.

MR SPEAKER: I do not believe that that is the case, Chief Minister. Mr Berry, I would ask you to conclude your remarks as quickly as possible.

MR BERRY: I will keep it as brief as I possibly can. There were a number of issues which were touched upon by Ministers and which have to be addressed. They cannot go unanswered.

Mr Kaine: Mr Speaker, this is a gross abuse of standing orders. He is now attempting to open up debate not only on what Mr Humphries said but also on what other Ministers said. We have to draw a line somewhere.

MR SPEAKER: Again, I uphold your objection, Chief Minister. Mr Berry, please conclude your remarks.

MR BERRY: Mr Speaker, you gave me permission to speak, pursuant to standing order 46, on the basis that I had been misrepresented. I intend to pursue that line.

Mr Jensen: You were specific.

MR BERRY: I was not specific.

Mr Jensen: You were very specific.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Order, Mr Jensen and Mr Berry!

16 April 1991

MR BERRY: I have dealt with the issue of ambulance officers. The other issue that was raised in relation to them was that there were some questions that needed to be answered about the truth or otherwise of a reported incident that was raised in the Assembly during question time today. I can say categorically that I was a witness - - -

Mr Humphries: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The remark Mr Berry is referring to was a question by Mrs Grassby, not by Mr Berry. How can he possibly be misrepresented by a remark that Mrs Grassby made to me, which I answered? It is impossible. He is abusing standing order 46.

MR SPEAKER: I agree, provided his name was not used in that answer. That is the question I do not - - -

Mr Berry: The Labor Opposition of course was, and that impugns the lot of us.

MR SPEAKER: That is not you. Mr Berry, I ask you to return to your seat.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I have not finished yet.

MR SPEAKER: I believe you have.

Mr Berry: You gave me leave.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Berry, please!

Mr Berry: You gave me leave. There is the issue of the briefing, the issue of the questions that are still on notice - - -

MR SPEAKER: Mr Berry, please resume your seat.

AUDITOR-GENERAL - REPORT NO. 2 OF 1991 ACT Government Vehicle Fleet

MR SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Audit Act 1989, I table for the information of members the following paper:

Auditor-General's Report No. 2 of 1991, "An Efficiency Audit of the ACT Government Vehicle Fleet".

Motion (by **Mr Collaery**), by leave, agreed to:

That the Assembly authorises the publication of the Auditor-General's Report No. 2 of 1991.

MR KAINE (Chief Minister) (3.41): Mr Speaker, in connection with the Auditor-General's report that has been tabled, and which we have given approval to publish, I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you, Chief Minister. Do you wish to refer it to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts?

MR KAINE: No. I just wish to move, at this stage, that it be noted.

Ms Follett: Mr Speaker, on a point of clarification: Is it not the case that Auditor-General's reports are automatically referred to the Public Accounts Committee? I do not believe that there is a necessity for a motion.

MR SPEAKER: The Public Accounts Committee can take it upon themselves to pick up the report and deal with it.

Debate (on motion by **Ms Follett**) adjourned.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION AND COMMENCEMENT PROVISIONS **Papers**

MR COLLAERY (Deputy Chief Minister): Mr Speaker, pursuant to section 6 of the Subordinate Laws Act 1989, I table subordinate legislation in accordance with the schedule of gazettal notice of commencement and notice for determinations, exemptions and regulations, as follows:

City Area Leases Act - City Area Leases (Betterment Charge Assessment) Regulation - No. 7 of 1991 (S23, dated 3 April 1991).

Drugs of Dependence (Amendment) Act - Notice of commencement - (S16, dated 15 March 1991).

Health Services Act - Determination of fees and charges - No. 8 of 1991 (S21, dated 28 March 1991).

Housing Assistance Act - HomeBuyer Housing Assistance Program - No. 7 of 1991 (S18, dated 2 April 1991).

Liquor Act - Determination No. 6 of 1991 (G12, dated 27 March 1991).

Poisons Act and Drugs of Dependence Act - Determination of fees - No. 9 of 1991 (S21, dated 28 March 1991).

Poisons and Drugs (Amendment) Act - Notice of commencement (S16, dated 15 March 1991).

Public Baths and Public Bathing Act - Public Baths and Public Bathing Regulations (Amendment) No. 6 of 1991 (S17, dated 21 March 1991).

Public Place Names Act - Determination No. 5 of 1991 (G11, dated 20 March 1991).

Tobacco Act - Exemptions (2) (S20, dated 26 March 1991).

16 April 1991

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS COMMISSION
Ministerial Statement

MR KAINE (Chief Minister), by leave: Mr Speaker, the Commonwealth Grants Commission's fourth report of 1991 on the financing of the Australian Capital Territory was released on Monday, 8 April 1991. Given the significance of this report in the negotiation of Commonwealth funding levels for 1991-92 and beyond, it is important, I believe, that the Assembly be aware of the major implications of this report.

I would first like to correct a mistaken impression created in the media on this report. Contrary to the headline in the *Canberra Times* on Tuesday, 9 April, I do not ridicule the estimates of the general revenue assistance grant for 1991-92 included in that report. I take the commission's findings very seriously. As one expects from the commission, it is a well researched and comprehensive report. I congratulate the chairman, Dick Rye, the members of the commission and their staff, for completing a complex task during a period in which they had many other references to complete.

To set dimensions to the level of the \$418.1m grant assessed by the commission for general review assistance for 1991-92, I point out that it is \$70m less than the estimates for the equivalent grants included in the ACT forward estimates for that year. Our estimate of \$488.8m was based on the assumption that the Commonwealth would maintain its contribution at this year's level. That was the only assumption that we could make in the absence of firm advice last year from the Commonwealth as to its intentions. The commission emphasises that their estimate of \$418.1m needs to be used cautiously. In particular, it does not reflect the ACT's continuing requirements for Commonwealth assistance for functions outside the scope of its inquiry - an amount which the commission was unable to quantify. Nevertheless, the commission's imputation is that there is additional assistance to which the ACT is entitled. This issue will be taken up in negotiation with the Commonwealth.

It reflects, I think, the lack of full alignment of Commonwealth funding for the ACT with Commonwealth-State arrangements and therefore the inability of the commission to apply full comparability at this time. I trust that in these negotiations the Commonwealth will also take the commission's findings, and particularly its qualifications, seriously. The commission's report will represent a crucial element of our negotiations with the Commonwealth because it confirms the magnitude of the budget adjustment task transferred from the Commonwealth to us in the ACT. Its finding of overfunding of \$135m in the year 1988-89 starkly shows the magnitude of the funding problem which must be brought under effective control by the ACT Government.

It must be noted that this figure - the zenith of overfunding - occurred in the last year of Commonwealth financial management which also happened to be the first year of a so-called three-year transition period in which we were supposed to be reducing our expenditures. The Hawke-Keating Labor Government clearly abandoned any attempt at fiscal control in the ACT in the years before self-government. Problems were addressed by throwing money at them, with such irresponsibility that we were left with only two years to adjust - not three. We were left with a base significantly higher than any of us here would have realised. It is significant that the Leader of the Opposition has consistently rejected my view that major adjustments were necessary. In fact, she is still saying it, surprisingly.

The irresponsible approach by the Commonwealth, and the failure to assess the true situation exhibited by the Labor Party in opposition here, contrasts with the measures that my Government has taken to reduce what would otherwise be an unmanageable financial burden on this community. Mr Speaker, you will recall, for example, that the 1990-91 budget papers, reflecting the first Alliance Government budget, showed an \$81m improvement in a full year in the ACT's recurrent budget. That represented more than 7 per cent of the total expenditures. This reflected hard decisions, taken of necessity, to address the task of reducing our expenditures - decisions that we have taken despite their unpopularity in some quarters.

The commission has concluded that for 1989-90, the first year of self-government, the Commonwealth should accept full financial responsibility for past levels of excess expenditure. That is a conclusion that I thoroughly endorse. It recognises that in the early years of self-government the ACT remains, to a large extent, locked into past expenditure patterns inherited from the Commonwealth. Most importantly, the report recognises the need for transitional arrangements to enable this past overfunding to be addressed systematically, logically and fairly. To be fair to Ms Follett, it must be observed that she has consistently argued, as I have, that ongoing transitional arrangements are essential.

I am gratified that, in view of the magnitude of the expenditure adjustments still required, the commission has now accepted the validity of that argument and has proposed special transitional funding allowances. The report, therefore, provides a more rational and ordered basis than has previously existed for the transition of ACT finances to a State-like basis. It does not, however, reduce the need for expenditure constraints or the urgency with which the ACT must address the fundamental overexpenditure in key service areas such as health, education and policing.

16 April 1991

On the contrary, it indicates that we will still have to effect budget adjustments in 1991-92 of a similar order of magnitude to those put into effect in this current year's budget. The task facing the Government in continuing to control expenditures remains very severe, notwithstanding the transitional allowances proposed by the commission. The ACT faces the prospect of significant further financial pressures in the forthcoming budget. We cannot anticipate, at this stage, the outcome of negotiations with the Commonwealth.

Major policy initiatives have already been decided upon in the most significant areas of excess expenditure identified in the report as part of our plan to get our house in order, and they are being put into effect. Hospital services are being consolidated with the establishment of a principal hospital and the better use of Calvary Hospital being undertaken to improve the quality of services at a cost that we can afford. As the commission's report acknowledges, several years will be required in order for those initiatives to achieve the full results we are seeking. Indeed, the Government had assumed that the full benefit would probably not be achieved in less than five years. In education, the cost-saving measures introduced since self-government have clearly been shown to be necessary and unavoidable, if even greater disruption in future years is to be avoided.

I am confident that the outcome of reviews currently under way, such as schools task force and the review of high schools in the Belconnen area, will also identify substantial additional benefits for the community, benefits which we must obtain in light of the adjustment task left to us by the Commonwealth. The program to place ACT TAFE progressively on a more viable basis is clearly essential and will assist in overcoming the financial problems that have been repeatedly identified in that sector.

The efforts already made in these functional areas, and which we will continue, will protect the ACT from an unacceptably high tax burden in the future. In addition to these, the Government is considering how to come to grips with the identified overfunding of the police services. We will not tolerate any diminution in protection for the community. I am appreciative of the deservedly high reputation of the Australian Federal Police. Police salaries, of course, are not subject to ACT Government influence. However, we will, of necessity, be closely examining service delivery arrangements in policing to ensure that overheads are reasonable, that efficiency is as high as possible, and that we do not require our police to carry out unnecessary functions.

We have an objective of continuing revision of all government agencies to ensure that the community receives value for money. The police will be included in this continuing review. We are moving to a major restructuring of the machinery of government to ensure that it best suits

the needs of this community, but restructuring is not cheap. The hospital and TAFE programs, in particular, require major additional expenditure over and above normal operating costs to enable future savings to be achieved. It is almost certain that significant expenditure of a similar nature will now be needed to reduce police operating costs in future years.

The transitional allowances assessed by the Grants Commission do not include any allowance for the high costs of restructuring. Much is being accomplished within the ACT budget, but it is essential that the Commonwealth now release the funds, totalling \$50m, that it has frozen in the ACT Transitional Funding Trust Account as a consequence of breaking its real terms funding guarantee to the ACT Government. The Commonwealth must release those funds over the next two years at the outside, in addition to providing the transitional allowances recommended by the Grants Commission and a proper allowance for the expenditures not allowed for in the commission's calculations.

There is no scope for attempts to return to the costly and inefficient practices the Commonwealth imposed on us and which this community simply cannot afford. I know that there are some who would wish to return to those comfortable arrangements, but the clock cannot be turned back and nor, in my view, should it be. The report shows the major efforts that have been made to overcome any earlier ACT revenue shortfall compared to the States. The ACT cannot sustain past levels of expenditure without having to impose unacceptably high tax burdens far exceeding those in the States. Such a high tax strategy would have a seriously adverse impact, not only on individuals but also on the ACT economy and, in turn, on local employment.

It would impose hardships, both directly and indirectly, on ordinary Canberra residents. The Grants Commission has not been persuaded by arguments that the ACT had in the past been overcompensated for the impact of national capital influences. I did not accept the arguments put to the commission by the National Capital Planning Authority. They were not well founded, and the commission was not persuaded by them either.

As I have indicated, there will need to be negotiation with the Commonwealth on the many detailed issues raised by the report. I have written to the Prime Minister to propose that we address these issues soon and that we meet prior to the Premiers Conference if major issues remain unresolved. The commission has completed a complex task. It has provided a reasonable basis for the intergovernmental negotiations now required.

In summary, the report's findings confirm that the ACT is still overfunded by the Commonwealth and that this overfunding is a legacy of earlier Commonwealth decisions. They reinforce the need for continued expenditure restraint

16 April 1991

in the ACT if the tax burden on the local community is to be kept down to an acceptable level. The alternative, of course, is a tax burden so great as would drive out the employment and investment that would be essential for Canberra's future. The findings provide the basis for the ACT's legitimate claim to transitional arrangements beyond 30 June 1991, as promised by the Prime Minister.

The report also puts beyond doubt the need for further responsible financial management on the part of the ACT Government - something, regrettably, that the Leader of the Opposition has consistently closed her mind to. I present the following paper:

Commonwealth Grants Commission - 4th Report of 1991 on Financing the ACT - Ministerial statement, 16 April 1991.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

Debate (on motion by **Ms Follett**) adjourned.

BLUEPRINT FOR THE AGEING - PROGRESS REPORT
Ministerial Statement and Paper

MR KAINE (Chief Minister), by leave: Mr Speaker, I will table shortly the Government's progress report on implementing the *Blueprint for the Ageing* which was released last week to coincide with Seniors Week. In March last year, I launched the blueprint and I promised at that time to provide the Assembly with regular progress reports on its implementation.

The blueprint gave a framework for the implementation of an integrated five-year plan covering all aspects of the life of the elderly. I feel it is therefore appropriate, a year after the release of the blueprint, to outline to the community how the Government is progressing in implementing the strategies outlined in the blueprint. Clearly, some strategies will take longer than a year to implement. This was recognised at the time that the blueprint was developed and accounts for its emergence as a five-year plan in which realistic targets for implementation of policies can be realised. This report does not say, therefore, that policies have been implemented when there is still work to be done; rather, it identifies the progress to date.

This progress report on the first anniversary of the launch of the blueprint takes stock of the work that has been done to date towards achieving our strategies. It has been coordinated by a government agency committee which brings together all the relevant agencies within the ACT Government Service responsible for services and policies affecting the ageing.

In the current climate of fiscal constraints it is important that the Government is delivering services both efficiently and effectively. By this I mean that we have to make sure that the ageing community is receiving services that are appropriate, that they are properly targeting the needs of the ageing and that they are delivered in a cost-effective way. Often these services may not be very different from those needed by the general community. There are a number of circumstances, particularly for the frail aged, where it has to fall to the Government to ensure that essential services are being properly provided.

It is important to provide an environment where the ageing are able to make choices and have options in their everyday lives and where they are able to realise their full potential in our society. The Alliance Government recognises that the ageing play a special role in this community.

I would like to recall some of the initiatives that have been taken since the *Blueprint for the Ageing* was released in March last year. On 1 July last year I announced the Seniors Card providing concessional off-peak hours ACTION bus fares to holders of the card. That card is issued to ACT residents aged 60 years and over regardless of income, in recognition of their contribution to the community. Seniors in the ACT collectively spend \$250m a year. There are approximately 24,000 ACT residents over the age of 60 and already 10,000 have taken up the Seniors Card. A schedule of the participating businesses was launched during Seniors Week. From the time of the card's introduction it was intended that the range of discounts available would be developed in the government, retail, hospitality, finance, travel, commercial and entertainment sectors. A number of additional discounts have already been offered through informal approaches to business, commercial and entertainment outlets, and the list is growing each week.

We also now offer free entry to government funded swimming pools for people over the age of 60 and concessions on ACT Government services such as a 15 per cent discount on sales from the Yarralumla nursery, recreational courses offered by ACTAID - the TAFE's commercial arm - and a 50 per cent concession on civil marriage ceremonies in the Registrar's office. I am sure that will be of great benefit for the over-60s. Other initiatives that have been developed are Housing Trust strategies for the ageing following the release of their discussion paper, Housing Options for Older People. In particular the Trust is currently negotiating joint ventures with Goodwin Homes and Brindabella Gardens. Work on a health strategy and a transport policy for the ageing has started. The progress report also outlines the initiatives for the home and community care program in 1991. The highest priority is being accorded to transport for people with special needs and to respite care for home and community care clients.

16 April 1991

Mr Speaker, in conclusion I would like to emphasise how important I believe it is to keep the community informed on how the Government is implementing the blueprint. I will continue to inform the members of what this Government is doing to make the lives of the ageing easier. I present the following papers:

Progress Report on Implementing the Blueprint for the Ageing -
Ministerial statement, 16 April 1991.
Report.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the papers.

Debate (on motion by **Mrs Grassby**) adjourned.

SELL-OFF OF SCHOOL SITES **Discussion of Matter of Public Importance**

MR SPEAKER: I have received a letter from Mr Wood proposing that a matter of public importance be submitted to the Assembly for discussion, namely:

The Government's fast tracking of the sell-off of school sites to prevent at the next election the democratic expression of the community's view about re-opening schools.

MR WOOD (4.03): Mr Speaker, this is the further chapter in the long and unfortunate saga of the Government's plan to demolish the government school system in the ACT. The saga still has some way to go before the system is saved; but it is clear already that the Government has lost its debate, and the Government knows this. This is the reason for the unseemly haste to move the planning proposals that we have seen today - so that the schools may be closed. The Government is rushing this now so that it will not be an issue at the election early next year, or before. It is fast tracking this issue, Chief Minister.

Mr Kaine: It is not.

MR WOOD: It is fast tracking, to get it off the agenda.

Mr Humphries: Prove it.

MR WOOD: I certainly will. The Government does not want to compete with the ALP on this issue. It knows that it cannot. The Government does not want the community to decide the issue of school closures because it knows what would happen if the community were given that opportunity. It would suffer a heavy loss in the polls. Well, of course, that will happen in any circumstance.

However, the Government has underestimated the determination of the community to save its schools. The schools and their communities are fighting on, and along with them the ALP is fighting on. The schools know that we will reopen them; and the Government knows that too, which is why it wants to act in the way it has.

Mr Collaery: You will reopen them, full stop?

MR WOOD: We will reopen those schools, yes. We will consult with the communities on reopening those schools. That will be a consultation, as I already understand following my discussions on how and when we will reopen those schools.

Mr Humphries: Which schools - the ones you closed?

MR WOOD: We will carry on the fight, Mr Humphries, and I will respond to your rather spurious claims about that a little later. The Liberals, of course, look on this with delight. They are very happy that schools should close. The Rally have surrendered and the No Self Government Party looks on, it seems, in confusion.

Mr Duby: It does not exist.

MR WOOD: It does not exist. It is the Independents, is it?

Mr Duby: That is right.

MR WOOD: All right. Well, they look on with added confusion. It was clear from the start that the Government's intention was to make a capital gain from the sale of the school sites. I think the first press statement I put out on this matter in about March last year, over a year ago, made the point that the school closures made sense from the Government's stance only if there was some capital gain at the end of it. There was no other benefit. The Chief Minister at other times has commented on the need to realise the assets of the ACT. Mr Kaine, when he sees schools, sees only dollars, whereas I can see education programs and learning and vital activity.

For the Liberals, the sites are good for construction. It seems that having green space is an offence. In these planning documents we see some sort of formula expressed that so many people earn so much green space. I would think that the only formula that counts is what the community wants and is prepared to support. This Government does not value the urban infrastructure of the ACT, but the community does value that infrastructure. It values Canberra. It appreciates and places the highest priority on its open spaces. Canberrans repeatedly say, over and above anything else, that they want to keep

16 April 1991

Canberra the way it is. This Government acts over and over again to change Canberra from the way it is. It continues its attack on Canberra, breaking down what the Canberrans appreciate most of all; and it was the same with schools.

The Canberra community accords a high priority to its schools, but not so the Alliance Government. Canberrans say that they want a great education system. Well, they should have it. Canberrans say that they want the green space that is here; so they should retain it. I suggest to the Chief Minister that he should ask those who live in the ACT, that he should consult with them. I suspect that that is a hope that will not be realised. We have not seen evidence of that sort of interest in the past. Unfortunately, we will not see it in the future.

I should warn him that the protest movement surrounding those schools is growing. It is being joined by those people who have no children but who have an interest in keeping the suburb the way it is. So the protest is not diminishing; it is increasing. A particularly unfortunate aspect of this is that the sale of the school sites, if it is ever achieved, would make the decisions about school closures irreversible. The reports we have seen and the documents about - - -

Mr Doby: You are not going to reverse them, Bill.

MR WOOD: Let me say this, most clearly: The ALP will reverse your decisions and those schools will be reopened. The position we have placed ourselves in is most emphatic and, unlike people on that side of the house, we honour our commitments. There is no recognition here that the situation can change. Populations can fluctuate. They can drop and they can grow again. What you have here is an execution of the schools. You are cutting off their heads. You are killing the schools and there is no possibility of any change subsequently. It is the Government's intention to close the options.

Mr Humphries: What is the difference between what you did and what we have done?

MR WOOD: I will be telling you that in a moment. Demography does change. Populations do vary. There is a ripple effect in the ACT. Inner suburbs decline in numbers and then they start to regenerate. I have seen that in the area where I live and where Mr Moore lives. We have seen it. Ainslie school is a great example. The situation will develop. The figures shown in the planning variations in some cases already illustrate that. The populations will increase and the time will come, on the Government's criteria, not the ALP's criteria, when there will be numbers there to justify that school.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr Wood! I would like to inform the members of the presence in the gallery of children and their supervisors from the Chernobyl region who are visiting Australia. They have been sponsored on their visit to Australia by the Chernobyl Disaster Relief Fund. On behalf of all members, I bid them a warm welcome.

MR WOOD: If the Government is intent on keeping schools with larger numbers it should have considered the option of keeping a school in its sight and using it for other purposes, eventually to be returned to education as that inevitable regeneration of population transpires. The Government has declined to do that.

The planning documents that arrived on my table today leave open the options of what may occur in these suburbs - whether there will be residential development, medium density housing, possible community use or, in one case, offices. I have no doubt that the Government will seek to maximise its income and will therefore be tempted to allow maximum density of living because that will maximise its profits. Maximising profits and making money is all that this Government is about. I think it is unfortunate that the documents are not more precise about the use that each site will be put to. That lack of precision is unfortunate. The documents refer, in each case, to trees; and these are important. Let me quote something from the document concerning Hackett school. It is a quite significant term, I am afraid, for the suburb. It says:

A plantation of mature pines and eucalypts on the southern side of the school site forms a distinct edge to the site ...

In fact, that is an understatement. It is a magnificent stand of trees. Not long ago I stood there, in front of some TV cameras, projecting into the future exactly what was going to happen; that they could go.

Mr Collaery: Where are the trees?

MR WOOD: At Hackett.

Mr Collaery: They are specifically preserved in the instrument. Read it.

MR WOOD: Well, you had better point it out. I thank you for that, because it does not seem to me to be clearly expressed.

The point I want to raise, as I conclude this speech, is the one indicated by Mr Humphries, by way of interjection, and comment in the paper today and by the Chief Minister in answer to a question earlier. They ask why we did not reopen schools that were closed earlier. Well, I will tell you why we did not. The circumstances are very different. Mr Kaine said that the ALP did nothing about those closed schools. Well, that is about right. We did not do

16 April 1991

anything. The history is this: Those schools were closed by a Federal Government - a Labor Government, I will acknowledge - to which the ALP in the ACT was totally opposed. We were quite unsuccessful. I am sure Mr Humphries has gone to his Federal Ministers from time to time, before this Parliament too, no doubt, and been knocked back. Well, that happened to us. We opposed it, strongly. I would like to hear that aside by Mr Humphries.

Mr Duby: He said that there have not been any Liberal Ministers since he has been involved in politics.

MR WOOD: Well, State parties are not always successful at convincing their Federal colleagues of courses of action. We opposed that, but we lost. We did not seek to reopen them when the Follett Government was in office for that seven months. It was not presented to us. No group in the community came to us and said, "Reopen those schools". It was not a part of our consideration. On this occasion there were so many requests that it did get that consideration. The ALP, in contrast with the Government, does listen to the community.

Further, a most significant factor was that Mr Humphries and his Alliance Government showed clearly that they were setting out to dismantle the system. This was no mere closure of a few schools. He was setting out, in the first instance, to close 15 to 25 schools, with no guarantee of further action. It was a fundamental change to the school system with which we were presented. Further than that, the Minister and his Government ignored carefully established procedures to be put into operation when schools were planned for closure. In those circumstances it was necessary to defend the schooling system. In those circumstances the ALP attended to the requests from the community.

In view of the Government's massive campaign to destroy the school system, in view of its avoidance of established strategies concerning school closures, and along with the lack of any mandate from this community to take that action, the ALP therefore considered seriously the approaches that had been made to it. We decided that, with the consultation of the community, we would reopen those schools. That view is respected and accepted in the community. It will remain an issue, despite these efforts of haste, to be decided at the next election.

The Government sets out to discredit this and to assert in here and in the community that we are not serious. We are serious. We have made it absolutely emphatic and, as I have said before, and it bears repeating, the ALP has demonstrated that it keeps its word, and that we will do.

MR KAINÉ (Chief Minister) (4.18): Mr Speaker, the issues raised in this matter are indeed issues of importance to the people of the ACT, but they are not important for any of the reasons given by Mr Wood. They are important because this exercise is another example of the firm intention of the Alliance Government to look after the assets of the Territory, to be prudent about the use of its resources, to ensure that costs are reduced and that decisions are taken in the broader interests of the Territory as a whole.

The schools involved in the draft variations to the Territory Plan released for comment by the ACT Planning Authority are all currently vacant. Four of them closed at the end of 1990, and the fifth, at Lyons, closed at the end of the first term this year.

The decision to close the schools was not an easy one, but we did not shirk our responsibilities to help create a more efficient school network. No responsible government could continue to sustain the situation in which school buildings were so underutilised while at the same time the pressures on the Territory's recurrent budget were so great.

The closure of the schools is a fact. The children have established new patterns of school attendance, and school administrations have responded well to the needs of the receiving schools. To hanker for the reopening of the closed schools may have some emotional appeal, but it is not a rational response to the needs of the Territory in terms of making the best use of resources or of providing the most efficient education system.

Mr Wood: That is not what they say.

MR KAINÉ: Mr Speaker, I listened carefully to what Mr Wood had to say. I would have thought that he would do me the same courtesy. Given the situation, Mr Speaker, the consideration of new uses for the sites of the former schools is a perfectly reasonable planning activity. The ACT Planning Authority has invited public comment on proposed variations to the Territory Plan. This means that they have set in train a normal procedure that, following public consultation, will lead to the authority making recommendations to the Government on the range of uses that may be appropriate for the sites in the future.

Current land use of a community facility has not been removed, as community use of the site remains a valid planning provision. The proposed policies also permit the existing buildings to be used for offices of sporting, cultural, social or other non-profit, community-based organisations. Indeed, this is the approach adopted by the Government in relation to the use of the Pearce school building - a school closed by Labor in 1988. Other uses are also seen as appropriate to be considered as alternatives for the reuse of these sites. The main additional use is housing, especially medium density

16 April 1991

housing and/or aged persons units, both urgently needed in Canberra. In the case of Holder there is also a proposed provision for small scale offices for professional suites on the edge of the site opposite the local shops, and in Cook policies have been identified for a number of blocks adjacent to the former school site.

Mr Speaker, the proposals that have been released for comment are the result of a professional assessment of the land uses that may be appropriate now that the schools have closed. In this regard I should emphasise two points. Firstly, the proposed planning policies will allow a range of uses and, secondly, the agreement of planning policies is neither a program for the demolition of the buildings nor a commitment to allocate the sites to any particular function. Essentially they set out to identify the uses which would be appropriate in the broader planning context. This action is not a hasty response to particular current pressures. It is the logical next step in a program to make appropriate use of the sites.

Members may recall that in questions without notice in September last year Mr Moore asked me what stage had been reached in regard to new planning policies for the schools then under consideration for closure. My reply was along the lines that I was not sure of the details but had asked that action be taken quickly to prevent a recurrence of the situation that occurred with the round of school closures put into place by the Commonwealth Government, that is, by the Labor Party. In that case the schools sat around for two years without any resolution of the issues. It was not until the Alliance Government gave the matter priority that new policies were gazetted.

There is therefore no case for claiming that the action is proceeding with undue haste, and that seems to be the thrust of Mr Wood's matter of public importance. It has been our intention from the beginning of this exercise that when any schools were closed action would be taken quickly to identify the ongoing uses for those sites. The issue will certainly be off the agenda, Mr Wood, for the next election - not because we wish to avoid the issue or because we do not believe that our decision was right, but simply because it must be determined long before then in the community interest. In passing I might add that, as a result of our action on the Labor initiated group of school closures, the people of the ACT have now benefited - it has taken three years - from the revenue earned from the sale of part of the former sites at Page and Pearce.

It is instructive to note that the Opposition seems to have adopted two different standards in its approach to this issue - one standard for schools closed by the Labor Commonwealth Government and another for the responsible actions of this Government.

Often have I listened to the members of the Opposition talking about the need for urban consolidation. Here we have an opportunity to put into practice the sort of project which would increase the population in some of the older suburbs and make better use of the existing physical and social infrastructure. In each of the five neighbourhoods involved with these schools the current population is down by 20 to 25 per cent from the suburb's population at its peak. Making use of the opportunity afforded by the closure of the schools gives us the opportunity to go some way to balancing this loss. Members of the Opposition who periodically raise issues on the need to provide better housing for low income earners would have to agree that some of the sites would be very suitable for public housing, and the Alliance Government will therefore be consulting the ACT Housing Trust on its requirement for land in these areas.

Yesterday's *Canberra Times* carried a story about an alleged threat to certain existing uses adjacent to the school site in Cook. This was a somewhat dramatic interpretation of the situation. There is no such threat. The policy merely provides alternative uses if current uses were to cease - a perfectly legitimate planning activity.

The documents that have been released by the ACT Planning Authority seek public comment on the proposed new planning policies for the school sites. The period for public comment closes on 4 May. The Planning Authority will then consider the written responses and forward its recommendations to the ACT Executive and, subject to the Government's decision, the variations will then be tabled in the Legislative Assembly. As members will be aware, there is then a period during which a member can move disallowance of the variations if he believes that his position is soundly based. I believe that these opportunities for public comment are adequate. That there are proposed new uses will certainly not come as a surprise to local residents, even if it is a surprise to the members opposite.

Yesterday Mr Connolly wrote to the Planning Authority seeking reasons for the decision to propose a draft variation to the Territory Plan in respect of these school sites. The answer, Mr Connolly, is quite simple; it is the Government's policy.

I invite members of the Opposition and, indeed, all members of the general public to consider the proposals and to write to the Planning Authority on the subject. I look forward to receiving the authority's recommendations and to making a decision on the basis of planning principles, efficient use of the land and the longer term interests of the ACT community.

16 April 1991

Mr Speaker, the Labor Opposition says that they will reopen these schools. I submit that this is a cynical and cruel promise, maintaining false hopes on the part of some parents which will simply not be realised. Labor will not reopen these schools, just as they did not and will not reopen those closed in 1988. They know that the community finances will not be available to allow them to do so. Those people at Lyons and Cook, in particular, who rely on Labor's promise are destined for disappointment. As to fast tracking, Mr Speaker, Mr Wood, at least, obviously believes that any implementation taking less than about five years, is, ipso facto, fast tracking. I do not accept that and neither does anybody else in this community.

MR CONNOLLY (4.27): Mr Speaker, the Opposition's attack in this matter of public importance is in relation to the fast tracking of the sell-off - the flogging of community assets - of the school sites. The Chief Minister in his peroration says that this is not fast tracking; that the Labor Party believes that anything that happens in less than five years is fast tracking.

Mr Kaine: That is what I said, and that is what I meant.

MR CONNOLLY: Well, three weeks ago term 1 finished and within three weeks they are trying to flog off the Lyons school. If that is not fast tracking, what is? The fact of the matter, Mr Speaker, is that this Government is terrified of the effect of the Labor promise on schools in the community. The Labor promise, made unequivocally by Labor leader Rosemary Follett, and repeated by members of this party, is that Labor will reopen neighbourhood schools provided the community wants that and provided the school sites are available for reopening.

The Government knows that it cannot match that promise in the community. No-one will believe them anyway. This is the Government that includes the Residents Rally - members of the party who said, "The Rally believes that no school in the ACT should close until all alternatives have been considered and the school community, students, parents and teachers, have had an opportunity to discuss the proposal and make recommendations on future ramifications". As the Rally members are so fond of pointing out, that policy is very similar to that of the Labor Party. The difference is that the Labor Party stuck to the policy and the Rally did not. There is nothing like a ministerial car to get between a politician and a policy. They were far keener to get into government and join the Liberal close-down agenda than stick to their policy.

They know that they cannot confront the community on a battle of policies. They know that they cannot go out there and honestly debate what their policy is, because the community will say, "Well, we do not care what you say your policy is; we have seen your practice. It is your practice we are worried about". So what they are trying to do is close this debate by ramming through the closure of the

schools, getting in and bulldozing those schools and putting up townhouses, so that when the next election comes along the Labor Party will have difficulty in saying that it can reopen Cook and Lyons schools because they will have put a bulldozer through them. They are not game to have this issue debated and decided by the community.

Mr Wood made the most fundamental point towards the close of his remarks earlier this afternoon. He made the assertion, which we repeatedly make, that this Government has no mandate to close the schools and has no mandate to sell these sites.

Mr Humphries: Did you in 1988?

MR CONNOLLY: It is abundantly clear that this is the most divisive issue in the ACT community. It is abundantly clear that it will be a feature at the next election; so these school sites ought to remain until after the next election.

Mr Humphries is very fond of debating what happened in 1988. This morning he was very fond of debating what may or may not have happened in Western Australia four or five years ago between Western Australian politicians and Western Australian business people. I have yet to hear him on what is happening between Tasmanian Liberal politicians and Tasmanian Labor politicians in bribery and corruption allegations down there. He is very keen to talk about anything other than the issue before this community, and that is these school sites.

But there is a difference, an interesting difference, which would fit into his argument about the school sites. He says, "Well, this is the same process as happened in 1988 and the same result should flow". Well, interestingly, of course, in the case of the 1988 school closures which, as we keep saying, Labor locally opposed but the Federal Labor Government proceeded with, the school sites remained as school sites and able to be reopened during an intervening election period. Had a candidate stood for any of the seats in Canberra with a promise to reopen the schools and won, those schools perhaps may have been reopened. But there was no party with a promise and commitment to reopen those 1988 schools.

Mr Humphries: No, not the Labor Party either.

MR CONNOLLY: No, not the Labor Party. There never has been a promise to reopen those 1988 schools. But the 1990 school closure is very different. It happened after self-government. It happened after the 1988 closures which, of course, were, at the time, sold to the Canberra community on the basis of a rationalisation of schools to allow a self-governing ACT to continue with an education system into the next decade.

16 April 1991

The 1990 school closures have split this community down the middle. There is a clear political divide. There is the Follett Labor promise that those schools will be reopened and there is the mealy-mouthed Residents Rally policy which gets implemented as a Liberal Party school closure. The community has a clear choice at the next election, and it has had that choice since the Labor Party made its statement of policy; that is, a vote for the Australian Labor Party will mean that these schools can be reopened and a vote for one of the various odds and sods of parties that form the Alliance will mean that the schools will remain closed. That is a decision that ought to be before - -

Mr Collaery: The people will not trust your party. Your party has lost its credibility.

MR CONNOLLY: Mr Collaery says that people will not trust the Labor Party. As I say, this is the man whose party has this admirable policy on school closures. What happened to the admirable policy on school closures? It disappeared into the Liberal Party agenda for the price of a ministerial car. Mr Speaker, we are quite content to be judged on the issue of trustworthiness by the people of Canberra. The Follett Labor Government promised not to close schools, and it did not. The Residents Rally promised not to close schools, and it did. We will let the people make the decision on that. Mr Speaker, we have consistently said that we will fight this decision. We have consistently said that this is a decision that, at the end of the day, is for the people of Canberra.

It was interesting yesterday that Mr Jensen declined to debate this issue on the basis that he had a conflict of interest - so the ABC told the people of Canberra - between his role as chair of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Committee and Executive Deputy Assisting the Chief Minister on Planning, Environment, Heritage and Leasehold Management. A public servant was left to justify this decision on morning talk-back radio, and he took some pains to point out that this was a decision initiated by the Planning Authority, not a decision directed by the Government. Well, the Chief Minister clearly said in question time that this was directed by the Government. In his final remarks this afternoon, in response to the fact that I have lodged a request for a statement of reasons for this decision under the Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act, he said, "I will tell Mr Connolly the reasons why we are rezoning the school; it is because it is government policy". That clears the air on this matter.

It is apparent that this is not a planning-driven decision. This is not a decision on planning constraints. That is not surprising, because when the Interim Territory Planning Authority was involved in making remarks and contributions to the Hudson report it was pretty clear that it maintains the longstanding policy of planners in the Territory in relation to the importance of neighbourhood schools.

It is clear that this is a politically-driven decision to fast track the sell-off in order to try to get the Government out of the political bind, the political bind being that it does not want to go to the people in a situation where the Labor Party is able to make good on its clear promise that it will reopen these schools if the schools remain. It is doing what it has done to the hospitals. It is certainly trying to ensure that the next Health Minister, Mr Berry, will have no option in relation to hospitals because it is ripping the guts out of the hospital system. It is trying to ensure that the same thing will happen to the schools. All it has to do is delay the process.

Well, if the Government will not delay the process, we will do the best that we can to delay the process for it. We will fight this by way of legal challenge. We will fight this politically in this chamber. We will encourage community opposition, and there will be vast community opposition, particularly in relation to the Lyons and Cook communities who seem to be the most committed to demanding that their schools remain. At the end of the day it will be fought in this Assembly. As the Chief Minister said, and he is quite correct in this, when these decisions are finally taken, when this Government decides in its joint party room to flog off these sites and to approve the planning variation to allow town houses to be developed, each variation will be subject to disallowance. And it is town houses that we are talking about.

We hear lots of pious statements about community facilities and varying community leases, but we see that medium density residential is an appropriate potential use. That phrase recurs in each of the five planning variations - medium density residential, town houses. That is what this is all about. When the Government has made that decision, each of the variations to plans will have to be tabled in this Assembly and will be subject to disallowance. When that happens you three Residents Rally members will have to vote to flog off the schools or to stay true to your policy. That will be an interesting and testing time. We will see whether you will, at last, do the decent thing and stick to your policy or commit the final sell-out.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts) (4.38): I can see that this is a somewhat last minute and ad hoc MPI put forward by the Opposition. It was written out, obviously in haste at the last minute, to make sure that it got on the notice paper. Obviously they sat around thinking, "Goodness, what are we going to put on for an MPI? Let us do the schools again. That is good for a run". And so they have. But I am still surprised that they think there is any mileage left in that. Mr Connolly has certainly found some mileage by creating a new avenue, a new vista on this matter, with new horizons as far as hypocrisy is concerned. I have to say that I am not surprised by any of this and I fully expect it, particularly in the lead-up to the next ACT election.

16 April 1991

There must be a few embarrassments for the ALP in having this debate. We all know that what the ALP in this Territory have said about school closures is inconsistent with their own Federal Government's policy of only two years ago in this Territory. They know that members of the ALP involved in this Assembly were in fact also intimately involved in the making of those decisions about the closure of schools in 1988.

Ms Follett: That is untrue.

MR HUMPHRIES: I am sure it is perfectly true. I am sure it is perfectly true if one looks at the position of the former Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in this place and the position he formerly held in the office of the then shadow Minister or the then Minister for the ACT. We know that there are people in the ALP who do not agree with this position, and I think we have to understand very clearly that the promise being made by the Labor Opposition at present is a promise which will never be fulfilled. I have absolutely no doubt about that, and I fully expect to see not one single school reopen as part of this policy.

Let us ask ourselves why that should be the case. The Opposition have had put to them the question, "Why did you not reopen schools that you inherited when you took Government in May 1989?". The answer to that question has been somewhat less than satisfactory. Of course, schools were closed by the Federal Labor Government at the end of 1988, say December 1988, and the Follett Government took office in May 1989 - a period of less than six months later. The wood nailed up on the door had hardly begun to rot when the Follett Government and the ACT Labor Party had their big chance to fulfil their promise to reopen schools and to preserve the neighbourhood school concept. That is what they say in this little rag they have been putting out. They say:

The Labor Party supports the concept of neighbourhood schools.

Ms Follett: We do. Hear, hear! Exactly so.

MR HUMPHRIES: Well, why did you not implement the policy of neighbourhood schools in respect of the schools that were closed by your own colleagues in 1988? Why did you not open those schools again? They were neighbourhood schools too, or were they not? Were they different schools in some way? Of course they were not. They were neighbourhood schools.

Mr Collaery: It is called having unclean hands.

MR HUMPHRIES: Why were they not reopened? The reason, of course, is - - -

Ms Follett: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. Mr Collaery interjects that I have unclean hands. I would ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr Collaery: Mr Speaker, I would like to speak to this alleged point of order. I referred to the Labor Party as having unclean hands on this issue. That is well within the ambit of debate in this Assembly. How absurd!

MR SPEAKER: I remind members that interjections are the cause of complaint in a lot of issues. I do not uphold your objection, Ms Follett. Please proceed, Mr Humphries.

MR HUMPHRIES: The fact is that, as the Deputy Chief Minister indicates, the Labor Party come to this debate having sinned the sin which they now accuse us of sinning. I do not think many people in this community really believe the ALP when they wring their hands and say that they are the defenders of the neighbourhood schools, because most people know full well who it was that closed schools only a few short years ago.

What is the excuse we have had given by those opposite? Why did they not reopen those schools in 1989? The answer is, "Nobody asked us. Nobody asked us to reopen any of the schools". Well, well, well! "We are supporters", they say, "of neighbourhood schools, but no-one actually got around to asking us to reopen a school". What a load of poppycock! What utter and complete poppycock! What trigger is necessary for the first Government under self-government of this Territory to begin the process of reviewing previously made Commonwealth Government decisions? What do they need to do? We have a new community, newly given self-government, new to the arrangements for self-government. What processes have to be gone through - - -

Mr Collaery: A Labor Party allegedly dedicated to the people.

MR HUMPHRIES: That is right, a Labor Party allegedly dedicated to the people of this Territory. What mechanisms do they need to begin the process of reviewing previous Commonwealth Government decisions, particularly ones which they claim they strongly disagreed with? What mechanisms are necessary? Obviously nothing at all is necessary, Mr Speaker. It would have been extremely easy for those people to have gone to the school committees and said, "Would you like your school reopened?". They did not do that, because, Mr Speaker, they are hypocrites - hypocrites par excellence. Mr Speaker, we have not had any - - -

Mrs Grassby: I take a point of order. I object to that. I object to being called a hypocrite. These people I am looking at would sell burial suits with two pair of trousers, and they call us hypocrites.

16 April 1991

MR HUMPHRIES: What else are you? If the shoe fits, wear it, I say.

Mr Collaery: But you would break the knees first.

MR SPEAKER: I do not uphold your objection, Mrs Grassby.

Mrs Grassby: I take another point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask Mr Collaery to withdraw that - "break their knees".

Mr Collaery: What you give you should take. Mr Speaker, if she withdraws I will too.

MR SPEAKER: I am afraid I did not hear your comment. If you would both withdraw I think that would resolve the matter. Do you withdraw, Mrs Grassby?

Mrs Grassby: Yes, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Collaery?

Mr Collaery: Yes, Mr Speaker.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, what mechanism is proposed by the ALP to consult with communities about reopening schools in the life of the next "Follett Government" next year? What is proposed? We have not heard a word about that. We have not had a word about how they are proposing to consult with the community. I quote from this rag they have been distributing. In a carefully hedged promise they say:

A Follett Government - - -

Mr Jensen: What if it is a Connolly Government?

MR HUMPHRIES: I think we could read it as a Connolly Government, of course. They say:

A Follett Government will re-open any school closed by the Alliance Government, with the agreement and support of the local community involved and teachers, as long as the building remains intact.

Mr Speaker, what is the mechanism for doing that? Can that be explained by the next speaker for the Opposition? How are they going to do that? Are they going to call back everybody who used to be at the school that was closed and have a vote? Are they going to ask the local school community to get together in a public meeting and have a vote? What are they going to do? The fact of life, Mr Speaker, is that they have no intention of complying with that promise. This is a ploy to win votes at the next ACT election. It is nothing more and nothing less.

Mr Connolly has emerged on the scene of school closure debate, beating his breast and saying, "I am a great champion of schools staying open, the champion of

neighbourhood schools. My party will do everything you want. We will reopen your schools. Don't worry; just give us your vote and we will fix you up. Don't you worry about that".

You have to ask yourself, Mr Speaker, one question though: Where was Mr Connolly when Mr Moore and his colleagues were mounting their legal challenge last year at the crucial stage of government decision on closing the schools in the first place, when the children were actually still in the schools and the teachers were still teaching at the blackboards? Where was Mr Connolly then? He was nowhere to be seen. Mr Connolly had no particular interest in the matter at that time. Mr Connolly was just as happy to let the thing roll by.

We all know that the legal basis for challenging these planning changes is far more shaky than any challenge that could have been mounted to the decision originally to close the schools themselves, and also far less timely. Mr Connolly mounts his challenge for one reason: He wants to show what a great champion of neighbourhood schools he is without actually proving anything, without actually having to reopen or prevent the closure of any neighbourhood schools in this Territory. That is the hypocrisy we have seen from this Labor Party and of which we will see much, much more in the coming months as the election draws nearer.

Mr Speaker, I do not give this claim any credibility. Nobody else watching or listening to this debate does either. I think that the community of the ACT will see through this thin sham and not vote for the party that closed schools two years ago.

MR MOORE (4.48): Mr Humphries is wrong in his last statement, Mr Speaker. The community will see this Government for what it is in terms of schools and they will recognise that both the Labor Party and I are committed to the notion of reopening schools. I have made that commitment publicly; that I will support a government that will do it. Should it occur - and who can look into the future, Mr Speaker? - that the balance of power in some way is in my hands, it would be a condition of going into government that the schools be reopened.

I take another comment by Mr Humphries. I think it is appropriate that I acknowledge the support that Mr Connolly gave me on a number of occasions when I was working on the legal challenge earlier in respect of the schools.

Mr Humphries: What sort of support? Was it financial support? Was he a party to the proceedings?

MR MOORE: Mr Humphries raises the financial situation. Yes, the schools legal action group is still in the process of raising funds to pay for the situation that arose out of that legal challenge. Mr Connolly on a number of occasions

16 April 1991

discussed at length with me the legal ramifications of a whole range of Acts and how they applied to schools. I appreciate that help from him. He made a significant contribution to putting that challenge together. While I am on that particular issue, Mr Speaker, I have an absolute commitment to do what I can to reopen these particular schools. Like Mr Connolly and Mr Wood who spoke earlier, I will take whatever action is necessary to delay the process of the variation to the Territory Plan in order to ensure that there is a chance that these schools still stand when a new government can reopen them. It is not just a matter of working in the Assembly for that delay; the variation process also has to be considered.

I think it is appropriate at this stage to point out the role that the unions have played in supporting the parents and their schools. There was a time, of course, when it would not have been necessary because our school system was a system of the parents, not the bureaucratic system that we have now under the leadership of Mr Humphries. I think it would be reasonable for parents to assume that the level of support that they have had from the unions will continue. That support, although a last ditch procedure, will be there to help to protect those schools. The schools have my assurance and that of the Labor Party that those schools will be reopened. That is a genuine assurance. That does not mean that the school will suddenly be a K to 6 school. Because of the damage that this Alliance Government has done to the schools already, it could well start, for example, on a K to 3 basis. That is something that is quite critical to the way people feel about their neighbourhood schools.

One of the things about the Alliance Government is that they have never really understood why the neighbourhood schools are so important and why they are important in strategic planning terms. That is something they have missed out on, and something that I believe they will never understand. Their attention was drawn time and again to a very definitive document on the nature of ageing populations and the closure of schools, a document prepared by the OECD. There is no point in my running through the issues in there again; I have done so before in this Assembly. That document sets out clearly the possible alternatives to school closures, and those alternatives are the most critical things in terms of what is best for the community. What is best for the community has hardly been the highest consideration as far as the Alliance Government has been concerned in this area.

In considering a variation to the Territory Plan, I think it is appropriate to draw some words from David Hall, the director of the Town and Country Planning Association in London and a consultant for the National Capital Planning Authority, who wrote a report entitled "The Future Planning and Development of Canberra - An Evaluation of Current

Policies". He commented particularly on the leasehold system. I will draw attention to a couple of comments he made about the Interim Territory Planning Authority's key issues paper. The key issues paper states:

Whilst the Territory Plan can identify opportunities for development and set aside land for different purposes, it cannot guarantee that the development will actually take place, or that essential community needs will be met.

David Hall drew our attention to the Territory planners' own attitude to it. But this is what is most critical. He then went on to say:

But that is precisely what the leasehold system should enable it to do - make plans happen.

We have a situation here where the Territory planners and the Minister responsible for planning do not seem to be able to understand the leasehold system; they do not seem to be able to understand that that is exactly what it is about. It is about something much more important and much more critical in terms of social equity than that. I continue quoting from page 47 of David Hall's paper:

Moreover, the leasehold system can be used to secure land use objectives much more effectively than is usual, including some that relate to social objectives e.g. the provision of affordable housing. As such, therefore, the right use of the leasehold system can assist in securing objectives of the Commonwealth Government's Social Justice Strategy. In addition the leasehold system, by variation in the financial terms of lease agreements, can affect the market for different types of development in different locations.

But, more importantly, in terms of social justice, if the leasehold system was administered properly, this Government would not be scraping and crawling to find the money in the way they have by closing down schools and thereby ruining suburbs and communities.

Fast tracking is the concept that Mr Wood raised when he originally raised this matter of public importance. The critical part about that fast tracking as far as I am concerned is that the community has been given three weeks to comment on the whole centre of their community, on the whole centre of their suburb. That is the same amount of time as somebody gets to comment on a variation that is to do with a house next door, yet this is to do with a critical part of the whole suburb. Three weeks is completely inadequate. It is three weeks for the people who are most concerned but who, most likely, have never before lodged an objection or a submission on a draft variation. This reflects a lack of commitment to genuine

16 April 1991

community consultation. If you really want genuine community consultation the appropriate thing to do is to ensure that there is more time for people to prepare their submissions.

I know of meetings in Lyons this week which, I understand, Mr Jensen is attending, and of another meeting in Cook next week. By the time the people in Cook hold their meeting they will have lost half the time they have to prepare objections to the draft variation. It is hardly a reasonable way to expect to have community consultation. That, on top of the advertisement that went in the paper on Friday, clearly discourages people from putting in an objection. That is a matter that I intend to raise in private members' business tomorrow. I have circulated a notice of motion calling for this draft variation to be readvertised and put in language that people understand, in a tone that is user-friendly. That is a matter that I will speak on later.

With reference to the Page residents that Mr Humphries brought up, quite a few of the Page residents moved to Cook, after their school was closed down in Page, and then they had to put up with what had become part of their Cook community being closed down as well.

MR JENSEN (4.58): Mr Speaker, in opening my remarks on this matter today I think I must, for the record, correct statements made by Mr Wood on two matters, particularly his reference to suggestions that the mature stand of pine and eucalypt trees to the south of the school site in Hackett is to be removed. Frankly, Mr Speaker, I would have thought that Mr Wood, of all people, would have done his homework. Clearly I have to do his homework for him. I draw his attention to page 12 of the document "Draft Variation for Public Comment", dated April 1991, relating to Hackett, section 12, block 8. On page 12 it says:

The existing plantation of pine and eucalypt trees to the south of the school site and adjacent to Madigan Street shall be retained.

In case there is any suggestion that I am reading selectively, let me continue:

Other mature trees will be retained where practicable.

Clearly, Mr Speaker, Mr Wood has not done his homework and was making a suggestion to the contrary. It is unfortunate that someone like Mr Wood has been a little bit tardy in that area. However, let me continue my comments relating to the last part of that paragraph that I just read out. My own comments to the Chief Territory Planner will make additional reference to the need to ensure, as I have always done in these cases, that tree management plans are

prepared, identifying the details of the existing mature trees, and that those management plans are discussed with the community when and if development is proposed to take place on those sites in the future.

That, Mr Speaker, leads me to a very important point. The draft variation to the Territory Plan proposals that have been brought before us and put before the community clearly say, in every case, that the status quo could well remain. There is no bar to the status quo remaining. That in fact is one of the reasons why that policy is written. That is a little bit contrary, one would suggest, to the comments that were made in the draft variation proposals for public comment issued by the then Follett Labor Government in July 1989. It was quite clear then that there was no suggestion that the existing uses might be retained - particularly in relation to Fisher, the one that I particularly refer to.

I also recall, Mr Speaker, at that time, a member of Ms Follett's staff coming into my office - I understand that he went to the offices of other members of this Assembly also - and suggesting in relation to the other issue that Mr Wood raised - that is, the issue of public open space and provision of public open space - presumably on instructions from Ms Follett, that the open space provisions in this green document were more than adequate for the community; that in fact they were in excess. He came to me to make very clear that that was the view.

If one were to look at all the draft variations for public comment produced by the current planning authority in this particular matter one would see a similar table. Almost exactly the same wording is used. In fact, Mr Speaker, if one were to go through this document and have a look at it, one would see that the wording is very similar because it is a planning document. It talks about the issues in planning terms. Quite frankly, it is sheer hypocrisy on the part of those opposite to suggest that what we are doing here is something different or something strange, or that it is being done in a hurry. Unfortunately, as we all know, Mr Speaker, it took the Alliance Government to make the decisions in relation to the schools that were closed by the Federal Labor Government.

Let me now move on to the comments in relation to the loss of green space. Neither that concern nor the speed suggestion, which I have already addressed, has much validity. I would suggest, Mr Speaker, that, as always, they are seeking to make cheap political points on this issue. We all know very well that any Labor government from this group opposite will do exactly what they did last time; they will not reopen one school, despite the comments and promises made by Mr Wood today.

16 April 1991

There seems to be a misunderstanding of what constitutes a school site. A school site affected by the draft variations is the area used for the school buildings, and the playgrounds directly adjacent to those sites, with the exception of Curtin which does not have a playground, are not included in this particular policy document. In exactly the same way, in some cases, they were not included last time, although we do note that in the case of Fisher Primary School the amount of open space that was allocated was reduced in comparison with what was provided before. They did in that case have a crack at the playgrounds. However, this policy document clearly does not do that, in any way, shape or form. In fact, Mr Speaker, the boundaries between the school sites and the playing fields are not normally apparent.

MR SPEAKER: Order! The time allowed for this discussion has elapsed. The discussion is concluded.

MR COLLAERY (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a short personal explanation. I claim to have been misrepresented.

MR SPEAKER: Please proceed.

MR COLLAERY: Mr Speaker, Mr Connolly, I believe, accused the Government collectively, including me, of having made a decision on the issue of the alternative uses of school sites. I want to assure Mr Connolly - just to save him some legal funds, if he is going to commence legal works - that our Government has agreed that, following public consultation and investigation by the estate management unit, the Chief Minister will bring forward to the Government a submission on alternative uses of the school buildings and grounds of the five primary schools involved. I want to stress that Mr Connolly misrepresents me if he claims that I have contributed to a decision about any one of those uses relating to those school sites. In all cases, one of the alternative uses is that the school sites remain community facilities; that is, they could remain what they are.

Mr Speaker, the second matter on which I claim to have been misrepresented is that Ms Follett said that I had not responded to a request to see her.

Ms Follett: You did respond. You said "No".

MR COLLAERY: Well, that is better, thanks.

SEMINAR PAMPHLET
Motion of Censure

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition), by leave: Mr Speaker, I move:

That Mr Stevenson be censured for bringing the Assembly into disrepute.

I refer to the document that was tabled during question time today, which is an invitation to a positive result seminar to hear Mr Dennis Stevenson MLA. These invitations were issued in Legislative Assembly envelopes and it is the substance of my motion that they contain both false and misleading information.

Mr Stevenson, in this invitation, is described, firstly, as the man "who held the balance of power in the Australian Capital Territory Legislative Assembly for seven months". Mr Speaker, that is simply not the case. I presume Mr Stevenson there refers to the seven months when the Labor Party was in government. It is a well-known fact that we were a minority government. There was no question of a balance of power. We clearly did not have the numbers. It is now a matter of history and of fact that the government changed when you, Mr Prowse, and Mr Duby and Ms Maher chose to join with the Liberals and the Residents Rally. That is what changed the government. No action of Mr Stevenson changed or could have changed the government, and it is therefore quite untrue to say that he held the balance of power.

The second point expressed in Mr Stevenson's invitation, and I will quote it, is, "the man who knocked back a proposed ministerial package of \$84,000 a year salary plus a car". Mr Speaker, I have never, and we have heard also that Mr Kaine has never, offered Mr Stevenson a ministry. If Mr Stevenson has been offered a ministerial package of \$84,000 a year salary plus car, then I think it is up to him to say who made that offer. It is quite untrue to say, as this invitation clearly asserts, that that offer was made either by my Government or, as we have heard, by Mr Kaine. I think it is up to Mr Stevenson, if there is any truth in that statement, to tell us what it is.

Mr Duby: There is no ministerial package of \$84,000 anyway.

MS FOLLETT: Mr Speaker, Mr Duby points out that there is no ministerial package of \$84,000. It is worth saying that whilst I was in government the ministerial package was precisely \$40,000, exactly the same as for any other member. So Mr Stevenson, I think, has made a quite misleading statement there.

Finally, Mr Stevenson claims to be the man "whom four Ministers of the Crown have accused of being too persistent". I am prepared to give him the benefit of the

16 April 1991

doubt there because I am unaware of which four Ministers of the Crown have made that accusation of him. I am also unaware of over what matter it was that he was alleged to be being too persistent. But, Mr Speaker, I regret to say that that is the only statement in this invitation of which there could be a possibility of truth.

It gives me no pleasure to bring forward this matter, Mr Speaker. I think that the Assembly generally has been most tolerant of Mr Stevenson's views and actions in relation to a number of subjects; but when it comes to issuing this kind of an invitation, which is quite untrue, I think that that reflects on the whole Assembly. The substance of the invitation, about holding the balance of power and the knocking back, as he puts it, of a ministerial package, also trivialises and brings into disrepute the whole of this Assembly. As I say, it gives me no pleasure to move this motion, but I trust that members will support it.

MR KAINE (Chief Minister) (5.10): Mr Speaker, I join with the Leader of the Opposition in my difficulty with this action that Mr Stevenson has taken and what, clearly, is nothing but false advertising. Just as Ms Follett does, I take issue with the claims. As Ms Follett has quite clearly pointed out, there was never a point at which Mr Stevenson ever held the balance of power in this Assembly. He overrates himself, or somebody else overrates him; I am not too sure which.

Secondly, he was certainly never offered a ministerial package by me. I would remind Mr Stevenson, and everybody else in the Assembly, that there have been only two people in this Assembly who could offer anybody a ministerial post. The first was Ms Follett and the second was me. I am sure Ms Follett did not and I can assure the house that I did not.

The third point is his statement that he is a man "whom four Ministers of the Crown have accused of being too persistent". Well, that is equally as untrue as the other two statements because I presume he means the four Ministers in this Assembly. I do not think any of us have ever stated that he is too persistent. I do not think so. I believe he is an opportunist - he jumps on the odd band wagon that comes his way - but apart from that he is a little bit flaky, let alone persistent.

I do not know who it is that is making these claims on Mr Stevenson's behalf, but I think that Mr Stevenson would do himself a favour by publicly disavowing this document. By getting to his feet, shortly, and saying that he has never made these claims, he will do himself a favour, he will do this Assembly a favour and he will do the people who elected him a favour. I would hope that he would be a man of principle who would set the public right on these matters.

He may well be capable of doing all the things that are said on the back of the pamphlet. He is a man of many parts. I would not mind going to this seminar, in many ways, to find out just how you do some of these things, but I think that the claims made on the front of the document are patently false, patently absurd. I would hope, as I said, that Mr Stevenson will set us straight by confirming that he has never made claims to these attributes.

MR STEVENSON (5.12): Firstly, I think any attempt by the Labor Party to spend time when I had a matter prepared to go before this Assembly, as everybody in the Assembly knows, indicating a connection between organised crime and the X-rated video industry, is appalling.

Mrs Nolan: It can be done tonight.

MR STEVENSON: It is all very well to say that it can be done tonight. It needed to be done this afternoon, ideally.

Mr Connolly: Why?

MR STEVENSON: I wanted to get it on as soon as possible so that the media would have an opportunity to report it. You well understand.

Mrs Grassby: Well, you should have moved that way. You did not move.

MR STEVENSON: Once again, I got leave to move after a certain time. But to bring this up at this time - by all means bring it up at another time; I welcome it - I wonder, why now? Secondly, as far as the leaflet is concerned, I did not create it. I did supply some of the information for it. First of all, let us have a look at holding the balance of power in the ACT Legislative Assembly. It is interesting, although not to me, that some people in this Assembly would say that I did not.

Ms Follett: About 16 of them, I think.

Mrs Grassby: Sixteen to one is awful odds.

MR STEVENSON: We have had 16 to one odds in this place before, and it will certainly happen again, I would not doubt.

Mr Collaery: I think it will, soon.

MR STEVENSON: I will have to seek an extension of time after a while. Let us have a look at a little history of this Assembly. On 11 May 1989 Rosemary Follett was elected as the Chief Minister. The actions leading up to that election were interesting. I had said that I was voting for Mr Collaery. I should make the reason known. It was because Mr Collaery represented what I and many other people held to be a community-based party and therefore I,

16 April 1991

personally, had no choice. I think one well understands my opinion of parties that control members of their group rather than allow them to represent the majority expressed wishes of the electorate who hire and pay them. But it was interesting on that day. I thought, "Well, the Labor Party have five, the No Self Government Party and five make eight; that leaves on the other side four members of the Residents Rally and four Liberals. That means eight/eight". I realised that my one vote for the Residents Rally would only make it five, and the Rally were not going to get any support from the Liberal Party for Bernard as Chief Minister.

However, prior to coming into the Assembly I made a statement to the media. The statement I made to the media was that, if the vote in the Assembly went nine for the election of Rosemary Follett, the extra vote would not be mine; and indeed it was not. For anybody who thought it may have been, I said, "Have a look at the number of votes for the Residents Rally and you will find that they will have five".

It is interesting to consider whose that extra vote must have been. What I said prior to coming in here and voting was, "If there is an extra vote, look towards the Liberal Party, although it would be most interesting if there were only one vote and the other three abstained". Indeed, that is what actually happened and I had said this prior to coming into this Assembly.

Mrs Nolan: Come on, Dennis. That is history.

MR STEVENSON: Indeed; but what a fascinating history it is, Mrs Nolan.

Mr Kaine: It is all speculative.

MR STEVENSON: Indeed, it is speculative, and I also intend to make some other speculative statements. The next point is that in this Assembly there was an unofficial coalition between the Labor Party and the No Self Government Party. You can call it what you will, but it was an unofficial coalition. Five and three make eight. That leaves nine. Being one of those nine, I held a balance of power for seven months.

Mr Moore: So did every other member.

MR STEVENSON: Indeed; that is why I said "a" balance of power. There is a major difference. The Residents Rally were prepared to join in an alliance with the Liberal Party. The interesting thing was that I was not. So that makes the difference. Ms Follett mentioned that no action of mine did make or could have made a difference as far as the Labor Party forming a minority government was concerned. That, of course, is nonsense. Had I given my ninth vote to the Liberal Party and the Residents Rally, it would have made a great deal of difference. It would have

made "the" difference. Alternatively, if I had given it to the Labor Party, of course they would not have been going anywhere provided they could have held on to the No Self Government people. So much for the balance of power.

Mrs Nolan: You have not got much time left.

MR STEVENSON: I am asking for an extension. As for "who knocked back a proposed ministerial package of \$84,000 a year", I did not say that specifically. That was slightly misrepresented; but not in a major way, not in a major way at all. I think we all understand that the proposal in the ACT for the Chief Minister was around about \$90,000 at one time. That was the proposal that was going around. For Ministers it was \$84,000. Indeed, I well understand that that proposal - I think the pamphlet does say "proposed" - was not followed through by the Remuneration Tribunal.

One can only speculate as to whether or not my indication that I would not take any increase in the salary that every other member in this Assembly or their party representatives had asked for had anything to do with that particular situation.

Mr Kaine: Are you going to take the increase this year, Dennis?

MR STEVENSON: Much of my money - I may as well mention it now - goes towards buying stamps. Let me tell you that 100 stamps a month is nowhere near enough for the amount of mail that we send out.

Mr Berry: Not if you are sending stuff to Queensland.

MR STEVENSON: Exactly. There you go. As you can see, it is nowhere near enough. Secondly, putting on public debates and going along - - -

Mr Berry: You are not going to get an extension, Dennis.

MR STEVENSON: It is not okay?

Mr Connolly: If we do not give him an extension he will say that he was gagged; that he would have told us if he had had the extension.

MR STEVENSON: Of course I would say that. As for the Chief Minister's thought about money, holding events where I can survey people and so on costs a great deal of money. As an indication, I spent over \$600 out of my salary at the Royal Canberra Show.

Mr Kaine: The rest of us spend the same sort of money. You are no exception.

16 April 1991

MR STEVENSON: You asked specifically whether I would use the increase in the salary. A small increase was allocated recently. (*Extension of time granted*) The small increase that was allocated recently I spend on letting the constituents know, as best I can, things that they need to know about, the advertisements and so on.

Mr Connolly: Get back to this knocking back the ministerial offer.

MR STEVENSON: The point about having held the balance of power is that you can stand here for as long as you like and suggest that I could not have given a ninth vote to the Liberal Party and the Residents Rally in this Assembly, not gone into alliance with them, and not received a ministerial position along with it, as Mr DUBY did; but people who know some of the things that are said by members of some political parties would know better. Indeed, anyone who looks at the practicality of it - - -

Mr DUBY: Tell us about "Just because you're paranoid doesn't mean they're not out to get you".

MR STEVENSON: That is an interesting point. Let us have a look at some of the others. "How to conduct - - -

Mr DUBY: Let us get back to the ministerial offer.

MR STEVENSON: I have never said that there was an offer of a ministerial package.

Mr Kaine: How can you knock one back if it is not offered?

MR STEVENSON: I did not use the words "knocked back". What I have said is, "Any fool would understand that if you hold the balance of power in an Assembly, and, indeed, in this one, a ministerial position is open for the asking". Mr Craig DUBY is far and away the best example of that we will ever get. I made the point before Mr DUBY took the ministerial position. I did not need that proof. Who would?

But, once again, let us have a look at some of the other things I mention. "How to conduct surveys - the most effective way of finding the majority view." Why would one want to find the majority view? Certainly, it does not concern the Labor Party in this Assembly unless it is something to do with getting re-elected. Unfortunately, it has nothing to do with the Liberal Party in this Assembly. Nearly 50,000 people signed a petition indicating that they do not want the Royal Canberra Hospital closed. What sort of a dictatorship do we live in? "How to work with your local Member of Parliament."

Mrs Grassby: Who are the four Ministers? That is what we want to know. Who are the four Ministers? Get to the juicy bit.

Mr Collaery: No, it is one person with four heads.

MR STEVENSON: I just thought Mr Collaery gave himself away then. On a number of occasions people within the Labor Party in this Assembly have indicated that very point. Mr Collaery made a statement to this effect at one time: "I am sure that while Mr Stevenson is in this Assembly this matter will not go away". That was to do with fluoride and pornography. Indeed, you are right; neither of them will go away until we do something effective about them.

"The six steps to hiring someone who will represent the electorate, not the party" - there are too many here - "or other vested interests." Why on earth would anyone suggest that members of parliament should represent their electorate? Why do you not all come along? I give you an open, free invitation - - -

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Stevenson, consider my eardrums, please.

MR STEVENSON: I am sorry, Mr Speaker; I wanted to make sure they all heard. Provided it is acceptable to the gentleman running the course, I give you an open invitation to come along. In fact I will be happy to run one in Canberra to save you the transport. We would find it very interesting to discover how to represent one's electorate. It is not something that is held well by members in this Assembly. "Why politicians hate people who won't go away." I think that is fairly obvious. Look at the school issue on which the Labor Party suggests that it represents the people of Canberra.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Stevenson, your time has expired.

MR MOORE (5.28): Mr Speaker, when I first saw this censure motion I was not inclined to support it, because it is quite possible that anybody could put out a flyer on somebody else and make claims that the person may not have been aware of. I am sure that we are all aware that that could have happened. But a couple of things have made me reconsider: Firstly, Mr Stevenson's response and, secondly, these flyers were put out in envelopes identifying the Legislative Assembly. Therefore, clearly, Mr Stevenson knew of their existence and had the opportunity to correct or change some of those things that are clearly not correct. I would draw attention to one or two of those things that I see clearly as not being correct. The balance of power, according to Mr Stevenson's dissertation on the concept, clearly belongs to each one of the 17 of us. To say that any one person held the balance of power in that period is absolute nonsense.

To give a specific example, I recall, on 11 May 1989, very early in the morning - it must have been about 8 o'clock - a meeting in the Liberal Party headquarters between the Liberal Party and the Residents Rally. I do not intend to divulge any of the events at that meeting. However, it

16 April 1991

concerned the fact that the Chief Minister was to be elected that day. At that time I distinctly remember a discussion with Mr Stevenson and the four members of the Rally, in what I could only describe as an anteroom off the main chamber of the headquarters of the Liberal Party, in which Mr Collaery made it quite clear that Mr Stevenson's vote would not be used in any way to form a coalition.

It was made very clear to Mr Stevenson at that stage, in my interpretation, that he did not have the balance of power; that it was not going to be used. That was the reality of it. There was never, as far as I can remember - I imagine that Mr Collaery can recall this too - any suggestion in the negotiations of a ministerial position at that stage for Mr Stevenson.

He has failed to answer the question about the four Ministers of the Crown who have accused him of being too persistent. I accept that it could be reasonable to construe Mr Collaery's comments as an accusation along those lines. I would have been quite happy if he had suggested that it was Mr Whalan. He could have described Mr Stevenson in that way, quite clearly, as he was a Minister of the Crown. But Mr Stevenson has failed to do that.

I turn to the notion of a ministerial package of \$84,000 a year. Mr Stevenson referred to a "proposed" package, as opposed to saying that it was proposed that he have the ministerial package. I think that that is hardly an appropriate attempt to answer the questions that have been raised in this censure motion.

I think that what has been set out is entirely inappropriate and reflects very badly on the Assembly as a whole. I think we have a responsibility, under those circumstances, to censure Mr Stevenson for misleading people about the role that he plays in the Assembly, and thereby misleading the broader Australian community in this case about the Assembly as a whole.

MR COLLAERY (Attorney-General) (5.31): Mr Speaker, I have some short comments to make. I think it is unfortunate for the Assembly that Mr Stevenson has not responded to the invitation issued in this house for him to correct the record. In other words, he is unrepentant. I seem to recall that word being used previously for him. What Mr Stevenson has done is to trivialise his own role here. In that sense it has been a victory for good sense today in that the public can clearly see what a trivial sort of role Mr Stevenson perceives for himself and how, as the Chief Minister said, he is opportunistic. I endorse the comments of Rosemary Follett and those of Mr Moore and Mr Kaine.

One of the items in Mr Stevenson's list of goods that he has to offer is this statement: "If it is to be, it's up to me". That made me recall what I read once on a toilet wall in Italy. I recall seeing in English - that is why I noticed it - this statement:

To be is to do - Jean-Paul Sartre.
To do is to be - Karl Marx.
Do-be-do do-be-do do-be-do - Frank Sinatra.

That third line is about the substance of Mr Stevenson in this chamber.

DR KINLOCH (5.33): Mr Speaker, I am distressed at this whole matter. When I saw this I thought it was partly a joke and, indeed, there is that thought there. It does contain the words "in a format of commonsense, comedy and first-hand experience". It seems to me that we are taking this far too seriously. We are doing somebody over, which I think is not a pleasant thing to do, and I do not wish to be involved with it.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Sitting suspended from 5.34 to 8.00 pm

**SCRUTINY OF BILLS AND SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION - STANDING COMMITTEE
Report and Statement**

MS MAHER: I present Report No. 6 of 1991 of the Standing Committee on Scrutiny of Bills and Subordinate Legislation and seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

MS MAHER: This report details the committee's comments on the Inebriates (Amendment) Bill 1991, Intoxicated Persons (Care and Detention) Bill 1991, Interpretation (Amendment) Bill 1991 and Subordinate Laws (Amendment) Bill 1991, together with one piece of subordinate legislation. I commend the report to the Assembly.

UNLAWFUL GAMES (AMENDMENT) BILL 1991

MR COLLAERY (Attorney-General), by leave: Mr Speaker, I present the Unlawful Games (Amendment) Bill 1991. I move:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

The Unlawful Games Act 1984 provides for the prohibition of unlawful gaming in the ACT. The Bill amends the Unlawful Games Act 1984 to provide for the legal playing of two-up on Anzac Day in the ACT subject to certain conditions.

Mrs Grassby: We would not have to do this if we had a casino.

16 April 1991

MR COLLAERY: Maybe I am doing this to head you off, Mrs Grassby. A licensed club is the only place a payment, benefit, commission, percentage or fee can be sought for the right to play two-up. The collection of such payments must be authorised by the licensed club and paid to a charity or non-profit organisation.

The proposed amendments will not prevent payment of an entrance fee to a racecourse or sportsground if the fee is not related to the game of two-up; nor will it legalise the playing of two-up in gaming houses or affect offences involving betting or wagering by or with a person under the age of 18 years.

The playing of two-up in Australia is steeped in history and tradition, particularly on Anzac Day; and, when played according to traditional rules, it is said to be the fairest game on earth. The proposed new legislative amendments simply reflect community standards and are consistent with legislative amendments introduced in New South Wales in 1989. Mr Speaker, I present the explanatory memorandum for the Bill.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Connolly**) adjourned.

PORNOGRAPHY INDUSTRY AND ORGANISED CRIME Statement by Member

MR STEVENSON: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a statement.

MR SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Kaine: About what?

MR STEVENSON: Concerning the connection between organised crime and pornography in Australia.

MR SPEAKER: What time are you looking for, Mr Stevenson?

MR STEVENSON: Somewhere between 20 and 30 minutes.

MR SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Kaine: Fifteen minutes, Mr Speaker.

Mr Collaery: Mr Speaker, this house can grant 15 minutes to the member. If there is substance in what he says, we might review the issue.

MR STEVENSON: That is acceptable, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Collaery. Is leave granted?

Mr Kaine: Yes - and I might even make you an offer of a ministership during the debate.

Ms Follett: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not wish to prolong this needlessly, but I thought that under the standing orders leave was granted or it was not and that the question of timing was a separate issue.

MR SPEAKER: That is a valid consideration, and I will just put the question once again. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

MR STEVENSON: The X-rated video industry, although most obvious in the Australian Capital Territory, is a problem which confronts all Australians. Whether we realise it or not, the effects of pornography and crime can touch any individual at any time.

I intend to show that vast profits are made from pornography, that its huge cash flow is highly attractive to organised crime figures, and that there is an interlinking web of companies and identities throughout Australia that are strongly connected to organised crime, particularly in the areas of drugs, prostitution and pornography.

I intend to show that the X-rated video pornography industry is strongly linked with drugs, violence, fraud and corruption and that criminals have been protected and have been allowed to prosper because we have maintained the Australian Capital Territory as a safe house from which they can thumb their noses at the State laws which make their activities illegal. I intend to show that much of the impetus for the pornography industry in Australia has come from leading Mafia figures in the United States and that, further, there is a direct connection between the video trade in the ACT and organised crime in the United States.

The question that remains unanswered for many people throughout Australia is: Why have X-rated pornographic videos not been banned in the ACT when they are illegal in every single one of the States in Australia? It is a question that, I believe, will not be asked for very much longer.

I want to now describe the US organised crime connection. Though I have a great deal of information available, I have tried to be brief in giving a summary of the major porn dealers in the United States and Australia and the criminal activities and associations of both.

The first version of the pirate video market in Australia began in the 1970s with legal Betamax copies of porn videos being purchased in the US, sent to Australia and subsequently copied illegally and sold furtively in limited quantities throughout Australia.

16 April 1991

United States organised crime figures visited Australia in the 1970s and several times in 1980 and 1981 to set up an organised pornography industry here in Australia. In the 1980s the representatives were Norman Arno and Theodore Gaswirth, both of whom were leading identities in organised crime in the United States. The activities of Arno and Gaswirth in the United States are most relevant, particularly their involvement in a pornography racket turning over some \$US4 billion a year - a figure estimated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In the United States special anti-racketeering laws, or RICO laws as they are called - RICO standing for the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organisations Act - have been passed to allow courts to convict criminals who have a proven track record in a specific area of criminal activity, rather than charge them just for individual criminal actions. The final report of the Costigan royal commission recommended that similar laws be introduced in Australia. It is unfortunate that these laws have not been introduced.

In the United States in February 1980 the largest ever crackdown on pornographers was undertaken by a special force of 400 agents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The size of the FBI operation is an indication of the concern held by law enforcement officers for stopping the pornography racket. Over a dozen warehouses were raided and literally tonnes of pornographic material was seized. Using RICO laws, 54 arrests were made in Los Angeles, Miami and other places.

Norman Arno was arrested as one of the ringleaders of the porn racket. Arno was the president of the North Hollywood based VCX Incorporated, a US Mafia linked porn company which in 1985 controlled 40 per cent of the US porn market, which has been estimated to be worth \$US9 billion a year. Ed Krasnof, who was vice-president of VCX Incorporated, was named as being another organised crime figure during the Los Angeles investigation by the FBI.

Norman Arno and his associate Theodore Gaswirth were named by the Organised Crime Control Commission of California as organised crime figures connected with a number of pornography operations in southern California. In that report, Arno was described as the business partner of Michael Zaffarano, a member of the New York Mafia. The Californian commission named Zaffarano as the main link between porn operators in California and Mafia groups on the east coast of America. A wanted man, Zaffarano died of a heart attack.

Theodore Gaswirth, who was also named as a Mafia associate of Michael Zaffarano, made three trips to Australia in 1981. The first was for five days in late January, the second for another five days in June, and the third for eight days in December. Like Arno and earlier Mafia visitors to Australia, Gaswirth did not come to put another

shrimp on the barbie, but rather to set up criminal connections and operations. Another of Gaswirth's partners in his US pornography operations was Jacob Molinas, a Californian organised crime figure who was murdered.

Shortly after Arno's arrest, Arno applied to the court to have bail conditions relaxed so that he could visit Australia. Arno subsequently flew into Australia on 21 May 1980. During his stay of 15 days, Arno held meetings with Australian associates in Melbourne, Sydney and Perth.

Initial corporate connections between Australian identities and the Mafia were made by Daniel M. Stein, an associate of Meyer Lansky. Lansky was one of the US Mafia leaders who was responsible for much of the overall direction of the Mafia. The investigative reporter Bob Bottom, in reporting the Stein connection in his book *Connections II*, wrote that Stein visited Australia a number of times between March 1971 and April 1976 and had dealings with that well-known Sydney criminal George Freeman, now deceased.

To give a summary of the United States connection so far, we have seen that Norman Arno and his associate Theodore Gaswirth were recognised by the FBI as leading organised crime figures in the United States and members of the Colombo family - one of five Mafia families controlling crime in New York. We have seen that Arno and Gaswirth had recently been arrested for illegal porn operations and that they then came to Australia to set up operations distributing pornography.

I have here Norman Arno's signature on a licence agreement with a company now operating in Fyshwick. But let me state it more clearly. It clearly shows a connection between Arno, the US Mafia racketeer, and our own Australian Capital Territory.

Mr Collaery: What is the name of the company in Fyshwick?

MR STEVENSON: I will be naming the various companies involved. The main contact in Australia for Arno and Gaswirth was Alexander Gajic who, together with his father Todor Gajic, was a director of Sienna Pty Ltd, a company formed in South Australia and now operating at Fyshwick in the Australian Capital Territory in association with the businesses Australian United Videos and Private Screenings Home Video.

Private Screenings Home Video was run by Gajic and Barry Taylor. This was admitted on a *Four Corners* television program called "X-rated". Taylor had been arrested in Asia for crimes connected with drugs and had escaped, initially to Hong Kong. Alexander Gajic was named by Justice Woodward during the 1980 New South Wales royal commission on drugs as a major player in the drug ring established by Bruce "Snapper" Cornwall and Barry Bull.

16 April 1991

Gajic also traded with Adivi Trading Nominees Pty Ltd, one of its directors being Bruce "Snapper" Cornwall. Cornwall was described as a drug baron by Justice Stewart at the Australian inquiry into drugs in 1985 and was convicted in 1988 for selling heroin. Cornwall is currently serving a long gaol sentence. Barry Bull, Cornwall's associate in the drug ring, is also in gaol after receiving a long gaol term on drug charges. Alexander Gajic confessed to dealing in both marijuana and heroin in testimony to the Woodward commission. Gajic was not charged for drug dealing offences as a result of his admissions. Evidence given before a royal commission cannot be used to convict the witness giving it.

Together with Joseph David Shellim, Gajic operated a web of companies which dealt in pornography across Australia. These companies included Curbydex Pty Ltd, Mr X-video, and Hollywood House Video. Joseph Shellim and his brother Freddie initially operated Hollywood House Video in Melbourne, but now they and Hollywood House Video are based in Sydney. The Victorian office of Curbydex Pty Ltd, which, as we have seen, was operated by Gajic and Shellim, was located in Bay Street, Brighton at premises owned by Esmond Mooseek. Mooseek is serving a life sentence as a major drug dealer.

Gajic's companies spread until TAG Video - a company named after the initial letters of Todor and Alexander Gajic - was used to distribute pornographic videos supplied by the Mafia operated video company VCX, the president of which, as we have seen, was Norman Arno. Organised crime figures in the United States and Australia have been able to put on a face of respectability by using the proceeds of criminal activities to buy into legitimate businesses. This gives them the opportunity to launder money and also to hide illegal activities behind a facade of legitimacy.

Organised crime in Australia has created an interlocking series of companies to provide a corporate shell to dispose of illegal money by shuffling it backwards and forwards through fake invoices and borrowings until it gets lost in the paper trail. This was outlined by Mr Douglas Meagher, senior counsel assisting the Costigan royal commission, when he spoke at the Law Reform Commission conference in Perth. In addition, corrupt bank managers and pliant accountants and legal firms have greatly assisted organised crime in Australia.

In attempting to expand his pornographic dealings and US connections, Alexander Gajic instructed Melbourne solicitor Leon Zwier to travel to the United States to buy porn titles for Gajic to distribute in Australia. Among Gajic's written instructions to Zwier was a report on Al Tapper, the president of CPLC. In his instructions to Zwier, Gajic wrote:

Speak to him, he's a top bloke, who virtually controls the West Coast market in pornographic books and accessories. I will be importing books etc. from him as well, as soon as I get more cash together. He knows Australia well, being a friend of Abe Saffron. His attitude is always cash up front.

Leon Zwier was a partner in the firm of solicitors in Melbourne called Harding, Brereton and Shiff, which has since ceased to operate. Expenses in the US and Zwier's fees were paid by Gajic.

It was reported in the *National Times* newspaper of 6 October 1983 that TAG Video distributed pornographic videos in Australia in connection with Unicorn Video, one of a large network of companies operated by Gerald Gold in Melbourne. The Australian Taxation Office yesterday petitioned for Gold's bankruptcy in the Federal Court.

Gold was associated with Mark Arthur Clarkson. Clarkson was charged with murder after it was alleged that he hired former standover man Christopher Dale Flannery to murder Melbourne barrister Roger Wilson. Clarkson was acquitted of murder, but convicted of fraud in connection with the collapse of the Athena Building Society in Victoria and given a 10-year sentence from which he has recently been paroled. These very people are linked with the X-rated video trade in the ACT.

Clarkson was an associate of Gerald Arthur Hercus, operator of the Canberra-based companies involved in pornography - Leisure Moments International and Leisuremail. In a brief to counsel for the Clarkson trial, Hercus said that he had regularly lent amounts of money totalling some \$100,000 to Clarkson and that he, Hercus, was also a business acquaintance of Gerry Gold.

Gerry Gold made use of a corrupt accountant, Charles Maxwell McCready, to assist in Gold's money laundering activities. This was revealed in evidence to the Costigan royal commission and continued until McCready was arrested for conspiring to free two drug offenders from Pentridge prison with a helicopter. The plan involved landing a helicopter on the tennis courts one Sunday lunchtime and departing with criminals on board. McCready was convicted and sentenced to seven years in Pentridge prison. There would have to be some ironic justice in that.

16 April 1991

The parent company for the Shellim-Gajic network was Trishon Nominees Pty Ltd, one of its directors being Amos Kormornick, who was connected to another trust which had as a director Esmond Mooseek who, as was mentioned earlier, owned the building in which Gajic and Shellim operated Curbydex Pty Ltd.

Mooseek was extradited from Thailand in 1989 and convicted on charges relating to importing \$A20m worth of drugs to Australia. Mooseek is currently serving 25 years in gaol. Kormornick operated a business which imported figurines from Thailand. Kormornick will be remembered as the person who used the hollow figurines to smuggle heroin and hashish oil into Australia. As a result of this activity, Kormornick was convicted for drug offences in 1988 and is currently in gaol.

The biggest group in the pornographic video industry in Australia was the video and publishing empire run by Joseph Shellim, Alexander Gajic and Gerald Gold - all named as eastern States organised crime figures at the Costigan royal commission in 1983. Royal Commissioner Costigan warned us about them, but we have not yet taken the action necessary to close down their activities in the Australian Capital Territory.

This contract was made between the Australian company Sienna Pty Ltd and the US organised crime company VCX. It provided for Sienna to pay \$30,000 for the rights to duplicate and sell pornographic X-rated videos. This contract was for 12 videos and it granted Sienna the right to operate as agents for VCX in Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and an area including Antarctica. The three-year contract, dated 1 October 1985, was signed for Sienna by Todor Gajic under the name Tom Gadajic, and for VCX by Norman Arno. I will seek leave to table this contract at the conclusion of my statement.

I mention the New Zealand connection. Using the licensing rights granted by the Mafia, Gajic sold video copying rights to a New Zealand company, Pro Equity Entertainments Ltd, based at Herne Bay in Auckland.

A major organised crime syndicate in Australia headed by a group of businessmen was identified in 1983 by Mr Douglas Meagher, counsel assisting painters and dockers royal commissioner Frank Costigan QC. Mr Meagher said that the group was "untouched by law enforcement agencies". Why? One reason is that organised criminals cover their underhand dealings by laundering money through legal businesses. If we are to be serious in attempting to control organised crime and its insidious undermining of judges, police and politicians, then we must take the actions necessary to limit or stamp out one of its favoured activities - the trade in X-rated video pornography.

We have seen that pornography in the United States is controlled by organised crime. We have learned of the identities of some of the major crime figures in America who profit from pornography. We have learned of the criminal activities and associations of some of the major identities in the ACT and Australia who also profit from pornography. We can see that Norman Arno and Theodore Gaswirth came to Australia with the intention of setting up similar contacts and operations to those they run in the United States.

We have learned of the connections that Arno and Gaswirth made with criminals in Australia. These criminals, like their US counterparts, are also involved in drugs, prostitution, fraud, money laundering, tax evasion and control of both the legal and illegal porn video trade. Does anyone doubt that these same people control the illegal porn trade in Australia? These Canberra identities have once more proven, by their actions of advertising illegal material in each and every State that has outlawed X-rated videos, that they hold nothing but contempt for the law.

We have seen the web of interlinking criminals in Australia. It might prompt one to ask: Why are all these criminals so closely associated with each other? I believe the answer is: That is why it is called organised crime. These criminals are organised. What we need to do, as lawmakers, is to organise against them. We need to put aside party affiliations or personal conflicts and do our utmost to act in the best interests of all Australians, and ban these X-rated videos that are currently protected in the ACT.

I appeal to you to do the following:

Ban X-rated videos in the ACT;
request that members of the Northern Territory parliament also vote to ban X-rated videos in their Territory.

I ask you to call on all States to:

Prosecute anyone advertising unclassified videos;
ban the manufacture and production of X-rated videos;
direct police to get tough - police can enforce a ban, if so directed;
increase penalties as needed; and
tabulate all the existing data and collect more data connecting pornography with rape, child molestation, domestic violence, murder, and other sex offences.

16 April 1991

We should also call on the Federal Government to do the following:

Firstly, direct the Customs Service to confiscate all unclassified pornography;
secondly, ban the transmission of unclassified material by post;
thirdly, dramatically tighten up on what is allowed in the R-rated category, both in sex and violence
- or simply follow the recommendations by the 1988 Joint Select Committee on Video
Material;
fourthly, ensure that unclassified material can quickly be identified as such so as to allow
prosecutions to rapidly take place.

Let us not hide behind the suggestion that if we ban X-rated videos these criminals will break the law. They already break the law. X-rated video pornography can exist only where there is relatively open promotion. If we ban X-rated videos and prosecute anyone who tries to advertise them, we will greatly reduce pornography and, as a consequence, its harmful effects on our community.

The only message that pornographers understand is that the potential profit from pornography is not worth the risk they run in breaking the law. Let us prosecute them every time they break the law. Let us, as legislators, give to the few media organisations who profit from pornography by accepting illegal advertisements a clear message that we will no longer condone their lawbreaking, either. In Australia, clear messages by legislators to criminals that their activities will not be tolerated, as well as the necessary support for the judiciary and police, will drive organised crime back under the rock it came out from.

The Queensland Premier, Wayne Goss, is taking the lead in this matter with his recent statements that, "Pornography sellers who hope the Government will turn a blind eye to their trade are kidding themselves", and, "We aren't going to pass legislation then sit back and let pornography sellers flout the new laws. They will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law". In indicating that an active campaign was in progress to undermine the Government's stand against pornography in Queensland, Mr Goss said, "I expected this sort of campaign from people who seek to make huge profits from the sale of pornography, but the Government won't be swayed. This material these porn dealers want to peddle is harmful to some people, offensive to most people, and particularly degrading to women". The Labor leader deserves to be commended for his no-nonsense stand. Governments should punish pornographers, not protect them with lax laws, token prosecutions and insufficient penalties.

One can speculate as to how much influence the knowledge of the role of organised crime and pornography in Australia had in the decision by every State Attorney-General and the past Federal Labor Attorney-General, Lionel Bowen, to ban the X-rated video industry. To say that this is an industry run by people of less than good repute is a major understatement. Let us no longer allow State laws to be violated by our inaction. Let us also support the recommendation of the 1988 Joint Select Committee on Video Material to ban X-rated video pornography in Australia. Let us heed the majority expressed will of people throughout Australia, who have made their will known to us by the many thousands of letters sent to members of this ACT Assembly, who ask for the ACT to join every State in Australia and ban X-rated pornography.

Today, leading criminals have once again been named, like many have been earlier named before the Costigan royal commission, the Woodward royal commission and the National Crime Authority and by other investigators and investigations. We have the opportunity to do more than reveal the activities of criminals. We have the power to curtail their activities. We can take a stand for the people and against organised crime by banning X-rated pornography. On behalf of all those who have been the victims of organised crime and pornography, I ask that each and every member in this Assembly support a ban on X-rated videos in the ACT. I seek leave to table the contract I mentioned earlier.

Leave granted.

Mr Collaery: Mr Speaker, I ask that Mr Stevenson be ordered to table the speech he just gave. It is extremely detailed and complex and very difficult for me to respond to.

MR STEVENSON: Happily, Mr Speaker. I table the following papers:

Pornography -

Copy of contracts between Sienna Pty Ltd and VCX Incorporated dated 1 October 1985 and 30 December 1985.

Speech notes entitled "The X Connection".

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Collaery, are you moving that that be tabled or just seeking - - -

Mr Collaery: Well, I was moving, under standing order 213, that it be ordered; but he has done it voluntarily, so I withdraw my motion.

Mr Moore: We could also authorise it for publication.

16 April 1991

MR STEVENSON: Mr Speaker, I also seek leave to authorise the document for publication.

Mr Collaery: Mr Speaker, it is a very large document to be incorporated in *Hansard*.

MR STEVENSON: It is only a few pages; there are about five pages.

Leave not granted.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1991

Debate resumed from 14 March 1991, on motion by **Mr Collaery**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MR CONNOLLY (8.31): Mr Speaker, the Opposition's attitude to this Bill can be briefly stated, and that is that we are supporting the Government moves. The main thrust of this Bill is to increase the maximum level of compensation payable in cases of criminal injuries compensation from \$20,000 to \$50,000. I think the members of the community would generally agree that that maximum level is inappropriate and that courts have been obviously striving to find ways of getting around the existing \$20,000 limit by looking at the cumulative effect of a series of offences.

It is easy to forget that criminal injuries compensation is a relatively new concept. It was only in the early 1960s that an English magistrate first proposed this concept that the state ought to intervene to protect or compensate the victim of a crime, and in 1963 New Zealand became the first country to enact such legislation. New South Wales took up the lead in Australia in 1967; but it was not until, indeed, 1983 that the ACT had criminal injuries compensation legislation. So we are dealing with a concept that is relatively new to Australia.

Most Canberra residents would have noted, through the pages of the *Canberra Times*, that the Supreme Court in this Territory has recently broken new ground in granting a substantial sum, by way of criminal injuries compensation - indeed, to the maximum - for the young survivor of a particularly serious series of incest incidents. This is the first time that an Australian court has sought to come to grips with the trauma that family sexual violence can cause to young persons. That was a landmark decision of this court and one to be commended.

A problem with criminal injuries compensation legislation, both here and in the States, is that one sometimes hears the criticism that the main beneficiaries, numerically, of criminal injuries compensation legislation can tend to be police officers. The reason for that, I think, was best brought out by a study in South Australia of the effectiveness of that State's criminal injuries

compensation system. It was part of a major initiative that is taking place in that State towards an emphasis on victims' rights. The basic problem that that study found with criminal injuries compensation was that people were unfamiliar with the existence of such a scheme. The police association, or the police union, of course, is very familiar with this scheme and provides an advocacy service and assists members who are the victims of criminal activity in bringing claims, but the general community lags somewhat behind that.

Dramatic steps have been taken in that State - and I have referred to this in the past - to swing the emphasis in policing matters towards a concentration on victims' rights. I have referred previously to the very useful document which is given to victims of crime in South Australia. My colleague Mrs Grassby was pleased when I was able to tell her that this document that is carried in all police cars in South Australia is printed in several community languages; so there is a serious attempt to reach all members of the community, not just people who are able to read material in the English language.

A central point in this document that is widely distributed in South Australia is to tell the victim, at the point at which they originally complain to the police, that compensation is available. It seeks to assist them in the process of bringing their own claim and to bring them into contact with the Victims of Crime Service, so that they get some additional assistance in bringing their claim. Perhaps in this Territory some emphasis could also be placed on assisting the victim to become more familiar with the availability of this compensation.

There will be a cost to the community in this legislation. By definition, we are providing that the courts may award larger levels of compensation and that compensation will come out of the public purse; it will be paid for, in effect, by the taxpayers of this Territory.

I would commend to the Government another initiative that was taken in South Australia some years ago when the levels of criminal injuries compensation in that State were increased; and that was to impose a victims levy on all fines and penalties imposed by courts in South Australia. The philosophy behind that was to seek to identify the source of funding for criminal injuries compensation and to seek, in effect, to say that criminal injuries compensation will not be funded by the general community but will come out of a pot that is accumulated from payments specifically by persons who have been convicted of various breaches of the law - and that goes down even to what may be considered relatively trivial matters such as minor traffic offences or speeding offences.

For all those \$60, \$50 or \$40 fines in South Australia there is a \$5 victim impact levy. That, if nothing else, serves to focus the attention of all persons who have dealings with the criminal justice system on the fact that

16 April 1991

their acts have consequences on others and that those consequences must be addressed. I think that is a useful initiative taken by the South Australian Government and one that may be looked at with interest here. In short, the Opposition has no objection to this legislation and wishes it a speedy passage through this place.

MS MAHER (8.38): I congratulate the Attorney-General for introducing the Criminal Injuries Compensation (Amendment) Bill 1991 as another part of the victims package of the Alliance Government. The Bill contains long awaited measures to reform the criminal injuries compensation law of the Territory and remedies inadequacies in the legislation. The main objective of the Bill will be to increase the maximum award of compensation payable to the victim of violent crime under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act from \$20,000 to \$50,000, which brings it into line with several other jurisdictions, particularly those in New South Wales. As Mr Connolly mentioned, an ACT court recently led the way in awarding compensation to a person who had suffered incest.

Another notable measure proposed in the Bill is conferment of the right of subrogation on the Territory. Where the applicant has not taken civil action to recover damages or compensation for the relevant injury, the right would enable the Territory to recoup the award of compensation from the assailant against whom there is a positive finding of guilt. In view of the Territory's right of subrogation, it is no longer considered necessary to require the victim to pursue damages from the assailant.

For this reason the Bill proposes to revoke the court's discretion to refuse to determine an application if the applicant has not pursued other remedies. This takes stress off a victim who is already under enormous stress. Although this discretion has rarely been exercised, its existence creates a degree of uncertainty in proceedings and can lead to time consuming adjournments. The revocation of the court's discretion will enable an applicant to seek compensation under the Act undeterred by any uncertainty as to whether the application will be accepted.

In its objective of ensuring just compensation for the crime victim expeditiously, the Bill proposes to simplify the application process. The application will need to be supported by an affidavit and accompanied by the relevant medical reports and other relevant documents. The court will thereby have all necessary information at the application stage and will be able to make a determination as soon as possible. The application will be required to be lodged with the Registrar of the Supreme Court or the Clerk of the Magistrates Court, depending on the appropriate jurisdiction. This measure is designed to promote administrative convenience and to reduce paper shuffling within the court system.

The Bill requires the copies of the applications and their attachments to be forwarded to the Government Solicitor of the ACT. This requirement will enable the Government Solicitor to be fully aware of the applicant's case and to participate in the proceedings to assist the court in determining the amount of compensation payable.

Rightly, this Bill proposes to apply the amendments to applications lodged after the commencement of the amendments, which clarifies any uncertainty as to the extent of their application. Mr Speaker, I commend the Bill to the Assembly.

MR STEFANIAK (8.42): Like other members, I am delighted to see this Bill come before the Assembly and I trust that it will be passed tonight unanimously. It is long overdue because, as other speakers have mentioned, other States have been in front of the ACT for anything up to four to five years. The State that surrounds us, New South Wales, I understand has had this increased level of \$50,000 for a couple of years. So, it is a very timely Bill, introduced by the Attorney-General and this Government, to increase the maximum amount payable under section 7 of the principal Act from \$20,000 to \$50,000.

Mr Connolly mentioned a recent case in the Supreme Court where, in fact, a \$50,000 payment was ordered under current law. Indeed, the courts have been somewhat innovative in Canberra in relation to applying the then existing criminal injuries compensation laws. I can recall Mr Justice Gallop, about two years ago, giving \$40,000 to one victim in relation to two offences. The maximum figure was \$20,000 but he got around that fairly low maximum figure by what I suppose was a bit of legal fiction, but it was appropriate and it worked. This timely increase alleviates the need for the courts to go into such mental gymnastics as they have had to do to ensure that victims get an appropriate level of compensation.

I am heartened by the comments of both Ms Maher and Mr Connolly in relation to the question of compensation for victims. It is also good to see in this Bill the proposed new section 29A, "Recovery of compensation from offenders". That proposed new section states a number of situations where it will apply. Then, subsection (2) states:

Where this section applies, the offender is liable to pay to the Territory an amount equal to the amount of the relevant award of compensation under this Act.

That will go some way to alleviating the cost burden to the Territory which we would otherwise have to pay in relation to the increase in the maximum amount payable. It will not completely cover that situation because, certainly from my experience as a criminal lawyer, there are very many offenders who simply do not have any money and who will be

16 April 1991

unable to pay that compensation. That is, of course, where the state has to step in and look after the interests of the victim, and it is only just and appropriate that that indeed happen.

Ms Maher indicated that this is just one of a number of initiatives that this Government is taking in relation to the question of victims. As I have said before, I have been heartened by Mr Connolly's interest in this matter and by the Attorney-General's committee which is looking at the whole question of the rights of victims. Certainly I would like to see victim impact statements introduced in the life of this Assembly as a further step towards looking after the legitimate rights of victims.

Victims, of course, have been the forgotten people in the criminal justice system over a number of years. That situation now is being remedied. Compensation, of course, is not the be-all and end-all. Money cannot bring back the situation before an offence was committed against a victim. For someone who loses a loved one, especially, and who quite often would be awarded the maximum amount of compensation, no amount of money is ever going to bring back that loved one.

In respect of damage to property or very serious injury to victims, people are often never the same after they lose perhaps some very valued and sentimental possessions or are seriously injured by a violent crime. No amount of money can really compensate for those things, but, certainly from my experience - both as a prosecutor in dealing with victims who were witnesses in court cases I did and also as a private defence solicitor who would take out applications for criminal injuries compensation - it does show that the system cares, and that they will get something back as a result of the wrong perpetrated on them by an offender. It is of some comfort to victims. Other steps are needed. This Government is looking at that, and I am glad we have bipartisan support on such questions as the rights of victims. Hopefully the Attorney-General's committee will make a number of other recommendations to make the lot of the victim easier in the criminal justice system.

At this point in time, I would like to again commend Mr Connolly and commend to the Assembly, and indeed the Government, the victims levy which the South Australians have had for a number of years. As Mr Connolly indicated, that State's levy is \$5 on any fine. This is a specific victims levy. It is, firstly, certainly a very good way of bringing home to anyone who is involved in the court system, especially as an offender, that there are victims, and indeed part of their fine goes to a general fund to assist those victims; and, secondly, such a levy would well and truly more than pay, I think, for the amount of money which will be paid out to victims of crime, and therefore it is basically self-funding.

I think that measure has a lot of merit. As the South Australian Government has had a \$5 levy for a number of years, perhaps in 1991 we might look at something like a \$10 levy on all fines as being an appropriate figure. After all, in the last couple of years the old court costs for summary matters have come back into the ACT. That was something we did not have for 10 years, but that was introduced as a necessary measure. Really, I can see a lot of merit in a compulsory \$10 victims levy being imposed by the courts. Certainly that would help, in these difficult financial times, to pay for this very good increase in compensation to \$50,000.

Finally, although probably the majority of offenders will not be covered by proposed new section 29A - whereby, if they have the means, they have to pay, rather than the Government, for the result of their action against a victim - I do think it will have a salutary effect on the offenders who are able to pay pursuant to that section. One of the best ways of bringing home to offenders the ramifications of what they have done to the victim is to hit them in the hip pocket nerve. That is another way of bringing that very important lesson home to them. I think that is a further benefit we will see, apart from a mere financial one, from the recovery of compensation from offenders.

This is a timely Bill. There are a number of other provisions in it which were alluded to by the speakers - which I will not go into - which simplify the procedure and make it easier for victims. Indeed, an offender who has paid out compensation under some other law will be reimbursed under this law. That is fair enough. It stops them paying twice. It is sensible legislation; it is timely. I commend it to the Assembly and I am sure it will receive unanimous support.

MR COLLAERY (Attorney-General) (8.49), in reply: I thank members for their comments and I will not retrace them. I note Mr Connolly's suggestions in relation to improvements to the scheme. With respect to Mr Connolly, I trust that the Community Law Reform Committee is looking at those matters in its victims reference, but I do accept Mr Connolly's proposition that there is a sort of guiding light on these affairs from the State of South Australia, as there has been in related areas for a number of years. I am sure that Mr Connolly, as a South Australian, is proud of that fact.

Whilst I was at a ministerial meeting in Adelaide recently, I took advantage of the opportunity to traverse some of these issues directly with the Victims Support Unit of the South Australian police. They are matters that are relevant at the moment not only to work of the Territory's Community Law Reform Committee but also to the reform work that is being carried out right now within the regional office of the Australian Federal Police.

16 April 1991

Moving from that, I want to broaden my comments in support of Mr Stefaniak's comments. I also draw to members' attention the back part of the last few annual reports by the Supreme Court on the administration of this scheme. I have chosen the year before last, in case anything is on appeal that I am not aware of. I want to draw members' attention to pages 27 and 33 of the 1989-90 report. At page 27, there is mention of the facts of an assault outside JD's Tavern in Civic. I feel free to mention this one because this establishment is no longer operational as such. This was an assault, in fact, by the doorman. There may have been others involved. The award given, from taxpayers' money, was \$19,654, for an assault where the person sustained a broken nose, a broken shoulder, and multiple bruises on the head, face, arm, chest and back.

At page 32, again there is mention of an assault where the applicant was injured in relation to an incident outside JD's Tavern in Civic. A leather studded belt was used, and so on. The applicant was awarded \$6,098. If you go through all of the awards listed in this 1989-90 report you will notice a significant number associated with, to put it loosely, drinking establishments.

If we are going to talk about levies - and I say this with respect to Mr Stefaniak - you are talking about taxing the community, when there may be arguments that there is a case for some form of recovery, not necessarily under the subrogation principles of this Bill, from the assailant - where we can now recover it. We may need to consider whether this community is not justified in creating a levy to cover the extra costs of policing, and the extra costs under this legislation that accrue to the community by virtue of the very profitable operations of these types of establishments.

That is an issue that I would like to nudge along, in the public's eye, at this stage. I am not referring, of course, to reputable and well-organised establishments; and, I hasten to say, nor was I referring in that context to prohibition discos. I am referring to those very quick-buck disco-type establishments. Members will know all too clearly what I am referring to. We need to question whether there should not be some further infrastructure contribution from those establishments.

Members will also note in those reports the fair number of applications by policemen. That is an issue we need to look at in the context of their support package, and in the context of interaction with other awards and compensation rights. We are conscious of that matter, and will be looking at it in due course. I thank the house. I believe that this measure advances the cause of victims' rights a step further. But I accept the suggestions made across the floor that there is still more work to be done in the area.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

PORNOGRAPHY INDUSTRY AND ORGANISED CRIME
Publication of Paper

MR COLLAERY (Deputy Chief Minister), by leave: Mr Speaker, I move:

That the speech tabled earlier by Mr Stevenson be authorised for publication.

I move this motion now because I have a time requirement in making this available to the police. My advice is that I cannot make it available outside this chamber at this stage.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

INEBRIATES (AMENDMENT) BILL 1991

Debate resumed from 21 March 1991, on motion by **Mr Humphries**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (8.55): The Opposition will be supporting the Inebriates (Amendment) Bill 1991. The purpose of the Bill that is before us is to do a tidying-up exercise. It is to convert all references in the piece of legislation to gender neutral terms. We believe, of course, that it is appropriate for the law, both in its written form and in its implementation, not to discriminate. We also note and support the comment made by the Government in the presentation speech that they have an aim of eliminating all discriminatory provisions from ACT law. That is an aim that has the support of this side of the house. Indeed, it cannot happen soon enough for my purposes.

We note as well that the action embodied in this Bill is a requirement of the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act which does have application in the ACT. It is a matter that does need to be done. It is appropriate that the Government do it, and we support it.

In concluding my remarks, I would just like to draw attention to what I see as a rather wistful little remark by Mr Humphries in his presentation speech on this matter, where he has referred to this action - - -

16 April 1991

Mr Humphries: Wistful?

MS FOLLETT: It is wistful, Mr Humphries. You will notice that. He referred to this action as a prelude to the proposed ACT Discrimination Bill. I was going to say - and, in fact, I have written down - that I wish we were hearing the opening bars of the ACT Discrimination Bill, but I think the fact that this is the Inebriates Bill probably rules out that sort of a comment. It also rules out my further comment that this Government is certainly not full bottle on anti-discrimination legislation. In fact, they are struggling badly. I cannot let the occasion pass without mentioning again that that anti-discrimination legislation is desperately needed in the ACT. It is well and truly overdue, and is, I am afraid, a further condemnation of this Government because they have as yet failed to produce it.

I am again stating that the Opposition does support this action, but we would much rather be supporting the introduction into this Assembly of the kind of anti-discrimination legislation that is required, that has been promised, and that has not yet been delivered by this Government.

MRS NOLAN (8.58): As Mr Humphries said when he introduced this Bill into the Assembly, the Inebriates (Amendment) Bill 1991 amends the Inebriates Act 1900 of New South Wales in its application to the Australian Capital Territory and is designed to convert all references to gender neutral terms. Sexist language discriminates against women by not adequately reflecting their role, their status and, often, their very presence in society. It is crucial that we combat this discrimination at every possible opportunity. By eliminating it in government legislation and in other documents, we will be assisting in the move towards eliminating gender discrimination in the wider community.

As members have already heard this evening from Ms Follett, the Sex Discrimination Act of 1984, the Acts Interpretation (Amendment) Act of 1984 and, in fact, the ratification in 1983 of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, have all led to an increase in awareness of these issues at the level of government. The *Australian Government Publishing Manual* sets out guidelines for eliminating sexist language from all government documentation. It is pleasing to see that the ACT Administration is being encouraged to follow these guidelines. It is important that linguistic portrayal of both sexes is balanced. We must be able to recognise and avoid language that denigrates or trivialises women's activities or that portrays women as dependent on men.

The amendments to this Act as presented to this Assembly by Mr Humphries are in line with the Alliance Government's commitment to the removal of sexist terminology from all ACT legislation, thus allowing full equality under the law. I commend the Bill to the Assembly.

MR COLLAERY (Attorney-General) (9.00): I wish to make a few comments. I congratulate Mr Humphries on his prelude. I also want to respond to the Leader of the Opposition's comments regarding the broader issues that will be incorporated in the Discrimination Bill. The response to the Discrimination Bill amounted to some 400 pages of comment. There have been highly significant submissions from national sources, particularly, I have noted with interest, from South Australia again. Some of those comments I am quite happy to make available to Ms Follett. She will see that they are laudatory comments about some aspects of the Bill. Those comments, in the language of the South Australian commissioner and also in the Women's Electoral Lobby submission, put the ACT at the forefront.

Unfortunately, there are other issues that need further clarification because the rest of the anti-discrimination human rights community decided that this document is to be the model for the nation. Therefore, they have made very heavy demands on us to bring in the very best and most complete Bill possible.

Ms Follett: You can have mine. I offered you mine.

MR COLLAERY: Ms Follett says, "You can have mine". Ms Follett's Bill is a copy from another assembly. It is comprehensively deficient on all these matters that I speak of. I am sure she realises that. The challenges are great to the officials working on this matter. There are dedicated men and women working on this Bill. It ill behoves us to, in effect, bag their work routine in this Assembly. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is bagging the officials who report to me almost daily and weekly on this project. It is a massive project. I did not see it undertaken during the time the Leader of the Opposition was in government.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts) (9.03), in reply: I am pleased to note that we have had, at least up until the last few minutes, a chorus of agreement on the need to introduce the Inebriates Bill 1991 and pass it, I am sure, swiftly. It is nice to see that the cacophony of opposition that we sometimes get in this place is being replaced by people in tune.

I know that we are all looking forward, as are Mr Collaery and others, to the Discrimination Bill. I assure those opposite that the house will be tuneful on that occasion. In fact, the house will reverberate to the sound of a hallelujah chorus, or something very similar, when we actually get around to bringing that Bill forward after due processes of consultation.

As Ms Follett accurately pointed out, the ACT is bound by the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act 1984. That Act, as Ms Follett pointed out, requires the removal of sexist terminology from the legislation. It is not a binding that

16 April 1991

I think the ACT much minds since, clearly, it is in line with the policy of this Government to remove references in legislation which alienate or remove women from a central role in the activities in our society.

The changes outlined in the explanatory memorandum, which I tabled when I introduced the Bill, are in line with the requirements, of course, of the Commonwealth's Sex Discrimination Act. The changes are amendments to the Inebriates Act of New South Wales 1900 in its application to the ACT. It may be that we need to consider an updating of the title of that Act in due course - not for reasons of sexist terminology, but because the term "inebriates" might be outdated in some way. But that is not a matter that is presently before us. Perhaps we should consider that at some point in the future.

The changes do not alter the regulatory impact of the Act in any way, but they do provide for that compliance with the Commonwealth Act. We have had some allowance or lenience provided to the ACT by the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department in allowing us the time to have this legislation brought forward. I cannot be certain, but it seems to me that this process will finally permit legislation in the ACT to be free of sexist language. I am not aware of any other legislation that falls foul of the Commonwealth Act. I am sure that if such legislation is produced or discovered it will be acted upon swiftly.

Equality under the law is an important issue in our society today. The changes in this legislation show our Government's commitment to eliminating discriminatory provisions from ACT legislation because, of course, legislation is absolutely central to the rights, privileges and responsibilities of citizens in our society. Where documents of such pivotal importance make references which are exclusory of a large part of our community, naturally that must have some impact on the way in which people perceive those rights, privileges and responsibilities under the law. I am very pleased to be responsible for bringing this to the house. I thank the house for its support for this legislation.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE - STANDING COMMITTEE
Report on Stage '88 Fencing

Debate resumed from 7 August 1990, on motion by **Mr Jensen**:

That the report be noted.

MRS GRASSBY (9.07): Mr Speaker, in resuming debate on this matter, let me say from the start that I find myself in total agreement with the recommendations of the report. I had to fight very hard to get my right to speak on this, but I have won. Let it always be said that I am a winner.

Mr Jensen: You are priceless.

MRS GRASSBY: Of course I am. I have just told you that I am a winner. You cannot put a price on me.

Mr Jensen: No-one would buy you.

MRS GRASSBY: That is right. For the first time, Mr Jensen, you have said the right thing in this house. I am priceless. You cannot buy me; I am priceless.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mrs Grassby and Mr Jensen, please!

MRS GRASSBY: Mr Speaker, for your information, and to refresh the memories of the other members present, the recommendations are as follows: Firstly, that the proposal to construct a fence around Stage '88 not be proceeded with; secondly, that the management of Stage '88 be transferred from the Canberra Theatre Centre to the Department of Urban Services; and, thirdly, that the remaining \$177,000 from the initial Commonwealth grant of \$1.4m be used by the Department of Urban Services on minor works to reduce the costs of maintaining the facility.

Mr Speaker, in addressing the first recommendation, let me stress my belief that a fence should not be constructed around this public facility. If we remember, Stage '88 was a gift by the Commonwealth to the people of Canberra to celebrate our nation's bicentenary. This naturally occurred back in 1988. It is a gift to the people of Canberra, and I believe that any suggestion to fence that gift off from the public is a very serious thing. It does belong to the people. It was given to the people of Canberra. I am sure the Minister is going to tell us that he is going to put a fence there. He is not going to agree with the report. He is going to put a fence there that can be taken down and put up, taken down and put up, which will end up costing a lot more money.

Mr Humphries: How do you know, Ellnor? You must be a mind-reader.

16 April 1991

MRS GRASSBY: I have a pipeline into your office. You forget that we have a pipeline into your office. Any argument to fence that gift fails to remember that the initial purpose of the stage was that it was for the people of Canberra. Moreover, it is clear that to construct a fence around Stage '88 would leave a significant section of Commonwealth Park unable to be used by the public at any time. This also would be a strange decision to make in relation to one of our best public facilities in the central Canberra area.

Further, the aesthetic quality of that part of Commonwealth Park would be ruined and most unpleasing to the eye. This argument is also maintained by the ACT group of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. Let us face the facts. If anyone should know about this matter, it must be the experts in that institute. Mr Speaker, it is worth noting paragraph 2.16 of the report, which reads:

The Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (ACT group) (AILA) expressed the view that as the stage was a gift from the Commonwealth it is not in the spirit of the gift, or the interests of the residents of the ACT, for the area to be permanently fenced for the exclusive use of special interest groups. The AILA objected strongly to the fencing of a portion of Commonwealth Park that alienated that portion of the park from use by the general public.

Even if you put up a fence that can be taken down and put up, the fact is that it will still alienate people from using that area at any time, or all the time. Paragraph 2.17 states:

Mr J. Grey, Consultant Landscape Architect, and a Fellow of the AILA, expressed concern that fencing of any part of Commonwealth Park would be contrary to the intentions of the park's designer, Dame Sylvia Crowe.

Of course, it is only fair to note that the prime argument in favour of fencing the area - even if I do not personally agree with it - is a simple one. It is to fence off the stage as a means of ensuring at least a partial recovery of its running expenses. I suppose it is understandable, to an extent, that in this time of economic restraint and economic rationalism it would be seen that it would be able to pay for it. However, I still believe that Stage '88, as a gift, must be accessible to those it was given to - in other words, the people of Canberra - and that it is not just for a special interest group.

I also strongly believe that fencing the area would make the park less accessible and it would not be pleasing. Let us face it, Mr Speaker; there are enough ugly things in the world. We only have to look across the house.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MRS GRASSBY: As to the last two recommendations of the report - those being paragraphs 3.8 and 3.11 - they naturally follow from the first. Should Stage '88 not be fenced, then it appears only appropriate, given the commercial responsibilities of the Canberra Theatre Centre, who are the current managers, that this pass to the Department of Urban Services. That is where I feel it should be.

Given this Department's current responsibilities with public facilities such as Lanyon Homestead, the Nolan Gallery, and other parts of Canberra, this decision is clearly a sound one, as the Department of Urban Services does a very good job in looking after all these other areas. Therefore, Stage '88 should be left with the Department of Urban Services.

The last recommendation is also a sound recommendation. It is to provide the Department of Urban Services with the remaining \$177,000 from the initial Commonwealth grant and to have that department use that financial allocation on minor works for Stage '88 which will make it cheaper to run and maintain. The last recommendation, in this time of budgetary restraint, is clearly one of substance. I am sure that Mr Duby will be very happy to have \$177,000 to use on Stage '88, and I recommend that it be put there. In closing, I can only say that the report, in my opinion, is a sound one. I look forward to the adoption of its recommendations.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts) (9.14): I am always delighted to allow Mrs Grassby to go first, as the gentleman that I am.

Mrs Grassby: And a scholar?

MR HUMPHRIES: And a scholar. Undoubtedly, also a scholar. Mr Speaker, tonight I will be providing the Alliance Government's response to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure Report No. 3 concerning provision of fencing for Stage '88. Stage '88, Canberra's premier outdoor performance venue, was a bicentennial gift from the Commonwealth Government to the people of Canberra. In a media statement of 24 December 1986, the then Minister for Territories, Gordon Scholes, said:

The Bicentennial Commemorative Music Bowl will be constructed on a site in Commonwealth Park. The \$1.4m project to be funded by the Commonwealth/State Bicentennial program will provide an outdoor performance area in an attractive natural setting.

Mr Scholes also noted that the former ACT House of Assembly had considered the matter in detail and had undertaken a process of public consultation before recommending the project. On Saturday, 12 March 1988, Canberra Day, in a

16 April 1991

ceremony that coincided with the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of Canberra, the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, formally presented Stage '88 to the people of Canberra. Since that time Stage '88 has been host to a range of exciting events that have proved very popular with both residents of and visitors to this Territory.

Some of these activities, like the extensive program offered each year by the Canberra Festival, were predicted in the planning of Stage '88. Others, like the live performances that now support the floral displays of Floriade, were then just part of the vision of what Stage '88 could become. There is, however, one chapter of the Stage '88 story which has not yet been completed. I am referring here to the construction of a combination of demountable and permanent fencing intended to enhance the range of possible uses of Stage '88. Funds of \$177,000 remain available for the provision of the fence, ancillary equipment and associated works.

I am not certain how many members of the Assembly would be aware that the construction of a fence was part of the original concept for Stage '88, as proposed in February 1986 by the Standing Committee on Development and Planning in the then ACT House of Assembly. Of even more significance was the fact that the potential for income generation provided by the fence became crucial to the selection of Stage '88 as the Territory's bicentennial project. From a long list of worthy projects for the bicentennial funds, the two front runners were an outdoor performance venue and an ACT museum.

The final decision to proceed with a performance venue, later named Stage '88, was made by the then ACT House of Assembly in February 1986. The minutes of that meeting clearly show that the crucial issue in the decision was recurrent cost. Not only was Stage '88 seen to be by far the cheaper to run of the two proposals, but there were direct references in the house to the contribution to income that a fence would make. Mr Peter Vallee, chairman of the Standing Committee on Development and Planning, said in the debate on 11 February 1986:

The question of running costs and the associated matters of fencing and charging raised ... are very important ... one of the advantages of choosing a project like this, which had a very low running cost because we pruned it down to the bare essentials, is that we believe it can be made available to non-commercial hirers at either no cost or at very low cost indeed. We have in mind for example that Sunday in the Park activities could use it without cost. Commercial hirers like rock groups or major performers would pay a fee, and that would also cover the cost of installing the demountable fencing which would be needed to allow them to charge ...

The minutes also clearly reflect that the fence was to be demountable, not permanent. Despite this, the debate on Stage '88 has been consistently sidetracked into an argument about the impact of a permanent fence - even tonight. Quite rightly, the then National Capital Development Commission and, later, the National Capital Planning Authority voiced opposition to permanent fencing in the park. Both planning bodies did agree to demountable fencing, plus a small amount of permanent fencing in areas that would not impede movement. In February 1988 the NCDC wrote:

The Commission still maintains the view that temporary fencing is the preferred solution but recognises that this would prove impracticable along certain sections of the perimeter due to sloping ground and existing plantings.

Furthermore, on 30 October 1989, the new NCPA agreed to a mix of some permanent but mainly temporary fencing. Chief Executive Lindsay Neilsen wrote:

Stage '88 is an important asset to the enjoyment of the performing arts in Canberra; in order for it to pay for itself and to continue successfully, there is a recognised need to introduce some form of crowd control.

In November 1990 the NCPA reaffirmed its support for the project. The issue of the Stage '88 fence and the unexpended funds was brought to my attention as Minister for the Arts early last year. In March 1990 I referred the matter to the chairman of the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure for advice. After consideration, the committee decided to adopt the issue of the fence as a formal reference and released its report in June 1990.

The Government is most appreciative of the work that the committee did on this matter. The committee heard submissions from government officers and called for written submissions from interested members of the public. The Government agrees fully with the committee's understanding of the arguments in favour of the fence; that is, firstly, that:

The fence was a unit of the original proposal for the music bowl in Commonwealth Park as the Commonwealth's bicentenary gift to the people of the ACT.

I refer members once again to the debate on 11 February 1986 in the then House of Assembly when the fence was incontrovertibly linked to the original decision to proceed with Stage '88. The committee found that the second argument in favour of the fence was:

16 April 1991

The fence was seen as a way of ensuring that at least some of the running costs associated with the Stage could be recovered.

It has always been envisaged that Stage '88 would primarily be used for free events. That is not to say that the event organisers would not pay some hiring charge for the use of the facility, but clearly these rates would need to be realistic. There are also some entrepreneurs, particularly in the contemporary music field, who would want to use such a venue for commercial events. Such activity would obviously attract a more substantial hire charge than a free community event. However, without a method of charging for admission - that is, through the use of a fence - no such commercial events can occur. The committee noted that:

The Canberra Theatre Centre, the current managers of Stage '88, and the ACT Government pressed very strongly for the fence on the basis of a contribution to the recurrent funding for the Stage.

However, I would also argue that this is not simply an issue of improving the income of Stage '88; it is about improving the viability of a public venue. Without the capacity to occasionally hire the venue to commercial promoters, an additional source of entertainment would be shut off to the community and the Government will be unable to maximise the use of this important public facility.

The third argument in support of the fence acknowledged by the committee was:

That the availability of the fence could provide control over crowds and vandalism.

For most events at Stage '88 the use of a fence for crowd control would be quite inappropriate. There is, however, one very important activity where the use of the fence for crowd control is essential. It is the holding of special events such as alcohol-free concerts for young people. As Minister for Health, I am most heartened by the current campaigns to raise community awareness of the effects of drugs and alcohol. This is particularly important for young people. The Government's initiative in creating the ACT Health Promotion Fund is a vital part of these efforts. The fence would make possible the holding of regular alcohol-free concerts for the Territory's youth. This alone is reason for construction of the fence as proposed.

There are, of course, some arguments against the fence. I would endorse the standing committee's view that:

The principal argument against the fence is one that might be called an aesthetic argument and is concerned mainly with the alienation of any part of Commonwealth Park.

The advertisement in the *Canberra Times* of 28 April 1990 invited comments on:

A proposal to construct a fence at Stage '88.

The committee received six submissions in response to this advertisement; three in favour of a fence and three opposed. Unfortunately, the respondents appeared to have assumed that the proposal was to construct a permanent fence. For example, the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, to whom Mrs Grassby has referred, wrote to express opposition, as follows:

For the area to be permanently fenced for the exclusive use of special interest groups.

The Government's proposal is to construct a combination of demountable and permanent fencing at Stage '88. (*Extension of time granted*) It should be noted that the majority of the fence would be demountable and will be erected only for special events. Limited permanent fencing is planned to take account of sloping ground and existing plantings, but will not impede movement. Hence, the opposition to the fence as presented to the committee was based on a misunderstanding of the Government's proposal. The committee further considered the viability of a temporary fence. They expressed a valid concern that there would be pressure to leave the fence up for long periods, making it de facto permanent. I can assure members that the temporary fencing proposed for Stage '88 is just that - temporary. A key element of its design is that it can be easily erected and removed, and at a cost that is not prohibitive to potential hirers. The Government's view on the policy for use of this fencing is clear. It is and must be seen as demountable fencing used only for single events as required by occasional hirers.

As to the management of the facility, the committee has questioned the continuation of the current arrangements with the Canberra Theatre Trust. The Government does not support the suggestion that the venue could be managed by the Department of Urban Services because of its experience in running museums. The manager of the facility clearly needs expertise in the performing arts. It is the Government's view that, as the major presenter of performing arts in the Territory, the Canberra Theatre Trust is the ideal manager of the Territory's premier outdoor performing arts venue.

The Government thanks the members of the standing committee for their consideration of this matter. The committee's efforts and the resulting recommendations have assisted the Government considerably in its deliberations on the final chapter of the Stage '88 project. Having given full consideration to the history of the project, it is clear

16 April 1991

that a removable security fence was an integral part of the original decision in 1986 to adopt Stage '88 as the ACT's major bicentennial project. Equally clear is the intention that such a fence should be a combination of demountable and permanent, and that it should be intended to enhance the use and enjoyment of Stage '88, and not restrict it.

This can best be achieved by the provision of fencing as originally intended - allowing for commercial use and special events such as alcohol-free concerts, as well as the major use for free community events. The Government has therefore decided to proceed with the construction of a combination of demountable and permanent security fencing in those areas agreed by the National Capital Planning Authority.

The Government will expend the remaining \$177,000 of Commonwealth funds on the fence, and ancillary and associated works. The Government has also decided to maintain the arrangement with the Canberra Theatre Trust to manage the operation of Stage '88 for the people of Canberra.

MR MOORE (9.28): What we have heard in the Government response to this report by the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure is, "Thank you very much for your work. You have done a wonderful job. But we are just going to ignore what you had to say". One cannot help wondering what sort of compromises have been made or why it is that the Minister has decided to ignore it. Is it his bureaucracy that has decided that the work of the committee is to be ignored, or is it just that Mr Humphries, of course, knows better?

What we have here is an appalling situation where the Government feels that it can just go ahead, ride roughshod over a committee report like this and give it no credibility whatsoever. In spite of the words that Mr Humphries has mouthed about, "Yes, we appreciate the effort you have put in", he then ignored the basic recommendations. The basic recommendation is that there be no fence. The reasons set out there are recognised. Mr Humphries says that he recognises them, but he then goes ahead and provides for this temporary fence.

Many of us know about temporary things. In South Australia just after the war, temporary schools were built. I would not be surprised if Mr Connolly was taught in some of them. I was taught in some of them, and I also taught in some of them some 45 years later. We had a temporary Parliament House that was temporary for a long time. I hear that one of the latest words around is that we have a temporary Prime Minister's residence as well.

Mr Doby: We have a temporary Prime Minister.

MR MOORE: And a temporary Prime Minister and, no doubt, a temporary Chief Minister, and a temporary Alliance Government. At least the Chief Minister, no doubt, will be back here, unless he chooses otherwise, for the next Assembly, unlike many of his colleagues over there.

Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

MR SPEAKER: Order! It being 9.30, I propose the question:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mr Collaery: Mr Speaker, I require that the question be put forthwith without debate.

Question resolved in the negative.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE - STANDING COMMITTEE Report on Stage '88 Fencing

Debate resumed.

MR MOORE: The reality is that Commonwealth Park ought not be split by the use of one of these fences. Part of the argument put by this committee was that, as it was a gift from the Commonwealth to all residents of the ACT, the stage ought to be available. The spurious argument that Mr Humphries puts up and goes back into history about - the intention and so forth - really carries very little water, indeed, when you are talking about the expenditure of some \$170,000 in order to be able to put up a temporary fence every now and then.

If that is going to be a temporary fence every now and again - and even if on each occasion you are able to charge something like \$4,000 or \$5,000 for renting it - then it would take a tremendous amount of time to be able to recoup that money. Granted that money is in an account here, but it is still taxpayers' money.

Mr Humphries: Commonwealth money.

MR MOORE: Commonwealth taxpayers' money. We are still part of the Commonwealth. We still pay part of those taxes. We have no reason to expend that money at all and, in fact, we have very good reasons not to put up a fence and isolate a section of Commonwealth Park in that way. Members should not think that a temporary fence can be built up in a wobbly way so that you can just put it up and pull it down without having a structure in the ground in order to link it, whether it is concrete pieces to bolt it

16 April 1991

into or whatever the structure is. You can be sure that this fence will put some ugliness into the middle of Commonwealth Park. Mr Humphries, I really think that the Government response to this report is totally and entirely and completely inadequate. I urge the Government to reconsider this response and to weigh up whether we do really need to spend that much of taxpayers' money, albeit Commonwealth taxpayers' money, and proceed with this one.

Mr Humphries: It has to be spent on the stage either way, Michael. We have no choice.

MR MOORE: Well, spend it on the stage on something reasonable.

MR COLLAERY (Attorney-General) (9.33): Mr Speaker, I turned the radio on a few weeks ago and I heard Mrs Grassby saying, "Here is a government spending a hundred and something thousands on putting a fence around Stage '88 when people are starving", or something. That was another extraordinary comment. We have heard her come into the Assembly tonight and applaud the situation, so I really - - -

Mrs Grassby: I did not applaud putting a fence around it. I said, "No fence around it. Stop wasting the money".

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR COLLAERY: Mrs Grassby knew that that was Commonwealth funded money. I think it does her no credit and the political process of this Assembly no credit when those sorts of extraordinary comments are made on the radio. I thought the statement was very unfair. It was not local money that is available for welfare, Mrs Grassby - through you, Mr Speaker - in this Territory. It was not a matter of welfare funds being diverted for a fence, and I thought that sort of comment was not on.

I have nothing further to say, other than to remind Mr Moore that that will be one of the most public temporary fences in Canberra. I am sure that the members of this Assembly are going to keep a close eye on how long any temporary structure stays up after an event. I think the proposition put forward by Mr Humphries will allow itself to be quite easily policed, almost directly, by members of this Assembly who will perceive if Mr Humphries is not abiding by the arrangements that he puts up.

MR JENSEN (9.35), in reply: As I presume there is no-one else wishing to speak on this, as the chairman of the committee and the one who brought the report to the Assembly, I will be closing the debate.

I am disappointed that the Minister has chosen not to accept what I considered to be the reasoned arguments within this report for not constructing a fence. We supported spending the funds on much needed additional

facilities for the stage, including lighting and sound equipment, which would help reduce one-off hiring costs for the users of the facility. I propose to stand up in this place and support the report that my colleague Mrs Nolan and I brought down in this Assembly. It is as simple as that. That is what it is about. That is what the Assembly committee system is all about, and that is what I propose to do. Regardless of all the nonsense and cackling and yahoing that is coming across from the other side, it is my right as chairman of this committee to make these comments, and I will make them. Mr Kaine knows full well that I have the ability to do so, and I am quite happy to do so.

However, let me reiterate that the committee was not provided with any clear advice on the income likely to be generated by the commercial use of Stage '88. I note the point that Mr Humphries made about the fence being useful for alcohol-free concerts. That is a commendable project and I support that particular concept; but it was our view, in fact, and evidence was put to us, that the estimated three to five commercial uses of the stage annually were not really possible. There did not seem to be any clear evidence that they would be provided, and I draw members' attention to paragraph 2.7 of the report where these matters are discussed.

Mr Speaker, our concern at the time was that any temporary fence could become permanent, and, while I note the comments by my colleague Mr Collaery on this matter, I certainly will be keeping a beady eye on this particular location if, in fact, the Minister proceeds to go ahead and construct the fence. But there was that and, of course, there was the clearly demonstrated need for additional equipment for the stage to enhance the nature of free events for which the stage was presented to the people of Canberra, and, of course, the people of Australia.

That, Mr Speaker, in a nutshell, is basically why the committee's report recommended to the Government that it not proceed with the proposal for the fence around Stage '88, and I can indicate that I express my disappointment at that decision.

MR MOORE (9.38): Considering the comments of Mr Jensen, Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move that the Assembly supports recommendation 3.5 of the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure, which reads:

The committee recommends that the proposal to construct a fence around Stage '88 not be proceeded with.

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The report has been tabled. The Government has considered it. It has identified for the Assembly what it intends to do. We are not going to redebate the whole matter.

Leave not granted.

16 April 1991

Motion (by **Mr Moore**) put:

That so much of the standing and temporary orders be suspended as would prevent Mr Moore moving - That this Assembly supports recommendation 3.5 of the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure Report on Stage '88 Fencing which reads "The committee recommends that the proposal to construct a fence around Stage '88 not be proceeded with."

The Assembly voted -

AYES, 6

Mr Berry
Mr Connolly
Ms Follett
Mrs Grassby
Mr Moore
Mr Wood

NOES, 10

Mr Collaery
Mr Duby
Mr Humphries
Mr Jensen
Mr Kaine
Dr Kinloch
Ms Maher
Mrs Nolan
Mr Prowse
Mr Stefaniak

Question so resolved in the negative.

MR SPEAKER: The question now is: That the report be noted.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

CONSERVATION, HERITAGE AND ENVIRONMENT - STANDING COMMITTEE
Discussion Paper on Fuelwood Heating

DR KINLOCH, by leave: I present a discussion paper on fuelwood heating in the ACT. I seek leave to make a short statement in relation to the paper.

Leave granted.

DR KINLOCH: First of all, I would like to thank all members of the committee. I am very conscious, in view of what we have just discussed, of the role of committees. I am thinking of the Ainslie tip, for example.

I would like to thank Mrs Grassby, in particular, who had a long interest in this subject when she was Minister; Mr Moore for his initiative in this matter because he was on the committee before many of the rest of us were; and Mr Stefaniak and Mrs Nolan for their support.

It was a unanimous decision of the committee to take this particular route to issue a discussion paper on this matter. The reason for that is that we are involved in the larger subject of looking at the question of energy for the ACT. So, as point 1 says:

As part of a broader reference on integrated energy resources, the committee is giving attention to fuelwood heating ...

We thought this was so specific and so necessary at this particular time of the year that we argued for a discussion paper. I understand that it is going to be about two degrees tonight, so we can expect those various fuelwood stoves to begin belching again very shortly.

Could I ask you to note, in particular, paragraphs 1.2 and 1.6? This discussion paper attempts to address those concerns about fuelwood heating and air quality. Hopefully it will stimulate interest within the community and prompt individuals and organisations to comment to the committee directly on the issues as presented. Therefore, paragraph 1.6 states:

... the committee will take account of comments received on this paper.

May I stress that comments should be made to the committee by 17 May 1991. I hope that this will receive wide coverage in the media and that people who feel that they would like to respond will do that.

Finally, I would like to thank our able committee secretary, Bill Symington, for his careful and excellent work in this matter. I present the following paper:

The Burning Question : A Discussion Paper on Fuelwood Heating in the ACT.

Motion (by **Mr Berry**), by leave, proposed:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

Debate (on motion by **Mrs Grassby**) adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion (by **Mr Collaery**) proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Hospital System

MR BERRY (9.49): I rise to speak on an issue of considerable importance for the people of the ACT. What it focuses on is an apparent move by the Government to cover up the difficulties which face the people of Canberra in relation to access to our hospital system. Today, in debate, the Minister seemed to favour the provision of admission and discharge figures which would indicate the utilisation of our hospital system but would not, of course, give any indication about how many people could not use our hospital system.

That is the embarrassment for this Government, because what has clearly been a problem for the Government has been the number of people who cannot use our hospital system. We know, for example, that on the figures provided to us - and they were to December of last year - there were 1,500 people - around a 60 per cent blow-out - on waiting lists. This has been caused directly by this Government's management of the hospital system.

In effect, it has done severe damage to the hospital system because there are many ACT and New South Wales residents who can now no longer be part of the admission and discharge figures that Mr Humphries talks about. So, that is a real matter of concern to the community and a matter of concern to a party which is concerned about providing an accessible and affordable hospital system. We stand remote from those people on the other side of the house who do not seem to have any commitment to such a hospital system.

In the course of discussion, Mr Humphries was also critical of me for raising the issue of waiting lists again. He had better get used to it, because we will raise them over and over again until we get all of the facts and the figures - and we want them quickly. We do not want to persist with the requirement of leaning on the Government to get these figures. The Government should stop the cover-up and make the figures available to the community and, of course, to this Assembly.

Mr Humphries failed to mention that on 12 February we asked for the figures for the months of October and November. That question, Mr Speaker, is still on notice and has yet to be answered. It was joined by another question, which was put on notice today, which calls for the waiting lists by specialty for people waiting for surgery in ACT

hospitals for the months of January and February; and we will ask the question in relation to March as well. We again ask the Minister: Will he provide the information requested as a matter of urgency, in order that the people of the ACT can be informed of the state of hospital services? The Government does not seem to be interested in providing any of these figures as a matter of urgency, because the question dated 12 February still lies on the notice paper and remains unanswered.

Also in the course of the debate, the Minister said that the ACT joined other States in relation to difficulties with waiting lists for beds in the public hospital system. There is no doubt in my mind that there will always be a waiting list in a hospital system. It is a question of how big it is. The Labor Party ensured, when it was in office, that we had the lowest possible waiting lists. This Government, of course, has said that we have a similar problem to the States. But not once has the Minister brought to the attention of this Assembly a State which has had its waiting lists blow out by 60 per cent in such a short time. So, that Minister was setting out to mislead the people of the ACT into believing that there was no difference in the ACT from what occurred in other States. He was wrong. He was very wrong.

Mr Humphries: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: Mr Berry knows that the expression that someone has misled the Assembly is unparliamentary. He should either have a full debate, where he brings the evidence forward and proves it - doing so in the middle of the adjournment debate is hardly the appropriate place to do that - or withdraw the phrase. I think he should be asked to withdraw that expression.

Mr Berry: If I could just debate the point, Mr Deputy Speaker: I did not mention misleading the Assembly; I said "misleading the community". I was very careful about that.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard the word "mislead", Mr Berry. If you said "mislead the community", that might make it a little bit different.

MR BERRY: I was very careful about that issue.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not quite hear the word "community". Mr Prowse, I gave you the nod as the second speaker in the adjournment debate.

Mr Prowse: I was just suggesting that you had to give your ruling before I proceeded, Mr Deputy Speaker.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: He seems to be deferring to you, Mr Humphries.

16 April 1991

Assembly Proceedings : Hospital System

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts) (9.56): Mr Berry loves to rake over matters that he does not fire on very well in the early part of the day. That is always the way, I am afraid. I have to say that it is a bit unfortunate that Mr Berry makes a habit of debating issues in the course of the adjournment debate. I think, in effect, Mr Deputy Speaker, he is abusing one of the traditions of the adjournment debate. The adjournment debate is used to raise other issues - issues which are not properly raised under any other umbrella, or under any other subject earlier in the day. It is there for members to use in respect of those matters.

Ms Follett: He did try; he tried earlier in the day.

MR HUMPHRIES: Ms Follett interjects that Mr Berry tried. Mr Berry has to work within the standing orders in the rest of the day. Mr Berry's flouting of the standing orders is well known in this place, so if he cannot understand and comply with the standing orders that is too bad.

Ms Follett: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: Mr Humphries has said that Mr Berry has flouted the standing orders. That is a reflection on the Speaker, and it ought to be withdrawn.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure that Mr Humphries will withdraw that, if he said it. I was talking to the Deputy Clerk at the time; so I did not hear it.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Deputy Speaker, the fact is that I do think it is inappropriate for this opportunity to be taken by Mr Berry; but, of course, he will continue to do it so - - -

Mr Connolly: On a point of order: Mr Deputy Speaker, you said that you were sure that Mr Humphries would withdraw that. Instead, Mr Humphries has just continued. So, is he going to withdraw it?

Mr Humphries: He said that he did not hear it.

Mr Berry: Did you say it? The record will show what you said.

Mr Humphries: All I said was accurate. That is not unparliamentary.

Mr Berry: That I was flouting the standing orders?

Mr Humphries If you think that is unparliamentary, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will make a submission to you on that question.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry; I did not hear what you said, Mr Humphries.

Mr Humphries: Mr Deputy Speaker, you and the Speaker have repeatedly brought Mr Berry into line for breaching standing orders. I therefore make no apology for saying that Mr Berry frequently flouts standing orders.

Mr Berry: On a point of order: That is not true.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: All right, Mr Berry. Perhaps you should just stick to the relevant points, Mr Humphries. What Mr Berry has done in the past in relation to other matters is not relevant to the point in question. Certainly, Mr Berry's point of order is not a point of order. Carry on, Mr Humphries.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Deputy Speaker, I think it is most unfortunate that, as I said, Mr Berry has used this opportunity, but I will answer his points very briefly. There is no cover-up going on.

Mr Berry: Why have I not got the answers? Give me the answers?

MR HUMPHRIES: I should point out that Mr Berry constantly changes the question that he wants to get answered.

Ms Follett: He is trying to get an answer. He is desperately trying to get an answer.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Berry gets plenty of answers from this Government.

Ms Follett: No, he does not.

MR HUMPHRIES: He has lots and lots of answers from this Government, but he is never satisfied with what he gets. That is the fact of life, Ms Follett.

Mr Deputy Speaker, Mr Berry was on radio this morning saying that he had asked for waiting list figures for November and December some time ago and he had not received them. That was not true. He had received the information. Mr Doby had given him that information. He received it some time ago, in fact, while I was overseas. That is a fact of life. If that is not the case, Mr Berry, then come forward and show what it was that you were given, and point out where it was not accurate, in terms of what I have just said. We know that it was accurate.

Mr Deputy Speaker, those opposite like to pretend that they have some issue by the throat here; they are going to constantly flog it for the next few months. But we know that there are much more complex ways of looking at these matters which more accurately reflect the reality of our hospital system. I would be happy to quote or table some figures on the next occasion that indicate that there are very clear trends in Australia towards declining bed days in Australian hospitals and increasing admission numbers in line with population increases.

16 April 1991

It follows that you cannot look purely at issues like bed numbers in our public hospital system. It simply is not an appropriate way of looking at those matters.

Mr Berry: How many States have a 60 per cent blow-out?

MR HUMPHRIES: The 60 per cent that Mr Berry refers to obviously depends very much on the size of your base. A 60 per cent blow-out in New South Wales is vastly more serious than a 60 per cent blow-out in the Northern Territory.

So, Mr Deputy Speaker, Mr Berry plays with figures, and will continue to play with figures because that is the way he wants to handle this debate. There are others in the community who are more sophisticated than that. I am sure that they will see through the tawdry approach that Mr Berry has adopted and see that much of what he says is pure and utter garbage.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: It being 10.00 pm, in accordance with standing order 34, the Assembly now stands adjourned.

Assembly adjourned at 10.00 pm

16 April 1991

Blank page.

16 April 1991

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MINISTER FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 328

Supported Accommodation Assistance Program Client Statistics

Ms Follett asked the minister for Housing and Community Services -

- (1) Is it true that the guidelines under which the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) is administered provide that the client statistics collected and supplied by individual SAAP services will not be used in any way which publicly identifies details for individual services?
- (2) Is it true that officers of his Department provided a reporter from The Canberra Times with the client statistics for several individual SAAP services which were published in an article on 14 January 1991?
- (3) Did the Minister know about this action in advance?
- (4) Does the Minister agree that this is a serious breach of the SAAP guidelines and of the trust placed in the Department by service providers?
- (5) What action will he take in relation to the release of the statistics?

Mr Collaery - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) There are no specific national or ACT guidelines relating to the release of data on services funded under the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program. There is an understanding that data collected by the States for the Commonwealth through the One-Night Client Characteristics Census will be published in aggregate form only, with no individual service identification. This understanding stems from client confidentiality concerns relating to the one-night census aspects of the collection. The ACT independently collects monthly on-going occupancy and turnaway rates. No client characteristics are involved in this collection. It is simply numbers in and out over the month and represents the barest minimum required for the public accountability of government funds. There are no agreed protocols on the use of this data.
- (2) At my request, a background briefing on the range of community service programs was provided to a journalist from The Canberra Times. As part of that briefing, the monthly ongoing occupancy and turnaway rates collected by my Department and referred to in (1) were provided in relation to youth refuges.

1353

- (3) See response to (2).
- (4) No.
- (5) Officers of my Department met with representatives of SAAP service providers on 24 January 1991 to discuss this issue. In suggesting strategies to address the providers concerns, the joint development of an agreed protocol on the use of ACT data was proposed. The representatives were to convey to the Department the views of other service providers on this proposal. No response has been received to date. Any protocol developed will need to take account of the need for both client confidentiality and public accountability.

1354

16 April 1991

ATTORNEY GENERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 334

Gaming and Liquor Authority Funding

Ms Follett - asked the Attorney General

For each separate funding source within the former Gaming and Liquor Authority (GALA), what was

- (1) The name of every sport, recreation, service or other community body which received funding from GALA in (a)1989-90 and (b)1990-91.
- (2) The name, purpose and funding amount for each project for which the organisations at (1) above were funded.

Mr Collaery - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

The following entities received funding from GALA in 1989/90, and in 1990/91 prior to the abolition of the Authority on 31 December 1990:

1989/90 1990/91

\$ \$

Racecourse Development Fund 1 576,730 0

ACT Racing Club 2 2,000,407 1,111,756

Canberra Harness Racing Club 2 221,341 124,959

Canberra Greyhound Racing Club 2 446,240 262,343

Radio Station 2SSS FM 3 198,000 249,425

1. The Racecourse Development Fund, established under the Betting (Totalizator Administration) Act 1964, provides funds to assist the race clubs with approved capital expenditure projects. Payments to the Fund are made annually.
2. Statutory distribution of funds paid to the racing clubs pursuant to Betting (Totalizator Administration) Act 1964. The funds are used for the general operation of the clubs.
3. It is important to note that, while 2SSS FM has been included in this answer, payments made to the station are not of the nature of a funding grant. They are a fee for service relating to the provision of race broadcasts, ACTTAB approximate and declared dividends, and other relevant betting information and are made in accordance with a commercial contract between the station and ACTTAB (formerly GALA).

1355

**CHIEF MINISTER FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 335

Ministerial Travel

MS FOLLETT - Asked the Chief Minister upon notice on 12 February 1991:

- (1) On what occasions have Ministers or Executive Deputies travelled outside the ACT on official business in the period from 6 December 1990 to 11 February 1991.
- (2) In relation to each visit at (1) above (a) what were the dates of the visit; (b) what meetings were attended by the Minister or Executive Deputy; (c) what cities were visited; (d) which public servants, members of staff or other people accompanied the Minister or Executive Deputy; (e) what mode and class of transport were used by each person; (f) what was the cost of travel for the Minister or Executive Deputy; (g) what was the cost of accommodation for the Minister or Executive Deputy; and (h) what was the cost of travel and accommodation for persons accompanying the Minister or Executive Deputy.

Mr KAINÉ - The answer to Ms Follett's question is as follows:

CHIEF MINISTER

- 1.(a)DATE/S: 10 December 1990
- (b)REASON FOR TRAVEL: Meeting of the VFT with the Prime Minister, Premier of NSW and the Premier of VIC
- (c)CITY VISITED: Sydney
- (d)ACCOMPANIED BY: Bill Harris - Secretary of the Chief Ministers Department
Nia Stavropoulos - SPS
Dan Steiner - Executive Director
Project Management
- (e)MODE OF TRAVEL:

Chief Minister Economy and First Class Air
Bill Harris Economy and First Class Air
Nia Stavropoulos Business and First Class Air
Dan Steiner Economy and First Class Air
- (f)COST OF TRAVEL: \$ 301-00
- (g)COST OF ACCOMMODATION: Nil

1356

16 April 1991

(h)COSTS FOR THOSE
ACCOMPANYING:

Bill Harris

Travel \$ 301-00

Accommodation Nil

Nia Stavropoulos

Travel \$ 331-00

Accommodation \$ 35-00 Travelling Allowance

Dan Steiner

Travel \$ 301-00

Accommodation Nil

MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

1. (a)DATE/S: 06 - 07 December 1990

(b)REASON FOR TRAVEL: Australian Education Council
Ministers

Meeting

(c)CITY VISITED: Adelaide

(d)ACCOMPANIED BY: Rohan Greenland - SPS

Max Sawatzki - Deputy Secretary

Schools

(e)MODE OF TRAVEL:

Minister Economy and First Class Air

Rohan Greenland Economy Class Air

Max Sawatzki First Class Air

(f)COST OF TRAVEL: \$ 719-00

(g)COST OF ACCOMMODATION: \$ 300-00 Rem. Trib. Determination

(h)COSTS FOR THOSE

ACCOMPANYING:

Rohan Greenland

Travel \$ 586-00

Accommodation \$ 153-00 Travelling Allowance

Max Sawatzki

Travel \$ 882-00

Accommodation \$ 328-91 Travelling Allowance

2. (a)DATE/S: 08 February 1991

(b)REASON FOR TRAVEL: Health Services Ministers
Conference

(c)CITY VISITED: Sydney

1357

(d)ACCOMPANIED BY: John Bissett - Chief Executive

Dr Vin McLoughlin - Executive Director Health Services Development

Len Withers - Chief Executive Royal Canberra Hospital (North)

Kathy Casey - Executive Assistant

(e)MODE OF TRAVEL:

Minister Economy Class Air

John Bissett First Class Air

Dr Vin McLoughlin First Class Air

Len Withers First Class Air

Kathy Casey Economy Class Air

(f)COST OF TRAVEL: \$ 127-00 (One way only)

(G)COST OF ACCOMMODATION: Nil

(h)COSTS FOR THOSE
ACCOMPANYING:

John Bissett (6 - 8 February 1991)

Travel \$ 384-00

Accommodation \$ 438-50 Travelling Allowance

Dr Vin McLoughlin (6 - 8 February 1991)

Travel \$ 384-00

Accommodation \$ 438-50 Travelling Allowance

Len Withers (6 - 8 February 1991)

Travel \$ 384-00

Accommodation \$ 438-50 Travelling Allowance

Kathy Casey (8 - February 1991)

Travel \$ 254-00

Accommodation \$ 26-00 Travelling Allowance

Please note the public servants shown as accompanying the Chief Minister and other Ministers, were in some cases invited to attend in their own right.

In response to this and earlier questions on this topic the Government intends to provide information. to the Assembly on Ministerial and other travel on a twice yearly basis, as a matter of course. It is proposed that the first such advice in this series be provided for the period 1 January 1991 to 30 June 1991.

1358

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 338

Consultants - Finance and Urban Services

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services -

- (1) In the period from 6 August 1990 to 11 February 1991 what consultants were employed by (a) the Minister; and
(b) each agency in the Ministers portfolio.
- (2) For each consultant employed what was (a) the purpose; (b) the duration; and (c) the cost of the consultancy.

Mr Duby - the answer to Ms Folletts question is as follows:

- (1) In the period from 6 August 1990 to 11 February 1991
 - (a) Nil
 - (b) See Attachment for details
- (2) See Attachment for details

1359

16 April 1991

A.C.T. PUBLIC WORKS

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems
15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page 2

DATE RANGE :06/08/90 TO 11/02/91
ISSUE BRIEF (MMYY) : 08/90A
DIVISION RESPONSIBLE: PEN(ENGINEERING:NEIGHBOURH000)

DURATION DESCRIPTION CONSULTANT COST

14/08/90 A 01/08/90 T 33.6817.31 WANNIASSA SECT 117 OLK11 ENGINEERING
INVESTIGATION BILL GUY d PARTNERS PTY L 666.60
30/08/90 A 01/08/90 T 59.4762.31 GINNINDERRA POND NO 1 FINAL FEES CLAIM SNOWY
MOUNTAINS ENGINEERI 4,882.39

i

**TOTAL: ISSUE BRIEF: 08/90A DIVISION RESP: PEN 5,548.99
23/08/90 A 01/08/90 T 64.1009.30 GUNGAHLIN-WM.SLIM DRIVE TO JOHN DEDMAN
DRIVE-PRE-DESI R.A.YOUNG 8 ASSOCIATES 5,750.00

**TOTAL: ISSUE BRIEF: 08/90A DIVISION RESP: PET 5,750.00
21/08/90 A 18/10/91 T 56.4169.30 CALWELL PRIMARY SCHOOL PLAYING FIELDS
STRINE DESIGN 29,810.00

**TOTAL: ISSUE BRIEF: 08/90A DIVISION RESP: PLA 29,810.00
20/08/90 A 01.1028.34 IN - HOUSE CONTRACT CELL - CONTRACT SUPPORT
CHANDLER CHANDLER PERSONNEL 22,346.31

21/08/90 A 01.1046.31 IN - HOUSE CONTRACT CELL - ARBITRATION FEE RIDGE CONS
G VERGE C/- INSTITUTE OF 3,000.00
**TOTAL: ISSUE BRIEF: 08/90A DIVISION RESP: PMF 25,346.31

20/08/90 A 01.1030.38 IN - HOUSE CONTRACT SUPPORT STAFF - INFOR. SYSTEMS A.
COMPUTER PEOPLE PTY LTD 46,638.82
21/08/90 A 01.1030.39 IN-HOUSE INFORMATION SERVICES - CONTRACT SUPPORT P.KE
BRIAN KELLETT SERVICES 19,000.00

**TOTAL: ISSUE BRIEF: 08/90A DIVISION RESP: PMS

65,638.82

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems
15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems

I

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page 4 I

Table included.

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems
15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page S

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page 6

Table included.

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information systems
15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page T

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page 8

Table included.

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page 9

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 vial Management Information Systems

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page10

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems
15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print il

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page12

Table included.

16 April 1991

FEE947 v1.1 Management Information Systems

15:40 11/03/91 Fees Issue Brief Date by Div Resp Print Page13

Table included.

16 April 1991

AGENCY CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST

A.C.T. TOURISM George Mackintosh Graphic consultant for 15.1.91 -

COMMISSION preparation of Canberra book 15.3.91 \$ 1330

Transom Tours Assist Melbourne office with 29.11.90 -

promotion and arrangement of 1.2.91

group travel to Canberra \$ 8776

Price Waterhouse Review of Commission structure 6.8.90 -

1.11.90 \$22500

Price Waterhouse/ Review Commissions computer August 1990 -

Deloitte Ross Topmast equipment and assist with 30.6.91

acquisition of new system \$13868

David Haley Assist Sydney office with 26.11.90 -

promotion and arrangement of 30.6.91

group travel to Canberra \$ 6569

AGENCY CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST
CITY SERVICES Compacc Consulting Training and accounts
implementation 2 days \$ 900

Bill Guy and Partners Contract administration and
programming assistance 172 hours \$ 8600

Bill Guy and Partners Contract administration and
programming assistance 127.50 hours \$ 6519

R M Moore Advice on contract administration 3 hours \$ 210

Bill Guy and Partners Contract administration and
programming assistance 397.50 hours \$20164

Malcolm Forsyth Specialist review of draft
Clinical Waste Manual 4.33 hours \$ 520

R Somerville Scribing for staff selection
Committees 22 hours \$ 572

Colin Burk Design Artwork and design for
recycling promotions 55 hours \$ 1651

Price Waterhouse Coordinating sale of Trade Waste Since mid
Dec 90

(continuing) \$15000

(fixed fee plus up to \$2000 incidental costs)

Communication Concepts Management Improvement for
28 senior managers 6 days \$10825

Communication Concepts Media skills for
3 senior managers 1 day \$ 1550

Frank Duncan Supervision, Interviewees and
staff selection workshops for
74 officers 12 days \$14400

Computer Training and Word processing and spreadsheet
Consultancy PC training for 238 officers 34 days \$

20400

16 April 1991

AGENCY CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST
Management and Technology Coordination and consultation for
Consulting Corporate Plan of Group 21 days \$23838
Management and Technology Management workshop for
Consulting 24 middle managers 6 days \$ 9000
Brian Movies Information Technology strategy 421.5 hours \$27397
International Behaviour Supervision training for
Systems 60 industrial employees 8 days \$ 9600
PALM Management Client services workshop 2 days \$ 4500
Daryl Dixon Superannuation Schemes seminar 2 days \$ 2200

w Renaissance Forestry Stromlo Management Plan 2 months \$12000
to

Sopherim Enterprise Scribing services for
Operations Manager interviews 2 days \$ 524
Ernst & Young Accountancy Services ongoing \$20000
Ernst & Young Evaluation of computerised
accounting systems and
implementation of accounting
software 3 months \$ 2500
Margules Groome Poyry PL Valuation of ACT Forests for
transfer from Commonwealth 1 month

(ACT Treasury to contribute \$5000) \$ 9980
Datacol Ad hoc traffic survey advice 31.1.91 -

30.11.91 \$50000

Harris Van Meegan Assistance with staff selection 3 months \$ 700

AGENCY CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST

Ward Veitch Bornhurst Bus priority measures 4.8.90
ongoing \$120000

Maunsell PL Tharwa Bridge Conservation Study 10.8.90
ongoing \$36000

R Begbie Planning workshop 1.9.90 -
31.10.90 \$ 5500

Planning day 3.10.90 \$ 1750

Planning days 15-17.11.90 \$ 2000

B Somerville Scribing services 12.10.90 \$ 390

Scribing services (interviews) 26-27.10.90 \$ 637

Scribing services 15-16.1.90 \$ 832

W Pradela Scribing services (interviews) 25.9.90 \$ 286

Scribing services 9.11.90 \$ 728

Scribing services 12-14.11.90 \$ 520

A Hardy Interview reports 1-30.11.90 \$ 3300

Dynatest Additional development of

Pavement Management Database 4 months \$72000

Australian Construction Pavement investigation of
Service Adelaide Avenue Buslane 3 months \$ 3400

Willing and Partners Drainage Design Practice ACT Pt 11 6 months \$

40000

16 April 1991

AGENCY CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST

Harris Van Meegan Course on Interview techniques 23.1.91 \$ 400
Management & Tech Consulting Planning & Resources Branch
Planning Study 2 months \$ 3300

R Somerville Scribing services 16.10.90 \$ 286

Scribing services 12.11.90 \$ 286

Harris Van Meegan Scribing services 2-16.11.90 \$ 832

R D Gossip Black Spot investigations 7.9.90 -

June 1991 \$10600

Denis Johnston Accident investigations 7.9.90 -

r

w June 1991 \$15000

Ova Arup Black Spot civil advice 7.9.90 -

Jan 1991 \$22600

Ad hoc civil advice 20.9.90 -

91/92 Capital Works Oct 90 \$ 6000

Black Spot Brierly/Hindmarsh 20.9.90 -

May 91 \$21600

R J Nairn Black Spot investigations 7.9.90 -

Jan 91 \$17000

16 April 1991

Electronic copy of this page is not available but it is in the printed Hansard.

16 April 1991

AGENCY	CONSULTANT	PURPOSE	DURATION	COST
FIRE BRIGADE AND	Work Futures	Industrial relations		
EMERGENCY SERVICES	facilitation		1 day	\$ 350
Emergency Systems Technology	Radio system	stage 2	5 days	\$ 3215
Computer Sciences	Fiscal / Supergems / LAN	interfacing	5 weeks	\$ 2200

AGENCY: ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION BUREAU
CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST (\$)
University of Canberra
History of ACT Self Government
12 months
44745
Anne Walls & Associates
Staff Selection Services
3 weeks
450
Harris van Meegan
Staff Selection Services
2 weeks
630
CSIRO
Collection of Seed for Research on
7 months
7000 Native Herbs

D. V. Selth
Information and History
4 months
3000
on Manuka Oval

Communication Pty Ltd
Presentation of "The Three Secrets"
10 hours
850

Environmental Play

ACT Technical and Basic Literacy Courses for Industrial
2 hr. per 1500
Further Education Employees week for includes a travel component 10 weeks

ACT Technical and Basic Literacy Courses for Industrial
2 hr. per 1320
Further Education Employees week for 10 weeks

Michelle Bolitho
Stress Management Course for 1000 Bureau Employees
Synapse Agricultural and Review of Agricultural Services
3 months
25000
Resource Consulting
conducted by the Agriculture and Landcare Section

16 April 1991

ACT TREASURY - FINANCE BUREAU

CONSULTANTS PURPOSE DURATION COST

Price Waterhouse Fraud risk assessment July - Nov 90 \$8,000

Scrivener Personnel Staff selection August 90 \$336

Pat Garnett Staff selection Aug - Dec 90 \$912

Harris Van Meegan Staff selection Dec - Feb 91 \$550

Sopherim Enterprise Staff selection September 90 \$1,920

QUESTION ON NOTICE NO. 338

CONSULTANTS EMPLOYED BY ACTEW IN THE PERIOD 6.8.90 -11.2.91

Alan White Pty Ltd

Purpose - consulting on project management techniques for construction jobs

Employed 28/8/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$7000

Amos Aked & Swift Pty Ltd

Purpose - upgrading two way mobile radio network

Employed 3/2/89 - 1/2/91 Cost \$65 064

Aquatech Pty Ltd

Purpose - review of water quality data Murrumbidgee and Molonglo Rivers and Burrinjuck Reservoir

Employed 28/6/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$11 430

ARC Cadcentre

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 23/7/90 - 31/12/90 Cost \$190 620

Archival Systems Consultants Pty Ltd

Purpose - development of records management classification system

Employed 9/4/90 - 9/9/90 Cost \$24 500

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - geological and geotechnical advice materials testing laboratory services and structure engineering advice

Employed 5/4/89 - 8/11/90 Cost \$5000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - report on remedial maintenance work to repair fasciae at Lower Molonglo

Water Quality Control Centre (LMWQCC) buildings

Employed 10/4/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$7000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - Googong Dam remedial works

Employed 10/1/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$2000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 8/2/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$62 000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 16/7/90 - 16/12/90 Cost \$68 400

1382

16 April 1991

2.

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - Capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital

format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 24/8/90 - 31/12/90 Cost \$105 000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - rise/fall assessment

Employed 9/11/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$2000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - assistance with selection of Engineer

Employed 26/11/90 - 30/11/90 Cost \$1250

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - earthworks supervision for contract

Employed 10/1/91 - 11/2/91 Cost \$12000

Australian Construction Services

Purpose - Googong Dam remedial works - earthworks supervision

Employed 10/1/91 - 10/2/91 Cost \$12 000

Australian Valuation Office

Purpose - professional valuations of corporate land and buildings

Employed 23/11/90 - 24/12/90 Cost \$5000

BHP Engineering

Purpose - 10-20 year capital and maintenance planning review

Employed December 1990 to current Cost \$100 000 (est)

Ginnie & Partners

Purpose - establish design criteria and functional requirements statement for ventilation improvement Project S25

Employed 3/9/90 - 3/12/90 Cost \$25 000

Carnet Pty Ltd

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 31/1/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$69 600

Coffey Partners International Pty Ltd

Purpose - provision of laboratory soil testing services on samples provided by ACTEW staff

Employed 4/9/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$8000

Commit Associates Pty Ltd

Purpose - Undertake specific air quality analyses - furnace stack monitoring

Employed 1/2/91 - 11/2/91 Cost \$11 000

1383

3.

Consulting Environmental Engineers

Purpose - review laboratory sampling and data collection requirements for Canberra

Sewage treatment facilities

Employed 18/10/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$8500

Coopers & Lybrand

Purpose - detailed review of security in the materials management operations of ACTEW

Employed 22/1/91 - 11/2/91 Cost \$15 000

CSIRO

Purpose - flow treating and production of small publication on CIF Employed 16/11/89 - 31/12/90

Cost \$25 360

Daryl Jackson Alastair Swain Purpose - provide expert comment on repair methods to asbestos cement sheet fasciae at LMWQCC Employed 9/2/91 - 11/2/91 Cost \$3200

Design & Contract Management

Purpose - investigate, design and commission modifications to (1) burner controls (2) centrifuge sludge handling and controls at LMWQCC

Employed 20/3/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$20 000

Design & Contract Management

Purpose - electrical design documentation, drawings and commissioning for Googong Water Treatment Plant and Fyshwick

Employed 14/8/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$15 360

Efficient Applications Software Pty Ltd

Purpose - provide specialist advice on finite element analysis of structures using "SUPERSET" computer software purchased by ACTEW

Employed 28/8/89 - 1/1/91 Cost \$6500

ELPRO Technologies Pty Ltd

Purpose - theoretical path and attenuation predictions; field survey of signal strength using calibrated equipment; recommendations and report

Employed 10/12/90 - 14/2/90 Cost \$3533

Facilities Management Pty Ltd

Purpose - undertake project definition of projects identified in sewage treatment section maintenance audit - Stages 1&2

Employed 16/5/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$15 000

Facilities Management Pty Ltd

Purpose - consolidated list of proposed modifications and other changes and improvements

Employed 14/1/91 - 14/3/91 Cost \$21000

1384

16 April 1991

Flexilyte Pty Ltd

Purpose - preparation and presentation material for Engineering Services

Employed 18/7/90 - 14/8/90 Cost \$5000

Guttering Haskins & Davey

Purpose - preliminary design, design, contract documentation and tender recommendation

Employed 1/12/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$49 220

Guttering Haskins & Davey

Purpose - site investigation, specification, interpretation and reporting on results of chemical/biological sampling

Employed 10/4/89 - 11/2/90 Cost \$19 530

Guttering Haskins & Davey

Purpose - provide specialist advice on ventilation requirements for early trunk sewer development in Gungahlin -

Employed 2/2/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$25 000

Guttering Haskins & Davey

Purpose - trunk sewer ventilation, site surveys, geotechnical work, review easements

Employed 26/10/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$9000

HONDURAS Pty Ltd

Purpose - provision of software for the Googong Dam Flood Warning System to integrate HANDSAWS, flood warning model and radio telemetry

Employed 8/9/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$15 000

Merlons Stephen Jaques, Solicitors and Attorneys

Purpose - general advice on corporatisation and legislation

Employed late October 1990 to current Cost \$34 363 (to date)

Margules & Partners Pty Ltd

Purpose - review existing landscaping, recommend remedial works, estimate costs and staging of recommended works; prepare six copies of report

Employed 25/5/90 - 25/8/90 Cost \$5000

McIver and Associates

Purpose - undertake a review of the Engineering Division

Employed April - September 1990 Cost \$34 631

McIver and Associates

Purpose - review the corporate structure of ACTEW in relation to corporatisation and regionalization

Employed November 1990 - January 1991 Cost \$39 583

1385

5.

Ova Atop & Partners

Purpose - inspection of the structural adequacy of cableways and travellers, report and recommendation on their safety and on remedial works needed

Employed 2/3/90 - 1/1/91 Cost \$14 000

Perth Cadcentre

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 31/1/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$71 320

Perth Cadcentre

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 23/7/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$191 000

Price Waterhouse

Purpose - provide advice on taxation matters for a corporatised ACTEW

Employed October - November 1990 Cost \$29 000

Price Waterhouse

Purpose - provide advice on financial systems for a corporatised ACTEW

Employed December 1990 Cost \$5 250

Price Waterhouse

Purpose - evaluate competing proposals for upgrading financial information systems

Employed 10/12/90 - 24/12/90 Cost \$7500

Purchasing & Sales Group

Purpose - engineering services for ACTEW

Employed 25/9/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$110 000

Purchasing & Sales Group

Purpose - rise/fall assessment

Employed 9/11/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$2000

Rothschild Australia Corporate Limited

Purpose - provide financial and business analysis, reports and advice during the corporatisation process

Employed November 1990 to current Cost \$54 631 (to date)

Scott 8 Murphy Pty Ltd

Purpose - review of water supply and sewerage pipe materials

Employed 31/8/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$31650

Sly and Weigel

Purpose - provide legal/industrial advice and assistance

Employed December 1990 to current Cost \$7375 (to date)

1386

16 April 1991

Strategic Technology

Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

Employed 31/1/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$65 090

Strategic Technology

Purpose - develop data entry and data editing procedures for hydraulic asset information -

Employed 17/9/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$26 000

Strategic Technology Purpose - capture of existing electrical asset data from hardcopy format to digital format using GDS/ARC-NET

. Employed 17/9/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$118 800

Techway Solutions Pty Ltd

Purpose - provision of support for VAX Network at LMWQCC

Employed 22/5/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$5000

Techway Solutions Pty Ltd

Purpose - preparation of invoicing system for Water Quality and Investigation Laboratory Cost \$15 000

Thermal Pty Ltd

Purpose - revision of drawings at Fyshwick Treatment Plant augmentation

Employed 14/4/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$33 750

Thermal Pty Ltd

Purpose - electrical engineering design and contract administration assistance

Employed 15/8/89 - 11/2/91 Cost \$75 700

Thermal Pty Ltd

Purpose - PLC programming setting to work and system documentation

Employed 1/4/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$45 000

Thermal Pty Ltd

Purpose - consulting engineering services for the programming commissioning and documentation for the Square D PLC control system for the returned nitrified sludge pumps at LMWQCC

Employed 1/6/90 - 11/2/91 Cost \$23 065

Thermal Pty Ltd

Purpose - design documentation and supervision of existing electrical projects

Employed 24/1/91 - 11/2/91 Cost \$25 000

Towers Perrin Forster & Crosby

Purpose - methodological advice data entry analysis and guidance

Employed 1/8/90 - 31/12/90 Cost \$110 000

1387

Towers Perrin Forster & Crosby

Purpose - specialist advice on superannuation issues for a corporatised ACTEW

Employed 6/12/90 - 31/1/91 Cost \$13 454

Willing & Partners

Purpose - panel member for vacant Engineer position interviews

Employed 28/9/90 - 29/9/90 Cost \$500

W J Goodman

Purpose - review design standard assessment materials, review of construction standards, conditions monitoring, recommend remedial works, review maintenance structure functions on sewerage systems

Employed 1/7/88 - 11/2/91 Cost \$102 000

1368

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 343

Public Relations Staff - Finance and Urban Services

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services -

What are the number and classification levels of staff engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in (a) the Ministers office; (b) the Ministers department; and (c) each agency for which the Minister has responsibility.

Mr Duby - the answer to Ms Folletts question is as follows:

One Journalist A1

(b) (i) The Department of Urban Services:

ACTION

One AS08 (part of duties)

One AS06 (part of duties)

One AS04 (part of duties)

ACT Tourism Commission

One Senior Officer C

Two AS06

One AS06 (part of duties)

Two AS05

Three AS04

ACT Fire Brigade and Emergency Services

One AO-05 (part of duties)

City Services Group

One AS06 (part of duties)

One AS06 (part of duties)

One AS05 (part of duties)

One AS04 (part of duties)

One Science 2 (part of duties)

(ii) The Department of the Environment, Land and Planning

Environment and Conservation Bureau

One AS06 (part of duties)

1389

16 April 1991

ACT Electricity and Water One AS08 One AS05 One AS03 One AS06 (part of duties) Two AS04
(part of duties) One AS02 (part of duties)

ACT Milk Authority One AS06 One AS04

1390

16 April 1991

**CHIEF MINISTER FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO. 345

Personal Staff - Chief Minister

MS FOLLETT - Asked the Chief Minister upon notice on 20 February 1991:

What are the numbers and classification levels of the Ministers personal staff, including consultants employed in the Ministers office.

MR KAINÉ- The answer to the Members question is as follows:

Number Title - Classification

1 Senior Private Secretary SEB1

1 Media Advisor Journalist A2

1 Private Secretary AS06

1 Executive Secretary AS04

* 1 Executive Assistant AS03

**I Executive Treasury Advisor SO Grade C

* Staff of the Chief Ministers Department

** Staff of the ACT Treasury

1391

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 397

**Personal Staff - Minister for Finance
and Urban Services**

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services -

What are the number and classification levels of the Ministers personal staff, including consultants employed in the Ministers office.

Mr Duby - the answer to Ms Folletts question is as follows:

One Senior Private Secretary - Senior Officer B
Two Private Secretary AS05
One Media Advisor Journalist AT*
One Departmental Liaison Officer AS06*
One Administrative Assistant AS03*

* Staff employed by the Department of Urban Services

1392

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 351

**Public Relations Consultants -
Finance and Urban Services**

Ms Follett - asked the minister for Finance and Urban Services -

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in (a) the Ministers office; (b) the Ministers department; and (c) each agency for which the Minister has responsibility.

Mr Duby - the answer to Ms Folletts question is as follows:

(a) Nil

(b) (i) The Department of Urban Services:

ACTION Media Marketing, Juliana Madden, Sign-Co and Peter Neaves.

ACT Tourism Commission Jo Spencer, Barry Brown, Grassroot Graphics and Barbara Brooks.

(ii) The Department of the Environment, Land and Planning

Environment and Conservation Bureau Communication Pty Ltd.

(c)

ACT Electricity and Water Neville Jeffress Advertising and Q Research Pty Ltd.

ACT Milk Authority Niree Creed.

1393

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

**QUESTION No 355
Canberra Harness Racing Club**

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services

- (1) Has NATEX been told that it will no longer receive Government subventions. for its development and operations.
- (2) Which body, if any, has a lease over Block 467 Gungahlin, or any part of that, the site of the training track of the Canberra Harness Racing Club.
- (3) If the Club has had permissible occupancy of the site since 1981 why is a charge now proposed.
- (4) Who currently owns the buildings and improvements on the site.
- (5) Does a proposed licence agreement by NATEX for this site require excessive control by NATEX and inadequate rights to the Harness Racing Club.
- (6) On what basis was a rental of almost \$20,000 proposed by NATEX for the Clubs use of a portion of Block 467. Did it include the value of buildings constructed by the Club.
- (7) Did the assessment of rental include a value for retailing, which is not anticipated.
- (8) Has NATEX and the Government been appraised of qualified assessment of rental at \$1.00 per annum.
- (9) What rental is paid by NATEX for that area.
- (10) If the new lease proposals proceed, will the Club be compensated for the loss of ownership of the buildings.
- (11) Why wasnt the occupier of the site given the first priority for the granting of the lease.
- (12) Does the Government support the continued progress of the Harness Racing Club.

Mr Duty - the answer to the Members question is as follows

- (1) The Trusts Act states that "...the Trust shall pursue a financial policy directed towards securing revenue sufficient to meet all its expenditure properly chargeable against revenue". The Trust has had as one of its objectives "...reducing the operating subvention...". The Trust has not

16 April 1991

specifically been told by the ACT Government that it will no longer receive a subvention for its development and operations.

(2) NATEX.

(3) In April 1986 the then Minister for Territories, the Hon Gordon Scholes, agreed in principle to the use of the subject land by the Trust for the establishment of a trotting training complex, amongst other things. In July 1985 he advised both organisations that there should be reasonable charges attached to any agreement made between NATEX and the Trotting Club.

(4) In the case of moveable assets, the Canberra Harness Racing Club. NATEX

owns assets affixed to land.

(5) The proposed licence agreement is currently the subject of negotiations

between NATEX and the Canberra Harness Racing Club. The current draft proposes reasonable controls and rights and is consistent with terms of conditions of the existing licence agreement for use of other facilities at NATEX.

(6) The basis of the assessment was the annual rental asked for and obtained by the Government for land available for the purpose of storage and some retail (hire/sub-licence of stables). The rental was discounted due to the restrictive conditions of the licence agreement initially proposed. It did not include the value of buildings on the site.

(7) The assessment of rental included a value for retailing (hire/sub-licence of stables) since this use is proposed.

(8) Yes.

(9) 5Q if and when demanded.

(10) No - there is no "loss of ownership".

(11) In July 1985 both organisations were advised by Minister Scholes "there. was a need to maximise the usage made of the NATEX facilities and that both the Club and NATEX should get together... to look at the sorts of proposals that may attract funding from the Racecourse Development Fund ... that funding for the Trotting Club from the Racecourse Development Fund should be provided for specific proposals integrated with the NATEX complex ...".

(12) Yes.

1395

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 357

School Closures - Traffic Safety Works

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services:

As a result of school closures -

- (1) What road works, street markings and signposting or other relevant work has been carried out on roads.
- (2) Which roads have been involved.
- (3) What has been the cost.

Mr Ruby - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) There has been strong political and community pressure to ensure that a high level of safety is maintained for children using different travel patterns to their new schools. This has made it necessary for the traffic safety measures to provide for all routes taken by children walking to school. The impact of these works is being closely monitored, and comments from the local communities and school users will be taken into account in any further refinement of the works.

The traffic management plans prepared provided appropriate traffic facilities within the suburbs affected by school closures, based on considerable survey work at each location and information gained as a result of the consultation process.

The major hazards which have been addressed are where primary school children are required to cross major distributor or connector roads in residential suburbs. These roads are typically 12 metres to 14 metres wide, carrying 1000 to 2000 vehicles per day and have 85 per cent of the traffic travelling at as much as 15 km/h above the 60 km/h speed limit. The treatments introduced modified these major roads by providing a single traffic lane 3.5 to 4.0 metres wide in each direction, separated by a central refuge median incorporating concrete pedestrian refuge islands, intersection turning lanes and an area for passing stopped or slow vehicles (such as buses) or for turning into driveways.

1396

16 April 1991

In general the treatment provided for the safety of school children is in the form of pedestrian refuges which provide crossing points over longer distances and are appropriate for the level of vehicular and pedestrian traffic conflict indicated in the traffic survey. The modified road cross section is expected to reduce vehicular speeds to be more consistent with the 60km/h speed limit but without the need for additional police enforcement.

In, a very limited number of locations, parking controls have been installed adjacent to pedestrian refuge islands or in other locations where vehicular or pedestrian safety would be compromised by parked vehicles, such as the far side of school frontage roads. _.

Additional footpaths have been constructed to ensure continuity of pedestrian and cycle pathways serving the childrens preferred route from residential school catchment areas to the respective primary school.

(2) and (3) The total cost of footpath and traffic safety works have been estimated to be approximately \$300,000, comprising work as follows:

. new footpaths \$75,000
. median treatments \$211,850
. other works \$20,000
TOTAL COST \$306,850

The costs associated with each receiving school are as follows (the particular roads affected are also given in each case):

a. Cook (closed) Macquarie and Aranda (receiving),

Roads affected:

Redfern St, Lachlan St, Templeton St, Goulburn St
cost: \$61,400

b. Lyons and North Curtin (closed)/South Curtin (receiving)

Roads affected:

Launceston St, Theodore St, Carruthers St, Devenport St
cost: \$121,350

c. Hackett (closed)/Majura (receiving)

Roads affected:

Madigan St, Antill St, Knox St
cost: \$55,200

1397

16 April 1991

d. Holder (closed)/Weston (receiving)

Roads affected:

Namatjira Dr, Stratton Dr, Mulley-St, Blackwood Tee,
Williamson St

cost: \$68,900

TOTAL COST. \$306,850

1398

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION No 359

School Closures - Bus Services

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts -

What new bus services have operated as a result of the recent round of school closures and what is the yearly cost of those services.

Mr Duby - the answer to Mr Woods question is as follows:

It is appropriate that I respond to this question because bus services properly belong to my portfolio rather than that of the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts.

School run 52 (am) Cook Primary School School run 95 (am) Hackett Primary School School run 96 (pm) Hackett Primary School School run 56 (am) Lyons Primary School School run 59 (pm) Lyons Primary School

The yearly cost of these services is estimated at \$85 000.

1399

**CHIEF MINISTER FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

Question No. 366

Gaming and Liquor Authority Reserves

MS FOLLETT - Asked the Treasurer upon notice on 12 March 1991:

What was the amount paid from the Gaming and Liquor Authority's reserves into the Consolidated Revenue Fund as a result of the abolition of the Authority.

MR KAINÉ - The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

The amount paid from the Gaming and Liquor Authority's reserves into the Consolidated Revenue Fund was \$15,888,781.97.

1400

16 April 1991

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO. 367

Public Area Paving

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services on 13 March 1991

(1) How much has the ACT Government spent in the 1990-91 financial year to date on paving public areas in pink pavers.

(2) At what locations, and at what cost were individual contracts let for the work included in the total a (1) above.

(3) For each location detailed at (2) above, did the work involve paving of a new area or the replacement of existing paving material such as asphalt.

(4) In each case where the paving involved the replacement of existing material, what was the reason for that replacement.

(5) What is the total 1990-91 budget for paving public areas with pink pavers.

Mr Duby - the answers to the Members questions are as follows:

(1) During the 1990-91 financial year the ACT Government spent \$860,121 on upgrading in public areas with pink pavers as part of works comprising two separate projects.

(2) Paving relating to the advice in (1) above was laid as part of the following contracts at the locations indicated -

Item (i) Civic Pedestrian Pavement Improvements Stage 1

costing \$635,092 included pavement improvements to:

(a) Bunda Street (northside) between the Griffin Centre and Petrie Street.

(b) Bunda Street (southside) between Mort Street and Ainslie Avenue.

(c) Bunda Street (southside) between Akuna Street and Binara Street.

(d) Petrie Plaza between London Circuit and the Carousel.

Item (ii) Civic Pedestrian Pavement Improvements Stage 2

costing \$225,029 included pavement improvements to:

- (a) Petrie Plaza between the Carousel and Honda Street.
- (b) Honda Street (southside) between Binary Street and Akin Street.
- (c) Mangan Street Between London Circuit and Allard Street.
- (d) Allard Street between Mangan Street and City Walk.
- (e) City Walk between Akin Street and Allard Street.

Included in both the projects above was the upgrading of the street furniture.

- (3) The work described in (2) above it was generally replacement of existing pedestrian paving.

In items (i) (a),(b) and (c) concrete, bitumen and granite gravel were replaced with pink payers.

In item (i) (d) existing tumbled payers were replaced with tumbled pink payers.

In item (ii) (a) repairs to existing pavement.

In items (ii) (b),(c) and (d) concrete, bitumen and granite were replaced with pink payers.

In item (ii) (e) a 1.5 metre wide concrete pedestrian path in a high use area.

- (4) In the cases where existing paving was replaced with

pink payers the reasons for this action are as follows:

In items (i) (a),(b) and (c) potential trips had started to appear over a period of time in the pavement as either cracks or upheavals caused by tree roots. The pavement was replaced to avert further claims against the ACT Government arising from personal injury.

In item (i) (d) existing pink payers with tumbled edges were replaced in response to public complaint concerning this type of paving and to avert further claims against the ACT Government arising from personal property damage and personal injury.

1402

16 April 1991

In items (ii) (b),(c) and (d) reasons for the replacement of existing paving is as detailed for items

(i) (a), (b) and (c) -

(5) The total budget for 1990-91 budget for paving public areas with pink pavers, is \$860,121.

1403

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

Question No 368

Fishing Legislation

MS FOLLETT - Asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services upon notice on 12 March 1991.

- (1) Are* there any proposals to update the Fishing Act 1967.
- (2) If the answer to (1) above is yes (a) what are the details of the proposals and where did they originate; (b) what is the Governments attitude to the proposals; and (c) what timetable is envisaged for any amendments approved by the Government.

MR DUBY - The following is provided to Ms Folletts question.

- (1) Amendment of the ACT Fishina Act is not one of the Governments high priorities at the present time.

1404

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 369

Litter Legislation

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services:

- (f) Are there any proposals to update the Litter Act 1977.
- (2) If the answer to (1) above is yes (a) what are the details of the proposals and where did they originate; (b) what is the Governments attitude to the proposals; and (c) what timetable is envisaged for any amendments approved by the Government.

Mr Duby - the answer to the members question is as follows:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The issue of litter and waste minimisation was considered by the Standing Committee on Conservation, Heritage and Environment in their Inquiry into Commercial and Domestic Waste Management and resulted in recommendation 41 from the Standing Committee that "the ACT Government take steps to reduce the amount of littering through introducing more stringent legislation, including the requirement that trailers be covered, and increasing penalties for littering".

In addition, there are changes which have been proposed for some years to better control the use of "junk" mail, a constant source of litter in suburban areas and on which many public complaints have been received.

In the Governments response to the reaearc3atians of the Waste Inquiry delivered in August 1969,, support was indicated for these proposed amendments to the Litter Act 1977

Details of the proposed amendments are being prepared for possible consideration by the Assembly in the Spring session of 1991.

1405

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 370

Protection of Lands Legislation

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services

(1) Are there any proposals to update the Protection of Lands Act 1937

(2) If the answer to (1) above is yes (a) what are the details of the proposals and where-did they originate; (b) what is the Governments attitude to the proposals; and (c) what timetable is envisaged for any amendments approved by the Government.

Mr Duby - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

The Government has no immediate proposals to update the Protection of Lands Act 1937.

Nevertheless, the Government proposes to incorporate into the proposed new ACT land and planning legislation package all parts of the Act that refer to land.

1406

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

Question No. 371

Road Safety - Milk Delivery Vehicles and Personnel

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services -

- (1) Does the Government have any plans for legislation to provide for safety identification of milk delivery vehicles and personnel.
- (2) Would the Minister consider as a minimum requirement the fitting of vehicles with hazard flashing lights and fluorescent stripes and personnel with -fluorescent jackets.

Mr Duty - the answer to Ms Folletts question is as follows:

- (1) There is provision within current legislation to allow for the fitting of a flashing amber light to the top of a vehicle deemed to be causing a traffic hazard whilst operating on a public thoroughfare. To obtain permission to fit this device, application must be made, in writing, stating circumstances, to Dickson Motor Vehicle Registry. Milk delivery vendors also have the right to place extra lights and approved reflectors and/or marking plates on their vehicles as long as the colours and locations meet registration requirements.
- (2) The Milk Authority actively encourages vendors to take all available and necessary safety precautions in operating their runs, and sees safety identification as an improvement to vendors professionalism. However, it is considered that the onus for providing safety related equipment for milk vendors staff and vehicles should rest with the vendors.

1407

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 372

Bus Services - Fadden Area

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services -

(1) Is the Minister aware of complaints about the bus service in the Fadden area. (2) What action will he take to improve the service.

Mr DUBY - the answer to Ms Follett's question is as follows:

Neither ACTION nor I am aware that there have been any complaints about the current state of bus services in the Fadden area.

However if Ms Follett would care to bring to my attention any complaints she has received, I will ensure they are investigated.

1408

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 373

**Valley View Court Retirement Village -
Grassfire Risk**

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services

(1) Is the Minister aware of concerns about the amount of dry grass surrounding the Valley field Court Retirement Village at Kambah.

(2) What action will the Minister take to reduce the fire risk in the area.

Mr DUBY - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

The area referred to is part of a block leased to the Anglican Church

My Department is contacting the Church to arrange mowing.

My staff have inspected the area and although unman the area does not pose a serious fire risk.

1409

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO. 374

Road Upgrading - Sulwood Drive

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services:

- (1) Does the Government have any plans to upgrade Sulwood Drive, and if so, how, when and at what cost?

Mr DUBY - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) The Department of Urban Services will seek funds in the 1991/92 New Capital Works Program to enable Sulwood Drive to be upgraded between Athllon Drive and Erindale Drive. As part of the upgrading it is planned to construct roundabouts at the intersection of Sulwood Drive with Sainsbury Street and Gaunson Crescent, Wanniasa, in order to assist motorists to safely exit from Wanniasa during the peak periods. Sulwood Drive will remain as a two lane undivided road but will be improved in alignment and riding quality.

It is estimated that the work will cost about \$1.2m in October 1990 values.

Plans to upgrade Sulwood Drive to the west of Athllon Drive are not as far advanced. It is presently not expected to be dealt with within five years.

1410

16 April 1991

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO. 379

Trucks Parked in Streets

Ms Follett - asked the minister for Finance and Urban Services:

- (1) Is the Minister concerned at the frequent complaints about trucks being parked in suburban streets and on nature strips.
- (2) What action has been taken, and what further steps will the Government take in this matter.

Mr Duby - The answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) This issue has been of concern to successive Governments in the A.C.T. since the 1970s. In fact, the former House of Assembly's Standing Committee on Management reported on it as long ago as April 1980. This Government believes it is now time for a solution to be found

Although the number of complaints my Department receives about trucks parked in residential areas is not great, all complaints are investigated and action is taken by responsible areas where possible to preserve the amenity of residents.

- (2) Finding a satisfactory and lasting solution will not be easy as there are two opposing, but legitimate, concerns. On the one hand, residential amenity must be maintained; on the other hand owners and drivers need somewhere secure to park the trucks on which they depend for their livelihood.

There is also the further problem of overlapping jurisdictions and legislation which does not address the issues directly. Four functional areas in three Departments share responsibility for the enforcement of the various laws. They are currently working together on options for consideration by the Government.

1411

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 380

Street Lighting - Tennant Street, Fyshwick

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban. Services:

- (1) Is he aware that ACTEW were requested in December 1990 to install street lighting in Tennant Street, Fyshwick, and that there has been no official reply.
- (2) Is it true that local business people have been advised by telephone that there is no money available to provide the lighting.
- (3) What action will he take to ensure that street lights are installed.

Mr Duby - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) The request to install street lighting in Tennant Street, Fyshwick was, in fact, made to the Roads Maintenance Section of the Department of Urban Services, not ACT Electricity and Water, in the form of a letter from Sandra Smithers of Artisan, received 8 January 1991. No written reply has been provided as verbal discussions have been ongoing while a consultants assessment and ACT Electricity and Waters street light design for the area have been sought.
- (2) Ms Smithers was advised that funds available in the 1990/91 program for street and public lighting have been fully committed.
- (3) The proposed installation of street lights in Tennant Street has been assessed as being of medium priority. This work will be considered for inclusion in the 1991/92 program, subject to assessment of priorities within available funds.

16 April 1991

MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 381

Bus Services - Calwell-Theodore Area

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services -

- (1) Is the Minister aware of complaints about the bus service in the Calwell-Theodore area. (2)
What action will he take to improve the service.

Mr DUBY - the answer to Ms Follett's question is as follows:

Neither ACTION nor I am aware that there have been any complaints about the current state of bus services in the

Calwell-Theodore area.

However if Ms Follett would care to bring to my attention any complaints she has received, I will ensure they are investigated.

1413

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO. 382

Road Safety - Kitchener and Kent Streets, Hughes

Ms Follett - asked the minister for Finance and Urban Services:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of complaints about traffic at they intersection of Kitchener and Kent Streets, Hughes.
- (2) How many accidents have been recorded at the intersection each year for the past five years.
- (3) What action will the Government take to increase safety at the intersection.

Mr Duby - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) I am aware that complaints have been made about a number of traffic and pedestrian issues in Hughes and Garran, by residents and by the Hughes Residents Association. I have given an assurance to those residents that a study of traffic and pedestrian issues will be undertaken this financial year in order to identify the issues and to develop a program of actions and works to address any problems which are identified.

The study, which will commence shortly, will closely involve the community in identifying issues of concern to them and in seeking their views on alternative strategies for dealing with these concerns. The concerns about the intersection of Kitchener and Kent Streets to which you refer will be included in the study.

- (2) The number of accidents recorded at this intersection over the past five years for which records are available are:

1989 - nine accidents with no injuries 1988 - four accidents with no injuries 1987 - four accidents with no injuries 1986 - two accidents with no injuries 1985 - four accidents with no injuries

The accident rate is very low in comparison with other intersections in the A.C.T. and the intersection does not appear within the 150 worst intersections.

- (3) See my answer to (1) above.

1414

16 April 1991

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO. 383

Road Upgrading - Abelson Drive

Ms Follett- asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services:

- (1) Is he aware of severe traffic congestion on Athllon Drive
- (2) What is the current position on proposed bus lanes on Athllon Drive.
- (3) Are there any proposals to upgrade Athllon Drive between Mawson and Tuggeranong, and if so when will this work occur.
- (4) What other action will the Government take to resolve this congestion.

Mr Duby - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

I am aware of traffic congestion and other problems on Athllon Drive during peak periods. In particular, I have been aware that congestion is preventing the residents of Tuggeranong from having a good express bus service to and from Woden and City.

My Department has recently received a report from a transportation planning consultant on a comprehensive study of the situation, and is now in a position to take steps to improve the situation.

The study is the second of two investigations which go back to 1988, into the future of the Athllon Drive corridor.

As a result of the excellent work undertaken by our consultants, the Government is now well placed to provide significant benefits to the Canberra community and Tuggeranong residents in particular.

A program of work to upgrade Athllon Drive, north of Sulwood Drive, has already started, with over \$1m committed this year to provide a second carriageway for Athllon Drive between Beasley Street and Mawson Drive, and to improve access-from Woden Town Centre and the Woden Bus Interchange onto Athllon Drive. Next year, subject to budget funding, we intend to start providing bus lanes along Athllon Drive, together with major improvements at all intersections between Sulwood Drive and Hindmarsh Drive.

1415

16 April 1991

Benefits to ACTION and bus travellers will be significant, because the express service between Woden and Tuggeranong will be able to use Athllon Drive instead of the more indirect Tuggeranong Parkway, thereby saving time, fuel and buses, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The work we have planned for Athllon Drive will result in public transport being given appropriate emphasis, and will be the first of many significant projects in the pipeline to radically improve bus travel throughout Canberra.

1416

16 April 1991

CHIEF MINISTER FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

Question Number 384

Natural Gas - Pricing Policy

MS FOLLETT - asked the Chief Minister and Treasurer upon notice on 13 March 1991:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 321, which I placed on the Notice Paper on 13 December 1990.

MR KAINÉ - the answer to Ms Folletts question is:

The answer to question on notice No. 321 was provided to Ms Follett on 28 March 1991.

1417

**MINISTER FOR FINANCE AND URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 385

Electrical Regulation and Inspections

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Finance and Urban Services:

- (1) Is it the case that electrical regulatory and inspectorial functions now performed by Australian Capital Territory Electricity and Water Authority (ACTEW) are to be transferred to the Department of Urban Services upon the corporatisation of ACTEW.
- (2) Is it the case that a process of deregulation of electrical contractors is to be implemented along with this transfer of responsibility.
- (3) Will there be a reduction of inspection and testing as a result of deregulation
- (4) What legislative controls will exist in any new deregulated environment. Will such controls be put in place before the responsibility for the function is removed from ACTEW.
- (S) What protection from liability for electrical installation inspectors or for workers in the industry will be provided.
- (6) What consultation have you undertaken on any proposals you have to change the system of electrical regulation and inspection.

Mr Duby - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) Yes, the transfer of electrical regulatory and inspectorial functions to the Department of Urban Services is planned to occur on or before 1 July 1991.
- (2) A process of deregulation is to be put in place with ACTEW assisting in the development of the new regulatory model and the Department of Urban Services will manage its implementation. Implementation will occur after development of appropriate legislative support. The process will commence after transfer of regulatory functions from ACTEW to MS.
- (3) Since 1977 electrical regulatory authorities throughout Australia have been reviewing obligations in respect to electrical installation inspections. Queensland and the Northern Territory have already made legislative changes which reduce the Inspecting Authority to undertaking "quality assurance" inspections. All other States are currently implementing a similar procedure. Under the new arrangements the electrical contractor certifies that the work is undertaken in accordance with all relevant standards. As in any inspection system "quality assurance" principles are a proven and cost effective system of ensuring standards are satisfied.

1418

16 April 1991

- (4) See the answer to (2) above.
- (5) Issues regarding safety, liability, and inspection of work are to be resolved as part of the consultative process in the development of legislation.
- (6) There has been consultation on this matter with staff and industry. The model proposed has been developed by a working group of six electrical inspectorial representatives assisted by three managers within ACTEW. ACTEW conducted an industry forum on 8 March 1991. All key stakeholders were represented including ACTEW electrical inspectorial staff and the Association of Drafting, Supervisory and Technical Employees. Support for the model was unanimous, subject to consultation on appropriate legislative support.

1419