



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

12 May 1992

Tuesday, 12 May 1992

Petitions:

Proposed land use changes - Hughes	213
Egg production - battery cage system	214
Fluoridation	215
Abortion clinic	215

Paper	215
-------------	-----

Questions without notice:

Budgetary options	216
Housing Trust properties	217
Disallowed question	218
ACTEW - corporatisation	219
Methadone program	220
Business promotion	221
Petrol levy: payroll tax	223
Redevelopment of section 10 City	223
ACTION buses - advertising	223

Personal explanations	224
-----------------------------	-----

Declaration of private interests of members and immediate families	228
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Unparliamentary language	228
--------------------------------	-----

Paper	229
-------------	-----

Subordinate legislation	229
-------------------------------	-----

Heads of government meeting (Ministerial statement)	230
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----

Light vehicle transport agreement	252
-----------------------------------------	-----

Tobacco company sponsorship - Canberra Raiders (Ministerial statement)	254
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Youth unemployment (Matter of public importance)	261
--------------------------------------------------------	-----

Select committee on youth unemployment	276
----------------------------------------------	-----

Conservation Heritage and Environment - standing committee	283
------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Tourism and ACT Promotion - standing committee	283
------------------------------------------------------	-----

Planning Development and Infrastructure - standing committee	285
--------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Labor Government program	285
--------------------------------	-----

World Health Day	302
------------------------	-----

Agents (Amendment) Bill 1992	302
------------------------------------	-----

Surveyors (Amendment) Bill 1992	304
---------------------------------------	-----

Districts (Amendment) Bill 1992	307
---------------------------------------	-----

Real Property (Amendment) Bill 1992	307
-------------------------------------------	-----

Adjournment:

Government housing	307
Caloola Farm	308
Housing Trust	309
International Nurses Day	309

Answers to questions:

Rural Firefighting Service (Question No 1)	311
Secondary colleges - mature-age students (Question No 2)	314
Primary schools - statistics (Question No 3)	315
Primary schools - vacant space (Question No 5)	316
Government schools - excess places (Question No 6)	318
Government schools - average per student costs (Question No 7)	325
Government schools - volunteer teachers (Question No 9)	326
Education and Training portfolio - publications (Question No 10)	327
School based management working party report (Question No 13)	330
Technical and further education - apprentices (Question No 14) :	331
Floriade (Question No 16)	333
Library Service - BOOK Plus system (Question No 20)	334
Housing and Community Services portfolio - statutory bodies (Question No 28) .	336
Red light cameras (Question No 36)	337
Unpaid traffic fines (Question No 37)	339
Legislative Assembly - Tuesday night sittings (Question No 42)	340
City Health Centre (Question No 43)	341
Legislative Assembly - paper and envelopes (Question No 45)	342
Health portfolio - consultants (Question No 52)	344
Treasurer - interstate visits (Question No 57)	348
Minister for Education and Training - interstate visits (Question No 58)	349
Minister for Health - interstate visits (Question No 59)	351
Minister for the Environment Land and Planning - interstate visits (Question No 60)	352
Attorney-General - interstate visits (Question No 61)	353
Minister for Housing and Community Services - interstate visits (Question No 62)	354
Minister for Urban Services - interstate visits (Question No 63)	355
Health portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 65)	356
Education and Training portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 66)	357
Environment Land and Planning portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 67)	358
Attorney-General portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 68)	360
Housing and Community Services portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 69)	361
Urban Services portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 70)	362
Minister for the Arts - interstate visits (Question No 72)	363
Minister for Sport - interstate visits (Question No 73)	364
Sport portfolio - public relations consultants (Question No 74)	365
Nursing home type beds (Question No 77)	366
Nursing home waiting lists (Question No 78)	367

Tuesday, 12 May 1992

MADAM SPEAKER (Ms McRae) took the chair at 2.30 pm and read the prayer.

PETITIONS

The Clerk: The following petitions have been lodged for presentation:

By **Mr Wood**, from 1,422 residents, requesting that the Assembly reject proposed land use changes to the following sections in Hughes:

section 58, block 1 (part), Kent/Carruthers Streets;

section 10, block 73/74 (part), Kitchener Street;

section 28, block 6, Webster Street; and

section 57, block 2, Kent Street

and direct the Planning Authority that the areas are to remain urban open space/buffer areas and that section 28, block 5, Webster Street be rezoned from residential to urban open space.

By **Mr Wood**, from 10,986 residents, requesting that the Assembly ban the battery cage system and encourage and foster the establishment of free range egg production.

By **Mr Stevenson**, from 575 residents, requesting that the Assembly immediately switch off the apparatus used to artificially fluoridate the ACT's water supply.

By **Ms Ellis**, from 1,051 residents, requesting that the Assembly reject any attempt to permit the establishment of a free-standing abortion clinic.

The terms of these petitions will be recorded in *Hansard* and copies referred to the appropriate Ministers.

Proposed Land Use Changes - Hughes

The petition read as follows:

TO: THE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR
THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

The petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that the areas in or adjoining Hughes specified below have been rezoned in the Draft Territory Plan from urban Open Space to PLUZ Investigation Areas or for Residential development:

12 May 1992

Proposed Policy Change Area

Map Ref 146 Hughes - Section 58 Section Block 1 Part Kent/Carruthers St.

Investigation Areas

Map Ref 92 Garran - Section 10 Block 73/74 Part Kitchener Street

Map Ref 93 Hughes - Section 28 Block 6 Webster Street

Map Ref 94 Hughes - Section 57 Block 2 Kent Street

Your petitioners thereby request the Assembly to reject the above proposed land use changes shown in the Draft Territory Plan and the Assembly direct the ACT Planning Authority:

- . that the abovementioned areas are to remain as Urban Open Space/buffer areas; and
- . that Section 28 Block 5 Webster Street be rezoned from Residential to Urban Open Space consistent with its primary function as an arterial road buffer zone.

Egg Production - Battery Cage System

The petition read as follows:

TO THE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

The petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that the battery cage system of egg production:

- 1) Causes an unacceptable level of suffering to hens.
- 2) Presents a long-term health risk to the ACT community.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

- 1) Ban the battery cage system in the ACT.
- 2) Encourage and foster the establishment of free range egg production in the ACT.

Fluoridation

The petition read as follows:

TO THE SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY:

The petition of certain residents of the ACT draws to the attention of the Assembly:

That cumulative toxins in the form of fluoride is being added to the ACT's water supply as a mass medication without the consent of the people.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

Immediately switch off the apparatus used to artificially fluoridate the ACT water supply and thereby stop this mad act of pollution.

Abortion Clinic

The petition read as follows:

To the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory:

The petition of certain residents of the Australian Capital Territory draws to the attention of the Assembly that:

ACT law prohibits free-standing abortion clinics;

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

Reject any attempt to permit the establishment of a free-standing abortion clinic in the ACT.

Petitions received.

PAPER

MR WOOD (Minister for Education and Training, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning): Madam Speaker, I ask for leave to present a petition which does not conform with standing orders as it does not contain a request.

Leave granted.

MR WOOD: Madam Speaker, I present an out-of-order petition from 148 residents opposing battery hen farming.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Budgetary Options

MR KAINE: I would like to address a question to the Chief Minister and Treasurer. I refer her to a statement made by the Premier of Victoria yesterday, specifically that the state of the economy meant that she was faced with three options: Raising taxes and charges, increasing debt levels or making massive cuts in services - her words, not mine. Does the Chief Minister agree that the lack of any outcome from the Special Premiers Conference yesterday leaves her with only the same three options? If she does not agree with that, what does she see as any additional option that she might have available to her?

MS FOLLETT: I thank Mr Kaine for the question. At the outset, Madam Speaker, I would like to say that at the conclusion of question time I will be making a statement to the Assembly on the heads of government meeting which took place yesterday, and at that time I will be relating that to the outcomes for the ACT.

But I would like to say also that I think Mr Kaine might be somewhat mistaken if he believes that the heads of government meeting yesterday was to address the funding by the Commonwealth to the States. That meeting was not set up to address those issues. In fact, the heads of government meeting that took place yesterday was designed to address issues that were of mutual concern to governments and of national concern. If it makes it easier for members, I should say that that meeting related to the Special Premiers Conference rounds that have been ongoing since, I think, about December 1990. I repeat that that meeting was not held to address the issue of funding to specific States. That issue remains to be addressed.

Mr Kaine has asked me in particular about a comment attributed to Mrs Kirner about the state of the economy and the way in which State governments might go about addressing that position. Could I say, first of all, that the ACT's economy, and indeed the ACT's budget situation, is in a very much healthier position than that of Victoria - and long may it remain so. So, Mr Kaine, I think, in equating our position to that of Victoria, does us less than a service. It is quite clear to me that even in Mr Kaine's single budget he did not attempt to put us on a level with Victoria - and thank heavens for that.

Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, Mrs Kirner is quoted as saying that she is faced with the options of raising taxes and charges, borrowing more or making massive cutbacks in services. I presume that she is intending to go for a balanced budget in doing that. But I do not really think that comment is of any constructive use to us. It is quite clear that in attempting to balance the budget - I have said it many times - you look at a range of options, including revenue options, reduction in outlays, and, of course, a review of services available to the community and ways in which those services might be delivered most efficiently. So, it is a generalised statement that is difficult to attack without knowing on what basis it was made and, in particular, the exact details of the Victorian situation to which, I presume, it relates.

MR KAINÉ: I ask a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Since the Chief Minister agrees that there are only three options - that is, you raise taxes and charges, increase debt levels or make massive cuts in services - since she has already excluded borrowing as a policy, and since taxes and charges are already at levels that are equivalent to those in the rest of Australia, and presumably there is not much elasticity here, would she then tell us: In which services is she going to make massive cuts?

MS FOLLETT: Madam Speaker, Mr Kaine really should not seek to continue to make political points on this. The fact of the matter is that in the only budget for which Mr Kaine was responsible he increased taxes enormously, including rates to householders by 16 per cent, on average; he increased business taxes, including payroll tax from 6 per cent to 7 per cent - - -

Mr Kaine: No, I reduced it from 8 per cent to 7 per cent.

MADAM SPEAKER: Could the Chief Minister be heard in silence, please.

MS FOLLETT: He increased borrowings at a quite marked rate. Despite all of that, he delivered a budget that had a deficit of some \$7m. So, really his own record is not one to be proud of. I have stated several times that I do not believe that this Territory should borrow for its day-to-day expenses.

I have stated also that I believe that it is essential that we maintain services to the community, and I have also said many times that those services must be delivered in the most efficient way possible. I do not think that is news to anybody in this chamber. But if Mr Kaine is yet again asking me to pre-empt what might be in the budget I will not be drawn on that matter. I will be making budget statements at the appropriate time and in consultation, as I have in the past.

Housing Trust Properties

MR LAMONT: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Community Services. Is he aware of recent statements made by a Canberra real estate agent attacking the Government's policy of integrating Housing Trust properties with other properties at Greenway?

MR CONNOLLY: I thank Mr Lamont for his very significant question. I am aware of those statements, and I very strongly dissociated the Government from them and condemned them. A real estate agent working for a prominent Canberra company was quoted in the *Canberra Times* as attacking a decision of the Government to purchase units in Greenway, for Housing Trust purposes, saying that they would reduce property values because, "Who would want to live next door to deserted wives and their children?". I found that attempt to stigmatise the Housing Trust client base quite unacceptable.

The matter arose from a letter that Mr Kaine quite properly wrote to me, asking for details of the Housing Trust purchases. It is quite proper that the Leader of the Opposition keeps an eye on what we are buying, to make sure that we are buying well. I was happy to be able to advise him that we bought those properties at quite a good price, well below the prevailing market price.

12 May 1992

The policy of integrating public and private housing is one that successive governments in the ACT have followed, from the early Commonwealth days. It is a mark of Canberra town planning that there are no public housing suburbs and no suburbs without any public houses at all. In most streets in Canberra you cannot tell what is a public house and what is a private house. So it will remain under this Government; and I am confident that the Liberals would want it to remain so, because I could not believe that the Liberals would associate themselves with that type of comment.

I am pleased to be able to advise members that the principal of Raine and Horne, the company involved, has written to me, dissociating himself from the reported comments and saying that he endorses the policy of the ACT Government on integration of government and private sector housing throughout the community. He says that he has observed the policy first-hand in the suburb in which he lives, and I am sure that many of us observe it first-hand in the suburbs or streets in which we live. Mr Smith, of Raine and Horne, goes on to say:

I believe that the success of the current policy is evident for all to see.

I hope that it is a policy that would be endorsed by all members.

Disallowed Question

MR MOORE: My question is directed to Ms Ellis, as chair of the Social Policy Committee. Youth unemployment was a major issue during the election campaign. In February this year, the Chief Minister, Rosemary Follett, expressed her concern over the lack of policy proposals by either of the major parties on the issue of unemployment. To date, there has been no public indication of any proposed action by either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. During the election campaign, the Labor and Liberal parties referred to youth unemployment as one of the major tasks that they would address once in government. Some weeks ago, my colleague Helen Szuty indicated that she would raise this issue when the Social Policy Committee met. Has your committee discussed the possibility of taking on youth unemployment as a reference, and what was the result of that discussion?

Mr Berry: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: This matter is already listed on the notice paper for discussion, and it strikes me that the question might well be out of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, it does seem to be anticipating business that is on the notice paper. I will speak to the Clerk.

I believe that to anticipate an MPI is not out of order; but, Mr Moore, I would ask you to repeat the question because I believe that in that question you will be asking for information that is confidential to that committee. Could we hear the question again, please?

MR MOORE: Certainly, Madam Speaker. I do not believe that that is the case, because the presiding member has the ability to answer whatever question she likes on a matter within the committee. The question is: Has the committee discussed the possibility of taking on youth unemployment as a reference, and what was the result of that discussion? If she does not want to answer the question, Madam Speaker - if I can respond to the possible point of order - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: Having listened to it now, I believe that you are asking for something on which a committee has deliberated, and a committee's deliberations are in confidence until the report of that committee's deliberations is published.

MR MOORE: Certainly, Madam Speaker; but the point is that the presiding member does have the prerogative to respond. If she decides that she does not want to respond, that is her prerogative.

Mr Kaine: I would like to take a point of order, Madam Speaker. In question time, I do not think Mr Moore has the right to debate such an issue and to use up question time. If he wants to debate it, there is a time later today when he can do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think we will rule that question out of order.

ACTEW - Corporatisation

MR HUMPHRIES: My question is to Mr Connolly, in his capacity as the Minister responsible for ACT Electricity and Water. I refer to the micro-economic reform agenda of his Victorian colleague Mrs Kirner, who has recently announced that State power and water utilities will be corporatised. I ask the Minister: Why is it that his socialist colleagues in Victoria are quite happy to take a decision to corporatise electricity and water utilities, while he flatly refuses to travel the same sensible path? Is there any difference between Victorian institutions and our own ACT electricity and water utility?

Ms Follett: They are a generator, for one thing. There is a bit of a difference.

MR HUMPHRIES: What is it about micro-economic reform that sends the Government into a frenzied lather of opposition?

MR CONNOLLY: Madam Speaker, the local Liberals seem to be obsessed today with what is going on in Victoria. Given the woefulness of the Victorian Liberal Opposition, perhaps this lot would do better. But we are not in Victoria; we are in Canberra. Mr Humphries asked: Is there any difference between ACTEW and the Victorian position? The Chief Minister very quickly interjected that there is a slight difference, in that they have a massive power generation facility, which we do not have. ACTEW operates as a distributor of power which it purchases.

Madam Speaker, ACTEW is an organisation which is extraordinarily efficient. In a publication late last year the Australian Association of Power Authorities - I think that is the correct name of the body - the umbrella body that covers power generation and reticulation authorities in Australia, provided an efficiency chart which showed that ACTEW delivers power to the consumer in Canberra at the lowest price in Australia and that ACTEW's rate of return to government, the return that government gets on its investment, is the highest in Australia. That was based on the previous year's ACTEW budget and, as members would be aware, last year the ACTEW dividend was increased. So, not only does it continue to supply power to the householder at the lowest rate in Australia but also its dividend - its return to investors, the ratepayers - is higher than anywhere else in Australia. It is a very efficient body.

12 May 1992

The Liberals seem to have this magic pudding approach to corporatisation, that all you have to do is wave the corporatisation wand at something and, like a magic pudding, it will produce endless dollars. During the election campaign they were saying that to corporatise ACTEW would result in an additional \$12m, and they were going to corporatise something else that was going to be worth \$12m. I was expecting that they would want us to corporatise the Cemeteries Trust and make a profit of \$12m. It was like a broken record.

With ACTEW, we take the view that not only is it not broke but it is performing remarkably well, remarkably efficiently, and we will continue to achieve micro-economic reform through better efficiencies, as we have done with the bus network, which you lot failed to do. When this lot were in power they talked about micro-economic reform, but they blew out the bus budget by \$7.5m. In our last budget we brought that down by \$2m. Yesterday we got agreement to a set of reforms that are probably worth another \$1m in the next 12 months. We are achieving micro-economic reform, while you lot are bleating about it.

Methadone Program

MRS GRASSBY: My question is to the Minister for Health. In today's *Canberra Times* Mrs Carnell was quoted as saying that the methadone program - I put it in quotes, as it was in the *Canberra Times* - is "no good". Is this claim true?

MR BERRY: I thank the member for the question. Of course the claim is completely untrue. But I have to say, Madam Speaker, that truth has not always played a major role in some of the claims that have been made by the Liberal Party in relation to health matters in the ACT. With this passion for privatisation, which the Liberals have generated over a period now and which has emerged in its best form in the "frightpack" - - -

Mr Humphries: Oh, very good - his joke for the week!

MR BERRY: The Liberals are of course attacking the public hospital system. The "frightpack" is the joke of the year. Here we have a bunch of people who are infatuated with privatisation, to the point - - -

Mr Moore: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Under standing order 52 a member may not reflect upon any vote of the Assembly, except upon a motion that such a vote be rescinded. This Assembly, at its last sitting, voted to support major changes in and expansion of the methadone program. That being the case, the statement being made by Mr Berry at the moment is a reflection on that vote.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Berry, please continue.

MR BERRY: I really do not need to argue a case on that one. That was not a bad try, but you will have to do better.

Some real improvements have occurred in the methadone program. For a member of this Assembly to come out and say that it is no good is an absolute disgrace, because it is well known that the methadone program in the ACT is a good one. It is all right for people to come out and criticise shortcomings; that is fair enough, if they want some things improved. But it is not all right to say that the whole thing is shot, because it is not; it is a good program.

I will give you some figures. It is the most effective abstinence-oriented program in Australia - 19 per cent of all clients remain drug free 12 to 24 months after treatment, and 55 per cent of all clients treated are working in some capacity. I think that is an indication that what has been said is not true. It clearly does some good work amongst those people who have difficulties with drugs. No other evaluated program can claim such a high level of effectiveness.

The high intervention format is suited to clients who want active professional involvement in their treatment. Other clients would prefer less involvement with support services. It is a program which is delivering for the ACT. What has not been said by the Liberals is that since Labor came to office the program has been expanded, from around 86 to around 120. That is a fairly major achievement in a short time.

Mrs Carnell: We need 200.

Mr Humphries: We need 200, Wayne.

MR BERRY: I hear the cry from the Opposition, "We need 200". Apparently the Opposition are interested in extra places only if pharmacists can provide the methadone. How much would pharmacists get paid? Nobody has told us that. All of these issues add to what I have said, that it is outrageous for members of this Assembly to come out and attack public institutions because of their privatisation objectives. This is a strong public program which will be preserved in the interests of the community of the ACT.

Silly statements made by members of this Assembly, that the program is no good, just show the lack of experience that the Liberals have on health matters and the lack of experience in being able to come to grips with the delivery of proper public hospital and health services. This lack of experience does them no good, but I have to say that it damages the confidence that people in the ACT have in good programs when they come out and say these sorts of outrageous things. People ought to consider the damage that they are doing, rather than their political aims, by making these sorts of outrageous statements. This is not the most outrageous one that they have ever made, but it goes close to taking the cake.

Business Promotion

MS SZUTY: My question without notice is for the Chief Minister. Could she outline the Government's thinking behind the advertisement, "How to succeed in business without really tiring", which appeared in the *Australian* on 5 March 1992 and which promoted Canberra as an appropriate place to set up business; and could she explain why calls to her department on the number given in the advertisement, requesting the free information kit, have so far met with no response?

Mr De Domenico: They forgot to turn on the answering machine.

12 May 1992

MS FOLLETT: No, not so. I thank Ms Szuty for the question. I thank her also for giving me a bit of notice, which has enabled me to get a comprehensive reply together. Madam Speaker, that advertisement, "How to succeed in business without really tiring", was included in a special supplement on Canberra which was designed to introduce potential developers and investors to Canberra's benefits as a place in which to do business. The supplement, which I thought was a very valuable item, highlighted the fact that Canberra is not just a public service town. It presented a variety of aspects of Canberra, including its history and cultural base, our tourist attractions and accommodation, our rental property situation and our lifestyle. Some of Canberra's successful industry achievements were also covered in it.

So, in keeping with the theme of the supplement, the advertisement to which Ms Szuty referred focused on those aspects of Canberra which also make it an ideal place in which to do business. To date, Madam Speaker, I am advised, 23 calls have been received in response to it. Each call has been received on the telephone number provided in the advertisement. That telephone number is (06) 205 0670. Each of those calls has resulted in the information kit being sent out on the same day. I am also advised that there have been no other complaints from callers, either that they were not able to get through or that they did not receive the kit.

Madam Speaker, this telephone number serves as a hotline for a number of other Economic Development Division activities, including Canberra Business Week. I know that members opposite will be particularly interested in this: In total, 1,118 calls have been received on that hotline over the past 17 months and none of those calls has resulted in a complaint. A record is kept of all calls, and the hotline is attended in office hours - that is, between the hours of 8.30 in the morning and 5 o'clock in the evening, Monday to Friday. The staff who are responsible for that hotline are all aware of their responsibility to record calls and to respond. They have particular procedures in place.

I should mention, Madam Speaker, that I have tried to ring the hotline and I did get through. But there is perhaps a trick to it that Ms Szuty may not be aware of, and that is that it cannot be accessed on our internal dialling system; you have to ring as though you were ringing from outside, so you ring the full number, not just the extension number. I am sure that if Ms Szuty cares to try that she will be sent the information kit, and I am sure that she will find it extremely useful.

MS SZUTY: I wish to ask a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Could the Chief Minister then please explain why two calls on that hotline did not result in the free information kit being received?

MS FOLLETT: No, I cannot explain that, Madam Speaker. I have given all of the information of which I am aware, but I can say that if Ms Szuty would care to give those details to me I will make sure that the information is sent if it has not been sent already.

Petrol Levy : Payroll Tax

MR DE DOMENICO: Madam Speaker, my question without notice is to the Chief Minister in her finance capacity. I ask her: Will her Government be honouring its pre-election promise to remove the 3c a litre fuel levy? If the answer to that question is yes, will the Government also then give a commitment to reduce the payroll tax impost in the ACT, thus helping to create more jobs and, in particular, more youth jobs?

MS FOLLETT: I think I have answered this question more times than we would care to mention, Madam Speaker. Mr De Domenico again asks me to pre-empt what is in the budget. But I will say that if he cares to study the forward estimates he will see in those forward estimates that the petrol levy is ceased at the date at which it was due to be ceased.

On the question of payroll tax, Madam Speaker, I say again that it was Mr De Domenico's party in government which increased payroll tax from 6 per cent to 7 per cent. Further than that, Madam Speaker, as I have said many times, I will not pre-empt the budget.

Redevelopment of Section 10, City

MS ELLIS: My question is to the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning. Now that the Federal Government has approved the recommendations made by the joint parliamentary committee on the redevelopment of part of section 10, City, will the Minister agree to the proposed redevelopment of the YMCA and Olympic Bowl sites? If the redevelopment is agreed to, can the Minister give an assurance that the lessees will pay full betterment?

MR WOOD: Madam Speaker, the YMCA and the lessee of the site of the former Olympic Bowl - that is, the adjoining sites across the road - have formally advised the Government that they wish to proceed with the redevelopment of the two areas of land combined. The Department of the Environment, Land and Planning and the National Capital Planning Authority - because they have a strong interest in this - are now assessing that advice. It will come to me subsequently, and any decision that I make will be based on the assessments of the proposal as submitted. If I subsequently agree to the redevelopment, I can assure you that the full betterment under existing conditions will be applied.

ACTION Buses - Advertising

MR STEVENSON: My question is to the Minister for Urban Services, Terry Connolly. Many people in Canberra have strong views on abortion and wish to present their case publicly to other people. A group of people who are opposed to abortion paid for the tiny feet advertisement that was displayed on the side of some ACTION buses. As this ad was cancelled without approval from the advertiser, would the Minister please indicate under which authority and guidelines the ad was initially accepted and later cancelled, and could he comment on the concern by many people in Canberra that such censorship would appear to be arbitrary and unjust?

12 May 1992

MR CONNOLLY: Mr Stevenson makes the point that this is a political issue in Canberra, and there are groups organising and agitating for and against on this particular issue. I thank him for the courtesy of indicating that he was interested in this issue, because I have been able to pull the information together. Australian Posters 3M, which is a company, has a contract for placing advertisements on ACTION buses. That contract with ACTION stipulates that no advertisement of a political nature is to be placed on buses, and that has been the case for quite some time. During the recent election campaign the Labor Party, using its usual innovative techniques, was the first into the back-of-taxi advertising. We were aware of the ban on bus advertising and did not seek to have that varied for us.

The Right to Life advertisements were placed on buses, without clearance from ACTION management. The practice in the past has been that the advertising company clears ads that may be seen to be political or seeks a view from ACTION management before placing the ad. They did not do that here. Following complaints from members of the public, ACTION sought a view as to whether these advertisements were of a political nature and prohibited by the contract. The view was that they were, and they were removed.

I would point out that the decision to remove the ads was taken by ACTION management before I became aware of the matter. So, I did not intervene in the matter before the ads had been withdrawn. As to the question of whether I would intervene to overrule ACTION management and thus allow the ads or not, a legal advising was sought. The effect of the legal advising has been passed on to Mr Humphries in relation to a request that he wrote - not the actual legal advising, but the authorities on which the Government Solicitor relied. I was confident of the nature of that advice and decided not to intervene, to allow the decision to stand. As a result of that, Australian Posters 3M has met with representatives of the Right to Life Association. I understand that recompense has been arranged, so they are not out of pocket.

The advertising company, Australian Posters 3M, has been reminded of the requirement to clear with ACTION management ads that may be political and of the clear contract provisions that preclude political advertisements. I would be happy to provide Mr Stevenson not with the entire contract with its commercial aspects but with the relevant clauses relating to political advertisements.

Ms Follett: I ask that further questions be placed on the notice paper, Madam Speaker.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation, in accordance with section 46 of the standing orders.

Leave granted.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, the Chief Minister has twice today, and on a number of previous occasions, asserted that I increased payroll tax when I was Chief Minister. That is patently untrue, and the Chief Minister knows it to be so. Prior to the time when I was Chief Minister there was a progressive scale of payroll tax - 6, 7 and 8 per cent, depending on the size of your payroll. I levelled

the field at 7 per cent. The 6 per cent rate used to apply to the smaller businesses at the bottom end of the scale. At the same time as I eliminated the 6 per cent rate I also lifted the threshold from \$432,000 to \$500,000 a year. That had the effect of taking the payroll burden off a lot of small companies in this city.

It is just as true for me to say that I reduced the payroll tax from 8 per cent to 7 per cent as it is for the Chief Minister to say that I increased it from 6 per cent to 7 per cent. I think it is a gross misrepresentation. It has been put forward by the Chief Minister on a number of occasions, and I think it ought to be on the record that what she says is simply not true.

While I am on my feet, Madam Speaker, I would also like to make a statement on another matter, under standing order 46.

Mr Berry: On a point of order: There have been two strong imputations that the Chief Minister has knowingly made untrue statements. That is completely out of order, and the Leader of the Opposition should be called upon to withdraw those imputations.

Mr De Domenico: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: On the same point of order or the same request, I believe that first of all the Chief Minister should be asked to withdraw her imputations made about Mr Kaine.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, I am not asking that the matter be withdrawn. I have made my explanation; it is on the public record. It refutes what the Chief Minister says.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Kaine, did I hear you say that they were not meant to be imputations in your response?

MR KAINE: I simply said that the Chief Minister knows that what she said is not true. I did not increase payroll tax from 6 per cent to 7 per cent; that is a fact.

Mr Berry: There is a clear imputation that the Chief Minister has knowingly made an untrue statement to the Assembly.

MR KAINE: She has indeed, and I am putting it on record to that effect.

Mr Berry: I would ask, Madam Speaker, that you call upon the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that imputation.

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe that you should withdraw that statement, Mr Kaine - not your personal explanation as to how you see matters, but your statement that Ms Follett has made an untrue statement.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, I assert that what the Chief Minister says is not true. Whether she is saying it knowingly or unknowingly, I do not know. But she has made a statement twice today - and she has made it before - which is not true. My comment on that matter is on the record. The Chief Minister can take the chips as they fall. She can either impute some ulterior motive to herself or not as she sees fit. I am not attributing anything. I am simply saying that what she says is not true, and I have refuted it.

12 May 1992

Madam Speaker, I also wish to make a statement under standing order 46 - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Kaine, I am sorry to interrupt you. You have been asked to withdraw it because it is unparliamentary to accuse someone of making untrue statements. I believe that you have made a statement in explanation, on which people can make their own judgments in terms of your statements and Ms Follett's statements. You have been asked to withdraw the imputation that what she says is untrue, and I believe that you should.

Mr Humphries: On the point of order, Madam Speaker: With respect, I believe that the ruling that you have made is in error, and I would like to argue the case. It is certainly against standing orders to suggest that someone has knowingly lied to or misled the Assembly or knowingly said something to the Assembly which they know not to be true. Mr Kaine has not put that in those terms.

Ms Follett: He has; he has just said that.

Mr Humphries: He has not said that. He has said that what Ms Follett has said is untrue, that she has made an untrue statement. That, with respect, Madam Speaker, as Mr Kaine has established, is quite the case. That is not a matter that he ought to withdraw. It is a question of whether or not he is alleging that Ms Follett knowingly misled the Assembly or knowingly told something to the Assembly that is untrue. I would argue, Madam Speaker, that that has not been the case; Mr Kaine has not alleged any knowledge on Ms Follett's part.

MADAM SPEAKER: It was my understanding that Mr Kaine did say that Ms Follett knowingly made a statement that was untrue, and it was on that basis that I asked him to withdraw that.

Mr Humphries: Madam Speaker, on the same basis, Mr Berry made the same statement this afternoon about Mrs Carnell. There was no request to withdraw that matter.

Mr Lamont: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order as well. Mr Humphries has attempted to debate the issue. I understand that you have issued a request to Mr Kaine to withdraw his statement. He should do so or depart.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have made that request, Mr Kaine.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, in deference to you, if I made any incorrect imputation against the Chief Minister, I withdraw it. The fact is that what she said is not true, and I want that on the record. I withdraw anything that flows from that, beyond that.

Ms Follett: Madam Speaker, that is a qualified withdrawal. If Mr Kaine were simply to withdraw any imputation, I think that would settle the matter; and I would ask him to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Kaine, I did believe that in the first part of your statement you did withdraw the imputation that what Ms Follett said was untrue. May we stay with that withdrawal, please?

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, obviously neither you nor the Chief Minister listened to what I just said. I said that what the Chief Minister said was untrue - that is patently a fact - and that I withdraw any imputation beyond that. But I am certainly not going to withdraw a factual statement that needs to be on the record.

It is unreasonable and unfair for you to expect me to do so. If I were lying, I would expect you to ask me to withdraw it. I am not lying; I am making a statement of fact.

Mr Lamont: Madam Speaker, you have been asked, on a point of order, to request the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the imputation. He has done so in a qualified manner, which should not be acceptable to this chamber. I would therefore ask, once again, that without qualification Mr Kaine withdraw it and that debate on this matter conclude as soon as that is done.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will speak to the Clerk.

Mr Kaine, I have discussed the matter with the Clerk; I have looked at the rules; I have listened to the debate. I do believe that you should withdraw that statement. If you wish to make that statement you can charge the Chief Minister with making an untruth in a substantive motion, but under the current rules my ruling is that you are suggesting that the Chief Minister has lied, and that is unparliamentary, and you should withdraw it.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, I find it quite offensive if, under the standing orders of this Assembly, the Chief Minister can make a statement that is untrue and I am not permitted to refute it. That needs to be on the record. But, if that is your ruling, I withdraw. I think the standing orders ought to be amended because they allow the Chief Minister to say anything she likes but members on this side are not even permitted to refute it. I think that is disgraceful.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Kaine. I accept your withdrawal.

MRS CARNELL: Madam Speaker, can I also make a personal explanation under - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: With caution, Mrs Carnell.

Mr Kaine: Be careful what you say.

MRS CARNELL: I promised, did I not? It is under standing order 46. In Mr Berry's answer to Mrs Grassby's question on methadone, he suggested that my attitude to pharmacists being part of the methadone program was, at best, something to do with privatisation and, at worst, something to do with my private and personal interests in the pharmacy profession.

Mr Berry: Come on; you are debating the issue.

MRS CARNELL: I am not. I would like to go on. I am sure that Mr Berry is aware that pharmacists' part in the methadone program was a recommendation of the drug and alcohol working party of last year. Mr Berry announced a pilot on 21 August last year, which has not gone ahead. Methadone is available through pharmacies in all mainland States, and it is an essential part of the methadone program to reassimilate methadone addicts into the community.

Mr Connolly: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: This happened last time Mrs Carnell stood to make a personal explanation. It must be drawn to her attention yet again that one cannot debate the matter, which she has repeatedly done.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Connolly.

12 May 1992

**DECLARATION OF PRIVATE INTERESTS OF MEMBERS
AND IMMEDIATE FAMILIES
Statement by Speaker**

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we move on to the next item on today's program, I want to make a couple of short statements. I wish to make a statement concerning the declaration of private interests that members are required to provide to the Speaker.

Section 3 of the declaration requires that members specify the precise location of any real estate in which they or their immediate family hold an interest. Concern has been expressed that members could therefore be required to state the precise location of their private residence. Following consultation with party leaders, I have allowed members, in declaring their private interests in relation to real estate property in which they reside, to specify the general location, rather than the precise location, should they wish to do so. I have done this because I do not think it is the intention of the declaration of private interests to make publicly available the private address of each member, where the member does not wish this to be publicised. Accordingly, members who have an interest in their principal place of residence will not be required to specify the precise location in future.

**UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE
Statement by Speaker**

MADAM SPEAKER: My second statement refers to my ruling on "hypocrisy". Members may recall that during the proceedings of the Assembly of Thursday, 9 April 1992, I was asked to make a ruling on Mr Berry's use of the word "hypocrisy". Mr Berry used the words, "The odour of hypocrisy permeates the atmosphere". Standing order 55 states:

All imputations of improper motives and all personal reflections on Members shall be considered highly disorderly.

The standing orders also provide that it is the Speaker who must determine whether words used are offensive or disorderly.

In ruling on these matters, I intend to base my judgment on the nature of the word and the context in which it is used. A word that may be disorderly or offensive in one set of circumstances can be considered quite acceptable when used in a different set of circumstances or delivered in a different tone of voice. Although the use of the word "hypocrisy" has been ruled out of order when used in a certain context in the past, I do not consider the use of the word on 9 April to constitute an imputation or a personal reflection on a member or members. I therefore consider that the words used do not require withdrawal.

Mr Humphries: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Wishing to remain consistent about the policy that has been adopted in the Assembly about withdrawal of imputations against a member of telling untruths to the Assembly, and referring to standing order 55, to which you have just referred, I would ask Mr Berry to withdraw the imputation made earlier this afternoon that Mrs Carnell was making untrue statements concerning the ACT's methadone program.

MADAM SPEAKER: Could we leave that matter until I have had a chance to look at *Hansard*; then perhaps we can come back to it. I do not think anybody in the chamber remembers that particular statement, and Mrs Carnell has already had an opportunity to make a personal explanation. We will refer to the matter again tomorrow.

PAPER

MADAM SPEAKER: For the information of members I present a letter that I have received from Senator Mal Colston, as Deputy President of the Senate, informing me that the letter that I sent to both the Senate and the House of Representatives, containing the terms of the resolution passed by the Assembly on 9 April 1992, relating to constitutional recognition of the Supreme Court and judicial tenure, has been tabled in the Senate.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

Papers

MR BERRY (Deputy Chief Minister): Pursuant to section 6 of the Subordinate Laws Act 1989, I present subordinate legislation in accordance with the schedule of gazettal notices for determinations.

The schedule read as follows:

Land (Planning and Environment) Act -

Declaration and specification of eligibility criteria for certain classes of leases - No. 49 of 1992 (S54, dated 6 May 1992).

Specification of criteria for granting certain classes of leases - No. 48 of 1992 (S54, dated 6 May 1992).

Public Place Names Act - Determination -

No. 45 of 1992 (S46, dated 10 April 1992).

No. 47 of 1992 (S52, dated 24 April 1992).

Stock Diseases Act - Determination of fees - No. 44 of 1992 (G14, dated 8 April 1992).

Taxation (Administration) Act - Determination No. 46 of 1992 (S50, dated 14 April 1992).

12 May 1992

HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING Leave to make Ministerial Statement

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer) (3.18): Madam Speaker, yesterday I attended a meeting of heads of government in Canberra to discuss a range of issues of national interest. As I indicated prior to my attendance at the meeting, I hoped to see three major outcomes from the discussions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Ms Follett, I am loath to interrupt. Could we just get leave for you to speak.

MS FOLLETT: I thought I had leave. All right, Madam Speaker, I ask for leave to make a statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Humphries: No. We were not given notice of this type of thing.

MS FOLLETT: You were. It is a ministerial statement.

Mr Humphries: We were not given notice.

Leave not granted.

Suspension of Standing and Temporary Orders

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

That so much of the standing and temporary orders be suspended as would prevent Ms Follett making a statement on the Heads of Government Meeting.

MR HUMPHRIES (3.19): Madam Speaker, may I speak to the motion?

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, you may.

MR HUMPHRIES: Madam Speaker, the Government appears to be a little bit inconsistent here. The argument of the Opposition is that we have not been given notice of the general thrust of this ministerial statement.

Ms Follett: You were. Talk to your Whip.

MR HUMPHRIES: Madam Speaker, I understand that what was told to the Whip this morning was that there would be a statement, probably by the Chief Minister, maybe about the Premiers Conference yesterday. There was no specificity about it, no indication of whether that was the case. In fact, a paper came out this afternoon referring, I understand, to the moving of a motion subsequent to this matter concerning national rail transport. This has added to the confusion about what is going on.

Mr Berry: That has already been raised with you.

MR HUMPHRIES: Maybe it was, but we have never had any clear statement since that time of just what it is that we are going to have a statement about today.

Mr Kaine: Even the notice paper does not tell us what it is about.

MR HUMPHRIES: Even that does not say what it is about. The fact is, Madam Speaker, that in the past the Australian Labor Party members have jumped up and down in this place, like jack-in-the-boxes, demanding or insisting that they have two hours' notice of what is coming up in ministerial statements in order to give proper and fair notice to those on the other side of the chamber. Mr Berry in particular should recall the number of times he rose, quivering with righteousness, about not having received his two hours' notice. Well, Madam Speaker, I am quivering with righteousness today and I want my two hours' notice. We have not had it. He will have to ask for the suspension of standing orders to achieve it today.

MR BERRY (Deputy Chief Minister) (3.21), in reply: Madam Speaker, the member who has just spoken is being just a trifle precious, I think. I am not going to go into the detail of discussions I have had with the Liberal Whip. I made it clear that there was to be a statement by the Chief Minister. There was no objection - - -

Mr Humphries: When? Two hours ago?

MR BERRY: I spoke to him on the telephone and discussed the issue with - - -

Mr Humphries: When did you do so?

MR BERRY: The timing escapes me for the moment.

Mr De Domenico: At a quarter past two.

MR BERRY: At a quarter past two, was it? Fine.

Mr De Domenico: At about 2.14, actually.

MR BERRY: Well, I will accept that.

Mr Humphries: You asked for two hours when you were in opposition.

MR BERRY: Would you like to wait until I am finished? I discussed it with the Whip and there was no objection then to the matter going ahead. Had he raised an objection in relation to the matter then, we would have taken the matter on board. There was no objection raised and, as far as I am concerned, adequate notice had been given. We discussed what the Leader of the Opposition might do with it; whether he might adjourn it and talk about the issue later.

Mr Kaine: That is interesting. I do not know what I might do with it yet, since I do not know what we are going to be debating.

MR BERRY: I think the most significant point is that discussions have been had. There seems to be a communication breakdown. Apologies for any inconvenience that might have been caused to the Liberal Party, but there is a substantive motion.

12 May 1992

We have before us an issue which has been raised with the Liberal Party. It was brought forward quickly by the Government. It was necessary, in our view, to bring it before this Assembly so that Assembly members would be aware as soon as possible after the Premiers and Chief Ministers' meeting with the Prime Minister. It makes a lot of sense that we do that. Of course, some corners were cut - there is no question about that - to get it to the Assembly quickly; but we can put it off until tomorrow if they do not want to hear about it. If they really do not want to hear about this issue we will just put it to bed and they can go to sleep in a corner somewhere. This is an issue that
- - -

Mr Humphries: We want fair notice, as you wanted. That is all we want.

MR BERRY: I just raise those issues for consideration by members. It is not an issue that one should get so angry about. I really do think that Mr Humphries is being a trifle precious on this issue. It is unwarranted, I think.

Mr De Domenico: Madam Speaker, can I rise to speak because - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: No; you may speak only by leave. Mr Berry moved the motion. Because he has spoken, the matter is now closed in terms of debate. If further statements need to be made you will have to seek leave to do so.

Mr De Domenico: Well, can I seek leave, Madam Speaker - - -

Mr Moore: No.

Mr De Domenico: Just hold on a tick. I am addressing the Speaker, not you, Mr Moore, with respect. Madam Speaker, can I seek leave to make a brief statement, seeing that Mr Berry did allude to conversations had by him me?

Leave not granted.

Question resolved in the affirmative, with the concurrence of an absolute majority.

Ministerial Statement and Paper

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer): Madam Speaker, I thank the Assembly for allowing me this suspension. Could I say at the outset, Madam Speaker, that there is an error in the daily program. The daily program, which I do not produce, foreshadows that I will be moving a motion concerning national rail transport. That is not the case. I will be seeking leave to move a motion in relation to the light vehicle agreement. I am not able to account for that error.

Madam Speaker, yesterday I attended a meeting of heads of government in Canberra to discuss a range of issues of national interest. As I indicated prior to my attendance at the meeting, I hoped to see three major outcomes from these discussions: First, a constructive dialogue on Commonwealth-State financial arrangements in preparation for a more detailed consideration of these issues at the June financial Premiers Conference; secondly, the establishment of an ongoing, cooperative forum of governments to discuss issues of mutual concern; and, finally, progress in a number of other areas of national importance. I believe that these expectations were met. Discussions took place in a cooperative, productive spirit, resulting in significant achievements across a range of issues.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, there has been a misapprehension in some quarters, including amongst the Opposition, notably the Leader of the Opposition, that yesterday's meeting should have resolved the level of Commonwealth funding for the ACT. This was never on the agenda of yesterday's meeting and was always a matter for the regular financial Premiers Conference next month.

Madam Speaker, as yesterday was the third anniversary of self-government in the ACT, the decision by heads of government yesterday to establish a Council of Australian Governments, and the inclusion of the ACT in its own right on that council, was particularly welcome and appropriate. The council will be a permanent forum for consultation between the Prime Minister, Premiers, Chief Ministers and the President of the Australian Local Government Association. Its role will be to increase cooperation among governments in the national interest and on reforms to achieve an integrated national economy, and to ensure intergovernmental consultation on other major issues. I see this continuing consultation between all Australian governments as an important means of achieving more effective delivery of services to people in the community.

In the area of Commonwealth-State financial relations, it was encouraging to note a commitment by the Commonwealth to work with the States and Territories in examining budgetary prospects and issues, including a consideration of underlying structural factors. This will provide a valuable basis for more detailed consideration at the June conference.

One particular matter I raised with the Prime Minister was my concern to protect the level of services to the ACT community. I believe that the Commonwealth must guarantee a realistic level of funding to all States and Territories to enable us to continue to deliver the services for which we are responsible. I therefore welcomed the Commonwealth's acknowledgment of the needs of the States and Territories for adequate resources, and for predictability, flexibility and growth in funding. I should add, however, that the Commonwealth set out in very clear terms its own financial pressures and the problems it is grappling with.

Turning to areas of micro-economic reform, a major agreement was reached to enact legislation for the mutual recognition of goods and qualifications between jurisdictions. The agreement continues the progress made in this area by Premiers and Chief Ministers at our meeting in Adelaide last November, and now includes the Commonwealth as a full participant.

Mutual recognition will ensure that goods which can be sold lawfully in one jurisdiction can be sold in other jurisdictions. Similarly, occupational qualifications will be recognised across State and Territory borders. This arrangement creates a common market within Australia, allowing the free passage of goods and skills across the country. This is particularly significant for the ACT in view of our close proximity to and our relations with the surrounding region of New South Wales.

However, the mutual recognition legislation will not apply to certain categories of goods in which a national market is not considered desirable, such as firearms. I was able to secure an important concession from the meeting yesterday. At my request the ACT Weapons Act has been specifically exempted from the scheme.

12 May 1992

While not detracting from the overall principle of mutual recognition, this exemption will ensure that the stringent provisions of our legislation, which is the toughest in Australia, are not compromised, in keeping with the Government's firm commitment to promoting a safer community.

Madam Speaker, agreement was also reached on further reforms in electricity generation, transmission and distribution. As an electricity consumer, the ACT is concerned to ensure that the electricity industry is as efficient and competitive as possible, and that we can negotiate directly with cost efficient generators of electricity. I therefore welcomed the agreement by heads of government to the principle of separate generation and transmission bodies in the electricity sector, and to develop an interstate transmission network across the eastern part of Australia. It is particularly pleasing that further work in this area will be undertaken by a body in which the ACT is a full participant, namely, the National Grid Management Council, in contrast with our continued exclusion from the review of the Snowy Mountains scheme.

In the area of road transport, agreement was reached to extend the role of the National Road Transport Commission, established at the July 1991 Special Premiers Conference, to cover all road users. In the same way as a national scheme has been established for regulation of heavy vehicles, national harmonisation of regulation will now apply to light vehicles. This is an important reform which will lead to greater efficiencies and overcome problems arising from varying regulations across Australia. It is also a reform in which the ACT has been asked to play a significant role.

Madam Speaker, the other parties to the agreement have asked us to agree to having legislation enacted by the Commonwealth to extend the role of the National Road Transport Commission to cover light vehicles. This legislation would then be adopted by other jurisdictions. As I believe that it is appropriate that we should take this further step through a parliamentary process, I will shortly be seeking the consent of the Assembly to adopting the approach that I have described.

Madam Speaker, before doing so, I would like to turn to some further areas of national importance in which progress was made at yesterday's meeting. Heads of government agreed to the need to achieve a major increase in the level of vocational education and training opportunities across Australia, particularly in order to equip our young people with appropriate skills and qualifications. We resolved to settle, as a matter of urgency, the responsibilities of governments for the funding and resourcing of vocational education and training. More detailed work on options in this area will be undertaken for the June Premiers Conference. A further important topic for the June meeting will be the issue of youth employment and training.

In Aboriginal affairs, we endorsed the report prepared for the Australian Aboriginal Affairs Council, "Achieving Greater Coordination of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Programs and Services", as a framework of principles and a plan of action for improved intergovernmental relations. I believe that the directions provided by this report will be a valuable mechanism for addressing issues of Aboriginal disadvantage, particularly by the development of a national Aboriginal policy statement.

Madam Speaker, in concluding I should like to note the very constructive atmosphere in which yesterday's meeting was conducted. Heads of government were prepared to work together to achieve progress in the national interest, rather than confining their outlook to the interests of their individual jurisdictions or levels of government. This provides a very positive indication of the further reforms we can achieve through intergovernmental cooperation. It also suggests that the new Council of Australian Governments will be an important and effective forum.

Madam Speaker, a detailed statement of the outcomes from yesterday's meeting is provided in the communique released at the conclusion of the meeting. For the information of members, I table the following papers:

Heads of Government Meeting -
Communique
Ministerial statement, 12 May 1992.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the ministerial statement.

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (3.33): Madam Speaker, I move the following amendment:

Omit "takes note", substitute "rejects".

Madam Speaker, Ms Follett has failed in her duty to present the case adequately on behalf of the ACT community. She made it clear yesterday morning that she had no intention of upsetting her Federal mates, and in that objective she clearly succeeded admirably. She was nice to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer and she came away with nothing for the people of the ACT. On that point, Madam Speaker, Ms Follett in her speech today has again misrepresented my comments concerning ACT finances. I did not say - - -

Ms Follett: I take a point of order, Madam Speaker. If Mr Kaine thinks I have misrepresented something he should move a substantive motion or withdraw it.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, I quote from page 2 of the Chief Minister's speech. She said:

... there has been a misapprehension ... promoted by the Opposition Leader, that yesterday's meeting should have resolved the level of Commonwealth funding for the ACT.

I would seek that she withdraw that, because I have never said it. That is why I say that this is a misrepresentation. I have consistently referred to the removal of the vertical fiscal imbalance which has been on the agenda of the Special Premiers Conference since the very first meeting in December 1990. That is what the Special Premiers Conference was originally convened for. It is still on the agenda, presumably; and that is what she should have been there putting forward. You, like a lot of other people, were diverted onto a lot of other issues, none of which have been brought to fruition, despite your claims.

12 May 1992

Madam Speaker, Ms Follett should have entered the conference yesterday with two major objectives in mind, bearing in mind the purpose of the Special Premiers Conferences. The first is to secure a fair financial deal for the ACT, a fair financial deal in terms of reducing this so-called vertical fiscal imbalance that has been in place for years. Secondly, she should have come out yesterday with a program of infrastructural change and micro-economic reform which would result in lower cost, lower taxing, and more efficient government for the ACT. That is what she should have gone there for. But she said that she was not going to go and heavy her Federal mates; that it was unreasonable to heavy them.

What in fact did she achieve, Madam Speaker? Clearly, high taxing, high spending government is here to stay. It is here to stay at the Federal level where their own current estimate is for a \$9.3 billion deficit for this year - a 40 per cent increase on the Treasury estimate. That is only an estimate today. Wait till the next couple of months are over and see what it blows out to. The Federal Government is guilty of mismanagement in the extreme. It has grossly overestimated its tax revenues. What is the Commonwealth's response to this situation? It is merely to continue to implement initiatives from its One Nation package - the seven nation package, a package that gives Canberra absolutely nothing.

The Chief Minister went to the conference yesterday with her cap in hand and she walked away with nothing. The Prime Minister, after yesterday's meeting, says that he is now prepared to talk about State funding levels. That is what the Special Premiers Conference was convened in December 1990 to talk about. Eighteen months later the Prime Minister, out of the goodness of his heart, says that he is now prepared to talk about it. How marvellous! He has given no firm indication of when he intends to talk about it. Given that it has been the major item on the agenda since December 1990, such a statement is breathtaking in its audacity. We clearly should not hold our breath, but Ms Follett says that she is pleased with the outcome. Well, she might be, but nobody else is.

We still have absolutely no indication of what will happen to the ACT's transitional funding. Ms Follett said yesterday that health funds were high on her agenda. When she left yesterday morning she told Matt Abraham, "Health funds are high on the agenda". Well, she got her answer on health funds all right. She was told to increase day surgery; that is the solution. She was told: "Do not ask us for any more money; we are not going to give you any. Fix your day surgery and the problem is resolved". We also had the Chief Minister quoted in the *Canberra Times* today as saying:

We will be looking to the Grants Commission's assessment of our relativities and our special needs and we will be making that argument (in June).

I would suggest that, if she did not know what the relativities were before she went to the Premiers Conference yesterday, she really need not have bothered going at all, because that is the basis of any further discussions on our behalf. She simply wasted her chair at the conference, given that on the Matt Abraham program yesterday morning she said:

As far as Canberra goes, I ... want to get an assurance on the certainty of our funding and on the capacity for growth on our funding from the Commonwealth.

She did not get any answer on those questions either. So, what did she go for? She failed miserably, Madam Speaker. She got no assurances, not even from the Health Minister, who did not want to know anything about funding guarantees. Again on the Matt Abraham show yesterday she went on to say:

So, really, there is a lot in it for the ACT.

There is indeed a great deal on the agenda of the Special Premiers Conference that is of great concern to the ACT. In the event, however, the conference gave nothing to the ACT. I must correct that. It did allow us, magnanimously, to retain our own Weapons Act - God bless them, as if it is any of their damn business - and we are allowed to keep our pornography. I am sure that the Chief Minister is pleased and delighted with that.

The Chief Minister agrees that we have got nothing from One Nation - she has said that - but suggests that we could possibly get more projects and programs out of the better cities program. Even the world's worst economist - and that might be marginally about where the Chief Minister stands - will tell you that not even Paul Keating will blow out his better cities program for Rosemary Follett when he has a potential \$9.3 billion budget deficit, at least, at this point. It is pure wishful thinking on the part of the Chief Minister.

We are told that "a government source" says that the ACT's transitional funding has been a lousy deal from the Commonwealth. Surely it has not taken Ms Follett three years to reach that conclusion. What we have, Madam Speaker, is a statement that says that the Chief Minister has failed miserably in having any effect on the Commonwealth on matters of financial affairs.

The Chief Minister says that the Premiers Conference is not a "State of origin stoush". In this she demonstrates her ineptitude in Territory-Commonwealth negotiations because, like it or not, she does represent this Territory. It is a State of origin contest. I would not use the word "stoush" myself, but that is all right. It is a State of origin contest. If the Chief Minister is not prepared to play hard ball on behalf of the Territory, then maybe Mr Lamont had better start getting his No. 1 guernsey on because he might need it a little earlier than even he expected.

Madam Speaker, there is absolutely no force behind the Chief Minister's ability to negotiate - I use the word loosely - with her colleagues from the Commonwealth and the States. She seems to believe in the patty cake approach to politics. Even the one Minister in her own Cabinet with any intestinal fortitude, and that is Mr Connolly, has been infected by Ms Follett's patty cake approach to politics.

Ms Follett: What is wrong with powder puff? That was it last year, wasn't it?

MR KAINE: No, patty cake is better. Mr Connolly just recently was confronted by the ACTION bus trade unions, and he went out there very macho. He was going to fix the trade unions in ACTION buses all right.

Mr De Domenico: What did he do? Tell us what he did.

MR KAINE: He had a great time. He took a tough stance, as we all know, and what happened? In the end the solution to the problem was to give everybody a pay rise. The fact is that a \$63m subsidy is coming from the taxpayer already. He gave them a pay rise. We even pay the bus drivers for work that they do not do.

12 May 1992

So, that is Mr "Macho" Connolly. He has been infected by this patty cake approach as well. In a world where micro-economic reform is the catchword, so much for micro-economic reform; you go in fighting, you give them a pay rise, and then you back off to your corner and wait till next year for another go.

What about health, while we are on micro-economic reform and structural reform? Where is reform occurring to remove outdated and costly work practices in the health portfolio? The best that Ms Follett and her dynamic Health Minister can do is to reduce bed numbers. I would like to know how many fewer beds we are going to have this December than we had last December. Mr Berry will not tell us, just as he will not tell us anything else about health. At least the Commonwealth Minister, Mr Howe, had a solution, and his response is consistent with what Mr Berry does - fewer beds and more day surgery. That is the solution. Pretty soon we will be sending triple bypass operation candidates down to Sydney in the morning and bringing them back in the afternoon. Day surgery!

Ms Follett: You will be one of them the way you are going. Come on, settle down.

MR KAINE: No, I will not; my heart will outlast yours, I can tell you.

Also in the area of micro-economic reform, let us look at land development. The Government makes no contribution to any micro-economic reform agenda when it suggests that it intends to take servicing back into the public sector, for heaven's sake. At substantial cost to the taxpayer - \$60m a year, I think, was Mr Wood's figure - the Government wants to get involved in commercial enterprises so that it can "benefit the consumers". It sounds like Victoria, does it not? It sounds like Western Australia, does it not? We are going to get into commercial enterprises to benefit the customers. Look what happened in those two States when we saw governments trying to get into private enterprise. I would say that we are going down the gurgler. Pretty soon Mrs Kirner's only alternatives available to adjust a budget will be the only ones available here as well - only we will be further down the road.

In connection with land development, of course, you can see nothing ahead if the Government takes over the land development thing - nothing but massive losses for the Government as it clearly demonstrates its inability to read the market, as it did last week. It could not even get the reserve prices on its land right; they were too high in one instance and too low in the other. So much for the Government's involvement in land development, Mr Wood.

On this particular element of their micro-economic development platform, how are they going to achieve it? The way they achieve that is that they send Mr "Storm-trooper" Jeff Townsend out there to intimidate the private sector land developers.

Ms Follett: Madam Speaker, I take a point of order. Mr Kaine has just referred to a public servant as a "storm-trooper" and accused him of intimidation. He must withdraw that statement.

MR KAINE: No, I am accusing the Government of it. It is a different thing.

Ms Follett: He must withdraw that statement.

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, I referred to the Government sending out their storm-trooper. If you do not like that, refute it. You sent Mr Townsend out there to intimidate the private sector - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Kaine, Ms Follett has the floor.

Ms Follett: Madam Speaker, I must insist that that point of order be upheld. Mr Kaine has made an extremely derogatory remark about a public servant, and I will not stand for it. I require him to withdraw every imputation.

Mr Humphries: Madam Speaker, there is, with respect, nothing in standing orders about casting imputations on people outside this Assembly with very limited circumstances - - -

MR KAINE: Madam Speaker, I withdraw that. Mr Townsend happens to be a friend of mine and I am sure that he will not be the slightest bit offended by it. Only the Chief Minister is, because she knows what I am saying. They will not go out there themselves, Madam Speaker. They send their public servants to threaten the land developers and to tell them that if they do not play ball they will not have any business by the end of the year.

Mr Berry: Madam Speaker, I take a point of order. We can see that Mr Kaine has taken a bit of advice from his consultants, but it is a bit like being mauled by a dead sheep. At the same time we have to ensure that our public servants are left alone in the course of this debate. To attack public servants in the way that they have been attacked by Mr Kaine is outrageous. There is no point in it, no point in it at all. They cannot defend themselves.

Mr Humphries: What is the point of order?

Mr Berry: We would like you to withdraw the word "threaten".

Mr De Domenico: Madam Speaker, I take a point of order. Madam Speaker, as a new member of this Assembly - I am sure that some of my colleagues might be enlightened by the way you might have this question answered - I ask: Can we get an indication as to what words happen to be unparliamentary? Is "threaten" unparliamentary? I doubt whether it is.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr De Domenico, I did rule earlier on "hypocrisy" and did talk about tone, context and relevance of the particular use of that word. I do believe that in this context Mr Berry and Ms Follett have both made a point which Mr Kaine did take up and which initially he withdrew. I assume that his withdrawal holds now for all other subsequent uses of "threats".

MR KAINE: I am merely saying, Madam Speaker - I do not know why we have to have a 10-minute debate in the middle of my speech, except for wanting to stop me from saying what I want to say - that the evidence is there that some land developers were threatened that if they did not play the game they would not have a business by the end of the year. I think that is a fair comment.

Mr Wood: Come off it. By whom?

MR KAINE: We know by whom. May I continue, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Kaine has the floor.

12 May 1992

MR KAINE: I must say that I was somewhat astounded to read in the communique from the conference that youth employment and training is a matter of national priority. It is indeed. But did the conference or Ms Follett deal with the youth unemployment problem? Not on your life; they did not. All they did was talk about it, just as they talked about everything else on the agenda. We have 1,100 young Canberrans who cannot find work. Nearly one in three young Australians is in the same position, and it has taken the Premiers and the Commonwealth this long to identify it as a national issue. We may get some answers next month or next year, according to the communique.

What we had, Madam Speaker, was a lot of talking, a lot of identifying problems, and no solutions. The only solution is, "Come back in June and we will tell you what we are going to do". In the meantime our Chief Minister is left to her own devices to see how much more of the system she can ruin before the June conference. Just as the Commonwealth clearly intends to remain a high spending, high taxing government, so quite obviously does this Follett Labor Government. (*Extension of time granted*)

I thank the members of the Executive opposite. I have to pose this question, in conclusion, Madam Speaker: Where are the assurances of certainty and capacity for growth that the Chief Minister went yesterday to secure? There are none. Where are the programs for structural change and micro-economic reform that this Special Premiers Conference has been talking about for 18 months? The answer is that there are none. Where are the solutions to the financial problems of the States and the Territories that the Special Premiers Conferences have been talking about for 18 months? The answer is that there are none. Where are the jobs for our unemployed youth? The answer to that question is that there are none. On all of those measures, on all of those criteria, that was a conference that had a zero outcome. The evidence speaks for itself, and I am astounded that Ms Follett can come here and claim that it was successful. It is indeed a strange measure of success, in my view, and, I suggest, anybody else's as well.

MR HUMPHRIES (3.50): I want to indicate that I support the amendment. I believe that in the circumstances it is time that the ACT Assembly took some issue with the very bland statement that has been made by the Chief Minister and indicated that we are not prepared to accept these kinds of dressed up defeats as victories of some kind for the ACT. No matter how you dress it up, no matter how you look at it, no matter how you might put your public relations machine to work to disguise the effect, the fact of life is that this Government failed in the meagre objectives it set for itself when it went to that Premiers Conference yesterday. It failed by any standard or measure of that word.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition Leader has indicated that at the outset the objectives that the Government set for itself in attending that meeting were not particular high and, indeed, having set its sights so low to start with, it accordingly achieved very little when it came to the time to deliver. We have to ask ourselves, of course: What goals did it actually set by attending that Premiers Conference? We are entitled to ask that question, Madam Speaker.

We have here a quite important, quite expensive meeting of the heads of government of the whole nine polities in the Australian context, coming together in the ACT, as it happens, on this occasion, to talk about matters of great importance, and we are entitled to ask ourselves: For the ACT's participation in

this process, for the time and the effort that went in on the part of public servants, of Ministers and so on, what did the ACT get out of it? Madam Speaker, I do not think that what we see in this statement by the Chief Minister really warrants the effort that has been put in.

What goals did the ACT set for itself before it arrived? Initially, none at all. The Chief Minister was very reluctant to be drawn on what exactly was going to happen at this conference, of any significance or impact to the ACT. She was prodded by the Leader of the Opposition on the weekend: "What exactly are you going to do when you get to this conference? What do you aim to achieve? Can we have some objectives, please, by which to measure, by your own standards, the success or otherwise of your attendance at this conference?". Of course, it would be very easy to go and say, "I am not planning anything in particular", and come out with something as a result of that because you cannot do much worse than nothing.

However, with the prompting that we generated on this matter, she announced that she was going to fight hard to protect the ACT - a laudable sentiment, but not much of substance. She went on to mimic State Premiers in talking about certainty of funding and guaranteed levels of revenue, but, again, nothing tangible; and, of course, as the Opposition Leader has indicated, she came away with nothing from that process.

Now, we have nothing to argue with here. There is out of this conference very little that we can say has benefited the ACT. We have the promise of some discussion in the future, some further meetings in the future, which might produce something of value to the ACT. That will be a debate for another day. But for the moment we have nothing to point to, the Government has nothing to point to, which you can claim with any pride is a great achievement. I will come to the meagre semi-achievement that has been referred to in the statement.

The Chief Minister says that the meeting was not actually intended to make any hard decisions; but, of course, Madam Speaker, she has said that now, after the meeting is over, rather than beforehand. This is a fall-back position, quite clearly. The fact of life is that what we should be talking about here is micro-economic reforms across the whole of Australia and in particular in the ACT.

Ms Follett: Like roads, rail, electricity.

MR HUMPHRIES: Those, Madam Speaker, are efforts and achievements being put on paper by other States and Territories, not by the ACT. We have very little to say about those matters, very little to contribute about those matters. I think, Madam Speaker, that we could have done rather better.

Let us look at some of the micro-economic achievements that we have talked about in the past in this Assembly, the sorts of things, with respect, that the Prime Minister would be talking about ahead of things like road and rail, things that in this Territory's context, in particular, are eating up revenue which we do not have in areas of education, of health, and of policing. Those are areas where the ACT needs most vital micro-economic reform and it is not good enough for us to hitch a ride on the back of the States, talking about rail, air and road transport reforms, when in fact those have relatively little impact on the ACT.

12 May 1992

Our real targets, our real accomplishments, must be in those areas I referred to, Madam Speaker; but they have not been, not under this Government. Under the former Government, of course, there were many. There were significant reductions in expenditure in the areas of both health and education, to name those with which I am most familiar. Even those were attacked quite relentlessly by the then Opposition, by the Government as it now is. We saved money in hospital services, in food services, in cleaning, in restructuring of our school system - all micro-economic reforms, all designed to bring our level of expenditure down towards State levels, all canned comprehensively by those sitting opposite.

We have had one win here. We managed to get recognition of the ACT's firearms legislation as a way of ensuring that our excellent legislation, which was passed by the Alliance Government, is not compromised by developments elsewhere. I have to say, Madam Speaker, that I suspect that this is very much an afterthought, putting a bit of icing on a very burnt and black cake to dress up this product for our consumption; but it will not really work.

The fact of life, Madam Speaker, if you think about it, is that that kind of exemption is applied not just in the case of firearms but in other cases as well. It is natural and to be expected, and would probably have happened even if Rosemary Follett had stayed at home yesterday. It is really no achievement at all. It is a natural consequence of the fact that we have different laws in this country between different jurisdictions, some of which are different for a reason. Our gun laws are a good example of that. We have better gun laws than other States; therefore we should retain that better status by not agreeing to commonality on that matter. That is not an achievement, Madam Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination.

I notice also that it was agreed that legislation providing for a common market, as the Chief Minister put it, should not apply to things including pornography. She argued for gun laws in the ACT to be exempted. Presumably she also argued for our pornography laws to be exempted, although she has not put out a press release about that subject. Presumably she said, "We want to continue to remain the centre of a very lucrative market for pornography in this country and we therefore would like you not to have any Federal laws compromising that particular situation. Therefore can you please exempt us from these arrangements?". I look forward to a full and honest press release on that subject coming out of the Chief Minister's office in the next few days.

Mr Kaine: And on banning X-rated videos.

MR HUMPHRIES: Indeed. I look forward to those comments. Madam Speaker, this Government patently has failed to achieve anything out of this Premiers Conference that is worth coming back and making a statement about. That is why it was something of a surprise to see the Chief Minister coming here today and, effectively, crowing about these achievements.

Ms Follett: You asked me to tell you about it. I heard you on the radio.

MR HUMPHRIES: No. We want to see some real achievements and we have not seen them. That is the fact of life, Madam Speaker. If we are going to spend the effort in future on exercises such as this, let us see the Chief Minister produce something of more tangible, long-lasting benefit to this Territory.

MR CORNWELL (3.59): I rise to support my colleagues and certainly to support the amendment moved by Mr Kaine. Let me begin by repeating what my colleague Mr Humphries said, namely, that there have been no benefits whatsoever out of this Premiers Conference - or was it perhaps the Premiers Conference that was not one? I was a little confused.

Mr Kaine: It is now the Council of Australian Governments. We changed the title.

MR CORNWELL: They are good at changing titles in this Labor Party, I notice. I will come back to that later. I was fascinated to hear as a defence, earlier in question time, the Chief Minister stating that the ACT's economy is in a better condition than Victoria's. Well, you know about damning with faint praise. It crossed my mind that that is like saying that the passengers on the *Lusitania*, torpedoed by a German submarine in 1915, were doing better than those on the *Titanic*. I do not see any difference.

Mr De Domenico: They had no deckchairs to shift on the *Lusitania*.

Mrs Grassby: Yes, the water was a lot warmer for the *Lusitania* than it was for the *Titanic*.

MR CORNWELL: I will let that matter rest; I do not see that I should continue on that. I have looked through this communique that has been made about what has come out of this Premiers Conference, and I can see very little of anything positive. My particular interest is in the area of education. What do I see of vocational education and training in the communique? What we see here is that the heads of government have agreed on the necessity of achieving a major increase in the level of vocational education and training opportunities across Australia. I would have thought that was self-evident.

In line with this objective the heads of government resolved that they are going to look at the matter further at the June meeting. The communique said:

... the issue of youth employment and training is one of national priority and will be further progressed at the June meeting.

They talk earlier in the communique about the Finn committee and they talk about the Carmichael report. For heaven's sake, these matters have been around since October last year. They were talking about the importance of education and training at that time. Ms Szuty has a matter of public importance in relation to youth unemployment listed on the notice paper for debate a little later. I would have thought that we could have something a little more positive coming out of yesterday's perhaps Premiers Conference on this matter, considering that it has been around for a long, long time.

Mr De Domenico: But it is not urgent enough. In June it will be urgent, Greg.

MR CORNWELL: No, it is not urgent enough so far as this Government is concerned. The fact that we have 4,000 people looking for TAFE places - - -

Mr De Domenico: How many?

MR CORNWELL: There were 4,000 looking for TAFE places at the beginning of this year. That the Finn report came down in October last year and we now, in May, are still not addressing these questions is a national disgrace.

12 May 1992

Mr De Domenico: But has there been any consultation with everyone?

MR CORNWELL: Mr De Domenico, everybody has been consulting. I see here a report on 24 April: "The Federal offer to pay for TAFE not agreed to yet. TAFE funding and its logistics are expected" - now wait for it - "to be the centrepiece of the Premiers Conference".

Mr De Domenico: Which one? June, or next year?

MR CORNWELL: No, that was on 24 April. So, I moved a little closer to the edge of my chair in excitement. Again, on 30 April, it was reported: "Government set for reforms of education". At that stage I was really teetering on the edge of it because it said that Mr Beazley's Cabinet submission - - -

Mr De Domenico: Who?

MR CORNWELL: Mr Beazley. He is the Minister for Employment, Education and Training. It said that Mr Beazley's Cabinet submission will be made in the context of the 11 May Premiers Conference and talks about general funding and untied grants. The report said that the Government is keen to maintain momentum on the Carmichael report. Well, we got some momentum yesterday, did we not? It was put off until the end of June, until the June Premiers Conference. In the meantime we have a million people out of work, we have massive youth unemployment not only in this Territory but right across the country, and what do we find? The One Nation economic statement.

I find even the term "One Nation" amusing when you consider that what this Federal Labor Government has done over this controversy with the flag is, if anything, to divide the nation rather than create one nation. But we all know, of course, that this is a smokescreen to avoid the real issues. These real issues should have been addressed in this conference yesterday, but they were not. As my colleague Mr Humphries said, there is important micro-economic reform that we have to address in this Territory. I certainly have no argument that it has to apply in education as much as anywhere else, but we have seen no effort on the part of this ACT Labor Government to address that question.

Mr Wood: You are unkind.

MR CORNWELL: On the contrary, statistics would indicate, Mr Wood, that, if anything, the micro-economic reform that should be being addressed is in fact being even more neglected. We now have here a situation where the number of surplus spaces in schools has increased.

Mr Wood: By what per cent?

MR CORNWELL: By 213, Mr Wood, from 1990 up to 1992, on your own figures that you provided to me a couple of days ago. That is approximately 106 per year.

Mr Berry: Have you been counting broom cupboards too?

MR CORNWELL: Do not talk to me about statistics, Mr Berry. Your bed numbers do not justify you making those comments. It is 106 per year. Obviously, by 1995, when the Chief Minister's guarantee that no school will be closed expires, that figure will have increased to 500 additional places, and that,

of course, is one primary school. Given the opportunity to practise some micro-economic reform, or indeed to address the problem of surplus spaces, what does this Government do? Well, in one area of the ACT, in relation to West Belconnen, it does exactly nothing. It puts out a statement saying, "We are not going to develop sections of West Belconnen".

Ms Follett: It is a little bit marginal on the relevance side, I would have thought.

MR CORNWELL: On the contrary, we are discussing micro-economic reform. That is what you went along yesterday to talk about at the Premiers Conference. I must have misread this paper, because I would have thought that these are matters that should have been addressed; but they have not been. They have not been addressed at all. We now have a situation where there is a chance to practise some micro-economic reform. We do not practise it here in the West Belconnen area and, Chief Minister, you have a problem that sooner or later you are going to have to do something about these schools.

Just like the vocational training issue that was not addressed yesterday, in spite of the fact that it was built up as being a major issue for debate at this so-called Premiers Conference, I have no doubt that you will not address the hard issues, any more than your Federal Labor Government will do so. I have no doubt that in 12 months' time we will be no further advanced in anything relating to micro-economic reform, or indeed in addressing the problems that are facing this country today.

MR DE DOMENICO (4.08): Madam Speaker, I, of course - - -

Mr Connolly: This is like a Residents Rally day.

MR DE DOMENICO: Once people on the other side, including Basil, listen, I will start saying something.

Mrs Grassby: Once more with feeling?

MR DE DOMENICO: Yes, and also the faceless men from Belconnen, Ellnor - once more with feeling. Here it is, from clan De Domenico. Here we go.

My colleagues, Messrs Kaine, Humphries and Cornwell, very eloquently said to you, Madam Speaker, that in summary the results of yesterday's Premiers Conference just go to show you once again that nothing from nothing leaves nothing. The Chief Minister went to the Premiers Conference, or whatever it was called, not knowing what she was going to say, or, if she knew what she was going to say, she would not let the people of the ACT know, because as early as last Friday, when the Chief Minister was asked to talk about what she was going to say, I believe that the argument was that she was too busy to say anything.

She knows what she had to say at the Premiers Conference, and she came back empty-handed because Mr Keating quite rightly said, "When the ACT starts to show me areas of micro-economic reform" - a phrase that has been bandied around this Assembly all afternoon - "when it proves to me that you deserve to be listened to, Ms Follett, perhaps I might sit down and listen to you". But no; we are told that we did get a say in the national electricity grid, so we are able to plug into that. That is fantastic!

Mr Kaine: You got a charge out of that.

12 May 1992

MR DE DOMENICO: Yes, we got a charge out of that. We are allowed to plug into the national electricity grid. We are still not allowed to say anything about the Snowy Mountains scheme, though.

Ms Follett: Whose fault is that? You were working for the opposition.

MR DE DOMENICO: As Ms Follett knows, last year, at the infamous ALP National Conference, when I was lobbying for the State Electricity Commission of Victoria, they quite rightly said: "It is the Federal Government that will not allow you to have a say on this because the Federal Government owns the Snowy Mountains scheme in conjunction with Victoria and New South Wales. Prove to us why we should allow you to have a say and perhaps we might". So, her own colleague in Victoria, the lady that made other statements as well yesterday, said, "No, you do not get a say in it". But now we get a say in the national grid. Well, that is fantastic!

We are also told that our gun laws are going to continue, which is good news; but we are not told anything about micro-economic reform. We are not told about anything that the ACT might have said about youth unemployment. I remind the Chief Minister and members opposite that we do have a 25.1 per cent level of youth unemployment, but more about that later. I am sure that Ms Szuty will quite adequately describe her concerns about youth unemployment. We have not been told anything about the fact that we do tend to subsidise ACTION buses to the tune of \$64m a year, and that perhaps there might be some more micro-economic reforms than the quite plausible ones that Mr Connolly is attempting to put in. We applaud him for even thinking about it and doing something about it. That is fantastic, Mr Connolly, and we hope that you continue to do that.

We are not told about the fact that this Government opposite intends to take over and get itself involved in land development. That is only going to cost a further \$60m approximately. Obviously there is plenty of money in the coffers because, if they can find \$60m to get back into land development, that is fantastic. I am sure that Mr Keating would have been delighted to have heard about that. At the same time, by the way, and I quote Ms Follett when she says - - -

Mr Kaine: Don't mention the word "storm-trooper" - - -

MR DE DOMENICO: No, I am only quoting. This is Chief Minister Rosemary Follett on 19 September 1991, at the launch of the Canberra Business Week. She said:

We cannot depend on the public sector. We need a diverse, vigorous, innovative and self-sufficient private sector.

I am continuing to quote:

It is growth in the private sector which is the key to providing employment and career opportunities for our young people -

she was smiling when saying this, by the way -

which will determine the extent to which our individual economic aspirations are met and which will provide the backdrop to meeting the community's social justice goals. My Government is determined to play its proper part in ensuring Canberra's future prosperity.

They were wonderful words, fantastic words, and we agree with them wholeheartedly. It will be the private sector that determines the growth of employment in this Territory. Not only Ms Follett agrees with that; even the *Canberra Times* editorial and the Canberra Business Council do, and I am sure that every member of this Assembly does also. Then we see this ministerial statement today. Once again I quote:

... I hoped to see three major outcomes from the discussions.

We know what she hoped for now, but she was not prepared to tell us last Friday what she hoped for. She was not available then. She says:

This was never on the agenda of yesterday's meeting and was always a matter for the regular financial Premiers Conference next month.

On Friday, had we known that she did not intend to talk about or bring up any issues besides a national electricity grid and - what was the other one, Gary? - the gun laws - - -

Mr Humphries: Gun laws.

MR DE DOMENICO: The gun laws. Perhaps we could have had something to say about that as well. The statement goes on to talk about the Council of Australian Governments being a permanent forum for consultation, intergovernmental consultation. She sees this as continuing consultation. We know that the word "consultation" is one of the favourite words in the repertoire of the Chief Minister. As Mr Kaine quite correctly pointed out, though, there is no manoeuvring in consultation with the Prime Minister now because the Prime Minister has problems of his own. He has at least a \$9.7 billion deficit to contend with. It will probably blow out to \$10 billion. Obviously he has to try to fight back from that sort of situation.

Mr Kaine: "Fightback" is a good word.

MR DE DOMENICO: Isn't it a good word? I like that. He needs more than seven nations to fight back from that situation as well. We were told only three months ago that the deficit was only \$6 billion. Now, all of a sudden, it is \$9.3 billion. Heaven knows what it is going to be next week. So, really, the Prime Minister quite rightly said, "Unless you, Ms Follett, like your colleague in Victoria, Mrs Kirner, show to me that you are prepared to go along the trail of micro-economic reform, and even corporatisation and" - dare I say it - "privatisation, you are not going to get one iota out of us". There will be no more \$53m packages that you used all in one lump sum last year. But, then again, they did not talk about future financing for the ACT. They are going to talk about that in June, is it, Mr Cornwell?

Mr Cornwell: Yes, we hope that it will be 5 June.

MR DE DOMENICO: We have not yet seen the agenda for that either, though, have we?

Mr Cornwell: No.

12 May 1992

MR DE DOMENICO: All right. We may talk about that on 5 June.

Mr Cornwell: To be continued.

MR DE DOMENICO: To be continued. Nor did we talk about the fact, as I mentioned before, that the best way to fix the micro-economic reform thing is that if a bus driver screams and goes on strike the best way to fix it is to give him a pay rise. Take him to the Industrial Relations Commission and give him a pay rise. That will keep him quiet for a while, until he wants another one. Nothing was said about the fact that we have 1,100 of our young people unemployed. Nothing was said about what Mr Carmichael said in his report about a youth wage, for example. That is not important enough; it is nothing to be consulted about. We have all these words right through the speech. Let me continue. Ms Follett says:

Heads of government agreed to the need to achieve a major increase in the level of vocational education and training opportunities across Australia ...

That is a wonderful thing that we need to achieve, but how are we going to achieve it? They did not talk about that, though. They talked about a need to achieve it, but not about how they are going to achieve it. She went on:

... particularly in order to equip our young people with appropriate skills and qualifications.

For what? To sit in an unemployment queue? So, we are going to have magnificently educated unemployed people. They will have no jobs to go to, mind you; but they will be well qualified and well educated. She continued:

We resolved to settle, as a matter of urgency, the responsibilities of governments for the funding and resourcing of vocational education and training.

If it was so urgent, Madam Speaker, why put it off till 5 June? The current unemployed will probably still be unemployed by then, as they were last month and the month before.

Mr Lamont: Because Nick Greiner wanted it put off. There will be a new Premier in New South Wales by then.

Mr Humphries: You wish. It will not be Bob Carr; that is for sure.

MR DE DOMENICO: Bob who?

Mr Humphries: Bob Carr.

MR DE DOMENICO: In the area of Aboriginal affairs they endorsed various things, which was quite admirable.

Mr Kaine: They endorsed a report.

MR DE DOMENICO: They endorsed a report of the Aboriginal Affairs Council on achieving greater coordination. So, we have all these words. We have "consultation", "urgency", "achieving major increases in levels", "endorsing" and all sorts of things. Nothing was done, though. As I said, nothing from nothing

leaves nothing. The ACT got nothing from the Chief Minister going to this meeting yesterday. It is not that we should not have asked for a lot of things. We are told that we should not really be going there with cap in hand, asking for anything from the Federal Government, because really our needs are quite few, our economy is the best in the country and we are very contented. Let me assure the Chief Minister that there are a lot of people out there and in this chamber that are not content with what we got from the Federal Government yesterday.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion - I note that I have 26 seconds left - I finish as I started. The ACT got nothing from nothing, which leaves nothing. What a waste of time, what a sham, what a public relations exercise! We got plugged into the national grid and we were allowed to leave our guns at home. That is shocking. One would hope that next time we get what we are entitled to.

MR WESTENDE (4.19): Madam Speaker, the problem with the Chief Minister's statement is that it is essentially not providing any comfort to the people of Canberra. We are in a talkfest and we had a talkfest yesterday. What we need is action, not talking. Apart from establishing the Council of Australian Governments, at which more people will look at things and at which more people will talk, we still do not get any action. What we need in this fine city of ours is some action.

The Chief Minister's statement gives absolutely no hope to the people of Canberra. How about a message to the Canberra community? What can they expect from yesterday's summit? I have heard absolutely nothing from this meeting that represents any signs of hope for the Canberra community. It does not seem that the One Nation statement has any hope for the future. Are not the real issues more jobs, stimulating industry and reducing public expenditure? After the Chief Minister's statement, the reference that she made to national road transport should probably read something like this: The only road transport that we are going to need is to shift businesses out of this town.

MRS CARNELL (4.21): I also support Mr Kaine's amendment. In the media prior to the Premiers Conference Ms Follett rightly stated that health is a central issue. She claimed - I could quote, but it would take up more time - that health and health funding was an area central to that conference. Unfortunately, when we look at the conference communique, we find nothing about health. Why is this so? I have to assume that Ms Follett took a plea from Mr Berry to the conference, because it would appear that there are no real policies in the ACT to address the very real problems facing ACT health. This is not to trivialise the very nasty health problems that we have in the ACT and everywhere else in Australia. I do not believe that this health issue should be taken trivially.

Ms Follett should have joined with her colleague from Western Australia and the Premiers of New South Wales and Tasmania in an attempt to look at the very real problems of health in Australia and look to private health insurance as a method of alleviating the problems that beset our public health system with a view to improving the level of revenue in our public health system and giving people real choice. They could even look to some of the Fightback health initiatives; initiatives like giving pensioners virtually free private health insurance, giving pensioners real choice and not putting them at the end of a waiting list of over 2,000 people.

12 May 1992

I really cannot finish without making some comments about day surgery. Day surgery seems to both Mr Howe and Mr Berry to be the panacea for health in Australia. Day surgery is all very well. Day surgery is a very good incentive. Mind you, I was very interested to hear Mr Howe quote American figures on day surgery. I think it might be the first time that Mr Howe has ever suggested that the American system of health care is a very good one.

Day surgery has the capacity to do very good things for health in Australia, but it will not achieve them quickly. Day surgery requires good domiciliary care. Mr Berry very successfully has cut funding to community nursing and to other community health facilities. So, if he is looking at day surgery solving the problems in our health system, he is sadly mistaken. Day surgery is a very useful part of improving the throughput of health in Australia; but with day surgery you have to have the guts in the first instance to reduce staff at your hospitals, and in the long term to reduce bed numbers.

Unfortunately, Mr Berry got it round the wrong way. He reduced bed numbers and kept the staff, which probably negates the whole thing in the ACT. It seems that day surgery is not going to save health in the ACT, and it certainly appears that the Special Premiers Conference did not do anything to save it. So, let us look at micro-economic reform in health in Australia.

MR MOORE (4.24): I thought I would make a comment and speak to the amendment. I will not support the amendment that Mr Kaine has presented because - - -

Mr Kaine: You disappoint me, Michael.

MR MOORE: I am aware that I may well disappoint Mr Kaine. That has happened before, and no doubt it will happen again on many occasions. The difficulty is that it seems to me that, by and large, a motion to take note of a paper is, in fact, a polite way of allowing the Assembly to comment on that paper. I appreciate the fact that that politeness is allowed. We have had a number of wrangles in the Assembly over that very politeness. Ministers in the previous Alliance Government and Ministers in all three Labor-led Governments have, by and large, allowed their papers to be debated by moving that motion to take note of the paper.

I think the most important comment in the statement made by Ms Follett today is her comment on page 3, where she said:

One particular matter I raised with the Prime Minister was my concern to protect the level of services to the ACT community. I believe that the Commonwealth must guarantee a realistic level of funding to all States and Territories to enable us to continue to deliver the services for which we are responsible.

That is quite right and quite appropriate. Unfortunately, the statement that undermines that and that, I think, is quite foreboding for the future of the ACT is this:

I should add, however, that the Commonwealth set out in very clear terms its own financial pressures and the problems it is grappling with.

I think the message to us is very clear - that at the next Premiers Conference we can expect that we will not be dealt with gently. I think that is a foreboding for all of us. As an Assembly, it is very easy to get up and berate the Government, as indeed it was very easy to get up and berate the Alliance Government when it was in. I have certainly participated in both. It seems to me, though, that if it is at all possible for us to resolve some of these problems in a cooperative manner we ought to attempt to do so.

The issue of the budget is going to be a very difficult one. It seems to me, from that statement, that we can expect to have a very difficult time with this ACT budget. Because of that it has become more and more important for the Government to set its priorities and not simply continue with the priorities that we inherited at self-government, as has happened with budget after budget, other than fiddling around with the edges. It is time to reset the priorities, and to set them in accordance with the philosophy that is part and parcel of whoever is in government.

MR BERRY (Minister for Health, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Sport) (4.27): I will reluctantly speak on this matter. First of all, I have to indicate that the Government will be opposing the amendment which has been proposed by Mr Kaine. It was, in my view, a little churlish. I do not think it was necessary. As Mr Moore has quite rightly pointed out, the tendency has been to propose a motion that papers be noted with a view to allowing people to discuss them. There has been some reluctance to do that on occasions, but it is a courtesy which has been provided by both sides of politics in this Assembly in the past.

Madam Speaker, the most important statement that was made today was made by Mr Humphries. Mr Humphries, so far today, has been a bit precious; but the most important statement was: "There is nothing to argue with here". That is precisely correct. They got the wrong meeting. This is the preliminary bout. Wait until the financial Premiers Conference; then you might have something to talk about.

Mr De Domenico: It is in June, is it?

MR BERRY: Ah, darkness lightens. June is the one. I have to say that if the Government ever does anything that you can be critical of you will have to do better than you have done today. What we have seen, I think, is what ACIL suggested you should do. ACIL suggested that you should take it up to us, not get bitter and twisted. It strikes me that you missed the game. ACIL made it abundantly clear that you have to do something. You have not done it today. It was a nice little practice run, but more practice is required.

I have to say, in relation to the preliminary punch-up that occurred during the course of the early part of proceedings today, when members of the Liberal Party complained about not being aware of the issue that was about to be discussed, that they all seemed to have long faces. Then there were six prepared speeches. That is not too bad. They did not know what was going to happen, but then we had six prepared, long and boring speeches which were about the meeting that will happen in June, next month.

12 May 1992

Madam Speaker, all I have to say is that if that is the best the Liberals can do we have not much to worry about. It will not make many headlines, but at least it will keep some of us amused. It gave many of us the opportunity for a short nap. Most importantly, what we have to do from this point forward is get on with the business of the Assembly. I am pleased to announce, again, that the Government will be opposing the amendment and supporting the motion before the chamber.

Amendment negatived.

Original question resolved in the affirmative.

LIGHT VEHICLE TRANSPORT AGREEMENT Motion

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer) (4.32): Madam Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion relating to the light vehicles agreement.

Leave granted.

MS FOLLETT: Madam Speaker, as I indicated in the statement that I made, quite some time ago now, on the outcomes of yesterday's heads of government meeting, I would like to move a motion in relation to the extension of the national heavy vehicles scheme to light vehicles. Members will recall that last year, in fact on 6 August 1991, the Assembly consented to the making of Commonwealth legislation for the ACT to give effect to the heavy vehicles scheme. Today we are being asked to extend that consent.

Following agreement at yesterday's meeting to extend the role of the National Road Transport Commission to cover light vehicles, the parties to the agreement have sought our consent - that is, the consent of this Assembly - to have legislation enacted for the ACT to bring about this extension. This would be achieved by our agreeing to the Commonwealth, firstly, legislating to extend the role of the National Road Transport Commission to cover light vehicles. Our consent is also sought to the enactment of light vehicles legislation for the ACT by the Commonwealth. However, Madam Speaker, the form of such legislation would be finalised only following consideration by the Ministerial Council for Road Transport, of which the ACT is a member. Other jurisdictions would then adopt the light vehicle legislation enacted for the ACT.

I should point out that the light vehicles agreement in fact envisages that the ACT's consent should be sought by a parliamentary process in acknowledgment of the fact that other jurisdictions will undergo such a process by their enactment of legislation. I should also emphasise, Madam Speaker, that, as with the heavy vehicles agreement, our participation in the scheme would be on an equal basis with other jurisdictions.

It would also be necessary to ensure that certain safeguards are observed to protect our distinctive position, as an extension to the safeguards put in place in relation to the heavy vehicles scheme. These would, for example, relate to the date of operation of the legislation relating to light vehicles, and arrangements with regard to our continued participation in the light vehicles scheme. As with the heavy vehicles agreement, these matters could be the subject of a separate agreement between the ACT and the Commonwealth.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the extension of the heavy vehicles scheme to cover light vehicles is a further important area of micro-economic reform, about which we have heard so much, which will lead to increased efficiencies and overcome problems arising from the current system of varying regulations across Australia. Together with other jurisdictions, we can gain real benefits from these reforms.

The proposed approach provides a further opportunity for us to make a unique contribution to the reform process by agreeing to the legislative implementation of the light vehicles scheme in the manner that I have described today. I therefore should like to move the motion that has been circulated in my name. I think members have a copy of it. I formally move:

That the Assembly -

- (1) Notes:
- (a) that on 6 August 1991 the Assembly consented to the Commonwealth making a law, referred to as the Commonwealth Road Transport Legislation, for the Australian Capital Territory that is necessary to give effect to an Agreement ("the Heavy Vehicles Agreement") dated 30 July 1991 between the Commonwealth, the States and the Australian Capital Territory relating to the establishment of a co-operative scheme to improve road safety and transport efficiency and reduce the cost of administration of road transport;
 - (b) that the Heavy Vehicles Agreement related to vehicles having a manufacturer's rated gross vehicle mass of more than 4.5 tonnes;
 - (c) that as part of the co-operative scheme the Commonwealth Parliament enacted the *National Road Transport Commission Act 1991* which amongst other things established the National Road Transport Commission ("the Commission") which is charged with preparing the Commonwealth Road Transport Legislation;
 - (d) that at the Heads of Government Meeting on 11 May 1992 the Chief Minister, on behalf of the Australian Capital Territory, agreed with leaders and other representatives to an extension of the role of the Commission to enable it to develop Commonwealth Light Vehicle Transport Legislation which will provide for the regulation of all road users other than those affected by the Commonwealth Road Transport Legislation; and

12 May 1992

- (e) that the extension is dependent on the conclusion of an agreement between the Commonwealth and the Australian Capital Territory under which the former, with the consent of the Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory, will seek to amend the *National Road Transport Commission Act 1991* of the Commonwealth to provide for the extension of the role of the Commission and make Commonwealth Light Vehicle Transport Legislation for the Australian Capital Territory which law will be a model on which the pertinent law of the States will be based.
- (2) Consents to the making, by the Commonwealth, of:
 - (a) amendments to the *National Road Transport Commission Act 1991* of the Commonwealth to extend the role of the Commission; and
 - (b) the Commonwealth Light Vehicle Transport Legislation.

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

TOBACCO COMPANY SPONSORSHIP - CANBERRA RAIDERS Ministerial Statement

MR BERRY (Minister for Health, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Sport) (4.35): I seek leave to make a statement in relation to the replacement of tobacco company sponsorship of the Canberra Raiders.

Leave granted.

MR BERRY: Last Friday I announced that the Government had reached an agreement with the Canberra Raiders rugby league team to replace their tobacco company sponsorship with sponsorship through the Health Promotion Fund. This agreement, Madam Speaker, is significant in that it places further restrictions on one of the few remaining avenues through which tobacco products can be advertised in the ACT and further toughens the ACT's stance against tobacco advertising, promotion and sales. I should add, Madam Speaker, that it is the first rugby league first grade venue in the New South Wales based competition that has anti-tobacco sponsorship advertising.

Mr Humphries: What about North Sydney?

MR BERRY: They have none. It is the first one where there has been anti-smoking signage placed on the paddock or adjacent to the paddock. I would like to take this opportunity to provide the Assembly with further details concerning the sponsorship arrangement and some other tobacco related issues. The dreadful impact that tobacco use has on the health of members of our community is an issue that I feel strongly about, and I know that many members of this Assembly share my concerns. Since self-government the ACT has led Australia in action to reduce the toll caused by tobacco use, including the introduction of measures to restrict the advertising and promotion of tobacco products.

In October 1990 the First Assembly passed milestone legislation in the form of the Tobacco (Amendment) Act which introduced widespread reforms to tobacco control in the ACT. The Act put the ACT in the forefront of tobacco control in Australia, a position which it will continue to hold under this Government. The Act introduced restrictions on certain forms of cigarette packaging and on the placement of vending machines, increased penalties for sales to minors and banned smokeless tobacco products. The amendments also include a ban on tobacco advertising except at the point of sale, and a ban on tobacco company sponsorship of cultural and sporting activities. The legislation made provision for the Minister for Health to provide exemptions from the advertising and sponsorship bans where considered appropriate.

The development of the Tobacco (Amendment) Act had an unusual history reflecting the constantly changing face of government in the First Assembly. The changes to the legislation had originally been proposed by the first Follett Government but in the end were introduced by the Alliance. It nevertheless enjoyed support from all sides of ACT politics and was passed unanimously. The provisions within the amended Tobacco Act which allow for exemptions from the advertising and sponsorship bans were supported by the Labor Party in the Assembly, but with reservations.

We are strongly opposed to tobacco sponsorship of sports and cultural activities and the associated incidental advertising. We established the Health Promotion Fund in 1989 so that such sponsorship arrangements could be replaced with health-related sponsorships. This broke the incongruous and highly inappropriate link between tobacco advertising and healthy activities such as sport. The sponsorship bans and the Health Promotion Fund are designed to work hand in hand by banning tobacco sponsorship arrangements but making sure that those groups who were already in such arrangements were not financially disadvantaged by the bans.

However, Labor also recognised that exemptions needed to be provided if the Canberra community were not to be deprived of top class sporting and cultural events. As I said during a debate in the Assembly in October last year:

Nobody regrets more than I the need to provide those exemptions, but it is a matter of fact that tobacco sponsorship and tobacco advertising are sourced from outside the Territory. Events that are held to be important by the people of the Territory have sponsorship sourced from outside the Territory, such as the Winfield Cup.

It is now over one year since the bans became effective, and with them the need to provide exemptions to allow some cultural and sporting events to continue unaffected. In that time exemptions have been provided to few events, in line with the thrust of the legislation. In the main the exemptions that have been provided have related to three groups of events: The display in 1991 of entries in a national photographic competition; international cricket matches conducted in the ACT by the Australian Cricket Board, including the Prime Minister's XI match; and the Canberra Raiders' participation in the New South Wales Rugby League competition.

12 May 1992

With that 12 months' experience it is now clear that the Government can confidently and legitimately take an even tougher line with regard to the provision of exemptions. I have already refused to grant an exemption to Rothmans of Pall Mall Pty Ltd to allow for the display of entries in the 1992 national press photo awards in a Canberra shopping mall. It is, of course, not the photos that are objectionable but the intention of the sponsor to display its company name and logo as part of the exhibition. This is tobacco advertising, pure and simple, and to allow its display in a shopping centre in full view of thousands of passing shoppers, including children, would be inconsistent with the aim of the Tobacco Act.

I have also now taken action with respect to the Canberra Raiders sponsorship. In taking this action I have been very conscious of the strong support in the Canberra region for the Raiders, support which has been matched by the Government, as evidenced, for example, by our support for the sale of Raiders series number plates. We have also been mindful of the importance of the Raiders' success to the local economy.

Contracts with Rothmans of Pall Mall Pty Ltd which relate to the Raiders' participation in the New South Wales League and to tobacco advertising at Bruce Stadium provide for perimeter and field advertising at Bruce Stadium. Last Friday I announced that perimeter advertising would no longer receive an exemption from the ACT's sponsorship ban. The Government has instead entered into its own sponsorship arrangement with the Canberra Raiders through the Health Promotion Fund. This arrangement ensures that the Raiders are not financially disadvantaged by the application of the tobacco sponsorship ban, while at the same time providing an excellent opportunity to promote health. The Canberra Raiders team and the advertising space at Bruce Stadium previously used by Rothmans will be used to promote various health promotion campaigns and will complement other health promotion campaigns and sponsorships already supported by the Health Promotion Fund.

It is a measure of this Government's strong views on the issue of tobacco sponsorship of sport that the advertising signs that are first being displayed at Bruce Stadium under the arrangement carry an anti-tobacco message, "Get smart, don't start". That is a signage arrangement which, of course, is aimed at youngsters in our community. Together with the signage goes the internationally recognised "no smoking" symbol. The contract between the New South Wales League itself and Rothmans relates to the naming rights for the league competition and various other sponsorship benefits, including the painting of the Winfield brand name on part of the in-goal area and other on-field advertising. Unfortunately, most elements of this contract are beyond the ACT Government's legislative control.

The fact is that the non-provision of an exemption may result in the Raiders losing television coverage of matches and thus considerable advertising revenue from other sponsors. In these circumstances I had no choice but to provide a further exemption under the legislation to this contract. Members of the Assembly should note, however, that this setback will be short-lived. This will mean that, despite the efforts of this Government and this Assembly, Canberrans will continue to be subject to tobacco advertising through media and press coverage of sports interstate and, to a very limited extent, at Bruce Stadium. It also means that children here and elsewhere will continue to take up smoking at a higher rate than if no sponsorship and advertising was allowed.

An immediate and complete ban was quite possible as major national sports will clearly have little difficulty in attracting alternative sponsors, and in three States and the ACT health promotion foundations or funds already operate and can replace tobacco sponsorship of other sports. However, this Government does not intend to restrict its actions with regard to smoking and health to the area of tobacco sponsorship.

In its election platform the Government promised action in the area of smoking in enclosed public places, and we will act on that promise. The Government also intends to review the legislative position in the ACT with respect to tobacco advertising, packaging and sales following recent changes to New South Wales and Commonwealth legislation, so that we can ensure that the ACT continues to be at the forefront of public health development nationally and internationally. I present the following paper:

Tobacco company sponsorship - Canberra Raiders - Ministerial statement, 12 May 1992.

I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

MR HUMPHRIES (4.45): I am not going to initiate a series of six speeches on the subject, I assure you; but - - -

Ms Follett: Oh, go on. Why not?

MR HUMPHRIES: If you insist, I will ask my colleagues to prepare something. I do want to make a few comments on this matter.

Ms Follett: ACIL was not up to the issue? ACIL has not covered this one?

MR HUMPHRIES: Madam Speaker, I am sure that the Chief Minister is very anxious to hear my words of wisdom on this matter, but she should be a little bit patient. She will hear them in due course. I am pleased to see that a compromise has been reached on this matter; that we now have some new regime applying to the advertising of tobacco products, as the Deputy Chief Minister rightly called it, in the form of sponsorship at Bruce Stadium. That is something, I suppose, to be mildly pleased about; but I am disappointed that this compromise took so long to be produced and that it was, on arrival, so very puny.

Let us be clear, Madam Speaker; taking up the question of the Raiders and their sponsorship by Winfield, or the league sponsorship by Winfield, was conceived by the Government, particularly by the Deputy Chief Minister, as a diversion from the start. It arose quite deliberately at the height of the crisis in health. Of course, it is very hard to say when the height of the crisis in health is. Health is constantly in a crisis under this Government and we never quite know when the peak has been reached. But, on one of the peaks that we have experienced, this whole idea was brought forward. We saw the whole idea of having something radical happening at Bruce Stadium - we are going to take on the Raiders.

Clearly, the Minister went to his bureaucracy and said, "Look, I really need to draw attention away from this very contentious issue. What can I do to get a bit of light on something different from health?". They said, "Well, Minister, you can

12 May 1992

take on the tobacco companies. They are always good for a few headlines. Take on the tobacco companies". It was not particularly original, of course. We had the North Sydney football club taking them on some time ago and doing quite well. So, it was not entirely original. Nonetheless, it was basically a good idea.

I might say that the idea produced tremendous angst in the sporting community on the way. I only have to look back at some of the headlines this matter has produced in the last few months to see how much concern this generated in the sporting community - "Raiders threatened in tobacco row"; "Tobacco row hits Canberra"; "Bruce signs - Raiders caught in cross-fire"; "The sport that is too clean to quit"; "Tobacco fag end causes confusion"; "The pollies must leave us alone", by someone called Big Mal.

Mr De Domenico: Who? Big Mouth?

MR HUMPHRIES: Big Mal.

Ms Follett: Aren't you going to read it to us?

Mr Connolly: Read it.

MR HUMPHRIES: That, of course, reflected quite genuine concern. What do you want?

Mr Connolly: Big Mal's bit.

Ms Follett: We would rather hear Big Mal than you, I think, Gary. That is what we are saying.

MR HUMPHRIES: There is Big Mal. There is his picture as well. I do not know who this is, but Big Mal wrote this article.

Ms Follett: Read it out. Read the good bits.

MR HUMPHRIES: I will read the first paragraph. He said:

Politicians are the latest lot who seem intent on making it very difficult for the Canberra Raiders to concentrate on playing football.

Perhaps he has a point. He continued:

The Raiders have not done particularly well in the first few games of this season.

Mr Connolly: They won with Mr Berry's signs.

MR HUMPHRIES: Is this the Raiders' in-goal sign? Are you talking about the A-frame, and things like that? The Winfield signs?

Madam Speaker, the fact of life is that this has been a matter of tremendous contention, tremendous difficulty for the ACT, particularly for our sportsmen, and particularly for the Canberra Raiders themselves. I would like to have seen, for all this fuss and bother, a slightly more significant achievement at the end of the day. I cannot say that we have really done that.

Ms Follett: Don't be churlish.

MR HUMPHRIES: I am not being churlish. Frankly, the Government is puffing itself up a bit about this matter. We have this press release: "Winfield Signs Come Down at Bruce proclaims the Minister for Sport". What he does not mention is that Winfield signs are also going up at Bruce, particularly on days when they are most effective, days when there are fully telecast matches on. Big A-frames are going in around the perimeter, telling people about Winfield cigarettes. That is happening on particular days. There are signs going up, not coming down.

Madam Speaker, the fact of life is that we have not a great deal to crow about here, as I said before in another context earlier today. I am referring to the Assembly, frankly, Madam Speaker. I am not saying that the Government has not achieved something here; it has. I would have been happier had they set out quite honestly, at the beginning, to indicate that we cannot achieve the world, but we are going to try to do something about tobacco advertising; we cannot seriously put at risk the televising of matches by the broadcasters, by Channel 9; we realise that we cannot achieve as much as that. The Deputy Chief Minister did not indicate that when he started; so we are going for something which will compromise the situation that exists at Bruce Stadium, and we will see how we go. Instead, we had far more promised and nothing like that delivered at the end of the day. I hope that we have a little bit more honesty in the way that this matter is approached in the future when the Government takes on other easy targets such as tobacco companies.

MR MOORE (4.51): The issue of exemptions from tobacco legislation was debated at length last year. At that time I indicated that, as far as I was concerned, there should be a tougher stance on exemptions to tobacco advertising and that exemptions under that legislation should be fewer. I welcome the statement by Mr Berry that the Government is taking a tougher line on this.

I find ironic, in many ways, the Liberal stance on tobacco advertising. It is interesting that staff of Liberal members in the previous Assembly are now very prominent in the tobacco lobby. I accept that they are not on the staff of members in this Assembly. Nevertheless, there seems to be a close relationship there in many ways.

Mr Humphries: Come on; that is a somewhat exaggerated statement.

MR MOORE: Allow me to accept the interjection, Madam Speaker, and say that there has been a close relationship, rather than reflecting on members who are currently in this Assembly, which I have no intention of doing. I am quite happy to correct that and to make sure that no imputation is intended on members. There are well-known members of the sporting community who are prepared to take on that sort of role in promoting the death drug that we deal with as far as tobacco is concerned, because that is exactly what this drug is.

It seems to me that one of the most important lessons to learn from our approach in dealing with tobacco is that a harm minimisation approach, rather than a prohibition approach, seems to be having some impact and some effect. I think that is a very important thing. What I would like to see, as I mentioned last year and would still like to see, is a specific time goal set for when we will see no more exemptions from the tobacco legislation.

Mr Berry: Ninety-five.

12 May 1992

MR MOORE: Mr Berry interjects that 1995 is the time goal. It seems to me that that is an acceptable time goal. I will be very keen to see that it is implemented at that time. There are some risks, of course, in taking on such a popular sport as rugby league in the ACT. I think that the Government needs to be commended on the fact that they have been prepared to do just that. The tobacco companies are, of course, going to choose the most popular sports that they possibly can. We have the appropriate approach here, and it is an approach that should be supported. I take pleasure in supporting the motion that we take note of the paper.

MR BERRY (Minister for Health, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Sport) (4.55), in reply: I am just a little disappointed with the Liberals' response to this. The opportunity to do something about tobacco sponsorship arose because - - -

Mr De Domenico: Gary started it. That is what the Liberals' response has been.

MR BERRY: The opportunity arose when the exemption that was agreed to by Mr Humphries, when he was Minister, to allow all tobacco sponsorship out there to be carried on, ran out. The opportunity then presented itself to this Government to do something about it. Nothing seems to peeve the Liberals more than to see somebody doing all right. I think in these circumstances there are a few major achievements. This is the first rugby league football field in the Winfield Cup to get anti-smoking material. None of the others have it. It has occurred in the ACT and I think again that the word "churlish" is most appropriate for the Liberals when they come up and say such things about what is a positive result.

The Canberra Raiders, a popular sports team here, were threatened by some actions that could have been taken by the New South Wales Rugby League in the early days, in what I describe as the froth and bubble of early negotiations. We have been able to achieve something that has not been achieved by anybody else. I am quite happy to be able to promote a message to some of those 20,000 kids across Australia who take up smoking every year and do not live out their full time as a result of their consumption of tobacco products.

If that is not a positive move, what is a positive move? I do not want to gloat or anything like that. Gary Humphries was a great supporter of the tobacco legislation and he is to be applauded for it, but I will not sit down here quietly and cop criticism from him when we make some achievements. It is outrageous. It cannot all be sorted out in five minutes. You know that the Federal Government has passed legislation, or is proposing legislation, I should say, which will bring about an early end to tobacco sponsorship.

You know that, in effect, tobacco sponsorship in New South Wales will be prohibited from some point in time in the future. You know that the viability of the Raiders was under some question mark as a result of some of the activities which had been proposed by the New South Wales Rugby League. If you are prepared to sit there and say, "Blow the Canberra Raiders. You get stuck into them, Berry; otherwise you are not doing a good job", that is not the way I operate. It is about getting sensible deals out of an arrangement which was not providing an appropriate message to the people of the ACT and anybody else who watches Raiders matches at the stadium.

The Government's move on this matter, and it has been a government move, has been applauded by many people. I would be just as happy if you said nothing, rather than to have the sort of response that we heard here today. Nobody wanted your applause. People just wanted to hear you say something positive about something that is really positive. I think you have not done yourself or the Liberal Party any kindness by taking such a churlish approach. Anyway, that is the issue. I think it has been a good result for health promotion in the ACT. It is something that I think will be good for kids in the ACT.

Mr Kaine: It is an outstanding success for Mr Humphries.

MR BERRY: Mr Humphries can take part of the credit for it because he was a supporter of the legislation which permitted me to knock back those exemptions. I think that at the end of the day this Assembly earned some credit because it was this Assembly that passed the legislation in the first place. Interstate we have been recognised as a bunch of people who are prepared to have a go when it comes to health promotion. Nobody wants too many bouquets; they just want recognition that something okay has been done in the interests of health promotion.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Discussion of Matter of Public Importance

MADAM SPEAKER: I have received a letter from Ms Szuty proposing that a matter of public importance be submitted to the Assembly for discussion, namely:

That the ACT Legislative Assembly urgently address the major social issue of youth unemployment.

MS SZUTY (5.01): Madam Speaker, I raise this matter of public importance on an auspicious day, World Unemployment Day. No doubt this morning members have heard calls from the Open Family Foundation for Federal Government efforts to create jobs by making young workers more attractive to employers and introducing the competency based wages system recommended by the Carmichael report. I support the call to investigate these options but feel that, as the elected representatives of the residents of the ACT, we can and must do more than wait for Commonwealth initiatives.

Only last week we were told of an increase in youth unemployment in Canberra - up to 25 per cent. Let us just seriously think of this for a second. One in four of our young people is unable to find work; 1,100 people who are no longer in the education system, who need to find paid employment, who need to start establishing themselves as real participants in the ACT community. By ignoring their need for employment, we really do deny them the right to participate.

A recent survey carried out by ACT TAFE students likened getting a job in Canberra for young unemployed to winning a lottery. The study detailed all the Wednesday and Saturday job advertisements in the *Canberra Times* over the month of March and found that only 86 ads fulfilled the criteria of full-time and

12 May 1992

genuine employment, paying less than \$25,000 a year; 96 ads surveyed attracted 3,655 inquiries and 2,649 formal applications and resulted in 794 interviews. The *Canberra Times* of 26 April reported the survey findings, which were that it is an employer's market, and experience and qualifications were specified for the most basic jobs. How are our youth expected to compete in this atmosphere? We need to be advocates and interventionists on their behalf.

The survey also took into account government jobs. The Department of Administrative Services advertised five ASO2 positions, paying \$23,000 a year, and received 400 applications. The Department of Employment, Education and Training advertised one general service officer position, and got 206 applications. Similarly, this shows the extent to which the unemployed are still seeking work and how onerous their task is. How much more so would it be for the youngest of the group defined as unemployed youth? A lot needs to be done, and, as the problem of unemployment has been with Australian society for more than two decades now, I feel that a fresh and dynamic approach, involving all levels of government and community representatives, is needed.

I must register my dismay at the action of the Federal Government in denying the training allowance to 16- to 21-year-old unemployed youth. Legislation is being prepared to block access to the allowance, after several cases have been won in gaining the money so that these young people could get basic training. The Federal Government rationale for its action is to claim that the allowance was never intended to be paid to this group. How can this be justified when it is these young people, with already limited access to education after leaving school, who need extra skills to make them attractive to employers? Whom can the Government be aiming this assistance at?

The ACT Council of Social Service, as part of its activities for World Unemployment Day, has called on the Federal Government to expand the educational opportunities for the unemployed in courses where their qualifications will be recognised, create jobs that are socially productive, and abolish the excessive targeting and age-related payment system of the Department of Social Security.

So, what can we members of the ACT Legislative Assembly do? I feel that there is no lack of spoken commitment to resolution of the problem. Only last week, when the unemployment figures were released, the Liberal Party said, with great forcefulness, that deregulation could be looked at as one means of helping to get more young people into the work force. In the Chief Minister's speech on the Labor Government's program she identified the community and employment as a central focus for policy and planning. She said:

The Government ... believes that the community needs a clear agenda from the Government - an agenda which will allow business, unions, families and individuals to be confident about the future of our community.

Again, she said:

Above all, we must focus on job creation so that jobs are available to those seeking them.

In a later section, she said:

... our election policy outlined a range of other initiatives to promote balanced economic growth ... and to improve access to employment for all Canberra residents.

Most importantly, she said:

The Government will also pay special attention to the needs of youth, most importantly by seeking to create jobs. The preparation of a youth budget paper will focus attention on the way in which government programs affect young people, and we will examine youth programs to close gaps and improve outcomes.

Madam Speaker, I applaud these sentiments but would argue quite forcefully that the time for action is now, as well as at budget time. It is now that we have an official youth unemployment rate of 25 per cent, and I might add that the ACT Council of Social Service estimates that the hidden unemployment level may be twice that figure. A creative and multifaceted approach needs to be arrived at quickly.

Both the Labor and Liberal parties went into the February election championing the cause of youth employment. In launching the Labor Party platform for the election, the Chief Minister said of the party's employment and economic development policy:

No policy can be more important to our future than this.

Although the launch contained no specific mention of youth unemployment, the youth policy put forward for the election declared that Labor believes that young people have a right to participate in the life of their community and to be consulted on issues that affect them. A goal of the Labor Party on gaining office was to create another 100 training positions of six months' duration, to provide the personal and social benefits which come from work and training. But this is only a temporary relief, and 100 is less than one-tenth of the number who need jobs.

The Liberal Party was more glowing in its terms, calling the youth of Canberra an asset for the Territory's future. It also identified youth unemployment as one of the most serious concerns facing the ACT. Research conducted by the Independents Group before the election confirms this view, with 90 to 95 per cent of respondents identifying it as the major problem for those in government. The Liberals were quite emphatic in their determination, as they went to the polls, to address the issue, saying that an ACT Liberal administration would act, as a matter of priority, to reduce youth unemployment. The policy went on to state that the Liberals would do this by working to basically dismantle wage structures, to allow employers more flexibility, overhauling adult-to-junior ratios, reforming industrial relations and reviewing the apprenticeship system. These issues need to be addressed.

In the platform on which I stood for election, we identified employment as a vital part of the economic management of the ACT. We feel that the most effective way to ensure full employment is through stable, productive business, and security for business through a long-term planning strategy. We also feel that short-term additional employment in the ACT public sector has its place but should be seen as a temporary measure, fitting into the long-term vision.

12 May 1992

With these two defined areas of policy, we also included in our reform agenda our commitment to refer the issue of youth unemployment to a select committee. As the major community issue of the moment, I feel that unemployment deserves the highest consideration and a timetable which produces real, achievable goals and an action plan that will see tangible improvements in the shortest possible time. I would here foreshadow that at the conclusion of this debate I will seek leave of the ACT Legislative Assembly to establish a select committee on youth unemployment.

I feel that a select committee would be the obvious vehicle for discussion of such an important issue, as it could devote all its energies to the matter at hand and include in its terms of reference the identification of short-, medium- and long-term strategies. I would here claim as a reference the Labor Government's own Economic Priorities Advisory Committee headed by Professor Fred Gruen. Earlier this year, after the committee's first hearing, he called on the Government to make youth unemployment one of the Government's priority targets. I feel that my suggestion of a select committee would meet the call admirably.

Let us not forget as well the interrelationship between youth unemployment, social dysfunction, crime and substance abuse. The ability to earn a living is an essential pillar of Australian society. Those who are kept on the outside of this major section of the community can often feel more than isolation, namely, anger and frustration. I feel that there is more to be gained from making youth unemployment the highest priority on the Government's agenda than just placing them in jobs.

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer) (5.11): I would like to thank Ms Szuty for putting this on the agenda for the Assembly. This matter is very close to my heart. In fact, it is an issue to which I have given top priority, and rightly so, because I think all members here would agree that unemployment, particularly for our young people, is a scourge in our community, and it is something that should be addressed vigorously.

I would like to outline briefly what action the Government has taken in relation to unemployment, and youth unemployment in particular. Recently, when I opened the south side office of Jobline, I said that the ACT is currently experiencing very high levels of unemployment, although, as members know, our unemployment levels continue to be somewhat lower than those elsewhere in Australia. That is not a cause for any sort of complacency. It is certainly not a matter upon which I congratulate my Government. It is a matter that continues to be of grave concern. The most notable feature of our unemployment statistics is the fact that young unemployed people continue to face severe disadvantage, and the unemployment rate for young people is at an atrociously unacceptable level. As has been pointed out, I think, by Ms Szuty, amongst young people, particularly in the 15 to 19 years age range, one in five is unemployed, and that is an unacceptable level.

Members of the Assembly would be aware that when I established my Economic Priorities Advisory Committee I identified youth unemployment as a priority for that committee - not the other way round, as I think Ms Szuty said. I asked them to address this issue as their No. 1 task, and indeed they have. EPACT will be presenting their report to me very shortly, and I know that they have made a careful study of this issue. Once I have that report, it is my intention to release it for community discussion and to address the recommendations that EPACT makes, as a matter of priority.

In the discussions that I have had with the chairman of EPACT, Professor Fred Gruen, he has indicated to me that youth face particular labour market difficulties; again I think it is something to which Ms Szuty has alluded. For some young people, the problem is one of accessing a full-time position with very limited work experience, and that is compounded if the individual has a low level of qualifications or lacks confidence or skills in job seeking. There is a very real danger that young people who are caught in that "no job, no experience and therefore no job" cycle will end up joining the ranks of the long-term unemployed, and that is clearly a matter that we have to address.

I have been criticised by members opposite and Ms Szuty for seeking to get for those young people a higher level of experience and training. I stand by what I have done there. It is a fact that we were able to attract some \$2.96m of Federal funding for the Jobskills program which will provide to 270 of the ACT's long-term unemployed people on-the-job experience and training and, quite importantly for them, a decent wage while they are doing it. I think that is a major achievement. Last week I was very happy to be able to make public the fact that we had offered contracts to five organisations charged with implementing the Jobskills program. Those organisations are the Community Company, the Work Resources Centre, Richmond Fellowship, Caloola Farm and Quest Solutions. They are called the brokers in this Jobskills program, and I am certain that everybody here would wish them all the very best in helping those 270 people to take on some additional work experience and some training.

I am sure that members would also be aware that the Government took a number of initiatives in relation to employment and training, many of them targeted at young people, and many of which were taken in the last budget. The focus has been, as I have said before, on equipping unemployed people with the skills and the experience that they need to compete successfully for jobs because we need to make a real difference in the job training opportunities that are available for unemployed people. The south side office of Jobline was one such initiative, and there are a number of others. For example, we have brought forward part of our capital works program. That will provide, we estimate, some 330 jobs. We have also ensured that there are a greater number of traineeships in the ACT Government Service. We have increased funding to Involve and the Streetlink program, to provide a greater employment focus. In addition, we introduced an entirely new venture and development assistance program to provide funds for training and employment programs that are targeted, again, at young people.

I have said, and I have been quoted as saying, that I believe that jobs growth must occur in the private sector. So, in addition to those targeted labour market programs, I would like to point to a number of initiatives that we have taken in order to develop the private sector in the ACT. Mr De Domenico, I think, referred to the address that I gave in Business Week last year, in which I outlined nine initiatives that I would be taking in order to assist business in the ACT. Some of those initiatives, Madam Speaker, have already been touched on. One of them was to establish the Economic Priorities Advisory Committee. That has been done, and it has been charged first and foremost with looking at youth unemployment.

12 May 1992

I have also established the Business Services Centre in the City. That is an extremely successful venture. It is providing practical and immediate support and assistance to people in business and people wishing to set up in business. I was very pleased last week to be able to launch the Business Licence Information Service, which is a telephone information service, again to make it easier for business people to get into business, particularly by providing them with all the information that they need on licensing and regulation arrangements in relation to the business in which they are interested. So, that has all been very useful and practical assistance.

Madam Speaker, we have also undertaken a lot of work aimed at establishing new industries in the ACT. The chief one that occurs to me at the moment is the casino. In contrast to the endless dithering of the Alliance, the Labor Government was able to make progress on the casino - to establish the casino legislative framework, find somebody who wished to develop it and find a site on which it could be developed. The casino, which is scheduled to open before October this year, will provide a number of new jobs, particularly for young people in the ACT. They will run into some hundreds of jobs. Further hundreds of jobs will be created by the permanent casino when that construction activity begins. So, we have actually assisted new industries like that to get going in a way that our predecessors, the Alliance, were not able to do.

Madam Speaker, I have also taken a great deal of personal interest in the tourism industry. It is my pleasure to be the Minister responsible for that industry in the ACT, because it has shown very encouraging signs of maturity and development in the past year or so. We have now a streamlined Tourism Commission which is spending the same amount of money on marketing the ACT as was achieved under the Alliance, although of course it is being spent now in a much more efficient manner. We have plans also to develop the Tourism Commission so that it will contain a development unit and a unit aimed at getting new and improved attractions and events in the ACT.

I am sure that members would agree that tourism, the casino and all of those hospitality areas are extremely fertile ground for young people's jobs. They are the sorts of jobs to which young people are attracted. They are very useful to people who particularly might want short-term jobs or some part-time work. But most importantly they offer a sustained industry in the ACT, which will be of ongoing benefit to people wanting to take a full part in the employment market.

Madam Speaker, I have also expressed a great deal of interest in the ACT's capacity for high-technology industries and, in particular, telecommunications industries. We have recently started a new campaign aimed at attracting high-technology and telecommunications business to the ACT. I have launched a new brochure and I have met on a continuing basis with senior people from both Optus and Telecom, and it is my intention to build on the business that both those companies already have in the ACT and to assist them to build up their presence here in order to provide a greater range and number of jobs, particularly for our young people.

Madam Speaker, I will be continuing that kind of activity, and I will be continuing to push for the air freight distribution centre to be located in Canberra. I have met with a number of organisations on that matter, including the Federal Airports Corporation. That is another area in which the ACT stands to benefit from a new industry, with a large number of jobs that have a future in the ACT. I will also continue to press for projects, such as the Gold Creek project, to be developed and advanced. That is a \$200m project that will create an enormous number of jobs in the ACT. Similarly, the Chinatown proposal for Dickson will add to our tourism potential; it will add a number of quality, sustained jobs.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to point out that I continue to believe that it is important that young people have appropriate training for employment. I reject criticisms that I have heard from members opposite about TAFE not being a solution. I reject criticisms that projects like Jobskills are not the solution. It is essential, in my view, that young people have both the skills and the training available to them so that they are competitive in the job market. I think we must continue to focus on those kinds of opportunities for young people; otherwise, as members have pointed out, our young people will be left behind in the competition for jobs. They must maintain their skills. They must remain competitive in the jobs market.

Madam Speaker, I also believe that we must actively pursue job opportunities. I hope that in my comments today I have persuaded members that the Government is actively pursuing real job opportunities in the ACT. I reject calls for the kinds of make-work propositions that I heard being talked about in the media this morning by the Open Family Foundation. I believe that we, as a community, as a society, are capable of providing real jobs and involving young people fully in the employment market. I do not believe that it is appropriate to provide them with some lesser form of activity. I think that is to do them less than justice. To compel them in any way to undertake that activity, I think, is totally unacceptable because young people, whether they are unemployed or employed, have a free will; they must have a choice in the matter; their human rights must be protected. I reject any kind of compulsion, any national service aspect, that I believe was contained in the comments that I heard this morning.

Madam Speaker, in concluding, I thank Ms Szuty for raising this issue. It is the issue to which I give priority, it is an issue which I am sure the Assembly will wish to discuss again and again, and it is an issue which will also be assisted, I believe, by a national recovery from our recession. So, whilst we as a government do everything that we can to address and target the issues, increase jobs and increase industries, we must not forget that this is also a national situation and that action taken nationally will also have an impact in the ACT.

Sitting suspended from 5.26 to 8.00 pm

MR CORNWELL (8.00): Addressing this matter of public importance on youth unemployment: I was interested to hear what the Chief Minister had to say about the various labour market programs. Goodness gracious, the front bench of the Government is empty. I was interested to hear the Chief Minister's statements about labour market programs and the various plans that have been put forward. I reject her statement that people on this side of the house believe that the TAFE is not a solution to youth unemployment. As far as I am aware, nobody among the Liberal members has ever made that statement. We support TAFE very strongly.

12 May 1992

However, the one thing that Ms Follett, in my opinion, failed to address was the other end of the pipeline, that is, at the primary school, the high school and the college level where many of the problems relating to youth unemployment, I believe, are located. I do not say for a moment that this is the case in every situation. Like other members here, I attended the University of Canberra graduation ceremony a couple of weeks ago and, no doubt like other thinking people in this Assembly, I did worry about those people who were graduating, as to whether or not they would be able to find employment. This is not a matter of their being inadequately qualified; it is just because of the circumstances that apply at the moment.

Nevertheless, there are people in the community who, I believe, are not being properly prepared to face the very competitive field of seeking employment, simply because our education system allowed them to slip through the net. On 8 April, Mr Moore delivered a little homily to us about the answer to the problems of students who suffered from basic difficulties. I am talking now, obviously, of literacy and numeracy. He said that these problems could be solved by decreasing class sizes. I do not know where we are to find the money for this little exercise, if it was true.

But I must support very strongly the comments made last week by Virginia Chadwick, the New South Wales Minister for School Education, in relation to the basic literacy and numeracy skills testing which she is promoting in New South Wales. I believe that her comments should be supported by any person with any concern in relation to this very difficult and sad problem of youth unemployment. I think it is worth while quoting some of the words that she said:

It's about time that we had a debate in our community about how we ensure that we don't doom young children to failure by sending them off after seven years of elementary education, into high school learning French, German, Japanese, physics, chemistry when they can't read, write or add up.

This seems to me to be simple commonsense.

Mr Wood: It does not happen here.

MR CORNWELL: I am not sure that you can say that, Mr Wood, because you have never put it to the test. I personally believe, Mr Wood, that we are probably doing better in the ACT, in terms of literacy and numeracy, than anywhere else in the country; that is a personal view. But I do not believe that we are 100 per cent correct. I do not believe that 100 per cent of our students who are going through the system are competent in literacy and numeracy.

Mr Wood: It is not bad, though, is it?

MR CORNWELL: I do not know. I have an expectation, Minister, that we are doing better than elsewhere, but I do not know for sure. I would like to have that reassurance, but you and the Labor Government - - -

Mr Wood: You have it.

MR CORNWELL: From Mr Berry? Goodness gracious!

Mr Kaine: He does not know what a split infinitive is!

Mr Wood: It is a medical condition!

MR CORNWELL: Yes, and I am sure that splints will help! In view of our little exchange here, I think it is germane to quote what Virginia Chadwick said:

For too long we have ducked this question in New South Wales -

and, I put it to you, that we have in the ACT as well -

and it is about time that we faced up to this.

We have passed the problem on from primary school to high school, knowing in our heart of hearts that those kids -

and I presume that she is referring, obviously, to those who cannot manage -

can't cope.

It was devastating for adolescents' self-esteem if they continued to fail throughout their high school.

I repeat that I do not believe that the situation in the ACT is as bad as some people may like to claim, but I would like to see the matter put to the test. I am concerned that the Labor Government appears quite determined never to do that because their own - - -

Mr Wood: We test it all the time.

MR CORNWELL: No, you do not. Your policy, Mr Wood, indicates that you are not going to do skills testing in literacy and numeracy. Therefore, you are not really going to put it to the test that we on this side of the house believe is the only sure one. This, I think, is a problem and an area that has not been addressed by your Chief Minister in supporting the MPI that was put forward by Ms Szuty. I hope that this committee will address that end of the pipeline to the same extent as it would address the other end.

Mr Lamont: Do you want to bring back the cane to make them learn a bit more quickly?

MR CORNWELL: I do not really know that I can answer that absurd interjection from Mr Lamont. I would hope that the committee would address this question in as much detail as the Chief Minister would have them address the various plans and procedures which she has put forward and which, I would remind members, as far as I am aware, have not created one job so far.

MS ELLIS (8.09): We recognise that today is a national day of action on unemployment. It involves visits by peak church and welfare organisations to Federal MPs and senators. This is an important action and, although it is targeting the Federal Government, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to discuss employment issues here today. In the context of youth unemployment, I was interested to read in the *Canberra Times* today that it is getting harder and harder to get into the public service. This affects young people more than any other group. The *Canberra Times* stated:

... the bottom two ranks, the ASO-1 and ASO-2, were a dying breed.

12 May 1992

Only 18 per cent of ASO1s in 1991 were under 20 years of age. This helps to put youth unemployment into a context that we can understand. Young people in our community have been affected by continuing high levels of unemployment, and they have suffered high rates of poverty and homelessness for a number of years. I believe that the major problem facing young people in the current climate is unemployment. It needs urgent and long-term action.

The March figures for unemployment showed that more than a third of young Australians were out of work. The proportion in the ACT is lower than that national high, but youth unemployment is still a very major problem and one which we cannot ignore. The Government's employment and training initiatives, which were announced in the 1991-92 budget and subsequently, are wide ranging and progressive. Their focus has been upon equipping unemployed people with the skills and experience that they need to compete successfully for jobs, rather than upon direct job creation. The Chief Minister has already referred to some of our programs that are aimed at assisting the long-term unemployed, and I would like to remind the Assembly of the diversity and intensity of our efforts in more detail.

The number of traineeships in the ACT Government Service has doubled to 40. Increased funding to Jobline and Involve will assist young people to get into short-term employment and meet skill training needs - that is \$73,000 this year and \$116,000 in a full year. Jobline has already opened their new south side office. The Streetlink program has been expanded to include an employment focus - \$77,000 this year and \$99,000 in a full year. The innovative venture and development assistance program will provide a range of assistance to young people and youth organisations to increase skills and create jobs - that is \$100,000 this year and \$200,000 in a full year.

An extra 57 places in TAFE courses were provided this year for school leavers - \$246,000 this year and \$343,000 in a full year. Since the budget, the Government has also announced the provision of alternative courses of study, including ones at TAFE, for those who enrol to repeat year 12 in 1992, in order to better meet young people's career aspirations. Two hundred and fifty positions have been provided under the Commonwealth funded Jobskills program, which will provide the long-term unemployed with the opportunity to gain new skills through work experience and training. During the election campaign we also announced that a further 100 positions will be made available in the 1992-93 year under this program.

In addition, the Government has announced an acceleration in its capital works program. This program, totalling \$35m, will provide 330 places and an important stimulus to the construction industry. Might I add that we should listen carefully to the criticism that these are only construction jobs; that sort of impetus to the employment base has flow-on effects through the local community which we cannot ignore.

I would like to give the Assembly a progress report on the initiatives which I have summarised to date. The venture and development assistance, or VADA, program was a 1991-92 budget initiative. The program focuses on ameliorating the impacts of unemployment on young people. It does this in three ways: Firstly, the program will provide grants of up to \$5,000 to young people to either undertake skill development outside of the mainstream education and training

system or establish their own businesses for ongoing employment; secondly, the program provides grants of up to \$10,000 to incorporated community organisations to provide skill or personal development programs with and for young unemployed people; and, thirdly, VADA provides grants, again to incorporated community organisations, which allow them to establish new businesses and ongoing employment opportunities for young people. The second and third sections have already been advertised, and many organisations have expressed interest.

This Government has also taken steps to expand the support services that are available to long-term unemployed and young people at risk, by extending the services available through Streetlink. Two new workers have been provided under this program, allowing two teams of four workers to cover both north and south Canberra. Figures from Streetlink indicate that most young people presenting to workers from this program are facing unemployment-related issues. The Streetlink staff provide support to these young people and pay particular attention to their overall needs, including income support, accommodation and personal support. In line with the Government's expansion of this program, Streetlink will, in the near future, be collocated with the Commonwealth's Youth Access Centre in Belconnen, providing Streetlink staff with the opportunity to directly access CES services on behalf of young people.

These initiatives were funded as a response to the Government's concern about the effects of unemployment on the young people in our community and the long-term effect of that on the economy. It was recognised that young people have experienced consistently high levels of unemployment, and there are some indications that many of those young people who failed to gain employment during the 1982 recession are still unemployed. The funded programs are designed to help prevent a recurrence of this problem for those young people who are currently unemployed, as well as to reduce the currently high levels of youth unemployment in the ACT. In particular, the Government is committed to breaking the "no job, no experience; no experience, no job" cycle.

MRS CARNELL (8.16): I would like to address this question, possibly with a more pragmatic approach. Ms Szuty's proposal was to establish a committee to deal with youth unemployment. I do not believe that this is the answer. I believe very strongly that we have had enough talk already. I believe that the young people out there who do not have jobs are by the minute, as Ms Ellis rightly says, becoming our long-term unemployed. I do not believe that putting the whole issue off for a couple of months, waiting for a committee to come down with some more words, will solve the problem for the young people who are out there today without jobs.

We already know what we have to do to address the problems of unemployment. Unfortunately, there has been no real action to date by this Government. Ms Follett previously talked about committees and programs such as Jobsearch, Jobskills and others, none of which actually have produced one real job. Ms Ellis also made the comment that skills produce jobs, that we must educate our young people better and that creates more jobs. That is not necessarily the case; in fact, it is categorically not the case. What actually happens very regularly is that we just end up with older unemployed young people. Older unemployed young people are more expensive to employ and therefore are more likely to become part of the very long-term unemployed.

12 May 1992

So, to go back to my more pragmatic approach, let us talk about it from the point of view of a business proprietor in the ACT; and there are many thousands of those in the ACT today. We have, probably, substantially fewer small businesses than we did a couple of years ago; but, even so, if just half of those businesses employed one extra young person - or one extra person at all - youth unemployment and, for that matter, unemployment totally, would be virtually eradicated. We are talking about private enterprise, even in the ACT. How do we actually encourage those businesses to put on this extra person - not down the track somewhere, not next month, not next year, not when the committee brings down its report; but now, when these young people need a job?

Mr Kaine: They do not want to hear how you encourage the unemployed people. That is beyond their comprehension.

MRS CARNELL: Obviously they do not. The first thing that we must do is remove some of the tax imposts on business. The most insidious of these taxes is payroll tax. Let us just look at this thing more pragmatically. Payroll tax, for better or for worse, is a tax on employment. You pay more if you employ more people; it is quite simple.

Let us look at this in another perspective. Let us look at governments that have the guts to make really hard decisions. Let us look at Queensland, in the past, when they decided to abolish death duties. It is, I suppose, a bit of a leap in the argument to talk about retired people in a debate about youth, but I think it is relevant because it shows how the abolition of a particular tax can really generate social changes. When Queensland abolished death duties there was an almost instant migration of retired people from all other parts of Australia to Queensland. And that is the basis of the economic boom that currently is Queensland. That was the basis of the turnaround for Queensland. If we, as an Assembly, had the guts to do something about payroll tax in the ACT, we could generate a beneficial change of similar proportions for our young people and for the business we talk so much about and do so little about in the ACT. We are talking about vision and we are talking about guts, and we are talking about a government with very little of both.

The second and equally important initiative is to make youth wages and conditions more flexible, and to address the area of penalty rates. From there we can easily move to a deregulation of trading hours; we can move to a situation where tourism is a real growth area for the ACT, where tourists stay longer because there is something to do after 5 o'clock at night, where businesses can employ people after 6 o'clock at night, where you can stay open on Saturdays and Sundays - not because Mr Berry says that we have to, but because it is economically viable to do so. From there we can create real and sustainable job opportunities for young people in our retail and hospitality industries. If we hold our breath waiting for government to provide jobs for our young people, we will suffocate.

To sum all of those things up - now we are talking about creating jobs next week; we are talking about now; we are not talking about down the track - let us, as an Assembly, have the guts to reduce payroll tax as a first step, possibly by increasing the threshold to \$1m, therefore allowing business growth, attracting business to the ACT, and creating immediate jobs for our young people. Let us make youth wages and conditions more flexible, and let us abolish penalty rates. Let us not stuff around. Then let us deregulate trading hours.

Mr Lamont: Let us abolish education while we are at it! Get them working 12-hour days - back down the coalmines!

MRS CARNELL: If Mr Lamont believes that any young person in the ACT would rather sit at home without a job than work for a decent amount of money - Saturdays, Sundays, at night - - -

Mr Lamont: But work in your pharmacy for \$1 an hour?

MRS CARNELL: That is absolutely ridiculous! Then let us make our TAFE courses and other training courses relevant, to equip people for real jobs which exist when the course finishes.

MR DE DOMENICO (8.23): Madam Speaker, in terms of the people on the other side of the house, the truth sometimes really does hurt. The facts are - these are not my figures; they are the figures of the ABS for the labour force - that in March, last month, in Canberra there were 1,100 unemployed young people. That is a fact; it is not fiction. There were 200 more in March.

Mr Lamont: Which is fact and which is fiction?

MR DE DOMENICO: Listen to this; you might learn something. The average cost of one young person on the dole is \$181.10 per fortnight. Take note, because this is fair dinkum, mate. But the cost is greater in terms of self-esteem. Let us not forget about the individuals concerned. Let us not just look at statistics. What is the cost in terms of self-esteem? Let us get some sanity into the debate. It is all about getting ahead, encouragement and incentive, as well. The cost of being idle, in other words, is incalculable in social and economic terms. But let us talk about some economic terms as well. Having 200 extra young people unemployed in the ACT costs the taxpayer \$36,220 per fortnight. Per year, it works out to be nearly a million dollars. That is just the additional economic cost of youth unemployment in the ACT in one month compared with another.

Let us get real about whether we want to do something about youth unemployment. Let us see what the Chief Minister said before. She said that the level was unacceptable. We all agree with that, and we all agree with motherhood. She said that EPACT and MYAC were doing something, and Ms Ellis tells me that VADA is doing something.

Mr Kaine: Is Rosemary doing anything?

MR DE DOMENICO: All these groups are doing something, but Rosemary and the Labor Government are doing a no-act - that is, no action whatsoever. There is a lot of talk about the fact that we are concerned about youth unemployment, but there is no action. Someone might say to me, "Okay, what are you going to do about it?". Mrs Carnell, quite clearly and quite eloquently, if I might say so, talked about what the Liberal Party has been saying for a long time.

Mr Lamont: And what the H.R. Nicholls Society has been telling you to say.

12 May 1992

MR DE DOMENICO: We are going to get all this sort of talk from ex-trade union bosses who have never been in a business, but the simple answer is that you have to make it cheaper for employers to employ people. That is not reinventing the wheel. Why did this Government last year not accept an amendment to the workers compensation legislation to put in a termination clause, which would have further reduced the cost of workers compensation to employers?

Mr Connolly: When they are injured, just throw them out on the street!

MR DE DOMENICO: There is Basil having another go again. Blame the employer! Whack Manuel on the back of the head again, Basil! You always do it. Shoot the messenger! Why has the Government not reduced the impost of payroll tax by increasing the threshold to \$1m? Once a Federal Liberal government comes in, rest assured that there will not be any payroll tax, Mr Connolly.

Have a look at some of the initiatives that Ms Follett was talking about. She keeps mentioning the importance of the private sector to the future of this Territory. We agree with her. The private sector is very important in the equation to create more jobs, but let us make sure that we create the atmosphere in which the private sector can flourish. We heard from Ms Follett in opening Business Week last year and, as president of the Chamber of Commerce at that stage, I was there. She said that she established a business services centre to support, EFACT to look at - these are her words - and a business licensing service for information, and that it made it easier to get into business. Not one job was created. Businesses were leaving Canberra and going broke in droves because of the impost on them.

She mentioned establishing industries. As early as November last year, the Liberal Party talked about the potential of high-tech and Optus. We are delighted that Ms Follett has taken that on.

Mr Lamont: But you did nothing.

MR DE DOMENICO: We were not in government, Mr Lamont; you were. You talked a lot. You were in government, and the truth hurts. She did nothing. She ran with our idea. It was fantastic of her to do that. Today she talked about the air freight terminal. We have been talking about it for the past year, for heaven's sake. You did nothing about it. You have been in government.

Mrs Grassby: But you didn't do anything.

MR DE DOMENICO: There is the voice from the faceless men in Belconnen. She is in the debate as well. She has done nothing either. Ms Follett said what a wonderful idea Gold Creek is. A feasibility study is being done in relation to Gold Creek. Not one job has been created, though. We support the feasibility study as well. We support Chinatown if it goes ahead, too. But not one job has been created.

Let us look at the national situation. We are now suffering from the recession that we had to have. It had nothing to do with the Liberal Party; it was caused by Mr Keating. That hurts. It was not a Liberal government that did it; it was a Labor government.

Ms Ellis: That is a bit of a change. They did it last time.

MR DE DOMENICO: You have had 10 years to do something about it. It is all well and good saying that inflation is running at zero. Close to one million people would be unemployed. Some of them would be very, very highly educated, but still they cannot get jobs. It is about time this Government stopped rhetorising, stopped talking and started to do something about it, so that the youth unemployment in the ACT, of 1,100, does not blow out again, as it will under a Labor administration. The truth hurts. What we need in this Territory and this country is a return to Liberal administration. Action speaks louder than words.

MR MOORE (8.29): It has been very interesting to listen to parts of this debate. It is ironic for Mr Berry to move that Ms Szuty's motion be referred to the Standing Committee on Social Policy for - - -

Mr Berry: Why don't you speak on it later when it comes up?

MR MOORE: The two are related. With a bit of luck, you will have to hear me only once. Mr Berry intends to move that Ms Szuty's motion be referred to the Social Policy Committee so that the committee can assess the necessity for a select committee and further inquiry. That is a standard sort of Wayne Berry tactic of delay - that we are not really going to consider the issue; we will ask a committee to consider whether another committee should consider the issue and perhaps take it up.

Mr De Domenico: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: Mr Moore, I dare say, will have an opportunity at a later stage to talk to the amendment that is to be moved by Mr Berry. Can I suggest that you instruct Mr Moore to talk about the MPI.

MR MOORE: I am quite happy to do that, Madam Speaker. I am quite happy to speak twice, if that is what the Assembly wants.

Mr Cornwell: Not necessarily.

MR MOORE: That is what is being asked for. So, rather than talk about how Mr Berry intends to put that off in his proposal, it is better to talk about how the Labor Government has done basically nothing on this issue. In this quarter I support the Liberals, in that we have seen a whole series of ideas which are starting to have some impact and which might have some impact in the next little while.

I think it is important to try to assess what can and cannot happen. We had a great deal of confusion coming from the Liberal Party as to the role of education in employment. Certainly, Mr Cornwell thinks, as does Ms Follett, that education is a very important and critical part of youth unemployment. That is true in one sense, that it assesses who gets employed and who does not. But the truth is that there is a limited pool of jobs but a much bigger pool of people looking for those jobs; somebody is going to miss out. Education sorts out who is and who is not going to miss out.

Mr Humphries: Up to a point.

MR MOORE: Mr Humphries interjects, "Up to a point", and that is true. I have oversimplified it in the same way as Mr Cornwell did. So, there is room for both to apply; but there is still a great deal of truth in what I say. No matter what we

12 May 1992

put into education as far as this goes, we still have a major gap between the number of jobs and the number of people who are looking for jobs. That is what needs to be assessed, and that is why the proposal has come up here.

It is interesting, Madam Speaker, that the question without notice which I asked earlier today and which you ruled out of order raised an issue about whether the Standing Committee on Social Policy was prepared to take on this particular reference. We do not know the answer, but we do know that Ms Szuty certainly had the intention of taking this issue to that committee, and we know that the committee has - - -

Mr De Domenico: Madam Speaker, on a point of order: Can I once again humbly suggest that Mr Moore is now debating what the Social Policy Committee may or may not do.

MR MOORE: You are drawing a long bow, Tony; come on!

Mr De Domenico: No, with respect, let me be heard. He has said nothing about the MPI. Can I suggest, respectfully, once again that he be asked to talk on the MPI.

MR MOORE: It is specifically on unemployment. Sit down. The point is critical because we are talking about the issue of unemployment, which is one that the Social Policy Committee, with two Liberals, two Labor people and Ms Szuty, were not prepared to take on. If Ms Szuty did present this - - -

Mr Lamont: Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order and ask you to address the question that Mr Moore is debating an issue which, quite rightfully, is the province of that committee and it is not for him to allege that its actions or non-actions have given rise to a particular result. We do not know the answer to that, yet he is attempting to insinuate that he does. If he does, I would like to know how; if he does not, then he should be quiet about it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Moore, you have 10 seconds left. Please speak about the MPI.

MR MOORE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I shall wait until the motion is put, and then I shall have another go.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for discussion on the matter of public importance has now expired.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT Proposed Appointment

MS SZUTY (8.35), by leave: I move:

That:

- (1) a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report on youth unemployment in the ACT with particular reference to the level of youth unemployment and strategies to alleviate the impact on the community;

- (2) the committee shall report by Thursday, 10 September 1992;
- (3) the committee shall consist of three members;
- (4) the committee shall be provided with the necessary additional staff, facilities and resources; and
- (5) the foregoing provisions of this resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the standing orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders.

I would like to speak to the motion briefly. I remind members that the current unemployment level among young people in this Territory is 25 per cent. I appreciate that the Follett Government has not been inactive in the area, but I feel that a better result could be achieved if all Assembly members took on this issue as a major task. We have heard from both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party in this debate, and there have been quite a number of sound suggestions as to what could be done in the area of youth unemployment. I will remind members that all 17 of us have a mandate from the ACT community to act on issues of major importance and that a unified response to the problem would be welcomed by the community at large and seen as a positive thing.

I also welcome clarification on the role of EPACT and feel that a select committee would be able to assist and take different directions from it and, in the end, help to address the problem.

MR MOORE (8.36): I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to this motion, and in doing so it may well be suitable to members of the Assembly that I speak to the motion that was foreshadowed by Mr Berry.

Mr Berry: After I move it.

MR MOORE: I am quite happy to speak another time if that is the wish of the Assembly. Madam Speaker, I think some of the important issues that were raised in the MPI apply to this proposed select committee. One of the issues raised was the notion of Ms Ellis, who said, "Youth unemployment cannot be ignored". That is patently obvious; it is a motherhood statement, and it is very important. When the Social Policy Committee was given the opportunity to not ignore this, it would appear, to those of us who are looking from the outside, that it chose instead to not deal with this but rather to deal with a - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: Excuse me for interrupting you, Mr Moore, but any reference to anything that is discussed by that committee is inappropriate. We do not know what they have and have not spoken about, and we will not know what they have and have not spoken about until their report is published. So, I will just caution you and any other member of the Assembly that there is to be no reference to what that committee may or may not have discussed or may or may not have refused.

MR MOORE: Madam Speaker, just to draw attention to what I was doing, I pointed out that it was my understanding that Ms Szuty was going to take an issue to that committee. Nobody has denied that that was done, and I have simply drawn a conclusion. I have not talked about what was discussed in the committee; I have said that there was an intention to do so and that this matter is not being undertaken as a study of the committee. That is as far as I have gone.

12 May 1992

That makes no reference to what was or was not discussed. It allows us to draw some conclusions about it. A question about the discussion in the committee could well have been answered by Ms Ellis today, but instead there was a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Moore, I will caution you. Even to presume that they did not discuss something is still to presume something about what that committee may or may not have decided. They may well still report on it in their report; we simply do not know. I will caution you: Please, do not refer to the work of that committee.

MR MOORE: Madam Speaker, we have a motion to refer this matter to a select committee. I think it would be of assistance to the Assembly if the chair of the Social Policy Committee pointed out to the Assembly whether that committee would be prepared to take on this motion or not to take on a motion such as this, so that the Assembly could then understand more clearly whether or not it would be more appropriate to take this issue to the select committee.

Mr Connolly: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I can perhaps be of assistance to you. You have consistently reminded Mr Moore of standing order 241 relating to the publication of evidence. That is modelled precisely on standing order 340 of the House of Representatives, and there is extensive discussion on the confidentiality provision at page 606 of Browning. Mr Moore is, in effect, trying to incite the chair of the committee to explain what the committee may or may not have done. That, surely, as you have repeatedly said, is a matter for the committee to decide on in their deliberations, and Mr Moore really is quite out of order in attempting to exploit what may or may not have happened. I remind him that he has made this point repeatedly in the past.

MR MOORE: Madam Speaker, since you spoke to me last I have not done that at all. I referred to it in a quite different way. Anyway, I have moved past that.

In Mrs Carnell's speech she pointed out that putting something like this to a committee would mean that it is an excuse for no action. I do not accept that, because the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive. There is nothing to stop a government proceeding with a program - for example, on unemployment - whilst a committee is looking at that particular issue. In fact, rather to the contrary, the two could work in a cooperative way. The committee could make suggestions and, through their chair, public suggestions, even before they report, as to what action could be taken by a government in order to assist in alleviating a particular problem.

All members of the Assembly have basically - and, I believe, genuinely - agreed that we ought to be doing something about youth unemployment. We can sit here and hit each other over the head all night and wind up trying to score political points on the issue or we can try to pool some of our ideas. For example, we heard some ideas from Mrs Carnell, who said that the way to resolve the problem is to cut payroll tax. Then she referred to death duties and used that as an example of how cutting tax can be very helpful, as it was in Queensland. The abolition of penalty rates and a series of other suggestions are worthy of consideration.

I find some of them entirely inappropriate. For example, it seems to me that one of the things that we would need to know about changing the payroll tax threshold from \$500,000 to \$1m would be: Who benefits? How many employers would actually benefit from this and what would it cost the ACT Treasury? It is not the sort of decision that can be made without that kind of information. Obviously when Mr Kaine, as he pointed out earlier today, moved the threshold, as I recall, from \$420,000 to \$500,000 - - -

Mr Kaine: It was from \$432,000 to \$500,000.

MR MOORE: He corrects me; it was from \$432,000 to \$500,000. When he then readjusted the percentages, it seemed to me that he was taking into account what it would cost in the budget and was looking for a method of lifting the threshold in order to provide the sort of solution that Mrs Carnell was talking about.

There is no point in our being able to throw out these ideas and say, "There is the easiest solution". The easiest solution, if you really want to encourage businesses, is not to tax them at all. Then we would have a lot more businesses around the place. But at the same time we also would not have any money to do any other things. Most of us have listened to Mr Bill Mason on these issues. He would present for you the Henry George view, which should carry as much weight as cutting the payroll taxes, and that is to change our whole tax basis towards a land tax basis. There is some sense in that as well, and perhaps that would resolve the problem.

Mr De Domenico: Including residential land tax, Mr Moore? Is it residential land tax as well? Are you advocating residential land tax?

MR MOORE: I am saying that whilst each one of these ideas has merit - - -

Mr De Domenico: Just say so, if you are.

MR MOORE: Can you shut up the little voice in the corner, please, Madam Speaker. While each one of these ideas has merit in itself, the notions of a committee looking at these ideas and a government proceeding with some of them are not mutually exclusive. They could benefit not necessarily any individual or party in the Assembly but the unemployed youth. If that is the case, we ought to go for it and try it and not sit around doing nothing about it.

Mrs Carnell: And have committees.

Mr De Domenico: And have committees.

MR MOORE: I hear an interjection again from Mr De Domenico.

Mr De Domenico: And others.

MR MOORE: And others. His interjection is something along the lines that if we give it to a committee that will be the end of it. Committees do not have to work that way. The committees of this Assembly have, by and large over the last three years, worked very, very effectively. They do not have to bury issues for the time being. A number of committees in particular have not buried issues but have kept them running in many, many ways and have kept them on the agenda. I think that is a perfectly reasonable thing to expect from a committee and a perfectly reasonable thing that we should see come from a committee of this Assembly.

12 May 1992

With that in mind, it seems to me that the proposal that Ms Szuty has put - that a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report on youth unemployment in the ACT, with particular reference to the level of youth unemployment and strategies to alleviate the impact on the community - is a very, very sensible one. The fact that Ms Szuty has also moved that the committee shall report by Thursday, 10 September - a very tight reporting time indeed - indicates clearly that her intention is that this committee work quickly, work hard and try to look for some very sensible solutions and try to find some new ideas that will perhaps alleviate the unemployment of youth in this area. If the ideas result in only 30 or 40 or 50 new jobs, it will have been worth it.

MR KAINÉ (Leader of the Opposition) (8.46): The debate over the last half an hour or so has convinced me of one thing, that we do not want any further committee consideration of the matter. Everybody has said - it is unanimous - that we have to do something about youth unemployment, yet here we have a proposal that would defer it for another four months while another committee has another look. It is absurd. If this Government, with all the facts before it, cannot make a decision to create some jobs for our youth, what is another committee inquiry going to contribute? The answer is: Absolutely nothing; it will simply contribute another four months' worth of delay. I do not think one month's delay, let alone four months' delay, in attacking this question is good enough.

The Government has had ample opportunity. For a year now the Chief Minister has talked about job creation for unemployed youth. When she was taking government at this time last year, one of the major points that she made in her speech was, "In our budget we are going to deal with youth unemployment". A year later, where is the delivery? There are more committees, more bureaucracy, more delay and more hypocrisy. It has to stop. For that reason, Madam Speaker, I will not support the amendment, and I will not support the motion. I want the Government to do something and to stop talking about it.

MR BERRY (8.48), by leave: I move:

That the motion be referred to the Standing Committee on Social Policy for consideration and report as to the necessity for a select committee and further inquiry.

Having moved that motion, I will go to some of the reasons that the motion has been moved. The motion which has been placed on the record by Ms Szuty first emerged during the course of proceedings this afternoon - somewhere around 4 o'clock, methinks. I suggest that there is an element of theatre attached to the motion, but it is such a serious issue that theatre ought not be attached to it. I say that because in my view, and if I were handling the matter, if something were so serious and so precious, I would take it up with the government of the day with a view to having the matter considered. But the Government was not aware of the detail of this motion until the matter was placed before the Assembly. There was no effort to discuss the issue with a view to arriving at some sort of consensus on the matter. That is not to say that the Government might have agreed with the motion; it is merely how matters ought to be progressed.

It has been suggested that it be sent off to the Social Policy Committee. I have to say that the question and debate which have received some attention in the Assembly today, though suggesting that the Social Policy Committee may have considered the matter, cannot formally be seen to have indicated so.

Mr Moore: Be careful, Mr Berry; you are getting very close there.

Mr Kaine: You are skating on thin ice, Mr Berry.

Mr Moore: Yes, exactly. There have been warnings about that matter this evening.

MADAM SPEAKER: There is about to be another one, I think.

Mr Kaine: Do you not have a word of advice for the Minister, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: No, I think the Minister knows the rules.

MR BERRY: I can assure the Speaker that I will be careful enough to keep out of trouble. It nevertheless raises the issue of whether or not the matter has been closely considered. In my view, the Standing Committee on Social Policy is the appropriate committee to consider aspects such as this, and that is evidenced by the appearance of youth unemployment or employment issues in the guidelines for the committee. I think it would be appropriate for the committee to sit down and flog out whether or not a further committee would prove anything.

From the Government's point of view, we are satisfied that we are working towards better things for youngsters in the community when it comes to the issue of unemployment. That is not to say that other people cannot provide constructive advice to government. I am not suggesting that the Liberals might do that, but other people may well do so.

Mr Kaine: You already have the advice from the Liberal Party, which you choose to ignore.

MR BERRY: Yes, but that is never constructive. That comes from consultants.

Mr Moore: Yes, just cut payroll tax out altogether - no worries.

Mrs Carnell: Do it, and I will employ three more people tomorrow.

MR BERRY: I hear Kate Carnell say, "Do it, and I will employ three more people tomorrow".

Mr Kaine: There would be \$85m worth of relief for the private sector. How many jobs does that translate into?

MR BERRY: How do you make up the \$85m? Is it out of the "frightpack"? It is all silliness from the Liberals again. We have to have the Assembly advised, and I think it would be appropriate for it to be considered by the Social Policy Committee. I trust that the Social Policy Committee would consider this as a matter of priority and report to the Assembly on whether or not we should do anything more about it or rely on the Government to get on with the job. That is something for the committee to consider, and I suspect that some serious issues ought to be considered.

12 May 1992

Unquestionably, it is a matter of great social impact for the community, but I think there is a time when one has to consider whether it is worth while going over all the same issues again. These issues have been gone over, over and over again. I suspect that we know most of the answers, and I am not sure that an inquiry would help us. But I am prepared to listen to some further advice on that. I think some consideration of it by the Social Policy Committee would help us to come to a view on what we might do for the future.

Mr Kaine: You can spend 50 grand on another investigation, I suppose.

MR BERRY: That is another consideration, as well.

Mr De Domenico: You already have two committees that you say are doing the job.

MR BERRY: We have a lively bit of cross-discussion there, Madam Speaker, from people who have already had a go at this. But once the matter is sent off to the Social Policy Committee we will be able to get a quick result and make a decision on the basis of some worthwhile consideration of the issue, rather than grandstanding in this place. We will then come to a decision on whether the matter ought to be proceeded with in the form suggested by Ms Szuty. I would commend the motion to members, even the Liberals.

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

That the question be now put.

Question put:

That the motion (**Mr Berry's**) be agreed to.

The Assembly voted -

AYES, 10

Mr Berry
Mr Connolly
Ms Ellis
Mrs Grassby
Mr Lamont
Ms McRae
Mr Moore
Mr Stevenson
Ms Szuty
Mr Wood

NOES, 5

Mrs Carnell
Mr Cornwell
Mr Humphries
Mr Kaine
Mr Westende

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

**CONSERVATION, HERITAGE AND ENVIRONMENT -
STANDING COMMITTEE**

Statement by Presiding Member

MR MOORE, by leave: I wish to inform the Assembly that on 14 April 1992 the Standing Committee on Conservation, Heritage and Environment resolved to inquire into and report on:

1. The potential for alternative forms of energy including solar energy and solar co-generation of electricity to supplement conventionally generated electricity in the ACT.
2. The resources and consumption of energy for home use and in commercial and industrial production in the ACT with particular reference to:
 - (a) energy conservation, and
 - (b) barriers to renewable energy resources.
3. Any related matters which may arise.

Madam Speaker and members of the Assembly, you may be aware that last year the Standing Committee on Conservation, Heritage and Environment put out a discussion paper on solar energy and solar co-generation of electricity. If any member does not have a copy, it is publicly available, and the committee staff or I would be delighted to provide you with one. That discussion paper was put out a short while before the end of the last Assembly. The committee feels that, considering the responses that we received, it is appropriate for us to continue with that inquiry. It gives me great pleasure to inform the Assembly that that is what the committee is intending to do.

TOURISM AND A.C.T. PROMOTION - STANDING COMMITTEE
Statements by Members

MR DE DOMENICO, by leave: Madam Speaker, I wish to inform the Assembly that on 27 April 1992 the Standing Committee on Tourism and ACT Promotion resolved to inquire into and report on:

1. The contribution made by tourism to the ACT economy including -
 - . tourist expenditure patterns;
 - . investment in tourist related infrastructure; and
 - . tourism related employment.
2. The potential for expanding tourism and related activities in the ACT in the short and long term with particular reference to -
 - . the role of the tourism industry and the Government in marketing and promoting the ACT and the region as a tourist destination; and

12 May 1992

- . the scope for minimising cyclical aspects of tourism and maintaining a continuous demand for tourist related facilities through co-ordination of cultural activities, festivals, conventions and recurring and special events in the ACT and the region.
3. The extent to which the image of and perceptions about the ACT community held by other Australians are coloured by media reporting and comments about the Federal Parliament, the effect this has on promoting the ACT and measures to counter adverse publicity about the ACT.
4. Any related matters which may arise.

I believe that this is going to be a bipartisan committee - I mean that - that is going to look into something that I think is of concern to all of us here, in particular "Canberra bashing", of which a lot has been said in the media in recent times. Madam Speaker, I commend to the Assembly the new inquiry of the ACT Promotion Committee.

MS SZUTY, by leave: As a member of the Standing Committee on Tourism and ACT Promotion in the Second ACT Legislative Assembly, I would like to support the initial inquiry and its terms of reference. I feel that identifying the contribution of Canberra's tourism sector to the community is very important in the bid to meet the industry's changing needs. No longer a country centre, Canberra is now recognised as part of an important region which offers a broad spectrum of activities for visitors. Our wineries have national and international reputations for their produce. The festival calendar already includes several major events, including Floriade, the Canberra Festival and the Summernats.

The establishment of this standing committee and its inquiry will focus a great deal of attention on the need to promote effectively all aspects of the ACT and explore opportunities to increase tourism to Canberra and the region. The committee has comprehensive terms of reference under which to perform its task and a generous timetable which will allow a thorough job to be done. I am especially pleased that we are going to examine the potential for expanding tourism in the longer term, giving the industry a focus, direction and framework for many years to come, including the possibility of attracting the Commonwealth Games to the ACT around the turn of the century.

I am keen to meet with people from the tourism and hospitality industries and to hear their views during this most important inquiry. As well, I hope that the aspect of the committee's inquiry which was highlighted by the chairman after its first meeting - that is, tackling the issue of Canberra bashing - will generate a lot of community support. It is an important community issue that promotion of our national capital should be a natural and proud thing for a Canberran to do, and we should make an all-out effort to remove from the minds of Australians living outside Canberra the indelible impression of ACT residents as "fat cats" and the people to blame for the country's woes.

MR LAMONT, by leave: Madam Speaker, I concur with the views of the two previous speakers in relation to the terms of reference that this committee has adopted, but I wish to refer particularly to one specific item which has received a great deal of airing this evening. One of the specific terms of reference that have

been adopted is in relation to youth employment being able to be generated by an expanded tourism industry. I just wish to draw to the Assembly's attention that that is a bipartisan view held by this committee, that it is an aim on which we should be attempting to advise government in this very, very important industry sector.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE -
STANDING COMMITTEE
Statement by Presiding Member**

MR LAMONT, by leave: I wish to inform the Assembly that on 10 April 1992 the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure resolved to inquire into and report on the future of the Kingston foreshores area. The terms of reference which the committee has adopted are similar to those which were adopted by the First Assembly; indeed, we see it as a continuation of the work which was commenced by the previous Assembly's committee. We have specific date by which this inquiry will conclude. We will be taking into account those submissions that were made to the previous Assembly.

**LABOR GOVERNMENT PROGRAM
Ministerial Statement and Paper**

Debate resumed from 9 April 1992, on motion by **Ms Follett**:

That the Assembly takes note of the papers.

MR MOORE (9.07): It is my intention, in responding to the Labor Government's ministerial statement on the program of the third ACT Labor Government, which was delivered by Rosemary Follett, to deal with some of the issues raised, rather than attempt to deal piece by piece with the system as a whole. The important thing is not what you say you will do, but what you actually do. In this program we have a great deal about what the Labor Government has said they will do. It will be up to us to assess what they actually do, and it will be up to members of the Canberra community to assess what they actually do.

The second Labor Government was known as the do nothing Government. It was known broadly in that way because, by and large, they seemed to be too afraid to rock the boat. I suggest that in order to be leaders in a time when creative action is required not only should we, and they in particular, rock the boat; they should set the sails, check the charts and set a course on track for the future.

Mr Humphries: And rock the boat.

MR MOORE: Yes, and rock the boat. We have had promises of open government and consultation. I think that is an issue that has been debated in here constantly, and it will continue to be debated again and again. We expect full consultation; then, all the information regarding the issues ought to be known and material ought to be available in an accessible form.

12 May 1992

One good example of that, of course, is the draft Territory Plan. For those of us who have spent years looking at planning issues it was possible, with some time and care, to understand what that draft Territory Plan was about. The difficulty for people who were not used to planning and saw the draft Territory Plan for the very first time was that it was almost impossible to read. They needed an interpreter. Indeed, a number of professional planners told me that they had a great deal of difficulty and required a great deal of time to understand what the plan was about. So, material must be in an accessible form.

In her statement Rosemary Follett suggested that the program of the third Labor Government was not a grab-bag of tricks but a planned agenda. From the public's point of view, it is still a grab-bag of politically expedient tricks, full of party politics and bearing little relationship to the problems felt in the community. If we are really going to assess the problems felt in the community, there must be a minimum 20-year plan for development, for employment growth, for education, health, conservation, environment, economic policies and so on.

Whilst we are dealing with the immediate issues at hand, we must also set about planning a long-term strategy for the welfare of the ACT. That the Labor Government intends to be more responsive to the needs of the community is an appropriate ideal. However, imposing laws such as the compulsory wearing of bicycle helmets, even though there has been a quite clear view in the community, backed by research, that the law could well be counterproductive - - -

Mr Connolly: There is no such view. Talk to the Child Accident Prevention Foundation.

MR MOORE: What people like Mr Connolly are doing is imposing their view rather than responding to what the community wants.

Mr Connolly: Every government in Australia shares that view.

MR MOORE: I do not care what every government in Australia does. Every government in Australia is run by either Labor or the Liberal Party.

Mr Cornwell: I am not so sure about New South Wales.

Ms Ellis: Say that again.

MR MOORE: The interjection was "I am not so sure about New South Wales". I thought it was an excellent interjection, Mr Cornwell. We should take a great deal of care to consider whether we are imposing laws or whether we are being responsive to community needs.

If we look at the closure of the Royal Canberra Hospital - granted, that happened in the previous Assembly, but it allows me to make the point - it was a notion that was imposed rather than being responsive. Any assessment in the ACT of whether that hospital should have been closed or not will come up with the same result - that there is widespread community concern about the closure of that hospital. There is now no long-term plan for Acton Peninsula. It is far too wafty simply to say that it will have a public health facility. What we need is a hospital for the growing suburbs in the north of Canberra, to take care of people on the north side. Indeed, we are past the point of no return. The point I am making is that it was anything but a responsive approach to the community.

On the education of our young people, we have heard a great deal this evening about education, about the importance of TAFE and about the importance of testing young children. It is important that young children be tested, but not in the way that the Minister, Virginia Chadwick, suggests; that somehow or other we should get an overview that suits a small number of politicians and people who want to make mileage out of it. We should allow our professionals to test to ascertain whether an individual has a problem and work out how to solve that problem. That is what modern education does. The Australian Council for Educational Research - if Mr Cornwell contacts that body it will provide figures for him - indicates that there has been a great deal of improvement in numeracy and literacy in the ACT - in fact across Australia, but particularly in the ACT - year after year.

When are the unpopular issues going to be given some priority? How are we going to deal with youth homelessness? How are we going to deal with things like incest, violence in the home, and issues like that? These issues are understandably daunting, but they are looming as vital. Canberra has huge social problems which are exacerbated by the fact that they are often ignored and denied. Violence in the home, child abuse for instance, is increasing at an alarming rate, according to all agencies involved, as are poverty and unemployment. Lateral thinking and long-term strategies are required for the future of the ACT. If this Government is serious about taking the lead in the ACT and responding to the needs of people, then long-term strategies to combat these problems need to be implemented.

Madam Speaker, another issue is that the public has a right to know the details of how the new ACT electoral system will be implemented. We know that Rosemary Follett made a commitment to the referendum on Hare-Clark, but I think it is important for us to understand the detail of that commitment. That is an issue for debate at a further time. I think it is appropriate to continue the sailing analogy with regard to rocking the boat. I wish the helmsman well and trust that the independent navigation system will help keep you on the track.

MR CORNWELL (9.17): Madam Speaker, I rise to comment on the Labor Government's program as announced by the Chief Minister. I will again refer to the education area. There are some 13 lines devoted to that subject in the program. I have no complaints with that, of course, because it was a program that had to deal with most areas. However, there are perhaps five points that I would like to make about those 13 lines.

The first relates to the quality of education. Ms Follett stated that it was time the debate focused on the quality of education, not simply the cost of schools and school buildings themselves. I would suggest to the Government that that may not be the case in some of the Tuggeranong suburbs such as Conder and Gordon, where I understand that there could be a move to create what I can best describe as jumbo primary schools with up to 750 students.

I am indebted to the ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Associations Incorporated for raising this matter with me. There are indications that primary schools in Gordon and Conder are planned for a catchment of around 2,000 standard dwellings which expect to yield a peak enrolment of 750. I would

12 May 1992

suggest that this is not a matter of quality of education. Indeed, the P and C Associations cite a survey of the Commonwealth Schools Commission of 1984 research results on the educational effects of school size, which concluded that primary schools should have fewer than 600 students. We are looking at something like 750.

Mr Wood: But no less than 300.

MR CORNWELL: Well, perhaps Mr Wood, because, as you would be aware, I am quoting from correspondence relating to this and I have questions on the notice paper for you. Obviously the P and C Associations are concerned about this, but they are even more concerned because, while it has been claimed that these peak enrolments will last for only a few years, in fact enrolments for each school will be in the range of 600 to 750 for about 12 years. I do not think that this can be regarded as a few years. The letter goes on:

In the long term these schools will have an estimated enrolment of about 330 each.

That is quite acceptable. It continues:

To plan for a smaller peak -

and this is important -

would result in long term lack of viability and possible closure of schools.

It is interesting that the Labor Party is suggesting a possible closure of schools if we do not have enrolments of that number, because we have an undertaking from Ms Follett that no further schools will be closed in the next three years. I would suggest again that this does not do a great deal for the quality of education. Whilst I have to admit that my own calculations on the total number of surplus spaces in government schools, as a result of information provided by the Minister for Education, were way out of line, which simply proves that I have a numeracy problem apparently, I do not resile from the fact that in the schools that had declining enrolments in the period 1990 to 1992 the number of surplus spaces has increased.

It is interesting to note that, in addition, some 1,140 places have been given over to the Minister for Urban Services at some four or five primary schools and that a further 850 places in our schools have been given over to special programs. I give notice to Mr Wood that I will be putting on the notice paper further questions about those figures. It is apparent that there are already pressures in at least one of the twinning schools and that the projected enrolments quoted for both Cook and Lyons - I speak of the original projections, I think, 155 at Cook this year and 140 at Lyons - are in fact less, as Mr Wood would be aware, with 111 at Cook and, I think, 112 at Lyons.

Finally, in this area of education we have the statement that the Government will continue to provide recurrent funding to non-government schools at a rate not less than the present 50 per cent of the Commonwealth's contribution. My only

comment on that, Madam Speaker, is: Who will believe the Government? The Government, after all, gave an undertaking to the non-government sector, prior to the last budget, and then proceeded to take \$550,000 from three schools. So, I would suggest that one should not regard that commitment from the Government as necessarily - - -

Mr Wood: We said that we would listen to them.

MR CORNWELL: You did not consult with them, though, Mr Wood, before making that decision. You will have to agree with me on that point.

Mr Wood: I certainly spoke to them about that decision.

MR CORNWELL: Mr Wood, I am sorry; you can understand that it does not give parents any great faith.

I would now like to turn briefly to the other area of my responsibility, which is housing. Again, there are only six lines; nevertheless they are relevant. Ms Follett said:

This Government believes that all people in the community have a fundamental right to secure and affordable accommodation.

I find that interesting, given that it was this Government that imposed a residential rent tax in its last budget. It is also known as Rosemary's rent rip-off because the result of that was that many tenants were disadvantaged - apart from people who own houses, and they are not all rich landlords. A great many people have invested in rental property in order to look after their own retirement.

I find this statement surprising because, in addition to discouraging that sort of investment, from a government that purports to be interested in tenants, it is also from a party that discourages, in my opinion, the purchase of government houses by their tenants. I will simply give two examples of that discouragement. Firstly, I see no reason why, if people wish to purchase their government home and fulfil the quite iniquitous ten-year requirement, those people should have to wait two months for a valuation on the house. I have written to Mr Connolly on that matter. I trust, Mr Connolly, that you have seen my letter.

Mr Connolly: I have read your letter, yes.

MR CORNWELL: I did deliver it personally to you and I would hope that you will look kindly and sensibly at that issue.

The other matter that I would like to mention is a strange business which I am still having a look at. It also appears that if you borrow too much you do not receive, as a first home buyer, an exemption of stamp duty. This is a peculiar situation and, again, I will be contacting - - -

Mr Kaine: Borrow too much in whose opinion?

MR CORNWELL: Presumably in the opinion of the Government. I will be writing to Mr Connolly. I give notice that I will be contacting you in relation to that matter and I would welcome - - -

Mr De Domenico: So, if you are too poor we do not look after you?

12 May 1992

MR CORNWELL: Indeed. There is no encouragement, I would suggest to members of the Assembly, for people either to buy their government homes or, indeed, to enter into this first home owners scheme. Therefore, in the 13 lines on education and the six lines on housing that I referred to, I do not really think that the Government has done much to promote any confidence in its program. I think, in fact, it has simply strung a number of words together in what I can best describe perhaps as kind cliches, but they do remain mere words.

MR WESTENDE (9.26): I am glad to have the opportunity to contribute to the debate on the Chief Minister's statement of 7 April and again today. Various other members have already made their comments, but not all points have been canvassed and thoroughly examined. The particular statement by the Chief Minister that I would like to take issue with is this:

The Labor Government recognises that there must be many strands to our recovery, and many areas where the Government must work with business, unions and the community to achieve a sustainable recovery.

This is an eminently sensible statement to make. It is imbued with high ideals and commonsense; but in terms of the Labor Government's record on consultation, the statement has more than a tinge of imagination. We want and need actions, not words. Where is this consultation? There are so many pressing needs in the community. Not one single person, group, organisation or political party, the Government or the Opposition has all the answers for solving these problems; so let us have consultation and let us have it as a matter of urgency.

To overcome increasing youth unemployment requires agreement between various sections of the community. Where is the consultation on this matter? I must confess that I was extremely disappointed in the Chief Minister's discussion on the matter of public importance raised by Ms Helen Szuty on unemployment this afternoon. I was as much disappointed by the tone in which she made her comment as by the substance or lack of substance in what she said. She, like many others in the Government, projects this incredible air of superiority and perhaps arrogance when addressing so many matters that are affecting people's lives in such a devastating way. These matters demand compassion and at the very least they demand a sense of humility. There is certainly no room to gloat, particularly when there is nothing to gloat about.

Employment generated by the new casino, while good in itself, does not necessarily provide jobs for those currently unemployed. To make inroads into the heart of unemployment there needs to be real reform. To streamline the Tourism Commission does not generate jobs. The best way to generate jobs in the tourism industry is simple - get rid of payroll tax and get rid of penalty rates for a start. You do not need any more public servants to tell you that.

It may come as some surprise to the Chief Minister, but she does not possess all the answers; nor does her Government. Private enterprise provided some strong views in their 1991-92 budget submission through CARD, now named the Canberra Business Council. In this submission the council suggested the establishment of an advisory board and a budgetary planning board. What has the Government done about that? The answer is zilch - absolutely nothing.

I presume, Madam Speaker, that "zilch" is not an unparliamentary word. The Business Council suggested in their submission that the Government should support a "buy ACT products and services" campaign wherever possible. What has the Government done about that? Zilch.

Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mr Berry: I require the question to be put forthwith without debate.

Question resolved in the negative.

LABOR GOVERNMENT PROGRAM Ministerial Statement and Paper

Debate resumed.

MR WESTENDE: The Canberra Business Council referred to many other areas of bad management and waste, such as overexpenditure on preschool education when compared with the rest of Australia. Of course, the one issue that will haunt the Government until it takes a commonsense approach is the overfunding of ACTION. In its reference to areas of waste and inefficiencies of overfunding, the Canberra Business Council quite rightly asked:

Does it lead to better provision of services and are the people who receive those services prepared to pay for them and if not is it fair that this burden should fall on the wider community?

This particularly applies to ACTION buses. This Government has to get together with the rest of the community and take some action on ACTION.

Turning to a further area, Madam Speaker, does it not strike you as ridiculous that on one hand employers are charged payroll tax for employing people, yet on the other hand the Government extends its commitment to the Jobskills program by a further 100 places within the private sector? Is this a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul? The members on the opposite side are full of rhetoric, but which one of them has ever provided a job for anybody in this town? I might say that I have some experience of providing jobs for people in this town.

Mr De Domenico: How many jobs?

MR WESTENDE: Plenty.

Mr Lamont: And knocking off their superannuation payments.

Mr Kaine: I take a point of order, Madam Speaker. That comment from Mr Lamont was quite uncalled for and it should be withdrawn.

12 May 1992

Mr Lamont: I withdraw that imputation, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: He has withdrawn it. It is just as well, because I did not hear it.

MR WESTENDE: Mr Lamont, of all people, Madam Speaker, should know what it is to provide jobs, or what actions he takes to cost jobs. Madam Speaker, I put it to this Government that a reduction in payroll tax would create far more than 100 places in the work force and not cost the Government anywhere near as much as the Jobskills program. Furthermore, the Jobskills program is a temporary fix, while payroll tax reduction would create continuing employment. I have some experience in this area. Lots of people that are employed for the 12 or 13 weeks that the Jobskills program provides for then get their jobs terminated. A reduction in payroll tax, however, would create permanent jobs and those jobs would not be terminated. It would also draw more business to this town, which is the supposed aim of this Government.

Why not realise some surplus assets by selling them, thereby reducing the need to borrow? Why not sell the Kingston Bus Depot and many other areas where savings could be made and income could be derived? Madam Speaker, does it not strike you as strange that, in the city with the largest per capita income, 13 per cent of our domestic dwellings are publicly owned, while in any other capital city in Australia the ratio is 5 per cent?

Mr Connolly: So, you want to reduce the number of publicly owned dwellings, do you?

MR WESTENDE: Naturally.

Mr Connolly: A great admission! I will send this *Hansard* out.

MR WESTENDE: Because people want to buy them and you will not let them. You will not let them buy them. Why do we need 13 per cent, when the rest of Australia can do with 5 per cent, in this town where we have the highest per capita income? Could not some of these dwellings be sold to longstanding tenants, to the benefit of both the Government and the tenant?

Mr Connolly: What do we do with the income?

MR WESTENDE: You reduce your borrowings and pay off your debt. You have never run a business, my dear friend; I have. (*Extension of time granted*)

A former Prime Minister and now current affairs reporter once called on Australia to become the clever country. Well, come on. Why does the Government not want to pursue that? Why does the Government not have the guts to try something new, something entrepreneurial, something that would create many new jobs, thus increasing overall revenue? It would not cost the Government a cent if it used some of those suggestions. Perhaps the Government is totally bereft of imagination.

Madam Speaker, if the Chief Minister is really serious about the statement that I quoted at the beginning, let us see some concrete evidence in the way of positive action. Let us see the consultation process go up a few notches. Let us see the

Government acknowledge that it does not have all the answers. Let us see the Government taking bold steps to significantly effect savings so that it can have the services in the ACT that are of greater importance to the employment of so many in desperate need.

MR CONNOLLY (Attorney-General, Minister for Housing and Community Services and Minister for Urban Services) (9.38): Madam Speaker, we have heard in the last few minutes a true admission of a Liberal Party agenda; an agenda that they never had the guts to admit during the election campaign; an agenda that they denied. Last week, when the public housing waiting lists were announced, these poseurs opposite were out there ranting and raving and saying, "We have to do more for public housing". The Liberal Party have always tried to squirm out of that. When they have said that we should sell public housing, they have always said, "But we will buy more; we acknowledge that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement commits us to buy more". That is what they always said during the campaign.

What Mr Westende said was that the Liberal Party should reduce the existing public housing stock, which runs at about 12 per cent and is a proud achievement for this Territory. He said that it should be closer to the 5 per cent in the rest of Australia. I asked him what we should do with the proceeds of the sale and he said, "Use it to pay off the public debt". That is an extraordinary admission from the Liberal Party. We are seeing the real privatisation agenda. What about all these statements they have been making in the past, saying, "We really are committed to public housing; we accept the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement; we accept that we are legally obliged to return any income from sales to public housing"? Mr Westende has proved that that was all a charade.

The Leader of the Opposition has to clarify whether the Liberal Party really stands by what it has previously espoused or whether Mr Westende has let the cat out of the bag. I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that I will be writing to every constituent who writes to me about public housing and enclosing the precise extract from *Hansard* where Mr Westende demanded that we slash by a half the number of public housing units. It is a very easy set of mathematics. Even the Liberal Party can understand this. There are 100,000 housing units, roughly, in Canberra, and 12,000 roughly equates to 12 per cent, as Mr Westende said. He wants us to get to 5 per cent, which equates to 5,000. What he wants us to do is to flog off 7,000 public housing units and not replace them.

Mr Kaine: Rubbish!

MR CONNOLLY: That is what he said.

Mr De Domenico: He did not say that.

MR CONNOLLY: It is exactly what he said. I gave him the opportunity to worm out of it. I gave him the opportunity to retract from that position, but he said, "No, we want to use the money to pay off the public debt". What about the houses in Greenway, where we all sat around today and said, "Yes, we all agree with integration; we are all outraged by what was said"? I wonder whether he wants to flog those off as well and not replace them.

12 May 1992

MR WESTENDE: Madam Speaker, I ask for permission to make a personal explanation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, Mr Westende.

MR WESTENDE: I will read from my two paragraphs that I quoted. I said that, in the city with the largest per capita income, 13 per cent of our domestic dwellings are publicly owned, while the average in the rest of Australia is 5 per cent. I then carried on to say: Could not some of these dwellings be sold to longstanding tenants, to the benefit of both the tenant and the Government?

MRS CARNELL (9.42): The Chief Minister's statement on the program for the third Labor Government is notable more for what it does not say than for what is actually contained in her speech. Her comments are full of platitudes and motherhood statements, with very little new direction or new policy to lead the ACT out of its current malaise. If this statement is, as Ms Follett says, the basis for judging her Government's performance over the next three years, it would appear that there will be very little for the people of Canberra to judge her by. Most of her more positive statements are really reports upon the progress of decisions and projects started under the Alliance Government. It is fascinating to hear the Chief Minister promise a better, more efficient health system, something that is now possible only because of the hospital redevelopment project - an Alliance initiative that Ms Follett strongly opposed.

Ms Follett alludes to the problems that the ACT is experiencing due to cuts in Grants Commission funding, but she gives no confidence that she has any plans for overcoming this difficulty. She claims that she wants to make the most efficient use of our assets, but at the same time she has virtually ignored the Else-Mitchell report and has scrapped most of the micro-economic reforms proposed by the Priorities Review Board.

Mr Kaine: All of them.

MRS CARNELL: All of the micro-economic reforms proposed. She attacks the Federal coalition's consumption tax proposal but conveniently overlooks the fact that the GST is only part of a wide-ranging Fightback package. Under Fightback, wholesale sales tax will be abolished, payroll tax will be abolished, and the fuel excise will go. These are just some of the taxes that will disappear under Fightback. Fightback will greatly reduce the tax pressure on business, allowing sustainable jobs to be created.

Ms Follett's reliance on Jobskills programs to fight unemployment cannot succeed unless business is in the position to provide real long-term jobs. Her solutions to youth unemployment and the very real problems currently being experienced by women in our work force are shallow in the extreme. They are almost as useless to the ACT as Keating's One Nation package. There are not a lot of railways or highways being built in the ACT.

Mr De Domenico: Or ports.

MRS CARNELL: Or ports. There are very few jobs for women on these projects. The abolition of the fuel excise will provide the capacity for ACT business to compete in the wider arena, as well as decreasing freight costs into the ACT, thus reducing prices. The coalition's proposal to out-source a number of functions

currently run by government will also create great opportunities for business in Canberra and will create real job opportunities for our young people.

Fightback also contains a package of health reforms which will greatly improve health care in the ACT as well as in the rest of Australia. Pensioners will be given private health insurance free of charge, and health insurance will be made substantially more attractive for all other ACT residents. This will dramatically reduce the pressure on our overstressed public hospital system and also improve our revenue base - something that I am sure Mr Berry would be very pleased to hear.

Ms Follett says that her Government is committed to providing the highest possible standard of accessible and affordable health care for the people of the ACT. I wonder whether the 2,000 people on our hospital waiting lists believe her. I also wonder whether the large number of Canberrans who have to seek hospital treatment outside the ACT believe that Ms Follett's health system is accessible. She talks about better financial management and accountability but still has not implemented full accrual accounting in the health system - something that is regarded as essential for good management, something that Coopers and Lybrand last year placed as a priority, a No. 1 priority, for our health system. We are still in the process of implementing Fiscal, a cash based accounting package.

It would seem that Ms Follett's Government believes that across-the-board cuts to all services in the health arena, including bed numbers, somehow equates to good financial management. What does constitute good financial management is program based management, appropriate targeting of resources, using all the resources available, including the private sector, and instituting performance agreements with all service providers. This assures quality within our health system.

The Chief Minister again promises public health facilities for the Acton Peninsula. I am sure that many Canberrans are asking: When? Ms Follett's plans for the Acton Peninsula appear to be haphazard, to say the least. It would appear at the moment that Canberra will have a hospice for those with terminal illnesses, a convalescent facility for those hoping to get better, and possibly QEII, a home for new mums with young babies, all adjacent to each other, regardless of where the most appropriate location for them may be.

I am sure that the Chief Minister is aware that the committee set up last year to look at the most appropriate site for the hospice recommended Calvary Hospital. Why is the Chief Minister not accepting the advice of experts? Is it that she wishes to avoid making any hard decisions on the future of Acton? The inquiry set up to look at the future of Acton has still not reported. Why?

I am very pleased that the Chief Minister has promised to increase the number of child-care places. Let us hope that these new places will be made available at Tuggeranong, where there is a desperate need, not in the inner south as has recently been the case. This decision to put child-care places in the inner south, where there are already vacancies, shows a lack of direction, a propensity to make politically expedient decisions and a great need to use up schools that they do not know what else to do with. In finishing, may I urge the Chief Minister to dispense with her motherhood statements and address the very real problems besetting the ACT.

12 May 1992

MR DE DOMENICO (9.49): Madam Speaker, may I rise to agree with what my colleagues have said?

Mr Moore: That will be an interesting change.

MR DE DOMENICO: I will ignore that. The statement made by the Chief Minister some time ago was an opportunity, I believe, for the Government to tell us what vision they had for the future of the ACT. I note what Mr Moore said in his remarks before, when he said that in his opinion the Government was too afraid to rock the boat. I always believe that we should try to avoid clichés like the plague. If I have said that, I have said it a million times.

Mr Moore: "Like the plague".

MR DE DOMENICO: Thank you, Michael; that was just to make sure that people have got the point. It is interesting to note what the *Canberra Times* said about vision and other important words in its editorial on 2 December. I quote:

Although ACT politicians now mouth appropriate sentiments about the importance of the private sector, their actions - or more correctly lack of action - often give lie to their words. Political instability and lack of clear government majorities means that valuable time has been lost in implementing economic development strategies which will foster private sector growth.

The *Canberra Times* went on to say:

... in future it will be the policies and practices of ACT Governments that primarily determine what are the economic advantages or disadvantages Canberra will have when compared to other states and regions in Australia.

Perhaps more significantly and finally, the *Canberra Times* went on to say:

If Canberra continues to delude itself that the public sector will provide jobs and economic growth, it will condemn itself to follow the path trodden by Wollongong and other depressed regional economies which relied too long on a major but declining industry.

There is no doubt that the public sector in the ACT and the rest of Australia is a declining industry.

The Chief Minister also said in her statement:

Madam Speaker, making the Government's legislative program available is basic to our commitment to open and accountable government.

Against this background, let us now look at what the ACT Labor Government has done to foster economic development through the private sector. As I sit here and listen, sometimes I get sick and tired of Ms Follett and other members opposite talking about what was done by prior governments. Let us have a look at what they have done when they have been in government.

It is a fact that in the most recent Follett budget the ACT Labor Party increased business taxation by 17 per cent. That is made up by an extra \$3.4m in general rates; a \$6.6m increase in land tax, showing the extension of the land tax to residential rental property; a \$5m increase in payroll tax; a \$6.5m increase in conveyancing duty; a 28 per cent increase in insurance stamp duty to \$1.6m; a \$1.7m increase in stamp duty on motor vehicles; a \$345,000 increase in stamp duty on commercial leases and change of liability to lessors; a \$4.1m increase in petroleum franchise fees which flow on into petrol pricing; a \$4.8m increase in tobacco franchising fees; an additional \$7m, being a 40 per cent increase in financial institutions duty; and a \$7.2m or 24 per cent increase in motor vehicle registration revenue. To then say, "We have kept increases in taxation to a minimum. In particular, we have avoided hurting the local business sector", is at best naive and at worst an insult to the intelligence and dignity of the 10,000 people who are unemployed.

But what can Canberrans expect from an ACT Labor Government? Let us quickly look at their platform. Once again other people opposite have said that the Liberal Party concealed what we were going to do, but what did the Labor Party conceal? What is not in there? We did not get to hear about a free-standing abortion clinic. We did not get to hear about introducing May Day - note May Day - as a public holiday in the ACT. I do not know whether the faceless men in Belconnen would agree, because there are more moves over there than Boris Spassky has. But let us look at what Labor did not tell us.

I have just mentioned a couple of things; I have not finished yet, though. They also refer in their platform to public enterprises, using nationalisation where appropriate. That is what they say in their platform. We also know, by the way, that the first and most important thing that the Labor Party document says - and Canberrans should know this - is that all members of the ACT legislature will be bound by the ALP platform and policy decisions of conference and the branch council.

Obviously we all know, but the Chief Minister does not tell us in this document, this vision for Canberra, that the vision for Canberra in this Government is a vision that is controlled by the Socialist Left. There are various factions - "various clans", perhaps, is a better phrase to use - in the Socialist Left as well. What I am saying, Madam Speaker, is this: What is the use of owning shares in ACT Inc. when you do not have a job, when eventually ACT Inc. will go broke? If you do not have to pay for it, your kids will. I am sure that we realise the dimensions of the unemployment problem, especially youth unemployment. My colleagues quite adequately and quite eloquently covered that this afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I have described the past and the present. For the sake of our credibility, but more importantly for the future of our young people, I would now like to set the scene for the future, which can be best summarised by saying that Canberra governments can create jobs and that an ACT Liberal government certainly would have done various things that would create jobs. Creating jobs, and real jobs for the future, is the most important challenge facing Canberra. The most important issue we have today is jobs, jobs and more jobs.

My colleagues have talked about payroll tax; so I am not going to go through that again, except to say that, whilst a lot of people laugh at the fact that we talk about payroll tax, payroll tax is a tax on employment. It does make Australian goods and services less competitive. It is complex to administer and its calculation,

12 May 1992

payment and collection is a burden both on business and on the Territory itself. It is a stupid tax. The abolition of payroll tax would significantly reduce employment costs and therefore create employment opportunities. We have heard about what the Liberal Party would do in relation to payroll tax.

Workers compensation is another impost. As I have said before in other debates, when the Liberal Party moved an amendment to the workers compensation legislation it was knocked back by the Government. That amendment would have more significantly reduced the cost. The other thing that perhaps a bit of vision might have revealed is that we should arrange for all our ACT statutory authorities and government business enterprises to buy their workers compensation cover through ACT private insurance instead of paying exorbitant rates through Comcare. I am told that if we read the budget papers we will see that there is a \$11.1m allocation from Treasury into Comcare.

Turning now to residential land tax, as my colleague quite eloquently said before, there is a one per cent land tax on private residential properties. A Liberal government would abolish that tax because, as Mr Cornwell quite correctly said, it is not a tax on the wealthy. Let us see what Mr Daryl Dixon said. Mr Daryl Dixon, an eminent, well known and well respected commentator, said this in the *Canberra Times* on 18 August:

The land tax will be a very visible and tangible reason for not investing in Canberra residential real estate. Canberra needs more real estate investors, not fewer, because the lower the cost of housing and of rents, the more attractive the ACT will be as a place for doing business.

Madam Speaker, Ms Follett and her Government had an opportunity of setting the scene and creating vision for the future of the ACT. There was nothing said about the better management of ratepayers' tax dollars. Canberra ratepayers and taxpayers deserve and should demand value for every dollar they are asked to pay. Madam Speaker, I need not remind you that there is no excuse for not taking stock of the way we manage our Territory. Housing was something that Mr Cornwell put to this Assembly. An ACT Liberal government would separate the management of subsidised and not subsidised housing. There was nothing as visionary as that in the document - that I saw, anyway.

As you know, Madam Speaker, just before the Follett Labor Government took over, there were moves to corporatise ACTEW. It was not done willy-nilly. The experience was that the corporatisation of Totalcare Industries was very beneficial to the coffers of the ACT Treasury. Mr Westende talked about ACTION buses and what could be done there. There was a lot of hoo-ha during the election campaign about vehicle inspection services. There is nothing in this document that I saw about what is going to happen along those lines. The queues are still there, as we hear on the radio every morning. As for parks and gardens, there are 71 or 80-odd parks and gardens and engineering depots. Surely we do not need all of those. Nothing is said about that.

Madam Speaker, there was no vision because I do not think the Government over there has any. We should be actively marketing our talents, our resources and, most importantly, our people. That was what, perhaps, the Government had an opportunity to say; but, unfortunately, it did not say that.

MR BERRY (Minister for Health, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Sport) (9.58): The first thing I would like to deal with is Mr Moore's concerns about the closure of Royal Canberra Hospital. He was right to be concerned about that, but the circumstances are well known. It was as a result of the fast-tracking of the former Alliance Government - - -

Mr Kaine: Here we go again. Why don't you take some responsibility for something yourself.

MR BERRY: All I would like you to do is - - -

Mr Kaine: Take responsibility for the lack of beds, for example.

MR BERRY: They twitch whenever I mention that. I thought I would mention it just to get another little twitch out of you, and it worked again. Mr Moore did mention that we need, on the last count, three more hospitals - one on the north side, one in Tuggeranong, and Royal Canberra Hospital as well.

Mr Moore: That is not what I said at all.

MR BERRY: Anyway, more new hospitals for Mr Moore. What we have to do is work out what the costs are but, at the same time, run a hospital system which services the needs of the people of the ACT, a public hospital system which is designed for the needs of the people of the ACT.

Mrs Carnell opened up early in her speech by singing the praises of the Priorities Review Board. The Priorities Review Board, for those who can take the time to remember it, was an extremely conservative right wing agenda which was set for the Alliance Government as a blueprint for the New Right in the ACT. It received the reception it deserved. It was completely ignored. It was giggled at, laughed at, chortled at and ignored.

Ms Follett: Even by Mr Kaine.

MR BERRY: Mr Kaine even said, "No, no, not us; not really; this is not the blueprint; don't you take any notice of that". Then, of course, other people were - - -

Mr Kaine: I did not say that.

MR BERRY: You did, to the trade union movement. Are you allowed to tell them one story and other people another?

Mr Kaine: I did not say that to the trade union movement.

MR BERRY: Yes, you said that it was not your blueprint for action. "This is not my plan of action", he said. Then, of course, it became a sort of dim, dark plan of action which never amounted to anything. Subsequently, of course, ACIL have given them another blueprint, and I suspect that we got our first dose of that today.

But then, of course, we have also been informed that as an alternative the Liberals would give their undying commitment to the "frightpack". The "frightpack" is designed to tax the food that our children eat, the clothes that they wear, the restaurants that our families eat at, tourism in the Territory and entertainment -

12 May 1992

and the Liberals say that they want to create jobs. They have to be kidding themselves. At the same time that they support the "frightpack", which, of course, supports the relocation of tens of thousands of ACT jobs to other cities - - -

Mr De Domenico: How many?

MR BERRY: Tens of thousands. Tens of thousands of jobs are to be relocated to Melbourne and to Sydney, away from the ACT. Would the private sector be able to pick up the slack? The best it can do so far is 50 per cent. I would be agitated with the "frightpack" because it is a terrifying document. It is not going to do anything for the ACT, except make it harder for poor people.

On health, it really comes to the fore when it comes to the sorts of difficulties that it will create for the community. It will ensure that there are two health systems - one for the rich and one for the poor - and the poor, of course, will not receive adequate care. They will get Kentucky fried medicine such as occurs in the United States. That is the sort of medicine that the Liberals want to create in Australia. They want to hand over control of medicine to the private sector and to private insurers - the kind, caring private insurers. They have always been kind to the poor! They are renowned for it. We know that. We know how insurance companies have looked after the poor.

We talk about waiting lists. What would happen under "frightpack"? What sort of attention would be provided for the people of the ACT? What sort of hospital care would be available for the ordinary person in the street? I can tell you what sort of hospital care would be available for the ordinary person in the street - expensive care for those that still had jobs. Let us not kid ourselves. Your support for the "frightpack" will bring only horror to the ACT. You are so committed to the Federal gurus that you are not game to move. You are not game to admit that they are wrong. We know that they are wrong. You know that they are wrong. Admit it.

One of the things that we have noticed - the same as has occurred with the Federal Liberals - is that the Liberals hate to see anybody doing a good job and they hate to see them get any credit for it. Over and over again we have seen examples of it. Take health in the ACT, and the sort of financial management that has been introduced there which has produced good results - unprecedented good results - - -

Mrs Carnell: Not many hospital beds.

MR BERRY: You see; they cannot say a good thing about it. They always have to spread poison and disquiet about the hospital system.

Mrs Carnell: The "Yes, Minister" approach to health funding.

MR BERRY: Of course, what Mrs Carnell repeatedly does is spreads the lie about what is going on in our health - - -

Mr De Domenico: Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order. Mr Berry quite clearly said "spreads a lie". I would ask him to withdraw - - -

MR BERRY: "Spreads the lie", I said.

Mr De Domenico: I would ask Mr Berry to withdraw that remark.

MR BERRY: I will withdraw that. Mrs Carnell repeatedly misleads the community of the ACT about what is going on in our health services, for cheap political reasons, for cheap political points.

Mr Kaine: Madam Speaker, I take a point of order. That is a clear imputation of lack of good faith on the part of a member of this Assembly - that she misleads. She does not mislead anybody. The people that are doing the misleading are the people over there. That should be withdrawn.

MADAM SPEAKER: I call Mr Berry.

MR BERRY: Clearly, the information provided to the community through the public utterances of the Liberal Party in relation to health has been misleading. One classic example of it today was the methadone program - "the methadone program is no good". Of course it is good. It might not be up to the standards that you want. It might not provide additional income for the pharmacists, and all those sorts of things; but it is a good program. Sure, it will be expensive and, sure, it warrants attention; but she said that it was no good. That is misleading.

Mr Kaine: As far as it goes, it is a good program. That is what Mrs Carnell has always said.

MR BERRY: "As far as it goes, it is a good program": "It is no good". There is a bit of a difference.

Mr Kaine: She did not say that it was no good. Stop misquoting.

MR BERRY: She said it in the paper. It is quoted in the paper - "It is no good".

Mr Kaine: Do you believe everything you read in the paper?

Mr De Domenico: Do you believe everything you read in the paper? I tell you what; they had some humdinger editorials about you, Mr Berry. I hope you believe those too. You were on the front page for about two weeks in a row.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! Mr Berry has the floor.

MR BERRY: It is quoted. It has not been denied yet, so there we have it.

To cap it off, Mr De Domenico talks about how the Government has performed on workers compensation. His party is the party that wanted to throw sick workers out on the streets. That is what they tried to do, and now they are laughing at it. Your party moved to introduce termination of workers compensation payments at the will of employers and for the insurance companies. I understand it very clearly. What I am supportive of, and this Government will also be supportive of, is good rehabilitation policies. Indeed, I know that we have the best termination clauses for workers - - -

Mr De Domenico: We do not have any.

MR BERRY: That is right.

Mr De Domenico: That it would rip off the system does not matter, as long - - -

12 May 1992

MR BERRY: "Rip off the system". So, sick workers rip off the system according to the Liberals.

Mr Kaine: It is the ones that are not sick that rip off the system.

MR BERRY: Sick workers rip off the system, according to the Liberals.

Mr De Domenico: No, you said that; I did not.

MR BERRY: What the Liberals wanted to do was throw sick workers out onto the street, out of their jobs, instead of endorse appropriate rehabilitation processes. I am not going to wear that.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

WORLD HEALTH DAY Ministerial Statement

Debate resumed from 7 April 1992, on motion by **Mr Berry**:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

Debate (on motion by **Mr Berry**, by leave) adjourned.

AGENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992

Debate resumed from 9 April 1992, on motion by **Ms Follett**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MR DE DOMENICO (10.10): Madam Speaker, the Opposition will not be opposing the Bill. The Bill has been discussed extensively and has bipartisan support in the Assembly as well as in the industry as a whole. The Bill, Madam Speaker, puts forward the concept of the fidelity guarantee fund. The fund protects consumers by ensuring that anyone who has moneys on trust in an agent's trust account will get their money back even if the agent has, shall we say, made irregular withdrawals or gone to Rio for an extended holiday. Such funds are a normal part of legislation in other States and it is pleasing to know that there is going to be one here in the ACT as well.

The industry is to be commended because it has taken a responsible view and has been lobbying for such legislation since the Agents Ordinance was first mooted in 1968. The Federal Government at the time promised that the establishment of a fund would follow shortly afterwards. It depends on your definition, Madam Speaker, of "shortly" and your evaluation of that word as to whether this promise has been fulfilled.

The fund will consist of moneys earned from the interest on agents' trust account balances. Up till now the interest was going straight into the pockets of the banks, which is an unfortunate pocket to go into, considering some of the things that some of the banks might do from time to time. They will be the only losers in the establishment of this fund, I believe.

The cost of administering the Act will be covered and will not be passed on to the consumers or the agents as the interest can be calculated and credited to the fund automatically by the bank. The legislation, Madam Speaker, includes proposed new section 59A, which will enable real estate agents to negotiate the best interest rates. After compensating any person who may unfortunately lose money through the illegal misuse of trust funds, the board of the fund will use the money to administer the Agents Act 1968 as it applies to the operation, licensing and registration of real estate, business and stock and station agents. The Government has proposed that any remaining amount be used to fund educational and housing programs relevant to the real estate industry under proposed new section 71Q(2).

There are a number of concerns that the Liberal Party shared with the industry on this section, Madam Speaker. We are concerned, for example, that no budget has yet been presented, and this would include an analysis of the administration costs and interest rates being paid on account balances. We believe that this money should be going to protect the consumer and to develop the industry and not to cover overheads or to be used as a money tree. We need to know the genuine costs of administration rather than creative accounting principles. We need to know the provisions made for money to be given to housing programs for people to buy or rent dwellings.

Madam Speaker, the Opposition accepts the principles but would like to see some guidelines. We do not want to see the fund becoming some money bucket for causes looking for a problem. The three amendments that I will move later on, Madam Speaker, will make sure that the two people from the industry are, in fact, suggested by the industry. This would go a long way towards alleviating the concerns about proposed new section 71Q(2)(b).

Clause 5 of the Bill is to be commended. It says that the chairman no longer has to be a public servant. That is a good move, as I have said. We are also happy with the changes in proposed new sections 41A and 54A making the renewal date for licences a common day. That is going to make life a lot easier and a lot simpler for the agents.

I would also like to note that the Opposition supports proposed new section 71Q(3), which intends to cap the fidelity fund. In Queensland - one example that comes to mind - a similar fund now boasts \$70m. New section 71Q(3) will ensure that the money is not needlessly poured into the fund. The Opposition has discussed this with the industry and we believe that the cap should be set somewhere between \$2m and \$3m.

Madam Speaker, that is all I need to say at this stage. As I said, I will move later on a number of amendments which I have had checked by the parliamentary draftspeople. Madam Speaker, I seek leave to circulate those amendments now.

MADAM SPEAKER: Leave is not required. That is fine. They can be circulated now.

12 May 1992

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer) (10.15), in reply: Madam Speaker, if there are no further speakers, I thank the Opposition for their support of the Bill. I have not had an opportunity to look at the amendments which Mr De Domenico is proposing, so I think we will have to take them up as we come to each clause of the Bill. As Mr De Domenico has noted, this is a Bill which was left over from the Assembly's business last year. It is one for which we have been pressing for some time. I think the sooner that it comes into operation and the sooner the fidelity guarantee fund is commenced the better it will be for our community, particularly for consumers in our community. I thank the Opposition for their support.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Detail Stage

Clauses 1 to 6, by leave, taken together, and agreed to.

Clause 7

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

SURVEYORS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992

[COGNATE BILLS:

DISTRICTS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992
REAL PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992]

Debate resumed from 9 April 1992, on motion by **Mr Wood**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the Assembly to debate this order of the day concurrently with the Districts (Amendment) Bill 1992 and the Real Property (Amendment) Bill 1992? There being no objection, that course will be followed. I remind members that in debating order of the day No. 4 they may also address their remarks to orders of the day No. 5 and No. 6.

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (10.17): The Opposition has no objection to these Bills and we have no amendments to put to them. There are some general comments that I would like to make about the general subject matter that the Bills relate to, Madam Speaker. The first is to note that what the Bills do is to recognise the reality that certain functions have transferred from the Commonwealth to the Territory and that requires amendment to our Acts to make sure that there are people designated to perform those functions. They are fairly straightforward amendments and we have no difficulty with that.

I do have a difficulty, however, with the fact that our information suggests that when this function transferred from the Commonwealth some 64 people were transferred with it. It is my recollection that a year or a year-and-a-half ago, when this matter was being considered by the Alliance Government, a judgment was

made at that time that, of those 64 people then employed by this office under the Commonwealth, only about 27 were required to transfer to the Territory to perform this function. I am at a loss to understand why we took the 64 and what function those 64 people are now performing.

Perhaps the Minister could deal with that question of the number of people that transferred, what they all do, and how we moved from a position only a year or a little over a year ago that we needed only 27 to the point where we needed and took 64. I was pretty sure that it was then said to me, as the responsible Minister, that quite a large number of these 64 people were on the verge of being offered redundancy packages. If they transferred to the Territory, then the Territory would have to pick up the tab when they took their redundancy packages. I do not know what happened after the proposition was put to me; but I would like some confirmation that we needed the 64 people, that the 64 people are gainfully employed, and that there is no question about paying out redundancy packages to retire all or some of them. I think that is a matter that needs to be clarified.

There is only one other matter that I would ask the Minister to comment on. I notice that we accepted a survey depot valued at \$1.5m, and some equipment and some data that went with all of that, and that these people are now housed in the Sir John Overall Offices in Northbourne Avenue. At the time that this function was transferred, with the 64 people, which represents a very large salary bill, apart from anything else, was there an adjustment to our budget base, the funding base from the Commonwealth, transferred with this function and with these people? When the police were transferred to us they came with their budget of some \$54m. When the magistrates courts were transferred to us they came with an adjustment to our financial base of funding from the Commonwealth. Was there also an adjustment to the Commonwealth's funding base for the Territory transferred along with this function and with these 64 people?

Can the Minister answer those two questions about, firstly, whether we needed the 64 people, what they all do and whether they are all gainfully employed; and, secondly, whether there was an adjustment to the budget base from the Commonwealth? If we are satisfied with those answers, the Opposition will be happy with the legislation and with the transaction.

MR WOOD (Minister for Education and Training, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning) (10.21), in reply: Madam Speaker, certainly we needed those 64 people. I do not know what figures Mr Kaine has in mind. I received the data when I became Minister. It was certainly a carryover of data from the Alliance Government to the Follett Government. The figure given to me was 64 and these were not all the people at that time in the employ of the Commonwealth, although it was almost all the people.

Mr Kaine, I think, suggested that he was given a figure of 27. I do not know whether he got his numbers transposed or something. All the data I have is that we needed those figures. They have very extensive tasks to perform. The action that developed also requires us to provide some work to the private sector. So, it is not just 64 people who carry out this function but some number more than that, depending on the work that is given over. Mr Kaine, I undertake to dig out the briefings and to show them to you. Maybe you and I can reconcile the figures that we have in mind.

12 May 1992

You also asked whether we got some return of funding for this and what compensation was made. It is my memory that prior to late last year when we took over this function we used these same people then employed in the Commonwealth under a memorandum of understanding. We actually paid out of our money to the Commonwealth under the terms of that memorandum for the services that were provided. As officers debated with me, and I believe before me with you, the best means of carrying out this function, they looked at a number of options. They looked at continuing the arrangements under the memorandum of understanding - that is, that we pay out of our money to the Commonwealth for the use of these people. Another option was that it be privatised; that the private sector alone do the work. The one that substantially transpired was that we take over these people and employ them ourselves. In fact, that is what we did.

We allowed some avenue for private enterprise in order to keep a bit of a balance; so that we can keep an assessment of how things may be done in terms of costs, and so that we do not lose it all and perhaps lose contact with the costs of the private sector. I am sure you would agree with that; that we should make sure that we keep up our level of expertise in relation to the private sector. In fact, the money is still being paid out for us but now these people are working directly for us. That is the way the financing was done. We have always paid for them. But again I will check the detail on that and advise you in the morning.

I think it is worth mentioning, as we conclude the debate, that the surveyors in Canberra have done a very great job over a number of years. We tend to pay great tribute to Walter Burley Griffin as the architect and the father of Canberra, but we sometimes ought to reflect on the fact that before Walter Burley Griffin could do anything we needed the surveyors. They had to provide the material from which he could work. From the very earliest days they have done a marvellous job, and they continue to do so today.

In Heritage Week I saw a display that they mounted. The equipment used by the first surveyor, Scrivener, was on display alongside the most recent equipment, which uses satellite and computer technology. This group has kept up to date. They are ahead of most of the players and right up with the most modern of what is happening in the world. I am happy to give them credit for the work they have done in Canberra over a long period.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

DISTRICTS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992

Debate resumed from 9 April 1992, on motion by **Mr Wood**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

REAL PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992

Debate resumed from 9 April 1992, on motion by **Mr Wood**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

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 Berry**) proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Government Housing

MR CORNWELL (10.28): I will be very brief. It was suggested earlier this evening by the Minister for Housing that the Liberals would use funds from the sale of government houses to pay off the public debt. I would just like to correct the record, as the housing spokesman, by reading the relevant section of the Liberal Party housing policy. It states:

... require that, in accordance with Commonwealth Law, all moneys received from the sale of Housing Trust homes shall be returned to the Trust to provide for new or improved housing assistance.

I trust that we will not hear any more of those misleading statements relating to the Liberal Party's policy.

12 May 1992

Caloola Farm

MS ELLIS (10.29): On this day of action on unemployment I would like to bring to the attention of this Assembly the work of Caloola Farm in training long-term unemployed people to re-enter the work force, particularly those in the southern Canberra and Tuggeranong regions.

Caloola Farm caters for a group of unemployed who have very special needs. Long-term unemployment is a situation which leads to loss of self-esteem, depression, loss of skills and lack of experience. The long-term unemployed are, indeed, the most disadvantaged within our community. Caloola Farm runs training courses which recover individual self-esteem, skill levels and confidence so that they can compete on equal grounds for employment when previously any prospect of working again seemed slim indeed.

I must say that at the graduation ceremony which I attended in April some graduates were unable to attend because they had already found employment. This alone is a great testament to the work of the training coordinator and the team out there, and in particular Reverend Roy Hensen. I have been happy to be involved with Caloola Farm for many years and my admiration and support for the work of Roy Hensen and his team continues to grow as I witness the success of the programs they run.

The ACT Government provides substantial funding to Caloola Farm for specific purposes. In 1991-92 Caloola Farm received two grants from the employment and training grants program. One grant of \$17,500 was to contribute towards the salary and operational costs in conducting three pre-vocational training courses for long-term unemployed older females, and women from non-English speaking backgrounds wishing to re-enter the work force. The second grant of \$12,200 was for the conduct of two fork-lift driving and stores maintenance courses targeting older males.

There are six courses in all targeting these special groups. Already two of the pre-vocational courses for women and one of the fork-lift courses for older unemployed men have been completed and, as I have said, some of the trainees are now employed or have continued with further employment training courses. Caloola Farm also receives substantial funding of \$175,000 under the Skillshare program from the Federal Department of Employment, Education and Training.

The Chief Minister announced last week that Caloola Farm and four other organisations in the ACT, namely, the Community Company, the Work Resources Centre, Richmond Fellowship and Quest Solutions, have been offered contracts to implement the \$2.96m Jobskills program provided by the Federal Government. The program provides 26 weeks' work experience and on and off the job training for people who have been unemployed for more than 12 months. This will help to break the "no experience, no work; no work, no experience" cycle. Caloola Farm will now be able to expand its programs and work with the ACT Government in assisting residents of the ACT who have been affected by long-term unemployment. The five organisations will work with 270 unemployed people to assist them with training opportunities. I take this opportunity of commending to the Assembly the work of Roy Hensen and the people at Caloola Farm.

Housing Trust

MR LAMONT (10.32): I rise to pay tribute to the ACT Housing Trust, in particular for the publication of a booklet now available through the trust called "The A-Z of Home Purchase". This booklet, released in May of this year, sets out the steps that a prospective home purchaser should follow. I wish that such a book had been available some 17 years ago when I set out with my wife to investigate how to purchase a house. I am sure that I would not have gone through a number of the pitfalls that I found myself in.

This document - it is attributed in the front to cooperation between the ACT Housing Trust and the New South Wales Department of Housing and is an adaptation of a New South Wales Department of Housing publication - I understand has been issued to over 300 persons who attended an information night at the Canberra Labor Club recently put on by the ACT Housing Trust. It was received wholeheartedly by the people who attended that meeting. I also understand that the trust will be holding other meetings in Woden and Tuggeranong, and again at Belconnen later in this year. I commend this publication not only to all members of the Assembly but also to all prospective home buyers in the ACT. I again congratulate the trust for its excellent work.

International Nurses Day

MR BERRY (Minister for Health, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Sport) (10.34), in reply: In closing the debate I would like to talk today about International Nurses Day, Tuesday, 12 May. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate nurses for their important role in the ACT health system. International Nurses Day is held on 12 May every year, commemorating the birthday of - guess who? - Florence Nightingale. She lived from 1820 to 1910.

The theme this year is healthy ageing. Delivering to older patients not only quality care but also successful health promotion programs continues to provide a challenge to nurses, health providers and social policy makers. New trends and innovations in the care of the elderly indicate that nurses around the world are meeting this challenge. From health promotion to terminal care, or home assessments to family care-giver support, nurses are using their knowledge and professional skills to meet the needs of their patients.

International Nurses Day 1992 is an opportunity not only to identify the needs of older patients but also to seek out opportunities for change and innovation. Nursing is recognised as the largest single component of the services needed in providing care for the sick or dying elderly. On a professional level, to deliver such care, new activities for the protection and the promotion of health are being developed. These emphasise limiting the development of chronic ailments and aged-related loss of functions.

Careerwise, the ACT Government is supporting developments in the nursing profession to create closer links in the professional structure across Australia. I welcome a proposal by Australian nurses to establish an Australian Nursing Council. In 1990 a steering committee was convened to develop and establish a national authority to be known as the Australian Nursing Council. The purpose

12 May 1992

of the council is to establish and maintain a consistent national approach to the regulation of nursing within Australia, and to ensure that the community is adequately provided with nursing care of the highest standards. It will also eventually facilitate the mutual recognition of nursing qualifications across States and Territories.

The Australian Nursing Council steering committee has developed a constitution, a corporate plan, an organisational structure and a draft budget for the establishment and operation of the council, which will be based in the ACT. Issues relating to the provision of funding for the establishment and ongoing operation of the council are still being resolved. However, they are anxious to establish this national initiative as soon as possible.

The ACT Government fully supports the proposal to establish the Australian Nursing Council in the near future and looks forward to further developments in resolving outstanding issues. International Nurses Day gives the ACT Government the opportunity to congratulate ACT nurses on the contribution to the Australian Nursing Council proposal. I wish them well in this endeavour and with their more local vision of continuing to deliver the best possible nursing care to the Canberra community.

May I also, Madam Speaker, wish the Australian Nursing Federation all the best in their representation of the industrial issues of nurses. Much has changed since Florence Nightingale and I think that the Australian nurses union should take much of the credit for the improvements in industrial conditions for nurses across the country. I ask the Assembly to support ACT nursing over the coming year.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Assembly adjourned at 10.37 pm

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 1

Rural Firefighting Service

Mr Humphries - asked the Minister for Urban Services:

- (1) Is the Rural Fire Service to be moved from its present location in Forrest to a site in Woden; if so, when?
- (2) What will be the cost of this move?
- (3) What justification can the Government offer for such a move after the control room was only recently relocated from Tuggeranong to Forrest?
- (4) Have consultants been engaged to conduct a feasibility study concerning the move, specifically concerning the radio communications implications of such a shift; if so, who are the consultants and what is the cost of the consultancy?
- (5) Why is the Government moving the Rural Fire Service Control Room before it has completed its review of the proposed amalgamation of the ACT Bush Fire Council and ACT Fire Brigade?
- (6) When does the Government expect the review to be completed?
- (7) What consultation has the Government engaged in with respect to that review, in particular with members of the ACT Bush Fire Council and workers involved with the Council.

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

- (1) The former Woden TAFE building is to be used as office accommodation to locate parts of the ACT Administration. The Fire and Emergency Services currently located in a commercial lease in Belconnen is one of the units being considered. The consideration will also cover whether to collocate the control rooms of the Fire Brigade and the Rural Firefighting Service currently located at Forrest.
- (2) The exercise is being driven by the desire to save the cost of current private leases and would not occur unless cost justified.

12 May 1992

(3) The relocation from Tuggeranong to Forrest resulted in savings by eliminating the need for contracted staff in the bush fire season and the Fire and Emergency Services budget was reduced accordingly.

The Rural Fire Service radio communications system was also improved at the time by utilising the resources of the Urban Fire Service to provide fail-safe systems that were not available at Tuggeranong.

(4) The ACT Government has been advised by the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Communications that the radio frequency bands allocated to a number of Departments have to be changed by 1994. This includes the Rural Firefighting Service and it means that their radio communications system will have to be changed in the near future regardless of any proposed move.

Because of the interaction between ACT Government radio systems and the effect on the frequency changes, a consultant has been engaged to provide expert advice on all ACT Government radio communication systems.

The consultancy is to advise the Government on the requirements of the various agencies and the broad direction for the future at a cost of \$5,000.

The consultant is Mr R Head who has previously provided advice to the ACT Government. Mr Head has particular expertise in the radio requirements of both Rural and Urban Fire Services.

(5) The Government has not made any decision on either the proposed relocation of the Control Room or the proposed amalgamation of the Fire and Emergency Services.

(6) The Government expects the review to be completed within the next 6 weeks.

(7) The previous and present Chairperson of the Bush Fire Council were members of the Steering committee that managed the Hannan Group consultancy. With the resignation of the Chairperson (Mr V M Jeffery) and the absence of the deputy Chairperson (Mrs C Parsons) overseas at the time, the only way for a meeting of the

312

Bush Fire Council to be called was at the direction of the Minister for Urban Services.

Because the meeting took some time to arrange the Bush Fire Councils representative could not be appointed.. Statutory appointees and the Deputy Chairperson (designate) of the Bush Fire Council Mr S Sanderson were present at the Steering Committee meetings to present the rural perspective.

As part of their initial study, the Hannan Group conducted more than 200 interviews involving representatives from all of the stakeholder groups including the Bush Fire Council. They also met with the Trades and Labour Council, the individual unions that represent the various groups of workers and the Volunteer Associations.

Further to this, to ensure that everybody concerned had the opportunity to express their views and have them considered, Pardon Associates were engaged to conduct a series of 7 workshops and again, all stakeholders were represented at one or more of the workshops.

I also understand that groups with special interests such as the Bush Fire Council are making their own submissions to me on the matter.

I am confident that the public consultation process has been very thorough and comprehensive.

313

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 2

Secondary Colleges - Mature-Age Students

MR CORNWELL: asked the minister for Education and Training on notice on 7 April 1992:

- (1) Are there procedures in place to offer initially unsuccessful mature-aged students a place in a government college if vacancies occur later in the college year;
- (2) If not, why not.

MR WOOD: the answer to Mr Cornwells question is:

- (1) Yes. There are course structures required by the Board of Senior Secondary Studies for mature-aged students. Dependent on these requirements, and if the college operates on the semester system, matureaged students could be offered a place later in the year.
- (2) See (1)

314

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 3

Primary Schools - Statistics

MR CORNWELL - asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 7 April 1992:

(1) What were the individual names of ACT Government Primary Schools and what were their individual student numbers:

(a) below 150 students;

(b) below 200 students.

(2) What was the teacher/pupil ratio at each of the schools by name, at (a) and (b) above?

(3) What was the per capita funding for students at each of these schools, by name, at (a) and (b) above?

WOOD: - The answer to Mr Cornwells questions are:

Questions (1) & (3)

The names and enrolments of government schools in categories (a) and (b) are outlined in the table below. The Government does not allocate funds to schools on a per capita basis, apart from a small amount of discretionary funds for nonsalary costs which are indicated in the table.

SCHOOL ENROLMENT PER CAPITA FUNDING

Uriarra 18 29

Tharwa 32 29

Co-Operative (a)(b) 57 29

Lyons 111 74

Cook 112 74

Hall 148 74

Yarralumla 198 74

(a) Includes 25 preschool level enrolments (b) No per capita funding is provided for Co-Operative preschool students

Question (2)

The Department does not calculate Pupil Teacher Ratios for individual schools. Staffing is generated by a formula in which the site and enrolment components are used for both generation and deployment of staffing points.

12 May 1992

**MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NO 5**

Primary Schools - Vacant Space

MR CORNWELL: asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 7 April 1992

In relation to Cook and Lyons Primary Schools

1. How much vacant space is available in each school for non-school use.

2. How much of this space, in each school, has been let:

(a) at commercial rates;

(b) at non-commercial rates.

3. How much revenue per annum has been generated, in each school, by such lettings?

MR WOOD the answer to Mr Cornwell's question is

In each of the primary schools at Cook and Lyons, the management of the vacant wing not required for school purposes has been transferred to the Department of Urban Services. The Department of Urban Services has provided the following information in response to the question.

Cook Pry School

1. (a) Gross floor area of wing managed by the Department of Urban Services 1004 sq metres

(b) Nett lettable area of the wing 594 sq metres

2. (a) Space let at commercial rates

Betsy Sawers School of Dancing 200 sq metres

(b) Space let at non-commercial rates

Youth Adventure Holidays 27 sq metres

Community Aid Abroad and

One World Living Centre, jointly 91 sq metres

3. In a full year the revenue generated from the above three tenancies is \$33,067.

316

Lyons Primary School

1. (a)Gross floor area of wing managed by the
Department of Urban Services 1157 sq metres
(b)Nett lettable area of the wing 942 sq metres

2. (a)Space let at commercial rates
Australian Electoral Commission 624 sq metres
Consumer Health Forum 215 sq metres
(b)Space let at non-commercial rates
Technical Aid for the Disabled 23 sq metres

3. In a full year the revenue generated from the above three tenancies is \$101,618. Currently there is
one room of 80 sq metres which is unlet.

317

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 6

Government Schools - Excess Places

MR CORNWELL - asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 7 April 1992:

as at 29 February 1992

- (1) How many excess places existed in ACT Government Schools, by name, at primary, high and college levels.
- (2) What is the resultant per capita funding for students at each of these schools, by name.

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Cornwells Question is:

- (1) The number of excess places existing in ACT Government

Schools, by name, is as per the attached table
Enrolment and Capacities, 1992.

- (2) The Government does not allocate funds to schools on a

per capita basis, apart from a small amount of
discretionary funds for non-salary costs which are
detailed on the attached table.

There is currently no systematic collection of data by the Department on the exact per pupil cost for individual schools.

318

ACT Government Primary and High Schools Enrolment and Capacities, 1992

BUILDING ENROLMENT SURPLUS
SCHOOL CAPACITY AT FEB 1992 CAPACITY
(REFER NOTE 1) (REFER NOTE 2) (REFER NOTE 3) (t REFER NOTE 4)

COLLEGES

COPLAND 874 880 0

DICKSON 1045 803 242

ERINDALE 931 702 229

HAWKER 912 925 0

LK GINNINDERRA 893 927 0

LK TUGGERANONG 893 905 0

NARRABUNDAH 779 930 0

PHILLIP 912 761 151

STIRLING 836 625 211

SWOW 57 69 0

HIGH SCHOOLS

ALFRED DEAKIN 912 611 301

BELCONNEN 912 600 312

CALWELL 798 652 146

CAMPBELL 836 683 153

CANBERRA 931 857 74

CHARNWOOD 741 486 255

CAROLINE CHISHOLM 760 585 175

GINNINDERRA 950 650 300

HOLDER 817 332 485

KALEEN 760 679 81

KAMBAH 722 744 0

LYNEHAM 969 794 175

MELBA 779 485 294

MELROSE 931 712 219

TELOPEA PARK 589 619 0

WANNIASSA 779 761 18

WESTON CREEK 969 744 225

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

AINSLIE 410 324 86

ARANDA 410 380 30

ARAWANG 410 410 0

BONYTHON 350 217 133

CALWELL 460 501 0

CAMPBELL 440 290 150

12 May 1992

ACT Government Primary and High Schools Enrolment and Capacities, 1992

BUILDING ENROLMENT SURPLUS

SCHOOL CAPACITY AT FEB 1992 CAPACITY

(REFER NOTE 1) (REFER NOTE 2) (REFER NOTE 3) (t REFER NOTE 4)

CHAPMAN 470 339 131

CHARNWOOD 525 334 191

CHISHOLM 310 437 0

COOK 145 112 33

CURTIN 415 325 90

DUFFY 440 265 175

EVATT 530 409 121

FADDEN 465 546 0

FLOREY 460 491 0

FARRER 380 370 10

FLYNN 410 366 44

FORREST 470 358 112

FRASER 320 368 0

GARRAN 440 390 50

GILMORE 460 555 0

GIRALANG 500 356 144

GOWRIE 350 408 0

GRIFFITH 290 178 112

HALL 85 148 0

HAWKER 415 247 168

HIGGINS 440 221 219

HOLT 525 370 155

HUGHES 565 280 285

ISABELLA PLAINS 460 547 0

KALEEN 555 412 143

LATHAM 380 315 65

LYNEHAM 525 485 40

LYONS 145 111 34

MACGREGOR 525 366 159

MACQUARIE 355 206 149

MAJURA 710 416 294

MARIBYRNONG 650 252 398

MAWSON 500 251 249

MELBA 560 232 328

MELROSE 410 228 182

MILES FRANKLIN 320 390 0

MONASH 465 513 0

MT NEIGHBOUR 470 351 119

NARRABUNDAH 290 141 149

NORTH AINSLIE 530 363 167

RED HILL 770 451 319

320

ACT Government Primary and High Schools Enrolment and Capacities, 1992

BUILDING ENROLMENT SURPLUS
SCHOOL CAPACITY AT FEB 1992 CAPACITY
(REFER NOTE 1) (REFER NOTE 2) (REFER NOTE 3) (a REFER NOTE 4)
RICHARDSON 465 295 170
RIVETT 230 197 33
SOUTHERN CROSS 380 293 87
SPENCE 655 248 407
TAYLOR 500 276 224
TELOPEA PRIMARY 380 402 0
THEODORE 350 344 6
TORRENS 410 369 41
TURNER 350 316 34
URAMBI 585 418 167
VILLAGE CREEK 500 343 157
WANNIASSA 495 359 136
WANNIASSA HILLS 615 472 143
WEETANGERA 415 236 179
WESTON 475 325 150
YARRALUMLA 235 198 37
TOTALS 49837 39637 11251

321

12 May 1992

SUMMARY

SURPLUS STUDENT CAPACITY 11251
LESS ADDITIONAL SPACE REQUIRED FOR SPECIAL CLASSES 1480
(REFER NOTE 5)

TOTAL SURPLUS STUDENT SPACES 9771

NOTE 1

Special schools and annexes, small rural schools are not included.

NOTE 2

The building capacity column excludes, where appropriate, concessions for A. Y. rooms, Teaching Studies, E.S.L. and Reading Recovery programs, design deficiencies and special circumstances pertaining to some schools.

NOTE 3 The enrolment column includes mainstream students only.

NOTE 4

All negatives are counted as zero as students are accommodated within the existing buildings using transportable classroom units where necessary.

NOTE 5

This is a space allowance for system wide programs such as Introductory English Centres (IEC), Junior Assessment Centres (JAC) and Learning Centres (LC).

ACT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION & TRAINING 21-Apr-92

322

PER CAPITA FUNDING

PRIMARY \$ PER STUDENT COLLEGE \$ PER STUDENT

AINSLIE 84 COPLAND 112
ARANDA 84 DICKSON 112
ARAWANG 84 ERINDALE 112
BONYTHON 84 HAWKER 112
CALWELL 84 LK GINNINDERRA 112
CAMPBELL 74 LK TUGGERANONG 112
CHAPMAN 84 NARRABUNDAH 112
CHARNWOOD 84 PHILLIP 112
CHISHOLM 84 STIRLING 112
COOK 74 SWOW 112
CURTIN 84
DUFFY 74
EVATT 84 HIGH SCHOOL \$ PER STUDENT
FADDEN 84
FARRER 84 ALFRED DEAKIN 102
FLOREY 84 BELCONNEN 102
FLYNN 84 CALWELL 102
FORREST 84 CAMPBELL 102
FRASER 84 CANBERRA 102
GARRAN 84 CHARNWOOD 102
GILMORE 84 CAROLINE CHISHOLM 102
GIRALANG 84 GINNINDERRA 102
GOWRIE 84 HOLDER 102
GRIFFITH 84 KALEEN 102
HACKETT 0 KAMBAH 102
HALL 74 LYNEHAM 102
HAWKER 74 MELBA 102
HIGGINS 74 MELROSE 102
HOLT 84 TELOPEA PARK 102
HUGHES 84 WANNIASSA 102
ISABELLA PLAINS 84 WESTON CREEK 102
KALEEN 84 SWOW 102
LATHAM 84 LYNEHAM 84
LYONS 74 MACGREGOR 84
MACQUARIE 74 MAJURA 84
MARIBYNONG 84 MAWSON 74
MELBA 84 MELROSE 74
MILES FRANKLIN 84 MONASH 84
MT NEIGHBOUR 84 NARRABUNDAH 84
NTH AINSLIE 84 RED HILL 84
RICHARDSON 84

12 May 1992

RIVETT 74
SOUTHERN CROSS 84
SPENCE 84
TAYLOR 84
TELOPEA PRIMARY 84
THEODORE 84
TORRENS 84
TURNER 84
URAMBI 84
VILLAGE CREEK 84
WANNIASSA 84
WANNIASSA HILLS 84
WEETANGERA 74
WESTON 84
YARRALUMLA 74

324

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NO 7**

Government Schools - Average

Per Student Costs

MR CORNWELL.: - asked the Minister for Education and Training an notice on 7 April 1992

What is the 1992 average cost per student at ACT Government (a) primary schools; (b) high schools; and (c) colleges.

MR WOOD: - the answer to Mr Cornwells question is:

The average cost per student in 1992 cannot be determined until the end of the financial year.

However the average cost per student in 1990/91 is as follows:

Full Cost

PRIMARY \$4,380 per student

HIGH \$5,460 per student

COLLEGE \$5,640 per student

325

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 9

**Government Schools -
Volunteer Teachers**

MR CORNWELL - asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 7 April 1992:

1. Do any ACT Government schools supplement their staffing levels with volunteer teachers in 1992 or did any in 1991.
2. If so,
 - a. Which schools
 - b. How many volunteers are or were so involved, by school;
 - c. What is or was the daily or weekly duration of their assistance;
 - d. What subjects do or did they teach or assist in teaching;
 - e. Has the Australian Teachers Union expressed any opinions about such activities to you or your Department?

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Cornwells question is:

There is no such category as a volunteer teacher. Only qualified and registered members of the teaching profession work as teachers in schools and these are paid.

Of course, some parents and other members of the community are involved with their schools in a voluntary capacity. Some of these may be qualified but unregistered teachers, but would not take a class without a teacher present.

326

**MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 10

Education and Training Portfolio - Publications

MR CORNWELL - asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 7 April 1992:

- (1) How many publications, by name, are regularly published by your Department.
- (2) How often is each published.
- (3) What is the annual cost of each publication.
- (4) How much is charged for each publication.
- (5) How much revenue is obtained from (a) advertising in; and (b) sale of each publication.
- (6) What is the print run for each publication.
- (7) What is the circulation of each publication.
- (8) How regularly is the circulation list culled for each publication.

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Cornwells question is:

Department of Education and Training

- (1) (a) Schools Bulletin
(b) Lets Get Going
(c) Annual Report
- (2) (a) Weekly during term
(b) Annually
(c) Annually
- (3) (a) \$20000

(b) \$7000
(c) \$3500
- (4) (a) Nil
(b) Nil
(c) Nil
- (5) (a) Nil
(b) Nil
(c) Nil

12 May 1992

- (6) (a) 6000
- (b) 7000
- (c) 1000
- (7) (a) equals print run
- (b) equals print run
- (c) equals print run - a small number of spares held
- (8) Annually for each publication

Vocational Training Authority

- (1) (a) The Training Agenda
- (b) VTA Annual Report
- (c) A Guide to the Industry Training Advisory Network in the ACT and S8 Region
- (d) ACT Training Development Strategy

- (2) (a) Quarterly
- (b) Annually
- (c) Annually
- (d) Annually

- (3) (a) \$3440
- (b) \$ 678
- (c) \$ 790
- (d) \$1179

- (4) (a) Nil
- (b) Nil
- (c) Initial distribution free, additional copies \$4 each (\$3 for ten or more copies)
- (d) Nil

- (5) (a) Nil
- (b) Nil
- (c) Advertising nil, sales estimated maximum \$400
- (d) Nil

- (6) (a) 3000
- (b) 500
- (c) 500
- (d) 300

- (7) (a) equals print run
- (b) equals print run
- (c) equals print run
- (d) equals print run

- (8) (a) Ongoing
- (b) Annually
- (c) Annually
- (d) Annually

ACT Institute of TAFE

(1)(a) Study in Canberra Course Guide for International Students

- (b) Annual Report
- (c) Graduation Handbook
- (d) TAFE Matters
- (e) Students Handbook

(f) Course Guide

(2)(a) Biannual

- (b) Annually
- (c) Annually
- (d) Fortnightly
- (e) Annually
- (f) Annually with 2nd edition in Semester 2

(3)

- (a) \$10866
- (b) \$3500
- (c) \$5465
- (d) \$3224
- (e) \$8000
- (f) \$34561

(4) (a) Nil (b) Nil (c) Nil (d) Nil (e) Nil (f) Nil

(5) (a) Nil

- (b) Nil
- (c) Nil
- (d) Nil
- (e) Nil
- (f) Advertising \$2250, sales nil

(6)(a) 8000

- (b) 700
- (c) 5000
- (d) 980
- (e) 20000
- (f) 38000

(7) (a) equals print run (b) equals print run - a small number of spares held

(c) equals print run (d) equals print run (e) equals print run (f) equals print run

(8) (a) Biannually (b) Annually (c) Annually (d) Ongoing (e) Annually (f) Annually

29 April, 1992

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 13

School Based Management Working Party Report

MR CORNWELL: asked the Minister for Education on notice on 7 April 1992:

When will a decision be announced on the Governments response to the 1991 School Based Management Working Party Report.

MR WOOD: the answer to Mr Cornwells question is:

The School Based Management Working Party has presented its report to me I am examining the report and a response will be provided when this examination is concluded.

330

**MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

Question No 14

Technical and Further Education - Apprentices

MR CORNWELL: To ask the Minister for Education -

- (1) How many apprentices, by discipline, attend ACT TAFE.
- (2) What was the 1992 application list for each of the categories in (1).

MR WOOD The answer to the members question is as follows:

- (1) Apprentices by School attending ACT TAFE at end March 1992 are listed below. (The distribution by discipline is at Attachment A.)

School of Applied Design 243
School of Applied Science 100
School of Construction Studies 343
School of Electrical and Electronic Studies 232
School of Engineering Studies . 417
School of Tourism and Hospitality 119
TOTAL 1454

NOTE: The 1992 attendance will increase through the balance of the year as students enrol, particularly for block release courses.

- (2) The Institute accepted all applications from apprentices at the start of 1992 and there were no waiting lists. Since classes commenced, late applications have been received from a further 6 Carpentry and Joinery, 4 Plumbing and 5 Electrical apprentices. These apprentices will commence studies once numbers are sufficient to justify additional classes.

331

12 May 1992

ATTACHMENT A

Numbers of Apprentices by Discipline attending ACT TAFE in 1992.
Numbers

school of Applied Design

Certificate in Hairdressing Trade 155

Certificate in Hand and Machine Composing 16

Certificate in Graphic Reproduction - Trade 22

Certificate in Printing Machining - Trade 21

Certificate in Bookbinding - Trade 10

Certificate in Printing and Dress Room Operations 12

Signwriting 7

School of Allied Science

Certificate in Turf Management 49

Certificate in Horticulture 51

School of Construction Studies

Certificate in Plastering - Trade 12

Printing and Decorating 16

Bricklaying 30

Cabinetmaking Trade 47

Carpentry and Joinery Trade 147

Certificate in Plumbing - Trade 86

Certificate in Flat Glass - Trade

School of Electrical and Electronic Studies

Electrical Trade 63

Certificate in Electrical - Trade 94

Electronic Trade 11

Certificate in Electronic - Trade 18

Refrigeration/Air Conditioning Trade 8

Certificate in Refrigeration/Air Conditioning - Trade 23

Certificate in Occ. Studies - Electrical/Electronic Trade 15

Certificate in Automotive Painting 24

Certificate in Panel Beating - Trade 50

Certificate in Fitting and Machining - Trade 13

Certificate in Heavy Vehicle and Plant Mechanics (Trade) 26

Certificate in Automotive Mechanics (Light Vehicle) -Trade 216

Certificate in Automotive Electrical - Trade 36

Certificate in Sheetmetal - Trade

Certificate in Metal Fabrication 8

Certificate in Metal Trades - Fabrication (Light) 17

Certificate in Metal Trades - Fabrication (Heavy) 18

School of Tourism and Hospitality

Certificate in Baking/Pastry Cooking - Trade 14

Certificate in Commercial Cookery - Trade 81

Certificate in Butchery - Trade 24

332

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO-16

Floriade

Mr Cornwell - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning

(1) What was the cost to the Government of staging Floriade in:

- (a) 1989
- (b) 1990 and
- (c) 1991.

(2) Was there any direct financial return through sponsoring to government expenditure and, if so, how much was recouped in. each of the years listed above.

Mr Wood -.the answer to the Members question is as follows

(1) The cost to the Government of staging Floriade in 1989, 1990 and 1991 was:

- (a) 1989 \$974,349.00
- (b) 1990 \$968,349.00
- (c) 1991 \$1,217,939.00

The additional expenditure in 1991 was due to:

- additional lighting for additional circulation paths;
- increased security costs due to increased vandalism;
- new street banners.

2. Cash and in-kind sponsorship levels increased each year, as did other revenues such as concessions, advertising and merchandising.

Sponsorship Other.

Cash in-kind Revenue

- (a) 1989 50,000 78,300 56,290
- (b) 1990 51,000 85,300 66,990
- (c) 1991 122,500 99,750 74,062

The official Floriade survey-estimated \$ 21 million was spent in Canberra by tourists during the 1991 Floriade.

12 May 1992

**MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 20

Library Service - BOOK Plus System

MR CORNWELL - asked the Minister for the Arts:

- (1) What was the cost of installing the computerised borrowing system, BOOK Plus, in ACT public libraries.
- (2) Has any study been conducted as to the savings achieved by this system in terms of book borrowing control, ie. any reduction in lost or stolen books.
- (3) If a study has been conducted, what were its findings.
- (4) If a study has not been conducted, why not.

MR CONNOLLY - to answer the question to my colleague:

- (1) The cost of installing the ACT Library Services automated system is \$1.1 million over a five year implementation period from 1988/89 to 1992/93.
- (2) The BOOK Plus system is still in its fourth year of implementation and while no formal study has been carried out so far, there have been a number of benefits/savings:
 - a) In 1988/89 (pre-automation) 1.7 million loans were recorded. Based on year to date figures it is estimated that loans for 1991/92 will reach 2.5 million. This increase has been achieved with no additional staff.
 - b) The introduction of the on-line catalogue has eliminated the need for the production and replacement of microfiche, a saving of approximately 34,000 pa.
 - c) The automated system has provided a degree of protection of the library's collections and compliance with the requirements of the Audit Act previously not possible. In particular: management reporting facilities which assist with more effective management and control of the collections regular and accurate stocktakes, audit trails of borrowings and outstanding loans.

334

d) Revenue from fines has increased from \$24,675 in 1988/89 to \$94,380 to date in 1991/92 as a result of being able to collect overdue fines more effectively.

(3) See (2).

(4) See (2).

335

12 May 1992

**MINISTER FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NO 28**

**Housing and Community Services
Portfolio - Statutory Bodies**

MR CORNWELL - asked the Minister for Housing and Community Services:

- (1) How many statutory bodies, by name, exist within your portfolio.
- (2) How many of these bodies or committees within your portfolio, by name, pay sitting fees or an annual remuneration.
- (3) What are the fees or remuneration that each of those bodies, by name, pay members.
- (4) What is the annual cost of payments to members of each of these bodies.

MR CONNOLLY - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

- (1) Statutory Bodies (2) Sitting fees paid (3) Cost of fees (4) Annual Cost

Belconnen Remand Yes \$20 per hour \$3360 (based on
Centre Official Visitor 84 visits of 2 hour duration)

Supported Yes Chair: \$137 \$6294 (based on Accommodation Members: \$114 6 meetings per
Assistance Program (daily) year

Advisory Committee

Family Services Yes \$20 per hour Official Visitor

Official Visitor recently appointed:

no annual data yet

available

Childrens Services No None None

Council

336

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 36

Red Light Cameras

Mr Cornwell - asked the Minister for Urban Services:

Has the Government assessed the installation of red light cameras, similar to those operating in Victoria, to photograph motorists running red lights; if so what is the result of the assessment; if not, why not.

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

Red light cameras are used at traffic lights to detect drivers travelling through red lights by photographing the offending vehicle and number plate.

Red light cameras are currently operating in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia with Victoria having used the system the longest.

The latest report assessing the feasibility of installing red light cameras in the ACT was prepared for the then Traffic and Transport Branch, Department of Territories, by Paul Kesby in May 1987. While this report is some five years old, more recent interstate experience does not suggest its conclusions are invalid.

In his report Mr Kesby indicated that, based on Victorian experience, although red light cameras reduce the number of right-angle accidents they in fact increase the number of rear-end accidents. The increase in rear-end accidents results from severe braking by drivers eager to obey the red signal.

Although there is an increase in rear-end collisions with red light cameras, a Victorian study of its red light camera program showed a substantial reduction of 41% in right-angle accidents. It was concluded that the benefits from reduced right-angle accidents far outweighed any increase in year-end accidents.

In the ACT the majority of controlled intersections with a high proportion of turning vehicles use right arrow controlled turning. The proportion of intersections with controlled right turning in the ACT is much higher than other capital cities. Accordingly this has led to a lower proportion of right-hand turning accidents in the ACT, thus limiting the beneficial effect that red light cameras could have.

337

12 May 1992

As only 12% of all accidents in the ACT occur at signalised intersections there is a clear limit to the impact that red light cameras could have on road safety in the ACT.

Mr Kesby concluded that it was unlikely that the community benefits from savings in accidents would outweigh the operational costs of a red light camera program in the ACT.

He also concluded that funds allocated to a red light camera system could be used to better advantage in other accident reduction programs.

The Government will continue to assess interstate experience and keep this matter under review.

338

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

Question No 37

Unpaid Traffic Fines

Mr Cornwell - asked the Attorney-General:

- (1) Does legislation exist to increase the penalties for traffic fines unpaid after a certain period, apart from suspension of licence.
- (2) If so, what is this period and what is the increased penalty.
- (3) If so, how much in such increased penalties has been collected in:
 - (a) 1990; and
 - (b) 1991 .
- (4) If no legislation exists to increase penalties for unpaid traffic fines, apart from licence suspension, why not.

Mr Connolly - The answer to the members question is as follows:

- (1) No. Penalties for Traffic Infringements are prescribed in Regulation 32 of the Motor Traffic Regulations. Penalties are independent of the time of payment.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.
- (4) The Motor Traffic (Amendment) Act (No 3) 1991 amended the Motor Traffic Act 1936 by imposing an administrative charge of \$25 on Traffic Infringement penalties that remain unpaid after 30 days.

The administrative charge is intended to offset the cost of administrative follow-up action necessary to recover unpaid fines and to encourage infringers to pay promptly. However, actual penalties for Traffic Infringements do not themselves increase by this legislation.

An important element of the policy to which the amending Act gives effect is that cancellation of a drivers licence or, in an appropriate case, the vehicle registration, is the ultimate sanction for non-payment of the penalty and the administrative charge.

On the basis of experience with the Parking Infringement fine default scheme, this is expected to be an effective enforcement policy. A commencement date for the relevant provisions is yet to be fixed by Ministerial notice in the ACT Gazette.

12 May 1992

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

Question No 42

Legislative Assembly - Tuesday Night Sitings

MR CORNWELL - Asked the Chief Minister upon notice on 7 April 1992:

- (1) What was the cost in full-time and part-time staff salaries of the Tuesday night sittings in the First Assembly.
- (2) How many Tuesday night sittings took place.
- (3) What was the average attendance during the First Assembly by members of the public.

MS FOLLETT - The answer to the Members question, is as follows:

- (1) The cost of Ministerial staff salaries for Tuesday night sittings in the First Assembly was 14023. This figure represents the overtime entitlement of staff at ASO 6 level and below. Public Servants and staff employed by Ministers above the ASO 6 level have no such entitlement.

Information relating to the cost of overtime for public servants below the ASO 6 level; employed for Tuesday evening sittings, is not available. However, it is likely that the cost would be minimal as support to the Executive in the conduct of business in the Assembly is usually provided by staff at Senior Officer level or above, who are not entitled to overtime.

- (2) The First Assembly sat on 38 Tuesday evenings: that is sittings where the Assembly adjourned on a Tuesday after 8pm.
- (3) A register of the attendance by members of the public at Assembly sittings is not maintained. Information on the average attendance is therefore not available.

340

MINISTER FOR HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION 43

City Health Centre

Mr Cornwall - asked the Minister for Health:

1. How many doctors are employed currently?
2. How many staff, other than doctors, are employed currently?
3. How many rooms does the centre occupy?
4. Approximately how many patients are seen each day?

Mr Berry - the answer to Mr Cornwall's question is:

There are 2.5 Community Medical Practitioners employed currently.

There are 12.2 staff currently employed at the City Health Centre. They are comprised of:

Nurse Practitioners
Podiatrist
Social Worker
Nutritionist
Physiotherapist
Speech Pathologist
Pathology Nurse
Health Risk Management
Clerical Staff

In addition, Community Nurses use rooms for child health and immunisation clinics.

The centre occupies 13 clinical rooms on the ground floor and 2 rooms for physiotherapy on the second floor.

An average of 173 clients are seen each day at the City Health Centre.

341

12 May 1992

**SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 45

Legislative Assembly - Paper and Envelopes

MR CORNWELL - asked the Speaker. on notice on 7 April 1992:

- (1) When is it intended that all Assembly correspondence, including the standard A4 sheet of letterhead and envelope be provided from recycled paper.
- (2) How many paper and envelope and paper sizes are available to Assembly Members, staff and administration.

MADAM SPEAKER - the answer to Mr Cornwells question is:

- (1) Although it is desirable to use recycled paper, advice has been received from the manufacturers of the photocopiers used within the Assembly building that the use of recycled paper through these machines is not recommended. Some machines only accept copying on one side of the recycled paper, while other machines would have to have the paper individually fed through so as to avoid a buildup of moisture within the photocopier and subsequent jamming. In the forward acquisition program for the Assembly budget a high priority will be placed on photocopiers that are compatible with recycled paper.

Accordingly, it is not intended to introduce recycled paper for the standard A4 copy paper or sheet of letterhead. However, should Members wish to have recycled paper that will not be used in photocopiers, stocks will be supplied. Consideration will be given to using other recycled stationery, not being A4 paper, as existing stocks are exhausted.

Envelopes are not currently provided on recycled paper, but it is intended to replace the current stocks once they are exhausted with recycled paper envelopes.

34 2

(2) There are four sizes of envelopes available to Members and their staff, and they listed below

DL (22cm x 11cm)

PC (23cm x 32.5cm)

PBS (25.5cm x 18cm)

PC3 (45cm x 32cm)

There are two sizes of paper available to Members, staff and administration, namely A4 and A3.

343

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION 52

Health Portfolio - Consultants

Mr Kaine - asked the Minister for Health on notice on 8 April 1992:

(1) In the period from 31 October 1991 to 31 March 1992 what consultants were employed other than for public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks by (a) the Minister; and (b) each agency in the Minister's portfolio.

(2) For each consultant employed, what was (a), the purpose; (b) the duration; and (c) the cost of the consultancy.

Mr Berry - the answer to Mr Kaine's question is as follows:

1(a) The Minister has not employed any consultants in the period from 31 October 1991 to 31 March 1992.

1(b) A full list of consultancies for ACT Health for the period 31 October 1991 to 31 March 1992 indicating the purpose and cost of each consultancy is attached. All expenditure listed in the Attachment has been paid within this time period. Some of the consultancies listed are not completed and are identified in the Attachment by the word "ongoing".

344

Cost Of Consultants Fees Paid For Services Rendered

From 31 October 1991 to 31 March 1992

Name of Consultant dose Duration Cost to Date
TASA/ERC Pty Ltd Staff selection Completed \$7,143
Melbourne Vic service
MG Sinclair Pty Ltd Financial Ongoing \$8,125
Forrest ACT consultancy
services on
budget allocations
Shane Solomon Future options Completed \$13,500
Kew Victoria for Community & Public Health structures

Judi Ann Dawson Case mix Ongoing \$763
Daffy ACT development

Fleming Associates Nursing Completed ^\$8,889
St Ives NSW information system project
Jenny Morison Financial Ongoing \$10,395
OMalley ACT Statements

Harris Van Meegan Staff selection Completed \$525
Canberra ACT service
Nicole Moutia Assertion course Completed \$100
Canberra ACT for women
Harris Van Meegan Staff selection Completed \$975
Canberra ACT service

Womens Health Network Seminar on Completed \$250
Canberra ACT women and body image
Rochford, Bancroft & Production of Completed \$6,085
Associates, Canberra annual report

Revin Hardy & Assoc Organisational Completed \$8,504
Hunters Hill NSW assessment,

Corporate development

Elaine Harris Case Mix Completed \$200
Campbell ACT workshop

Coopers & Lybrand P/L Management & Completed \$16,746
Canberra ACT peoples skills program

345

12 May 1992

Cost Of Consultants Fees Paid For Services Rendered

From 31 October 1991 to 31 March 1992

Name of Consultant Purpose Duration Cost to Date

ACTAid Pty Ltd Writing for Completed \$3,736

Canberra ACT work workshop

Intellectual Frontline Completed \$1,810

Disability Service managers program

Canberra ACT

Roger Fry and Co Handling the Completed \$11,200

Canberra ACT media program

Roger Fry and Co Needs analysis Completed \$4,450

Canberra ACT interview program

Roger Fry and Co Communication Completed \$6,650

Canberra ACT refresher program

hpnette 6lending Individual Completed \$200

Canberra ACT development program

Professor E. Davis Senior Completed \$2,500

Macquarie University management program

Pauline Chiarelli Physiotherapy Completed \$370

Mount Vincent NSW quality assurance
workshop

C. Gostelow Workshop on Completed \$1,500

Subiaco WA prevention and

management of

youth suicide

Harris Van Meegan Staff selection Completed \$1,287

Canberra ACT service

Harris Van Meegan Staff selection Completed \$312

Canberra ACT service

Ambulance Service Investigation Completed \$2,000

Victoria of replacement

ambulance

Work Futures Ambulance Completed \$1,500

Goulburn NSW management training

Driver Training Defensive Completed \$2,100

Consultancy Services driving course

Canberra ACT

34 6

Cost Of Consultants Fees Paid For Services Rendered

From 31 October 1991 to 31 March 1992

Name of Consultant Date Duration Cost to Date

Work Futures Ambulance ongoing \$1,350

Goulburn NSW consultancy service

Thelma Leach Workshops on Completed \$800

Canberra ACT creative capers
in the kitchen

Computerised Software Development of Completed \$3,000

Solutions, Mitchell centralised respite
booking system

Imagepod Pty Ltd Equipment scheme Completed \$200

Canberra ACT project -

J. Herrill Development of Completed \$340

Chiley ACT CIwealth report

on ACT Cervical
Screening Campaign

Nick Read Discussion, paper Completed \$14,000

Glebe NSW on HIV/AIDS

Strategic Plan

347

12 May 1992

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

QUESTION NO 57

Treasurer - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Treasurer upon notice on
8 April 1992:-

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992 -

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MS FOLLETT - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows:

In my official capacity as Treasurer I did not travel interstate during the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

348

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 58

Minister for Education and Training - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for Education and Training upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; -and (b) each staff member.

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Kainés question is as follows:

I have made five interstate visits in my official capacity as Minister for Education and Training in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992 the details of which are as follows:

- (i) CITY VISITED: Melbourne
DATE/S: 8 - 9 August 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Education Ministers Conference
ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil
COST OF VISIT: Minister \$ 498-00

349

12 May 1992

(ii) CITY VISITED: Adelaide
DATE/S: 2 - 5 October 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Visit Schools in Adelaide

* this travel also included the Animai Welfare Ministers Conference

ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil

COST OF VISIT: Minister \$ 600-00

(iii)CITY VISITED: Melbourne
DATE/S: 17 - 18 October 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Education Ministers Conference
ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil

COST OF VISIT: Minister \$ 485-00

(iv) CITY VISITED: Melbourne
DATE/S: 8 November 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Ministers of Vocational,
Education, Employment and Training
Meeting .
ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil

COST OF VISIT: Minister \$ 370-00

(v) CITY VISITED: Adelaide
DATE/S: 20 March 1992
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Education Ministers Meeting
ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil
COST OF VISIT: Minister \$ 743-00

350

MINISTER FOR HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 59

Minister for Health - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for Health upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR BERRY - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows:

I have made two interstate visits in my official capacity as Minister for Health in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992, the details of which are as follows:

(i) CITY VISITED: Sydney
DATE/S: 5 - 6 September 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Health and Social Welfare
Ministers Conference
ACCOMPANIED BY: Sue Robinson - Senior Private
Secretary
COST OF VISIT: Minister for Health S 300-00

Sue Robinson S 241-00

(ii) CITY VISITED: Sydney
DATE/S: 24 - 25 October 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Visit to Westmead Hospital
ACCOMPANIED BY: Sue Robinson - Senior Private
Secretary
COST OF VISIT: Minister for Health \$ 300-00

Sue Robinson \$ 222-00

351

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

Question No 60

**Minister for the Environment, Land and
Planning - Interstate Visits**

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows:

I have made one interstate visit in my official capacity as Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992 the details of which are as follows:

- (i) CITY VISITED: Adelaide
DATE/S: 2 - 5 October 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: Animal Welfare Ministers Conference
* this travel also included
visiting schools in Adelaide
ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil
COST OF VISIT: Minister \$ 600-00

352

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 61

Attorney-General - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Attorney General upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992

(1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.

(2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.

(3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.

(4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR CONNOLLY - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows:

I have made two interstate visits in my official capacity as Attorney-General, in the period 7 August 1991 to . 31 March 1992, the details of which are as follows:

(i) CITY VISITED: Melbourne

DATE/S: 24 - 25 October 1991

REASON FOR TRAVEL: Standing Committee of Attorneys
General

ACCOMPANIED BY: Jo Baker _ Senior Private
Secretary

COST OF VISIT: Attorney General \$ 670-00

Jo Baker \$ 559-00

(ii)CITY VISITED: Launceston

DATE/S: 12 - 13 March 1992

REASON FOR TRAVEL: Standing Committee of Attorneys
General

ACCOMPANIED BY: Nil

COST OF VISIT: Attorney General \$ 894-00

353

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

Question No 62

**Minister for Housing and Community Services -
Interstate Visits**

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for Housing and Community Services upon notice on-8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to,31 March 1992

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR CONNOLLY - the answer to Mr Kainés question is as follows:

I have made two interstate visits in my official capacity as Minister for Housing and Community Services, in.the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992 the details of which are as follows:

(i) CITY VISITED: Melbourne

DATE/S: 29 August to 1 September 1991

REASON FOR TRAVEL: Housing Ministers Conference

ACCOMPANIED BY: Jo Baker - Senior Private Secretary

COST OF TRAVEL: Minister \$ 670-00

Jo Baker \$ 565-50

(ii) CITY VISITED: Sydney

DATE/S: 5 - 7 September 1991

REASON FOR TRAVEL: Health and Social Welfare

Ministers Conference and visit

to Long Bay Gaol

ACCOMPANIED BY: Jo Baker - Senior Private Secretary

COST OF TRAVEL: Minister \$ 600-00

Jo Baker \$ 509-00

354

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

Question No 63

Minister for Urban Services - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for Urban Services upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August to 31 March 1992

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, byname and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR CONNOLLY - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows:

I have made one interstate visit in my official capacity as Minister for Urban Services, in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992 the details of which are as follows:

(i) CITY VISITED: Goulburn
DATE/S: 13 December 1991
REASON FOR TRAVEL: NSW - ACT Consultative Forum
ACCOMPANIED BY: Jo Baker - Senior Private
Secretary
COST OF TRAVEL: Minister Nil

Jo Baker Nil

355

12 May 1992

**MINISTER FOR HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION 65

**Health Portfolio - Public Relations
Consultants**

Mr Kaine - asked the minister for Health on notice on 8 April 1992:

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in (a) the Ministers Office; (b) the Ministers Department; and (c) each agency for which the Minister has responsibility in the period.? August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

Mr Berry - the answer to Mr Kaines question is as follows:

There were no consultants engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in (a) the Ministers Office; and (b) in ACT Health in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

356

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 66

**Education and Training Portfolio -
Public Relations Consultants**

MR KAINÉ - asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 8 April 1992:

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in

- (a) the Ministers Office;
- (b) the Ministers Department; and
- (c) each agency for which the Minister has responsibility in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is:

Ministers Office - nil

VTA - nil

TAFE - nil

EDUCATION - Government Schooling Program.

Fairweather Bebbington Associations Pty Ltd. Burson-Marsteller.

357

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 67

**Environment, Land and Planning Portfolio -
Public Relations Consultants**

Mr Kaine - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning -

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in

(a) the Ministers office; (b) the Ministers department; and (c) each agency for which the Minister has responsibility in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March . 1992.

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

(a) Nil

(b) and (c) Attached

358

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

Question on Notice No. 67

CONSULTANT PURPOSE DURATION COST

To facilitate and publicise the July 1991 to 5,000 (Total)

Apple Blossom Festival September 1991 3,300 (for period)

(The Apple Blossom Festival is held at Pialligo each year on the final weekend of the Floriade Festival as part of the Floriade Program. Approximately 10,000 people attend this agricultural/horticultural event which has a carnival atmosphere. The festival is successful in building rapport between urban and rural communities and is beneficial in providing increased business and tourism for the ACT and Pialligo in particular.)

Mr P Hobbs Assistance with public 18 March 1992 to 10,500 presentation of Departments 31 July 1992 programs

Turnbull Fox Phillips Preparation of Public August 1991 Consultation Material and November 1991 management of the Public Consultation process for the release of the Draft Territory Plan

12 May 1992

**ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL
TERRITORY**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 68

**Attorney-General Portfolio - Public
Relations Consultants**

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Attorney General upon notice on 7 April 1992:

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in

- (a) the Attorney Generals Office.
- (b) the Attorney Generals Department; and each agency for which the Attorney General has responsibility in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

MR CONNOLLY - The answer to the members question is as follows:

- (a) Nil
- (b) Nil
- (c) Nil

360

**MINISTER FOR HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 69

**Housing and Community Services Portfolio -
Public Relations Consultants**

MR KAINÉ - asked the Minister for Housing and Community Services:

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising and related tasks in: the Ministers Office;

(b) the Ministers Department; and each agency for which the Minister has responsibility in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

MR CONNOLLY - the answer to the Members question is as follows:

None

(b) None

The NSW Department of Housing provided assistance to the ACT Housing Trust between December 1991 and 31 March 1992 to establish Home Ownership Information Nights: the cost was \$4200.

361

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 70

Urban Services Portfolio - Public Relations Consultants

Mr Kaine - asked the Minister for Urban Services:

What consultants have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in (a) the Ministers Office; (b) the Minister's Department; and (c) each agency for which the Minister has responsibility in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

Mr Connolly - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

(a) Nil

(b) ACTION - Juliana Madden
Media Marketing Group Pty Ltd

(c) ACTEW - Neville Jeffress .
Grey Advertising

362

MINISTER FOR THE ARTS
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 72

Minister for the Arts - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992

- (1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.
- (2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.
- (3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.
- (4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR WOOD - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows:

In my official capacity as Minister for the Arts I did not travel interstate during the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

363

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR SPORT
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NO 73

Minister for Sport - Interstate Visits

MR KAINÉ - Asked the Minister for Sport upon notice on 8 April 1992:

In the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992

(1) How many interstate visits were made by you in your official capacity.

(2) What was the destination, duration and purpose of each visit.

(3) What staff members, by name and position, accompanied you on each occasion.

(4) What was the cost of each visit by (a) yourself; and (b) each staff member.

MR BERRY - the answer to Mr Kainé's question is as follows

In my official capacity as Minister for Sport I did not travel interstate during the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

364

MINISTER FOR SPORT

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION No 74

**Sport Portfolio - Public
Relations Consultants**

Mr Kaine - asked the Minister for Sport -

What consultants. have been engaged in public relations, media, advertising, promotional and related tasks in (a) the Ministers. Office;. (b) the Ministers Department; and (c) each agency.for which the Minister has responsibility in the period 7 August 1991 to 31 March 1992.

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

No.consultants have been employed for this purpose by the Ministers Department or any agency for which the Minister has responsibility in the specified period.

365

12 May 1992

MINISTER FOR HEALTH
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION 77

Nursing Home Type Beds

Mrs Carnell - asked the Minister for Health:

1. How many nursing home type beds exist within ACT public hospitals?
2. What percentage of total hospital beds does this represent?

Mr Berry - the answer to Mrs Carnells question is:

1. At Calvary Hospital there is a dedicated twenty bed unit for nursing home type patients, that is, patients who have been in hospital for more than 35 days and who are not expected to recover sufficiently to be discharged, but who do not require acute care. These beds are not funded by the Commonwealth as a nursing home.

At Woden Valley Hospital there are no dedicated beds. Numbers of nursing home type patients vary throughout the year. These patients may be accommodated in various areas as suitable.

2. In 1990-91 4.2 per cent of occupied bed days in the ACT public hospitals were for nursing home type patients.

366

MINISTER FOR HEALTH

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 78

Nursing Home Waiting Lists

Mrs Carnell - asked the Minister for Health:

Can the Minister inform the Assembly as to how many older people have been assessed by the Geriatric Assessment Team (GAT) as qualifying for nursing home placement but who remain on a nursing home waiting list?

Mr Berry - the answer to Mrs Carnell's question is:

The number of older people assessed by the Geriatric Assessment Team (GAT) and awaiting a place in a nursing home is 73.

These people are currently located at:

Woden Valley Hospital 11
Calvary Hospital 3
Hostels 7
Within the Community 15
Queanbeyan 8
Other Interstate Awaiting
Transfer (not assessed by ACT
GAT but assessed by GAT
interstate) 29
Total 73

367