



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

6 June 1991

Thursday, 6 June 1991

Chief Minister (Motion of want of confidence)	2167
Election of Chief Minister	2237
Follett Government (Ministerial statement)	2237
Election of Leader of the Opposition	2238
Administration and Procedures - standing committee	2238
Cultural Activities and Facilities - select committee	2239
Suspension of standing orders	2239
Supply Bill 1991-92	2240
Special adjournment	2241
Leave of absence to member	2241
Answers to questions:	
Hospitals - nurse vacancies (Question No 398)	2243
Private hospital (Question No 399)	2245
Weston Creek Health Centre	2246
Fluoride	2247
Motor vehicle servicing	2249
Slow-Stream Rehabilitation Unit	2250
Hospital beds	2251
Hospital beds	2252
Acting Director of Pathology	2253

6 June 1991

Thursday, 6 June 1991

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

CHIEF MINISTER
Motion of Want of Confidence

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (2.31): I move:

That this Assembly has no confidence in the Chief Minister, Mr Kaine, and his minority Government.

Today members of the Assembly face a choice, and I believe that it is a clear choice. In voting on this motion members can choose to support the neighbourhood school system and to reopen schools closed by the Kaine Government. In voting on this motion members can choose to work towards retaining a public hospital on the Acton Peninsula and restoring our public health system. And in voting on this motion members can choose to protect the community's interest in the commercial leasehold system and avoid handing windfall profits to developers at the community's expense.

To do one or all of these things, the only answer is to pass this motion and then to install a government committed to those policies. To vote against this motion, or to abstain, is to say that you support the choices made by the Kaine Liberal Government without a mandate for those choices and without community support for those choices. Those are the issues which prompted me to move the motion and those are the issues on which I ask members to vote.

Frequently in speaking in this Assembly I have outlined my belief that we need a stated and certain agenda for the ACT. Mr Kaine has presided over a government of chaos and confusion. This Chief Minister and his Education Minister have terrorised those in the community who depend upon and care about the public education system. At first they said that 15 to 25 schools would close. Then the number was reduced to 11 and then to seven.

In the end, of course, four schools have closed, with terrible consequences for the school children, their families and the communities around them. There has been no evidence of stability, of predictability, or of social responsibility in those school closures. We have seen one community set against another; we have seen citizens and parents arrested for their beliefs; we have seen the very

lives and safety of children jeopardised as they cross major roads to get to school. The financial cost of closures has never been revealed by Mr Humphries. The community cost simply cannot be calculated.

Stability is also needed in planning and lease administration. The present law has made planning and lease decisions the province of lawyers and the court system. The prospect that development proposals will end up in court is a major obstacle to investment confidence and to rational and stable planning of our city. After criticising my Government for not introducing new planning legislation in the space of seven months, Mr Kaine's Government has failed to deliver the goods in the 18 months that it has had. Even after that 18 months and even after adopting all the basic policy work done by my Government, Mr Kaine has managed to produce only a hopelessly complicated draft Bill. The Kaine Government's confusion on planning legislation and its outrageous decision to give away the community's interest in commercial lease renewal show that this Government is incapable of providing a workable and balanced result.

It is typical, unfortunately, of Mr Kaine's style and agenda that he chose to announce his decision on commercial leases to a business lunch. He apparently did not inform his Cabinet colleagues at the time; he certainly did not inform this Assembly of his decision to pre-empt the new planning legislation; and he has apparently, since then, sought to deny that he made the decision at all. This is hardly a recipe for inspiring investor confidence in the ACT, and it is yet another disaster in terms of community confidence in the Chief Minister and his Government.

Indeed, the audacity of Mr Kaine's decision is breathtaking. His Government's decision to scrap the charge for renewal of commercial leases has handed developers a windfall gain of many millions of dollars. At a time when Mr Kaine is cutting community services for lack of money, when he is crying poor to the community and the Premiers Conference, he has given away a growing source of the Territory's revenue. This decision, as we know, was the straw which broke the Alliance camel's back. And, on the ground of abdicating responsibility for the leasehold system alone, I believe that this Government must go.

There is a host of other examples of where this Government has demonstrated its contempt for community interests. Perhaps the most blatant and the most heartless is the impending closure of Royal Canberra Hospital. The Liberal agenda has always been to place health services in the hands of private individuals for private profit. But the casual way in which Mr Kaine and Mr Humphries have dismissed the views of Canberra citizens is appalling. Who will forget their contempt for the views of more than 40,000 citizens who signed petitions about the hospital? What about the health care interests of people in North Canberra and Belconnen? What about the provision of hospital services when Gungahlin is developed?

6 June 1991

This Government has failed to show how the hospitals redevelopment could be in the interests of the community. It has presided over a 60 per cent blow-out in hospital waiting lists. It has cut the number of public hospital beds. It has presided over an ambulance service so understaffed that sick and injured people must wait for up to three-quarters of an hour for an ambulance. Mr Kaine, I ask you: Is this the government that you said in 1989 we could afford? I remind members of Mr Kaine's election slogan in 1989, "government you can afford".

Much of the devastation caused to the Canberra community by this Liberal Government has been done in the name of financial responsibility. Mr Kaine vainly attempts to project the Greiner image of supposed responsible management. But the Liberals' appalling mismanagement of the hospitals, the schools and the commercial leases issues gives the lie to this claim.

It was clear from the very start that the school closure decision was taken not only against the wishes of the community but also in the absence of financial facts. Faced with questions in the Assembly, Mr Humphries and Mr Kaine stumbled along for months either failing to answer, giving contradictory estimates or resorting to bluster. The fact that Yarralumla parents were able to do better than the first effort of Mr Kaine and Mr Humphries says it all. This Assembly should have no confidence in a government which had to wait for the Opposition and community groups to point out some of the added costs outside the education system. Mr Kaine and Mr Humphries have not, so far, ventured even an opinion on the full costs of those school closures.

This so-called "government you can afford" is also responsible for a hospitals recurrent budget and a redevelopment program at Woden which are both out of control. It was apparent in 1989 that there were problems with the management of the hospitals recurrent budget. My Government at that time initiated the Treasury report which Mr Kaine received in December 1989. That report, 18 months ago, highlighted some of the problems which have continued to plague the management of hospital finances. But Mr Kaine and Mr Humphries failed to act. They failed to act when they received the report and they have failed to act appropriately ever since.

The handling of this issue by Mr Kaine and Mr Humphries brings a new meaning to the term "ministerial responsibility". The repeated blow-outs in the hospitals budget have become a running joke around this town. First it was \$3m, then \$10m; and now Mr Humphries acknowledges that he must find \$17m to make up the shortfall. All along Mr Humphries has been unable to explain the blow-outs. All along he has denied our charges that he failed to act. All along he said that he was in control. And all along Mr Kaine has said that he has full confidence in Mr Humphries.

Mr Kaine has also refused all along to intervene, other than to tell us that he will make up \$11m of the \$17m blow-out from the Treasurer's Advance.

Real financial management has been the last concern of the Government when it comes to hospital redevelopment. The decision of Mr Kaine and Mr Humphries to close Royal Canberra Hospital at the Acton site was based on very simplistic thinking. There is some superficial appeal in thinking that one hospital would be cheaper to operate than two. But, even leaving aside the cost to the community, it now appears that this bungled decision, and the poor management since, mean that it would have been cheaper for the Government to keep open both hospitals.

Time and again we have seen evidence that the Government was rushing to close the Acton site - rushing to make the process irreversible. The Government's contempt for the community and for this Assembly is demonstrated yet again by Mr Humphries signing a \$44m contract just as Mr Kaine sacked Mr Collaery and precipitated this no-confidence motion. To commit the Government to such a major and controversial contract when the Government may have been about to fall was a very cynical move.

The commercial lease decision is another example of financial incompetence and betrayal of the public interest. The Government's decision to stop charging a premium for the renewal of commercial leases will hand many millions of dollars to large commercial interests. The decision has substantial implications for the Territory's revenue - implications which grow in future years as the number of commercial lease renewals increases. The most extraordinary fact in this sorry saga, and the best example of the Government's incompetence, was Mr Kaine's acknowledgment at question time last week that the decision was taken without any knowledge of the financial implications. They did not even bother to ask. It could not be clearer that this is a government which operates in the private interest of some, not in the public interest.

The examples that I have outlined, of schools, hospitals and commercial leases, show the truth about financial management by this Government. When these matters have been raised in the Assembly, Mr Kaine has failed to accept financial responsibility himself, or to require his Ministers to conform to normal standards of responsibility. This is not the kind of government we can afford.

I ask members to have a look at the alternative governments they are offered here today. On the one hand, members can vote for a Kaine government which comprises three former members of the No Self Government Party, who have already changed their tune at least once each. Two members of Mr Kaine's Government have been convicted while they have been members of the Assembly. One of those members has remained in office as a Minister when he should have been sacked by Mr Kaine.

6 June 1991

Mr Kaine is asking members to vote for his Government, in fact, without knowing who his Ministers will be. Members must ask themselves whether Mr Kaine will again have to succumb to the bids made by those members who will sell their vote for the biggest personal benefit they can derive. In Mr Kaine's position, you can only offer government by auction. The *Canberra Times* has told its readers today that we should prefer Mr Kaine's Government. I will leave it to the Canberra community to judge that opinion, just as they will judge the vote by each member on this motion.

In contrast, I am offering to form a minority government with a certain and known agenda. Our agenda was outlined at the 1989 election and again on the assumption of office. In government, we kept our promises. No schools were closed. We developed a plan to retain and refurbish the Royal Canberra Hospital. The budget was balanced. Our commitment to open and consultative government was demonstrated by the announcement of a draft budget for public consultation. And, at that time, we endured the criticism of that draft budget, and we changed the budget in response to community feedback.

If we are returned to government, we will be open and consultative with all groups in the community and in the Assembly. We will adopt a conciliatory approach in order to provide stable government up to the election scheduled for next February. The schools will be reopened. We will endeavour to retain a public hospital on Acton Peninsula. The leasehold system will not be compromised.

The facts that I have outlined today make it clear that there is only one choice. Mr Kaine has said that he will not do what the community or the majority of the Assembly members want. The course is now open to change the government. I ask members to follow that course and declare that this Assembly has no confidence in the Kaine Government.

MR KAINE (Chief Minister) (2.45): Mr Speaker, some months ago it fell to me, as Chief Minister, in similar circumstances to those currently pertaining, to answer charges levelled against me and against my Government. And, incidentally, they are the same charges that are being levelled now. There is nothing that has changed in the intervening months. I say now, as I said then, that I am by nature an introspective man and when people make accusations against me, when people question my probity and integrity, I take those matters very seriously. I do not dismiss them out of hand. I am prepared to listen quietly and attentively - and I have done that for Ms Follett - so that I might know clearly what it is that is being said about me and thus hopefully understand the message and the motives of my accusers.

In a sense, I and my Government are on public trial today. We stand accused of an array of wrongdoings and misdemeanours. In her characteristic way, we have already heard of some of them from the Leader of the Opposition. More accusations, I am sure, will be hurled at us in a frenzy of self-justification by others on the benches opposite shortly. I and other members of the Government will attempt to answer those other charges. At the end of the day, I am convinced that the force of our argument will be sufficient to sway any reasonable person - any person, that is, who is not bound by barren ideology and who is not committed only to hatred, chaos and discord.

What I will be putting to you, Mr Speaker, and to this Assembly is a vision of this Canberra - this vibrant, verdant, still in the making capital, a city not much older than many of us here today. Our city has always had its detractors. Sadly, some of our most bitter scoffers have come from within - a result of what one might call a kind of Canberra cringe. Unfortunately, during the most recent chapter of our city's history - that is, our accession to self-government and to equal partnership in the Commonwealth of Australia - the scoffers and the tearers-down have been in their element. Self-government, as we well know, was not so much granted to us as thrust upon us by a cynical Federal Labor Government seeking merely to rid itself of some tiresome expensive thing. The Commonwealth's treatment of us since has been consistently cynical. Well, whether we like it or not, Mr Speaker, self-government is here to stay and we must now make the best of it.

Mr Connolly: You have three No Self Government members in your party.

MR KAINE: Not everybody is prepared to give me the courtesy that I gave to the Leader of the Opposition, obviously, Mr Speaker. I said that, whether we like it or not, self-government is here to stay and we must now make the best of it. In doing so, we first must comprehend the sheer magnitude of the problems - and especially the economic and financial problems - that confront us today, because amid all the fuss and bother we sometimes tend to forget, and in some cases deliberately deny, the underlying basis, the essential rationale, of a government's actions.

Indeed, some political groupings have seen it as in their interests to try to encourage the people of Canberra to lose sight of those underlying objectives and principles. Some people - and I regret that I must include most of the Opposition in this - see it as in their interests to obfuscate, to muddy the waters, to distort and to pander to irrational emotions. My great sadness is that all too often the only result of this disgraceful behaviour is that the community falls even deeper into a crisis of confidence about all their elected representatives. In the end, it is detrimental to everyone in this place and to the community itself.

6 June 1991

As I said, Canberra has always had her scoffers. In the end, such denigration serves only to divert the attention of the unwilling away from the real and pressing issues that must be confronted and overcome if we are to guide our city successfully into the future. Mr Speaker, I beg your indulgence, and that of the Assembly, to reiterate a series of facts which I believe are integral to any debate about the state of the Australian Capital Territory in the 1990s.

Canberra is the most rapidly growing city in Australia, currently with a population approaching 300,000 people. Not too far into the next century our population will have expanded to at least 400,000. For me, these are the most important statistics in any examination of the state of the ACT, for they represent the people - for whom and about whom all decisions of government are or should be made. The infrastructure and the services needed to cater for our 300,000 fellow Canberrans are incredibly complex. Only two years on from the start of self-government, we are coming to grips with the management of that infrastructure and those services - fortunately, with a professional and competent Government Service, the members of which have willingly and enthusiastically taken up the challenge.

The job would be difficult enough in the best of circumstances merely because of the unique local problems involved. But, of course, we live in a country which is suffering under the worst economic recession in a generation. By far the most pressing problem facing government in the Territory in the 1990s is the requirement, imposed by the Commonwealth, to cut back on overservicing to bring us more into line with the States. In short, we have been told - every one of us has been told - that we must get off the back of the Australian taxpayer.

If ever there was a time for economic responsibility and stability in the ACT, this is surely it. In these terms, my budgetary strategy has, I believe, been fair and equitable. We are promoting the development of the all-important private sector because this is where Canberra's economic future lies. We are making better use of the Territory's existing capital base. In the meantime we are minimising government borrowings and we aim to bring in balanced recurrent budgets. How many governments around Australia have been able to manage that in recent times? Precious few, as we all know.

But there is more to government, of course, than financial management, crucial though it is. I am sure that my colleagues, during the course of this debate, will mention the many initiatives and achievements in their respective portfolio areas. For my part, it is on the public record that we have made major advances in social policy and environmental policy. The planning and land management package - which Ms Follett disparages - which we have been developing over the past year will be the best in

Australia. And, of course, we have given considerable emphasis to regional economic development and micro-economic reform of the public sector.

At the moment, I am also Attorney-General - a post formerly held by Bernard Collaery. In mentioning the achievements of this Government, I have no difficulty whatsoever in crediting Mr Collaery with a whole range of social justice achievements which will make our city a better place in which to live. Whatever Mr Collaery's faults, he cannot be accused of lacking social conscience. The Alliance, which included the Residents Rally, has, I believe, some major achievements on the record. Mr Speaker, I table a list of those achievements of this Government over the preceding 18 months - a very impressive list. I table the following paper:

Alliance Government - Major achievements - December 1989 to June 1991.

But this debate must go beyond mere cataloguing of achievements. What we are debating, in the end, is the ability of government to provide a responsible and stable administration for the people of Canberra. Against all the odds, my Government has, I believe, provided the requisite responsibility and stability. What the honourable members of this Assembly must ask themselves is this: Which political grouping will provide stability and continuity up to the next election? Is it my Government, or is there an alternative? What is the possible alternative? What do Ms Follett and her Labor Opposition propose in order to lead us out of our straitened circumstances?

What worries me most is that, even in terms of broad policy initiatives, there is nothing - I repeat, nothing - that is concrete in anything put forward by Ms Follett and her colleagues. I suspect that they do not stipulate exactly what their policies are for the simple reason that they do not want the community to know. What we are being offered by Labor, instead, is a confidence trick - because the Follett theory of economics is one that will go down alongside the works of the great politico-economic philosophers like Adam Smith, J.S. Mill and John Maynard Keynes. The Follett theory embraces what has become widely known as the nip and tuck approach. The nip and tuck approach has all the essential characteristics of the economic confidence trick. For instance, it sounds harmless, even homey; it defies close scrutiny; and it seems painless - unless, that is, you get pricked in the finger while nipping and tucking. But the most important characteristic of it all is that it is utterly meaningless.

Here is how the Follett nip and tuck approach works. Take this coming year's net \$40m cut in Commonwealth payments to the ACT. Say we have to find savings of \$40m out of the 1991-92 budget. It is simple. Using the Follett nip and tuck approach, you merely nip \$20m off here and you tuck \$20m away there. Alternatively, you nip \$30m off here and

6 June 1991

you tuck \$10m away there - or maybe it is \$15m or whatever. But you get the picture. It is the acclaimed nip and tuck approach, pioneered by Rosemary Follett of the loony left faction of the ACT branch of the Australian Labor Party. I am quite surprised, frankly, that Bob did not consider Rosemary for Paul's job.

But this is not really a laughing matter. I do not seek to trivialise; I seek merely to focus on the paucity and the inadequacy of the Follett Labor alternative. It would be funny, I suppose, if it were not so serious. So, instead of hypothetical examples, allow me to describe an actual example of Follett nip and tuck folly. In the one and only budget that Ms Follett managed to bring down, in 1989, the now Leader of the Opposition, using her famous nip and tuck approach, made provision for savings of \$10m - "if necessary". "If necessary", she said, we could nip, say, \$5m here and tuck another \$5m there - \$10m worth of savings following on from a first transitional year in which, we now learn, the ACT was overfunded by a record \$135m. And that, incidentally, was not entirely unknown at the time. I had heard a figure of up to \$120m being cited by the Commonwealth Treasury, and I am sure that Ms Follett was closer to the Labor Party than I was at the time. So, if I had heard it, I am sure she did.

Ms Follett did this in the same year, by the way, that her Federal Labor colleagues withheld \$20m of ACT funds in a special Commonwealth piggy bank. Is it any wonder, then, that when we came to power four months later we found the ACT heading for a \$37m deficit? What had happened to the nip and tuck approach? What indeed? Nip and tuck had become rip and tear.

That is not all. It is not the only policy approach of Ms Follett and her Labor colleagues - that team of economic and financial worthies who occupy the benches opposite. There is another plank to the Follett theory of economics. It is called the cruel and cynical hoax, and it applies especially to hospitals and schools - and we have heard more of it here this afternoon. To get the best results from the application of this part of the theory, one needs to be especially skilled at manipulating community expectations. The theory goes like this: To start off with, you promise not to change anything, ever. That is a falsehood, of course, not to say an impossibility. But that is all right, so long as you can sound sufficiently sincere to fool a lot of people. My friends in the media, of course, have spotted the lie a mile off. But a story is a story, and they are happy to come along for the ride.

Next, you carefully select a couple of issues - say, school closures and hospital redevelopment - that are sure to whip up community emotions. Never mind that when you were in government you had done nothing about schools closed the year before by a Federal Labor government; that is totally irrelevant. The public have short memories, and a hefty dose of double-dealing does nothing to detract from the

hoax that you are perpetrating. Then you make the following announcement: "All those schools and hospitals that the evil Kaine Government has closed I promise to reopen, if only you will let me be Chief Minister".

Mr Kaine has carried through the sad but necessary closure of a small number of schools for exactly the same economic reasons that the Labor Party closed schools in 1988. And Mr Kaine has publicly pledged on several occasions that Acton Peninsula, the site of Royal Canberra Hospital North, will nevertheless be retained for health related purposes. But that is all right; you are raising false hopes in those concerned sectors of the community, so you totally ignore the facts. And, by the time you have successfully used this obfuscation to scramble back into government, it is just too late - I am sorry - to reverse the responsible decisions taken by the previous Government.

But there is a small problem. The cruel and cynical hoax begins to flag. So you whip up some public hysteria by inciting people to break the law. You even manage to get a few people arrested during the illegal occupation of a school building - among them, of course, a couple of union extremists - - -

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order. Suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition caused people to break the law is out of order, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, Chief Minister, I would ask you to withdraw that.

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, facts are facts; but, if it hurts them, I will withdraw it. Among those people, of course, are a couple of union extremists, predictably; worse, an Australian Democrat; and even a blind woman and her guide dog. The media, of course, have gone into a feeding frenzy. They cannot believe their luck. Amid chaos and confusion, you effectively obscure the fact that all Canberrans must pay for the consequences of your hoax. "Damn the expense", you say - "Feed the cat another goldfish". And who knows the total extent of the bill anyway? Least of all, the Labor perpetrators of the hoax. Suddenly, shock, horror! There is the possibility that you might grab government much sooner than you expected. "Oh, dear, what do we do now?". You might have to honour your promises about the hospitals and the schools.

What we then witness is an exercise in ACT Labor Party back-peddalling that would rival the Iraqi army fleeing from Kuwait. "Unfortunately", Ms Follett tells the ABC, with a suitably sad sound in her voice, "we can no longer guarantee to keep Royal Canberra Hospital North open if Labor wins office". And, on the schools: "It is no longer that simple", Ms Follett tells the television news. A couple of days later, from the alarming vantage point of having been hoist with her own petard, Ms Follett now announces that, yes, two schools can be reopened. Which

6 June 1991

schools might they be, Mr Speaker? Why, they are the two that screamed the loudest. There is no chance of rational argument getting in the way here; we are talking decibel democracy. We are talking a fistful of votes, and to hell with the rest of the community. It is a cruel and cynical hoax. You talk of shame, Ms Follett; you are enveloped in it and you are absolutely suffused with it.

And, Ms Follett, what about the other Rosemary? I refer to Rosemary Richards of the Teachers Federation, a person with a credibility and a stature that you will never achieve. Rosemary Richards well remembers your solution to education overfunding when you were in government. Your solution was to sack teachers. So, what has Rosemary Richards said to you about your latest plan, to reopen Lyons and Cook primary schools? We know what she has told you. She has told you that she will never allow you to use her members - the hardworking, dedicated teachers of the finest education system in Australia - as pawns in your pathetic little political game playing. And I agree with her.

The Leader of the Opposition claims also to be prepared to leave the matter of school reopenings up to the communities concerned. But, for Ms Follett, there are communities and there are communities. The community that gets her support is the community that suits her purposes. There are other communities, however, like the community at Macquarie Primary School, which a large number of former Cook Primary School children now attend. They are not in any way impressed by Ms Follett's political machinations. Macquarie's parent representative said on television news on Tuesday night:

We have a wonderful school here with 300 students who are able to access a very broad curriculum, with a number of specialist programs running. That can potentially be placed in jeopardy if this decision -

that is, Ms Follett's decision -

is carried through.

And, of course, the Hackett community, encouraged, is now saying, "What about us?". So, what is it to be, Ms Follett - decibel democracy, rule by the noisy minority; or measured, mature government decision making as a result of consulting all concerned sections of the community? You have declared where you are.

My Government's policy is clear: Responsible, stable administration to provide some certainty for the long-term future of all Canberrans. In an economic climate of continuing Commonwealth funding cuts to the ACT, my Government aims to bring in balanced budgets. We are causing, I know, some pain, but as little as is humanly possible - and we are not holding our children's future to ransom.

But what is the Follett Labor alternative? For "nip and tuck" read "do nothing to confront the problems". The Follett alternative involves a secret Labor agenda of huge tax increases or, alternatively, putting us into crippling debt just like her disgraced Labor colleagues in Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia. So, what is it to be, Ms Follett - Bankcard or taxes, or both? The people of Canberra, the media and I would be fascinated to know. It is time for you to account for yourself.

The accusations against me and my Government are baseless. The motion before the house is the product of barefaced political opportunism and nothing more. The choice for members is clear: Stability and strength or chaos and equivocation. Let us get on with the real reason for our being here - to guide Canberra, to the best of our abilities and in the community interest, into a sustainable future. I and my Government have done what had to be done. When this charade is over, I will again do what has to be done. If members of this Assembly see that as something deserving of censure, then so be it. But you must look at the alternative and ask yourself seriously: Will they do as well? The evidence suggests not. By any objective measure, I submit, members, you must reject this motion of want of confidence.

MR WOOD (3.05): Mr Speaker, let us have no doubt about this bout. This is the main bout. You can forget the Greiner versus Carr fight, or Hawke versus Keating. The one that matters is Follett versus Kaine. The others were mere preliminary bouts. At least, that is certainly the case with the people of the ACT, because our focus in this debate is on what concerns our citizens. So, for them this is the important fight. The decisions that are made in this chamber today will have, in the future, a significant effect on our community, and Ms Follett has moved this motion on the community's behalf.

This community and this Opposition have no confidence in this intransigent and uncommunicative Government. They are rather familiar words. It is an arrogant Government. It is one that does not listen to the people. To compound that, this Government is incompetent. They have taken one of our treasured possessions, the education system, and inflicted severe damage on it. This is due to their incompetence, of course, and to a number of other factors. They have an ill-defined philosophy on education. There was no background of thought. Therefore, they developed policies that simply, for our circumstances, were wrong. To add to their troubles, and to the troubles they inflicted on our education system, they had a simple lack of knowledge of what our education system was about. The Minister, I believe, came in with preconceived ideas based on past experience, as so many people do, and that was fatal to our system. And, of course, to make bad things worse, there was simple, plain bad management.

6 June 1991

Let me remind you that there has been agreement in this Territory about the excellence of our system. There has seldom been dispute about that. It has been carefully developed over many years. It was not randomly put together; it was not developed without careful thought. It has a well considered philosophy. Let me state just a couple of the very few guiding principles that it has. One is participation at all levels of the community. Another is devolved decision making - devolved to the communities. They are prime factors in the way that this system operates.

But how did this Government treat this system? First of all, it did not take the time to understand it; it did not want to get to know the system. It would not have taken very long, but that was never done. What happened was that, three or four months after the election of the Kaine Government, the Minister for Education, Mr Humphries, abruptly announced that up to one-quarter of our schools - up to 25 were to close. Think what an effect that would have on any system. It was a revolution in our schools, and it was done so early. Clearly, there was no prior thought given to it; there was no careful development of ideas; there was no development of a consistent framework by which to undertake such a massive change.

This revolutionary change - with this abrupt and destructive style of management - was made in a community that had been educated, indeed exhorted, to participate in the operations of schools. It was done in a community that had just been told in an election campaign, by most of us at any rate, that self-government was justified in terms of the voice that the community would have in the management of the ACT. And this drastic change was made after an election campaign in which there was no suggestion that further schools would be closed.

What sort of planning and what sort of understanding are behind that sort of change? Immediately, the community lost confidence in this Government, the Chief Minister and the Minister for Education. To compound that, the Minister announced that, apart from a reference concerning the criteria for closing schools, there would be no consultation. Of course, there subsequently was, because our community was educated that there would always be communication; but it was forced on the Minister and the Government.

This radical proposal was also brought down with no documentation at all. Day after day in this chamber I stood up in this position - and Mr Humphries was right there - and sought details. We sought costings, enrolment details and a host of information that is fundamental in the planning for any change. And day after day the Minister stood up and said, "We will tell you that later on when we know".

Mr Humphries: When the budget comes down, I said.

MR WOOD: Yes, when the budget comes down. But you still do not understand that, if you are making such radical decisions to close a quarter of the education structure, this information - - -

Mr Humphries: What? Who has told you that?

MR WOOD: That is right; you go and check your figures. To make such a massive change you need to know beforehand the full implications and all the ramifications.

Mr Kaine: This is part of the nip and tuck theory.

MR WOOD: Well, let me do a bit of maths. There are about 100 schools in this system, and he was going to close up to 25 of them.

Mr Kaine: He never said that he was going to close up to 25.

MR WOOD: I see. Well, that is news to me; I cannot read and I cannot hear. "Up to 25", he said, and if 25 is not a quarter of 100 I do not know what is. But that is thoroughly consistent with your knowledge of mathematics and the figures on that side of the parliament.

Further, there was no effort and no ability to provide documentation for this change. There was no philosophical groundwork laid. There was simply the statement - and an important one, I concede - "We have to do it; we cannot afford anything else". Of course, the decisions were progressively reversed as the community revolted. Mr Kaine, let me tell you again - you have been told before in this Assembly: We did not whip up the community; we did not whip up the Cook and Lyons communities and others. I can tell you: They did not need to be whipped up. They are very active groups, as were the Weetangera and Higgins groups. We did not whip them up. I will tell you what we did, which you could not do; we listened to them. We heard what they were saying. And, as your own Liberal Party says, that is something that you cannot do. We heard them and we responded, as we continue to do, to what they are saying.

Mr Humphries never learnt, and this Government does not seem to know, that decisions, while sometimes not hard to make, very often are difficult to implement; and the processes to do so often take a great deal more care, thought, attention and time than you may have taken in making the decision. If Mr Humphries had had some background in administration, he would have known that, to bring in such a radical and destructive change, he had a lot of work to do beforehand. Indeed, the Education Department had long ago - some six or seven years ago - established procedures by which schools would be closed if it was considered they needed to be, but these were ignored. Perhaps they are in the archives; I do not know.

6 June 1991

They were quite sound, as I remember them. But they were not taken up on this occasion. It is just plain bad management that has caused a most destructive year for education during 1990 and into 1991. How can anyone have confidence in a government of that low calibre?

We have had a high quality system and that quality is now diminished. I will now be careful - in this debate and in the coming months - about describing our system as one of high quality, because significant problems have developed and they have not been attended to. All the concentration of effort, energy, thought and time has been directed towards the negative aspect of school closures. And this has meant that we have not been able to concentrate on the problems that are developing.

There is nothing static in any system, and most especially a school system. And if you neglect it, as you have, it does not get better. I have no doubt that the Labor Government that I expect to be operating very soon will attend, with urgency, to these problems that are emerging. I have mentioned them before. Let me run over just a few of them now. We have very real problems in our high schools, not the least of which concerns the behaviour of so many of our students - while always acknowledging, of course, the calibre of most of those students. We have lost a sense of direction in our high school sector in particular. Urgent work is needed on curriculum, across all sectors of the schools. We have come so far, and we need a redefinition for our schools for them to be more confident of the paths they need to follow.

We need to do a great deal in respect of teacher stress. Teaching is, in my belief, the most difficult of all occupations, and we are not directing enough attention to the stresses experienced by teachers. For me, that is an urgent problem. Along with that is the problem of student alienation; it is a growing one. As the committee on which I serve has heard many times recently, the problem is growing and it is becoming more and more serious. These are just some of the matters that a Labor government will attend to with great urgency in the very near future.

But this Government is not just disrupting the system, as it has in the last year; it is not even able to maintain a routine administration. It cannot get anything up and running. I will mention just a few things as I reflect on the remarks that were made in the Chief Minister's speech when he took over some 18 months ago. There were some priorities for education, such as a schools council. We still have no progress on that. I believe that there is a paper written somewhere, but it has never been released 18 months on. No wonder I can say that there is a lack of direction.

Mr Humphries: It was delayed at the request of the school groups; that is all.

MR WOOD: Oh, was it? Well, I think it needs to be out there. We need that direction. We have not yet got down to the details of Mr Humphries' testing proposals. Those testing proposals, thankfully, have not been developed into a final stage, and I can say now that they will not be. Nevertheless, in 18 months, on a matter that was of high priority, the Minister has not been able to get something close to anywhere near a final form.

Another matter of some significance that was raised was school-based management. Again, while there are some steps that have been taken after 18 months, there is clear evidence that there is no ability to pursue a target and have something completed. These are all matters of significance, whether it is the great mess that has been made over the policy on school closures, or the inability to bring in a defined philosophy and to encourage the system, or the simple inability to get relatively less important matters up and running.

This Government is inept; it is incompetent. It has not been able in education, as in other areas, to make the significant progress that is so urgently needed. I will not develop, for lack of time, the basis of all this, which comes back to the needs of our young people in our schools. The Labor Party claims that this is the greatest priority in our community.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts) (3.20): We have come full circle in the Assembly today. The Labor Party, which lost government in such controversial circumstances 18 months ago, now has an opportunity to tip out of power the Alliance Government. Whether that will be the case remains to be seen. During the debate on the last successful no-confidence motion, in December 1989, the then Deputy Chief Minister said - and I think it is worth quoting his words:

... the no-confidence motion before the house today is based on nothing more than a perceived new-found ability to count heads on the part of a couple of political opportunists.

I do not think, Mr Speaker, that Mr Whalan, on that occasion, was referring to Ms Follett and Mr Berry, although today those very words might well apply to them because that is precisely what this motion is leading the Territory into today. Everything that was said on 5 December 1989 about a power grab and about an act of contempt could equally be said of this motion today. Ms Follett said on that day:

None of this is achievable if there is uncertainty.

6 June 1991

Indeed, Mr Speaker; and that is exactly what is offered to the Territory today by this motion. I will listen with great interest to the arguments that the Opposition uses to distinguish Labor generated uncertainty from Alliance generated uncertainty.

Of course, the basis for this motion is the Government's supposed failings in the areas of health and education, and Labor has criticised, I think it is fair to say - - -

Ms Follett: And planning.

MR HUMPHRIES: Well, all right, planning as well; but I am going to talk about health and education. Labor, I think it is fair to say, has criticised every step this Government has taken in the areas of health and education, and probably in the area of planning as well. I think it needs to be pointed out, however, that throughout those criticisms, throughout those unrelenting criticisms of the Government's position on those matters, Labor has never once, to my knowledge, to my recollection, spelt out or costed its alternatives to the Government's policies, and today, an hour into the debate on this no-confidence motion, having heard two speakers from the Opposition, we still do not know where they stand on those questions. We still do not know what the alternatives are.

I think, Mr Speaker, the least thing that could be said about this Government is that people do know where they stand. They understand very clearly what our position is on schools and hospitals, on planning, and on other issues. They do not know that position with respect to the Labor Party and, in particular, they do not know where this alternative government sitting opposite would find the money to pay for the promises it is now making to the electorate of Canberra.

Labor has capitalised relentlessly on the painful decisions that this Government has taken. It has pretended that it would do differently if it were in government, but I think we have to ask ourselves how credible is that claim. Since this motion of no confidence was put on the notice paper last week the Follett Opposition have become medal contenders in the Olympic sport of back-peddalling. The promises to restore schools and hospitals closed by the Alliance have been rephrased, qualified or scrapped.

We were told at first that Labor would reopen any school that the community sought to have reopened. I might say that no details have ever been provided as to how the community's view on this important matter was to be discerned. Never have we been told how we will establish what communities actually want. Nonetheless, we then heard, some days afterwards, that, other than Cook and Lyons, the alternative Follett Government would probably not be able to reopen any schools. Now, we have to ask the question, "Why have the others fallen by the wayside? On what basis have the other schools not received the same guarantees that Cook and Lyons have received?".

One can only assume that an angel has somehow appeared to Ms Follett to advise her of the community's views on these other schools. Obviously, if that was the case, it was a misinformed angel, because now it appears that some of those schools also want to be considered for reopening. Nonetheless, Cook and Lyons received some kind of guarantee. However, that was qualified. Cook and Lyons would have guarantees of staying open only for the next five years.

That raises a very interesting question. Has the Labor Party finally acknowledged that schools like Cook and Lyons do face an uncertain future? If so, will they tell us why? Is it the same reason that the Alliance put forward for closure of those two schools, and others, over the last 18 months? Is that the reason? Is it because of the declining school-age population base? Is it because the schools are too small to be viable? Could the community of Canberra be entitled to share the reasons why the Labor Party has now decided that no guarantee should be given for Cook and Lyons beyond five years? I might remind the Assembly, Mr Speaker, that the promise before was that no school would be closed unless it agreed. Clearly, at the end of five years, as far as Cook and Lyons are concerned, all bets are off.

The other question, of course, is what will happen in 1996 when, as will inevitably be the case, I assure you, the guarantee expires and the people with children at those schools still decline to allow those schools to close? And, take my word for it, they will decline. Once again, Mr Speaker, we do not know what Labor's position is because we do not understand the basis on which Labor has made these announcements; nor do we understand the basis on which Labor will pay for those announcements.

Mr Berry: You have never been much good at figures, so I am not surprised.

MR HUMPHRIES: I am glad words spring to Mr Berry's lips. Mr Speaker, the same can be said about the future of hospital redevelopment. Labor's position over the last seven days has been about as straightforward as a plate of pasta. Labor will put, we are told, a moratorium on the closure of Royal Canberra Hospital North. Hospital redevelopment overall would be reconsidered, we were told originally, a week ago. Within days the line transmogrified into, "We will put a temporary moratorium on the hospital redevelopment process". That, of course, Mr Speaker, begs the question, "If it is temporary, why put one on at all?". What is the point of a temporary moratorium? If you know that it is temporary, why not proceed? Why not provide the jobs? Why not provide the certainty? Why not get on with the business of refurbishing and enhancing our ACT public hospital system?

6 June 1991

If, Mr Speaker, it is not a temporary closure of the public hospital redevelopment process, why will Labor not say so clearly and explicitly now? Clearly, Mr Speaker, they are trying to tread a very careful path between the promises they have made in the past and the ones they will have to stick to if they ever regain government.

I think, Mr Speaker, we also have to ask another question. There are many questions here today which I have not heard answers to yet, particularly from those opposite. How is it possible, Mr Speaker, given the establishment of new facilities on the Royal Canberra Hospital South site, to freeze the removal of duplicated facilities on the north side? How, for example, could you have a new coronary unit established on the south side and leave the one on the north side frozen? Are we going to have two coronary units or two cardiovascular units or two obstetrics units under the new Labor Party proposals for our public hospital system? We do not know. In other words, how do you put a moratorium on part of the hospital redevelopment process and not on all of it?

Mr Speaker, the fundamental question, however, is not how Labor will achieve its promises in the light of the cold, hard day of reality. The real question, Mr Speaker, is how it will pay for those promises. In the last seven days Labor has made promises totalling many millions of dollars to the people of this Territory; yet it has not said one word, not one word, about how it will pay for those promises in the coming months. They expect this Assembly, facing up to the prospect of electing a new government today, to take the Labor Party on trust. "Trust us", they say, "We will find the money. We will deal with the problems. Just trust us". Mr Speaker, I, for one, am not prepared to trust the Labor Party with these valuable and important issues for the people of Canberra. How will Labor pay for its promises?

There are facts we have to face up to. The first fact is that the ACT faces a quite massive reduction in our Commonwealth level of funding. That is a fact, Mr Speaker, which Labor consistently, over the last few months, indeed, over the last 18 months, has declined to recognise or acknowledge. They have declined to agree even with the proposition that we have a serious problem facing us. For them to fail to do that, for them to pretend to the people of Canberra that we can face the future holding our head high, with no worries to deal with, that we can sail into the future without cutting any services we presently enjoy and without looking at any changes in our basic structure in Canberra, for them to say that to the people of Canberra is nothing less than deceitful and it is profoundly irresponsible because there is an enormous problem facing the Territory.

This Government, this Alliance Government under Trevor Kaine, has faced that problem, and you people opposite have not done the people of Canberra the courtesy of acknowledging that there is a problem and acknowledging that at least our solutions are facing that basic problem. The reason you have not done so is that you do not have any solutions of your own. You do not even understand, I suspect, the nature of the problem itself.

Comparisons have been made in the past between Ms Follett and Joan Kirner, the Premier of Victoria for the time being. Mrs Kirner's solution to the problem of, for example, a shortfall in the education budget was to sack several thousand teachers. I might note also that in 1989, while in government for only seven months, the ACT Labor Party also removed some 50 teachers from the ACT Teaching Service. We have to ask ourselves how Labor would deal with the problem of saving money in education, because they would have to face that problem. Nobody can avoid that problem. We would have to assume that Labor would do so by sacking teachers. It did so on the previous occasion. They cannot pretend that they have not done so before. They have done so in other States, and I believe that Labor here would do so. That stands in stark contrast to the position taken by this Government, that buildings and bricks and mortar are less important to education than are teachers and students.

Mr Speaker, Bill Wood said today that the decision we made in this place would have significant effects on the future of Canberra, and I agree with that proposition; but I think the effects on the people of Canberra of passing this no-confidence motion today and electing a Labor government have not been spelt out. We do not know what they are. We do not know what Labor's financial strategy is. They have not spelt it out. They sit there deliberately, intently, tight-lipped. They have no intention of coming before us today and spelling out what they are going to do, because they might lose the vote today and, if they do, they would be up for attack over the next few months in opposition. Clearly, they are not prepared to do that. So, what they want to do instead is simply say that what the Alliance is doing is wrong and they would do better. How, we cannot say.

I will not accept that. I intend to support the Government today and defeat the no-confidence motion because I believe that Labor has failed to answer basic questions. Until I have answers to those basic questions I, for one, do not believe that anybody in this Territory should take very seriously the alternatives, so-called, being put forward by the ACT Labor Opposition. I think also, Mr Speaker, that the Territory's very difficult problems need in the first place to be acknowledged and to be faced constructively and squarely, not to have people pretend that they are, in fact, not real problems at all.

6 June 1991

I think, Mr Speaker, that our numerous achievements in government have been well set out in the document that the Chief Minister has tabled. That is a very impressive list of achievements, some of which the Opposition have supported. They cannot deny that they have supported those things. Others have been achieved in the face of opposition from the ACT Labor Party. I am very proud of those things and I stand by them. We have a proud record in government, an impressive list of legislation that we have enacted in our 18 months in government, and I believe that all of us who shared in that government over those 18 months have something of great credit to our names as a result.

Mr Speaker, the ACT deserves stability. It will not have stability while motions like this are moved. I think Ms Follett should accept that she does not have a mandate to govern and that she should, for that reason, await the election in February of next year and take her chances then.

MR BERRY (3.34): Mr Speaker, this is truly a very serious matter, but I think what is most serious for the Chief Minister is that during that entire speech by his Health Minister I did not hear any defence of the Chief Minister - not one word of defence. Sure, there was a - - -

Mr Humphries: What is he charged with?

MR BERRY: Not once did he defend the Chief Minister's record. It is the Chief Minister who is subject to the no-confidence motion here today, as they would well know had they taken the time to have a look at their standing orders.

Mr Humphries: And his minority Government. Read the paper.

Mr Kaine: Did you not read your own motion?

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR BERRY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I know what it is like to squirm, Mr Speaker, because I have been involved in a minority government that has been the subject of a no-confidence motion against its leader. I can see, Mr Speaker, that the government members opposite, or those that are left of the government members, are squirming, and there is good reason for that.

It is now time to reflect on how we arrived at the no-confidence motion in Chief Minister Kaine. We are here essentially to judge his performance. He has had no defence from his own most senior government Minister and Liberal colleague. I wonder when that defence will come. I have to look back to December 1989 when a no-confidence motion was considered in this place and Mr Kaine said:

Today is a very important day for the alliance Government and the Assembly. It is an historic occasion, which will see this territorial Government lead the way with its forward vision for the ACT.

It is strange, Mr Speaker; I heard the word "vision" again today. Here we have the Chief Minister subject to a no-confidence motion and it seems that he still has the same vision, but it is not working. He also said:

The alliance Government will put the people of the ACT first ...

You all remember that, I am sure. Or do you? I think you have forgotten it. Which people will you put first? The ones with all the money? He continued:

and will do so in a cooperative form of government -

listen to more -

in which all members will participate actively for the good of our citizens.

What hypocrisy!

Mr Kaine: I take a point of order, Mr Speaker. I thought that we had dealt with that word, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: We have dealt with someone actually being called a hypocrite, Chief Minister; but "hypocrisy" is a borderline issue. I remind members to keep the debate at a higher level.

MR BERRY: Now let us have a look at the performance. By any account the Government that the Chief Minister leads will be judged as having reneged on its promises. There is no doubt about that. The words that I just read out have been reneged upon, and the community know it. There is no question about that. They have not had cooperative government. Where has the cooperative government been? This Government has been riddled with conflict.

Mr DUBY: It is there in this legislation that we have passed. Look at it.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr DUBY!

MR BERRY: This Government has been riddled with conflict, and they are squirming. Listen to them; a government of uncertainty. Let us look at what the Alliance has achieved under the leadership of Chief Minister Kaine. It has been a disaster for the community. The Liberal Party have been happy to ride roughshod over everyone to implement what is

6 June 1991

purely Liberal philosophy, but it is the leadership of the Alliance that is the key to the disastrous performance of this Government. There is no question about that. It is an unhappy Alliance because it has been led badly.

The Chief Minister has led a government which has fostered division, mistrust, constant conflict and an unprecedented period of instability at a time when Canberra needed and deserved much better. It is not good for government; it is not good for public confidence; it is not good for Canberra. Mr Speaker, the other Alliance partners, unfortunately, because of the Chief Minister's leadership and because of the arrangements in the Government, have been judged by the community to have sold out. It is an unfortunate turn of events for the people of the Australian Capital Territory. The interests of the community are said to have been ignored because it has been no less than a Liberal agenda. There is no question about that.

Let us go back to the promises on health and education. On 7 December 1989 the Chief Minister, Mr Kaine, said:

This Government will address the community's real concerns.

Do not laugh. He continued:

Education will be maintained at the present level of excellence. The Government will build on the good foundations of our education system to create an environment where high standards and excellence are the primary objectives.

Well, you have a long way to go before you achieve your objectives. You still have a bit of work to do. He then proceeded down a path which attacked our school system's very foundations. He ignored all the evidence put forward by the community - evidence which pointed out the flaws in his financial arguments and demonstrated that his plans would lower the quality. He led an attack on the community which ended up in people being arrested for trying to defend their schools, and he called that, just a little while ago, a cruel and cynical hoax. That is what he thinks about the people of the Australian Capital Territory defending their community assets. That is what this Chief Minister thinks.

Mr Kaine: Tell us which schools you are going to reopen.

MR BERRY: They are squirming loudly, Mr Speaker. I wish you would quieten them down. The Chief Minister who promised to address the community's real concerns is deaf, Mr Speaker, to the pleas of the people of Canberra.

What did the Chief Minister have to say on hospitals? He said:

We will proceed with hospital redevelopment plans and accelerate financial planning arrangements.

A bit slow off the mark, methinks. Here we are, a fair way down the track, and we know of a \$17m budget blow-out. I note that Mr Humphries did not mention the figure of \$17m, which seems to suggest to me that something else has gone wrong; but there we have it. A long way down the track after that commitment we have massive budget blow-outs in the hospital system. Mismanagement has been uncovered. We know now that the hospital redevelopment program that was planned by this Government will cost \$35m more. It will cost \$200m. It will cost almost as much to close Royal Canberra Hospital as it would to keep it open. There is no question about that. I cannot help going back to that phrase "accelerate financial planning arrangements". Under this Chief Minister they have accelerated all right - backwards. That has been the difficulty.

The blow-out in the hospital system alone has more than doubled. The blow-out identified under Labor was known only a few weeks before Mr Kaine took power. The source of the problems was not identified until Mr Kaine's Government took office. What was the effect? The budget blow-out reached over \$17m. As I have said before, it has more than doubled under this Treasurer.

Mr Speaker, under Chief Minister Kaine, we find that it costs us more for less, and when we point it out he does nothing. He does not stop the mismanagement; he will not sack the Ministers responsible. He seems happy to let it go on. We are paying more for fewer services. What is the response of the Minister for Health? The head of his department got the bullet and he still tells us that he has no idea where the money is coming from to sort out his hospital system.

The Kaine Government's hospital redevelopment plan, Mr Humphries finally concedes now, is premised on wrong information. He now admits that demand for services is higher than expected. Mr Humphries got it wrong again. He had the wrong formula - something we are getting used to under Mr Kaine's leadership. Now Mr Humphries wants more money for his budget.

But his Chief Minister, Mr Kaine, of course, has different ideas, as we heard in recent times. He wants more cuts in health and education. Our health and education services are bleeding to death under this Government and Mr Kaine says that he wants more cuts. The people of Canberra have a right to know that their money is being spent wisely before being asked to take further cuts. The madness of the Alliance Government can no longer proceed, Mr Speaker, because it will mean worse conditions for the people of the Australian Capital Territory. It has to fall.

6 June 1991

Mr Speaker, I have to go back to Mr Humphries, the Minister who seemingly does not know what is going on in his portfolio. He demanded that Labor tell him of the details of its plans. Mr Humphries, we are all judged by our performance. We are here to look at the Chief Minister's performance, which you will not defend. I think we have a situation where the Government has treated everybody in the community with contempt, and, dare I say it, in some cases members of the Alliance Government.

The Chief Minister has been caught out. There is no question about that. In spite of the repeated failures by his Minister for Health to come to grips with his portfolio, the Chief Minister has failed. Our hospital systems should have been relieved of the attention of Mr Humphries. I think they would have suffered less if that had been the case. Mr Kaine, the Treasurer, had to read about the financial chaos in the health portfolio in the *Canberra Times*. Would you believe it? Only the day before in this Assembly he was denying that there was anything wrong. He told us that all was well and that if anything was wrong he would have been told. I am glad the *Canberra Times* got onto this. Whilst the Chief Minister is the one who is the subject of scrutiny today, he has had some lead in his saddlebags with his ministry; but what must be said is that it is the ministry that he chose and refused to change.

I need to outline the most important features of hospital disasters and slack budgetary control under Mr Kaine's Health Minister. In 1989, as I have said before, the Chief Minister said:

We will proceed with hospital redevelopment plans and accelerate financial planning arrangements.

How many times has the Alliance Health Minister had to apologise to this house for getting it wrong? The Minister for Health has persistently come into this house and made incorrect statements on both health and education. He has been caught out, and I ask you, Mr Speaker: How many times has he had to apologise?

The December 1989 Treasury report sat around gathering dust, Mr Speaker, while this Minister sat on his hands and Mr Kaine watched, until the budget had blown out by \$17m. Ultimately the budget blow-out was raised by Labor. I recall clearly that it was denied by both the Chief Minister and the Health Minister, and it took the *Canberra Times* to tell them. That is what I find astounding in all of this, Mr Speaker. They got it wrong in the Assembly, and again what did the Health Minister say? In December 1989 he promised to act immediately to implement the recommendations of the Treasury team which uncovered the hospital mess, in line with the Chief Minister's promise on 7 December; but Mr Enfield, whom Mr Humphries sent in, informed us in his report that neither the Minister for Health nor the Chief Minister would act to address the

problems in spite of the repeated requests from the then interim board. The people of Canberra have spent a lot of money for a report which should not have been necessary, Mr Speaker.

There is no doubt that the feelings of the community toward this Government are shame and that there is no confidence in this Government. Mr Speaker, their time has run out.

MR CONNOLLY (3.49): Mr Speaker, I am surprised that no member of the Government back bench or their remaining frontbencher is prepared to get up and defend the Chief Minister. Perhaps, on reflection, I should not be so surprised.

The most staggering remark made in this chamber so far today - a remark which is the hallmark of this arrogant Government and which should be of concern to any person in this chamber who is minded to support this Government in the belief that they may be changing their spots on schools and hospitals and that we may be seeing a warmer, cosier, fuzzier Liberal Government - was the statement by the Chief Minister where he was attacking Labor on what he called decibel democracy; attacking Labor because Labor listens; attacking Labor for listening to the community views. Decibel democracy, says the Chief Minister. Any member of this chamber who is not a member of the government parties and who is thinking that this Government is going to change its tune should contemplate those words of the Chief Minister. It is decibel democracy, he says, when you go out and listen to community views.

That is typical of the arrogance of this Government and, dare I say it, typical of the arrogance of this Chief Minister, reflected, we read in the *Canberra Times* - we often find useful information in the *Canberra Times* - in the views of members of the executive of his own party last weekend, as they were reported. It is this arrogant style of this Liberal Government that the community of Canberra is rejecting, and that style is shown most clearly by that throwaway line, "decibel democracy", when we say that you should be listening to the community.

Mr Speaker, in the farrago of farce and failure that has marked this Liberal led Alliance Government over the past 18 months no single issue better exemplifies that Government's failure to properly administer this Territory than their announcement recently, in a bizarre fashion, of a total reversal of the longstanding commitment in Canberra to the leasehold system as the basis of planning and land management and the basic concept of a premium to be paid for renewal of commercial leases. Certainly, Mr Speaker, the dismemberment of the public health system and the assault on public education by this Government were appalling. My colleagues Mr Wood and Mr Berry today have

6 June 1991

amply demonstrated once again the folly of Liberal policy in those areas. But, Mr Speaker, the audacity shown by Chief Minister Kaine in leading this assault on Canberra's leasehold system is simply astounding.

Let us be clear about this; the proposal to renew commercial leases without payment of a premium, which we are led to believe was announced contrary to a Cabinet decision, would amount to a windfall profit for certain developers in this town. The practice in Canberra, at least since 1970, has been that short-term commercial leases - that is, leases for terms of less than 99 years - may be extended to 99-year leases upon payment of 10 per cent of the unimproved value of the lease and, of course, any betterment charge that may result should the lease purpose clause be changed at the time of the extension.

Mr Speaker, I am advised that at present about 85 per cent of Canberra's commercial leases are, in fact, 99-year leases, but that very important group of 15 per cent of short-term leases remains. It has been the practice, where a commercial lease site is redeveloped, for the proponent to extend the lease. The reasons are obvious. Lending institutions require security and a lease nearing the end of its term, or even with, say, 15 or 20 years remaining on the term, is less attractive as security for a mortgage than a 99-year lease. It makes commercial sense to so extend and pay the premium, and developers have had no difficulty paying the premiums over the years.

Mr Kaine's proposal would have represented a windfall to those developers or investors who currently hold short-term leases. They would obtain, for a nominal fee or for nothing - we were never quite clear about this - exactly what they have previously been prepared to pay for, namely, the extended security of a long lease. What was previously a standard development cost and source of Territory revenue becomes windfall profit; straight into the developers' pockets. A more naked attempt to rob the public purse and fill the pockets of Liberal Party mates is hard to imagine.

Now, we know, Mr Speaker, the duplicity that has been involved in this announcement. We know that Cabinet took an in-principle decision and that that decision was not to be announced until details were worked out. Yet Mr Kaine went ahead anyway and made the announcement at a business lunch. What we learned in question time only last week, and this was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, was that this so-called decision was made without any background information. I asked the Chief Minister what projections had been done on the future income source or stream for the next decade from lease renewal premiums and how that would translate by way of an increase in land tax.

That was a logical question to ask, Mr Speaker, given that the Chief Minister has repeatedly defended this decision by saying that it is not really an important matter of principle whether or not you renew a lease by way of

premium; the matter can be dealt with financially by way of a variation to the land tax base. That has been the Chief Minister's proposition and defence. When I asked the Chief Minister what projections on revenue had been done and what adjustment was necessary for land tax, he said, "I do not know; I hope to have some figures next week". At best, all the Chief Minister could point to was the income for the last four years and project that.

Mr Speaker, I find it staggering that the Liberal leader and Chief Minister could persuade his Liberal dominated Cabinet to make such a fundamental change without sound financial information. We have long suspected that this is a government of bumbling amateurs. Mr Humphries' sorry record of financial ineptitude as he has lurched from budget blow-out to budget blow-out - \$3m, \$6m, \$9m, \$17m - amply shows this. There are 17 million reasons for suspecting that this Government does not know what it is doing. But it is inconceivable to anyone in this Territory that Cabinet would make a fundamental decision affecting the basis of leasehold in this Territory without doing any homework - none at all.

This is not just decision making on the run, Mr Speaker; this is adhocery advanced to an art form. Never before in this Territory or in any other State or Territory in Australia have we seen Cabinet take decisions of such great importance driven only by dogma, with an admission from the leader of the Government that the financial implications had not been considered because the background financial information had not been sought. "We are going to get that next week", he says. How can anyone have confidence in such a shambles?

What is the cost to the community of this proposed change? As I said, the Government does not know, because it has not done the figures. The figures for the last four years are instructive; they shed some light on the matter. The six lease extensions granted in the 1987-88 financial year, for example, netted \$1.13m to the Territory, or about \$189,000 per lease. Substantial sums of public money are involved. But there has been no projection as to how that will apply in the future, and no calculation of the number of leases in issue, the value of those sites and how that is likely to project into revenue over the next few years. It is just decision making on the run.

Mr Speaker, we must ask: Has there been a case demonstrated to abolish the lease premium? The answer is, clearly, that there has not been. There have been two comprehensive reviews on this question in the last few years. The first is the Langmore committee report of 1988 and the second is our own joint standing committee report on the planning package when the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Committee and the Conservation, Heritage and Environment Committee jointly looked at the proposed planning and land management legislation. Labor, I must say, agrees totally with the views of Mr Jensen and Dr

6 June 1991

Kinloch at page A7 of that report, where they say quite clearly that the current provisions for the difference between the renewal arrangements for residential and non-residential leases should be retained. That is a very sensible proposition.

It is unfortunate that, because of the insistence on Executive Deputies chairing committees, Labor members and Mr Moore were unable to take part in the deliberations of those committees. As a result of the committee members who were present, the report records, at page 31, that there was a deadlock on this issue, with two members - Mr Jensen and Dr Kinloch - supporting the present provisions on lease renewals and two other members, surprisingly the Liberals, suggesting that things should change. But, when you read the additional comments of the two Labor members and Mr Moore, it is clear that there was a three-two split on views there in favour of retaining the current system. There was no suggestion - there had been no suggestion in the public arena until Mr Kaine dropped his bombshell - that there would ever be a change.

Mr Speaker, the clear view expressed in those reports and in the Langmore report is that there is no need for change in this area. Professor Neutze, of the Australian National University, prepared a very significant study on this, which was tabled for the Langmore report and should be read alongside it. Everyone who has looked at this seems to agree that there is no demonstrated case for change.

The development lobby argues for the changes proposed by Mr Kaine. They have a good reason for arguing for it - it amounts to a windfall profit. But they have been consistently unable to demonstrate a case for change. The Canberra property market cannot be said to perform poorly because of lease premiums. The lease premium is a cost of development, true; but developers paying this cost have shown that Canberra is a sound and profitable place to invest. Witness the extremely good performance of the Capital Property Trust, which has been confirmed by the share market - one could presume that the market is the best judge of these matters - as one of the most successful property investment trusts in Australia.

I have repeatedly asked the proponents of change for factual data to support their view that the lease premium is in some way a disincentive to desirable development. They have been unable to substantiate their case to me. I read within the Langmore report that they were unable to substantiate their case to the Langmore committee and I am sure, from speaking with members who served on the planning committee and from reading its reports, that it is the same story there. There are assertions that the lease premium is a problem and assertions that the lease premium in some way results in problems for investment in Canberra, but no facts and figures, no hard data - mere assertions.

And the

Cabinet fell for those mere assertions. The Cabinet, doing, it would seem, no sound financial analysis, has just been driven by this nonsensical developmental dogma and has prepared a windfall.

Let me repeat, Mr Speaker: The abolition of the lease premium on the extension of commercial leases amounts to nothing less than a gift of public funds to those persons who now hold short-term commercial leases. The decision is wrong in principle and it has been implemented in a ham-fisted and amateurish manner. It must and will be rejected by a majority of this Assembly. But, of course, the concern of all members of this Assembly who share Labor's view on the leasehold issue is that, under present arrangements, this Government could implement its change in policy administratively during a recess of this Assembly.

Should members of this Assembly see fit to vote against the no-confidence motion and return a Liberal government, it is no doubt open for Labor and other interested members to prepare private members' legislation to prevent the extension of commercial leases without payment of a premium; but during the period that this Assembly is in recess it could be open slather if this Liberal dominated, minority Government has its way. I would urge members who are concerned about this issue to contemplate that. I urge all members who oppose this windfall profit to developers to join Labor in supporting this vote of no confidence in this amateurish Government.

MR COLLAERY (4.02): Mr Speaker, this is not a new-found ability to count heads. The only new-found ability in that regard was the ability to crack heads as the bells were ringing. This really is a post-mortem on a marriage breakdown. When it was originally constituted, the Alliance was a balanced model with social conscience linked with Liberal economic theory and management. It was an exciting concept, and it was one that promised much.

Mr Speaker - and I say this with respect - your recruitment to the Liberal Party, or your persuasion to the Liberal Party, upset that balance. It was a good balance prior to that. That meant that the Government turned inexorably to close advisers, who pressed a steady diet of economic rationalism on us. We did not see imaginative structural changes. Great things were done by the Government - and I will come to them in a moment - but that, indeed, was the deep underlying strain that developed in the Alliance, not these ephemeral issues, important though they are, of lease changes, education and health. There was more to it than them. The deep underlying issue was the economic management of this Territory and the clear desire of the people of this Territory for a sound economic base.

6 June 1991

Whilst I exculpate much of our competent senior bureaucracy, the fact is that, when the finance and coordinating departments are not balanced with an economic planning council of the type sought by the Rally, social balance is lost. We have seen that recently on the national stage, where the move to a new federalism has so frightened the Left that it has made a most remarkable and uneasy marriage of convenience with Mr Hawke to crush the rationalism stemming from the Federal Treasury. On a smaller stage, we have had the same struggle in this Territory.

In March, on the eve of my departure to the social welfare Ministers conference in Adelaide, I was informed by a Treasury official on behalf of the Chief Minister that I should not endorse any resolutions which could impede the untying of Federal grants and the move to the new federalism espoused by Mr Greiner and the Federal Treasury. That meeting of social welfare Ministers in Adelaide was a sombre affair, with some of us, regardless of our political persuasion, unhappy with the caveat that we had received from our treasuries. So, I stress, Mr Speaker - and I make no personal accusations whatsoever in this debate - that the ACT was not alone in embracing economic rationalism, and that that way of working and the Greiner model, in those days, seemed to be the ones. Perhaps we were all taken in.

In any event, Trevor Kaine's March budget restatement, entitled *From Strength to Strength*, outlined four laudable goals for establishing a fair and responsible approach to financial management, namely, to promote the development of the private sector; to produce a balanced recurrent budget; to minimise borrowings; and to make better use of the Territory's existing capital base. In delivering that statement, Mr Kaine said that he believed that the outcome of the 1990-91 budget would reinforce those goals not only as achievable but also as the most responsible approach to managing the Territory's finances. He went on to say:

... a budget is not a static thing. My job as Treasurer is to keep the budget strategy under review as economic circumstances change.

I believe that the Chief Minister did those things, and I believe that he worked conscientiously to achieve and to carry out that level of surveillance which he had undertaken to do; but, within government there was a sense of frustration as we pressed for reforms over a long period - more than a year - at a time when we were, of course, accused of going outside our portfolio areas of interest. Of course, that was within the health area, where what was ultimately recommended in the Enfield report was basically what we had been saying all along.

The significant overexpenditure in health may be historic, and it may well be part of the lead in Mr Humphries' inherited saddlebags; but the fact is, from the Rally's standpoint, that we kept saying it. We kept saying that we needed to do profound management reviews of the type ultimately recommended by Mr Enfield. It has meant, of course, that we have ended up with a recurrent budget blow-out in health. What it further means to the Rally is that that excessive recurrent loss now presents a prospect of being borne, as the Chief Minister has indicated, by other areas of government. That is axiomatic, perhaps.

Mr Speaker, as a Minister in that Government, I was most unhappy to find that further inroads were to be made into the budget base of areas of my portfolio, particularly community services, justice and the areas of social impact. Making an attempt at balancing the budget in those departments has been difficult enough without shortfalls induced from outside the system, and with mixed luck; but the impending collision between the Rally and the Liberal Party on the economic management of this Territory was the real impasse that we were going to reach within the next few weeks. That is the real issue. As we again discussed very recently with the Chief Minister, the Rally cannot concede that necessary new policy proposals which have been carefully developed in government should go because of our problem with the recurrent budget. We have looked to other matters, and I will come back to what we see as the prescription. I will complete this minor historical review.

The first Kaine budget required Ministers to find a 4 per cent uniform expenditure reduction, and we should not forget that that was what prompted the offer from the Education Minister to close schools. It was not an agenda, and I do not really accept the accusations, put to Mr Humphries on the Labor side of the house, that he set out personally to close schools. He set out to find 4 per cent, and he found it in closing schools; but it is not a priori that he had an agenda to close government schools. I do not believe that he ever said that in any fora that I was present at.

Mr Speaker, I am very unhappy with the concept of uniform expenditure reductions. I believe that they would have been largely dropped in the forthcoming budget anyway; but that approach, which still looms, does not take social priorities into account. It does nothing to tackle built-in featherbedding in our Public Service. It is unrelated to efficiency and work practice concerns. Of course, those cuts became indiscriminate; they lacked sophistication; and they certainly became divisive, because, as we saw in education, the choices were left to those with vested interests. Hence, the weak, the schools, suffered, while the top structures remained there and they even expanded.

6 June 1991

Mr Speaker, we should have been tackling restructuring, in my view, by prudently borrowing funds from the Commonwealth - as have other States - which were sufficient to match the funds held in trust by the Commonwealth, but certainly no more, so that there was no net increase in borrowing on that notional scale. Using those funds, we should have dramatically restructured the Public Service where the largest recurrent savings are defined. Those restructuring funds could have been properly used in the redundancy areas.

Mr Speaker, key top management sections have not delivered in our Government, not only in the health area, as exemplified by Mr Enfield. I am also strongly critical of the economic development area. It has not even been able to set up a small business counselling service that I wished for when I was Acting Chief Minister. Likewise, I am equally critical of the Chief Minister's social policy unit. It has failed to deliver a concessions review which I have pressed for since I first came into government.

Mr Speaker, the overly large Senior Executive Service in the Chief Minister's Department has rankled with me and with other areas of government. I believe that it has something like 15 Senior Executive Service positions, which almost equates to the whole of the SES in the rest of the Public Service. That should have been tackled, as it offered strong recurrent savings. I doubt that there would have been a strong PSU reaction in some of those restructuring areas; but, even if there was, we should have bitten the bullet earlier. Similarly, other functions in health and education should have been reviewed. Those issues were unsuccessfully argued and put down to angst against the Public Service each time I became frustrated and mentioned them in public.

The Rally was accused of being unable to make hard decisions, but at that time I was running six difficult portfolios. That arch conservative, Hugh Morgan, has recently acknowledged that the most important ministries in the political dynamics of the electoral scene are the social justice ministries, and we have seen Mr Howe prove that recently. The Rally has received very little recognition for its administration, particularly my colleague Mr Jensen. It is easy to say from the tabloids that we are a group that cannot make hard decisions.

This image, which is perpetrated strongly at editorial level, is deeply resented by many in the administration who joined with me as Minister, with Mr Jensen, and with others in our Government, in making decisions about the care and custody of children - excruciating decisions at times; granting funds, or not, to worthwhile organisations; initiating social policies; starting new directions; and arguing strongly in the fora of government, winning and losing sometimes on issues. What recent event illustrates that better than the manner in which Mr Duby and I brought those petroleum executives to town recently? We gave them seven days to do something, and they did it on the sixth.

We have also dealt sensibly, carefully and prudently with the judiciary and with many other sectors of the community, puzzled and worried and sometimes alarmed by self-government. Where we have been decisive - particularly in the Rally sense - and resolute, we have been labelled as indecisive. Where we have bared our conscience, we have been labelled, even by people in the Government, as naive. But the real test is whether the community interest is being pursued, regardless of the eventual result at the ballot-box.

Mr Speaker, the Chief Minister has tabled a listing of the Alliance Government's major achievements, and I am proud to have contributed to many of them. It is a good list of achievements. I have also circulated a list of the Bills that were due to be introduced before the guillotine fell - so to speak. This is a magnificent sweep and a great credit to the officials, the policy makers and the many anxious hours spent by the Ministers of the Alliance Government in Cabinet and those spent by my colleagues in the joint party room. Many of the vexed issues required a lot of discussion. The adoption Bill was one where we discussed a great number of social issues.

Mr Speaker, in this respect, I have nothing but praise for my former colleagues. They have all willingly helped with a lot of the Rally-driven reform process, and there has been give and take. The fact that there is no public recognition and the Rally is pilloried, as it was disgracefully this morning, is one part of the jaundiced, unintellectual tabloid view of self-government. The Alliance Government's major achievements are that, and they set a new level of maturation for government. I regret that we do not see the same from our grade C journalists.

Mr Speaker, I return to the prime issue that affects our city, that is, economic stability, and the Chief Minister's recent utterances about cuts in health and education. What it really boils down to is that Mr Kaine is prescribing more of the old, and the old has been, frankly, unimaginative and, in some areas, close to a failure. We cannot balance our recurrent budget, although I do not believe that that is Mr Kaine's personal fault. That falls clearly and strongly on Mr Humphries' head. We gave an assurance that we would balance that budget and I corporately share that blame, even from this distance.

Mr Speaker, how can I say in good conscience that I have confidence in the economic management of Gary Humphries and, by implication, that of Trevor Kaine? The question is: Would Rosemary Follett make a better Treasurer? In my view, the Rally is between a rock and a hard place, but we may be able to soften the hard place. We have already had a taste of Rosemary Follett's temporising approach to the budget situation, but I believe that the situation is now different.

6 June 1991

The budget settings are already in place. The new policy proposals, which are an important aspect of government, have already been developed over the months by the bureaucracy in consultation with the community. There is an inertia in much of the budget process which cannot be reversed. Likewise, Mr Speaker, the taxing reviews and many other ancillary aspects are complete and cannot really and easily be fiddled with. In my view, there is little damage that Ms Follett could do in the short term before the next election, but I am sure that she will not push on with unilateral cuts in the same fashion as indicated in the Chief Minister's statement about health and education.

We want to be frank, Mr Speaker. The utterances of the Chief Minister in the last few days on those issues have been practically decisive in the manner in which we are going to approach this debate, because we cannot go back to more of the old. I am sure that Ms Follett will be sensitive in the area of budget management. She has to quarantine the social impact of our recurrent budgetary problems as much as possible. She has to look at new solutions. Were she to be elected Chief Minister, she should quickly bring in eminent outside and independent economic advice to provide practical solutions now. (*Extension of time granted*) She must now look to those issues if she seeks to govern. I have not heard an undertaking from her today; but, no doubt, she has to close this debate.

Mr Speaker, there is a danger, I believe, that Labor in government may be too sensitive and may give in to single issue groups, but I doubt that. Ms Follett has seen what has happened to her colleagues interstate and I have no doubt that she will resist that temptation because the lesson lies in Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia. She would know, were she in a minority situation, that her practices could easily be curbed.

Mr Speaker, the Rally, having learnt the skills of government and having found out what goes on, or maybe some of what goes on, in the cloisters of the bureaucracy, believes that it is fit to provide a stabilising influence in this chamber. I pledge to the people of Canberra that we will do that. We will remain on the cross benches come what may in this debate today. We have a blueprint for stable government which, in effect, requires either incoming government to stick to sensible parameters set already and to stay away from the pork-barrelling and single interest feedlines which have, in fact, marked much of Labor's performance elsewhere in this country.

Mr Speaker, I conclude by saying that on 29 May 1991 Trevor Kaine said that the Rally and the Liberal Party simply could not work together any more. I think that says it all. There has been a great deal of lengthy debate. It may well have been good if we could have got this over and done with at the time, because it has been obvious to many that we are unable to get on; we are unable to support the economic directions and economic imperatives, particularly

of Mr Humphries; and we are unable to perform any good service to the people of the ACT by continuing to prop up that situation.

MS MAHER (4.20): I rise today in disbelief that the Opposition has had the nerve to bring this motion, given its appalling and lazy performance in government and in opposition. It has been notorious in its use of scare tactics on the most vulnerable members of the community. It has been scandalous in its promises to the community. But, worse still, it has been cruel and mischievous in promising what it cannot deliver in education and health. It is a cruel hoax on the community.

I have spent many hours in consultation with community groups, women's groups and many individuals, trying to allay their fears. Unnecessary fears, cruel scare tactics and misleading letters have stemmed from that lazy and ill-informed Opposition over there. They are tactics so low that I am amazed that Ms Follett was a party to them. It is amazing how tarnished she looks when a party to such low acts of frightening the community - low acts like misinformation to tenants of Housing Trust homes, misinformation on health and education, and misinformation on the availability of services to the community. And Ms Follett has been involved every inch of the way. In government, she treated the community with contempt, and in opposition she continues. It will be a shameful day if a Follett led government is ever returned to this Assembly.

This Government has a strong commitment to social issues. My personal commitment, both as an MLA and in my capacity as Executive Deputy to the Chief Minister, has ensured that we have progressed the Government's social equity programs. For example, a couple of major projects that this Government has pursued, and is still pursuing, are the review of training and skills development options for women and a plan of action for women in TAFE. These projects will improve access to training for women which will help their chances to get the jobs they want and ensure the training to realise their full potential. A top priority, for example, is helping women to get back into the work force after they have had children or have been out of the work force for other reasons.

This Government is committed to producing a plan for women in ACT TAFE, to complement the national plan of action for women in TAFE. The national plan has been developed with a lot of consultation with which I have been involved. The plan aims to accelerate and coordinate current action to improve women's access to and achievements in all Australian TAFE systems. I am convening a task force on developing that ACT action plan.

6 June 1991

In other areas of social equity, the Government has been looking at ways of ensuring access to women in the work force by promoting the idea of employer-provided child-care in the ACT. We have encouraged the work of the Women's Employment Advisory Committee in this regard. I have had a round of consultations with government and non-government employers to seek their views on this issue.

Domestic violence is another area in the community that this Government has a commitment to resolving. I have ensured that the Government's work on domestic violence has had a high priority. I have met with many concerned individuals, experts, community groups and government agencies, to try to improve coordination in the area of domestic violence. This Government is seeking options for consideration, so that we can improve services for people who are affected by domestic violence. On national Stop Domestic Violence Day, the Government announced the formation of a Domestic Violence Consultative Committee which will report to the Government on the full range of issues affecting domestic violence sufferers. This initiative once again shows the Government's total commitment to involving the community extensively on matters affecting it.

This Government has set up and has continued to maintain many consultative and advisory committees and positions. I have mentioned two, namely, the Women's Employment Advisory Committee and the Domestic Violence Consultative Committee. Others include the Multicultural Advisory Committee, the Industrial Relations Advisory Council, the Women's Consultative Council and the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Employment. We have also set up liaison positions in the areas of disability, multiculturalism and the ageing, just to mention a few.

This Government is very committed to helping those people in our community who normally do not have a fair go. Unlike the Opposition, we do not try to scare or provide false hope. Our Government has put pressure on the Commonwealth to set up an ACT office for the Child Support Agency as quickly as possible. We have continued the pressure on the Commonwealth, which has set up an enforcement task force for the ACT. In the meantime, I have been helping many people get their entitlements.

Our continuing community discussions, State-Commonwealth relations and this Government's forward looking programs have improved not only our information base but also the information which can be disseminated to the community. In the areas of ageing, multiculturalism and disability, this Government has an outstanding record on which it can stand. Mr Kaine has already tabled a list of our major achievements so far, but our tasks are ongoing. This Government has committed itself to looking after the community in a responsible and effective manner without stepping on people's pride or dignity.

Mr Speaker, I conclude by saying that I have a personal commitment to ensuring that this Government stays and provides to the community all the necessary and effective programs which Labor could never deliver. This Government, with Trevor Kaine as Chief Minister, has provided good, stable government. He and the Executive have taken hard decisions and acted responsibly. I will not be supporting the motion. Mr Kaine has my support as Chief Minister.

MRS GRASSBY (4.27): Mr Speaker, in speaking to this motion, there are a number of important points which need to be made concerning the administration of government in the ACT. For my part, Mr Speaker, I will concentrate on what I have perceived as the bad administration of the Department of Urban Services for the past 18 months.

It is worth mentioning the problems surrounding Public Works contracts in Canberra. To be sure, the Public Works contracts system has been a shambles for the past year and a half. This is why we were forced to raise the issue as a matter of public importance earlier this year. As we all know, the problem really came to a head with the R and G Shelley debacle. That debacle was important because it highlighted the flaws in the Public Works contracting system, and also because those opposite said that they would not allow such a problem to occur again. To fix this up, they said that they would implement a project management system.

Mr Speaker, this sounded wonderful; but, of course, this was nothing but an illusion created by those opposite in their ongoing pretence of being caring and responsible managers of the public purse. I can say this, because only a short time later we saw this Government's project management system tested, and we saw it fail this test miserably. I am, of course, referring to the Hunt Boilers dispute. What the Hunt Boilers dispute highlighted was the fact that the Government did not introduce the project management system as a means of improving the Public Works contracting system in Canberra. It simply introduced the system as a means of making itself less accountable to the process.

We saw the responsible Minister turn around during the dispute and argue that the problem was not of his making, and consequently was not his responsibility. He argued that his department had appointed project managers to manage the entire contract and consequently the subcontractors, the unions and the Labor Party should look elsewhere to blame someone. Mr Speaker, I need not tell you how this came as quite a shock to all those who were involved. Let me tell you that those subcontractors and I could not believe the Minister's argument. To be quite frank, Mr Speaker, I had to ask myself, "What is this Minister paid to do?". Certainly, he is not paid to delegate away his responsibilities. He is paid from the public purse to manage effectively and responsibly. However, it was clear to all at the time that there was no effective or responsible management from him.

6 June 1991

Mr Speaker, it needs to be stressed just how important construction is to Canberra and the local economy. It is a significant employer in this town and consequently adds to the well-being of many. Let us remember that, when contractors go broke and do not pay their subcontractors, real people and real families suffer. It means that mortgages are threatened and tensions increase in households. Life is made pretty much unbearable for those in such a position as this. This was the reality being faced by many during the Hunt Boilers dispute, when the Minister decided that it had nothing to do with him. He is the Government, but it had nothing to do with him.

That episode, Mr Speaker, was one of the prime examples of how bad and irresponsible this Government could be, but there are many more examples. To highlight the negatively unique style of management which the Urban Services Minister has employed over the past 18 months, it is worth remembering the relatively recent problem that arose in the ACT with the traffic black spots. Let us be clear about this matter. The allocation of Commonwealth funds for those particular traffic black spots represented yet another government debacle, and a typically wasteful use of money.

Having agreed on and adopted a package of national reforms, the ACT became eligible for Commonwealth funds. The responsible Minister, Mr DUBY, had to nominate so-called traffic black spots in the Territory and forward them to the Federal Minister, the Hon. Bob Brown, MP. Mr Brown's department then had to ensure that the nominated spots met the necessary criteria to receive the funding. Those black spots did. This process was followed and the ACT did receive the Commonwealth funding. The only problem, however, was that Mr DUBY had forgotten to consult with the obvious experts in the area - that is, he did not consult with the Australian Federal Police. As a result, we discovered that Mr DUBY appeared to have not given priority to the most dangerous traffic areas in Canberra.

There is no denying that the 18 black spots selected were hazardous. Let us face the facts. Can anybody nominate a truly safe stretch of road anywhere in Australia? But, according to the Australian Federal Police and the statistics, the 18 nominated spots were clearly not the most dangerous in ACT. I cannot begin to understand how the Minister could have arrived at his decision without consulting the Australian Federal Police. But he did exactly this, and in doing so he was acting in that incompetent and irresponsible manner that has become the hallmark of this Government.

Mr Speaker, let me just refer to this paper that was handed to us when we came in here - the Alliance Government's major achievements from December 1989. I can speak only for the area that I am spokesman for, which was my portfolio area of Urban Services, and I am fascinated by

it. I have put a line through many things. Motorcycle rider training - that was ours; we put that in and they carried it on. The Civic Shopfront relocated to East Row - I organised that before I went out as Minister. The new library location - I organised that before I went out as Minister. The new bus depot in Tuggeranong - I organised that before I went out as Minister.

Government trade waste service sold for \$1m - that was great; ask the people around Canberra now what it is like getting trade waste collected. We had a very good service, but this Government decided to destroy it and it got \$1m for it; that is great. And people were put out of work. The opening of Namadgi Visitors Centre - that was started before I went out of government. I have to say that it was already started by the Federal Government; I must tell you, Mr Minister, that not even I started that one. Extensions to Tidbinbilla - I organised them before I went out. The Birrigai Recreation Camp - that was in my budget before I went out of government, Mr Minister. I could go on and on, and I have not had time to read this, Mr Speaker. I could have gone on a lot more.

All I can say is that anything that they say that they did well was due to the Follett Labor Government's budget. It was all done when we were in government. They just took it over and did it. I am sure that if Mr Berry read through the health part he could say that that was part of his budget. I am sure that if Ms Follett read through it she could pick out all the parts of her area that were all part of her budget. And I am quite sure that if Mr Wood looked through the education part he could pick out all the parts that were in the Whalan part of the budget.

They are saying that those are the major achievements of the Alliance Government. There is a very nice way of saying what that is; but you would stop me saying it if I said it, Mr Speaker, so I will not say it.

Mr Moore: You are allowed to use "furphy".

MRS GRASSBY: It is worse than furphy; it is the sort of word that a lady never uses. A nice way of saying it is "balderdash". We all know what that means in rude words, and that is all complete balderdash. I guess that it was rushed out for this particular day. You can tell that it has gone to the printers in a jolly hurry. There are words missing; and I am not the greatest speller in the world, but even I can see that some of the spelling in it is bad. It was obviously rushed to the printers before we came into this house. It obviously had to be got through to prove what the Government had done.

6 June 1991

As I say, when I read through the area that I am the spokesman for, I can tell you right now, Mr Speaker, that half the things in there were in my budget. All they have done is implemented them. So, all I can say is that the Follett Labor Government was the greatest government that the ACT has seen and will hope to see again. It obviously did a dashed good job while it was in government.

As for Ms Maher talking about TAFE, every single day of the week I get a phone call about people who cannot get into TAFE, or whom it is costing \$600 for the whole semester when they are doing only two subjects, but they still have to pay that amount. Do not tell me, Mr Speaker, that Ms Maher can stand up there and tell us what a wonderful job this Government has done with TAFE. It has done a wonderful job, just like it has done with the health system! It has just got rid of it all; there is none. Do not get sick and do not try to get an education in this city, because you cannot get it; it is not available. We had a wonderful system under the Follett Labor Government. But that has all gone by the way, Mr Speaker - completely gone by the way. We have had this city completely changed to what people do not want.

We do not have the government we can afford. We have the government we cannot afford. We want responsible government, government that is caring and government that cares about the people who put it in. What we have ended up with is a whole lot of people who did not want a government, and with the Liberal Government. We all know that all it cares about is looking after the wealthy; to hell with the people who really care in this city.

So, Mr Speaker, I must honestly say that, as far as I am concerned, I am sorry to see that Ms Maher made comments like that. As I listened to her speech, I could not find any part of it that really showed caring for Canberra.

MR STEFANIAK (4.37): It has certainly been an interesting afternoon and a quite interesting result. It would seem that the Residents Rally is going to do back flips, side turns, and probably a fair bit of squirming, and is now going to support Ms Follett in this no-confidence motion. It seems that it will support the former minority Government - that is, if I heard what Mr Collaery just said correctly, and I am still not too sure because one is never too sure anyway. It is a pity he is not here. He is out on his little ego trip with the media, and he will enjoy that, I am sure.

Mr Speaker, governments have to govern, and I think this Alliance Government has done so. I think that perhaps the events of this afternoon have given a clear indication of the Chief Minister's action in getting rid of Mr Collaery.

As the Chief Minister himself said, he was elected not to win a popularity poll but to do a job and to do it properly and responsibly, and I believe that he has done so. Certainly the Liberal members and the two No Self Government members of this coalition have done that and are here today as a seven-person minority Government.

We live in hard economic times, Mr Speaker. The ACT has been progressively on a self-government footing since 1986. We have heard a lot of ranting and raving from the Labor Party opposite and, indeed, from the Residents Rally, too, and other people in this Assembly in relation to the hospitals and the schools. Let us talk about Royal Canberra Hospital. That should have been refurbished by the Federal Labor Government back in 1983 and 1984, along with a number of other things that the Federal Labor Government should have done for the Territory. It did not do so. It left this Government and this Assembly with some very hard decisions to make because it did not take the required action at the time.

Let us not delude ourselves about self-government, either, Mr Speaker. We have self-government, a State style of self-government because that is the cheapest option for the Federal Parliament. It is much better for it to let the ACT go it alone, so that it can save money, than to continue to pour in the money that was put into Canberra before self-government.

The Grants Commission report, unfortunately, states that we are still overfunded and, of course, did not the Federal Government latch onto that and give this Territory less still in the last Premiers Conference? I think that is, unfortunately, going to be a trend that we are just going to have to get used to. Canberra, unfortunately, is going to have to pay its way. At last count, I think we are owed over \$800m by the Commonwealth Government - and I doubt that we will ever see it. Unfortunately, the tooth fairy no longer exists for the ACT. We have to go it alone financially. Times are tough and, because of that, whichever government is in power here will have to make hard economic decisions if it is to be effective.

This Government, the Kaine Government, has had the guts to make those hard economic decisions. Some of them have not been popular, but it has provided responsible government. Efficiencies have to be made. I do not really think it is an option to tax people out of existence. That is not, really, any alternative and it is, in fact, counterproductive.

In the seven months of Rosemary Follett's first Government both she and her Government took no hard decisions; they just drifted along. This Government, the Kaine Government, has taken hard decisions. It has been responsible. Regardless of what occurs in the February 1992 election - that is, assuming that we get that far - this Kaine Government will have left the ACT on a fundamentally sound

6 June 1991

financial footing. I doubt whether an ALP government, be it majority or minority, could deliver that. Indeed, when one looks at the dreadful track record of the Federal Labor Government and the State Labor governments, one shudders.

When the Federal Labor Government took over in 1983 I think we had a national debt of about \$33 billion. That has ballooned to \$170 billion. The Cain Labor Government in Victoria - that is spelt with a C and not a K - bankrupted that State. Indeed, there is a joke going around which probably most of you have heard: "What is the capital of Victoria?"; answer, "About \$1.50".

South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania are also broke. Funnily enough, Queensland's much maligned National Government - half of whom seem to be in gaol - nevertheless seemed to at least get that State on a reasonable financial footing. Mr Goss has inherited a quite financially sound State there. In New South Wales, a person that the Opposition - who might soon be the Government here - like deriding a lot, Nick Greiner, has got his State back on a reasonable financial footing.

Do we want the ACT to join the ALP States? Do we want the ACT to become bankrupt? Do we want financially strong management or - especially if I understood Mr Collaery correctly - to go to a lot of borrowings which really will just take us into debt? I wonder whether we could really pay them off.

If you want to take a risk and risk the ACT's financial stability, vote for this motion, go right ahead. If you do not, and you want responsible government, vote against it. Other government speakers have touched and, indeed, further ones will touch on the achievements of this Government. I will deal with a few of the areas where I have had some involvement, and those are the areas of law and sport.

Whilst criticising Mr Collaery and his party for another of their amazing turns here, I will not be churlish. He had involvement in some of the matters, especially in these areas, and he implemented quite sensible policies. The Alliance Government, when all three groupings were in it, enacted a large amount of very good legislation for this Territory.

Our domestic violence legislation is perhaps the most comprehensive in Australia, and I think that is something we all can be proud of in this Assembly. I was pleased to see - having a very great interest in victims of crime - that our criminal injuries compensation has now been raised from \$20,000 to \$50,000 to bring us into line with New South Wales. Also, there has been a full review of the questions of victims and victims' rights by the ACT Community Law Reform Committee, chaired by His Honour Mr Justice Kelly.

In relation to police, I think we have more police on the beat now than we did two years ago and, by the use of such things as police shopfronts and innovative ideas such as the police bicycle squad, the police have a greater presence in the community than they have had for some time. I was pleased to see the Alliance Government - and a couple of other members of this Assembly also - defeat a Bill Wood amendment Bill to try to get rid of the very useful move-on powers. That was defeated and those very useful powers remain. Little wonder, I think, that the police and the community have confidence in this Government to do its little bit to preserve law and order in the Territory. I think that confidence is well founded.

Some legislation that has been around for a long time was introduced by this Government, Mr Speaker, and that is the Weapons Act. That had its genesis in 1977, but it was this Government that brought it in. In early 1990 Mr Collaery introduced a rather half-baked Bill that had quite a few problems. However, with the 12-month community consultation that Bill was tightened up and renovated considerably and the legitimate concerns of the gun lobby were then catered for in that Bill. What we have come up with is a Bill that balances the rights of individual citizens, but also looks after the rights of the community. I think that is certainly a very important piece of legislation, fine-tuned and then passed by the Alliance Government.

There have been a number of amendments, too, to the Liquor Act. Those amendments have tightened controls on under-age drinking and the criteria for determining the suitability of liquor licence holders, together with greater powers of the licensing authority. Also, of course, we have done things like legalising two-up on Anzac Day, which seems to come under that Act as well. More significantly, perhaps, our Motor Traffic Act has been amended in a number of areas. The Motor Traffic (Alcohol and Drugs) Act has been amended to bring us into line with New South Wales, and we now have .05 as the legal limit rather than .08. This is very important. It removes an anomaly whereby people could drive from Canberra to Queanbeyan at .07, get through a random breath test somewhere out at Harman and then, when they cross the border, they get picked up for drink-driving.

We have also increased the fines payable for traffic infringement notices, to bring us more into line with other States as well. Other Acts which this Territory has benefited from include the Tobacco Act. I think the Minister for Health's Act there leads the country in some of its provisions.

That leads me to a second area which I will speak on, Mr Speaker, and that is the area of sport, because sport has benefited from the Health Promotion Fund. I think there are a few bugs that still need to be ironed out there so that the fund can be more effective; but, to date, general

6 June 1991

health bodies have received some \$574,000 worth of sponsorship and sport has received some \$437,000 worth of sponsorship. That is certainly a very necessary and useful boost to a number of bodies, especially sporting bodies, who have benefited from that Act. I hope that they will continue to benefit.

During the time of the Alliance Government I was very happy to be involved in the sports area. I was working there with the Deputy Chief Minister who finally started taking an interest in it in about August last year because there were votes in it. I suppose that during that time I was fairly happy to be - for a couple of months, anyway - sort of the de facto Minister for sport. I know that Mr Berry brought that to my attention through some racing article back in about February last year. That was very interesting, and I am very happy to see a number of achievements of this Government in that area.

Sorting out the mess of Bruce is something that this Government has undertaken. That was a Labor Government initiative - and a rather bad contract - in June 1989. This Government is in the process of trying to sort that out. That being the case, a number of other initiatives were taken there and I am pleased to see that a number of major events have been, or will be, held there, including some international soccer matches. We had a Gaelic football match there between Australia and Ireland last year; we had a gridiron invitation match; and, hopefully, there will be some more major gridiron matches there. In 1993, the World Youth Cup soccer championships will hold several matches there. I am certainly hopeful that Canberra can get rugby league and rugby union test matches there in the near future. We have, in fact, been promised some matches in 1995 in the World Cup rugby union, given that they come to Australia and New Zealand, which looks most likely.

Other major events will be coming to Canberra. They are very important in terms of sporting-tourist dollars coming into the Territory. These have been initiated by this Government, and I have certainly been pleased to have had a lot of personal involvement in them. They include the 1995 World Cup showjumping championships which will be held in Glebe Park, the 1994 world ballooning championships, the 1992 Australasian dragon boats championships and the 1994 international dragon boats championships. We are likely to get, in 1994, an Australasian golden-oldies competition, which is not all that much smaller than the international golden-oldies rugby union competition which brings in about 8,000 people. Hopefully, we look like getting that in 1995. We also have the world orienteering championships in the year 2000. All these major events - and they are major because any event that brings in over 1,000 people is seen as a very useful event which injects a lot of money into the local economy - have been initiated during the time of this Alliance Government.

For many years Ros Kelly promised a pool in Tuggeranong. I have correspondence and I have seen letters to the paper back in 1986 where she was promising it and not delivering. This Alliance Government has started work on a pool in Tuggeranong. It is a very major complex and it will cost about \$11.2m; but, where Labor promised, we have actually delivered.

Mr Duby: It is \$11.5m.

MR STEFANIAK: I thank my colleague Mr Duby; it is \$11.5m.

Mr Duby: Minister for Finance.

MR STEFANIAK: Indeed, that is why he corrected me there. Well done, Mr Duby. Mr Speaker, a number of other major capital works have been undertaken during the course of this Government in relation to sporting facilities. The racing industry's financial future and development future has been secured by legislation which ensures that 0.75 per cent of the TAB moneys go to the Racecourse Development Fund. This is the first time that they have been able to have secure financial planning as a result.

Under this Government, a number of other matters of significance have occurred. There is a review of sport, which I hope will be taken up by whichever government emerges today. It is a very comprehensive review which shows ways of saving money and administrative costs. By so saving that money I would hope that some of those savings could be turned back to where they should go, that is, the sports at the coalface.

This Government has given a greater emphasis, too, to women in sport and also people with disabilities playing sport. We have also increased funding and support to the ACT Academy of Sport, and the elite programs there are going very well. One particularly useful one was where four young ladies were selected from a study of all year 10 students and developed as rowers. They won the world championship rowing tournament in New Zealand.

I was certainly happy to make myself available, Mr Speaker, as the Executive Deputy for sport, to all groups, both big and small, which the former Deputy Chief Minister simply did not have the time to see. I think that was appreciated by those groups.

Mr Speaker, I close by saying that when one looks at the record of achievements of this Government - I have mentioned only very few in a couple of specific areas - when one looks at some 20 pages of this, there were a lot of achievements in a very short space of time. That is not bad for three very different and disparate groups of people; much better, I think, than all the other logical alternatives which we have before us today.

6 June 1991

I would ask members to reject this motion and let this Chief Minister, Trevor Kaine, and his Government, his now minority Government of seven, get on with the job of governing the ACT. I think you will be very sorry and the ACT will be very sorry if you elect a different government.

MR JENSEN (4.52): Mr Speaker, today, unfortunately, once again, we are debating a motion of no confidence in the Chief Minister of the ACT. This motion was not forced upon this Assembly by the Rally; it was forced upon it by others.

In a way, given the community feeling about the manner in which self-government was introduced into this Territory, I guess it is not surprising that this first term of this Assembly has been characterised by conflicts, political manoeuvrings, poor public image and media theatricals. It is sad that the learning curve, mistakes and hard work of some have taken place in such a goldfish bowl, under the hostile gaze of much of the media and public. Of the latter, of course, many did not want self-government.

It seems to me, Mr Speaker, that for some reason the ACT Assembly has been seen as somehow different from all the other assemblies around Australia. All around Australia at the moment almost all parliaments are suffering from the sorts of issues that we are finding here in the ACT, particularly in the way that their parliaments are operating. I think it is unfortunate that people have seen fit to portray our Assembly as somehow being different. Maybe being smaller is the reason why this has been the case. However, there is no going back on these matters, Mr Speaker, and all we can do is, hopefully, learn from our errors and work together for the good of the Canberra community for the next seven months. The Residents Rally, Mr Speaker, makes a pledge to the people of Canberra to do that for the community.

The Residents Rally, Mr Speaker, was formed in response to the autocratic style of decision making of the Federal Labor and Liberal parties and their local counterparts - a style of decision making which meant that, by and large, Canberrans had very little say in the processes of government which affected them most. We in the Rally believed that the people of Canberra would be best served by a community based party which had a strong social justice agenda and roots in the suburbs, serving the total community and not sectional interests. The Rally, Mr Speaker, had no polarised agenda and was not interested in power for power's sake. I would suggest that the events of the last few days clearly support that attitude. Whatever happens today, as my colleague Mr Collaery has already said, the Rally will remain on the cross benches.

Since being elected, the Rally has sought to achieve these ideals. While not being successful in all cases, we have learnt that politics is a tough game. The two major parties have regarded us as a threat to their cosy duopoly

and I have no doubt that, whatever happens today, they will continue to keep us in their sights. However, Mr Deputy Speaker, they may well find us a much more elusive target than would at first appear.

When the Federal Labor Government prepared the Australian Capital Territory (Self-Government) Act they gave us a form of government which was ill-suited to the ACT's needs. We have a Westminster style, executive led Assembly, which is characterised by a time-wasting adversarial system. The Rally's preference for a collegiate or council style of government was torpedoed right at the beginning. Hopefully, in the not too distant future, that aim for a community assembly may well be achieved. Otherwise, Mr Deputy Speaker, it could well be a tragedy for Canberra. Nonetheless, we have endeavoured to make a positive contribution to this Assembly, both in government and in opposition. We have insisted on many occasions that the views of the community should be taken into account, including during the schools closure debate last year and, conversely, when Ms Follett was Chief Minister and was planning to sack teachers.

When my colleague Bernard Collaery was Deputy Chief Minister he was able to commence a process of much needed reform in the social justice area - reform that would have done a Labor government proud. The Rally has the skills to ensure that the Territory has not only responsible government but government that can achieve a program of legislation and social reform. I note that Mr Kaine made some comments today about the fine role that my colleague Mr Collaery has played in that area.

We must recall, Mr Deputy Speaker, that Mr Humphries and Mr Kaine were quite happy to take extended holidays earlier this year, leaving the entire Territory in the capable hands of Mr Collaery and Mr Doby. Mr Collaery has clearly demonstrated that he is quite capable of taking hard decisions when they are required, as he had to do many times with police matters, welfare issues, Housing Trust disputes and so on.

It is unfortunate, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the career of this Minister has been cut short by a Chief Minister who was not prepared to hand the letter of dismissal to Mr Collaery face to face. Even John Kerr was prepared to hand the letter of dismissal directly to Gough Whitlam.

The Kaine led Government could have pulled back from a crash-through approach and listened to the point of view of the Rally. Unfortunately, this was not to be - and the rest, as they say, is history. Mr Kaine was not even prepared to give Mr Collaery an opportunity to resign. Mr Kaine was wondering, surprisingly, this morning, why Mr Collaery would not approach him directly. I really do not think that that comment warrants a further response.

6 June 1991

As anyone on the fifth floor could attest, Mr Collaery's time has been regularly filled, as he has listened to community groups, public servants and professionals, seeking good advice before proceeding with courses of action. It has been a constant disappointment to me that Mr Kaine has not been so keen to seek or to take advice. Most of the public perception problems of the Alliance Government could have been avoided if the processes had changed.

After all, it is the residents of Canberra who are affected by the decisions we make here. While they usually do accept that tough decisions have to be made, they need to own those decisions by being involved in the process. There is consultation and consultation. In the planning arena, the days of trucks and plans arriving on Friday morning and saying, "Work starts on Monday; this is what we are going to build", are long gone, Mr Deputy Speaker. The planning legislation that will be brought in very shortly will put that sort of problem very quickly to rest.

Mr Deputy Speaker, this is an area that I have tried to push in my time as Executive Deputy. At this stage I wish to express my thanks to the many public servants with whom I have dealt in the last 18 months, especially in the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning and the Department of Urban Services, who have taken these ideas on board and, in their normal efficient and cooperative fashion, have steadily increased the level of consultative forums and their responsiveness to the community. I extend my thanks to them all and wish them all the best in the months to come under whatever ministerial arrangements are provided.

Indeed, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is this whole issue of listening to the community which has brought us to this place today. Like his colleague Mr Greiner, we have here, unfortunately, a Chief Minister who has failed to listen to the voice of the people and who has failed to understand that the community wish and require to be consulted on the issues which affect them. While government, Mr Deputy Speaker, is about financial responsibility and stability, it is also about responsiveness and maintaining our heritage for the future.

In supporting this motion of no confidence, Mr Deputy Speaker - let me say that it gives me no joy to do so - I am aware that we will be accused of destabilising the Territory at a critical time prior to the budget.

Mr Kaine: That is dead right.

MR JENSEN: My colleague Mr Collaery, I believe, has answered that adequately.

Mr Kaine: And Rosemary had better watch out because they will pull the rug out from under her, too, again.

MR JENSEN: The Rally will support the Supply Bill, Mr Kaine, and seek to ensure a responsible budget, albeit a tough one because of the treatment of the ACT by the Federal Treasurer and the Prime Minister with their thimble and pea trick of "Here is your \$53m, but we will take it off this year's allocation". Frankly, Mr Speaker, the ACT community has been ripped off by them providing us with funds from a trust account. I wonder where the interest on that went. I will just wonder aloud on that one. I notice that the \$53m does not include any interest on that money that has been languishing there for the last two years. That account held funds for the people of the ACT from the last two Federal budgets. Talk about a thimble and pea trick; that is a ripper.

Mr Speaker, we have no mining in the ACT and very little rural industry or heavy industry. The leasehold system was designed to provide the ACT with an ongoing revenue base which Mr Kaine was prepared to dismantle. Ms Follett has acknowledged the importance both - - -

Mr Duby: That is a lie, and you know it.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR JENSEN: I request that that be withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Duby, please withdraw that.

Mr Duby: Yes, I withdraw the word "lie". It is clearly an untruth, though.

MR SPEAKER: Order, Mr Duby! Let this not degenerate. I would ask you to make an unqualified withdrawal.

Mr Duby: Mr Speaker, it is a qualified withdrawal. It is untrue; it is as simple as that.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Duby, I ask you to withdraw unqualifiedly.

Mr Duby: I have withdrawn the word "lie".

MR SPEAKER: Yes, but you qualified it by calling it an untruth.

Mr Duby: If I interjected that it was an untruth, Mr Speaker, I would not be standing here before you now. The fact of the matter is that it is an untruth. Mr Jensen knows it and so does everyone else in this house.

Mr Collaery: May I speak to the point of order. Mr Duby lost his chance to say "untruth". He called Mr Jensen a liar.

Mr Duby: No, I did not. I said, "It is a lie".

6 June 1991

Mr Collaery: Mr Jensen is an honourable person. Mr DUBY should withdraw it in an unqualified sense and await his moment to try to get the word in at some other time. He has not acceded to your direction, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Mr DUBY, I would just ask you to make an unqualified withdrawal.

Mr DUBY: I withdraw.

MR JENSEN: Mr Speaker, Ms Follett has acknowledged the importance both of closely examining the financial affairs and bureaucratic handling of health in the ACT and of ensuring that a proper system of premiums is in place for the renewal of commercial leases. The people of Canberra will be watching with interest to make sure, if she is elected Chief Minister, that she does not forget these undertakings.

We in the Rally have always had one overriding aim - to ensure that, whether in or out of government, we are achieving the best outcome for Canberra. That is why we have produced a blueprint for stable government, Mr Speaker - so that the community will know that we have been striving, on their behalf, to achieve undertakings from the major parties - - -

Mr Kaine: Will you put your blueprint on the table?

MR JENSEN: Yes, I am quite happy to put our blueprint on the table, through you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Kaine: Has that got Rosemary's signature on the bottom of it?

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR JENSEN: I am quite happy to put our blueprint on the table, Mr Speaker, and I seek leave to do so.

Leave granted.

MR JENSEN: I table a copy of the blueprint for restoring stable government put out by the Residents Rally and dated 5 June 1991. Mr Speaker, I still believe that the government versus opposition style is not appropriate for an Assembly of this size. As the Rally takes its seats on the cross benches, we will be trying to keep both parties open and accountable. What I now want to table, for the edification of members, is a document showing the Rally's policy summaries.

Leave granted.

MR JENSEN: The policies shown in green are those policies that have been achieved by the Rally while it has been participating in the Alliance Government. Those in red - rhodamine, actually - are areas that were in the process of

being implemented in the legislative program that you will find attached to the document that I previously tabled. This shows which parts of our policies had been achieved and those which were in process.

The Rally will be a vigilant watchdog during the remaining months of this Assembly. It will exercise this role in a responsible and responsive manner. I will continue to seek to play a role in the development of policies and programs, particularly in the areas of planning, conservation and the environment, and I give, once again, a firm commitment to groups and individuals that I will make myself available to discuss the various issues in those areas as they come to hand.

MR STEVENSON (5.05): The people of Canberra have no confidence in any government in this Assembly. Indeed, they have no confidence in any of us. Mr Kaine said that self-government was thrust upon us by a cynical Federal Labor government. Indeed, that is true; but, of course, it was also agreed upon by a cynical Federal Liberal Party.

The tremendous opposition against self-government in Canberra was because people well knew that they would never be able to pay for the nation's showplace. It just could not be done. They realised that with self-government would come increased taxes and charges and reduced services. Indeed, since self-government, what we have had is increased taxes and charges and reduced services, particularly in the schools and at the Royal Canberra Hospital.

I certainly believe that the Alliance did not close schools or the Royal Canberra Hospital because they wanted to. I believe that it was simply because they looked at the books. When you look at the books you realise that Canberra cannot afford to pay for a State-like government. We never could. We never will be able to. So, the Alliance, in their way, supported by the Residents Rally, made certain decisions that are totally unpopular with people in Canberra. Indeed, our surveys show that people in Canberra do not want the Royal Canberra Hospital closed as a hospital. They do not want it used for community health services. They want it kept as a hospital, though not necessarily as the major hospital. Some other people, perhaps, would like to put a casino there.

As far as the schools are concerned, people in Canberra generally believe that the schools should be maintained as community services. The buildings should not be bulldozed and, if, at a later time, there is need for more schools, then those schools should be reopened. I support the people on maintaining Royal Canberra Hospital as a hospital and not allowing the schools to be closed where the community does not want them closed or wants them held so

6 June 1991

that they can be reopened in the future. That is their desire, and it is certainly a strong one. It is the community's money that pays. Certainly the vast majority of the large budget in the ACT goes towards health and education.

There have been many decisions by both sides in this Assembly that the people do not agree with. I have not the slightest doubt that if self-government is not abolished there will be many more decisions, one after another, that large numbers of the community will not agree with. But, while ever the Assembly is here, there is perhaps one remedy so that there will be some sort of a democratic say from the people of Canberra. Through a voters' veto the citizens, when they feel strongly about a particular issue, can put a matter to the community.

How is that done? Possibly 3 per cent of the electorate in Canberra, perhaps some 5,000 people, would sign a petition and submit that to the Assembly. The Government would be required to hold a referendum, perhaps on one set day each year. The referendum results, unlike referendums we normally have in Australia, and have certainly had in Canberra, would be binding on government. People ask us all, again and again, "How is it that we had two referendums on self-government, yet ended up with self-government?". The reason is that democracy in Australia and in Canberra has been suffering near mortal wounds for a long time. The voters' veto would give great heart to people in our community. There will never be a situation in any community, business, family or organisation where you can survive, let alone flourish and prosper, when people are at loggerheads with each other. That has never happened and it never will happen. We need to work together as a community.

Trevor Kaine has called for a collegiate government. There are perhaps two ways you could look at that. Firstly, I think it is true and is agreed upon by the vast majority of people that if there are people in a government, be it a State-like government, State, Federal or local government, they should all use their abilities to benefit the people in the community. They should not use their abilities to score points, supposedly, from other groupings in the Assembly. It is entirely destructive of community and society when groups within parliaments decide that they will attack the other side. Quite often they will attack the other side for doing something which they themselves supported in the past. A classic example would be the tax that Dr Hewson has said he will introduce. That was a strong platform of the Labor Party. But once the shoe is on the other foot there is a tremendous attack.

This will never benefit any of us and, if we are to do well as a community, it must cease. That is what the people want. There is not the slightest doubt about that. One thing most of us have maintained in this Assembly is that every single person here has abilities that would be useful

in advancing our community in Canberra. If ever there is something that is needed, it is the use of whatever abilities we have. I refer not only to the members of this Assembly, but to people in Canberra in unions, in businesses and in every other aspect of our society. All people in this Assembly should be using their abilities. We do not need a shadow this, that or the other.

Secondly - and this is something else we have surveyed - people want elected members of parliament to follow the majority expressed will of the people. They do not want them to follow the minority expressed will of the party, or whatever vested interests are controlling the party. Eighty per cent of people in Canberra want that, as against 8 per cent. We all know this; yet so many of us tie ourselves up within party groupings and again and again vote against our conscience and vote against that which we know is sorely desired by the community.

I firmly believe that self-government should be abolished. I have never retreated from that viewpoint. The people in Canberra increasingly, on our surveys, have said that I should continue to work for the abolition of self-government. I should make the point that while I have been in this Assembly I have never sought to destroy the Assembly by creating havoc. I think it should be stopped, but it should be stopped legally. It should be stopped by the people of Canberra demanding that their will be heard above the voice of controlling political parties.

We have a phenomenally wealthy country in Australia. I defy anybody in this community to come to me at any time and tell me one single thing that we lack in Australia that one would need in a society. If the rest of the world sank beneath the ocean five minutes ago, I defy anybody to prove to me that we would have a problem in surviving. We have phenomenal wealth in every single area.

There is one thing we lack; we lack the will of people who are controlled by political parties to follow what they know should be done. Enough people know what should be done, regardless of whether they are prepared to tell the public that they know that or not. Other people may not have done their homework and may not realise that the financial and banking control of our country, of our Territory and of our community is such that we can go only one way. Like the rest of the world, under these insane economic policies, if you could call them that, and corrupt bookkeeping principles, we can only continue to go into ever-increasing debt. More and more people will be unable to afford homes; more and more people will become unemployed; more and more people will not work together as a group.

We are seeing tremendous destruction within the family unit, in Australia and elsewhere. But it is not because we lack anything in this country apart from the will of good people who are elected by the community to support them to

6 June 1991

consult with them and to follow their directives. I believe that citizens initiated referenda around the world have proven again and again that where a decision is made by the people in a community it is seen, in the majority of cases, to be a better decision on vital issues than a decision made by the politicians in various parliaments around the world. I support totally a voters' veto. I support the right of people to have a valid say. The voters' veto is democracy in action.

People do not want a say on every issue. We would not be having referendums every second weekend. It would not cost a fortune. All these statements are made by politicians who want to cling to power at all costs, basically at the cost of the community. I believe that the voters' veto will be introduced into Canberra sooner or later. Even if it is not introduced under self-government, it could be introduced under a local municipal council, which is what I now believe the majority of people in Canberra want. Eventually, when it is introduced, members of parliament will find that they are not looked upon by the community in the way that most people in this community look at every single member in this Assembly, bar none. I believe that they should take out the lot of us and abolish this Assembly.

What are the consequences of self-government remaining in Canberra? People believe that taxes and charges will increase. People believe that community services will be reduced. People believe that there will be greater deficit financing. In other words, if you cannot pay for Canberra, if you cannot pay for the community services and someone wants to maintain them, more and more money will be borrowed to do just that.

Mr Speaker, I think it is a sorry day for Canberra when we have people clutching for power in this Assembly. Indeed, on this day the Alliance will be no more. I am afraid that the replacement will be no better.

DR KINLOCH (5.20): I now address myself briefly to several issues related to the motion before us. That motion is:

That this Assembly has no confidence in the Chief Minister, Mr Kaine -

and then there are four significant words -

and his minority Government.

So, it is not only a no-confidence motion on the Chief Minister. First of all, I continue to regret for the umpteenth time that the Federal Government of the Commonwealth of Australia saddled us with this pocket-handkerchief version of an Australian version of the so-called Westminster system. It is absurd that in this tiny Assembly we should be divided into government and opposition. It is absurd that we are required to play out

this game of no-confidence motions. How much more sensible it would be to have a city council, with an elected mayor and aldermen, for a fixed term of office. I wish that, at the very least, we had a collegiate government, and I commend Mr Kaine once more for having suggested that.

Secondly, I regret the circumstances which have brought us to this particular no-confidence motion. Recently I have sought to avoid such motions of censure or no confidence, or to vote against them, as in the cases of Mr Humphries recently and Mr Stevenson. I cannot avoid this one, for obvious reasons; so, although I would prefer to abstain, I will not do so, as abstention is in itself a political choice.

Thirdly, I wish to discuss some implications of my 26 April letter of resignation from the Alliance Government. I stress the context and circumstances of that letter. At the time Trevor Kaine was Chief Minister, Bernard Collaery was Deputy Chief Minister and Norman Jensen was Executive Deputy for planning. As I say in my letter at the opening of a paragraph on page 2:

In resigning, I am not opposing the Government as such.

My resignation at that time was not designed to bring down that Government of which two of my Rally friends and colleagues were a part. In the next paragraph, I commended them for their work and said that they:

... will ably continue to represent the Rally viewpoint on the casino issue from within the Alliance Government.

In that resignation letter, therefore, I wished to give no comfort to anyone who might want to divide the three of us over the issues we care about, and I wished to avoid any political act which would bring down that Government. It was necessary, therefore, for me to opt out of any vote of censure or vote of no confidence in relation to members of that Government. That I did, for example, in the case of Mr Humphries.

In that same paragraph in which I stressed, "I am not opposing the Government as such", I noted my view that Trevor Kaine "is the ablest member of the Assembly for that difficult task". I commented, "I will not join in any vote of censure against him". Neither I would have, if the Kaine-Collaery Government had continued. I continue to argue today that, in himself, when he is at his best - and I have to say that I have also seen him at his worst - Trevor Kaine is the ablest member of the Assembly for the task of Chief Minister.

6 June 1991

He speaks well, as we have seen today. He has a good grasp of the principles of accounting and economic management. In that area, he is professionally better qualified than other members of the Assembly. He also has excellent experience first in the armed forces and subsequently in business. He performs his public duties well. But so, too, might it be said of many other members of the Assembly that they would also be excellent Chief Ministers. He is also the selected head of one of the larger political parties in the Assembly.

But, unfortunately for Mr Kaine and for the ACT, the ship of state went on the rocks in the month of May. We all watched as the unfortunate confrontation between the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister erupted, beginning with the ill-advised statement at the CARD lunch. The joint party room had again been bypassed, as I had seen several times. Decisions were declared before consultation. Others have made mention of this, and I endorse their comments. This arbitrary process continued to the point where Mr Kaine formally dismissed Mr Collaery and therefore, by association, Mr Jensen. All three Residents Rally members found themselves again on the back benches.

At that point - at the point of that dismissal - the Kaine-Collaery Government was at an end; any commitment I had to the Kaine Government was over, and any promise of continuing support had been negated. The matter then escalated beyond a vote of censure to a formal vote of no confidence.

It gives me no pleasure to be involved in this vote of no confidence, but Mr Kaine has to know that our Rally executive of 15 members - that is 12 and the three MLAs - was only one vote short of being unanimous on this matter - 14 out of 15. I repeat my acknowledgment of Mr Kaine's good qualities; but he will be the first to see that, as far as the Residents Rally is concerned, he forfeited that good opinion at the moment he arbitrarily took away Mr Collaery's commission as a Minister. Again, where was the accord, which I had seen violated on previous occasions, and one violation of which had preceded my own resignation from his Government? I have also to remind him of our differences over schools and school sites, over many planning and leasing issues, and especially over that planning issue related to Civic Square and section 19. Alas, we seem to be irrevocably opposed on that issue.

In personal terms, I continue to wish Mr Kaine well; but as a member of the Residents Rally I cannot now continue to support him as Chief Minister. I therefore support this motion.

MR MOORE (5.26): Mr Speaker, on 5 December 1989 I said to Trevor Kaine, through you, Mr Speaker:

Allow me to provide just one small warning by quoting from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* ...:

Let me have men about me that are fat ... and such as sleep o' nights: Yond Cassius has a lean and hungry look ... such men are dangerous.

I then went on to congratulate Mr Kaine on his coup and I said to him at that stage:

It will require all your ability and all your own integrity to keep it together.

And, of course, that was not possible. The Alliance Government was founded on self-interest and it has foundered on self-interest. We have heard time and time again the argument that it was there for stable government. In the last two and a bit years that I have been a member of this Assembly, I have heard that term "stable government" used again and again. And every time I hear it I hear something being covered up. Stable government seems to be the excuse used for almost anything.

It is interesting and it is ironic that members of the Residents Rally and members of the Liberal Party have suddenly regained an enthusiasm for collegiate government. They were not interested in collegiate government; they were not interested in consultation; they were not interested in being able to allow other members to participate fairly in the business of this Assembly; no, they would get their numbers together. But now, when they are on the back foot, they are interested in some form of collegiate government.

I said also on 5 December:

... I now seek an assurance from you, Mr Kaine ... that the discussion and the openness that has been a part and parcel of this minority government will continue with the new Government; and that the debates will be in the open, in this Assembly, where members of the crossbenches, Mr Stevenson and I, can continue debating each issue on its merits.

Let me take you back now to the debate on the interim planning legislation a year after that statement. I debated long and hard over a series of issues on which I was well aware that members of the Rally in particular, and other members of this house, agreed with me wholeheartedly. But was there an open debate? Was there anything open? Were issues debated on their merits? Not at all. Rather, the contrary.

6 June 1991

The issues that we are dealing with in this no-confidence motion are really the issues that are of most concern to the people of Canberra. They are issues about planning, health, education, the leasehold system and the environment. On the planning issues, I believe that it is very important that the Chief Planner have direct responsibility to the Minister for planning. Under the Kaine Government, the Chief Planner had to go through the Office of Industry and Development in that line to the Chief Minister.

It was under that Alliance Government that the destruction of the neighbourhood schools was seen as an education issue. Certainly, it was an education issue to a certain extent, but by isolating it as an education issue on its own they failed to see the significance of what they were doing. Those neighbourhood schools are really about a planning issue - a planning issue that makes the school the centre, an integral part, and the heart of a neighbourhood in Canberra. If they had understood that, they may have understood what it is that motivates people to try to protect their school and to protect that heart.

With reference to the schools, I have prepared an amendment to the Schools Authority (Amendment) Bill, which I will read:

The Minister shall, upon commencement of this Act, direct the Authority to:

... reopen the primary schools at Cook and Lyons by the first day of third term 1991 as fully functioning primary schools ...

Had the situation today turned out differently - had we had a situation where Trevor Kaine was going to continue in a minority government - I was prepared to put that amendment. It will still stay with me, but I understand that the incoming Chief Minister has given assurances that those schools will be opened, and I will expect it to be done as quickly as possible. If it is not, then it will be the responsibility of the Assembly as a whole to look at a Bill like that and, of course, I would be prepared to put it up. But, in the initial instance, I think it appropriate to allow somebody who has given a commitment to carry that commitment out.

No matter which way the government went today, there was going to be a decision that those schools - the hearts of those neighbourhoods - be reopened, because the majority of members of this Assembly believe that to be the case. The excuse of stable government - and that is what it always was - and that alliance founded on self-interest destroyed the ability of the people of Canberra to be represented. They were represented on many occasions by a minority vote of five people - five out of 17 - because it was five out of 10 carrying motions within the joint party room, or perhaps six on occasions.

In terms of health, it will be very interesting to see what damage has already been done by this Alliance Government and what can be done to return the Royal Canberra Hospital to a hospital. Hopefully, we will be able to get it to a community hospital. I accept the concepts behind a principal hospital, but I do not accept that the Royal Canberra Hospital should be used as anything other than a hospital. It is something that I will be working within this Assembly to ensure, and I believe that the majority of members of this Assembly will go down that line. There are other issues within health that are also critical, and they will come up for discussion in an open forum in this Assembly. They will include the concepts of health promotion and community health. We will look at the community nursing centres, we will look at postnatal depression, and we will look at other issues to do with health. And they will be dealt with in open forum.

Similarly, in education, I have already mentioned the schools at Cook and Lyons, but there are also schools at Hackett, Holder and North Curtin. In the cases of Cook and Lyons, it is quite clear that there is a very different situation that can be dealt with immediately. In the cases of Hackett and Holder, if those communities - represented by a majority of their own community in appropriately called general meetings of their community associations - are interested in opening their schools, perhaps on a K to 3 level to start off with, then I am prepared to support that and I am prepared to push it. It is entirely up to the community. There are issues that must be dealt with in terms of leasehold. There is no point in reiterating some of the issues that were raised by Mr Connolly earlier and the debates that I have had with Mr Kaine over leasehold.

Today I noticed in this morning's paper the fact that this Alliance Government had made a \$3m offer to AGC to buy back section 52. For those who do not know section 52, it is the car park site opposite the Parkroyal and opposite the Boulevard theatres. Of course, because the lease conditions have been broken, this community is entitled to terminate that lease. It is entitled to take that land back because that firm has not met the lease conditions. In fact, what has happened here may have been the most appropriate way to go about it, and that is something that needs to be looked into. The whole administration of the leasehold system needs to be taken out into the open and the best possible options considered. The best possible options, particularly for renewal of leases, whether they be residential or commercial, should be considered.

It is my own personal view that these options should at least include the renewal of leases on a rental basis, so that the leasehold system is put back on the basis upon which it was founded - that is, a landlord and tenant relationship - so that this community can have the advantage of having the wealth that it has in the land. We are a very fortunate community, and this system needs to be

6 June 1991

protected because those leases and our leasehold system can so easily be given over to the advantage of 30 or 40 people in Canberra instead of the community as a whole.

There are environmental issues that are significant. We have seen the Joint Parliamentary Committee on the ACT recently recommend a light rail system and no freeways from Gungahlin. That is an important issue; but even more critical than that issue, on an environmental basis - and it overlaps, of course, with the planning issues - is the decentralisation of the town centres in the ACT, so that, no matter how people travel, whether by car or preferably by public transport, their trips are short because they can live near where they work. It is a social justice issue. It is recognised federally as a social justice issue. Every other city in Australia is trying to decentralise its employment. We have the chance to do that; yet we have seen a massive effort to try to centralise our planning. Just across the road from us we have the Taxation Office planning to employ more people in Civic and attempting to get a 40,000 square metre area in which to accommodate about 2,000 more workers. We are not ready. That will happen in due time, but at this stage those workers ought be provided in areas like Tuggeranong where we need the employment.

This Government that we have seen has not been a consultative government. I think the clearest indication of that has been the difficulty we have had over the committees. Whichever minority government had taken power today, the same situation would have applied. It is very important for us to rely on the work of those committees. We need to ensure that they are adequately funded and to provide support where necessary, perhaps by seconding people from policy sections within departments so that we do not raise any further cost. It is very important that they be supported appropriately and that members use that opportunity to make their compromises. The committees can work well. I refer to the one that I know best has worked well, and that is the Committee on HIV, Illegal Drugs and Prostitution. It has been a great credit to Mrs Nolan and Mr Wood, and I must say that I have been delighted in working with them on that.

I use that as only one example, but I recognise that every member here has been on a committee that has worked well and some people, such as Mrs Nolan, would have been on a lot more committees than other people, of course. I think that that is our real chance for getting a collegiate form of government working. It is not a collegiate form of government in the sense that Mr Jensen meant. I understand that, but we have what we have at the moment and I think that we can at least make it work. With a minority government we can make it work in order to go for some consultation.

My decision in supporting this no-confidence motion - which I am going to do - is best illustrated, I think, by looking at the paper entitled "Alliance Government - Major Achievements" that has been tabled. I am not saying that this document made my decision; it did not. I have only just seen it and I had made my decision last night. This decision is most aptly illustrated by opening up to nearly the last page where it says, "Bills introduced and passed by the Alliance Government". The Bills were introduced, and sometimes pushed through, by the Alliance Government; but what it should have read was, "Bills introduced by the Alliance Government and passed by this Assembly". It is this Assembly that is the body holding the power here. It is the critical factor. By the way, while I am on that "Major Achievements" document, there are many important achievements that have been made, and many of those issues I have supported.

The critical path that we have now with a minority government is that we can debate the issues. It is an appropriate time to take personalities out of it - as much as possible, because it is probably not possible to do so entirely - and to concentrate on the issues as much as we possibly can. I have made my decision because I believe that, on the issues that affect Canberra most, Canberra people will be better off having a Labor government under Rosemary Follett as Chief Minister.

MRS NOLAN (5.41): Mr Speaker, today in this debate we have heard much about who should be Chief Minister and who should govern this Territory. I must say that, since the former Deputy Chief Minister was sacked early last week, much speculation has been put forward by many people - many, I hate to say, pursuing their own egos rather than what is best for Canberra. I am not sure this afternoon that the Rally members even know why they are supporting this no-confidence motion. Perhaps it is that they are still hurting - or Mr Collaery is still hurting because he was sacked last week as Deputy Chief Minister.

Mr Collaery: That is why we appointed David Read to do the negotiations.

MRS NOLAN: I certainly have not heard anything this afternoon that gives me any reasons at all as to why the Rally should be supporting a no-confidence motion this afternoon. But they have decided that that is the path they are going to go down. I must say that I wish Rosemary Follett well, because five minutes after they decide to go one way they could perhaps go the other.

The one thing I do need to say is that on this motion this afternoon it appears that people have made their decisions on the way they will vote without necessarily taking into account the view of the community or giving any consideration to the people. Again, it has been about self-interest and their own egos. We have not heard much about what would be best for Canberra. We have certainly

6 June 1991

heard about only what the individual members of this Assembly are going to do and how they are going to vote. For quite a while I was wondering just how the Rally members were in fact going to vote.

Mr Collaery said a little earlier that that was the reason why he appointed David Read to do the negotiations; I think they are the correct words. Well, he did not negotiate with me; but certainly, if what I have read in the paper was accurate, it was a funny way to negotiate.

It is most important that we should be looking at self-government for this Territory and the way that it has been seen around the rest of Australia. It certainly has not been seen in a good light. Some of the decisions taken today by some of the members form one of the reasons why, in fact, that light is not so good. It is a pity. They have taken their course of action and obviously they are going to look at the consequences when it comes to the next election which, really, is not going to be all that far away.

It was not going to be easy for Trevor Kaine as Chief Minister with a minority government. It is not going to be easy for Rosemary Follett as Chief Minister with a minority government. Perhaps, on reflection, it might be easier if the Canberra community went to an election after August and then really determined the people that they would like to see representing them in this Assembly.

Something that we have not heard much about this afternoon has been the private sector. The private sector certainly was referred to by Mr Kaine in his speech, but we really have to give consideration to where our children are going to get jobs if it is not in the private sector. I have two children; many members of this Assembly have children. I think that much more consideration should be given to attracting business to this city. It is something that has not been done as well as it should have been. Obviously we have seen the list of Alliance Government achievements. I recognise that there have been some very good ones. There have perhaps been some that have not been so good. But it is very difficult when you are in an alliance of three political groupings, obviously, to go full steam ahead and achieve as perhaps we would have been able to do if we had had a majority in our own right.

There are many other things that I could mention here this afternoon, not only in terms of achievements but also in terms of the difficult time I have had in my role as whip. It has not been an easy role. It is very difficult, looking at the number of groupings. I have to say that for the last 12 months the Rally wanted that position; it seemed to be some sort of coveted position. I am not quite sure why. Perhaps they can tell me some time why it was so important for them to have that particular position.

It is a pity that, as Mr Collaery said earlier, the marriage did come to an end. It did, but there is no good in smarting about it and now suddenly turning around and going full steam at 180 degrees - "Let us vote for the other side". I am looking forward to seeing how long they are going to be supporting the other side. I am quite sure that it will not be very long before they change their position - or change their spots, if you like - and end up then wishing that they had perhaps not supported the no-confidence motion this afternoon.

One of the things that I do believe that we in this Government have been able to achieve - it has not been easy in this situation; financially we have been very much hindered - is that we certainly have not left the Territory with the same sort of financial problems that the other States around Australia have. It is still not going to be easy over the next few years, as we see a situation whereby there will be significantly fewer dollars than there were prior to self-government. That had nothing to do with self-government. That was purely a situation whereby the Federal Labor Party decided that it did not want to any longer manage the Territory and it decided to hand it back to the people - but it took lots of money from them at the same time.

I should mention one thing. It relates to the Residents Rally in government and out of government. I had this reminder last night when John Brown was speaking at the TAFE graduation dinner. He was talking about the roller-coaster ride that the priorities of government had taken under previous Federal Ministers. He talked of the time when he was Minister for tourism, when the third runway was a priority and a casino for Canberra was on the bottom rung of the ladder. He went on to say that the next Territories Minister came along and the casino became a top priority and the third runway appeared on the bottom rung. And then the next Federal Minister came along, et cetera, et cetera.

One thing is very sure: The Liberal Party has clearly articulated its policies. It went to the election with clear, decisive policies. And, while obviously not all of them have been implemented because we have had a situation whereby we have been within an alliance, at least people knew what those policies were. It is a little bit more difficult for some of the other political groupings, and I am sure that the people will tell the test when the next election comes around.

MR PROWSE (5.49): The concern of this community is for stable, consistent and responsible government. We have heard that today and it still is the fact. It has been in the past and it will ever be. The budget brought down by the Chief Minister this year has addressed the major problems that we are confronted with. The dwindling Commonwealth funding is being made up from our own resources, and that is an important issue.

6 June 1991

Responsible government demands that we live within our means. The Alliance Government has made the transition to that position a feasible reality. Responsible government is not only about fiscal restraint or coming to terms with the determinations of an uncooperative Federal Government; it is also about maintaining services. This is a most difficult task for any government, but it is all but impossible in a nation when it is in recession and at the same time significant funding cuts are also imposed on us by the Federal Treasurer. It is an almost impossible task, and the Chief Minister has brought us through that.

The Kaine Government deserves applause and accolades from the people of the ACT for good government in a most adverse situation. Our transport and urban services are still envied by the rest of Australia. Our health and education services remain of the highest quality. Our record on creating employment, reducing youth unemployment, providing social security services and caring for those in our community who are disabled and disadvantaged is equal to, if not better than, any of the other States.

The Government has put in place programs to promote multiculturalism and all the versatility and cultural richness that that brings with it. Our urban and natural environment has been planned and managed to provide not only a beautiful garden setting for our daily lives but also a variety of facilities for recreation. The ACT is one of the few wilderness-conserving States or Territories.

Unfortunately, we have before us today a motion from the Leader of the Opposition which has a destabilising effect on the whole of the ACT community. The arguments presented by many of the members during this debate have been based on what can now be achieved by a minority government. The point I would make is that the Kaine minority Government was not given a chance. We have had to appeal and to act as a majority government in an alliance that was not working.

You are about to change your colours, you are about to change your vote, you are about to change government, on the basis that you can now control this Assembly in a minority government situation. I put it to you, and this is the last chance you will have: Give the Kaine minority Government a chance. You have not seen them in action; you have never seen the Kaine minority government in action. So, I say to you, give the man a chance.

Much has been said about Mr Kaine's personal style of man management and leadership. He is aggressive and, at times, difficult to deal with. So what? This is the claim that we got from the Residents Rally; that they could not cope with Mr Kaine's position.

Mr Collaery: None of us said that.

MR PROWSE: I agree that it has not been said today, but it has been said on a number of occasions. What I am coming back to again is: So what? This may be due to his service background, and there may be a better method of dealing with politicians; but no-one can deny that Mr Kaine is always immutable and forthright and does not vacillate, and that is the thing we are going to get in some areas in this parliament from now on. He does not vacillate.

These attributes, to my mind, are the most important qualities of a leader. You know where you stand. We, the people of the ACT, need a firm hand to guide us through these most difficult times. I therefore give my full support to Trevor Kaine.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call Mr Duby.

Mr Moore: The anchorman.

MR DUBY (Minister for Finance and Urban Services) (5.53): I like that description.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I have a lot of speech notes here that I was going to use today in this matter of no confidence in the Government. Of course, what they have addressed quite adequately is all the good things that we, as the Alliance Government, have achieved over a period of time, something like 18 or 19 months. What I was going to say was, first of all, how grateful we as a government were to be in a position to do that and, secondly, how grateful we were to have had the likes of Mr Collaery, Mr Jensen and Dr Kinloch to assist us through those difficult times.

I have decided not to continue along the lines of that speech because what I have heard this afternoon and tonight makes it fairly apparent to me that clearly this no-confidence motion in Mr Kaine as Chief Minister, and by reflection this no-confidence motion in this Alliance Government, is going to be successful. I assume, the silly that I am, that, whilst I accept the Labor Party's view and whilst I accept Mr Moore's view, what I have heard from the Rally members this afternoon still applies, even though the time is now five minutes to six and they last made those statements some two hours ago. One never knows.

Mr Jensen: Not a problem, Craig.

MR DUBY: It is always a problem, Mr Jensen, in dealing with you and Mr Collaery; but, I must admit, strangely enough, not Dr Kinloch. I am personally very disappointed that it is apparent that this no-confidence motion is going to succeed. Having listened to Mr Stevenson's speech, I am still not all that sure which way he is going to vote.

Mrs Nolan: He is abstaining.

6 June 1991

MR DUBY: I am still not sure which way he is going to go. It is clear that this no-confidence motion in this Government is going to be passed, God forbid, on the voices of Mr Collaery, Mr Jensen and Dr Kinloch. So be it. There is nothing we can do about that. We cannot make them change their minds. We have tried to talk reasonably with them over a long period - and I am talking about a period of some 18 months. I am particularly disappointed since, having listened to the words that Dr Kinloch said - and I am starting with you first, Dr Kinloch - I know for a fact that he has on a number of occasions, both in writing and verbally, given a commitment, not only to Mr Kaine and not only to the other members of this Government, but also to me - - -

Dr Kinloch: The Kaine-Collaery Government.

MR DUBY: The Kaine-Collaery-Duby Government.

Mr Collaery: Savour the words.

MR DUBY: Yes, precisely. I know that on a number of occasions you have told me, with your hand on your breast, "I can assure you that I will never ever vote against Trevor as Chief Minister".

Dr Kinloch: That was before he sacked Bernard.

MR DUBY: Nevertheless, that was the assurance. We then get onto the issue of whether he sacked Mr Collaery or not. Of course, you, through your own actions, absented yourself from joint party room action. Let the record show this, because I am going to say what the truth of the matter is. On Tuesday night of last week, both Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen - as I indicated in my speech here last Wednesday - said that they disagreed with a certain line of action and accordingly Mr Collaery said, "As Leader of the Rally" - and I remember that phrase - "I now declare to you that the Rally is no longer a member of this Government". That was on the Tuesday night.

Mr Moore: It was a negotiating technique. You were supposed to crawl to him and get him to come back.

MR DUBY: That may well have been the case. Strangely enough, that coincides with a conversation that I have subsequently had with the president of the Residents Rally, who described to me how he never dreamt that Mr Kaine's action would be taken. He said, "We pushed you so far so many times before, we never thought you would do it". That is the fact of the matter. Mr Collaery knows it, Mr Jensen knows it, and you have noticed that they are not jumping to their feet and saying that this is an incorrect version.

The fact is that Mr Collaery has made a lot of points - as has Mr Jensen - about the fact that they were supposedly sacked. The letter arrived on the Wednesday morning as a result of the Tuesday night discussions that were held in

government, those very meetings where both Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen said, "If this is going to be the circumstance, we can no longer be part of this Government". The rest of the group said, "So be it". So, this is all baloney about, "I never knew that I was going to get sacked"; "I never knew that we were going to get booted"; "I never knew that we were going to get the chuck".

Mr Moore: Who said that?

MR DUBY: The question is, "Who said that?". I have heard a number of times, Bernard, that you have said quite categorically, "I never knew that I was going to get sacked".

Mr Collaery: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker.

MR DUBY: Mr Speaker, on a number of occasions Mr Collaery has said, "I never knew that I was going to get sacked". The fact of the matter is that Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen resigned from this Government on the Tuesday evening. There is no question about it.

Mr Moore: It was just his negotiating style.

MR DUBY: That was subsequently borne out. The comment, that it was just a negotiating style, has subsequently been borne out by discussions that I have had with the president of the Residents Rally; nevertheless, I am still greatly disappointed that somehow this Alliance Government has come to an end, and it clearly has, by the look of things.

Mr Speaker, I cannot wait for the nominations for the new Chief Minister. It is going to be a lot of fun, is it not, folks? Anyone with a sensible head can work out what is going to happen. The logical thing is that, if Ms Follett can move a no-confidence motion against this Government, she should be the new leader of the ACT Government. So be it. That is the Labor Party's position. That is what its members have worked very hard to do. That is their job - to try to achieve government - and they have been effective in doing that. But I cannot wait for the machinations that are going to occur come the vote for Chief Minister, because I know and you know and everyone here knows, including all the people in the gallery, that some enormous surprises are going to be sprung on us.

Mr Moore: Will you join me, Craig?

MR DUBY: I have heard a call from Mr Moore, saying, will I join him? Mr Moore, I am flexible. The remarkable thing is, of course, that we are in this position; and we are in this position for no other reason, it appears to me - and I will say this to Bernard, I will say this to Norm and I will say it to Hector - than because of a fit of pique. The bottom line is that somehow all this has stemmed from the fact that Mr Collaery never got the opportunity to resign.

6 June 1991

Silly me; if only I had thought that through, Chief Minister. You know what I would have recommended, because I have been reasonably effective, I think, in maintaining relationships between the Liberal Party and the Residents Rally. It never occurred to me that a simple matter like that, particularly after we already had a verbal resignation, would lead to this; but that is where we are. I think that what we are going to see - and I cannot see any other alternative, although undoubtedly there are other alternatives - is a Follett Labor administration in this Territory for the next seven months. Good luck to you, because you are going to need it.

Mr Kaine: That is as long as Bernard supports you, but wait for it.

MR DUBY: Hang on, now. We can only stand these things once every six months or so. I think you are going to be in power, clearly, I would imagine, between now and the next election, which I assume is going to be in February. Good luck to you. You are going to need it, because the situation that the Territory faces is a disastrous one. We are facing an absolutely astronomical position in terms of the financial arrangements that this Territory and its citizens have to live under.

Whatever the Residents Rally has achieved by putting you in place I do not know. Its members have clearly thought it through and they have decided that that is the way that they are going to go. So be it. I must admit that I have given up trying to work out what goes on in the minds of not only the three members but also the executive of this party that is not a party.

The only other thing I need to say is that we conducted a sweep on the fifth floor today and I have a funny feeling that out of the 23 - - -

Mr Collaery: Who is the chook?

MR DUBY: I do not know who the chook is; but, Bernard, I certainly know who the turkey is. The bottom line is, strangely enough, that I have a funny feeling that at the end of the day, Chief Minister, out of the 23 combinations of numbers - and I have the \$23 here - there is not going to be a winning combination. It was not taken into account. Given those circumstances, I think it is safe to say that the \$23 will now be donated to the Salvation Army appeal.

Chief Minister, it has been an honour to serve you.

Mr Kaine: It has been fun while it has lasted.

MR DUBY: It has been a real honour to serve you. The same goes for my government colleagues, including Mr Humphries, of course, who has been badly dealt with by some members opposite. Nevertheless, I know for a fact that Mr Humphries is a man of integrity and he is a very capable person. By removing Trevor Kaine from this position, in my view the Territory is suffering a great loss. To my other colleagues in government, both present and former, I say thank you very much for a most enjoyable time.

MR SPEAKER: As this motion, under standing order 81, must be carried by an absolute majority, I propose to call a vote.

The bells being rung -

Mr Duby: Mr Speaker, all members are present, with the exception of Mr Stevenson, who clearly intends to abstain. I think the vote should be taken.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you for your observation, Mr Duby. Is it the will of the Assembly to get on with the vote? There being no objection, that course will be followed.

Question put:

That the motion (**Ms Follett's**) be agreed to.

The Assembly voted -

AYES, 9

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

NOES, 7

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

Question so resolved in the affirmative, by an absolute majority.

6 June 1991

ELECTION OF CHIEF MINISTER

MR SPEAKER: The next business is the election of a Chief Minister.

MR BERRY: Mr Speaker, I nominate Rosemary Follett. I move:

That Ms Follett be elected Chief Minister for the Territory.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts): Mr Speaker, I nominate Trevor Kaine. I move:

That Mr Kaine be elected Chief Minister for the Territory.

MR SPEAKER: Members, is there any further proposal?

The time for proposals has expired. Debate may proceed, if desired.

There being more than one candidate proposed, the election of a Chief Minister will proceed by ballot. Pursuant to standing order 3(f), the bells will now be rung and a ballot taken.

A ballot having been taken -

MR SPEAKER: Members, the result of the ballot is: Ms Follett nine votes; Mr Kaine seven votes. Ms Follett, the candidate with the majority of votes, is declared elected as Chief Minister.

FOLLETT GOVERNMENT Ministerial Statement

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister): Mr Speaker, is it appropriate for me to seek leave at this moment to make a very short statement?

Leave granted.

MS FOLLETT: I thank members. I would like to thank the Assembly for electing me as Chief Minister. It is certainly not a task that I undertake lightly, nor would I ever undertake such a task lightly. I believe that there are particular difficulties involved in leading a minority government, which is the position that I will be in. It is my intention to begin by honouring the undertakings that I gave in my speech this afternoon; that is, the undertakings on schools, on the hospital system and on the leasehold system.

We will be seeking leave at a later stage to make a statement about ministerial arrangements and about the Government's program. I think it has been a long enough day on this matter already. But I do give an absolute commitment to working in as open and as consultative manner as is possible, both with the community and with all groups in the Assembly.

Mr Speaker, again I thank the Assembly for electing me as Chief Minister, and I look forward to working in a productive manner and in the best interests of the Territory.

ELECTION OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

MR SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the Assembly to proceed with the election of a Leader of the Opposition? There being no objection, that course will be followed.

MR HUMPHRIES (Minister for Health, Education and the Arts): Mr Speaker, I nominate Trevor Kaine. I move:

That Mr Kaine be elected Leader of the Opposition.

MR SPEAKER: Is there any further proposal?

The time for proposals has now expired. There being only one candidate, I declare Mr Kaine, the member proposed, to have been elected as Leader of the Opposition.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURES - STANDING COMMITTEE Report - Proposed Ethics Committee/Code of Conduct

MR SPEAKER: Members, I present to the Assembly the report of the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedures inquiry into the proposed ethics committee/code of conduct, together with extracts from the minutes of proceedings.

6 June 1991

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES - SELECT COMMITTEE
Alteration of Reporting Requirements

MR WOOD: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion concerning the report of the Select Committee on Cultural Activities and Facilities.

Leave granted.

MR WOOD: Mr Speaker, I move:

That -

- (1) if the Assembly is not sitting when the Select Committee on Cultural Activities and Facilities has completed its inquiry, the committee may send its report to the Speaker or, in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker who is authorised to give directions for its printing and circulation; and
- (2) the foregoing provisions of this resolution have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders.

The committee has completed its inquiry and I thank Mr Stefaniak and Dr Kinloch for their efforts.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

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

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent order of the day, No. 1, executive business, relating to the resumption of debate on agreement in principle on the Supply Bill 1991-92, being called on forthwith.

SUPPLY BILL 1991-92

Debate resumed from 28 May 1991, on motion by **Mr Duby**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a very short statement concerning the Supply Bill.

Leave granted.

MS FOLLETT: I thank the Assembly. Mr Speaker, when Mr Duby introduced this Bill and we, the Labor members, examined it, we did have some reservations about it and some of the amounts included in it. I am sure members are aware that it is in the nature of a housekeeping Bill. The usual basis for framing a Supply Bill is to include five-twelfths of last year's budgeted amount to provide for five months of government services.

It seemed to us, on examination of the Bill, that the strict reading of five-twelfths of last year's budgeted amount was not always the figure reflected in it. We had intended to question Mr Duby in the detail stage of debate on the basis for the figures in his Bill. There might, of course, be reasons such as seasonal expenditure, or other matters, which explain the figures.

In the circumstances, Mr Speaker, I have decided to proceed with the Supply Bill as drafted by Mr Duby rather than cause confusion and perhaps a lot of extra work, which would be required to withdraw it and introduce a new Bill. Mr Speaker, I indicated at the time that Mr Duby introduced the Bill that we would pass supply. That was an unequivocal undertaking. It is a most important matter, to enable the continued operation of Territory services and so on. I hope that if there is any deficiency in supply the Assembly may be able to deal with the matter later in the year.

I thank members for their courtesy in allowing me to speak a second time on the Bill. I trust that the Supply Bill will receive unanimous support.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

6 June 1991

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Motion (by **Ms Follett**) agreed to:

That the Assembly, at its rising, adjourn until a date and hour to be fixed by the Speaker either at the request of the Chief Minister or on receipt of a request in writing from an absolute majority of members and that the date and time of meeting shall be notified by the Speaker to each member in writing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MEMBER

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

That leave of absence from 7 June to 6 August 1991 be given to Mr Moore.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion (by **Ms Follett**) agreed to:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Assembly adjourned at 6.26 pm until a date and hour to be fixed

Blank page.

6 June 1991

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 398

Hospitals - Nurse Vacancies

MR BERRY - Asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts on notice on 7 April 1991:

Since 5 December 1989, both Royal Canberra Hospitals and also Calvary Hospital

- (1) How many times and in which publications has the Government advertised vacancies for enrolled nurses.
- (2) How many times and in which publications has the Government advertised vacancies for nurses.
- (3) How many responses were there in each case.
- (4) How much did it cost to advertise these vacancies.
- (5) How many vacant positions exist for enrolled nurses, in what areas are these vacancies and how long have they been vacant.
- (6) How many vacant positions exist for nurses, in what areas are these vacancies and how long have they been vacant.

MR HUMPHRIES -The answer to Mr Berry's questions are as follows :

- (1) Advertisements for Enrolled Nurses were placed in The Canberra Times on two occasions. It should be noted that there is a minimal turnover of Enrolled Nurses at both Royal Canberra Hospital North and South.
- (2) 72 advertisements for nurses were placed. 44 of these were published in the Staff Bulletin with the remaining 28 published in the Commonwealth Gazette, The Canberra Times and other local media, The Sydney Morning Herald, the Weekend Australian and professional publication such as the Army nursing publication Grey and Scarlet.
- (3) It is not possible to calculate the number of responses. Employment queries are received on a daily basis, sometimes in response to advertisement and sometimes not. Some queries take the form of written applications while many are telephone enquiries.
- (4) I have been advised that the advertising costs are in the vicinity of \$37000.

2243

(5) Staffing levels at Royal Canberra Hospital are being constantly reviewed as the amalgamation of services takes place. Vacancies for Enrolled Nurses are being filled from within in the first instance, with outside applicants being placed as the need arises. There is not a significant number of current vacancies nor has there been for some months.

(6) Staffing levels at Royal Canberra Hospital are being constantly reviewed as the amalgamation of services takes place. Generally speaking the availability of skilled nurses has improved in recent times although there are still shortages in some specialist areas such as psychiatric nursing. Vacancies for Registered Nurses are being filled from within in the first instance, with outside applicants being placed as the need arises.

2244

6 June 1991

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

Question No 399

Private Hospital

MR BERRY Asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts upon notice on 17 April 1991.

(1) How many submissions have been received to construct, and manage the 150 bed private hospital on the shores of Lake Ginninderra which you announced as part of your Government's Hospital Redevelopment Plan.

(2) Are any of the submissions for the construction and management of a private hospital of different size; if so, how many beds have been proposed.

(3) Will the Government give consideration for a private hospital with less than 150 beds and, if so, what is the minimum number of beds the Government will accept.

MR KAINE. The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1) A number of applications were received. At this stage, it would be inappropriate to indicate the actual number as the Government is still in negotiation with the applicants to finalise all bids. As soon as the assessment process is finalised, I will provide further details.

(2) The majority of the applications received undertook to construct a hospital containing 150 beds with one proposal of 140 beds.

(3) The requirements contained within the Expression of Interest document required the hospital to be of 150 beds or similar, with the final number to be agreed with the Department of Health.

The first 60 beds are to be commissioned before the end of 1992, with the remainder being progressively brought on line as soon as possible thereafter and no later than the end of 1994.

2245

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 12 MARCH 1991

Weston Creek Health Centre

MR MOORE -Asked the Minister for Health Education and the Arts :

How much money was spent by the Government on alterations to Weston Creek Health Centre in preparation for the movement of the Therapy Centre before the move was aborted because of a tenant, Dr Reeve, could not be moved? And, why did the Ministry not check Dr Reeves lease before work began?

MR HUMPHRIES -The answer to Mr Moores question is :

Some work was commenced on the re-fit for the move of the Therapy Centre. This construction work, which commenced as part of the Therapy Centre, has been incorporated into construction requirements for the Independent Living Centre. No extra cost was involved.

The move of the Therapy Centre was not possible because of delays caused by picket action at South Curtin and Weston Creek.

Negotiations with Dr Reeve have been proceeding since it was decided that the Independent Living Centre would relocate to Weston Creek.

Although there was no legal base why Dr Reeve could not be moved, I decided, that negotiation was a better method than legal means.

2246

6 June 1991

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 13 MARCH 1991

Fluoride

MR STEVENSON -asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts.

I refer the Minister to a letter from the Australian Dental Association regarding fluoride which was sent to his office dated 15 February 1991. I was sent a copy of that letter. Paragraph 2 of the letter states the following:

The total fluoride ingested by individuals can be readily determined by urine analysis techniques. The methodology is well established and reliable and is not invasive, costly or otherwise troublesome to implement.

My questions are as follows, they number four. Firstly, how would this be done?, Secondly, what scientific evidence is there to suggest that urinalysis is effective in the determination of total fluoride ingestion? Thirdly, where in the world is this used on a community basis? And fourthly, where in Australia would these tests be made?

MR HUMPHRIES -the answers to Mr Stevensons questions on a possible study of fluoride levels are:

A study could be undertaken on a statistically selected population sample to obtain 24 hour urine samples for urinalysis to estimate the daily total fluoride intake.

Evidence from the World Health Organisation publication Fluoride and Human Healthl. States Persons who have for a long time been resident in communities where the water contains fluoride, ...ultimately excrete each day an amount of fluoride essentially equivalent to the amount taken in², it goes on to observe that in fluoride analysis, 24 hour samples are more reliable and should be collected if the data for a single individual are to form the basis for decisions and interpretations. ,³

1 World Health Organisation: Fluoride and Health, Geneva, 1970, P. 147.

2 World Health Organisation: Fluoride and Health, Geneva, 1970, P.147

3 World Health Organisation: Fluoride and Health, Geneva, 1970, P. 150

2247

This method takes into account all sources of fluoride. Samples for analysis would need to be obtained from several hundred subjects and advice would be needed on the structure of the sample with respect to such things as age, residential and working locations, time resident in the ACT and similar variables.

In Australia, the most recent urinalysis study along similar lines was undertaken by Dooland and Carr in Adelaide although, since the sampling involved pre-school children, they did not use a 24 hour sample but employed a more complex estimation involving creatinine fluoride relationship. This study was reported in the Australia Dental Journal.

In the event that a study along the lines suggested by the Australian Dental Association was warranted, the ACT Government Analyst would be equipped both in expertise and facilities but not resources to carry out the tests involved.

Australian Dental Journal
December 1985. Volume 30, No 6

2248

6 June 1991

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 13.3.1991

Motor Vehicle Servicing

MR CONNOLLY -asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts:

What is the governments policy on the servicing of Department of Health vehicles, that is the SES vehicles, Health Surveillance, Community Nursing Service, etcetera, and does the Government plan to change the prcedures for servicing of these vehicles?

MR HUMPHRIES -the answer to Mr Connollys question is :

The Government decided with the Corporatisation of Health Services Supply Centre as of 1 July 1991, that the Board of Health vehicles would continue to be serviced at the Mitchell garage for a period of twelve months.

2249

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 14 MARCH 1991

Slow-Stream Rehabilitation Unit

MR BERRY -asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts:

What are the projected recurrent costs for the Slow Stream Rehabilitation Unit to be located at the Acton Peninsula, and what will be the impact of this service on the budget for the current Rehabilitation and Aged Care Unit?

MR HUMPHRIES -The answer to Mr Berry .s question is :

The recurrent costs of the Convalescent Care Slow Stream Rehabilitation Unit are estimated at \$1265000 per annum. This figure comprises \$984000 in labour costs and \$281000 in other operating costs. As the Convalescent Care Unit is a new style of service, the Government will allocate the funds to supplement the budget of the current Rehabilitation and Aged Care Unit.

2250

6 June 1991

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 30 APRIL 1991

Hospital Beds

MR MOORE -Asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts

Identify the 772- your figure -772 beds in the combined Royal Canberra, Woden valley Hospitals at that time, what is the number of beds now?

MR HUMPHRIES -the answer to Mr Moores supplementary question is:

The number of available beds in the public hospital system- as at 30 April, 1991 was 908 beds:

HOSPITAL Beds
(no.)

Royal Canberra North 286

Royal Canberra South 431

Calvary 178

Queerl Elizabeth II 13

TOTAL 908

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 2 MAY 1991

Hospital Beds

MR BERRY -Asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts

Mr Humphries, can you tell us how many public hospital beds we have in the ACT at this very moment?

MR HUMPHRIES -the answer to Mr Berrys question is:

The number of available beds in the public hospital system- as at 30 April, 1991 was 908 beds:

HOSPITAL Beds

(no.)

Royal Canberra North 286

Royal Canberra South 431

Calvary 178

Queen Elizabeth II 13

TOTAL 908

2252

6 June 1991

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE ON 2 MAY 1991

Acting Director of Pathology

MR BERRY - asked the Minister for Health, Education and the Arts:

Is the Minister aware that the acting Director of Pathology spends three afternoons per week working for a private pathology company in competition with the Board of Health's Pathology Department? How will the Minister resolve this conflict of interest?

MR HUMPHRIES -the answer to Mr Berry's question is :

The Acting Director of Pathology provides, and has been providing for the past three years, consultative service on patient specimens to a private pathology company, in accordance with the agreement between the ACT Health Authority and the ACT Medical Officers Association, which applies to all salaried Medical Specialists employed by the ACT Board of Health. This agreement allows two sessions of outside employment per week to all Specialists - the Acting Director of Pathology has official approval as per the terms of agreement. There is no conflict of interest involved since the Board of Health's Pathology Department does not compete with the private pathology laboratories in actively obtaining pathology specimens from John James Memorial Hospital and General Practitioners. In fact, since his appointment, the Acting Director of Pathology has contributed significantly in raising standards and the profile of the Pathology Department - a fact acknowledged by ACT Medical Specialists.

2253