



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

14 November 1989

Tuesday, 14 November 1989

Appointment of Clerk of the Assembly	2457
Petition: Pornography	2457
Questions without notice:	
Hospitals	2458
Hospitals.....	2460
Concessions	2464
Hospitals	2464
Canberra Times site	2465
Hospitals	2465
Asbestos removal	2466
Bicycle storage	2467
Hospitals	2467
Grass mowing.....	2468
Personal explanations.....	2469
Planning, Development and Infrastructure - standing committee	2471
Radiotherapy machine.....	2471
Conservation, Heritage and Environment - standing committee	2472
Multifunction polis concept	2473
Motor Traffic (Amendment) Bill (No 3) 1989	2491
Traffic (Amendment) Bill 1989	2495
Adjournment:	
Berlin Wall	2502
Berlin Wall	2503
Holocaust	2505
Holocaust	2506
Holocaust	2507
Holocaust	2509
Answers to questions:	
Horticultural maintenance (Question No 32)	2511
Mowing equipment (Question No 35)	2512
Horticultural machinery (Question No 36)	2512

14 November 1989

Tuesday, 14 November 1989

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

APPOINTMENT OF CLERK OF THE ASSEMBLY

MR SPEAKER: I wish to formally advise the Assembly that Mr M.J. McRae has taken up his appointment as permanent Clerk of this Assembly. On behalf of all members, I welcome him.

PETITION

The Clerk: The following petition has been lodged for presentation, and a copy will be referred to the appropriate Minister:

Pornography

To the Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly.

The humble petition of the undersigned citizens shows that:

- . In June 1988 all State Attorneys-General called upon the Federal Government to ban X-rated videos.
- . It is apparent that a majority of Australians object to the present situation whereby X-rated videos are legally distributed throughout Australia from the Australian Capital Territory, notwithstanding the fact that they are banned in all Australian States.
- . A newspaper survey undertaken in the Australian Capital Territory clearly indicated that the overwhelming majority of ACT citizens want X-rated videos banned.
- . In particular, concerned citizens object to X-rated video material as detrimental to the status of women and harmful to children.

Your petitioners therefore ask the Assembly to exercise the powers available to it to prohibit the distribution of X-rated video material within and from

14 November 1989

the Australian Capital Territory. Your petitioners also call upon the Assembly to use all means within its capabilities to influence the Federal Government to ban the importation, production and distribution of X-rated and excessively violent R-rated videos in Australia. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

by **Mr Kaine** (from 13 citizens).

Petition received.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Hospitals

MR DUBY: My question is directed to the Minister for Community Services and Health. I refer to recent publicity concerning a reported budget blow-out of \$10m in relation to the ACT hospitals system. I wish to know: is that figure of \$10m accurate? If not, what is the estimated blow-out at this stage? What steps are you taking to address this overbudget expenditure?

MR BERRY: I thank Mr Duby for the question. Certainly the blow-out, if we can use that rather emotive term about cost overruns, has been the subject of some media reporting recently. The issue was brought to the attention of the Government by the interim hospitals board.

As a result of a request from the interim hospitals board, the Government made available a team from Treasury to investigate the matter and to look at the resources in reporting programs within the hospital to determine what action would be appropriate. It was to report to the Government and, based on that report, the Government could take appropriate action in relation to financial matters within the hospital system.

At this stage I have received an interim report from the team that has been investigating the matter. Preliminary examination of the hospital services division budget by the Treasury review team does not support the recently publicised figures suggesting a \$10m blow-out in the hospital budget for the 1989-90 financial year. The \$10m figure was derived from a supposed overrun of \$2.5m to the end of September. It is based on a number of false assumptions and does not represent a true picture of the budget outlook.

Analysis of the position is still under way, but at this stage Treasury has highlighted a number of factors which must be taken into account in providing a more accurate picture of the potential budget outcome for the year.

14 November 1989

These factors include the impact of seasonal trends, including what is described as the traditional downturn of activity over the Christmas period, and the impact of abnormally high activity levels which have occurred in the first quarter of this financial year.

One of the unfortunate factors about the reporting of this matter and the reaction to it - and I describe it as a reaction because I saw a number of groups within the community responding to the reports - is that a great deal of tension and disquiet has been generated amongst the health care providers. The first group to respond to this was the doctors union - based on rumours - and the reporting of that created some tensions amongst health care workers. Most recently, the Liberal Party spokesman on health got into the act as well.

I have to say that what I describe as the irresponsible reaction to the reporting has led to industrial tensions and an undermining of confidence in our hospital system. I recall that some little time ago the Leader of the Opposition complained.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Minister Berry, would you stick to the terms of the question, please.

MR BERRY: Mr Speaker, I think it is important to announce what we are doing about this issue. One of the issues that has developed as a result of the reporting of the \$10m blow-out has been some industrial disquiet in the hospital system, and I intend to cap off my answer to the question by announcing what we will do about the industrial issues.

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker; I submit that once again the Minister is using question time to make a statement on this matter. It is obvious that he is going to go on for some time and he is going to effectively destroy the purpose and use of question time for this Assembly. I ask, Mr Speaker, that he be directed to answer the question specifically so that we can get on with question time. If he wants to make a statement he can do it later.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Kaine. Please proceed, Minister Berry.

MR BERRY: Indeed, Mr Speaker, and I think the question asked what we are going to do about it. We are going to approach the budget issue responsibly, and we will approach the industrial issue responsibly by addressing it in a sensible industrial relations environment. We invite those people who do not really know enough about the situation to keep right out of it and let the Government get on with looking after the hospital system.

MR DUBY: I wish to ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. The Minister has denied that the figure of \$10m is accurate. But the question also included: what is the

14 November 1989

estimated blow-out at this stage? If it is not \$10m, he must have some idea of what it is. Could he please provide the answer.

MR BERRY: Thank you, Mr DUBY. Mr Speaker, I think I made it clear when I began to answer the question in the first place that I received an interim report, and I think it would be inappropriate for me to make a guesstimate about what the outcome of the final report might be. The issue of the final figure, as far as I am concerned anyway, should be left until we receive the final report from the Treasury team rather than start another speculative round in which all the players become upset and our hospital system is talked down again by the likes of the Liberal Party.

Hospitals

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, I would like to address a question or two to the Minister.

Mr Berry: Which one?

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, does the Minister deny - - -

MR SPEAKER: Which Minister, Mr Kaine?

MR KAINE: The Minister who just sat down and talked about stirring up disquiet but who, by refusing to answer his question, is doing more to stir up disquiet than any other member of this Assembly. Mr Speaker, my question relates to the same issue. Does the Minister deny that there was a \$2.5m overrun in his budget in the first three months of this year?

Is that not an example of absolute lack of management control over his department? In particular, I understand that the options mentioned by the board in the letter that it wrote to the Minister included productivity measures in food preparation and distribution, and the rationalisation of nursing shift arrangements at Royal Canberra Hospital, both of which were part of the Government's health budget expenditure cuts. Can the Minister tell us: when does he intend to take action on his budget and put these cuts into effect, since we are now five months into the fiscal year?

MR BERRY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for giving me the opportunity again to point out the Government's position on the management of the health - - -

Mr Kaine: But will you answer the question, Minister?

MR BERRY: If you give me a chance, Mr Leader of the Opposition.

14 November 1989

Mr Kaine: You told me that you are going to give me the Government's position, but you have not said you will answer the question.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Kaine, please do not interrupt.

MR BERRY: The fact is that there was a report to me in a confidential document from the interim board of the Woden Valley and Royal Canberra Hospitals. It suggested that there was a blow-out in the hospitals' budget. I think the rest of the history was reported in my answer to Mr Duby but, for the sake of clarity, I will go through it again.

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker; I am not interested in Mr Duby's question. I just asked three specific questions. I would like the Minister to answer them. I do not care what he said about Mr Duby's question. That is irrelevant.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you. Do you have those particular questions listed, Mr Berry?

Mr Kaine: If he does not, I will repeat them, Mr Speaker; I have them.

MR BERRY: Thanks. I think you could repeat them.

MR SPEAKER: Would you please repeat the question, Mr Kaine.

MR KAINE: I will repeat the questions. First of all, do you deny that there was a \$2.5m cost overrun in your budget in the first three months of this year? It is an explicit question - nothing to do with Mr Duby's question. The second one is: would you not agree that that is a case of gross mismanagement of your budget, that you can overrun by two and a half million dollars in the first three months of a fiscal year? Thirdly, I alluded to your budget in which you proposed to make two sets of cuts in your budget expenditure. I asked: given that five months of the fiscal year have now elapsed, when do you intend to put those cuts into effect? They are three specific questions, and I would like specific answers to them.

MR BERRY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As I said, the issue that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition has some relevance to my answer to Mr Duby in relation to what was described as a blow-out of \$10m in the hospital budget. As I said previously, I had a confidential letter from the interim board which, by the look of it, has fallen off the back of a truck in several places. Nevertheless, it is a confidential letter from the board to me. There was a reported overrun in the budget.

As a result of the reported overrun, the Government took action to send in a team to examine the issue. As I mentioned in my answer to Mr Duby, in which I referred to the interim report, the \$10m figure at least is not

14 November 1989

supported so far by the team, but there is a way to go. As I indicated to Mr Duby, I was not prepared to make a guesstimate about what the eventual report of the review team might be. I think that is a responsible position. I do not think we need to have any more speculation about budget blow-outs in the hospital system. We need to deal with facts and deal with the matter responsibly, and that is what the Government intends to do. In relation to the second question - - -

MR SPEAKER: Please proceed. They thought you had finished, Mr Berry.

MR BERRY: There are three parts, and I would not want to miss - - -

Mr Kaine: He has not answered the first one, so maybe he will do better with the second and the third, Mr Speaker.

MR BERRY: There are three parts and, Mr Speaker, I am now onto the second part. I think I told Mr Kaine the answer to the first one.

Mr Kaine: No, you didn't.

MR BERRY: I did not give Mr Kaine the answer that he wanted, perhaps. That is all he is going to get.

Mr Kaine: We are well aware of that, Minister, but now get on to question 2 and see if you can do any better at that.

MR BERRY: In relation to question 2 the answer is no. I think I have made it very clear, in relation to the second part of the question, that we have responded to a report about budget overruns by sending in a Treasury review team which is examining the issue very closely, and there has been an interim report. I will not go over that because of my fear of something of a rebuff from the Leader of the Opposition but we have dealt with that responsibly. No, there is no mismanagement on my part.

The third part of the question related to the budget which was announced by the Government. The situation is still the same. The Government's bottom line on savings in the health system is the same as it always was. Currently, there are negotiations going on with relevant unions about how those budget savings can be made in the areas which affect workers in the hospital system.

Those negotiations are, by their very nature, sensitive, and I think you would have all learned from the press today about anxiety amongst workers in the hospital system over the issue of cost savings. I do not think it does any good to speculate about progress in the industrial relations area. My experience dictates to me that these issues have to be dealt with in a commonsense environment and in a very sensible and responsible industrial relations management environment. I think I have answered all of the questions.

14 November 1989

MR KAINE: Since the Minister has not answered any of the questions that I asked him, I would like to ask a supplementary question. In his response earlier he referred to a letter from the interim board. In the interests of removing all speculation from the matter, would the Minister care to table the letter so that we can all see what the board recommended and we can all judge whether he is doing anything about it or not?

MR BERRY: I think I made it clear that the letter was a confidential one from the interim board, and it was sent to me - - -

Mr Kaine: This is open government, is it, that we are talking about?

MR BERRY: If the lunacy of the Liberal Party's actions in its criticism of the hospital system - - -

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker; I totally object to being referred to as a lunatic, and I wish the Minister would withdraw it.

MR SPEAKER: Overruled, Mr Kaine.

Mr Kaine: He has to be referring to me.

MR SPEAKER: He did not, Mr Kaine.

Mr Kaine: Mr Speaker, I do not regard this as being funny. I object to being referred to as a lunatic.

MR SPEAKER: I am afraid that was an interpretation that I did not take from - - -

Mr Kaine: I did, and I would like him to withdraw it.

MR SPEAKER: The ruling on that is: please proceed, Mr Berry.

MR BERRY: The letter to which I referred earlier, in which the interim board had reported to me some matters, was a confidential one and, in my view, if it were tabled in this place, it would do nothing to assist the Government in resolving potential industrial situations amongst the workers in the hospital field. I can say that the likely speculation and reporting of matters contained in that letter would be inappropriate in the current circumstances. There is nothing terribly secret about the letter but, given that it was sent to me in confidence, I intend to treat it that way. I do not therefore care to table it. I intend to make sure that all of the negotiations which are associated with, firstly, any hospital cost overruns which are identified by the review team and, secondly, the implementation of the budget are as isolated as possible from political point taking which I previously described as lunacy.

Concessions

MR WOOD: I direct a question to the Chief Minister. Soon after the Government came to office, it instigated a review of the range and application of concessions that apply in the ACT. Can the Chief Minister advise whether that review will be completed and then considered in time for any implementation of decisions in the next budget?

MS FOLLETT: I thank Mr Wood for the question. It is indeed a matter to which I give some priority, particularly in view of the Government's commitment to social justice and to a fair go for people in our community, particularly those who are at some disadvantage. The concessions review is going to be a very complex task, and I will be announcing the terms of reference for that review in the near future. As I said, it will be a complex task, and I do not believe that it would be possible to complete the whole review in less than about 18 months. So it is going to be a process which will take some time and which I hope will be quite comprehensive in looking at the range of concessions that ought to be available to people in the community who need that sort of help.

Nevertheless, with regard to next year's budget, I believe we should look at those areas in which there is obviously the most need and review those concessions in time for the 1990-91 budget. I would certainly undertake to do that. The concessions areas which I am particularly interested in looking at at the moment are those which impact upon the elderly people in our community and also the young and the homeless. They would be the two areas to which I would give priority for next year's budget. But, as I say, I expect the whole review of concessions to take some time - not less than 18 months.

Hospitals

MR COLLAERY: My question is directed to the Minister for Community Services and Health. Minister, I congratulate you on making today's social column in the Canberra Times, but could you reassure the house that your presence at the Soviet embassy function the other day does not indicate that you are about to defect? Secondly, were you seeking specialist advice on disaster relief, or are you and the Deputy Chief Minister about to depart for the Urals to set up a Revlon factory?

MR BERRY: I think a resounding no would suffice.

MR COLLAERY: I wish to ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Minister, could you reassure us that the community, as well as the workers, will be represented on any future hospital management structures?

14 November 1989

MR BERRY: I think a resounding yes would suffice.

Canberra Times Site

MR MOORE: My question is addressed to the Minister for Industry, Employment and Education. In the light of the principles of natural justice established in the judgment effected by the full bench of the High Court of Australia in respect of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs v. Peko Wallsend in July 1986, the court ruled - I will be brief if you can put up with it - that where the Minister has received additional submissions from a party he is required, before acting on them, to afford other interested parties an opportunity to answer them. Have you, as a party to the Canberra Times site case, agreed to an adjournment of the hearing until March next year, and are you considering a surrender and regrant of that lease?

MR WHALAN: Mr Moore's question is very similar to, and it may indeed be based on, a letter which was forwarded to me by a citizen who has an interest in the litigation involving the Canberra Times site. A detailed response based on substantial legal advice was given to the author of that letter. As this involves quite an important point of law, I would rather be very precise in the response to the question, so I will undertake to provide a response later today, Mr Speaker.

MR MOORE: I wish to ask a supplementary question. The other point about which I am most concerned, Minister, is the Errington principle, an example of which I have just cited, and obviously you are aware of it. Are you intending to apply it by hearing arguments from the opponents of the case, which was not done by the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure?

MR WHALAN: I will take that aspect of the question on notice also.

Hospitals

MR HUMPHRIES: My question is directed to the Minister for Community Services and Health. Can he inform the Assembly what decision has been made about the future of the hospital board of directors? If no decision has been made, when can the Assembly expect it? Finally, if a new board is to be put in place by 1 January next year, as indicated by the Minister in June, what is the latest date by which hospital staff elections can be held?

MR BERRY: The replacement for the interim hospitals board - which, as is by now well known, is to have its term expire on 31 December - is in the hands of Cabinet. The Government is currently considering the matter, and a

14 November 1989

report to the Assembly is largely in the hands of Cabinet, so I am unable to give a specific date in respect of when the announcement will be made. I am hoping to be able to comply with my original position, which was to announce it by the end of November, although that time frame is looking a bit tight at this stage.

In relation to a replacement structure, that too is in the hands of Cabinet and the Government, and the announcement will incorporate a description of the structure to replace the interim board arrangement. Therefore, until such time as there is an announcement about what the structure will be, I think it would be inappropriate for me to speculate on the dates for what you suggest ought to be staff elections.

MR HUMPHRIES: I wish to ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. The Minister indicated earlier, I think, that he was prepared to consider having on the hospitals board staff or community representatives - I forget which he mentioned. Is the Minister saying that staff representatives are not likely to be on the new board? If there is at least a possibility that staff representatives will be on the new board, I repeat the question, which I submit is relevant: what is the latest date by which those staff elections can be held?

MR BERRY: All of the issues which Mr Humphries has raised really depend on the structure which is decided on by the Government to replace the interim board arrangement. Therefore, until an announcement is made in relation to the interim board arrangement, speculation by me adds nothing to the debate.

Asbestos Removal

MS MAHER: My question is directed to the Minister for Housing and Urban Services. Can she advise what is the total cost of the asbestos removal program to date to citizens of the ACT? Does this cost include the running of the branch, or is it merely the cost of physically removing the asbestos? What is the maximum amount so far spent on any one property? Can the Minister provide a breakdown of that cost?

MRS GRASSBY: I thank Ms Maher. Since the program was announced on 10 October 1988, almost \$6m has been spent. This sum includes \$1.7m on the survey, \$2m on the sealing up of the affected houses, and \$800,000 on reimbursements to home owners who had the asbestos removed privately. About \$1m has been spent on developing removal techniques, procuring equipment for removal and undertaking removal. Air monitoring of affected houses has cost \$400,000. As for the cost for one particular house, I cannot give you a breakdown of that at the moment, Ms Maher, but I will get back to you on that.

14 November 1989

Bicycle Storage

MR JENSEN: My question is directed to the Minister for Housing and Urban Services. I understand that ACTION has met with Pedal Power to discuss a proposal for bicycle storage facilities at bus interchanges. In view of an agreement by ACTION to conduct a survey to determine the likely patronage of these facilities if they were to be installed at Belconnen, Civic and Woden interchanges, can the Minister advise whether the survey has been conducted and, if so, when the results of the survey can be expected to be released?

MRS GRASSBY: I thank Mr Jensen for the question. It was to be undertaken but I am not sure whether it has been. I will get back to Mr Jensen on that. If it has been, I will give him the results of it.

MR JENSEN: I wish to ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Can I just add to that for the Minister: if it is proposed to install these facilities to encourage dual bike-bus transport within the ACT, when may ACTION be considering doing that?

MRS GRASSBY: We are getting back to Mr Jensen on the first part. We are trying to encourage people to use their cars, park them at certain areas and bus in. We would be encouraging the same thing with bicycles, and I will have that in the answer as well.

Hospitals

MRS NOLAN: My question is addressed to the Minister for Community Services and Health. Is it true that the number of hospital disputes has dropped dramatically since the interim hospitals board has been operating?

MR BERRY: I can say that the number of industrial disputes has noticeably fallen in my period as Minister, and I think - - -

Mr Kaine: They are about to increase again if you follow your present route, mate.

MR BERRY: If the Liberals would keep out of it, they would probably be - - -

Mr Humphries: On a point of order, Mr Speaker; the question to the Minister was whether hospital disputes have decreased during the term of office of the interim hospitals board, not of the Minister. The Minister's period has overlapped that.

MR SPEAKER: Please answer the question, Minister Berry.

14 November 1989

MR BERRY: It is a matter of fact, Mr Speaker, that the period of my being Minister coincided with - - -

Mr Humphries: By about half. January to May is quite a long time.

MR BERRY: Of course, I take much of the credit for that, and I think the Government, in its relationship with the trade union movement, takes the credit for that as well.

Mrs Nolan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker; can I have a yes or no answer?

MR BERRY: No.

Mr Humphries: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question was quite clear and explicit. The Minister has made no attempt to answer it. The period of his stewardship of health, if that is what it could be called, has extended for only half of the period during which the interim hospitals board has been in place. The Minister is attempting to answer only half of Mrs Nolan's question.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you.

Grass Mowing

DR KINLOCH: Mr Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for Housing and Urban Services. On behalf of several constituents I would like to draw attention to extensive growth of tall grass in many public areas. I give an example from the north side. The situation is so bad that one of the tall signs naming the Mount Ainslie Nature Park is not visible because of the tall grass. One elderly woman, whose home I visited this morning, which backs onto Mount Ainslie, is worried about a potential bushfire on Mount Ainslie.

Could the Minister investigate the current crisis dimension of heavy growth? I am not blaming the Minister for that, of course. Could the Minister rethink the situation in which private contractors have been given reason to believe that their mowing contracts may soon be over?

Mr Duby: When is she going to start the Hustlers?

Mr Moore: Exactly. Get a few Hustlers in.

MRS GRASSBY: Thank you, Dr Kinloch. No, we are not talking about Hustlers. We have had that, have we not, Mr Stefaniak? There are going to be no more Hustlers, either. Can I say that, with the amount of rain we have had, Dr Kinloch, the grass has grown very high. I do not know whether I have had any say in how much rain we have had. Obviously I would like to think I could do things like that, but I do not think I can.

14 November 1989

Unfortunately, we have a backlog of grass needing to be mown because of the wet weather. You will notice that out the front here they tried to get the grass mowed. The next minute it started raining and they could not. Our highest priorities are sportsgrounds, school grounds, approaches to road intersections, child play areas, pedestrian ways and areas of potential fire hazard.

Because we are behind with it, we are asking people, if they can, to mow behind their houses when they are mowing their lawns. Of course, if it is an older lady it is a different matter. I can see that point. We would have to look at that. I will look into it, Dr Kinloch. Perhaps people could run the mower just past the back of their fence if they back onto hazardous areas. We are trying to get round to do as much as we can. I understand it is going to rain again tomorrow, Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, so we will be behind again. It is like the driveways; if it does not stop raining we cannot get them done either.

Mr Collaery: Did the rain start after you came into office?

MRS GRASSBY: Definitely, it did.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

MR WHALAN (Minister for Industry, Employment and Education): Mr Speaker, I claim to have been misrepresented and seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

MR WHALAN: Mr Speaker, in a news report on WIN television on Thursday, 9 November, a reporter, Ms Fia Cumming, made quite preposterous and untrue allegations. These allegations were, firstly, that the Government had refused to provide full details of the sale of land to Revlon Pty Limited for its major new plant at Hume; secondly, that I had refused to respond to an allegation, based on a leaked document, to the effect that the land had been valued at half price or less; thirdly, that I had refused to provide other parties in the Assembly with access to the file on that matter; and, fourthly, that my approach in this matter is inconsistent with ALP industry policy which provides for public release of details of government assistance to industry.

In relation to the first three points, I have answered several questions in this chamber concerning the sale of land to Revlon. I have emphasised that the valuation of the land sold to Revlon was made by the Australian Valuation Office in the usual way. I cannot understand how

14 November 1989

anyone could suggest that a valuation set by the Australian Valuation Office could be at half price. I would have thought that any such allegations should be directed to the Australian Valuation Office.

Apart from answering questions in this place on several occasions on the matter, I have also provided a briefing on the matter to representatives of the Residents Rally party, at their request. Mr Collaery and Mr Jensen sat with me in my office for about one hour and were provided with information from the files on the matter. The officials present were the secretary to my department, Mr Townsend, and two first assistant secretaries, Mr Guild and Dr Adrian. We also explained to Mr Collaery the status and origin of the leaked document on which he based his allegations about the valuation. That meeting was positive and conciliatory.

In relation to our industry assistance policy, the Government has undertaken to provide full public disclosure of any specific assistance given by the ACT Government to individual businesses. This would include details regarding the name of the recipient and the quantity and nature of the assistance given. However, at no stage have we given a commitment to release commercial-in-confidence information or other information held on files which documents material pertinent to commercial negotiations.

Nevertheless, to ensure accountability we have undertaken to provide private access to the material to party leaders in the Assembly in order to allow them to assure themselves that matters have been handled properly. We are also happy to provide detailed briefings by officials to party leaders. This process was followed in relation to the Revlon case.

In short, Mr Speaker, Fia Cumming has been told lies by her sources and has, without checking the facts, repeated those lies. I thought that Ms Cumming would have learnt from her embarrassment in badly reporting the National Aquarium case. As Mr Humphries said in this Assembly on 1 November, in presenting the committee report on the National Aquarium, members have a responsibility to check their facts before making wild allegations. I am pleased that that course is generally followed by members of the press gallery and that there is a commendable commitment among those professionals to checking and establishing facts.

MR COLLAERY: Mr Speaker, I wish to make a personal statement. I claim to have been misrepresented. Mr Speaker, there was a thinly veiled reference by the Deputy Chief Minister in his statement that a reporter had been told lies. Those of us on this side of the house are likely to be in the direction of that allegation. I will take that allegation, and I will respond to it.

The first point was that the Deputy Chief Minister implied he had made a file available. I claim to have been

14 November 1989

misrepresented implicitly in that. No file was made available; a file was quoted from. Secondly, Mr Speaker, the leaked document, for which I still await the consent of the Deputy Chief Minister to table, said - and this is where I am misrepresented again - that the prices asked are well below market value, possibly half real value.

The point at issue is - and the reporter was correct in saying - that the officials of the department, after valuation, had maintained that the property was going at half value; it was after the valuation, and nothing to do with the Australian Taxation Office, Mr Speaker. There are other issues that we can take up elsewhere, but I reject this attack, this unwarranted slur, on a member of the press gallery. It should have been more properly taken up with the head of the press gallery.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE - STANDING COMMITTEE -
REPORT - GOVERNMENT RESPONSE
Ministerial Statement**

MR WHALAN (Minister for Industry, Employment and Education), by leave: Mr Speaker, I seek to make a short statement to indicate the Government's interim response to the report of the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure on the redevelopment of the former Canberra Times site. The Government generally supports and accepts the broad thrust of the committee's findings. The report will receive further consideration in the context of other related planning and leasing matters.

Recommendation 2 of the report calls for collation of information on the impact of the development on traffic, parking, public transport and pollution levels. In order to allow the Government to respond to those issues as soon as possible, the Government, together with Concrete Constructions, is preparing the necessary data and the assessment for public release. I thought it appropriate to advise the Assembly of this action.

**RADIOTHERAPY MACHINE
Paper**

MR HUMPHRIES, by leave: I table the following paper:

New radiotherapy machine for ACT and Queanbeyan districts - Petition.

This is in fact a petition, which does not conform with standing orders, from 4,456 concerned citizens of the ACT and Queanbeyan, regarding the need for additional radiotherapy equipment for the treatment of cancer patients. The petition is a fairly substantial one, and I appreciate the efforts made by the Secretariat for the

14 November 1989

petition to be accommodated, notwithstanding the fact that it was outside standing orders.

It is, as I have said, supported by nearly four and a half thousand residents of Canberra and surrounding districts. It calls for the purchase of a new radiotherapy machine for the treatment of cancer patients at Woden Valley Hospital. The petition was the idea of a Queanbeyan resident, a Mrs Joan Storey, whose brother contracted cancer some time ago. Mrs Storey had been taking her brother to Woden Valley Hospital for treatment involving the radiotherapy machine located at the hospital.

It is, as members will be aware, the only machine of its type in the district and is used to treat patients from many parts of south-eastern New South Wales as well as Canberra and Queanbeyan. On several occasions Mrs Storey and her brother arrived at Woden Valley Hospital, only to be told that the machine had broken down and that treatment would be delayed. I learnt about two weeks ago that Mrs Storey's brother has, since that time, died.

It is matter of concern to me, Mr Speaker, that we have such a dependence on a single machine and, further, that such a machine, because of the extremely heavy use it receives, is prone to breakdown. To many cancer patients this machine offers them the only hope of survival. It is tragic that these people are forced to suffer delays and interruptions to their treatment, especially when they know that this treatment represents their only chance of survival.

Many patients travel a long way to receive treatment, and it is appalling to know that some sufferers have to return home without treatment. I understand from the Minister, because of a letter he sent me, that his department is seeking to purchase a new machine but that this is unlikely to occur before 1992-93. I hope the Minister will take note of this petition and will take steps to minimise breakdowns in the present equipment and reduce, in that fashion, the trauma which is caused often to cancer patients, particularly those who travel long distances to take advantage of the equipment.

CONSERVATION, HERITAGE AND ENVIRONMENT - STANDING COMMITTEE
Membership

MR JENSEN, by leave: I move:

That paragraph (2) of the resolution of appointment of the Standing Committee on Conservation, Heritage and Environment be amended by omitting "4" and substituting "5".

MR SPEAKER: Have copies been circulated, Mr Jensen?

14 November 1989

MR JENSEN: No, I do not believe they have. Mr Speaker, in the interests of carrying on, I am quite happy to withdraw the motion and bring it back on tomorrow.

MULTIFUNCTION POLIS CONCEPT Ministerial Statement and Papers

Debate resumed from 18 October 1989, on motion by **Mr Whalan:**

That the Assembly takes note of the following papers:

Multifunction Polis Concept -

Canberra - A Multifunction Polis site - The ACT Vision.

Ministerial statement, 18 October, 1989.

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (3.19): Mr Speaker, in the Minister's statement of 18 October on the Government's concept of the ACT's involvement in the multifunction polis and by the tabling of the proposal for the joint feasibility study entitled the ACT Vision he identifies an exciting potential major development for Canberra. Unfortunately, Mr Speaker, that is all that is identified.

Like so many so-called ministerial statements in this place, the statement and the report are pure window-dressing, another glossy paper of the kind to which we became accustomed in the days of the NCDC. Like the housing policy review, it has not been thought through. Like the ACT public hospital development, it has not been costed. While land has been set aside, there is no indication as to where the funds will come from to create the infrastructure to support this polis of 25,000 people.

In these respects, Mr Speaker, the statement and the glossy brochure are deficient. They are simply representing yet another example of this Government's preoccupation with the shadow rather than the substance of its stewardship of Canberra. This is a matter of great regret and concern because the idea with the multifunction polis is deserving of our united support, offering as it does the opportunity for unparalleled growth and development for the ACT in what I believe could be a made-to-order project.

Indeed, Mr Speaker, I raised the question of the multifunction polis with the Government in July, at which time it even seemed surprised to hear about it. However, in October it had become quite expert, it would seem. The ACT Vision brochure makes the case in support of Canberra's involvement in the MFP abundantly apparent. I will not dwell upon the many advantages, both natural and man-made, that we can offer its backers.

Rather, in the hope that the Government will take them up and really think about them beforehand, I will direct my

14 November 1989

remarks to two important issues associated with the polis, which should be addressed even at this very early stage because they deal with essential planning and development steps that will impact upon all of the ACT if the MFP is established.

The role of the very fast train project has been properly recognised as fundamental to the MFP. The provisional siting of both the MFP and the VFT Canberra terminal has taken account of this connection, as has the MFP's proximity to the airport. However, the MFP will require not only external transport links but internal links as well. This is the first of the issues that I urge the Government to address immediately.

It is fortuitous, if coincidental, that this debate comes so soon after the release of the Gungahlin external travel study and the Government's consultation paper Transport ACT, because the outcome of those two reports must take account of the internal transport needs of the MFP if it is ever to be successful. From our studies it would appear that an MFP located at Jerrabomberra could be easily served by traffic from Tuggeranong by the Eastern Freeway.

Ease of traffic from elsewhere - and I note that it is planned that the MFP will have a working population of 25,000 people - is not so easy to assess. For example, while traffic from Gungahlin could reach the MFP via the proposed Majura Parkway and the Eastern Parkway, I am not sure what effect, if any, this increased traffic flow through Fyshwick would have upon that already congested heavy vehicle area.

Indeed, I doubt that the 11,800 people or 9,800 vehicles estimated in the Gungahlin report to be travelling southward from Gungahlin during peak hour include a component of those travelling through to the MFP. The MFP proposal may well force a revision of the conclusion of the Gungahlin external travel study, even though it has just been tabled.

If traffic from Gungahlin to the MFP raises questions, a much more serious problem arises with regard to traffic from Belconnen and north Canberra. My examination of the road system shows that Belconnen traffic would tend to flow through Civic while vehicles from north Canberra would tend to use Fairbairn Avenue.

The added traffic on Fairbairn Avenue could possibly influence the timing for Monash Drive, bringing forward construction to a much earlier date than the Gungahlin proposal currently envisages. Whether or not the Monash Drive construction is advanced because of the MFP, the twin pressures of traffic to the Jerrabomberra based MFP upon Civic and the surrounding suburbs from Belconnen and north Canberra would appear to work counter to the Gungahlin study proposals to divert additional vehicles from those areas.

14 November 1989

The second issue, Mr Speaker, that I would urge the Government to address is the residential needs of the estimated 25,000 working population of the MFP. On even an average family projection we are looking to house up to 100,000 more people somewhere in the region. Do the population predictions for the remainder of the Tuggeranong Valley development and the estimated 80,000 people to live in Gungahlin include the 25,000 work force and their families that the MFP will generate?

I expect that a project such as this would generate an increased work force over and above present projections. Quite simply, questions need to be addressed. Where will they live? Will the Government have the funds to provide the infrastructure that this substantial number of people will require? Suburban roads, transport, health, education, and shopping and recreation facilities will all require planning. I submit, Mr Speaker, that there are additional requirements over and above those currently planned.

Mr Speaker, I raise these issues not to denigrate the proposal, which I support in the interests of the future economic well-being of the ACT; on the contrary, I wish merely to draw attention to these needs and urge the Government to address them now rather than later.

I appreciate that the multifunction polis will not be created overnight, nor will there be an instantaneous work force of 25,000 people; it will build up gradually. Nevertheless, if the MFP is to become a reality and if it is to realise its great potential, we must be prepared to service its maximum working population and we must make allowance now for this significant addition to our population.

Mr Speaker, we must demonstrate to the proponents of this project that we in Canberra have the capacity to appreciate the magnitude of the project and all of the ramifications that will flow from it and that we are capable of addressing them in the pre-planning phase. If we fail in that, we will have no credibility later in arguing our case for implementing any part of the project in Canberra.

It is the responsibility of the Government, therefore, to begin to plan and develop the transport, services and residential support that the MFP work force will require. The document that it has produced so far simply does not address those issues. Mr Speaker, the Liberal Party looks forward to early answers to the questions that I have raised and indeed to participating in defining both the questions and the answers. I reiterate our pledge to fully support this ambitious project which could be of such enormous benefit to us in the future.

MR JENSEN (3.27): Mr Speaker, the Residents Rally welcomes the participation of the ACT in the multifunction polis

14 November 1989

proposal and will continue to support this participation. However, we also echo the concern of Mr Kaine that the ACT Vision, as the report is called, is a little long on glossy pictures but a little short on detail.

One clear benefit to the ACT of this participation is the opportunity the project provides for the development of the private sector as well as the expansion of existing industries in the ACT, which provide a service related facility to the education industry we have here, as well as moves by firms like Wang Australia Pty Ltd, Unisys (Australia) Ltd, Blohm and Voss (Australia) Pty Ltd and Plessey Australia Pty Ltd to establish part of their operations in Canberra.

The Rally notes, Mr Speaker, the support for the concept by the major educational and research institutions like the ANU and the newly named University of Canberra. With regard to research, we can refer to participation by the CSIRO. When all this is added to the material benefits we have here, as outlined by the new tourist promotional theme and our location midway between the two major urban areas of Australia, it is a benefit of which we should be making use now to encourage the right sorts of industries to come to the ACT. That, Mr Speaker, is what I want to concentrate on in my remarks this afternoon.

However, this task is not a simple matter of throwing some dollars out into the market as incentives for industry to come here. We must never forget that if we are able to encourage an industry to come to the ACT it can just as easily decide to relocate later if someone else provides a better deal. The key to successful diversification, however, is not to depend on a few relocations to provide the base. It is often a disadvantage to encourage large firms to move their operations or part of an operation to Canberra. They can just as easily, as I have already indicated, move elsewhere - very quickly.

So, sometimes the "small is beautiful" approach may be the best move, as smaller firms are less able to move as easily. By encouraging smaller firms in greater numbers there is a much better chance of long-term success. The explosion of the small firms into Silicon Valley in the USA provides an example of the sort of industry and style of operation that we could attract to the Canberra region. We must seek to read the next growth market and ensure that we play a major part in it. There is not much point, Mr Speaker, coming up at the rear end of the next growth market in Australia - or the world, for that matter.

Canberra can offer a planned city, an increasingly diverse and pleasant lifestyle, minimum transport problems, as those of us who have travelled both in Canberra and the other major suburban areas of Australia can clearly attest, as well as closeness to the snowfields and the coast.

14 November 1989

One industry that could be encouraged to develop here is the education industry. As we have already seen, our national university and associated research schools, when added to the new Canberra university, close to a developing technology park, and our developing TAFE system, when coupled with a strong public and private education system, provide a degree of incentive for encouragement for the education industry to come to the ACT.

There is an ever-increasing desire by our neighbours - and I mean overseas neighbours - to obtain the benefits of our education system. They are prepared to pay and provide opportunities for related industries to service their stay. Friends and relatives of those who come to us from overseas to study would also increase demand on the service sector and the tourist industry of the ACT.

The multifunction polis concept could clearly find a home in our city. The concept may just provide that core industry used by regional geographers to meet the growth pole and spread effect concepts of Perroux and Myrdal, which are part of the development theory on which many of these concepts of regional development are based. For that, Mr Speaker, is really what this whole concept is about - providing an opportunity for our city to become a key player in the nationwide participation in the proposal for a multifunction polis.

It could be argued that what we in the ACT should be doing is seeking to build on the benefits of Canberra, which I have already outlined, such as our high standard of living and lack of problems suffered by the huge urban centres of Melbourne and Sydney by way of long commuter times, traffic and pollution problems. If we are to have a chance to participate in the MFP program it is important to start to encourage the relocation of workers and industries with the higher-level skills to join in these benefits. I have no doubt that there may be some who would object to this concept on purely selfish grounds.

What do I mean by this, Mr Speaker? It has been said that Canberra is the best kept secret of our country. Why should we share it? Unfortunately, the realities of the situation are that we must provide opportunities and employment for our children. We must never forget that the multiplier effect ensures that one new job creates many more. The nature of that new job often determines the extent of this multiplier effect.

Fortunately, we have some more things going for us than the good burghers of Campbelltown did when they sought to promote and develop what is known as the Macarthur region. What initially was considered as a growth centre for the development of manufacturing on the outskirts of Sydney would seem to have its major role in life being a dormitory suburb for the main Sydney employment centres. Mr Speaker, we can do better than that. We must do better than that.

14 November 1989

The success of some existing growth centres provides lessons that can be learned. One that comes immediately to mind is Albury-Wodonga. In some respects it has a similar location to Canberra, in that it is between Melbourne and Sydney - with one important asset that we should consider for Canberra, an inland port for customs. This means, Mr Speaker, that goods can be received from and shipped directly to overseas markets. This means it is able to service the largest markets outside Europe and the Americas - I refer, of course, to Asia. No doubt, an international airport for the Canberra region would assist us in this area - a concept that the Rally strongly supports.

It is also interesting to note that Albury-Wodonga is keen to see the location of more government employees there. It would seem that there are fewer such employees in Albury-Wodonga than any other provincial city - outside Canberra, of course. It is understood that the greater certainty of employment for the public service and more certain pay packets tend to aid the economy. Maybe we in Canberra should not be too hard on the large number of public servants we have here. They are, some would suggest, more of a bonus than a minus. If one cares to look at all the advantages that Canberra has to offer compared with those of Albury-Wodonga and other centres, the list is fairly comprehensive.

In the resources area Canberra has planned environments; well developed land; industrial estates, or technology parks; ample water supply; and excellent infrastructure facilities. Our location is close to markets; close to tourist areas, our own and the snowfields; and on the main Melbourne-Sydney-Adelaide routes. Also we are close to, and will probably participate in, the VFT project. As far as labour is concerned, we have an ample skilled and unskilled work force in the ACT and full range of training and educational facilities available.

Mr Wood: And a good government to go with it.

MR JENSEN: You must have been reading my mind, Mr Wood. I was just about to mention that there is also support from the ACT Government and this Assembly as a whole to promote Canberra as a regional growth centre. If, as I suggest, these factors that I have mentioned apply in Canberra, we should be on a winner, in much the same way as Albury-Wodonga has been.

The paper we are debating today certainly provides the sorts of ideas and concepts that would enable us to participate in the MFP project. However, we should not pin all our hopes on being chosen to be involved. The Government should ensure that it does not sit on its hands and wait for the project to fall in our laps. We do not have the time to wait. We in the ACT should be able to show the proponents of the MFP that we deserve to participate in the project because we have already demonstrated how self-reliant and forward-thinking we are.

14 November 1989

In closing, let me make one comment about the suggestion that the paper provides that Jerrabomberra is the place for our MFP satellite settlement. Let me suggest something a little more radical. With advances in technology that will enable links between industry - one of the main concepts which the MFP, with its satellites, is designed to cater for, of course - why should it be limited to a single location, Mr Speaker? Surely we should strive to ensure that the existing infrastructure we have in Canberra provides the base on which to build the notion that Canberra as a major regional centre for education, technology and lifestyle, and of course the nation's capital, should become the key Australian link in the regional MFP - not just Jerrabomberra, but the whole of the Canberra area, the whole city of Canberra.

From this, Mr Speaker, we can then plug into the worldwide concepts from the MFP, which is a logical extension of what our Japanese neighbours proposed in 1987. The Rally commends the concept to all residents and seeks their support to make it a reality.

MR DUBY (3.37): Mr Speaker, I heartily welcome the involvement of the ACT in this extremely important project, the multifunction polis strategy. Firstly, I would like to stress the fact that this project is one of the most sophisticated concepts put forward in the latter half of this century. Here we have a golden opportunity to leap into the future by developing a high-tech multifunction city in Australia. The MFP is a complicated and intricate concept and will involve a great deal of planning, taking into account such aspects as the environment, the economy, the community and the resources which are available.

The MFP idea, as we all know, originated in Japan. The Australian and Japanese governments have joined forces to work on the project. Mr Speaker, I am sure that all members of this Assembly will agree that if this project gets off the ground and the ACT becomes involved by having a high-tech satellite city it will bring about vast changes to our Territory. The multifunction project will involve a number of options. We do not know where it will be situated or which people will live there, but there are a number of options being investigated, and I am sure that the Sydney-Canberra region will play a major role in the development.

I note, Mr Speaker, that the ACT has been actively involved with New South Wales, and it has prepared its own submission to the multifunction study team. This submission envisages that the ACT would be a satellite city and that the core would be located in Sydney. I also note that the ACT submission to the multifunction study team emphasises that education, research and lifestyle are fundamental aspects which are important for the successful development of the multifunction polis.

14 November 1989

The submission also emphasises that a high-tech transport system will be a vital link with other multifunction satellites in other cities. Transport is a major aspect, and it is envisaged that the very fast train and the multifunction polis will be closely linked. Planning has to be given careful consideration so as to avoid environmental disasters and mistakes occurring.

Mr Speaker, I note in relation to this subject that there are some so-called conservationists who are strongly opposed to both projects - the very fast train and the multifunction polis. Their opposition is supposedly based on the environmental impact that the projects will have on untouched bushland and also on the concept of a satellite city. I reject these objections utterly.

Those knockers also say that these cities will most benefit Japanese interests. I do not share the concern of these people that the MFP will be strongly dominated by Japanese idiosyncrasies and their technology; I do not believe this is the case. The multifunction polis project is based on the concept of international cooperation. It will be built to fit Australian society, and I strongly believe that we will benefit greatly from the commercial aspects. The Japanese economy is the powerhouse of the Pacific, and we must not forget that Japanese business will be investing a great deal of money into this project - as well as Australian companies, of course.

Mr Speaker, if the ACT Jerrabomberra site is accepted as a location for a satellite of the MFP concept, in my view the benefits will be more than one. I believe that the ACT has great potential for the successful development of this major project. We have the ability to expand our resources. To begin with, the ACT submission envisages that the focus will be on education, research and lifestyle. In the ACT we already have an education system of the highest standard. We have a world-famous university, the ANU, and now the new University of Canberra. We also have a number of colleges and technical colleges.

In the private sector we have colleges such as the Australian National College of Business and English which is doing extremely well and marketing overseas successfully. The ACT is also very advanced in the research area. The CSIRO and the ANU medical research unit are working extremely hard towards achieving new and better ways of dealing with health and environmental problems, as well as working on new drugs, et cetera.

Another aspect is the private commercial sector. This sector will get a boost in the new environment, and I believe this will be a major step towards creating a new image for Canberra. By this I mean changing Canberra's public service image. Even though there is now less than 50 per cent public service employment in this city, it is still perceived throughout the nation as being a public

14 November 1989

service town. If this MFP project were established here, I think it would help to dispel that myth.

I also see the idea of a centralised high-tech medical research centre as a major step towards the improved future health of the Australian people. I might add that this type of project will not only attract professionals from other parts of Australia but also draw people from all over the world. Another important aspect is the very fast train proposal and possibly the upgrading of the Canberra airport. There is no doubt that, again, these two projects will bring in more jobs to this area and go a long way towards lowering the unemployment rate.

Mr Speaker, there are some negative aspects that need to be addressed and perhaps clarified with regard to the MFP. One of them is the fact that some people argue that a project like the multifunction polis is not needed in Australia. We already have high-technology centres in Australia, they say, and they also argue that it will promote social separation so that a number of privileged, educated and wealthy people will be able to participate and live in such sophisticated surroundings while the disadvantaged and poor will continue to live in substandard conditions.

I am positive that the feasibility study is investigating every aspect that may affect our society, and I have great confidence that the right decisions will be made. Overall, I think that this is a major project that will benefit greatly the ACT, especially our children. Their future lies in our hands, and the decisions we make will affect the future of their society. Mr Speaker, I firmly believe that the onus is not only on the Government but also on all groups represented in this Assembly to make sure that the ACT has a chance to participate in the development of the multifunction polis, the city of the future.

MR MOORE (3.44): Mr Speaker, I have heard a number of speakers saying what a wonderful concept the multifunction polis is. In general terms I agree with them, but there have been very, very few negatives put. Mr DUBY presented some of those and then immediately argued them away. So I feel that it is most appropriate that I draw attention to some of the problems rather than join the others in singing the praises of the thing, because that would only be reiterating.

That is not to say that I do not find the project particularly exciting in some ways - I do, and I think it has great possibilities - but the way the paper is written and some of the things presented cause some concern. The first one to which I draw attention is on page 12 where it is stated:

The NSW education concept is built largely around the research element, and this can be developed further to include - in the first instance - ACT

14 November 1989

institutions, then Australian and international ones.

Why the cultural cringe, especially coming from a Minister who is the Minister for Education as well as the Minister responsible for the Office of Industry and Development? Why do we not look at what we have in the ACT? Firstly, we have ACT research institutions, headed perhaps by the Australian National University which is recognised worldwide as a leading research university. There is no need for us to bow, as we have in this paper, to New South Wales education.

If you go to secondary education, similarly it is very easy to argue that the ACT secondary colleges in particular are much more research oriented than the New South Wales education concept leading to an end of year exam. So I think there is a special question to be asked there.

Further on page 12 is the implication of a third university for Canberra. That is absolutely ridiculous. That, by the way, is emphasised again on page 57, where the paper says:

The ACT considers that education, as developed in the ACT Vision, has commercial potential in its own right as well as being the fundamental enabling factor for the MFP. The latter attribute will, of itself, produce synergies with all other MFP activities.

We already have two, or potentially two, excellent universities - the "potential" applies, by the way, to the CAE becoming a university - and I think the concept of presenting a third university, a private university, is absolute nonsense. Whatever we do here ought to be tied in with the current universities that we have.

I then look at a comment on planning, on page 33, where it says:

The ACT has been planned and developed as a series of distinct new towns linked by high speed peripheral roads ...

I am very pleased to see that included in the physical features of the ACT as a planned city. The concept that another decentralised town should become part of the ACT is, I think, excellent. I would emphasise here that, to ensure that the ACT plan works, and works as it ought, we should be ensuring that the working areas are retained in the new decentralised town, if that is what we are attempting here. Looking at the plan, I think the Jerrabomberra estate is more likely to be an extension of one of the existing towns, a centralised area, from Narrabundah.

Then we go on to transport. I do not know whether we are just writing things up or whether we are being offered a

14 November 1989

series of enticements. The Kings Highway is going to be a national highway. I think that is great, and I will be seeking more information on that. A tollway will be established between the ACT and Moruya, with a 40- to 50-minute drive. I think that is great. It will be interesting to see how and when that is to be established and what are the environmental implications of that. It also includes a light railway or monorail, with service trunks along that route. There are some general special questions about that.

Then we move on to further transport links, particularly the emphasis that we have heard today on the very fast train. I certainly support the very fast train concept, but I have very, very grave doubts about the very fast train going along the route that is shown in this document. That implies that the route will go through Gippsland, but it has very major environmental implications. If the very fast train were to follow the route that goes through Wagga, near the Hume Highway, that would be another story entirely. That is a factor that should be presented in a final report.

I accept that this is a proposal for a joint feasibility study, so it is an inaugural statement. I accept that, but it does have some major problems. While I am mentioning rail, I suppose it is a good time to draw attention to the fact that the XPT service from Canberra is to be cut, but that is not mentioned at all in this document, in relation to the general rail links and transport links.

The telecommunications link is another factor to which I draw attention. On page 39 it mentions FOCAS, the Fibre Optic Customer Access Service, an optical fibre loop which will be installed around the Canberra CDB initially by March 1990. I think that is excellent. A decentralised town centre, I have held for a long time, does not have a central business district, and that is recognised here because the term CDB is used, but I am not quite sure what CDB stands for. The usual meaning of CBD is central business district. So, having recognised that there is no such thing in Canberra as a central business district, the Office of Industry and Development has referred to it on page 39 as "the CDB". I am delighted at that.

The other final comments that I would really like to make are to draw attention to the artist's impression. On page 22 of the document we see a rather wonderful aeroplane flying over Canberra. I presume it is a Concorde or futuristic version of some such thing coming to our international airport. I think that is rather advanced thinking. It does have some environmental problems. But what is more significant is that, if you turn to page 36, in relation to transport links, there is a picture of an air vehicle flying between Canberra and Sydney, and it looks to me very much like the space shuttle. I wonder whether some special thing has been left out of the transport links there.

14 November 1989

Mr Kaine: It follows a ballistic trajectory.

MR MOORE: With an interesting trajectory; you are right. I have taken this opportunity to present some negative aspects of the multifunction polis site. I did pre-empt the speech by saying that I support it but that I was not going to run over it and just give it a glowing report. I have some particular environmental concerns about it. I do not think they are of the calibre that would necessarily stop the project, but they are very reasonable and sensible concerns. They must become a major area of interest in any further move in relation to a feasibility study on this because, if the environmental factors mean that it is not feasible, we should come to that conclusion as quickly as we can.

DR KINLOCH (3.52): May I immediately pick up one of Mr Moore's interesting points and ask you to look at the map on page 45. In addition to those other two technological marvels, we have a twin-winged prop plane, so there is something for the nostalgia buffs in this report.

Mrs Grassby: You can have a balloon too, if you like.

DR KINLOCH: Right. I join in a general appreciation of the project and also in some of the criticisms of it. I also recognise, as Mr Moore and Mr Kaine have, the temporary nature of this document; that is, it is obviously a draft document. I would like to come back to that in a minute. So let us welcome the project. I join Mr Kaine, Mr DUBY and Mr Moore and, in particular, I endorse Mr Jensen's comments, some of his imaginative proposals and his comments about Albury-Wodonga.

There is a series of what I might call hiccups about this report. I hope these comments will be helpful to the group that takes this temporary, draft document and produces the final document. I congratulate the team for producing what is essentially a temporary document and not polishing it up, not changing all the things that need to be changed, so that we can have a chance to criticise it in this way.

On the question of the photographs and the image of Canberra, might I suggest there is one area that has been omitted altogether. That is the cosmopolitanism of our city in terms of religious and national structures. Could there be another page which perhaps could include, especially for our Asian friends who need to read this document, a Japanese garden and the Indonesian Embassy and, in terms of religion, the Greek Orthodox Church, a Muslim mosque, the new Chinese Embassy - not in terms of religion but in terms of the range of material in the city - the Thai Embassy, St Andrew's Church, the City Uniting Church, and Black Friars in Watson. That is one area that is omitted from the report in terms of lifestyle. I would very much like to see that added.

14 November 1989

On the question of education, I will not repeat what has already been properly said about the ANU, the University of Canberra, ADFA and so on, but I would pick up this question of a third university which Mr Moore also mentioned. Let us remember that Signadou is in Canberra. It is very properly part of a multifunction polis because it will be linked as part of a private university across Australia with Catholic connections. It will add yet another area to the educational excellence of this city. I would like to see that built into the report in the education section.

Several people have already mentioned the private business colleges. It is good to see that. I would like to pick up another point that Mr Moore rightly made; that is, the uniqueness of the years 11 and 12 colleges. We have a very special benefit here in this city with those colleges. There is nothing else like it in Australia. Some other States are looking at our colleges and beginning to see how excellent they are and how they might copy them. I think that overseas groups coming here would recognise that very special feature. I would like to add, on the educational side, the possibility of private national and international schools, as there are in Sydney, for example. May I commend to the Minister for Education the possibility of an international school within our own school structure. I understand that is being considered. That would be another area which would be very appropriate for a multifunction polis.

I will touch briefly on the question of research. There are some areas omitted altogether from the report. They are areas that almost all deal with the Humanities. Let me urge on those who are rewriting the report, putting it out in a final form, that the Humanities surely ought also to be considered in relation to a multifunction polis. The stress is on the sciences, understandably, and on economic considerations - there are obvious reasons for that - but let us remember, and it is very strange to see this omitted, that we have the National Library in this city. It is surely one of the absolutely central research areas for the whole of Australia as well as for the ACT. So, on pages 14 and 26 I would ask that the National Library, the National Film and Sound Archive and the Humanities Research Centre be added as other possible functions of the multifunction polis.

I do not wish to bore the Assembly with the next part, but I want to do this to indicate problems with the draft report. I have read it all with great interest. I began making changes and corrections at about page 27. Very quickly, I am going to run through the mistakes in the report. Each one represents a grammatical or proofreading mistake. They are on pages 27, 28, 28, 33, 34, 34, 35, 37, 39, 39, 39, 39, 44, 49, 49, 50, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56 and 60. I do wonder at that sloppiness. I wonder whether the final report that will be issued will be in immaculate form so that a representative of an overseas business firm, whether it be Japanese, Korean or whatever, looking at it will say,

14 November 1989

"Well, there is also a city which gets things right and gets things immaculately right". I would worry about the quality of the prose in the report. I am happy to work with the people involved with this. I do not know who they were, but if they would like to consult me I would be very pleased indeed to help in that matter.

MR STEVENSON (3.59): The ACT Vision for the multifunctional polis mentions a great number of benefits to Canberra. We have heard today that there are perhaps some potential problems. I found it very difficult to gain a lot of information on the proposals for Australia in general. I have an article that was printed in the Melbourne Herald shortly after 14 December last year. While not all aspects may apply to Canberra specifically and also while I may not agree with all the points raised, I do, however, feel that it is important to look at other viewpoints. So I quote from the article titled "A multi-function disaster".

As information is slowly released about proposed Japanese high-tech cities in Australia, it becomes clearer that if instituted they would be an unmitigated social and cultural disaster ...

The concept has been given the esoteric name of multifunctional polis. They would be clean, well-lit cities with their own security forces and centralised control of communications and other services.

While transport and community services in existing Australian cities require massive refurbishing, the proposal nevertheless uncritically promotes new metropolises of teletopian splendor, costing billions of dollars.

The feasibility study alone will cost up to \$5 million.

It is envisaged that 21st century housing will accommodate "highly educated and talented individuals": 100,000 people, many of them Japanese nationals will live in elitist settings of ceremonial gardens and designer golf courses.

They will be doing research into areas of controversy such as genetic engineering and artificial intelligence, areas which are still to be fully debated in Australia.

According to a "strictly confidential" document obtained by The Herald (December 2) the initial proposal was first mooted by the powerful Japanese Ministry of Trade and Industry (MITI) almost two years ago.

The original MITI report emphasised enclaves of technology, leisure and entertainment.

14 November 1989

This was in keeping with the so-called "Silver Columbia" concept of Japanese retirement and tourist communities to relieve some of the population and spatial pressures in Tokyo, Nagoya and Osaka.

This "retirement villages" dimension has since been played down by the Australian Government, but it is clear from the statements of people like Barry Jones that the polises are still planned to attract wealthy foreigners ...

The Government is concerned to avoid any suggestion that the new cities would be "Japanese enclave(s)" within Australia or a form of Japanese "cultural imperialism."

However, those spokesmen of the steering committee, such as Mr Will Bailey of the ANZ Bank, continually stress that other countries may join the scheme, in two years none have shown more than limited interest.

The original Japanese proposal was in fact knocked back by a number of countries fearing an intrusion upon their national integrity.

Beneath all the rhetoric the plan has two basic thrusts.

First, it is intended to relieve pressures on Japan's overcrowded tiny islands.

Second, it is intended to provide for extensions of Japanese predominance in scientific research. In other words the polises are to be off-shore service stations for excess Japanese capital.

The MITI's initial report, for example, showed explicit interest in Australia's strategically significant resources including zirconium, titanium and uranium.

Quite apart from the social problems endemic in having elite foreign enclaves in proximity to Australian cities, the grand hopes for technological spin-offs to Australia are ill-founded.

As Australian officials are half-aware, whenever Japan's MITI has contributed to joint research ventures, the Japanese have monopolised all rights to research results.

Victoria's brown coal liquefaction project provides a telling illustration of this tendency to take control of intellectual property.

14 November 1989

Australia has a long history of selling off the farm to "great and powerful" friends in return for peppercorns.

We have a long history of treating Australia as an empty space - from nuclear bomb testing at Maralinga, dumping of radio-active waste, and monitoring the possibility of a nuclear first-strike by the USA, to woodchipping disappearing rainforests.

Perhaps it is time to stop and consider that the consequences go far beyond short term economic gains.

The multifunctional polis proposal needs wider debate.

That article was written by Paul James, a lecturer in social theory at Melbourne University. Perhaps it highlights that, certainly well prior to any serious consideration being given to such a proposal, there needs to be full and informed debate both in parliament and in public prior to anything happening.

On 29 September this year Senator Button issued a statement on the multifunction polis, but unfortunately it has not been made public. It has just gone to certain groups but is not available for the rest of us to see. Any suggested benefits of the MFP to Canberrans specifically, and Australians in general, I feel, should be concrete and exact prior to going ahead with such a proposal which on the surface sounds highly attractive. So the point which I make and which I emphasise is that there needs to be a great deal more open debate. This has not been shown to be the case over the last two years in Australia.

MR COLLAERY (4.06): I have only a few comments to make. As an Assembly member I welcome a largely bipartisan debate of this nature. It is good to hear the various people contributing to an aggregate outlook. I have a very small contribution to make. It is not the area that I have been assigned to comment upon within our Rally function.

Mr Speaker, the study is informative, and of course it is speculative in some regard. It occurred to me that some of the speculation could have been of a further amplitude. It does refer at page 35 to the Kings Highway connecting the ACT with the south coast at Batemans Bay. I found that somewhat narrow in its concept and also, in the diagram of the transport links, the tie in with the VFT seemed to some extent to restrict the thinking that is latent in the document.

It is apparent to me at least that a seaport gives Wollongong, for instance - and I am trying to be objective on this - a strong argument for the MFP itself. Of course

14 November 1989

it has stolen a march on the ACT and already has very firm indicators that set it up ahead of us to date in terms of having some part of the core at least if we treat Wollongong as part of the metropolitan Sydney area. If we do not treat Wollongong as part of the metropolitan Sydney area, as the diagram following page 35 indicates, then Wollongong of course is ahead of us, with the recent announcements by Professor McLachlan and others with regard to technological emplacements for Wollongong.

Mr Speaker, the Jervis Bay territory is a fascinating appendage to the ACT - or it was. I went down there recently, on the old Sassafras Road. I had not been down there for 20 years. Sadly, the lyrebirds have gone. That road, except for one small section, could easily carry a rail link, and Jervis Bay itself could be connected quite easily to Canberra, in a single run to a major seaport. I imagine some people would wince at that prospect. Additionally there is already a very sizeable naval airfield there, in terms of airport connection.

So really, the MFP does not explore a lot of the options. Certainly, from an environmental point of view, I would not be pushing that one, but I see it as one issue that does not appear to have been carried. Given the constitutional structure of this country, in connection with section 92, a seaport for Canberra could have quite interesting implications into the next century for the economic future of this Territory. There is one aspect of the absence perhaps of some wider lateral thinking.

I would join with Dr Kinloch in mentioning style. Some of the diagrams and photos are not numbered and the pages on which they are printed are not numbered. It is difficult when you are analysing a document like this and referring to it as a consultant to a client if you are not able to refer accurately to an element of the document. But it is the beginning, Mr Speaker. The real gain to date is the large bipartisan acknowledgement of the broader issues, including the environment, which of course is not a topical issue; it is going to be a long-running, sustained issue for the future of the Territory.

Mr Speaker, the MFP idea has not explored the concept of how far we wish to go with the population growth of the ACT; what the end limit is, even with clean and high-tech industry; how far the Canberra growth should go; and whether it is proper that, with self-government, the ACT lost the potential seaport that it could have had, along with a corridor on that route through Braidwood to Jervis Bay.

There are still significant, if I could call them that, appendage arguments latent in the document. They are that we are an appendage of the larger cosmopolitan and metropolitan centres. If this is to be a document that takes us into the twenty-first century, perhaps it should have explored more broadly setting up Canberra itself as

14 November 1989

having, in and through the next century, the capacity to expand out along a corridor through the heath lands that go for many kilometres towards Jervis Bay. Inherent in its documentation - and I have referred to page 35 - is this Batemans Bay focus in terms of where Canberra lies; it lies somewhere next to Batemans Bay and between Sydney and Melbourne.

It did not connect Canberra with the possibility of its being the arrival point internationally, from an air point of view, for tourist entry to the centre of Australia, directly from Canberra to Alice Springs, and so on.

There are a number of issues that I would like the framers of the document to explore, but the Rally, in the terms that my colleagues Dr Kinloch and Mr Jensen have announced, broadly supports the initiatives therein, subject to those other matters.

MR WHALAN (Minister for Industry, Employment and Education) (4.12), in reply: Mr Speaker, I would like to express my delight at the unanimous and cross-party support for the general conceptual position which has been put forward by the Government in this particular paper. I acknowledge some of the criticisms of the presentation, and they will be a valuable input in refining the final document. I appreciate those comments. The very constructive suggestions which have come forward from so many speakers will make the Hansard of this discussion a very important tool for those who are working on the preparation of our position on this. It is clear that we all understand that we are preparing for the next century in relation to this and it is important that we consider our position carefully so that we maximise the opportunities that are available to us.

I would like to report to the Assembly that a function is being organised tomorrow by RAIPA - the Royal Australian Institute of Public Administration. It will be conducting a seminar on the multifunction polis at the Lakeside Hotel. It is being organised jointly by the Canberra Association for Regional Development and my department. The purpose of this seminar will be to present the ACT's MFP vision to industry and research groups in Canberra, with a view to identifying specific investment and business opportunities from that MFP vision. Of course, the private sector involvement in this is absolutely crucial.

The Office of Industry and Development has produced a video on the ACT MFP vision and that is being sponsored by the Canberra Development Board, the St George Building Society and Lend Lease. It is valuable to see the joint effort of government and the private sector in developing this concept, and their support for the government initiative is appreciated. This video will be used at the seminar along with a Japanese version to be used this week in a full presentation of the ACT Vision to the Australian-Japanese joint steering committee. That presentation will take

14 November 1989

place at the steering committee's meeting in Melbourne. It is worth while for our representatives at that meeting to be able to report the unanimous support of this legislature to the approach in relation to the MFP. That is of great value. I thank the Assembly for its support.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

MOTOR TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL (NO. 3) 1989

Debate resumed from 28 September 1989, on motion by **Mrs Grassby**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MRS NOLAN (4.16): Mr Speaker, at the outset I would like to say that the Liberal Party will be supporting this amending Bill. It welcomes the Government removing the anomaly currently in the Motor Traffic Act which technically defines wheelchairs as motor vehicles and therefore does not allow them to travel on footpaths.

I am pleased to see that the national road traffic code, which provides guidelines for the States and territories, has been taken into consideration on this matter. I am also pleased to see any legislation which removes such discrimination against those very special people with disabilities in our community. I was amazed that such legislation had not been introduced long ago. Such a lot is said today about discrimination.

I am also concerned that there is other legislation that needs amendment to remove such discriminatory practices against the disabled in our community. While I recognise that, as the Minister said, the existing law has not been enforced, it is important that all laws in place be enforced, and in this particular case this Bill will clearly be of benefit.

Mr Speaker, I do not think a lot needs to be said. As I mentioned earlier, the Liberal Party will be supporting the amending Bill. It is a straightforward Bill and I am sure all parties will vote to allow its passage.

MR WOOD (4.18): Mr Speaker, this Bill is no minor matter. The amendment to the Motor Traffic Act will allow people using motorised wheelchairs to travel on footpaths without fear of being penalised for committing an offence. It may seem of no great moment but it does express principles that are very important. Those principles are concern, support and equity for the disabled.

At present, as we know, no distinction is made between a motorised wheelchair and motor vehicles under the Motor Traffic Act. This is because a motor vehicle is defined as a vehicle that uses spirit or steam, gas, oil, electricity

14 November 1989

or any other power as its principal means of propulsion. Because of that definition, a motorised wheelchair is required to conform to laws governing motor vehicles, including registration, compulsory third party insurance and such items as a horn, blinkers, wipers and so on. These are clearly inappropriate requirements in today's circumstances.

However, more seriously, the Motor Traffic Act states that wheelchairs are prohibited from travelling on footpaths or in any public places where motor vehicles are prohibited. Of course, today these are clearly archaic requirements, especially in today's circumstances where motorised wheelchairs are now rather commonplace. To correct the anomaly, the definition of a pedestrian is being widened to include a disabled person travelling in a motorised wheelchair, as long as that wheelchair is not capable of exceeding seven kilometres an hour. That is the speed of a very, very brisk walking pace - well, certainly for me, a brisk walking pace.

While this law that I have quoted has not been enforced, it is nevertheless a law which discriminates unnecessarily against a small sector of the community. As matters currently stand, a disabled person who needs to travel in a motorised wheelchair is technically breaking the law when travelling on paths and in public places such as the foreshores of Lake Burley Griffin or Lake Ginninderra. Clearly, such a situation is untenable, and I am pleased that this Government has moved so quickly to remove that discrimination against disabled people.

Under the proposed Bill, disabled people using motorised wheelchairs will be subject to the same laws and regulations which cover pedestrians. They will be required to exercise due care and attention and to provide reasonable consideration for other users. A penalty of \$100 is proposed for offenders convicted of contravening that provision.

In addition, the definition requires that the wheelchair be specifically designed and constructed for use by a disabled person. This is included to stop possible abuse by able-bodied people using motorised wheelchairs for purposes other than those intended. I suppose we do have to cover all options. I believe that this Bill has wide-reaching effects, more than simply correcting the anomaly quoted. It demonstrates that the Government is sensitive to the disadvantaged members of our community by ensuring that they are accorded the same rights and privileges available to other users of transport facilities in the ACT. That is the major importance of this Bill.

MR JENSEN (4.22): From the outset let me say that the Rally is supporting this amending Bill, but let me also add to the comments made by Mr Wood in relation to the importance of this particular Bill to those less fortunate in our community who are required to use wheelchairs

14 November 1989

and such devices to move around our city. Those of us who are able-bodied, Mr Speaker, take for granted the opportunities that we have to move effectively and efficiently around our city. People who are not as fortunate as ourselves are forced to rely on mechanical means to get around to the same extent that we do.

It is also important that this amending Bill takes into account the move that we have seen in recent years to develop and increase the facilities for disabled people to move around, particularly in public buildings. Mr Speaker, I will make a comment here on the work of ACROD, an organisation which has made some considerable efforts in the past to provide information to disabled persons in the ACT about public buildings within Canberra. This work, of course, applies all over Australia, and ACROD has done this with the assistance of service organisations and service clubs. I commend both ACROD and the service organisations that assist it in that area for their work.

There was one matter that Mr Wood alluded to in his comments. It relates to the question of the third party personal injury aspects of the Bill, particularly now that it allows wheelchairs to operate in areas that are going to be used by pedestrians. There are going to be bikes, children and various other aspects that may cause some problems for these particular people. It is apparent to us that vehicular wheelchairs are to be defined as not being vehicles; they are to be de facto pedestrians. Now wheelchairs, for the purposes of this legislation, are defined as pedestrians, and we should ensure that disabled people are aware of their responsibilities to take out some public liability insurance for the damage to persons or property caused by, for example, a runaway wheelchair.

We enjoin the Government to ensure that wide publicity is given to this amendment, when it is put into place, concerning the responsibility of these people to ensure that they have coverage to avoid the possible problems associated with damage to either property or other persons by circumstances beyond their control. For example, a person who operates a wheelchair might be taken suddenly ill while operating that particular facility on a bike path or in a pedestrian area. The person might be unable to control the wheelchair and it might get away and cause some damage to people or property.

Mr Speaker, it is appropriate, I would suggest, for people to be aware that they have a responsibility in this area so that, as well as being disabled or possibly injured in this particular case, they are not subject to considerable litigation brought against them by people who seek to be recompensed for the damage caused to them or their property. So in this area we enjoin the Government to ensure that it takes into account and makes sure that disabled people are fully aware of their responsibilities in this area.

14 November 1989

In closing, Mr Speaker, let me reiterate that the Rally will be supporting this particular amending Bill, with the appropriate comments in relation to the responsibilities of the Government to encourage disabled people to ensure that they are able to participate in the use of this facility in the ACT.

MR WHALAN (Minister for Industry, Employment and Education) (4.26): Mr Speaker, I am pleased to support this amendment to the Motor Traffic Act. In my view, this is quite a significant step in recognising the very legitimate rights that disabled people have to enjoy life on the same basis as their more able-bodied friends and other members of the community. There can be no doubt that attitudes towards disabled members of the community have changed greatly since the Motor Traffic Act was originally prepared.

Many of our attitudes were, of course, challenged during the international year of the disabled a few years ago. It is clear that that occasion served as a catalyst to bring many attitudes into a more positive and sensible position. Technology has also made significant advances since the Act was written and we now see motorised wheelchairs being used as an everyday occurrence. Most of us, I am sure, take for granted a person's right to operate a wheelchair in those areas where the rest of us go freely.

This Bill ensures that today's more enlightened attitudes about disabled individuals - their rights to mobility and enjoyment of life - and today's technology are matched with the law. It ensures that individuals do not have to break the law just to lead a life which is normal. I know that there has been no effort to enforce the law as it stands, but that is not good enough. Law-makers need to ensure that the community is protected by the law, not by the discretion of those whose duty it is to enforce the law. This Bill ensures that the wishes of the community are properly reflected in legislation and that disabled people do not have to break any law simply to go down the street.

MRS GRASSBY (Minister for Housing and Urban Services) (4.28), in reply: I am pleased at the generous support given by the Assembly to this Bill, which looks at streamlining the Motor Traffic Act of 1936 to ensure that disabled persons travelling in motorised wheelchairs may legally travel on footpaths and in public places in the ACT. It is important for these people and means that all sections of the community have equal access to Canberra's lovely parks, foreshores and pathways, without any discrimination or fear of retribution through unknowingly breaking the law.

This Bill ensures that those in our community who need motorised wheelchairs to travel will be accorded the same rights and privileges as other members of the community. Mr Jensen wondered whether users of motorised wheelchairs would come under the same obligations, really, as cyclists. You have to go at a certain speed, Mr Jensen, before you

14 November 1989

have to worry about being registered and have third party insurance. I do not think we are going to have any wheelchairs screaming down the street, so I do not think this is a problem.

Mr Jensen: I was not talking about that, Ellnor; you were not listening. I was not talking about third party.

MRS GRASSBY: So, they are not up for public liability.

Mr Jensen: I was talking about personal liability, Ellnor; you were not listening.

MRS GRASSBY: Well, they are not up for public liability. You see, it does not come under - - -

Mr Jensen: Personal liability, Ellnor.

MRS GRASSBY: I think you will find that it does not come under it because I am told it is the same as using your footpaths.

Mr Jensen: The same liability as you have for people tripping in your house, tripping over in your front hall.

MRS GRASSBY: I think that you will find that it does not come under that liability.

Mr Jensen: I would check it out, Ellnor.

MRS GRASSBY: Anyway, Mr Speaker, I commend the people for supporting this Bill and I thank the Assembly very much because I think it is important that we sort this out and get the Bill straightened up.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL 1989

Debate resumed from 28 September 1989, on motion by **Mrs Grassby:**

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MRS NOLAN (4.31): Again, Mr Speaker, the Liberal Party will not be disagreeing with this particular piece of legislation. Today, with the escalating costs of bicycle paths, they cannot remain exclusively for the use of cyclists. Both pedestrians and joggers use cycle paths. Sometimes the cycle path replaces a footpath, as in the

14 November 1989

case of part of Athllon Drive from the Woden area to the Tuggeranong Valley. So this Bill amending the Traffic Act to omit the definition of a bicycle path is, I consider, appropriate.

Many more people are looking to exercise. Our community especially considers exercise - whether cycling or jogging, or many other forms of sport - to be very important. In the ACT we are lucky to have a network of cycle paths. I believe there are over 130 kilometres of them. Cycle paths which enable cyclists and joggers to partake in such sport without using the road system make a significant contribution to safety. I hope this amendment reflects the Government's continuing commitment to improving road safety in the ACT.

Mr Speaker, it is perhaps timely for me to mention the lack of use of bicycle helmets. I think it is one of the things that needs much more promotion. We are all aware of many children who have had some serious injury through not wearing a cycle helmet, and I am sure all of us here recognise how important they are. I would like to see much more done in the area of the education program. Obviously legislation to make bicycle helmets mandatory is not the right way to go because it is one thing to actually have legislation and it is another to actually police it. In this case it would be very difficult.

Having bicycle helmets available with the sale of bikes is probably another way that it can be looked at. I hope, Mr Speaker, that Mrs Grassby will look into helmet wearing in the ACT, compare it with what is being done in New South Wales, and take immediate action to try to increase the numbers of children who are wearing helmets. At this point in time, less than a third of our children riding bicycles actually wear helmets. I would like to put the Government on notice that much more needs to be done in this area, and I hope that something will be done very quickly. The recently concluded Bicycle Week was another good time to make mention of the safety area and I think it was something that brought to our attention how important helmet wearing is.

As I indicated earlier, Mr Speaker, the Liberal Party will be supporting this amending Bill. We recognise just how important it is that cyclists do not have exclusive use of those bicycle paths, but that people walking, jogging, pushing prams or whatever can legally use that cycle network as well.

MR WOOD (4.34): Mr Speaker, the cycle paths - soon to be recreation paths - in the ACT are a unique resource in our city. I think there are few cities so well served by the extensive carriageways or paths that we have. Therefore, I am pleased to support this Bill that acknowledges that conversion.

14 November 1989

When the NCDC commissioned that network in the early 1970s it expected that they would be, as announced, primarily for cyclists travelling to and from work and in their recreation, and that no doubt will remain the most important use of the paths. Research was undertaken by the ACT Parks and Conservation Service and the CCAE, now the University of Canberra, which showed that the paths have a much wider use. Anyone who uses the paths would readily see that, as Mrs Nolan pointed out. The fact is that the urban and cycle ways network in the ACT has been identified in that survey as one of the most important recreational resources available to visitors and local residents. The large numbers of people who undertake activities which rely on access to these pathways clearly show their importance.

It is reasonable then to expect that they should be designated as having a wider use. This could create a potentially greater safety hazard, and I want to make some mention of that. As one who is a fair weather and warm weather cyclist, I know the very great volume of traffic that they carry. I am in the happy position of living between Lake Ginninderra and Lake Burley Griffin. When the weather is fine I spend my time cycling in these areas. I see a large number and variety of people who use them.

I think there is a potential for danger because there are people who walk their dogs; there are casual strollers; there are people in some parts who do their shopping, taking the cycle path towards Dickson, for example, or towards Jamison, who use them and walk along them; there are people pushing baby's strollers and the like. It all adds up to a fair volume of traffic. Along with that you have got the people with the very, very reasonable expectation that they should be able to pedal fairly furiously on them because they are designated as cycle paths. I have seen accidents happen on them, and I think the potential for accidents will increase. It is something that we need to be alert to.

Mrs Nolan suggested the greater use of helmets. I would recommend the greater use of bells. It seems that many cyclists think that it is impolite to ring a bell, and I know I do myself, but I think it is going to become necessary to clear the path of those people who take a much slower approach along it. I might mention that my approach, even on a bike, is pretty slow too - especially up O'Connor Ridge. Something that we will have to consider is that the great volume of traffic is going to require that all those who use the cycle paths, or the recreation paths, take greater responsibility. Those people who are admiring the flowers or walking the dog on a lead have to be alert to the fact that there may be a cyclist bearing down - sometimes very quickly - behind them. So, as the Minister makes announcements about this, she might bear in mind advising all those who use the paths to take greater care and show greater responsibility in the future.

14 November 1989

MR STEFANIAK (4.39): I would like to support the comments of my colleague Mrs Nolan and also Mr Wood, and commend this Bill. I think it is a bit unfortunate that the Minister responsible for the Bill did not join me on a very enjoyable cycle ride along about 50 kilometres of our cycle paths several Sundays ago when it was Bicycle Week.

Mrs Grassby: I could not, Bill. I thought you would have move-on powers.

MR STEFANIAK: Well, we were all moving pretty quickly, Ellnor, so I do not think that was really necessary. But certainly it enabled me to travel along quite a lot of our very good cycle paths and experience not only the volume of cyclists who used them on that most pleasant Sunday but also other people, families out for a stroll and several joggers. I am also very grateful to Mrs Nolan for coming to pick me up at Pine Island at the end of our first leg and take me to the top of the hill so that I did not have to ride up the hill all the way through Tuggeranong. This allowed me to ride back downhill along the cycle paths to Civic. Certainly they are very much recreation paths, and indeed I bumped into a few people I knew, including an old Pole at Yarralumla who directed me to a municipal problem.

Mrs Grassby: My goodness; are the poles talking to you now, Bill?

MR STEFANIAK: No, no; it was a live one, Ellnor, an old family friend, who certainly could not be described as a jogger because he is an elderly gentleman and he was just taking a stroll. He drew my attention to some sewerage and twigs that had banked up near the Yarralumla oval, near the path, and I duly passed that on to the Minister's private secretary. I hope that has been attended to. In fact, I may take a ride out to Yarralumla and check on that shortly. But they are a wonderful form of recreation, not just for cyclists, but for joggers, for families, for people out for a stroll, and I wholeheartedly support this legislation, as does my party.

MR JENSEN (4.41): Mr Speaker, I think that it is very important to identify the difference between the true commuter cyclists and the recreational cyclists who seek to use our bicycle paths. My discussions with organisations like Pedal Power have clearly shown that there is a major difference between the two. Those who wish to move quickly between the town centres using an alternative to the motor vehicle have some difficulty in using the existing bike paths that we have around the ACT.

However, what worries me is that there seems to be a suggestion that the existing facilities that we have are appropriate for the fast commuter cyclists in their attempts to get out of their motor cars and move between the major centres. As the question I asked the Minister this afternoon stated, there are also people who wish to travel from the suburban areas to major bus centres, put

14 November 1989

their bikes in storage - paying for the privilege, of course - and then catch the fast bus into the city. That was the purpose of the question and I understand that that was the reason why the organisation, Pedal Power, raised it with the Minister's office. I am pleased to say, Mr Speaker, that there seems to be considerable contact between organisations like Pedal Power and the Minister's office and other cyclists' groups, and I trust that that particular arrangement will continue.

The majority of the existing paths are really only designed, so I have been informed, for speeds of up to 25 kilometres an hour. However, these days, with modern cycles, with bike frames and various equipment, they reach speeds almost twice that; in fact, up to 40 kilometres an hour. They are not only a danger to themselves on some of the existing bike paths but also a danger to those others, like myself, who are using them for recreational or slower commuting purposes. I am still working on that. I have yet to take the plunge into the right sort of gear and the right sort of bike to give it a whirl.

It is a long way from Tuggeranong to town, but I have certainly been given an offer. One of the commuters who regularly commutes from Tuggeranong to the city - he is quite a senior member of the public service - offered me the opportunity to come along and have a look at some of the problem areas that appear after weekends, particularly underneath overpasses, where certain of our less public spirited citizens rain large quantities of glass and bottles and other things into these areas. This causes a considerable problem to commuters.

Mr Kaine: We need a move-on powers Bill, Norm.

MR JENSEN: We will not get into that, Mr Kaine, that is another area. I received the letter with interest and indicated to him that there were two major problems that would stop me from accompanying him on a ride from Tuggeranong to town: one was my current level of fitness, which has gone down quite considerably, and the second one was the fact that I do not own a suitable machine for that sort of travel. I did offer to meet him at one of the locations and take a short trip until I got my true level of fitness back again. Maybe you will see me flashing into the Assembly, suitably attired, on a bike.

However, there are some major problems if I am to do that; if I am to use the existing major traffic way from the southern part of Canberra into the city. I refer to the major road from Woden and also the major road from Tuggeranong. In a lot of areas there are facilities for the bike riders to use the breakdown lane as a means of operating. However, as I observed this morning as I came to work, there are some major problems from Phillip through to the city where the breakdown lane disappears. Fast commuter cyclists would be quite happy to use the breakdown lane provided it had an appropriate hot mix surface - a fast surface.

14 November 1989

In case there is some concern about the dangers of mixing cyclists, particularly fast cyclists, and motor traffic, studies overseas, particularly in Canada, have indicated that where these facilities are provided for the use of commuter cyclists there is a marked reduction in the accident rate. I would encourage the Minister's department to look at this very carefully when they are discussing the issues with organisations like Pedal Power.

In closing, I would like to take up a point that my colleague Mrs Nolan made in relation to helmets. I seem to recall that there was a proposal initiated by a service club in the Tuggeranong Valley which encouraged school children within the area to wear cycle helmets. The club provided a considerable subsidy to young students of the schools so that they could purchase appropriate headgear. Of course, we have all heard the discussions about hard helmets versus soft helmets, but I will not get into that. That is another argument for another time. I know certain people in the cyclists' fraternity believe that the hard helmets are a danger, whereas the softer helmets are more appropriate. That is an interesting argument which we will not continue today.

The service club I was referring to encouraged large numbers of children to purchase and use cycle helmets. One of the major problems with this is the problem associated with peer pressure. I think it is important that we start our children wearing helmets as young as possible if they are going to cycle to school using the cycle paths. The suburban cycle paths were designed so that children would not have to ride on major roads or cross major roads to get to schools. That was basically my understanding of what this particular aspect of planning was all about.

So I think it is important, and I would like to see the Minister's office possibly assisting service organisations and others who might wish to encourage and develop the wearing of helmets amongst the youngsters at our schools from the very earliest age. From the time they get onto their bikes and use them to ride to school, helmet wearing should be encouraged. Service clubs, I am sure, would be happy to participate in this. The service club that I was involved with, Mr Speaker, nominated the project for an Australia-wide competition - in fact it made the finals of that community based competition - because of the initiative and clear thinking behind that particular concept.

So, Mr Speaker, the Rally supports quite strongly the amendments that have been made here today, but I think it is appropriate that the Minister's office should take note of this, particularly when planning new freeways. I understand that the eastern freeway makes no provision for fast commuter cyclists, which is unfortunate. That is something that the Minister may wish to look at. Certainly, if we are talking about Gungahlin - I know it is

14 November 1989

mentioned in the GET study - fast commuter cyclists should be clearly provided for.

So, Mr Speaker, the Rally supports this particular amendment and hopes that the Minister will take on board some of the matters that I have raised and continue discussions with Pedal Power and other organisations.

MRS GRASSBY (Minister for Housing and Urban Services) (4.49), in reply: I am pleased that the Assembly will be supporting this Bill. It is important that we streamline the Traffic Act 1937 by omitting the definition of bicycle paths, thereby ensuring that many kilometres of bicycle pathways used for bicycles in the ACT will remain open for the use of pedestrians, cyclists, joggers, skateboard riders and other non-motorised traffic, as a shared resource. It is important that this goes through because, as has been said by many of the speakers, this is a city that can be very much enjoyed by cyclists.

May I say right now to Mr Jensen that I would not like to see any cyclist - I do not care how fast or how good he is - on an expressway, because, believe you me, at the speed cars go by in this city, you would be flat out trying to get on one. May I also tell him, in relation to the cities he is pointing to overseas, that the entire countries would fit into the ACT. Mention was made of countries like Holland. They would all fit in here. They have special cyclists' paths and they do not put them on expressways.

As for helmets, may I tell Mr Jensen that we have a road safety program that goes through all the schools, which is part of my department, and we encourage all young people to wear helmets. So we are not wasting our time.

Mrs Nolan: You did not get to enough schools.

MRS GRASSBY: We are doing this in all schools, I must tell you, Mrs Nolan.

Mrs Nolan: But you only got to 80 or something.

MRS GRASSBY: He is talking about school children. I am answering him on school children. I am not answering him on 80-year-olds. But if you would like us to start up schools for 80-year-olds to wear helmets, we will start up schools for 80-year-olds to wear helmets.

Mrs Nolan: We are talking about numbers of schools.

Mr Kaine: Listen, Ellnor; please listen. Once Ellnor gets wound up, she does not listen.

MRS GRASSBY: When I get wound up, I do not listen to any of you.

14 November 1989

Mr Stefaniak: There are not many 80-year-olds on bikes, Ellnor.

MRS GRASSBY: This is a lot of nonsense; it is wasting time. We are talking about helmets. They are already teaching kids in schools to wear helmets, Mr Jensen, and if you would stop interrupting me I would get through this.

There is no way that I am going to suggest that cyclists get on expressways in this city, because I have seen the way people pass me in cars on expressways and, I can tell you, sometimes I wonder whether they think they are in some great motor race somewhere in Europe and not just on an ordinary road in Canberra. So I would certainly rather keep cyclists on the cycle paths and build more for them.

Mr Jensen: Both New South Wales and Victoria allow them on freeways now.

MRS GRASSBY: Mr Jensen, my God, would you let me get on? I let you speak. For God's sake, he is like a cockatoo, 50 to the dozen, all the time. I cannot get anything in here, Mr Speaker.

Mrs Nolan: The gramophone needle is breaking down.

MRS GRASSBY: The gramophone needle never breaks down; don't worry about it, Mrs Nolan. I will be here long after you. I feel that this is a very important Bill, and while I am the Minister I would like to see more cycle paths being built right throughout Canberra. We should keep cyclists on the paths and ask them to use their bells a bit more. Maybe a few people here need a few ding-dong bells too. It might keep them quiet for a while. Anyway, Mr Speaker, I commend this Bill to the house.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Berlin Wall

MRS GRASSBY (4.54): I rise to speak on a very important point, the fact that the wall came down between West and

14 November 1989

East Berlin. I rise to speak on what caused that wall to be built, and what many of us feel was a very dark page in history. As a very famous man, Robbie Burns, once said, "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn". Countless thousands today mourn the fact that six million Jews and others were gassed, shot, tortured and experimented on by a madman or at his direction. We must be ever vigilant that this never again happens in the world - no matter when, where or by whom - to any persons, no matter what their colour, race or religion.

We are lucky that we live in a country which is democratic and in which we have the right to express our feelings through the ballot-box. Let me remind the house that Germany in the early 1930s was also a democratic country, but one man, Adolf Hitler - a house painter, I believe - was able to change this. He gave the world one of the greatest horrors that the human race could ever commit against itself. If we saw animals do this we would, I am sure, be shocked. The world for some time turned its back on the Jews and others and would not believe that this was happening. Today we have the proof, not only moving pictures, stills and books, but records made by the Nazis themselves. They kept records so that they would know how well they had achieved this, the horror of what they were doing.

Some of the people who lived through this hell under Hitler and the Nazis did not make it by using their wits or anything else; they were just lucky. May I say to the people who did not survive this horror, whether they were Jews or others - and there were many other people who were killed for their beliefs - on this day on which we have seen a wonderful happening, a wall coming down between two cities, may they rest in peace.

Berlin Wall

MR HUMPHRIES (4.56): I also rise to speak on the subject that Mrs Grassby has raised. I, like Mrs Grassby, was pleased, excited and gratified to see the wall come down between East and West Berlin, and symbolically between Eastern Europe and Western Europe for the rest of the world, though I would not have attributed much of that wall to the excesses of Nazism.

Mrs Grassby: It would never have happened if there had not been Nazis.

MR HUMPHRIES: Naturally the Holocaust and the excesses of Nazism gave rise to the circumstances where that occurred, but the wall was not built by Nazis, Minister; it was built by a totalitarian state which remains in power today.

Mrs Grassby: It came about because of Nazis.

14 November 1989

MR HUMPHRIES: The totalitarian power has changed, and I think we are all pleased to see that it has changed, but it was it that built the wall, not Nazis.

Mrs Grassby: What caused it?

MR HUMPHRIES: This is a very important topic, Minister. I think you should listen a little bit; I think you might learn something.

Mrs Grassby: I have learnt a lot.

MR HUMPHRIES: That wall has been a symbol of division in our world; it has been a symbol above all else of the failure of socialism. It showed us a society which needed so badly to keep its people from voting with their feet against the system of government imposed in Eastern Europe that a wall was necessary to achieve the imprisonment of its citizens. In my view, it has long been an abomination against humanity, against free will, against the freedom of expression which we enjoy in this country, and I applaud the decision to tear it down. I think it reflects on the acknowledgment by countries in Eastern Europe - particularly, in this case, East Germany - that the system of government that necessitated that wall has failed.

It is a stark, total, abject admission that it has failed and I, for one, am pleased to have seen the wall while it was standing and am pleased that the governments of West Germany and East Germany will attempt to preserve part of that wall as an indication of what people can do to each other. I saw the wall as a young child. I was 11 or 12 when I saw it. That above anything else, I think, confirmed my belief that I should be a liberal and that I should oppose communism and socialism.

Mrs Grassby: Yes, what went wrong?

MR HUMPHRIES: I am quite astonished that these sorts of petty little interjections should come from the Minister opposite me. Minister, this is a major event in world history, a quite significant event and you - - -

Mrs Grassby: Yes, but it was also a major event that six million people were gassed.

MR HUMPHRIES: Minister, no-one objects to that.

Mrs Grassby: That is what I am talking about.

MR HUMPHRIES: I am very sorry that you have this sort of pent-up problem about the Nazis. Nobody is going to get up in this place and defend Nazis, but nor should anybody be coming into this place and defending the kinds of excesses that have occurred in our lifetimes - not in the lifetimes of people now dead, but in our lifetime - by communist regimes in Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world.

14 November 1989

Mrs Grassby: I was alive when they were getting rid of six million people. I was alive, yes.

MR HUMPHRIES: I am sure you were, Minister, but I am sorry that age has not given you any more wisdom.

Mrs Grassby: I do not think it has given much to you either.

MR HUMPHRIES: Minister, you talked about the excesses of madmen that do terrible things to the human race. Those excesses are not finished. There are regimes in this world which have continued that kind of oppression even within my lifetime. Only a few years ago there was a government in Cambodia which, on the scale of human tragedy, was far more excessive and was far more suppressive of the people of that country than anything Adolf Hitler did. Half of the people of Cambodia were killed by that regime - half. Hitler never quite got to those heights, Minister. But let us keep something in perspective. I am happy to acknowledge and to share with you the horror of Nazism but do not for one minute, by your calling across the chamber, hint to anybody that you are prepared to tolerate the excesses of totalitarian communism.

Holocaust

MR BERRY (Minister for Community Services and Health) (5.01): I would like to follow on from what Minister Grassby has said about the terrors of Nazism. I think that the anniversary of the most important and significant event in recent times, if we can relate to that, occurred on 9 November. That was Kristallnacht. It marks an important day of remembrance for Jewish people around the world.

Kristallnacht - night of glass literally, but night of broken glass in reality - was the start of overt actions by the Nazis against the Jews, and I am sure, Mr Stevenson, that that is not rubbish, as I heard you say a little while ago. On 7 November 1938 a young Jew, whose parents were deported from Germany to Poland by the fascists, assassinated a German diplomat in Paris. In so-called spontaneous reprisals, on Kristallnacht in 1938, synagogues, Jewish shops, businesses and homes were attacked and destroyed by mobs including civilians and the military. The Nazis mobilised the might of a modern industrialised society against unarmed and unprepared civilians. They included not just Jews but also trade unionists, gypsies, communists and anybody else who spoke up against the terrible regime.

During World War II tens of millions of people were killed, of which several million were Jews. It was long before Kristallnacht in 1938, however, that Adolf Hitler and the Nazi party began their persecution of the Jewish people. As early as 1924, Nazis had introduced anti-Jewish Bills into

14 November 1989

the Reichstag. In 1933, the Nazis proclaimed a general boycott of all Jewish owned businesses, and Jews were dismissed from the civil service and denied admission to the bar. It was also at this time that books written by Jews and opponents of Nazism were burnt. In 1935, "Juden verboten" - "No Jews" - signs were increased in number outside towns, villages and restaurants and, of course, in stores. But after Kristallnacht the scale and level of persecution against the Jewish people intensified.

Mr Speaker, three days after the fateful night, 26,000 Jews were arrested and sent to concentration camps. Also, in December that year, the Nazis enacted a Bill for the compulsory expropriation of Jewish industries, businesses and shops. It was between 1939 and 1944 that the extensive deportations and horrific mass extermination of the Jews that is now well known to all of us took place.

Generally, Mr Speaker, in the ACT Kristallnacht is not commemorated in any significant way. I must say that I am deeply shamed that there are some - a very, very small minority - who refuse to recognise the terrors that were committed against the Jewish people. I think the reason why I have raised it now is that it is quite close to a day of significance, 9 November. Last year, however, was the fiftieth anniversary and, of course, special events were organised, including tree planting and a seminar. The main day that is commemorated in the ACT, as indeed all over the world, is Yom Shoah, the Holocaust memorial day, and that will be remembered in April 1990. Mr Speaker, I think it is appropriate for this place to note with horror the acts and atrocities which were committed against the Jewish people in those terrible times.

Holocaust

MR COLLAERY (5.06): Mr Speaker, I am somewhat puzzled by the drift of the adjournment debate. We were not sitting last week, and I presume it was the intention of the members of the ALP who have spoken to commemorate the Holocaust. That is entirely appropriate and proper and should be close to our minds. I think my colleague Mr Humphries was puzzled but did not have the chance I have had to work out what was going on. There was no mention of the anniversary last week to remind the rest of us.

On a day when, as Minister Grassby said, she rose to speak about the coming down of the Berlin Wall, it might be appropriate to wish the German people well in the same context. I thought perhaps Minister Berry could have gone on to say that. Against the background of all that suffering, and speaking as someone whose father perished at the hands of the Germans in the last war, I feel that we must look towards the most significant developments of the last week in the context of the duty of the German people to recognise the past, as indeed they have. When I was in

14 November 1989

Germany, school children were taken to Berlin to witness the events in a special memorial place where the evidence of the Holocaust is displayed graphically. School children and school history books in Germany have been written appropriately, most unlike in Japan where the Japanese people have failed lamentably to recognise their history, and that will be a source of future problems.

The Germans have put a lot into recognising their misdeeds as a corporate group under the leadership of Adolf Hitler. But I do say to Minister Grassby that she should be, at the same time, generous to the German people who may well found another powerful middle Europe. This event of the last week has seeds of instability for the European Common Market if it goes the other way. With the mass of cheap labour available to the east of Germany, there is the possibility of the formation of a new market force. They are significant foreign policy considerations even for Australia, given the market. With east and middle Europe as a market, as Russia now divests itself of its empire and as it may come together with the extraordinary industry and technological skills of the German people, we may see the beginnings of a new world force factor. That could be welcomed by us at this stage. I say that guardedly, depending upon other events.

But, indeed, the German people are still coming out of the ashes that they brought upon themselves. Their misery has been obvious for many years. Those of us who have been in Eastern Germany have seen one of the most sinister communist regimes alive - or formerly alive. I believe, from the textbooks, that it ran one of the most effective intelligence services. It trained the Cuban intelligence services. It has been extremely active, even in Australia. East Germany's demise is something we must all welcome because it puts aside the Marxist-Leninist totalitarian approach that has bedevilled the world for the last 45 years.

I welcome the emergence of the new Germany. I say that as someone whose family suffered at the hands of the German people - not because they were Jewish; they were Australian. I think we need to be generous. There is a good German population in the ACT region and I think it should be on record that we wish them well with their family reunion plans in the near future.

Holocaust

MR STEFANIAK (5.11): As Mr Collaery said, he has had the benefit of hearing Mr Berry's speech and, having heard both Mr Berry and Mrs Grassby, perhaps the Berlin Wall might not be a pretty apt analogy. What we are talking about is an event 51 years ago - Kristallnacht - and we are talking about the Holocaust. Indeed the events in Germany in recent weeks are significant, but the question of what is

14 November 1989

happening in Eastern Europe can perhaps be left for another time. Having just briefly discussed that with Mr Humphries, perhaps we might raise it ourselves on Thursday. That is a different topic.

There are a lot of lessons, I think, from the Holocaust which we should remember and which Germany should remember especially if it is to reunite. Firstly, Mr Speaker, as Mrs Grassby said, a madman came to power in Nazi Germany and brought his gang along with him. As a result of a number of factors, he took over what was formerly a shaky democratic government in 1933 and instituted in Europe a reign of terror. Of course, at the same time, there was an equivalent reign of terror going on in the Soviet Union with his ally, briefly, Joseph Stalin. Indeed, the effects of that continued and really were responsible for the erection of the Berlin Wall.

However, to get back to the Nazis, the Germans were considered by the Jewish population to be among the most civilised people in Europe. It was quite shocking to see what one madman and his followers could do to a country. That madman caused the death of over six million Jews in a systematic campaign of extermination.

To the Western Allies' shame, especially Britain and France, the major Western Allies, this lunatic could have been stopped in the Rhineland in 1936; he could have been stopped during the Anschluss; he could have been stopped at Munich when the absolutely gutless Neville Chamberlain and the equally gutless French leader went there and capitulated to Adolf Hitler. After that, war was inevitable.

The Western Allies took until halfway through 1939 to wake up to the fact that he really was a menace, despite the loud protestations of a significant few led by such people as Winston Churchill. I suppose I have got something personal in this, Mr Speaker, because several members of my family on my father's side were killed by the Nazis. Poland was the first country hit by the German onslaught in World War II. Five and a half million Poles, including three million Jews, were exterminated by the Nazis.

Hitler's plans and the Nazis' plans for Eastern Europeans, who were Untermenschen in the Nazi creed, were the enslavement and execution of any intellectuals, any people in the bourgeoisie, anyone with a high school education. The Pol Pot regime has many similarities in terms of what Hitler intended to do to the people of Eastern Europe, Poland, the Soviet Union and other states in Eastern Europe.

As a result of World War II in Europe, some 30 to 35 million people were killed and also a significantly huge number of people in Asia, some 40 million. However, I suppose that is another story. That was another regime. One of the problems during World War II was that, despite

14 November 1989

information getting out through the various resistance groups in Eastern Europe, from Czechoslovakia and Poland and from the East where most of the death camps were, that there were death factories there and people were being exterminated, the Allies did nothing to bomb the camps. I think they refused to believe it, did not believe it, or did not want to believe it. For whatever reason, though, nothing really was done which could have perhaps alleviated to some extent the misery of those people in the camps.

Again, that is something that all the wartime Allies, the West and the Soviet Union, can be quite ashamed about. That is something I do not think we should forget. I think it is relevant because twice in the history of the twentieth century - in fact, it depends on who you listen to; maybe there have been some other instances as well - there have been two very noticeable instances of genocide. The most notable one is the event that we are talking about now, the Holocaust, the attempt to wipe out the Jewish race, a race that has been persecuted for the last 20 centuries. Also, of course, more recently, there was another madman, Pol Pot, trying to wipe out his own country.

Mr Collaery: And the Armenians.

MR STEFANIAK: And, as Mr Collaery says, the Armenians, and also the Ibos in Africa. There have been various other problems in Africa of one tribe trying to wipe out other tribes in the last 30 years. Despite the advances in technology and science, it seems that human beings still have a great deal to learn, and I think we should never forget the Holocaust. Certainly, I hope that, whatever happens to Germany, Germans will never forget the Holocaust so that at least that country will never participate in anything like that again.

Holocaust

DR KINLOCH (5.16): Mr Speaker, it has been a joy to have had this debate and I thank Mrs Grassby for beginning it. I welcome, especially across the chamber - a chamber in which we have no walls - the sometimes sharp interchanges. We can have them here, and let us hope there are no walls between us as individuals.

On behalf of the widely dispersed family of Moses McIlwaine, my great-great-grandfather, I welcome the honouring of the Jewish people and the memory of the 1930s. Specifically, I wonder whether you, Mr Speaker, on our behalf - perhaps in conjunction with the Chief Minister - could write to the Ambassador for East Germany to congratulate the government of that country on their action, no matter what we may have felt about them in the past. Equally, could you write to the Ambassador for West Germany to congratulate the West Germans on their efforts

14 November 1989

to extend friendship and hospitality to their confreres in East Germany.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Assembly adjourned at 5.18 pm

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The following answers to questions were provided:

Horticultural Maintenance (Question No. 32)

Mr Stefaniak asked the Minister for Housing and Urban Services, upon notice, on 18 October 1989:

In respect of horticultural maintenance -

- (a) What parts of the Territory are maintained by private contractors.
- (b) What parts of the Territory are maintained by the Parks and Conservation Service.
- (c) What are the actual areas private contractors are contracted to maintain.
- (d) What are the actual areas the Parks and Conservation Service covers with its own resources.

Mrs Grassby: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (a) There are two main types of contracts let by City Parks. The first of these is a service and supply contract where contractors provide a machine to work under the direction of a City Parks overseer. No area is specified in these contracts.

The second type are horticultural maintenance contracts where contractors tender to undertake specific tasks within set boundaries for a set price.

Service and supply contracts are predominantly for drygrass mowing while horticultural maintenance contracts are predominantly for public buildings and uncommitted open spaces.

- (b) The Parks and Conservation Service is responsible for the horticultural maintenance of all public schools, aged persons units, flats, public buildings, sportsgrounds, road verges and public landscapes including lake foreshores.

There is no clear demarcation of functions except that contractors are less frequently involved in maintaining high use open space where public contact is common. This includes recreation areas such as the lake foreshores and school grounds.

- (c) The actual areas maintained by service and supply contractors vary from year to year depending on seasonal conditions. Service and supply contract

14 November 1989

mowing is predominantly drygrass with the Parks and Conservation Service maintaining most irrigated, turfed areas.

Horticultural maintenance contracts cover approximately 18 per cent of the urban landscapes. Although these contracts cover most horticulture requirements, some very specialist tasks are still carried out by the service staff, for example, tree surgery.

Contractors predominantly maintain public building landscapes while the Parks and Conservation Service maintains most recreational areas and schools.

(d) The actual areas the Parks and Conservation Service covers with its own resources equates to approximately 80 per cent of total annual workloads. This percentage may rise or fall depending on the extent of service and supply contracts used. This will vary with annual fluctuations in seasonal conditions.

Mowing Equipment (Question No. 35)

Mr Stefaniak asked the Minister for Housing and Urban Services, upon notice, on 25 October 1989:

In respect of the five Hustler mowers owned by the Parks and Conservation Service -

- (1) How many hours (real not projected) are the mowers used each year in winter and summer.
- (2) How many hours are the mowers idle each year due to lack of work or need of repairs.

Mrs Grassby: The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The front mounted rotary mowers (includes Hustler brand) are operated by Parks and Conservation Service an average of 760 engine hours per mower during a five to seven months period over the summer season depending on climatic conditions. During normal years, minimal use occurs over the winter period.
- (2) The front mounted rotary mowers (includes Hustler brand) are idle for the remaining period, that is, 1,216 hours per year, mostly during the winter season.

Horticultural Machinery (Question No. 36)

Mr Stefaniak asked the Minister for Housing and Urban Services, upon notice, on 25 October 1989:

14 November 1989

In respect of machinery -

- (1) What are the repair costs incurred by the Parks and Conservation Service.
- (2) What are the fuel costs per year.
- (3) What is the rate of depreciation of government machinery.

Mrs Grassby: The answers to the member's questions are as follows:

- (1) The estimated annual cost of repairs to plant and equipment operated by the ACT Parks and Conservation Service is \$1,261,400.
- (2) The estimated annual cost of fuel for plant and equipment operated by the service is \$188,300.
- (3) The annual depreciation rate for tractors and the larger mowing equipment operated by the service is 16.7 per cent.