



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

25 November 1992

Wednesday, 25 November 1992

Petitions:

Residential development - North Watson	3403
Stirling Avenue Reserve	3404

Paper	3404
-------------	------

Bail (Amendment) Bill 1992	3404
----------------------------------	------

Education (Amendment) Bill 1992	3406
---------------------------------------	------

Australian Federal Police - poem	3410
--	------

Acton Peninsula	3415
-----------------------	------

Questions without notice:

Public and private sector enterprises	3435
---	------

Government Service - enterprise agreement	3436
---	------

Crime rates	3438
-------------------	------

Woden Valley Hospital - surgical operations	3440
---	------

Urban renewal - North Watson	3440
------------------------------------	------

ACTEW - employment policy	3441
---------------------------------	------

Public sector productivity	3441
----------------------------------	------

Tuggeranong swimming centre	3443
-----------------------------------	------

Violence against women - national strategy	3444
--	------

Papers	3447
--------------	------

Public safety in Civic (Matter of public importance)	3448
--	------

Appropriation Bill 1992-93	3462
----------------------------------	------

Estimates - select committee	3480
------------------------------------	------

Adjournment:

Mrs Kate Carnell	3480
------------------------	------

Floriade display : Taylor Primary School fete	3481
---	------

Wednesday, 25 November 1992

MADAM SPEAKER (Ms McRae) took the chair at 10.30 am and read the prayer.

PETITIONS

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

By **Mr Moore**, from 65 residents, requesting that the Assembly act to delay any substantial residential development in North Watson until the wider impact of such development on North Canberra and Gungahlin has been fully assessed in the context of the Territory Plan.

By **Mr Moore**, from 77 residents, requesting that the Assembly direct ACT Electricity and Water to plant and nurture an equivalent number of trees in "safe" locations in the Stirling Avenue Reserve as a demonstration of the Territory's commitment to the "billion trees" program initiated by the Federal Government.

The terms of these petitions will be recorded in *Hansard* and a copy referred to the appropriate Minister.

Residential Development - North Watson

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

at this time the Watson and Hackett communities believe that any residential development in North Watson is "greenfields" and not "urban infill" and that any such development will be at the expense of the residents and developers of Gungahlin as well as adversely impacting the amenity of the area for the residents of North Canberra.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

act to delay any substantial residential development in North Watson until the wider impact of such development on North Canberra and Gungahlin has been fully assessed in the context of the Territory Plan.

25 November 1992

Stirling Avenue Reserve

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

a large number (in excess of 100) of mature wattles, and other trees, which enhanced the amenity of Stirling Avenue Reserve in Watson, were chopped down by ACT Electricity and Water in an act of environmental vandalism on November 18 and 19.

Your petitioners therefore request the Assembly to:

direct ACT Electricity and Water to plant and nurture an equivalent number of trees in "safe" locations in the Stirling Avenue Reserve as a demonstration of the Territory's commitment to the "billion trees" program initiated by the Federal Government.

Petitions received.

PAPER

MR STEVENSON: Madam Speaker, I ask for leave to present a petition which does not conform with standing orders in that it does not contain a request.

Leave granted.

MR STEVENSON: I present an out-of-order petition from 26 residents opposing the sale of X-rated videos and the promotion of pornography.

BAIL (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992

MR HUMPHRIES (10.32): Madam Speaker, I present the Bail (Amendment) Bill 1992.

Title read by Clerk.

MR HUMPHRIES: I move:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

The presentation of this Bill today is a response to considerable and fairly grave community concern about certain aspects of our criminal justice system in the ACT. The Bill will effect a small but important change to the law with respect to the granting of bail by our courts.

Members will recall the very considerable community concern that has been expressed in the past few months about questions relating to bail. Earlier this year, one woman in particular who stands out staged a protest for several days outside the Supreme Court. She camped outside the court to make a protest about a particular issue with which she was involved. Her concern - and I think she spoke with not only me but a number of members of this Assembly - was the position of the courts on the granting of bail for a second offence while a person was out on bail on a first offence. I do not wish to delve into the circumstances of that case. I say only that other cases of that kind have given rise to similar concerns, and there are other instances of community reaction to a court order granting bail.

I spoke to the police about the circumstances in which bail is granted, and I was told of a particular case they were concerned about where an offender had been granted a third set of bail, after an initial offence, and police were quite sure that that person would appear again for a further breach of bail. I think it is true to say that bail is not a right; it is a privilege which is granted in certain circumstances where a court is satisfied that a person is entitled to his liberty, notwithstanding that he has been charged with a particular offence. The community has, I submit, every right to regulate the circumstances in which that privilege is granted.

This measure is designed both to assess properly the worthiness of an applicant before a court to receive bail and to protect the legitimate interests of the community. Those interests, of course, are primarily interests of safety, not only for witnesses in particular proceedings but also for victims. Obviously, matters involving sexual molestation and sexual offences have a very high profile in this area. The Bill amends section 5 of the Bail Act, which we put into law only early this year.

Mr Connolly: And in which we tried the same amendment.

MR HUMPHRIES: Indeed. The circumstances in which a person is given bail on a first offence and then comes before the court for a second offence while on bail are dealt with in section 5 of that Act. Where this occurs and the person appears before the court on a second bail application, this Bill provides that bail will be granted only in exceptional circumstances. It still means, I emphasise, that bail is possible. Bail will be granted if the court feels that that is the most appropriate course of action in the circumstances. For example, trivial second offences or very minor breaches of bail conditions would, in the circumstances of this amendment, still be overlooked by the court and a second grant of bail would still be possible.

The onus, in a sense, shifts onto the accused to satisfy the court that a second grant of bail is warranted in the circumstances, notwithstanding the person's apparent unworthiness to receive that grant. This is a tightening of the protection that bail affords both to particular people and to the community generally. This is because the first objective of the criminal justice system is not, I submit, the social rehabilitation of offenders; it is rather the protection of the community and the defence of victims. That means victims both before and after offences are committed.

25 November 1992

I am not the first person in this country to raise concern about bail and bail circumstances in recent days. Members will have seen a discussion paper issued by the New South Wales Labor Opposition about a number of sexual offences and matters relating to that. One of the proposals, according to the report I saw, was that "bail will be refused to offenders who threaten their victims after the initial crime".

Mr Connolly: And that is the current law in the ACT.

MR HUMPHRIES: That is not the case. The situation is that courts at the present time have fairly unlimited discretion, taking into account certain matters.

Mr Connolly: Because the new Act does not come into force until Saturday, but under the new Act we have addressed that.

MR HUMPHRIES: Okay. The fact of life is that the Opposition in New South Wales were saying that the community is entitled to impose standards as to when it sees bail being granted. The community as a whole is entitled to formulate and set those standards, and this Bill does that. It sets certain standards and says, "We believe that only in exceptional circumstances should a person who has clearly shown himself or herself on face value to be unworthy of bail receive bail a second time". This is, in a sense, an imposition on the discretion of judges and magistrates; there is no doubt about that. But the community is entitled to set standards that it believes are applicable in the case of certain offences and the granting of bail for those offences.

To give an example, we provide for a minimum penalty in the case of a person who drinks and drives. That person must, mandatorily, lose his access to a driver's licence. That is in a sense a minimum penalty. We also set maximum penalties for almost all offences, and probably all offences under our criminal code. We should be looking at making sure that the community standards on this question are adequately reflected in our position with respect to bail. This Bill will reassure many in the community who have concerns about the state of the bail law. I hope that the Government will allow this matter to be debated on the floor of the Assembly. I believe that it might have the prerogative of doing otherwise. I commend the Bill to the Assembly.

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

EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1992

MR MOORE (10.40): Madam Speaker, I present the Education (Amendment) Bill 1992.

Title read by Clerk.

MR MOORE: I move:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

This Bill is intended to promote fairness in decisions regarding the suspension, compulsory transfer, expulsion or exclusion of students from any school in the ACT. In presenting this Bill I am intending to give students and their parents access to a basic right enjoyed by all in our society, outside of the defence forces

and some independent schools - the right of appeal against a decision made by others that may have a lifelong effect on one's future. In order to achieve this, the Bill sets up a board of review the composition of which reflects the interests of the students and the government and independent schools. In other words, it is an external review process that allows a relatively detached and factually based consideration of what is often a contentious issue affected by personal perspectives and antagonisms. An important principle underlying the Bill is the idea that, by publishing the results of the review by the board, schools will be encouraged to make decisions in as fair a manner as possible.

Expulsion from a school is not a minor incident in one's life, especially if it occurs in the critical years 11 or 12. However, I believe that the decision to expel should never be taken lightly and that in some cases it may be the only alternative left to the school. It is generally an action that signifies defeat; that is, the behaviour exhibited by the student has not been seen as symptomatic of a problem - either the student's or the school's - and this problem has not been dealt with. By expelling a student, the management of that school is merely shunting the problem away unresolved.

I am aware that the government school system already has an appeals mechanism and that their policy on student management provides sound mandatory procedures for transfer, exclusion and expulsion. I am pleased and proud to say that these procedures are part of government school policy. I also applaud the Catholic system's recent moves to put an appeals board into operation. However, this leaves quite a few schools with no appeals mechanism, and they appear to be setting themselves above the law and conventional legal processes. The board of review proposed in this Bill will have the capacity, upon application by a student or parent, to examine the decision made by the school, to determine whether or not it was fair, and to remit for consideration any decision that is considered unfair.

This Bill represents the culmination of extensive public consultation. An exposure draft was circulated in September to all schools and relevant bodies for comments. This Bill has substantially the same effect as the exposure draft but has been simplified and further revised to make its language easier to understand. Responses to the exposure draft have ranged from eager support from government sectors and students, from both government and independent schools, to outrage and indignation from some independent executives. I find it interesting that the most outraged responses have come from the very sectors that purport to offer the highest levels of education - they are certainly the most expensive - and that would deny their own charges a basic democratic right: The right to challenge a decision that will severely affect them for many years to come. Does this same educational philosophy demand unquestioning acceptance of a curriculum and educate young people to be submissive and not to defend themselves?

Before those who would scream "interference in the autonomy of schools" jump up and down, I reiterate that I do understand that some expulsions are necessary; that this action is sometimes the only one left to schools in a situation that has become untenable; that schools, as a last resort, having tried a whole host of positive disciplinary actions, are left with expulsion as the only logical choice of action. These schools would find, if a student lodged a complaint, that the

25 November 1992

proposed board of review would ratify the decision made by the school, and ratify it publicly. However, if a school expels a student without going through procedures that are deemed by any reasonable person to be fair, the board of review would just as publicly set aside the decision and remit the decision for reconsideration by the school.

Although the name of the school and the date of the decision would be identified when published for public information, the name of the student involved would not be. The intention underlying the provision in the Bill allowing this action is that the prospect of publicity should encourage schools to make decisions in as fair a manner as possible. Notions of fairness, of course, vary from person to person. This Bill, therefore, lays down guidelines that the board of review must take into account.

The inspiration for this legislation came from the action taken by the Canberra Grammar School earlier this year, which demonstrated a total lack of respect for the law and the principles of natural justice. You may recall that eight year 12 students were expelled from the school in March and, according to a parent of one of the students, "without any effort to counsel the student nor support for the problem". The same parent was upset by the actions of her son and had hoped for support to deal with the problem. Instead, the student was summarily expelled, with absolutely no redress whatsoever.

One of the reasons this case stands out from others is that the school had displayed extraordinary inconsistency in its disciplinary procedures. The misdemeanour that sparked such a flagrant disregard for natural justice was that these eight boys had admitted to smoking marijuana out of school hours and out of school grounds. Apart from the opportunity lost for some sound drug education to be delivered at a most appropriate time, and that these boys were punished severely for their honesty - it actually would have been better for them had they been untruthful - the subsequent action made a mockery of democracy and natural justice. In fact, they were actively being taught that injustice is okay in some exclusive cases, that a favoured few can operate above the law without recrimination.

Many in Canberra, including the parents and other students, described the action taken by Mr Tim Murray, the principal - or, as he terms it, the headmaster - as a witch-hunt and Dickensian, especially as the previous year other students, including Mr Murray's own son, had been suspended for a similar offence. Mr Murray's response to public pressure on the issue this year was to make no comment. Many observers probably saw this as a way of protecting the school. The reality was that he was protecting himself because the laws of defamation made it impossible for anyone else to draw attention to those inconsistencies in school policy.

The reason for raising this issue is to highlight the need for schools to act in accordance with the same laws these students will face in the rest of society. It is not acceptable for any school to set itself above the law and the legal processes. Those students - and probably many we do not hear about - have a right to a fair hearing and to a reasonable punishment consistent with the community's sense of justice.

Mr De Domenico: They probably already get that anyway.

MR MOORE: Clearly, Mr De Domenico was not listening, or he has no idea of what a sense of justice is. The parents have the right to test evidence used, to determine - - -

Mr De Domenico: No; I am listening. I am finding it very difficult not to object a bit more to this garbage that is going on.

MR MOORE: The interjection from Mr De Domenico again says that he finds it difficult to understand. Mr De Domenico, what is proposed here is an arm's length body to assess that a fair and equitable decision was made - nothing else.

Mr De Domenico: That is your opinion.

MR MOORE: That is exactly what is proposed. It would allow for the decisions to be tested - the same system that applies to law across Australia. Any time somebody goes to court, he or she has the opportunity to test a decision that is made, and that is what we are saying here. Why ought not these students to have the right to test a system, as indeed they do in most schools in Canberra? In government schools they have had this right for quite some time. The Catholic education system, since I put out my exposure draft of this Bill, has now established a system. It is a general system. The schools that have not are the schools that at this stage are most guilty.

The parents have the right to test evidence used, to determine whether it was gained under duress, as indeed was the case in the Canberra Grammar School - that is something we would not allow our police force to do - and to examine the disciplinary procedures that were put into action before the decision to expel was made. I am not saying that you cannot expel; I am saying that it has to be a fair process. The fact that the phone call at 6.00 pm from Canberra Grammar to the parents informing them that their son had been expelled was the first indication these parents had that there was a problem is evidence that appropriate disciplinary procedures were not used to deal with this problem. Perhaps these students were scapegoats, as indeed they believed, expelled in an unjust way as an example to others. This is not just, it is not sound educational practice, and it sends out conflicting messages about justice and why the law has due process. In the example just quoted, it also sends out inappropriate messages about drug education.

This Bill will have the effect of ensuring that the schools adhere to procedures that are fair and can stand up to scrutiny by an independent board. It is my sincere hope that, should this Bill pass, the board of review will not even have to be convened, but the possibility of a review will ensure a just approach to disciplinary problems. The Bill is basic to democratic principles. It gives students in all schools the same right they can expect in all other sectors of our community: The right to be treated justly and with fairness.

Madam Speaker, I seek leave to present an explanatory memorandum to this Bill.

Leave granted.

MR MOORE: I present an explanatory memorandum to the Bill.

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

AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL POLICE - POEM

MR HUMPHRIES (10.53): I move:

That this Assembly:

- (1) notes that Dr John Tomlinson of the ACT Council of Social Service is the author of a poem titled 'Too Many Cops' published in the Green Left Weekly No. 62 of 15 July 1992;
- (2) notes that this poem contains a number of statements concerning the Australian Federal Police operating in Canberra as well as a reference to the murder of Assistant Commissioner Colin Winchester;
- (3) notes the following extracts of the poem:

*There are too many cops here in Canberra,
coppers who lie and cheat.
But the bourgeoisie of the ACT
wants more of them on the beat.*

*There are too many cops here in Canberra
coppers who bash and who maim
But the bourgeoisie of the ACT
wants more of them all the same.*

*They had a Commissioner in Canberra
who shot him we'll never know.
But it's one cop less
and it caused no distress.*

*They're cutting more staff in health
increasing police budgets by stealth
corruption and fraud is by coppers ignored
and welfare we just can't afford;*

- (4) condemns allegations contained in the poem as sick, tasteless and highly offensive; and
- (5) affirms its confidence in the very high standards set by officers of the Australian Federal Police and its commitment to the protection of all law-abiding residents and visitors to the Territory regardless of age, race, gender or social circumstances.

Madam Speaker, this matter has been on the notice paper for some time. I do not intend to take long, because I think the matter has sifted down into our minds fairly well by now. There are some important points to make about this incident which should not be lost on the Assembly and which I believe we need to make very clearly in case anyone should choose in the future to emulate what Dr Tomlinson has done.

Let me say at the outset that I know Dr Tomlinson quite well and I think he is a man who has a great deal to offer the ACT community. However, I believe that on the occasion to which I have drawn attention in this motion Dr Tomlinson crossed the line from acceptable and decent behaviour in the course of public debate on issues that affect our community and entered into an area where debate became below the standard we would expect of people who are, as it were, figures in the community and whom we would expect to make responsible contributions.

In a publication that has the excuse of being obscure, I suppose - the *Green Left Weekly*, published on 15 July 1992 - Dr Tomlinson published a poem that contained a number of comments or statements about the Australian Federal Police, who provide policing services in this Territory, and made references also to the late Assistant Commissioner Colin Winchester. I will not dignify the poem by reading it into the *Hansard*. I note only that it contains a number of scurrilous and scandalous assertions and that it represents an attitude towards the police in this Territory that I believe none of us could afford ever to uphold.

I believe that the allegations contained in the poem are sick, tasteless and highly offensive, and I believe that it behoves this Assembly to put as much distance as possible between those sentiments and us. I also believe that it is important for us at the same time to reaffirm our confidence in the very high standard that is set by officers of the Australian Federal Police, who do an important job, a vital job, for the welfare of this community, and to reaffirm our commitment to the protection of citizens of the Territory through the agency of the Australian Federal Police.

Clearly, there are certain obligations on all of us who take part in debate on major issues in this community to abide by certain standards, to operate under certain obligations. I believe that the first and foremost of those obligations is to debate matters in a responsible manner. It is extremely easy for people in the position of, for example, those of us in this place to make statements that are irresponsible, that act to ignite public hatred, and that could in certain circumstances cause grave harm to the community interest.

Mr Wood: I take great care. Speak for yourself.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Wood indicates that he always says things in a responsible fashion, and I am sure that that is very true. I hope that it is true of all of us in this place. I think that on occasions we get tempted to say things we ought not to say, and occasionally we have succumbed to that. We all might have been guilty at least once of succumbing to temptation, at least in part; but, when we do, we are drawn up pretty quickly on those matters and we accept that that sort of behaviour, for the most part, is beyond the pale. I think Dr Tomlinson in this particular case has indicated that he understands that he went beyond the pale, that what he did was unacceptable and a tasteless intervention in a matter that has caused serious concern among the Australian Federal Police and also the family of the late Colin Winchester.

We have the duty I mentioned to debate responsibly, and that is because all of us who take part in debate on public issues in this community represent a constituency of one sort or another. Obviously, those of us who sit in this place have a direct constituency based on our election to the Assembly, with whatever

25 November 1992

varying percentage of the vote we might have achieved at the most recent election. Others, who represent peak organisations such as the Council on the Ageing or the Council of Social Service or union organisations or whatever it might be, represent that constituency. That gives those people both the right to say certain things and the duty to exercise that right in a responsible manner. If that position is abused, we abuse our position and reflect badly on those we represent in our constituency.

We should be quick to indicate that we do not believe the sentiments that were expressed in Dr Tomlinson's poem. I believe that the police of the Australian Capital Territory - the Australian Federal Police - operate at a very high standard. It is a matter of public record that police forces in other States have experienced problems ranging from minor misdemeanours of various sorts to full-scale corruption. That is not a revelation of any startling impact in the present environment. But I will say that the Australian Federal Police have maintained a standard that is considerably higher than those that have operated on occasions in other State police forces. We are extremely lucky that we have a police force of the high standard we enjoy in the ACT. We should cherish that high standard. We should commend the police for their capacity to maintain those standards and help them, through cooperation, to build on that good record. We do nothing to assist that standard's maintenance or the high repute in which the police are held by letting poems of the kind that is before us today go uncommented upon.

It would be foolish to assert that there has never been any corruption of any kind in, for example, the Australian Federal Police. It would be foolish to assert that no policeman has ever assaulted a person in the Australian Capital Territory in circumstances that were not warranted. Those things are true in a very limited sense. It is equally true to say that there have been politicians in the past - not necessarily in the Australian Capital Territory - who have acted improperly. There are public servants who have acted improperly. Whether that constitutes a symptom or a characteristic of those people that is typical of that class of person is another matter. I would say to the Assembly that it is clearly the case that exceptions here prove the rule. I am not pretending that people in these categories, particularly in the Australian Federal Police, are perfect; but I believe that to make the assertions that are made in this poem reflects in an unwarranted way on the vast majority of police, and the assertions ought to be repudiated by this Assembly.

I will say no more than that, other than to urge the Assembly to pass this motion on the basis, most importantly, that it affirms our confidence in the high standards that are set by police in the Territory and our belief that we can build on those high standards by working with the police to maintain a high level of integrity, free of the taints and problems that have plagued police forces in other States, and to ensure that the quality of servicing we get from ACT police is second to none in Australia.

MR CONNOLLY (Attorney-General, Minister for Housing and Community Services and Minister for Urban Services) (11.01): The Government supports this motion. When this poem was first brought to my attention, it was condemned immediately in the most vigorous terms. I said at the time that I personally and most members on this side of the house have a lot of respect for Dr Tomlinson in his role in ACTCOSS as the champion of the underdog. The work he does in the

welfare lobby is very valuable and his views are treated generally with the utmost respect by government. But on this occasion, as I said at the time, he went overboard. That poem was offensive and unacceptable. At the time, I spoke with the widow of the senior police officer concerned and expressed my and the Government's concern for the distress the poem must have caused her.

The Government supports Mr Humphries's motion. In concurring with his views about the way the police are generally held in the community, it is a matter of considerable pride to this Assembly that the community surveying that is regularly done shows that the AFP is held consistently in very high esteem by about 90 per cent of the Canberra population. That is a public approval rating for which any other police force in this country would give its right arm. Police forces in a number of jurisdictions in recent years have been shown to have had corrupt elements in them; they have been shown to have been engaged in unacceptable conduct. The AFP has not been in that position, and that is a matter of considerable pride for every resident of Canberra.

MR MOORE (11.03): Madam Speaker, in rising to support this motion I think it is important to note some concerns I have. I emphasise that I am supporting the motion and that I also have the same concern about the publication of an entirely inappropriate poem. Members of the Assembly have already expressed their distaste for that poem. However, at the same time it is very important for us to realise that it must be a very frustrating experience for people who are on the receiving end of police violence particularly to express what is happening, and at Deakin recently I noticed a couple of walls painted in disgust at police violence.

I have a great deal of respect for the Federal Police. I am sure that many people in Western Australia would have said recently that they had a great deal of respect for the Western Australian police. Yet only yesterday a police sergeant was dismissed for violence - an appropriate action for that police force to take - and I imagine that that sends a message to all police forces. Where there are constant reports of violence, it is important for us to be conscious of it, to be aware of it and to assess it. That is not to take away from that part of the motion that says that the Assembly affirms its confidence in the very high standards set by officers of the Australian Federal Police. In all these situations - in the Western Australian situation in relation to violence - it is most likely that we are talking about one officer who has let the side down, and perhaps that can happen.

At no stage am I making the general comment that I think it is a practice, or whatever, in the Australian Federal Police. I also support this motion to affirm my confidence in the police generally. Nevertheless, I think we have to be aware, because it is part of our role, that such things go on occasionally. We have to be aware of the incredible frustration people feel when they are on the receiving end of such actions. To that extent, I would like to congratulate the Attorney-General, as Minister for police, for moving to install video cameras in police lock-ups throughout Canberra. I think that will serve two purposes: Firstly, to make people who are arrested feel more comfortable; and, secondly and in many ways much more importantly, so that the police not only are acting above board but are seen to be acting above board - - -

Mr Connolly: And the police are very comfortable about it.

25 November 1992

MR MOORE: And when people make untrue claims they have a way to defend themselves. My discussions with a police officer on duty one Saturday night when I went out with the police indicated that the police themselves are very pleased - as Mr Connolly interjected - to have those video cameras there. That in itself reflects a very positive attitude by our police force. To end on a very positive note, Madam Speaker, I think Mr Humphries was right to put this motion and, with those few words of caution, I am delighted to support it.

MR STEVENSON (11.06): Dr John Tomlinson has a position of authority in this community with the ACT Council of Social Service. He has been responsible for many achievements in the community for those who are underprivileged. However, in this case he has abused his authority. This was not an off the cuff statement. It was not a spur of the moment thing. It was a poem that was worked on and then sought to be published and published. John Tomlinson, whom I also know well, deserves to be condemned for supporting the very thing that he would say he works against. What he supports with the action of publishing this poem is a division in our society between the police and those people who may be influenced by his position, by his past activities, and who may read this poem as the statement of someone who should know and should be the sort of person who can be followed and believed.

On many occasions I have spoken to young people in Canberra, particularly around Garema Place, about the police. It is not rare to hear them speak disparagingly of police. I have also on rarer occasions spoken to police and heard them say things about some of the younger people. Why does this happen? If we continue to support this idea of a disconnection of separate people, we will continue to have the problems. Many times I have said to young people when they have said something about the police, "Why don't you look at it from their point of view? Why don't you try to work with the police?". Certainly, I say the same thing to police.

It is only by working together that we will make changes and have the understanding we need to live in harmony in our community. As a former policeman I well understand both viewpoints. Mr Moore mentions the frustration of someone who has been beaten. There is also a frustration by police when they arrest somebody who was part of a group of 20 people on a Saturday night and who went up to a father walking along with his wife and kids and king-hit him and put the boot in. I can well understand the frustration of police with young people who do these things. As a former policeman with nearly eight years' service, naturally enough I have come across many, having worked in the city of Sydney, particularly at night-time.

So, while there is frustration on both sides, the answer is not to do the things that were put forward in this poem. As Mr Humphries so well put it, the statements about the late Colin Winchester were absolutely appalling. Dr Tomlinson should make an apology to all concerned, and in the *Green Left Weekly*. This morning none of us has mentioned the *Green Left Weekly*. After all, Dr Tomlinson's poem would not have been read had it not been published. Is it not fair to condemn also the magazine that published his words? Many people state things that should not be published. It is the editor's responsibility to act as a censor. Naturally enough, when something is said that is as disgusting as this poem, it should be censored.

I know that some people will say, "Oh, here is Dennis Stevenson talking about censorship". But we should understand that every society that has ever existed and every society that will exist will have censorship. When you look at this poem, it is a good example of something that should be censored. I too will make sure that I do not put the words in the *Hansard*, but those people who have read it will know of what we speak this morning.

The Australian Federal Police have long been known for their high standard. When I was a member of the New South Wales Police Force, we looked upon the AFP as having the best standards of any police force in Australia. There is one benefit from being in a smaller community: I must admit that it could be easier to gain a better name. Nevertheless, they have had a very good name for a long time, and deservedly so. There are always cases within any organisation - police, social welfare, parliaments and others - of acts that need condemnation. We all know, because of reports in the media of charges against people in these areas, that action has been taken, and so it should be. Dr Tomlinson, supported by public money, has done a disservice to this community, to the people who read *Green Left Weekly* and to the people he stands for, and he should apologise.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ACTON PENINSULA

MR MOORE (11.13): I move:

That this Assembly directs the Government to:

- (1) retain the use of the Acton Peninsula site, namely section 55 and 33, block 5, for a public health facility with rehabilitation, aged care services, convalescent facilities, Queen Elizabeth II home for mothers and babies, a hospice, clinical medical school, community health and related facilities; and
- (2) establish a Chair of Community Medicine and a Chair of Rehabilitation and Aged Care as part of a Centre of Excellence in Aged Care on the Acton Peninsula.

I make no apology for the fact that this motion comes directly out of Labor Party policy. But, Madam Speaker, you watch them squirm when they are directed to put their policy into practice. What we are going to see over the next little while is a big squirm from the Minister for Health, and probably the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning, because he does not want to put his policy into action.

Labor Party policy makes it quite clear what should happen. But I will bet you that what we are about to see is a repeat of what we saw when Labor came into power in their second time in government in the First Assembly. They made it very clear to the people of Canberra that they wanted to retain the Canberra hospital, and the Chief Minister had even tabled a Bill to retain the Canberra hospital. They had been hitting Gary Humphries over the head for ages saying, "You cannot close the Royal Canberra Hospital". They had the opportunity to reopen it, Madam Speaker, but what did they do? They squirmed, turned around and broke their promises, and basically let down the people of Canberra. It was a shameful activity, and I would not be surprised if we see a repeat of it here.

25 November 1992

The Labor Party has been entirely inconsistent on the Acton Peninsula. They have a new idea for it now: "Let us put down there a stack of high density homes". They are going to start with two- or three-storey homes; and before we know it there will be a whole series of towers down there similar to the Kingston Tower. Who knows what they are going to do with it? What we do know is that if this motion were to be carried they would at least be directed to carry out the policy they went to the people of Canberra on. Are they going to be happy with that? You can be sure that they will not be. Wayne Berry has already been over to me to say, "Can't we just modify this a little bit? Let us not direct; let us see what we can do to modify this so that we do not actually have to do what is in our policy, so that we have room to move". That, of course, is what they want to do.

Add to that the fact that the National Capital Planning Authority is also trying to get into the act, probably to save their own skins, so that they can be seen to be doing something. They too have a plan for the Acton Peninsula. Basically, they want to take the city of Canberra in a swoop around through university land down to the lake. That university land, of course, is the university's under perpetual lease, and that would require agreement from the university. But at least the National Capital Planning Authority has a long-term strategy. I might not agree with it all, but at least they have it. We know what they are thinking, and they are putting out ideas.

What about the ACT Government? Where is their long-term strategy? They do not have one. They have never had one, and they are unlikely to have one in the future. It will be very interesting to see how the draft Territory Plan, when it becomes a Territory Plan, is modified in order to make it a strategy. The one thing that overwhelmingly came out of the public consultation about the draft Territory Plan was the very message I sent to the Government two hours after I got my embargoed copy in this Assembly: That it had no strategy; that it was a statutory plan, not a strategic plan. We have the same problem here with the Acton Peninsula. They have no idea where they are going or what they are doing. There is just adhocery all over the place as far as the hospital is concerned.

The Minister for Health was kind enough to provide for me a visit to the Woden Valley Hospital, where I was able to look at the procedure that has now taken place to redevelop the hospital. I must say that I appreciated his kind offer to provide that for me. My general feeling, having been through Woden Valley Hospital, was to reinforce the view that it was a mistake to go for the one principal hospital concept; that Gary Humphries and the Liberal Government were conned, in particular by the AMA, on this issue. That is understandable because that is where the Liberals are coming from, and I can understand that. As to Labor being conned - Wayne Berry has often been critical of the AMA - that is another story, and we will probably get a repeat of it here today. In fact, I see that Mr Berry has already circulated an amendment, and no doubt we will have the opportunity to discuss that at a later time.

I am a realist in the sense that, even though I think it was a mistake to close down the Royal Canberra Hospital and move the principal hospital to the Woden Valley site, that has been done and it is not going to be reversed in the foreseeable future. The people of Canberra have pinned their hopes on the Acton Peninsula being used in a very sensible way. Many of them, no doubt, voted for Labor on

the grounds that at least it would use the Acton Peninsula site for a public health facility, particularly because of its clear advantages in convalescent terms. Madam Speaker, you only have to walk around the Acton Peninsula to understand that the tranquillity of the place is its most important factor in relation to rehabilitation and convalescence.

Mr De Domenico: Who said that?

MR MOORE: I just said it. We hear interjections from the gallery, although we are not supposed to hear them, Madam Speaker, that many people have said it. I am certainly not on my own; but no doubt the Liberals will be deaf to those, as they were deaf to the community when they originally closed the Royal Canberra Hospital and put it through a fast-track process, the penalties for which we are paying now. That site is absolutely perfect for the people of Canberra.

Mr De Domenico: She lives in Queanbeyan.

MR MOORE: I hear an interjection from Mr De Domenico, referring to Miss Slazenger, no doubt, that she lives in Queanbeyan.

Mr De Domenico: I did not interject. I was speaking to Mrs Carnell. You are eavesdropping.

MR MOORE: It is an interjection now, let me tell you. When Mr De Domenico says something about it, it reflects his total lack of understanding of the issues. Our hospital system is not just for Canberra; it serves a population of 450,000. I am sure that the Minister and Gary Humphries would verify that. It is a hospital of the Canberra region. I see the Chief Minister acknowledging that. It is something that clearly Mr De Domenico does not understand or does not approve of.

Mr Stevenson: She is not even here.

MR MOORE: I said "the Chief Minister" then, Madam Speaker. I meant the "Leader of the Opposition". I am living in the past on this issue.

One of the difficulties we have is that our planners seem to be frightened of the very thing that people in Canberra really love, and that is some open space. You only have to go to Geneva or some of the harbour cities of the world to look at what happens when a city meets the water. It has its own special kind of character, but in Canberra we have an even more beautiful character. The area around our lakes is much more natural. We do not have people living down on the foreshores. We have some room; we have some green space. That is what makes Canberra special, and that is what members of this Assembly, members of the community and the planners want to attack. They see that space and think, "We have to have something there. This will be great. This will be good on my CV if I do a great planning system from the city all the way down to the lake". There are a few other problems to resolve first, and those problems will have to be resolved in terms of setting a general direction for Canberra.

The question people must ask is: Why is there so much angst in terms of planning in Canberra? The answer is very simple. It is because the community generally has no idea where the Government is going. They have no idea what the direction is. They have no idea what the Government's strategy is for the future. It is no good giving us a strategy for another six months or another two years

25 November 1992

or another three years. That is why you have the angst out at Watson; that is why you have the angst out at Belconnen. People do not have the opportunity to see the big picture, to see the Government's direction, the community direction, for the people of Canberra. I challenge the Minister to come up with a better answer than to say, "You will be happy with the direction of the Territory Plan when it comes out". I have grave doubts about whether that will be the case. That is something that remains to be seen when it is tabled.

Madam Speaker, in moving this motion we are putting the Government on notice. We are saying, "Why don't you deliver for once to the people of Canberra what you promised to deliver?". There is your challenge.

MS SZUTY (11.24): I believe that the reason for today's debate on this motion is to clarify the positions of the ACT Government, the Territory Planning Authority and the National Capital Planning Authority on what will be sited on the Acton Peninsula and West Basin area. We know that the ACT Government gave a commitment to certain health facilities on the site during the election campaign. These were "rehabilitation and aged care services, a convalescent facility, the Queen Elizabeth II Nursing Home for Mothers and Babies, a hospice and the Chair of Community Medicine from the Clinical School". Even Mr Kaine, when he was Chief Minister, ordered that the proposed launching of the joint study for future uses of Acton include mention of health facilities on the site. That study has taken two years to complete and still we have a major conflict brewing over what the site will eventually house.

In more recent times, we have heard the Minister for Health, Mr Berry, further articulate the ACT Government's policy on Acton. The ACT Government has had to do that because of what the National Capital Planning Authority is doing with regard to Acton Peninsula. At page 20 of the National Capital Plan, the stated aims are:

Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores should remain predominantly as open space parklands while providing for existing and additional National Capital and community uses in a manner consistent with the area's national symbolism and role as the city's key visual and landscape element.

Further:

Lake Burley Griffin and Foreshores are intended to provide a range of recreational, educational and symbolic experiences of the National Capital in both formal and informal park settings with particular landscape characters or themes.

It seems that the National Capital Planning Authority has unlimited resources when it comes to the future consideration of Acton Peninsula, and there is evidence for that statement. Firstly, the charette competition was an invitation to architecture and design schools around Australia to become involved in a design competition for the area. Around 30 designs were submitted. A seminar was held over a weekend to discuss the entries put forward, as part of what the National Capital Planning Authority says will be extensive community forums to enhance further debate about the proposals.

Interestingly, the results of the charette placed little emphasis on health facilities or their inherent need for a certain type of surroundings. The students were guided by the National Capital Planning Authority and Territory Planning Authority's glossy joint discussion paper, which paid scant regard to health facilities. The special needs of such facilities were not addressed by the charette entries. Only a few mentioned them, and most appeared to have the unstated view that health facilities could be fitted into one of the structures on the site.

I have said previously that I believe that the question of the future of Acton Peninsula could have been resolved much more positively and constructively. It is not too late for this to happen. Let the ACT Government outline fully to the Assembly today its plans for Acton Peninsula and let us give the National Capital Planning Authority the chance to take on the Government's views and truly consider proposals for the remainder of the area, including retaining it as open space, as my colleague, Mr Moore, has said. In this way, we maximise the proposals we already have for the future of Acton Peninsula and the community receives a clear message about future directions. We should be planning Acton Peninsula together. If this occurs, we will in turn maximise community support and interest in the outcome.

MR WOOD (Minister for Education and Training, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning) (11.28): Madam Speaker, once again today Mr Moore has lectured us about vision - something we all have, although Mr Moore himself will concede that it is something he has not always had. We remember that famous cartoon in the *Canberra Times* two or three years ago, with some words attributed to Mr Moore, I think. Certainly, he was a member of the former Residents Rally, and the cartoon showed them sitting out in the moonlight and the caption was, "We don't necessarily have a vision but we will recognise it when we see it". I raise this lightly. I know that Mr Moore is very serious, and he will continue to be serious when shortly we come to consider the Territory Plan and a whole range of futures for the ACT in a number of areas which the Government pursues and which I, as Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning and other things, also pursue. Mr Moore, vision is not something that is confined to you.

I think failure to state the case, failure accurately to report on events in the Assembly, is something that you and others have conducted in relation to the Acton Peninsula. I will quote you shortly the history of some events, a history you know because you sat somewhere in this chamber when certain things unfolded. From time to time we hear in the community similar comments to those made by Mr Moore. People who have not been as closely involved as you may be excused for failing to indicate the facts of this case.

Mr Moore began and finished his speech by saying in respect of the Royal Canberra Hospital that the Government squirmed, turned around and broke promises. That is simply wrong, and you know it. Let me go back to the Legislative Assembly proceedings of 6 June 1990 - interestingly, one year ahead of the time Rosemary Follett again became Chief Minister. That was the time when the then Leader of the Opposition, Rosemary Follett, introduced a Bill to keep open the Royal Canberra Hospital. It is that point that Mr Moore jumps on, because the ALP had been saying, "We will keep Royal Canberra Hospital open". We made as much to-do of that in this Assembly as we did of the schools that the government of the day was also proposing to close.

25 November 1992

We introduced into this Assembly legislation to save Royal Canberra Hospital. We did so, I repeat, on 6 June 1990, exactly one year ahead of the return of the second Follett Government. What did Rosemary Follett say during her speech - a speech, I might add, much interrupted by members of the then Government? What she said has stuck in my mind, and it has been said by the Labor Party and its spokespeople outside from time to time, but people like Mr Moore ignore it. She said:

The Bill that I have presented today offers a last opportunity for members opposite to show that they are prepared to listen to the desires of the Canberra community and to act to protect public health services.

It was the last opportunity, because Mr Humphries was fast-tracking the hospital redevelopment.

Mr Humphries: You still are.

MR WOOD: Indeed, we still are. There is no question about that. Rosemary Follett said, "After today it is too late". In fact, it had already gone a long way down the track. The Bill did not come through, because the Government did not want to know about it; but, if that Bill had been accepted into the Assembly and passed, Royal Canberra Hospital would have been saved. But that was the last opportunity, because after that events proceeded too rapidly, too far. When Mr Berry became the Health Minister again one year later, he had a review to see whether it was possible to reverse that process. It was not possible to do so because of the cost.

Mr Moore: Rubbish! That is where you are wrong.

MR WOOD: It would be possible; but the cost, Mr Moore, is something that nobody - - -

Mr Moore: The cost was no different than in 1991 when Rosemary Follett tabled that Bill.

MR WOOD: No, it was not. The processes had gone so far that it was quite irreversible. I think these claims about breaking promises are just so much nonsense.

I want to come back to the document about which some people made a fuss some months ago when it was released by the people who have responsibility for the planning of Acton Peninsula, the National Capital Planning Authority. They are the planning agents, and everyone knows that. There was some comment at that time that they paid no attention to health matters and the possibility of health facilities on that site. Let me put this in the perspective - I am sure that most of us are now familiar with the way these things occur - of the planners, the National Capital Planning Authority, who prepared this. It is a planning document. It places a great deal of emphasis on the way things look, locations, how it fits in with the city, environmental matters, and a whole host of things. It does not really give much attention at all to what might go on it. There is a lot of speculation about possible land uses. It says:

... our view is that the following wide range of potential land uses should be explored as part of a mixed use development ...

That is what it says in about six different ways - "should be explored", "may be", "it is a possibility that". There is an exception to that, and I quote it explicitly from page 37:

The Territory Government has decided to provide health care and medical facilities on the site. These are to be integrated with other land uses.

There is nothing wishy-washy or may be about that. It says it explicitly, and that is what needed to be said in this document, bearing in mind that the Government had a commitment to do just that. It is in our policy; we wrote it in there, and obviously we are supportive of that policy.

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (11.37): Madam Speaker, I begin by stating quite explicitly that the Liberal Party will not support Mr Moore's motion. I also foreshadow that we will not support the proposed amendment the Labor Party has indicated it is going to put forward. My reasons for taking this position are, I believe, quite logical and quite explicit. The first is, as the Minister has just pointed out, that there is a public consultation process in place that has been going on for a long time now about what the public expects to see this site used for. The discussion paper has been out for some time, and Mr Wood has properly noted that it is qualified by the fact that the Government has decided to provide health and medical facilities there. So, indeed, has the Liberal Party made a commitment to do that. I will come to the details of that in a minute, but the fact is that both the Government and the Opposition have made a commitment that there will be some health related facilities there, which the two parties differ on in detail.

I come to the summary of this report on page 47, where the National Capital Planning Authority and the Territory Planning Authority have indicated the generality of the way they see this thing going, but it is a discussion document. I do not believe that this Assembly should be cutting off, truncating, that public consultation process by passing a motion such as this. It anticipates what the public might decide in the end as a result of this discussion process. You cannot start a consultation process and then cut it off and say, "We are not interested in what you have to say". You must let the consultation process run its course. Only then can you say with certainty, whether you are in government or opposition or on the cross benches, that you are accurately reflecting public opinion today. Quite frankly, public opinion about Acton Peninsula three years ago, I submit to you, is changing. It is totally different today. Various elements in the community now have different expectations in connection with that site than they had two and three years ago.

My basic argument is that we cannot, nor should we, truncate a public consultation process that is in being. I criticised the Government for this once before in connection with land planning and development. There was a Territory Plan out there, and yet the Government, two weeks before election day, said, "We are going to change the rules. There is not going to be any infill. We are going to take all the pink bits out". That cut off the public consultation process that was still taking place about the Territory Plan. My position remains consistent. I did not agree that the public consultation process should be truncated then; I do not believe that it should be now.

25 November 1992

To come to the detail of Mr Moore's motion, he is saying that the Acton Peninsula site should be retained for all of these things. I can only read into that that he means solely for these things. He is not admitting of any other potential use of the peninsula. He is saying that this Assembly directs the Government that it retain the use of the Acton Peninsula for these facilities. He is not saying that we might admit of the possibility of other uses as well.

I mentioned before that I believe that public opinion about Acton Peninsula is changing. Three years ago, that kind of proposition put by the Government may well have got majority support. But opinion has changed. The Royal Canberra Hospital is no longer there. I think a debate about that is totally unproductive today, and I am not going to get into it. That is history. People now look at Acton Peninsula in terms of today's world. There is not a public hospital there; there is no possibility of there being a public hospital there. So, what can and should we use that facility for? For us to say that we will use it for these and only these purposes I do not believe would get public acceptance today.

The discussion document is out there, and a lot of people have had a lot to say about it. There has been no ground swell of opinion saying, "Stop. It may be used only for health-related facilities". There has been no such ground swell. We have to have regard for what the community is thinking about this, and I do not believe that we can confine it to these and only these things. There is an opportunity here to use that prime piece of public property in the public interest - whatever the public perceives that interest to be. I do not believe that Mr Moore is reflecting that. I understand that this is almost a direct quote from the Labor Party policy and, if that is the case, I say that Labor Party policy is not reflecting it either, just as Labor Party policy does not reflect public opinion on a lot of other issues - and we will not get into those right now. Even the Labor Party, if that is what their policy says, ought to be having another look at it.

I think, frankly, that the Labor Party is forward looking enough to review their policies. Any major party that publishes a policy and then says "That is immutable forever" might as well write itself off the political agenda. You cannot write a bunch of policies that remain your policies immutably forever. In doing that, you simply reject public opinion about what people expect of major parties in government. If that is their view here, they have locked themselves in.

Not only can you not commit the use of the Acton Peninsula solely for these purposes; the other side of the coin is that the Liberal Party does not agree that all of these facilities ought to be appropriately on Acton Peninsula. For example, we have always argued that the Acton Peninsula is not a place for a hospice. A hospice, by its very nature, needs to be associated with a major medical facility. People in a hospice are likely to require urgent and major medical attention, and if they are 10 miles away from the nearest hospital they are immediately put in jeopardy by their isolation. I use the word "isolation" advisedly; one of the problems with the Royal Canberra Hospital was that it was difficult to access. I know that people have a sentimental attachment to the old Canberra hospital; but there were some facts, and that was one of them. The Liberal Party does not agree that that is the place for a hospice. Put it next to Woden hospital, put it next to Calvary Hospital, but put it next to a major health facility.

We are not sure, for example, whether Acton Peninsula is the place for a clinical medical school. Again, surely a clinical medical school has to be associated both with a university and with a hospital. There will be some argument, I submit, and there are people better qualified than those sitting in this room to comment on whether a clinical medical school ought to be co-located with the university or with a hospital. I think there is a body of professional opinion that would suggest that it ought to be associated primarily with a hospital, and that its secondary role is associated with the university. We are not saying that such a school should not be there; we are saying that it is not for us at this stage arbitrarily to make a decision about it. We have not yet heard the arguments for or against.

To try to bind the Government with this kind of motion is totally irrational; it is totally inflexible. No government - and I am speaking from opposition - ought to feel itself bound by this kind of unthinking motion, which takes no account of changing circumstances, no account of changing public opinion, and purports to lock a government into a course of action that may be totally contrary to what the community really wants. As I said, there has been no ground swell of public opinion on this issue that I have detected. There are a range of voices expressing different opinions. Our responsibility, as elected representatives of the people, is to listen to those opinions, sort them out, come to a rational, logical decision about what the community wants, and then move to put that into effect.

I reiterate, Madam Speaker, that I cannot accept this as a motion that would bind the Government, because I believe that it is too inflexible. In any case, we have no right to truncate that public consultation process that has been going on now for nearly two years. I point out that the discussion paper was the result of a joint study put in place by the Alliance Government when it was in power two years ago. So, this debate has been going on for a long time. These are the sorts of decisions that you should not take off the top of your head. They should not be taken on the spur of the moment. They should not be taken without a real and proper analysis of what it is that the community expects of us. I do not think we know what that is and, for that reason, I will vote against Mr Moore's motion. As I foreshadowed, if the Labor Party proceeds with its amendment, I will be compelled to vote against that as well.

MR STEVENSON (11.48): I know how to solve the hospital bed shortage in Canberra: Reopen Canberra hospital, the only Royal Canberra Hospital that in the hearts of most Canberrans will ever be worthy of bearing the name. There is no doubt that in Canberra we will need another hospital. All one can do is argue over when.

Mr Kaine: And where.

MR STEVENSON: Indeed, one could argue over where. One could argue against the will of the people, who first of all voted overwhelmingly to retain the Royal Canberra Hospital. When the Labor Party had their chance, had the power to retain the hospital, they closed it. It is all very well what you say when you are in opposition - as Mr Humphries said yesterday, "Now I can tell the truth", or words to that effect - but the important thing is what you do when you have the power. When the Labor Party had the power, they let down the people in Canberra who wanted the Royal Canberra Hospital to remain open.

25 November 1992

Once the decision was taken to close it, we again surveyed people in Canberra. They wanted it reopened, but that was ignored by the Labor and Liberal parties in this Assembly. When we asked people whether they wanted the Acton Peninsula site to be retained for community health services, once again, overwhelmingly they said yes. When we asked them whether they wanted a hospice on the site, again, overwhelmingly they said yes. Mr Kaine may not be aware of a ground swell that wants the Acton Peninsula site retained for health services; but, if you get out there and survey people and talk to enough people, you will find that it is there strongly.

Everybody in this room, if they acknowledge the truth, would know full well that the vast majority of people in our community want the Royal Canberra Hospital site, the Acton Peninsula site, retained for community health services. Some 60,000 people - one-third of the voters in Canberra - signed a petition to save the Royal Canberra Hospital. What sort of people, in the face of that community will, would close the Royal Canberra Hospital? We understand what sort of people. We see them here today. It was a dastardly deed that closed the Royal Canberra Hospital. It was a dastardly deed for the Labor Party, when they had the power to reverse the decision - when they had the power to pass the Bill they introduced and knew that it would not be passed - to fail to do so.

It is Labor policy, as Mr Moore said, to use the Acton Peninsula for community health services. The fact that the Federal Government have other policies is neither here nor there. We should fight them at every turn. We should fight on behalf of the people of Canberra and stand up against those politicians in the Federal Parliament who could not give a continental about people in Canberra.

Mr Moore mentioned earlier that the Royal Canberra Hospital site has a great convalescent value. One of the members said that there was no real convalescent value there. What absolute nonsense! If there is one thing that people who are not well need, it is a harm-free, stress-free environment in which to relax and get well. It is not the drugs that do the healing; it is the body that does the healing, and the person needs a peaceful environment. Where could you find a better spot than the Royal Canberra Hospital on Acton Peninsula?

The National Planning Authority talked about the site being used for recreation facilities, among other things. Some would see recreation facilities on the Acton Peninsula as including a permanent casino. Given the chance, I am sure that that could happen. Once again, we should fight on behalf of the people of Canberra against anyone who would use the Royal Canberra Hospital site for anything other than health facilities, until it becomes overwhelmingly obvious to even the slowest of people that we need another hospital to solve the hospital bed shortage, and then the Royal Canberra Hospital can be reopened and regain its correct name.

I commend Mr Moore for introducing the motion, for standing up for the people of Canberra on this issue, as he has done repeatedly over the last three-and-a-half years. Only two people in this Assembly have continually stood up for the people of Canberra - the 60,000 who wanted Royal Canberra Hospital saved.

Mr Kaine: That is rubbish, Dennis. That is political rhetoric, and you know it. You are talking to the gallery.

MR STEVENSON: Mr Kaine says something about, "That is rhetoric, and you know it". What I know absolutely clearly is that people in Canberra want the site kept for community health services. If you are not sure of it, ask the question. Going around with your head in the clouds or in the ground, thinking that you understand what people in Canberra want, is an absolute nonsense.

Mr Kaine: You think you know.

MR STEVENSON: The way to find out is by asking them.

Mr Kaine: What makes you so good?

MR STEVENSON: Mr Kaine says that I think I know, and what makes me so good. It is not that I am so good; it is simply that I ask. Any members here can get the same responses if they but ask. When I see the questions, when I see the polling results, when I see the checks by the Australian Bureau of Statistics validating the studies, as ours have been validated, then and only then will I believe that people here can speak for Canberrans as an electorate. This idea that politicians know better is like running a dictatorship. They do not. How on earth can we expect the community to abide by decisions of this Assembly when we do not abide by the overwhelming response of people in Canberra?

I shall move an amendment to the motion. I was happy enough to vote for the motion because I do not doubt that most people in Canberra would. Mr Kaine mentioned that there is a community consultation process going on. If it is anything like the consultation process of the last three years, I think we know what it will be like. How do we know exactly what type of health services we should have? How does the Labor Party know? How does the Liberal Party know? My amendment solves the problem. I therefore move:

Omit all words after "block 5", substitute "for community health services".

The amended motion would read:

That this Assembly directs the Government to retain the use of Acton Peninsula site, namely sections 55 and 33, block 5, for community health services.

That takes away all the concern about what community health services will be on the site, and we could well agree with that, and it needs a direction.

MRS CARNELL (11.58): It is hard to believe that Mr Moore believes some of the things he said. By including section 33, block 5, as I think Mr Kaine has already said, Mr Moore has included in his motion areas of land which comprise not just Acton Peninsula but also much of West Basin, and he has declared that all of this land should be set aside for health facilities. We already know that much of this land has never been used for health facilities. Indeed, much of West Basin is currently used as a tourist-cum-picnic park. Surely Mr Moore is not proposing that this current usage should make way for health facilities.

I am prepared to support the motion only to the extent of recognising that there is a place for some health facilities on Acton Peninsula, but the way Mr Moore's motion has been put does not suggest only some facilities on some of Acton Peninsula. It is also not the case that Acton Peninsula should be used

25 November 1992

exclusively for these purposes. I think Mr Kaine adequately put that case. In fact, to have facilities for rehabilitation and aged care isolated at Acton Peninsula would be a disaster - a position that I understand is shared by the ACT Council on the Ageing, a group of people who, one would suggest, would know something about care of the aged.

Mr De Domenico: At least we talk to put people like that, anyway.

MRS CARNELL: That is right. Let us see what Richard Glenn and Associates had to say on the subject of a nursing home at Acton Peninsula. The Acton health facilities planning study was commissioned by this Labor Government at a cost, I think, of some \$25,000 to prepare. This Government should pay attention to the finding of its own expensive study, and Michael Moore would be advised to do likewise. Amongst other things, the study says:

The site selected for the nursing home should facilitate community access and promote the residents' independence and quality of life.

Further, it states:

The building should be located to maximise views from the nursing home.

It goes on:

Generally, residents find views on "people activity" more interesting than passive landscapes.

That is at odds with what other members have said, yet this is in the \$25,000 report. When considering the relocation of a 40-bed nursing home to Acton Peninsula, the study says:

Unless the National Capital Planning Authority which is currently planning the redevelopment of the Acton Peninsula approves a residential development adjacent to the peninsula, such a location would not meet the outcome standards of the Commonwealth Government.

That means that, unless we have residential development at Acton Peninsula as the National Capital Planning Authority has suggested, a nursing home on Acton Peninsula would not be funded, and the ACT Government would end up paying. That is obviously not appropriate. Therefore, if we are going to have aged care facilities on Acton, we need residential development as well.

The unfortunate thing is that too many people want to hark back to what went on before on Acton Peninsula, and their determination to reinvent Royal Canberra Hospital may lead to some health facilities being very inappropriately located. What the Richard Glenn study stresses - and, as I have already said, the ACT Council on the Ageing - is that convalescing patients want to be part of the community. Cutting them off from the community is the last thing they want, and it is the last thing that is of any use at all for their health outcomes. These facilities ought to be close to shops and close to other centres of activity such as senior citizens clubs, church groups, places they can go to during their convalescence time. They do not spend their months convalescing in bed or staring out the window at the lake. They need to be reintegrated with the community, and you have to have a community to reintegrate with.

Mr Moore also suggested that the Queen Elizabeth II home for mothers and babies should be moved to the Acton Peninsula. Mr Moore is obviously not aware of the views of the Canberra Mothercraft Society. This is the group that runs and manages the QE II home for mothers and babies. They do not want to move to Acton Peninsula; they would rather keep their central location in Civic.

Mr De Domenico: But you disregard that because that view happens to be contrary to yours!

MRS CARNELL: That is right; we do not like that. The president of the Canberra Mothercraft Society has cited the following reasons for wanting to remain in Civic: Firstly, there is its proximity to the ACT transport system and to the bus interchange, and, secondly, its closeness to shops, retailing and other centres of activity. They say that this actually serves a therapeutic purpose because it breaks down the isolation recovering patients may feel in some institutional environments. Thirdly, it is adjacent to other health facilities provided by ACT Health - that is, the City Health Centre. Fourthly, incorporating the QE II home for mothers and babies into the old Canberra hospital building would run counter to the purposes and practices of the present hospital. That is what the group that is actually running QE II says, but of course we will disregard them. Clearly, this is another facility that should not be transferred to the Acton Peninsula, at least under the sort of arrangements envisaged by Mr Moore.

There are others on this list that would also be terribly inappropriately located at Acton - for instance, the clinical school. This clearly must be part of Woden Valley Hospital. Mr Moore has evidently not understood the full rationale for a clinical school. In fact, part of the rationale for the clinical school is the enhancement of the nature and quality of the services at Woden Valley Hospital. We are trying to develop Woden Valley Hospital as a centre of excellence, and there are many benefits that we all know will flow from this. Since we are concerned with Woden Valley Hospital, it is obviously not appropriate to locate the school elsewhere, such as at Acton. Certainly, the medical school may need the facilities of the ANU or possibly the John Curtin School for research facilities, but I am not sure that these facilities which are provided on campus cannot also be used for a clinical school that is based at Woden Valley Hospital.

I am more than ready to support proposals to establish chairs of community medicine and of rehabilitation and aged care, because I believe that the focus of the medical school must be relevant to the Canberra community. It would be knowledge of great practical value to Canberrans and would allow the medical school to differentiate itself from medical schools in other parts of the country. All the same, I cannot agree at this stage - and I emphasise "at this stage" - that these chairs of medicine should be located at Acton Peninsula. I would not like to pre-empt, as others obviously like doing, proper consideration of this important issue.

The hospice should certainly not be located at Acton Peninsula, and I have spoken on this issue time and time again in this house. It undermines the chances of developing an integrated, holistic palliative care service - something that is absolutely essential to Canberra. The hospice should be co-located on the

25 November 1992

grounds of Calvary Hospital or, as Mr Kaine said, at the very worst Woden Valley Hospital. It had been discussed over a long period before Minister Berry suddenly blundered into this debate and got it wrong again. It should be run by the Little Company of Mary, who have an excellent track record in precisely this kind of palliative care.

One might also note that the ACT Hospice Society would prefer to see the hospice at Calvary. This is easily demonstrated from correspondence I have received, and I am sure many others have too. In a letter dated 3 March this year, directed to the Chief Minister, the Hospice Society said:

We submit that the provision of a hospice by grant aid to Calvary would be preferable to the provision through a fully Government owned/managed facility.

I wonder why they said that. The letter went on to say:

We would not wish our disagreement over the location of a hospice facility to prevent or delay construction. That being said, we believe that the best solution is a purpose built hospice in the Calvary Hospital complex.

Those are the people who know about where a hospice should be. That is not just what somebody on the street might think; it is the people who know, the people who understand this issue. Evidently, the Hospice Society is now resigned to seeing its facility built on Acton. In other words, it is better there than nowhere. I think it is really unfortunate that in these debates we get to the stage where the views of the people who know about facilities - the Council on the Ageing, Richard Glenn and Associates, the Hospice Society - are totally overrun.

MR LAMONT (12.08): I am reminded of the old saying about how many folk singers it takes to change a light bulb. The answer is 23. It takes one to change it and 22 to sing about how good the old one was. That is a bit like Mr Moore's speech this morning. He was saying, "Let us change the world, only so long as I can make a few points, some cheap shots, about the Royal Canberra Hospital".

Madam Speaker, before entering this house my position on the Royal Canberra Hospital was greatly influenced by one of the activists to save the hospital, Regina Slazenger. My family has known Regina for a very long period of time and has been involved with her in the public health system here in Canberra.

Mr Moore: Did she deliver you at Braidwood?

MR LAMONT: No. The way I addressed the issue was greatly influenced by the way Regina pursued her defence of the public health system. On this date in 1992 I think it is generally accepted that Royal Canberra Hospital will not again become a functioning public hospital. That is something which around this chamber and generally in the community is an accepted fact. People may not like it and they may not accept that it needed to be closed when it was, but on this day in 1992 it is an accepted fact.

We must look at - and to some extent this is encapsulated in Mr Moore's motion - what we do with the Acton Peninsula site. There is a quite unequivocal statement from the Labor Party as to what public health facilities should be provided on this site. That policy was determined by listening to people such as Regina Slazenger, to people in the medical profession and our own party and the advice that it was providing to government. The reason why we have some objection to the way in which Mr Moore has put the issue, for fairly cute political points - - -

Mr Moore: Would I do something like that?

MR LAMONT: It is something that you cannot always be accused of, but on this occasion you certainly can be. Mr Moore is suggesting exclusivity in the wording of his motion. That causes considerable concern. I want to go through a number of the issues. Mr Kaine said, "Yes, there should be a range of health facilities on this site". Then Mrs Carnell got up and knocked over every single thing that had been suggested.

Mrs Carnell: Not every one of them.

MR LAMONT: I am sorry. There were two that she did not. One was probably a pharmacy.

Mrs Carnell: No, it is not on the list.

MR LAMONT: Was a pharmacy knocked off?

Mr Moore: No, it was not knocked off, so that is one possibility.

Mr Kaine: Perhaps you should have listened to what Mrs Carnell said. Then you might be able to quote her.

Mrs Carnell: I did not knock them off. I said that they had to be part of residential development.

MR LAMONT: Mrs Carnell would probably like to see a pharmacy down there and, I suppose, a dentist. Was the dentist knocked off?

Mr Moore: The dentist was the other one. No, she did not knock off the dentist.

MR LAMONT: The dentist was the other one that was not knocked off. From the gist of what she was saying, they are about the only two health related facilities that she would like to see back on the site. Let us go through a number of the other issues. Let us have a look at Sylvia Curley House. Mrs Carnell's lovely statement was, "Let us sell it". To whom?

Mrs Carnell: The ANU.

MR LAMONT: Sell it to the ANU. What do we do with Sylvia Curley House?

Mrs Carnell: Sell it to the ANU.

MR LAMONT: Let me finish. I mean in relation to Mr Moore's proposition about the exclusivity of health related facilities. What do we do with it? Under what Mr Moore has included exclusively in his resolution, Sylvia Curley House would be mothballed. It would never be used again. You are not going to put a hospice in it. You are not going to put the Queen Elizabeth II home for mothers and babies in it. You are not going to put the clinical medical school in it.

25 November 1992

Mr Kaine: We might.

MR LAMONT: It would be very difficult. The motion also mentions community health and related facilities. I believe that Sylvia Curley House would be inappropriate for such facilities. So, there is one question that is raised about the exclusivity of Mr Moore's motion.

Mr Moore: Where do you get the exclusivity idea from, apart from Trevor?

MR LAMONT: That is the effect of your motion, Mr Moore.

Mr Moore: No; you are wrong.

MR LAMONT: I am sorry; I am not wrong. That is what the words say and that is the intent. It can be construed in no other way.

Mr Kaine: But you did not believe me when I told you that an hour ago.

MR LAMONT: That is not what I said an hour ago, Mr Kaine. The Leader of the Opposition misquotes me, Madam Speaker. With the admission of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition last night, I can understand why that may be the case. So, what in fact we have - - -

Mr Moore: You have nothing to argue on, so you are squirming.

MR LAMONT: Not really. Mr Moore's motion proposes an exclusivity. The reason why he is interjecting as much as he is, which is not unusual for Mr Moore, is that the penny has finally dropped in relation to what he has done. When you raise these types of issues, Mr Moore can finally see. As I said, the penny has finally dropped. The Labor Party is committed and has announced in this place that it will put on that site those things outlined in paragraph (1) of Mr Moore's motion. It has said that quite clearly.

Mr De Domenico: All of them?

MR LAMONT: It has said it quite clearly. Mr De Domenico, you do not need to wave your hands in the air or stand up and carry on.

Mr De Domenico: I am not. I am not standing up. I know that it is difficult to know when I am and when I am not, but I am not in this case. But go on with your wonderful speech.

MR LAMONT: Thank you, Tony. It is a pleasure to be able to educate one of the Opposition. It is probably impossible to educate the rest. The proposition that we are pursuing includes consultation in relation to any other possible use for that site. The basis of that consultation is a discussion paper put out by the National Capital Planning Authority. That document was referred to by the Minister, Mr Wood, and the current Leader of the Opposition.

That will say to the Canberra community, "Here is a range of possibilities, but when you consider them you must bear in mind that the only definitive statement has been made by the Government and it says quite clearly that these things must go on the Acton Peninsula site". That is the only definitive statement that has been made, but the motion that Mr Moore is proposing is one of exclusivity.

Mr Moore: It is not.

MR LAMONT: It certainly is. If it is not, then why will you not accept the amendment that we are proposing, which makes it unequivocal that it is not exclusive? You cannot, Mr Moore, and the reason you cannot is that it would not allow you to make a cheap political point. It would not allow you to continue to run a bankrupt argument. Your argument has no currency.

Mr Humphries: I can see him squirming a bit there.

MR LAMONT: You can? It is the chair. It is the size of the chair. Madam Speaker, the simple position is that if Mr Moore argues that his motion is not an exclusive proposition he should support our amendment. Otherwise, there is no choice. That is what it means.

MR DE DOMENICO (12.18): Madam Speaker, I was not going to stand up and say anything in this debate, but I heard a few statements made by various speakers that cause me to stand to say just a few words. I heard Mr Moore say that we should be developing the Acton Peninsula site in a sensible way. From what I heard of Mr Moore's remarks, his definition of a sensible way seemed to reflect only his point of view, as if he were the only one in this place who was sensible. I agree with Mr Wood that Mr Moore is not the sole repository of sensitivity, knowledge and vision in this Assembly. That is point No. 1.

The word that I did not hear Mr Moore or Mr Stevenson talk about is the word "reality". As Mr Lamont quite correctly said, after obviously discussing it with Mr Kaine outside, the reality of the situation, notwithstanding what we might agree or disagree with it, is that there is no chance of the Royal Canberra Hospital being retained. That is a fact. People may disagree or agree with that, but that is the reality. With that in mind, I tend to agree with the paper that has been alluded to. We have a unique opportunity in the ACT to create for Acton Peninsula and West Basin a new vision which is not solely embodied in Mr Moore.

Mr Moore: Where the city meets the lake?

MR DE DOMENICO: The joint paper, yes. Like Mr Moore, I do not agree entirely with some of the sentiments in the discussion paper, but I do agree with some parts of the document. I accept that Mr Moore is entitled to have his view, but so are other people in this Assembly. For Mr Moore to stand up and say that vision is something that only he possesses is not reality.

Mr Stevenson's comments were interesting. He said that politicians think that they know better. Mr Moore and Mr Stevenson should realise that politicians do not walk in here without being elected by the community. As I used the word "reality" before, I will use it again. The reality is that 87 per cent of the community disagree with Mr Moore, Ms Szuty and Mr Stevenson. Whether you like it or you do not, 87 per cent of the community disagree with some of the views of Mr Moore, Mr Stevenson and Ms Szuty. That is a fact as well.

Mr Kaine quite correctly said that a consultative process has been going on in the community for a considerable length of time. I repeat that that process was begun by the former Alliance Government of which Mr Kaine was Chief Minister. I agree with Mr Kaine and some of the remarks made by Mr Lamont and Mr Wood. You cannot, all of a sudden, stop the consultation process just because

25 November 1992

Mr Moore happens to disagree with it. Let us wait and see what the people of the ACT and others say. As Mr Moore quite correctly said and as I am aware, the hospital facilities of the ACT are also for people in the region. As you would know, Madam Speaker, I am one who purports to have strong links with the region and who appreciates the importance of the region for tourism and other purposes. We in the Liberal Party consult with the community.

Mrs Carnell put it more eloquently than I could. When you talk to some of the people who are actively involved in these sorts of things, they say that therapeutically, for example, views of people are better than the views of trees. Mr Moore is squirming there again, but let us say that he is correct. Why should we not make sure that as many people as possible avail themselves of the views from Acton Peninsula and not restrict redevelopment to those few things that he has mentioned in his motion? We will debate that further, if you like, at another time.

The Liberal Party - like the Labor Party, from what I hear - is saying that there is a place for certain facilities such as the ones mentioned by Mr Moore on the Acton Peninsula site, but they should be developed in an integrated way. We are not saying that we are against any of those facilities being built there, but we are saying that there is a place for integrated development on Acton Peninsula. Like Mr Wood, I read very carefully what the discussion paper said. I think it bears repeating. As Mr Wood did, I quote it in full:

The Territory Government has decided to provide health care and medical facilities on the site.

Importantly, it goes on to say:

These are to be integrated with other land uses.

Mr Moore's motion, I suggest, does not say that. Mr Moore's motion goes way over and above that. Not only does he want to use the Acton Peninsula site; he wants to go a bit further as well. That is why the Liberal Party, as Mr Kaine and Mrs Carnell eloquently said, will not be supporting Mr Moore's motion.

Things were said about consultation. Like Mrs Carnell, Mr Kaine and everybody else in this Assembly, I have received letters and representations from various groups in the community. I say again that the Liberal Party will not be supporting the motion. The Liberal Party, like the Government, sees room for certain facilities on Acton Peninsula, but let us try to look at the vision. Let us try to make Canberra the same as, if not better than, some of the most magnificent cities in the world. Mr Moore, I am sure, as one of the most widely travelled members of this Assembly, would realise that we have a wonderful opportunity here to make use of that beautiful area called Acton Peninsula for use by as many people of the ACT and region as possible.

That is what vision is all about. Vision does not reside only in Mr Moore's head. We all have vision. There are things that we agree with and there are things that we disagree with, but one thing we can do if we have that vision is make sure that as many people as possible living and working in the ACT and region get the most use of that beautiful site called Acton Peninsula.

MR BERRY (Minister for Health, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Sport) (12.25): Madam Speaker, I intend to confine my remarks to Mr Stevenson's amendment. Members will note that a couple of amendments have been circulated in my name. To suit the appropriate machinery for considering these matters it is best, I am informed, to deal with the Stevenson amendment first.

What I find most amusing is the squabble amongst the Independents for the few votes that are around in relation to the future of Acton Peninsula. I heard Mr Stevenson complaining that the will of the people ought to be served. He is somebody who just last night announced that he would not be supporting the will of the people. You cannot have it both ways. It is all right for you to set your sails to pick up a few votes, but the people whose votes you expect to pick up have to know that you are not interested in the will of the people. You are interested in - - -

Mr Stevenson: Why don't you tell the truth, Wayne?

Mr Lamont: Madam Speaker, I take a point of order. The imputation from Mr Stevenson is that Mr Berry has lied to this Assembly by not telling the truth.

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, I was just going to ask Mr Stevenson to withdraw. I ask you to withdraw that comment, please, Mr Stevenson.

Mr Stevenson: Absolutely not. It is about time they told the truth.

MADAM SPEAKER: I warn you, Mr Stevenson. If you do not abide by my order I will name you. You will withdraw that statement.

Mr Stevenson: Tell the truth about it, then. You will not have a problem.

MADAM SPEAKER: I name you, Mr Stevenson.

MR BERRY: You can't do that.

Mr Stevenson: Why can't you do that? Make a change.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Stevenson, I have named you.

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

That Mr Stevenson be suspended from the service of the Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the Assembly is that the member be suspended.

Mr Berry: All you have to do is withdraw.

25 November 1992

Mr Stevenson: Why don't you stop telling lies?

MADAM SPEAKER: It is too late now. The question before the Assembly is that the member be suspended.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Stevenson, you are suspended from the service of the Assembly for three hours.

Ms Follett: You are a disgrace.

Mr Stevenson: The disgrace is the lies, and you know it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, Mr Stevenson!

Mr Stevenson: You did it yesterday as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: You have been suspended.

Mr Stevenson: And I am off. Read the evidence and stop telling lies.

Mr Stevenson thereupon withdrew from the chamber.

MR BERRY: Madam Speaker, it is a pity that Mr Stevenson took the line he did, because I am sure he would have wanted to respond to the debate on the amendment he put before the chamber. I am left on the horns of a dilemma. I wish that he were in a position to debate the issue, but I will proceed anyway. It seems to me that the approach by Mr Stevenson in attempting to put his scent on this matter has been purely for political reasons rather than to look at the facts which are before the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

Before the last election Labor made it very clear what their position was in relation to the Acton Peninsula site. We said that we would retain the site as a public health facility. In a paper which was publicly available to the community entitled "Building a Better Health System: Better for Canberra" we said that we would set out over the next three years to implement our policy of a public health facility on that site, with rehabilitation and aged care services, a convalescent facility, the Queen Elizabeth II home for mothers and babies, and a hospice.

Mr Stevenson wants to overturn the specifics in that. That is not something that the Labor Government is comfortable with, because we want to retain our commitment, very clearly and publicly made for the community of the ACT to police. It is quite inconsistent for the broad-ranging description which has been put forward by Mr Stevenson to be implemented. I do not know his reasons for it. I just do not see that there - - -

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! It being 12.30 pm, the debate is interrupted in accordance with standing order 77 as amended by temporary order.

Sitting suspended from 12.30 to 2.30 pm

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Public and Private Sector Enterprises

MR KAINE: I would like to address a question to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, in your budget strategy statement on 16 June this year you said:

... Labor stands for a strong public sector and a thriving private sector.

However, in your policy platform, which you hid from the electors during the election campaign recently, at paragraph 2.2.3 it says that your intention is to:

Encourage the establishment and development of viable public enterprises using nationalisation where appropriate, and forms of social ownership in the ACT and the democratic participation of labour in economic decision making and ownership of enterprises in the ACT.

Which of these two statements do we believe, Chief Minister - your own unilateral budget strategy statement or your Labor Party policy statement?

MS FOLLETT: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Mr Kaine for the question. It is a fact that the Australian Labor Party publishes its policy document. That document, Madam Speaker, is available for anybody to purchase. The Liberal Party appears to have done so and to somewhat resent it, Madam Speaker. It is a matter of pride for members of the Labor Party that our policies are drawn up by our members, who represent the largest community based party in this Territory, and they are drawn up in public. They are done each year at our annual conference. I think that puts us in marked contrast to some other parties who do have hidden agendas and who do indeed, as we saw with Mr Kennett in Victoria, seek to deceive their electors; to implement immediately after being elected policies which they had failed to mention.

Madam Speaker, if you wish to know what the Labor Government has on its program you need to go to additional documents to the party policy. Mr Kaine has rightly pointed to the budget strategy statement which I made in June of this year and in fact have made each year when I have been responsible for the ACT budget. The strategy statement that I put out states that we do indeed in this Territory need strong public and private sectors, and I stand by that statement. I believe that the actions of this Government in fact bear out that that is what we stand for.

Far from pursuing an ideologically driven and utterly mindless program of privatisation and of slashing the public sector, such as is put forward by the Liberal Party - not just in this Territory, but nationally and in other States, as we have seen, particularly in Victoria - this Government recognises that in fact we do need both a public sector and a private sector in the ACT. Not only does the Government recognise it, but the private sector in the ACT recognise it as well. They know - Mr Kaine and his colleagues will not accept this, but the private sector does - that in the ACT the public sector is essential to the well-being of our economy, and if you slash the public sector the private sector bleeds. Members opposite will not accept that simple economic fact in our Territory.

25 November 1992

Madam Speaker, I think that the Territory can be proud of the public sector enterprises that we do have. I do not need to remind members of what they are. Most of those enterprises are making a return to the community. They are operating with increasingly efficient methods. I believe that the distinction that Mr Kaine is trying to draw is not entirely valid. It is purely ideologically driven and, as I said, reflects the Liberal Party's view that nothing good ever came out of the public sector. Left to their own devices - as we have seen in Mr Kennett's State - they would slash that sector. They would deny the workers in that sector the rights and the conditions that are their due. It is a purely ideologically driven attack.

MR Kaine: I ask a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Would the Chief Minister undertake to provide the people of Canberra, through this Assembly, with a statement indicating which of her party policy elements she does agree with and will put into effect, and which she does not agree with and will not put into effect?

MS FOLLETT: Madam Speaker, as I have indicated to Mr Kaine, the Government makes the decisions. The Government decides on policies in government. As he said himself, Madam Speaker, the budget strategy statement set out our economic directions in the ACT. That is what we are implementing. His question is entirely rhetorical.

Mr Kaine: No; you are not bound by your party policy after all.

Mr Lamont: Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I refer you to standing order 39. It is getting an absolute travesty. Those on this side of the house who are interested in hearing the answers to the questions are unable to do so because of the repeated interjections by members of the Opposition.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Lamont.

Government Service - Enterprise Agreement

MS ELLIS: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Chief Minister. Can the Chief Minister indicate what the Government is doing to ensure that staff of the ACT Government Service are not disadvantaged compared with Commonwealth public servants who will receive pay rises under the enterprise agreement recently concluded by the Federal Government and the unions?

Mr Kaine: They are still Commonwealth public servants. What is the basis of your question?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS FOLLETT: I believe that the question was directed to me, Madam Speaker, rather than to Mr Kaine.

Mr Kaine: Well, why don't you tell her the same thing?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! The Chief Minister has the floor.

MS FOLLETT: Madam Speaker, it is an excellent question from Ms Ellis; it is very timely. Following, as it does, on Mr Kaine's attack on the public sector, which we have just heard and which we have seen in action in States where the Liberals hold government, I think it is timely indeed to assure the Assembly and our own Government Service that the ACT staff will certainly not be falling behind their counterparts in the Commonwealth service.

The agreement with the unions which the Commonwealth has recently concluded is a general framework for local workplace productivity enhancement and a broad range of efficiency measures which will have a general effect across the public service and also, of course, for associated pay increases which are linked to productivity and performance improvements. The Government has examined the terms of the Commonwealth agreement. We consider that they represent a valuable tool to assist the process of work force change and to link the achievement of programs to pay.

For technical reasons that have to do with the definition of a single business in the Industrial Relations Act, it does appear that ACT Government Service staff cannot be encompassed with Commonwealth staff within the one enterprise agreement. That being the case, we have taken the view that the best way to proceed is for an ACT Government Service agreement to be designed to mirror the arrangements reached in the Commonwealth service, both in terms of its content and in terms of its timing. We have approached the unions on that basis and they have recently agreed with that view.

Madam Speaker, the Commonwealth arrangements will be replicated in the ACT Government Service agreement, the intention being that pay rises in the two agreements will operate from the same payday. We are in the process of completing the necessary industrial procedures, which includes appearing before the Industrial Relations Commission - a body, incidentally, which members opposite would abolish. The intention is that the Commonwealth and ACT Government Service agreements will be presented to the commission together for certification over the next week or so.

The ACT Government Service agreement will apply to staff under the Public Service Act and those whose terms and conditions are linked to the Public Service Act arrangements. Other groups such as the nurses, teachers and firefighters are being given the opportunity to enter into a similar enterprise agreement with us, but specific terms may need to be arrived at for inclusion in agreements relating to those groups. I repeat my assurance, Madam Speaker, that the Government remains committed to the policy of maintaining parity in terms of conditions of employment between the ACT Government Service and the Commonwealth Public Service.

Crime Rates

MR HUMPHRIES: Madam Speaker, my question is to Mr Connolly and concerns rising levels of crime in the ACT. Minister, when I put it to you in July that armed robberies in Canberra were up, you said that the Liberals were simply wrong. When the DPP said in August that the rising crime was a cause for concern and most disturbing, you said that he was talking about prosecutions, not crime. When the NRMA recorded unprecedented jumps in house burglary in September, you said that their figures did not agree with police figures. Given that the annual report of the AFP, just released, shows a rise of 43 per cent in offences against the person in one year, a rise of 38 per cent in assault, a rise of 47 per cent in armed robbery and a rise of 141 per cent in sexual assaults, will you now admit to the Assembly and to the people of Canberra that escalating crime is a serious problem facing the Canberra community?

MR CONNOLLY: That was a 10 out of 10 for oratory in the introduction to make a political point. In relation to the first rhetorical statement about armed robbery, as I explained to this Assembly as soon as the police advised me, on the police figures with which I had been provided by police armed robberies were down slightly in the last financial year as against the previous year. However, the police came to me and said, "Minister, the figures that we had given you were incorrect and they were, in fact, up a couple rather than down a couple". As soon as that information came to my attention I came into this Assembly and made that point clear. So, Madam Speaker, at all times I have been accurately passing on the accurate information.

The Liberal Party will often seek to make political capital out of this sort of issue and I have always said that crime rates are a matter of concern. However, again, the Liberals look for the worst set of figures to beat the drum over, in relation to sexual assault in particular - a matter which we take extraordinarily seriously. Yes, I am very concerned that the figures show an increase of 140 per cent, this year to last year; but if we go back to the year before it is only a very marginal increase. We had 140 offences this year, 58 offences last year and 123 the year before. So, we have a lot of fluctuation in the ACT because of our small base.

What we have said, Madam Speaker, consistently, is that the ACT, like everywhere else in Australia, faces a steady increase in crime rates. However, Madam Speaker, we remain a safer community than other capital cities; we remain the safest major capital in Australia. Australian Institute of Criminology figures, which tend to be the best available comparative data, consistently show the ACT at the bottom of the rate per 100,000 of prevalence of offences, as it should be and as we would expect it to remain.

Madam Speaker, we have to accept that crime is a problem in this community. Every other government accepts that that is a problem, as do we. We are looking for constructive solutions, as is every other government in Australia. Mr Humphries accompanied me only on Thursday to a meeting of all State and Territory governments and community leaders which was convened, in effect, because governments across Australia are having to say that the increasing crime rate is a problem that has been there for 10 years, and we have to look at additional solutions. I have never made light of or misled anyone in relation to crime rates. I have always responded to the data as and when it becomes available and have conceded that we have some difficulties in these areas, as does the rest of Australia. What we need to look at is constructive solutions rather than hollow drumbeating from opposition politicians.

MR HUMPHRIES: I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. The Minister suggested that I have been selectively quoting from these figures, I think, or alternatively, that these figures show only a steady increase in crime. I ask the Minister: Does assault occasioning actual bodily harm rising by 28 per cent constitute a steady increase? Does a rise in motor vehicle theft of 13.7 per cent constitute a steady increase? Does shop stealing being up 22.3 per cent constitute a steady increase, or does fraud and misappropriation being up 100.2 per cent constitute a steady increase; or am I again quoting selectively from the figures released by the AFP yesterday?

MR CONNOLLY: Yes, you are quoting selectively because you did not quote, for example, the rate of assault causing grievous bodily harm, the most serious assault, which is down to 31 from 34 - down about 10 per cent. These figures do vary. You are always quoting. You are quoting this year to last year. If you look at this year to last year to the year before, we tend to see trends that even it out. The sexual assault rates increased by 13 over two years, which is, in fact, just over 10 per cent over two years; so you do have to look at these figures over time. We never deny that there is a problem, but we would say that picking the greatest increase and beating the drum is politicking.

Healthy Cities Program

MS SZUTY: Madam Speaker, my question without notice is to the Minister for Health, Mr Berry. I have twice before asked the Minister for Health what measures were being taken to fund the activities of the healthy cities program. In August, two months after the funding for the program ran out, the Minister stated that he was looking at the issue, but that health promotion funds would not be available. In September the Minister said that he was pursuing avenues for alternative funding for the healthy cities program. Can the Minister inform the Assembly as to what funding alternatives have been made available to the healthy cities program, or has the Government given up on this worthwhile project?

Mrs Carnell: He is still pursuing it.

Mr Humphries: He is still pursuing it, yes.

MR BERRY: I did not hear, Madam Speaker, that Mr Humphries or Mrs Carnell was asked that question; it was directed to me. As I said to you earlier, through you, Madam Speaker, the appropriate source of funding certainly was not, in my view, within that area of funding which is available from the Health Promotion Fund. We made that clear to the healthy cities people, and I stand by that position. I said that we were exploring alternative arrangements for funding. My last advice on the subject indicated that it is still a matter which is under consideration and there has not been a source discovered at this point which would fund the healthy cities organisation. We are not a never ending source of money for all organisations.

Mr Cornwell: Cornucopia.

MR BERRY: Cornucopia, yes; that is the word. We are not one of those. It is true that the healthy cities program has provided a positive emphasis on the sorts of things that ought to happen in a healthy city, but as far as priorities are concerned, as I have said, we have decided that it is not a priority for the Health Promotion Fund. It remains a matter that we will pursue and exhaust in terms of alternative funding arrangements if they are available. I made it clear from the start that I am not promising anything.

Woden Valley Hospital - Surgical Operations

MRS CARNELL: My question is to the Minister for Health, Mr Berry. Is it true that as a cost cutting exercise the number of operations per theatre session at Woden Valley Hospital has been cut in a number of specialties to one major and one minor operation from what could have been one major and a number of minor operations in any one session? Does the Minister acknowledge that this reduction could easily mean that fewer people will be treated at Woden Valley Hospital and a possible lengthening of waiting lists?

MR BERRY: That is the sort of question that ought to have been put on notice. What I will do, first of all, is examine whether the claim is true and respond as a result of my investigation.

Urban Renewal - North Watson

MRS GRASSBY: My question is to the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning. Will the Minister ensure that North Watson residents have adequate time to respond to urban renewal proposals affecting that area?

MR WOOD: Madam Speaker, yes, I will ensure that. As members would be aware, the Government is undergoing a careful process of consultation with the community of North Canberra, particularly the area of Watson. As part of that consultation and as background information for it - very important information - we are preparing a preliminary assessment. At the request of the community, I extended the period sought for a response to that to 12 February. I am sure that they will be satisfied with that. I might indicate, Madam Speaker, that, in accordance with the Government's policies, it is the Government that has initiated this process of consultation. We have called the public meetings. We are continuing to talk very closely with the groups - a major group and several other groups - in that area and, of course, the affected leaseholders. As a result of that, I think the process will be a very careful and thorough one that should accommodate the wishes for consultation. Obviously, in the future we will be undergoing this path again in other areas of Canberra.

ACTEW - Employment Policy

MR MOORE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to Mr Connolly as Minister for Urban Services. Does ACTEW have an affirmative action policy or do its recent advertisements targeting only school leavers represent an ad hoc approach which appears to breach discrimination laws?

MR CONNOLLY: ACTEW in general has the same policy as the rest of the ACT Government, which is equal employment opportunity. They have recently advertised for eight apprentices and they have targeted those advertisements to school leavers. The decision to employ eight apprentices was taken by the ACTEW board really as a service to the community, as opposed to meeting an industrial need that they have. ACTEW, frankly, do not have an urgent need to take on an additional eight apprentices, but they have always regarded themselves as a responsible part of the ACT economy. ACTEW for years has taken on more apprentices than it actually needs. Many of those do not continue with ACTEW in the long term; they go into the private sector. Many of the electricians who currently work in the private sector got their initial trade training through ACTEW. Given the current state of youth unemployment in the ACT - a matter with which the Government is concerned and on which the Chief Minister has repeatedly spoken - ACTEW made a decision that they would take on eight additional apprentices and they did target the advertisements at school leavers.

There have been some concerns raised by older people that this may be discriminatory. I have had some communication with the ACT Human Rights Office, who advised me that yes, this probably is discriminatory. We do not have at the moment specific age discrimination legislation in the Territory; but it is something that the Government has clearly indicated its intention to move on, and it is a matter that I will discuss with the ACTEW board with a view to ensuring that all the applications that have been received are dealt with on merit. Clearly, the intention of ACTEW in advertising for eight apprentices was to act as a responsible corporate citizen and provide training opportunities for Canberra's young people. The way the advertisements were placed has perhaps been unfortunate if it has given the impression of discrimination, and I will speak to ACTEW management to ensure that everyone's application is considered on its merits.

Public Sector Productivity

MR DE DOMENICO: Madam Speaker, my question without notice is to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Berry. First of all, I remind the Minister that, in answer to a question from Mr Kaine, Ms Follett referred this afternoon, when talking about public servants, to salary increases linked to productivity and performance improvement. Mr Berry, I refer to comments made last night by a Mr Trevor Santi - someone you and Mr Connolly especially should know very well - who said, "The only way to improve productivity is for the Government to first agree to higher wages". Mr Berry, does the Government share Mr Santi's sentiment? If it does not, what other measures does the Minister advocate to improve productivity in the public sector?

25 November 1992

MR BERRY: The first thing is that I do not debate industrial relations questions on the basis of a television report. Anybody who knows anything about industrial relations would know that that is a short road to disaster and confrontation, and we are not about to get involved in that process. The issue of productivity and workplace bargaining is one which is very much on the agenda. The sorts of efficiencies that can be achieved in a consultative environment, I think, are fairly evident to everybody who has any knowledge of industrial relations.

If you can work closely with the people you employ, it is often easier to reach an amicable arrangement on industrial issues than it is if you take the approach which has been taken by the Liberals - for example, by Mr Kennett in Victoria. That approach would lead to the sort of chaos that is happening now around Melbourne. It is not the approach that I am prepared to take. It seems to me that that is the sort of approach which is promoted by the Liberals opposite, in particular by Mr De Domenico. We will not do that. We will not take the approach that is taken by Mr Kennett. We will not take the approach that has been proposed by Mr Howard and supported by Mr De Domenico.

Mr De Domenico: What is the answer to the question?

MR BERRY: The answer to the question is that I will not debate an industrial issue on the basis of a television report. That is the answer to the question, and it is the correct answer. What I will do, in all cases where I am concerned, is negotiate and promote negotiation with the parties in a consultative environment where people work towards a common end. If you want us to do anything else, you are barking up the wrong tree.

MR DE DOMENICO: I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. What measures does the Minister for Industrial Relations have in place in order to achieve higher productivity in the public sector?

MR BERRY: You see, you do not understand. Again, here you go - - -

Mr De Domenico: Well, tell me.

MR BERRY: The first thing you have to do if you want to negotiate increased productivity and efficiency in the workplace is to go to the workers and try to work out a formula around which you can find productivity and efficiency gains. I am not going to dictate to every worker in the public sector what those areas of productivity and efficiency gains might be, because that would not work. Anybody who has any sense on these issues knows that it would not work. You have to go out there and do the hard graft. You have to get out there and talk with the workers. It is very clear to workers that things have to be more efficient. The people who work in the public sector know that and they are keen to cooperate with sensible governments.

Mr De Domenico: What measures have you in train?

MR BERRY: As I have said to you, I am not going to dictate to workers in the workplace - I will say it again - what the productivity measures - - -

Mr De Domenico: You will let them dictate to you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order!

MR BERRY: No. Mr De Domenico interjects, "You will let them dictate to you". No; we are trying to avoid confrontation, not promote it like the Liberals would. We are going to work with people to search out productivity gains and efficiencies which are most acceptable to all of the parties. If you stand in this place and say, "We are going to lay down the law to workers", like the Liberals would, you end up with the chaos that exists in Victoria. We are not going to do that.

Tuggeranong Swimming Centre

MR LAMONT: My question is also directed to the Deputy Chief Minister, but in his capacity as Minister for Sport. What is the current state of construction of the Tuggeranong pool?

MR BERRY: This is an important issue for the people of the ACT because it means that there will be a new and quality facility for all of the people in the Territory, particularly for those people in Tuggeranong because it will, by virtue of distance, be more accessible. I emphasise that this is a facility for Canberra and it will be recognised as such. I went out and had a look at it a couple of days ago. It is in the construction stage and I must say that I was most impressed, particularly by the size of the pool and the complex as a whole, and the sorts of services it will offer.

The structural steel and concrete work for the basis of the pool and those sorts of things is virtually complete. There is a significant amount of brickwork and the roof is going on, which is a good sign. The exterior of the fitness area is nearly complete and work has commenced on the roof of the main pool hall. Construction of the walls of the main pool hall is also progressing satisfactorily. In recent weeks there has been a water test of the main pool. They pumped some water in and tested the pool, and apparently everything is fine. The water has been taken out and they are getting back on with the construction. The finishing process is necessarily a long one, but ideally we will end up with a pool - - -

Mr De Domenico: A great pool.

MR BERRY: We will be ready for a swim, Mr De Domenico, in about March.

Mr De Domenico: March, did you say?

MR BERRY: In about March.

Mr Moore: Just after summer.

MR BERRY: Mr Moore calls out, "Just after summer", but we will be swimming there quite comfortably in winter. It is a pool which I think will be warmly accepted by the people of Tuggeranong in particular. It will be widely used by sporting organisations and people who want to involve themselves in swimming as a recreation across Canberra. It is something that I think we can all be quite proud of.

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

25 November 1992

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN - NATIONAL STRATEGY Paper

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer) (3.02): Madam Speaker, for the information of members, I present the National Strategy on Violence Against Women, prepared by the National Committee on Violence Against Women, and I move:

That the Assembly takes note of the paper.

Madam Speaker, recently I attended the fourth meeting of the Commonwealth-State Ministerial Conference on the Status of Women. At this meeting the Prime Minister and the ministerial conference were presented with a strategy aimed at achieving the elimination of violence against women. Today I wish to commend this strategy, the National Strategy on Violence Against Women, to this Assembly and to highlight the issues it discusses and the recommendations it makes.

This Government is firmly committed to the objectives of the strategy and will be giving its recommendations very careful consideration. I would like to take the opportunity today to describe a number of important ways in which the ACT has already taken action which is relevant to the objectives of the strategy, and to outline the process which will now be followed in considering further ways to give effect to these objectives.

Madam Speaker, the National Strategy on Violence Against Women is the result of extensive work by the National Committee on Violence Against Women. This committee was established by the Commonwealth Government in 1990 to investigate the issue of violence against women in Australian society. The 19 committee members are drawn from Commonwealth, State and Territory governments, the police force and the community. The ACT is represented on the committee by a government representative and by a community representative from the Rape Crisis Centre. The committee's development of the strategy follows significant research, consultation and discussion on the national legal, policy and service delivery issues associated with dealing with violence against women in our society.

Violence against women is one of the most significant concerns in our community. It is a fundamental violation of human rights we can afford neither to condone nor to allow to continue. The costs to individual women and to society are enormous. Violence, and the threat of violence, deprive many women of their ability to live equally in our society. Contrary to public perception, most violence is perpetrated in the home rather than on the street. Evidence of this is provided by the fact that every year in the ACT the Domestic Violence Crisis Service is approached as the first point of contact by about 3,000 women, or about 3 per cent of our adult female population.

The national strategy deals with male violence against women in all its forms. It also seeks to identify and refute the popularised myths which obscure the reality of this violence. The strategy provides us with a background to the problem of violence against women, including the cost to society. It also raises

the importance of a national approach to this issue and presents the argument that the safety, freedom, economic independence and personal autonomy of women is contingent on their achievement of equal status.

Importantly, the strategy also sets the cultural context for violence in Australian society and raises some possible legal and social responses to the current level of this violence. This situation is highlighted by the well-publicised mass shootings and other tragedies which we see and read about all too frequently in the media, but these are only symptoms of the fundamental problem. The strategy recognises that violence against women is endemic in Australian society. It provides directions to tackle the underlying culture of violence, particularly by promoting a universal intolerance of the use of violence and a recognition that violence against women is a crime, regardless of the circumstances.

Within this context, the strategy identifies five key objectives for the elimination of violence against women and provides directions for all levels of government in Australia to work towards these key objectives. I believe that it is vitally important that governments understand these objectives and directions as the basis for considering action within their own jurisdictions to deal with the issue of violence against women.

The strategy's first objective is to ensure that all women escaping violence have immediate access to police intervention and legal protection which prioritises safety for the woman, safe shelter, confidential services and the longer-term resources to live independently and free from violence. Its second objective is to work towards a universal intolerance of the use of violence in Australian society generally and, in particular, to achieve full acknowledgment by all Australians that violence against women is a crime, regardless of the circumstances, the background or the culture of the violent person or the victim.

The strategy also aims to achieve more just and equitable responses by the criminal justice system which highlight the seriousness of the offences and to strengthen the authority of the law in its effective and important role of influencing community attitudes and supporting social change. A further objective of the strategy is to build on the significant reforms, policy and program work of all levels of government and the community towards improving the status of women, including the elimination of violence against all women. The strategy's final objective is to develop mechanisms and processes which allow for a coordinated approach to the implementation of the preceding objectives and which are effective in monitoring the progress and achievements of governments in the elimination of violence against women.

Under each of these objectives, the strategy details specific directions for action which range from the continued development of comprehensive crisis services and improved training for service providers to the need for community education. The directions for action provide roles for the different levels of government in implementing, monitoring and evaluating the progress of the strategy. In particular, heads of government have been asked to set aside time each year to discuss this issue and to make it an agenda item for the newly formed Council of Australian Governments.

25 November 1992

I am pleased to say that a resolution was taken by the ministerial conference last month to give effect to this recommendation. As the only head of government present at the conference, I undertook to refer the strategy to the Council of Australian Governments. In keeping with this commitment, I have written to the Prime Minister asking that this issue be placed on the agenda of the inaugural meeting of the council which is to be held early next month. In view of the significance of the strategy's objectives, and their whole of government nature, I believe that it is essential that they be dealt with at head of government level.

In terms of the ACT's implementation of the strategy, it is important to note that we have already taken many steps towards meeting its objectives. In providing immediate protection to women escaping violence, the ACT was one of the first Australian jurisdictions to have portability legislation in place which enables a domestic violence protection order made outside the ACT to be registered in the Magistrates Court and subsequently any breach to be enforced. This was a matter which I pursued at head of government level last year to ensure that protection orders are recognised across borders - a mechanism which is especially significant for the ACT in view of our close relationship with New South Wales.

Amendments have also been made to strengthen the ACT domestic violence legislation by giving the police power to search for concealed weapons in domestic violence situations. The Domestic Violence Crisis Service's role has been clarified through provisions which ensure that a worker from the service attends domestic violence incidents with the police. This proactive involvement of the service ensures that women are informed about all their options in such circumstances. The ACT also has a system of interim protection orders which enables women to obtain almost immediate protection from violent situations. We have a policy that no court fees are payable on any proceedings under the ACT Domestic Violence Act. In addition, a Legal Aid duty solicitor is available to assist with all hearings for interim domestic violence orders.

I announced a further important initiative in this area in the context of the 1992-93 ACT budget. A domestic violence advocate will be employed in the Women's Information and Referral Centre to assist women who are survivors of domestic violence to gain access to the ACT government services that they require. Funding has been allocated for a Domestic Violence Survivors Support Group which will also be run from the centre.

The national strategy's findings indicate that the availability of guns in the home is a significant factor in violence against women. Statistics show that firearms are used in one-third of domestic homicides. In response to this issue, the strategy puts forward directions for action which include working towards stricter uniform firearms legislation, banning military-style semiautomatic weapons, and legislating against guns being allowed in domestic situations. It should be noted, Madam Speaker, that the ACT legislation in this area is amongst the most advanced in Australia. In the ACT the sale of military-style semiautomatic weapons is banned and the ACT Weapons Act imposes tight controls on the ownership and use of weapons.

Many other measures are currently being developed which will further strengthen the ACT Government's good record in allowing women to live in safety. In particular, the Community Law Reform Committee's current investigation into the adequacy of domestic violence laws and related services has been presented to my colleague the Attorney-General as a discussion paper.

This paper will be released for public comment shortly and I look forward to considering the issues this paper will raise in the context of addressing the implementation of the objectives of the national strategy.

Development of an integrated crime prevention strategy is also under way in the Attorney-General's Department. I understand that this strategy is being developed in consultation with the Australian Federal Police and that initiatives to prevent and reduce violence against women will be given priority consideration. The emphasis of this strategy will be on ensuring the cooperation of and coordination between relevant government and non-government agencies in dealing with violence in the ACT.

Another particular priority of the Government is an examination of the adequacy of ACT sexual assault laws in protecting women and children and a review of the services which are available to women and children in need. Naturally, I would anticipate that any policy initiatives the Government decides to make following this investigation would be in accordance with the directions of the national strategy. These actions indicate that the ACT has already taken or is in the process of taking significant steps towards addressing levels of violence against women in our community.

What will now be important in considering how best to give effect to the directions of the national strategy will be a period of extensive consultation involving both the ACT community and ACT government agencies. I shall certainly be giving a high priority to providing opportunities for meaningful community consultation. I believe that my Women's Consultative Council would be an appropriate focus for such community consultation in the ACT, in conjunction with the community representative on the national committee. It should also be noted that the work of the National Committee on Violence Against Women will continue to provide guidance to governments in addressing the strategy and to monitor the progress of its implementation.

Madam Speaker, the release of the national strategy marks a significant stage in our recognition as a society that violence against women cannot and must not continue. I hope that this document will act as a turning point for all governments to work together in creating an environment which allows women to live in safety and in dignity.

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

PAPERS

MR BERRY (Deputy Chief Minister): For the information of members, I present the following papers:

Environment, Land and Planning - Department - Financial statements, including the Auditor-General's report, for 1991-92.

Occupational Health and Safety Act - Occupational Health and Safety Council - Report for 1991-92.

PUBLIC SAFETY IN CIVIC
Discussion of Matter of Public Importance

MADAM SPEAKER: I have received letters from Mr Cornwell, Mr De Domenico, Mr Humphries, Mr Kaine and Mr Westende proposing that matters of public importance be submitted to the Assembly. In accordance with standing order 79, I have determined that the matter proposed by Mr Kaine be submitted to the Assembly, namely:

Public safety in the Civic area.

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (3.16): It is a great pleasure that I have the opportunity today to address what really is one of the most important matters of public importance that confront the ACT community today. Madam Speaker, the first duty of a government is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens. The Follett Labor Government has demonstrably failed to discharge that obligation. By any measure, the safety of citizens in Civic Centre after dark is at grave risk. Almost daily now, the media recounts details of yet another victim of violent crime in the centre of our city.

Parents have complained to the Liberal Party, and I am sure to the Government also, that their children are attacked by kickboxing gangs. Young men have been stabbed to death in Civic in the last few years. Old people are being robbed and bashed. Concerned citizens have variously described Civic at night as a disaster area and a war zone. These are emotive words that describe what, for most people, is the real situation. It indicates a real community concern, a concern that is echoed by the police themselves.

The city centre is important for residents and for the economy. It has become a focus for entertainment for both Canberrans and visitors to our city. We are promoting Canberra as a safe and exciting place to visit, but the face of the city after dark gives the lie to the promotion of the city as a safe city. It is evident to even the most naive that the city after dark is an unsafe, insecure place. For some people, it may well be that that very jittery atmosphere has an excitement that is addictive. However, to those people who are in town for a night of entertainment, those ordinary people going quietly about their lives, the element of risk to their safety, even their lives, is a disincentive to visiting Civic Centre.

Neither tourism nor domestic entertainment industries will benefit from a continuation of the present situation in Civic. The attractiveness of the inner city to Canberrans is diminishing. The Government has a dual responsibility to protect its citizens and to ensure that the amenity of the city is guaranteed. The heart of the city should be revitalised by projects that enhance the amenity not only for workers between the hours of nine and five, but as a place for the community to live, work and enjoy at any time. It should be a place in which we have civic pride.

Unfortunately, crime in Canberra is a growth industry not confined to the city centre or to Garema Place in particular. In their recent report, the police clearly indicate that crime is growing at an astonishing rate - not my words; theirs. Garema Place is no more than a symptom of a general decline in civic law and order. Sexual assaults have increased by almost 150 per cent in the past year; common assault by 38 per cent; robbery and extortion by 10 per cent; burglary by 13 per cent; and motor vehicle theft by 14 per cent.

In any industry growth rates of this magnitude would be welcomed as a sign of an economic miracle. Unfortunately, this Government has not delivered economic growth of this order of magnitude. It has permitted, instead, a phenomenal level of growth in the most undesirable of industries: Violence, robbery, assault, rape, theft, vandalism and drunkenness. The Government has developed and pursued a consistent program of liberalising laws relating to civic behaviour. In a truly liberated society, that of course is most desirable; but to pursue those liberalising policies in the face of overwhelming evidence that this type of social experimentation is failing is madness. The solution to these problems is not to continue the process of reducing controls on anti-social behaviour, but to put further liberalisation on hold while taking steps to identify the root causes of our problems and dealing with them. Parents and the entertainment and tourism industries have called for stiffer laws relating to violence and public drunkenness and disorder. Stiffer laws mean tougher penalties consistently applied.

The economic disaster that we find ourselves submerged in at the moment clearly exacerbates the level of violence and criminal activity in the community. Young people desperate to survive in the city are driven to violent crime and to more pervasive criminal activity such as theft, housebreaking and assault. Frustrated at their failure to find work and to take their place in the ordered structure of society, locked out of the respectable middle-class life that we hold up to them as a model, many young people, perhaps understandably, vent their frustration in violence. That violence is often against people and, less tragically but nonetheless expensively, against property. It is mindless; it is enraged; it is indiscriminate.

That view is supported by the observed facts in Garema Place, Manuka and such places. Drunken behaviour and violence are perpetrated not entirely by people in nightclubs but by those unable to afford entry to those places - the poor, the victims of the economic crime that we are enduring at the moment. Madam Speaker, we cannot expect to see change in that behaviour until opportunities are recreated for young people to join in the mainstream of social and economic life. I submit that in this context training is an inadequate response to the urgent social and economic needs of our day.

The Follett Government has in all its budgets since self-government in 1989, to be fair, increased expenditure on programs compensating for criminal behaviour or dealing with the consequences of it. Counselling services have been increased for the victims. Cells at the Remand Centre have been expanded in number. Facilities at Quamby have been made more secure. Policy attention has been paid to the development of prison facilities in the ACT as an option to sending ACT prisoners into New South Wales gaols. Refuges for the victims of domestic violence have been provided. But all of these things, while necessary and beneficial, are treating the results of anti-social behaviour rather than attempting the better course of trying to ameliorate that behaviour. Even a few minutes ago the Chief Minister tabled the national strategy on violence against women and in her speech outlined the things that her Government had done. She mentioned five things. Only one of them had to do with changing behaviour. The others talked about treating the consequences of crime. So, the Government still, right to this moment, is putting its emphasis in the wrong place.

25 November 1992

The costs of compensating for the rise in violence are increasing each year. Yet the police budget is reducing and there is little evidence that the police are able to restructure the force to provide a sufficiently high level of community police presence to deter crime. In times of recession the budget for policing must be reduced along with all other budgets, but at the same time more enterprising approaches to solving the problems such as those of Civic Centre must be developed. The Government must be innovative. Neighbourhood Watch has had a significant impact in the suburbs, and the introduction of the bicycle patrols in town centres has improved visible police presence notably. Similar initiatives are needed in Civic Centre.

Madam Speaker, it is not adequate to shift responsibility for curbing violence and drunkenness in Civic to the operators of nightclubs. If clubs are licensed and run in a responsible way, then the behaviour of their patrons once outside is no longer the operators' responsibility. The police and indeed individual members of the community have to pick that matter up. To avoid policing the problem and curing the ills that produce it is to encourage the vigilante approach that is increasingly advocated in our community. That is an unacceptable approach. The problem requires government action rather than community action.

Labor discounts strongly Liberal Party moves to deal with the problems, but the fact is that legislation to reinstitute some of the police powers of summary arrest may well discourage people from violence and vandalism. Legislation to increase the penalties for violence, together with increased application of those powers by the courts, may well discourage people from doing as they please, when they please, and to whom they please.

To some degree we appear to have an unhelpful community attitudinal problem concerning violence. Perhaps educational programs in schools and colleges should be focused more clearly on the development of socially responsible attitudes and behavioural patterns. Young people should not be left to grow up without guidance and without appropriate role models - with the belief that anything goes. Parents must be encouraged not to abdicate from their responsibilities for their children's behaviour. They should be persuaded that it is socially unacceptable for them to relinquish their responsibility in favour of some role model on television. Arnold Schwarzenegger may be entertaining, but the roles he plays are not admirable roles for our children or our young people.

Countering those models that accept violence and a disregard for the rights of others when they are in contrast to our own rights is difficult, but it appears that we have to confront that challenge. This Government has to confront that challenge. It cannot sit back and just let it happen. Spending money on counselling after the event may be beneficial in the short term to the individual victims or to the perpetrators of violence, but it will not lead to general behavioural change. Madam Speaker, it is behavioural change, attitudinal change, that is needed as much as stricter law enforcement and penal regimes.

I personally find it appalling that people would condone violent behaviour. Worse, I simply cannot understand people who stand by and let violent crimes occur without doing anything to assist the victims. There are reports of crowds forming to watch assaults or brawls. That kind of behaviour used to be sneered at in Australia as the degeneration of social life that occurred in places such as New York but never in Canberra. It is in Canberra now. Wider issues such as the planning laws that lead to concentrations in places such as Garema Place of

entertainment that is not integrated into community life but externalised as businesses rather than treated as social activities should be seriously examined. We need to deal with preventive measures in the context of education, social welfare and health, because the results of violence have cost implications for all of those functions.

Madam Speaker, if we as a community want to be confident that our children will come home from nightclubs, if we want an assurance that we can go to the shops and entertainment facilities in Civic Centre ourselves and return to our homes unmolested, then strong action is needed. Strong action is in fact demanded. The Government cannot delay in acting on this issue. If they do, the wrong signals will be sent to those who are given the task of enforcing the law on the streets; a wrong impression will be conveyed to our magistrates and our court officers; and, worse, the wrong message will be sent to the people who bring violence and danger to our public places.

Madam Speaker, at the 1992 Walter Burley Griffin Lecture, our Chief Minister said:

The ACT Government also has a long-term vision for Canberra. It is a vision based on a commitment to see that our children and the others who will live here have a secure social, economic and environmental future.

That is what I am talking about. They are fine words coming from the Chief Minister. She has a duty to provide that secure economic and social future that she spoke of. The Government has the responsibility of ensuring the security of its citizens. That is where I started. This Government must show by action rather than empty words that it accepts that responsibility. In doing so, it must address the underlying causes of violence with as much vigour as it attacks the results of that violence.

Madam Speaker, to come back to the document that the Chief Minister tabled today - the national strategy on violence against women - we cannot rely on initiatives coming from the Commonwealth and elsewhere. We as a community, this Assembly as an elected body and this Government as an elected government have a responsibility to take our own initiatives rather than waiting for somebody else to do it. I think the time is almost too late. The Government must act now.

MR CONNOLLY (Attorney-General, Minister for Housing and Community Services and Minister for Urban Services) (3.30): I thank Mr Kaine for his MPI today. It is truly, as he said in his opening remarks, a matter of public importance. One of the prime responsibilities of government is, of course, to provide a secure environment. The safety and security of our town centre, Civic Centre, is a matter of concern for all of us. I would echo Mr Kaine's concluding remark that we as a community have a responsibility to work together on this problem. There has been a tendency in Australia for too many years to assume that crime is a police problem, that police can solve it and that all we need to do is to leave it to the police and the matters will be sorted out. That is unfortunately not the case.

25 November 1992

In this debate, Madam Speaker, there is probably a lot more common ground between the Government and the Opposition than there are points of divergence. I noted in particular Mr Kaine's acknowledgment of the need for budget restraint, which he has made publicly before. It is a very honest statement that he has made publicly both in government and in opposition. Even though it is easy for an opposition to make a cheap political point, Mr Kaine has consistently said that the ACT region of the AFP has to look at budget constraints and that we have to achieve savings in the police budget, as we do across the rest of the ACT administration.

I thank Mr Kaine for his comments. It would be very easy for an opposition leader to make all sorts of promises. For example, whenever there is a report of violence, he could say, "If I were Chief Minister I would recruit another 50 or 60 police". I think it should be said that opposition leaders of all political persuasions in Australia, both Labor and Liberal, have had a tendency, when crime has been an issue, to make all sorts of promises about boosting police numbers and police budgets.

The Opposition here has taken a constructive approach. Mr Kaine said words to the effect that the Government has to take some initiatives; that we cannot just rely on national initiatives but have to seize the issue ourselves. I agree with that. Earlier this week I announced that the Government is coordinating a meeting which I hope will be held on Friday but which may - on my latest advice from the police, who are coordinating this - be held on Monday. I will get together with the relevant players in Civic and look at strategies for reducing violence in Civic.

The town centre is the area where our young people like to congregate on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights in particular. There is nothing wrong with that. It is an area where our young people like to come, have a few drinks, socialise and have a good time. There is nothing wrong with that. The overwhelming majority of the young people who are in Civic late at night - and it is a very different place after midnight from the Civic that we are familiar with - are law abiding and enjoy themselves. But there have been problems.

I have just received some information from police as to the number of assaults that occurred in Civic in the 1991-92 financial year, and I have a note to write to Mr Humphries to tell him this. In the 1991-92 financial year we had 172 assaults in Civic and 20 assaults in Braddon. In the four months to date we have had 19 offences of assault in Braddon, which is a worry. That means that in the first four months we have had almost the same number as we had in the last full year in Braddon. In the same period there have been 62 assaults in Civic. So, Civic is on a par with last year. That third of the year is just on track with the full year last year, but it would seem that there is more activity occurring in Braddon.

They are matters of concern. The beat squad based in the kiosk in Civic tend to spend a lot less time in the kiosk now and a lot more time on foot patrol. Their beat is not just the sidewalks and footpaths. The beat patrol officers tend to wander about and go through the licensed venues, through the discos and often into the back alleys. Those back alleys in Civic are a matter of concern. One of the things that I want to discuss with the Australian Hotels Association, representing the licensed premises, and the traders is the possibility of some coordinated action to make the alleys a little bit better lit.

Garema Place and Northbourne Avenue, which are the centres of the entertainment strip in Canberra, are both backed by alleyways which at night are fairly dimly lit. We have standard government streetlighting in the centre of those areas. That provides some lighting, but the walls of the private venues tend to be very much in shadow. I would like to talk with industry about working together to provide a more secure environment there. I would like to talk with industry about the way their private security resources - and we know that bouncers are employed at most of these venues - cooperate with police when there is a brawl or a fight. I have had reported to me instances of a fight going on for some time and no-one calling the police. That is an extraordinary position, but that seems to be the case. So, again I think we need to work with industry to ensure that there is a good cooperative attitude between them and the police.

There are a couple of points on which I must take issue with Mr Kaine. Overall his remarks were very balanced. He referred to some government initiatives. He mentioned the pushbike squad, which has been a very effective community policing initiative in the suburbs, less relevant perhaps in the city. A couple of points, I think written by an enthusiastic Liberal Party speech writer using a good bit of rhetoric, are a bit hard to reconcile with reality. Mr Kaine accused the Labor Party of consistently liberalising the laws in this area. I challenge him to find one point of the criminal law where this Government has repealed offences - - -

Mr Humphries: Marijuana.

MR CONNOLLY: No, we are talking about street offences; we are talking about violent offences. About eight years ago a substantial number of street offences were repealed in the ACT - the old public affray, vagrancy, public drunkenness offences. Everyone would accept that some of the offences - public drunkenness and particularly the vagrancy offence - were a problem. They were very much victimless crimes and had a potential for abuse. In recent days I have spoken with the police, and my officers have been in contact with the law office. We are preparing a paper on the possibility of reinstating some of the specific offences relating to fighting in a public place, because I believe that there is a problem in enforcing the law in the case of some of these brawls.

A police officer who comes across a group of youths fighting may lay a charge of assault. Assault is a serious charge under our criminal law. While an assault charge can be laid, there can sometimes be a problem in working out which of the two youths is assaulting the other. If neither youth wishes to proceed with a complaint against the other, which I am told is often the case, there can be some difficulties in making out assault charges before a magistrate. I think that it may be appropriate to look at reinstating the specific offence of fighting in a public place.

There is a point of difference between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party - and it has been argued repeatedly in this chamber - in relation to move-on powers. We have always said that we do not like arbitrary powers; that we believe that powers that are arbitrary and that give police a general power to move on a group of individuals are not conducive to good police-youth relationships. I also note that in some recent cases before magistrates in the ACT the magistrates have been fairly rigorous in applying the move-on test and some charges have in fact failed as a result of the broadness of the power.

25 November 1992

While we have always said that we do not like broad and arbitrary powers, we have consistently said that if there were problems with specific offences we would be happy to look at them. I have been advised that there is a problem in relation to dealing with a street brawl under the current law of assault. My advisers are drawing up proposals, which I hope to bring before this Assembly in due course, for specific and quite well targeted new offences to deal with the all-in street brawl. I think members would generally be supportive of such powers when they come to be.

Madam Speaker, I return to some areas where we are on common ground with Mr Kaine. He stated very accurately that these are community problems. We really are seeing around Australia that we have to start taking a different attitude to these sorts of problems of behaviour in the inner cities. We just cannot say, "Look, it is a police problem. We will rely on our uniformed police to ensure that we have a safe city". We as a community spend something like \$4 billion in Australia on law enforcement and the criminal justice system, from policing through to corrections. Yet we have seen over a decade in all States and Territories both a consistent increase in expenditure in that area and a consistent increase in crime. As I have said before - and it remains very valid - America pours vast resources into the criminal justice system, has vast numbers of police, imposes ever increasing sentences and puts more and more people in gaols, to the point where America has the highest imprisonment rate in the world; yet crime is out of control in inner city areas.

We have to deal with the problem as a community. Mr Kaine made a few remarks about values that need to be instilled at the family level, and indeed he is right. We as a community perhaps need to re-instil values about how we relate to one another. They are the sorts of issues that are being addressed increasingly around Australia now under the umbrella of crime prevention strategies. There is no quick and easy solution to this sort of a problem. It is an historical trend. As the National Committee on Violence, which reported a year or so ago, has said, there has been a steady increase in rates of violence throughout Australia in the postwar period. This has been a long ongoing trend within our society. It has taken a long time for us to get to where we are. It will take us a while to reverse the trend, but I believe that we can make advances. The criminal law does have a role to play. Where there are difficulties in the existing criminal law, this Government will be prepared to look at them. As I have said, my advisers have indicated that there is a problem in the way in which we can deal with the all-in brawl. I have indicated that I want some papers on that and I want some proposals for reform.

In relation to cooperation between business and police and between the community and police, we have a long way to go in the ACT. We are heading in the right direction. With the community policing strategy - all members have had the opportunity for briefings from the AFP on the results of the Small and Associates surveys - we are clearly moving in the right direction. We are getting our police away from the 1970s tradition of having police officers sealed away in a fast car, responding to radio calls around the town, running in, doing a job, getting back into the car and going off to another job. We are going to a new form of policing which is really not a new form of policing at all. It is an old form of policing. Police officers are walking the beat more and more. We are trying to get a police officer at a more senior level, at the sergeant level, to take

responsibility for a particular area. We are trying to get to a situation where the traders, the shopkeepers, in Civic, for example, know by name their local sergeant and their local constable so that there is a better rapport, so that they can chat with police officers.

There was an operation earlier this year in the Belconnen Mall. When police officers developed closer relationships with the store operators they picked up pieces of intelligence that resulted in more charges being laid. They would chat to one shop owner about how some kids had been ripping some stuff from the store; they would chat to another shop owner and another piece of information would emerge. The jigsaw pieces would fall into place and arrests would follow. Getting back to that old fashioned approach to policing is a very positive initiative, but it is one that has required a change in police attitudes.

I think our region of the AFP is as far along that track as any police force of the country. Indeed, in some areas we have taken initiatives here which other States are looking at. The pushbike patrol is one that there is considerable interest in. We mentioned at the meeting the other day in Melbourne - was it there, Mr Humphries? - the possibility of a skateboard patrol.

Mr Humphries: It was here.

MR CONNOLLY: It may have been here. It was a jocular suggestion, but the strategy is to get police closer to the people that they are policing. Relationships between young people and police have been a problem.

To summarise, this is a matter of public importance that Mr Kaine has raised. I welcome the fact that, in general, there is a lot of agreement between the Government and the Opposition. It seems that the points of agreement are that we have to accept that we will have, for the foreseeable future, constraints on the police budget; that the answer to this problem is not simply to have more police or to apply more force to the situation but to take a community approach to the problem.

The Opposition calls on the Government to take some initiatives. I would say that our first meeting of traders, members of the entertainment industry, representatives of the ACTION bus system and other relevant parties to look at crime in Civic with police indicates that we are taking the initiative. We are prepared to look at the criminal law where there are problems with specific offences. I expect to come back to this Assembly in due course with some initiatives in that area. I think that we can start to turn this trend around. It would be foolish of me to pretend that there was a simple answer that could suddenly turn it around. I do not think that Mr Kaine would expect me to say that. I think there is an acknowledgment that we have to work together to deal with this important problem.

MR HUMPHRIES (3.44): I am heartened by the comments that have been made in the chamber today about this matter of public importance, because on previous occasions when we have debated crime and community safety there has always been an element of recrimination and blame passing from one side of the chamber to the other. It may be that the Minister has been sobered by the very alarming figures I referred to today in my question in question time. Whatever the reason, I am grateful that the Government is prepared to acknowledge that there is a problem and that we are collectively responsible for finding some solution to that problem.

25 November 1992

The first way of dealing with a serious problem such as crime in our community is to acknowledge the dimensions of the problem and seek to find solutions. I am pleased to see that the Government has taken action in a number of areas on crime and, in particular, initiatives on crime in the Civic area. We put forward this matter of public importance today well aware of the Government's steps in this area, but determined that we should nonetheless bring the matter to the Assembly's attention and discuss it here because it is, in a very real sense, a matter of public importance. I am heartened to see that the Government is prepared to cooperate - I think that was the implication - with the Opposition on ways in which we might deal with this problem.

In the past it has been irritating, to say the least, to raise constantly indicators of a serious problem - such as the comments of the Director of Public Prosecutions, the comments of the NRMA and comments by police indicating a serious problem and serious changes in the dimensions of the problem - only to be told all the time that we were scaremongering and that the Liberal Party was just beating its own drum. I think that the Attorney today acknowledged, as far as he could, that there is a drum that needs to be beaten in the public interest and that collectively we - government and others - have an obligation to attempt to solve this problem.

The Minister made reference to the conference that he and I attended last week in Melbourne. I was extremely pleased to be invited to that, and I believe that it was a very profitable experience from the point of view of the whole Territory. I noted, for example, that the South Australian model of dealing with crime is a coalition against crime chaired by the Premier of South Australia and consisting of the police Minister, community representatives and a representative of the South Australian Opposition. If the ACT Government is serious about building a cooperative approach to the question of crime, it will find us open to approaches which incorporate that kind of joint effort to dealing with this problem.

What I am saying is that I am prepared to meet the Government halfway. We are prepared to commend the Government for its initiatives in this area - and it has taken some, undoubtedly. If it is prepared to look seriously at what we have had to say about the nature of the problem as reported to us by our constituents and take seriously some of the matters that we are putting forward to deal with that problem, even if only those particular initiatives which have been adopted by the Labor Party in the States in other places, we are very happy to discuss those matters with the Government.

Public safety in Civic is a matter we have all heard about at various times as members of this Assembly. The concern about public safety in that area is sustained and it is very serious. It comes from users of the area, shopkeepers in particular. There are many horrendous stories of incidents of crime. Vandalism is one of the most serious, because it is fairly persistent. It occurs, unfortunately, every day of the week. It has a serious impact on the amenity of that area. We have had reports of shopfronts being defaced, urine and excrement appearing on the walls and windows of shops and buildings, glass being broken, windows being smashed and graffiti being sprayed or scratched on walls. Assaults are a matter of serious concern. The Minister gave us some figures about the level of assault. In the past assault has ranged from shoppers or shopkeepers simply being pushed around by louts to people being knifed or even murdered. Cases of theft and armed robbery have also been recorded, although I assume that there would be fewer cases of armed robbery in Civic than in other parts of the ACT.

This matter is not just about actual offences. It is also about the perception of an affront to public safety in Civic. People, sometimes unreasonably, fear certain things. For example, graffiti is a factor in public safety. People do not feel safe about walking in an environment which is dirty, dark and graffiti-ridden. For those reasons the Government attacks a problem of unsafe environments by dealing with things such as graffiti.

As I indicated, constituents have expressed a number of concerns to us. One person rang my office in the last few days and talked about an incident last Saturday night in Northbourne Avenue near the Private Bin in which his 17-year-old son was assaulted by a kickboxing gang. It was alleged that a crowd of about 200 people actually gathered and stood around watching this incident; but, of course, there were no police there. Eventually one of the son's friends called some other friends who belonged to a soccer club and they came and assisted. A melee broke out. There was fighting going on. His son ended up with a chipped tooth and another boy had his nose broken.

This constituent approached the police on Sunday morning about safety in Civic and was told, to his surprise, "There were only three patrol cars in the Civic area on Saturday night. There is not enough money in the budget to do what is needed. We have lost control of the situation in Civic. The streets around Civic are unsafe and there is an incident in Civic almost every night of the week". It is not unusual, apparently, for crowds of 50 or 60 youths to surround a police car and rock the car and spit on it while the police are inside it.

The sort of behaviour we are talking about, he went on to point out, is not just confined to people who are in the very young age group, the 15 to 18 or 15 to 21 age group. He told my office about the case of a 28-year-old schoolteacher who has been in a coma for the last two-and-a-half weeks after being bashed at Manuka. That person was just going about his business at the time of the bashing. Obviously, as the weather gets warmer we are going to see a rising problem. This person suggested that if some of us walked through Civic late at night - I certainly do not do that very often, and I do not know whether any of us here do - it would be a valuable way for us to feel just what things are like in Civic in that sort of environment, particularly on a Friday or Saturday night.

I am heartened, as I said, by what the Government, and the Minister in particular, had to say about this matter. I hope that we will see more cooperation from the Government. If it is an offer that is genuinely made, it will be reciprocated by the Opposition. The Minister recently was kind enough to make available a briefing by Frank Small and Associates on community surveys of policing. I could not be present at that briefing and I have not received a copy of the survey report and I am told that I cannot get hold of a copy. If the Minister is anxious to make sure that the Opposition takes part in dealing with this problem, he might like to consider making that report available.

I am also extremely heartened by the Minister's comments about reinstating the offence of public fighting. We have argued before about offences and about increasing the powers of police, but the situation is a serious one. The Minister and those on this side of the chamber would agree that we really cannot afford not to act on this question. In those circumstances, looking at additional powers

25 November 1992

to equip the police to deal with this problem, particularly when the police themselves are saying again and again that they do not have the capacity to deal with it - for example, they say that there are weaknesses in the public drinking legislation we passed in the Assembly last year - is a very sensible move and it will certainly receive support if it comes forward from the Government.

MR WOOD (Minister for Education and Training, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning) (3.54): Two years ago or more I was a member of a committee of this Assembly that looked into public behaviours. That committee arose out of moves by the Liberals at that stage to introduce move-on powers. In the course of that committee's hearings we were told by people who were competent so to advise us that Canberra was perhaps the safest of Australia's capital cities. Any violence is unacceptable. Community safety standards can never be too high. If there is a trend towards greater violence in the community, it is one that we would all be concerned about. I have listened with interest to the comments made today by Mr Connolly. A large number of measures might be taken to improve public safety. Mr Kaine sensibly raised the responsibility of the community as a whole and the broad standards that obtain in a community. That is the starting point. The focus today in this debate has been on law enforcement, but we acknowledge that law enforcement is fairly far down the track in ensuring public safety.

I would like to mention two factors that are appropriate for me to mention as Minister for Planning. The paramount one is that for Civic to be safe it needs to be a busy, active, lively place. The more people in an area, the safer that area is. I do not think there is any doubt about that. I am sure members would not question that.

Mr Humphries: There were 200 in that crowd the other night and they did not feel very safe.

MR WOOD: I am not talking about a specific crowd like that, Mr Humphries. I drive past the Private Bin from time to time at night. It is not my drinking area. There is often a large overflow crowd on the footpath, though I have never observed any violence there. Certainly, there has been violence in the lanes at the back of that area.

We must be careful to see that Civic remains busy. If people become concerned about safety in Civic at night, especially late at night, and stay away from Civic it will become a less desirable place. Indeed, if there is a danger of violence, it could well increase in that circumstance. Civic is the main entertainment-commercial centre of Canberra. It is designed as such and it must remain that way. It is the place where there should be the greatest variety of shopping, more entertainment, appropriate commercial activity and ample opportunity for recreation, particularly dining out. Civic must stay in that style. It must be easily accessible, well lit, interesting and varied. I repeat that it is important that Civic remain the heart, the very healthy heart, of Canberra.

In order to ensure that it continues in this way and improves, the Government has begun a study of Garema Place. I recognise that that is not the whole of Civic, but it is certainly the heart of Civic. This study is being conducted jointly by the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning and Mr Connolly's Department of Urban Services. It has only just commenced, but it will examine comprehensively the physical and social issues involved in the continuing

development and refurbishment of the area. Matters to be considered include street furniture, pavings and the lighting of public areas. The study also includes the site of the existing police booth in City Walk and what should happen to that. It is prompted in part by the likely development of the BMI Building and the removal of the electrical substation in the defunct toilet block. There will be some consideration of that building and of the adjacent chess pit.

Public safety is essentially a social issue, but I believe that physical planning measures do contribute to a safe environment in Civic by day and night. The environment is critical to the way people behave. We are pleased that the architects who designed the new Parliament House and who have done other work for us - Mitchell Giurgola and Thorp - have been selected to make the study. They have an international reputation for the quality of their urban design, and I think we are fortunate to have access to their expertise.

I am particularly pleased that, consistent with government policy, they will start the study by consulting the community. This will ensure that the study has a starting point before assumptions are established, rather than there being a public information process after principles have become entrenched. I particularly mention that Ms Pamille Berg, a specialist in city planning and urban design with an emphasis on integrating public participation and public art, is a member of the study team. She is chair of the Visual Arts/Craft Board of the Australia Council. She will give us very excellent advice.

One of the central themes of the study will be to look at community art and how it and the craft of local artists can be incorporated in the Garema Place development. The first round of consultations is about to take place and there will be more next year. I am confident that that sort of approach will give us a design and recommendations that reflect user, community and business ideas to ensure that this really is the hub of civic life. This was part of the debate on the public behaviours committee when the design of the Woden Bus Interchange led to problems in that area.

Mr Connolly: We are fixing that.

MR WOOD: You fixed that and I have not heard anything about problems out there in the last couple of years. I think Garema Place presents a bit of a problem. It has both advantages and disadvantages. It is a plaza. No vehicles pass through it, and that is great; but it also means that there is no traffic flowing past it and - - -

Mr Kaine: It needs people living in it.

MR WOOD: We do need people living in it. I will expand on that. Thank you for the prompt. It means that there are no cars passing by, and what is actually happening within that square is sometimes less than obvious. Mr Kaine, if we can encourage more housing around Civic we will do so. We have recently announced changes to what will happen on the Travelodge site. I have had people suggest to me that we could put something over Garema Place. I am not sure whether that is a proposal that people would accept. It is no more than an off-the-cuff suggestion at this stage, but if proposals for residential development right on the fringe of Civic in appropriate places were to proceed - and they would have to be very carefully done - I am sure that they too would be of benefit to this important area.

MS SZUTY (4.05): Madam Speaker, I feel that the issue of public safety in Civic, which is the topic for the matter of public importance debate today, needs to be addressed in a holistic fashion, looking at the factors which contribute to violent crimes being committed in the area from both the social and planning points of view. A lot of what I had planned to say today has actually been said by Mr Wood, which I find interesting. I am pleased that the Attorney-General and Minister for police has decided to call a meeting of interested parties for Friday and that he has himself identified some improvements that can be made in the area - for example, with regard to lighting.

Civic has had an unfortunate history of assault and other criminal behaviour and is often the place where people congregate for a night out. With a concentration of people in one general area there are a lot of factors that come into play, not the least being the fact that the place acts like a magnet to young people and, it appears from incidents in the past few days and weeks, people who would take advantage of these young people.

There are, I believe, two timeframes that need to be taken into account, and they are obvious - the short term and the long term. The most urgent need at this time is to make Canberra people feel safe in the Civic area; therefore this should be the short-term goal. This may include redirecting more foot patrol police into streets surrounding Civic as well as adopting the measure mentioned by the Attorney-General of increasing illumination in the area. The areas around the Sydney and Melbourne buildings have been the focus of crime prevention design in the past. In 1988 the then Minister for Territories ordered the shrubs surrounding the car parks on London Circuit to be removed to improve the surveillance of the area. Similarly, the City Hill toilet block proved to be difficult to keep under surveillance and was closed. However, it continues to provide police with an ongoing problem.

In the short term these measures have probably had some effect and it is time that more such measures were taken to help people to feel safer in Civic. Some basic elements are good lighting and clear lines of sight in walkways and car parks. The Australian Federal Police has already moved towards a higher police presence in Civic with a shopfront and foot patrols, so emphasising its community policing aspect. Encouraging people to approach police with concerns is another way of reinforcing the security message.

While crime is increasing, this should not prevent a long-term approach from also being considered at this time. Social strategies as well as planning strategies will help to reduce the problem. There is a need for our society to address the feelings of alienation felt by both young and older unemployed people. We need to provide employment or a living wage to ensure dignity for all members of our community. These issues can be addressed through increased job creation schemes and participation and life skills training for young people as well as providing affordable housing. In the longer term it needs to be recognised that there are opportunities for crime to occur in areas of any city, and it is in the designing area that we need to, and can, take account of the problems that occur in any particular locality.

If, for example, the problem in Civic is that development is too dispersed, leaving people to walk significant distances to their own or public transport, then thought and consideration shall be given to ways to overcome those issues in the longer term. The redevelopment of Civic revolves around the current discussions about Garema Place, which Mr Wood has talked about, and may be a good place to start. In the 1988 publication of the Institute of Criminology, *Crime Prevention*, Susan Gason and Paul Wilson outlined the processes involved in how to develop a crime prevention program. One of the first and most important priorities identified by the two criminologists was the need to draw up a crime map of the area under consideration.

Their research points out that, while you can identify a problem in an area, if it is not quantified and qualified and the location of the crimes being committed is not carefully studied, then remedial measures taken may just shift the crime. In Civic we need to identify the location of the crimes reported and the types of crimes and then consider all strategies which will bring about workable solutions. I look forward to hearing the outcome of the discussion forum to be held on Friday of this week or possibly Monday of next week, which will seek to eliminate as far as possible the occurrence of the crimes that are of concern to us all.

MRS CARNELL (4.09): I will speak very briefly. I think a lot of the important things that need to be said have been said on both sides. I am very pleased to see a bipartisan or non-partisan approach to this important issue.

One issue that has not been spoken about quite as much, though, is the problem during the day. Ms Szuty made some comments about the problems that exist for those who are unemployed and Mr Wood made some very good comments about redevelopment of the Garema Place area. I know that the shopkeepers in the Garema Place area have concerns that the chess pit is used as a congregating place for people who are unemployed. Once they are there, there is really nothing to do. That is causing most of the problems. Sitting around in the chess pit all day cannot be terribly stimulating for anybody. That is where I think the shoplifting and vandalism problems that Mr Humphries spoke about become a problem for the shopkeepers, the traders, in the area. That is when we see some of the drug problems. I heard from one shopkeeper the other day that some very young children were found to have stolen some hair spray and were sniffing it in one of the alleyways. In fact, I think the children were as young as 10 and ended up being hospitalised. You could only assume that that sort of behaviour happens when there is just nothing else to do.

Another public safety problem that has not been raised is the problem of skateboarders and rollerbladers in the Garema Place area. It is a pedestrian thoroughfare. It is an area where people are trying to make their living out of coffee shops and shops generally. Skateboarders and rollerbladers zooming past their front doors, as one of the shopkeepers told me this morning, is causing shopkeepers quite substantial problems. In fact, one trader told me that three elderly people had been skittled in the last month outside the shops. That is just as much a public safety problem for those elderly people as is being bashed after hours. Those people feel unsafe in the Garema Place area. Let us be fair. We have encouraged elderly people to live in the Civic environs. It is appropriate for ageing people to live in the flats and other accommodation in that area. If we do not make it safe for them to shop in the Civic area we have a problem as a community. I can understand them feeling very fearful, and I believe that it is important that we stop rollerbladers and skateboarders from using the pedestrian thoroughfares that shoppers use and stop that fear problem that they have.

25 November 1992

The other people who seem to be quite fearful of the developments in Civic are the traders. I spoke to a few of them this morning. A number of them say that they lock their doors now when they do their tills at night. As most traders do, they used to keep their front doors open for as long as possible; but they are not game to do that any more. There have been too many problems. They are now locking themselves in. One trader at one stage was staying open later than the normal 6 o'clock just to get a little extra business in tough times, but he is not game to do it any more and is closing when his counterparts in adjacent shops close. I think it is sad when we get to a stage like that.

Again I get back to the real problem - the youth in the Civic area feel that they have nothing to do. A couple of the traders indicated that they would be willing to fund activities in an area somewhere other than Garema Place that - - -

Mr Moore: Why do they not fund a spot in Garema Place?

MRS CARNELL: They were suggesting Glebe Park or somewhere else. These people were willing to put up money - not because they wanted just to get rid of these young people, but because they were concerned that these young people are sitting around with nothing to do all day and ending up getting into trouble. I think it is appropriate for those people to look at ways that they may be able to help young people get over that problem. The consultations that will occur over the next week or so will obviously bring those ideas - those constructive approaches to this very real problem - to the fore. I am pleased to see the efforts that Mr Connolly, and Mr Wood through the planning approach, have made in this area. I certainly hope that the non-partisan approach continues.

MADAM SPEAKER: There being no further speakers, the matter of public importance discussion is completed.

APPROPRIATION BILL 1992-93

[COGNATE PAPER:

ESTIMATES - SELECT COMMITTEE - REPORT ON THE APPROPRIATION BILL 1992-93 -
GOVERNMENT RESPONSE]

Detail Stage

MADAM SPEAKER: It is an order of the Assembly that this order of the day be debated concurrently with executive business, order of the day No. 2, Select Committee on Estimates 1992-93 - Government response. I therefore remind members that, in debating executive business, order of the day No. 1, they may also address their remarks to executive business, order of the day No. 2. Standing order 180 sets down the order in which this Bill will be considered; that is, in the detail stage, the Schedule must be considered before the clauses and, unless the Assembly otherwise orders, the Schedule will be considered by proposed expenditure in the order shown.

Schedule - Part II

ACT Legislative Assembly

Proposed expenditure - Division 10 - ACT Legislative Assembly, \$3,714,600 - agreed to.

Chief Minister's Department

Proposed expenditure - Division 20 - ACT Corporate Management, \$14,705,100.

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (4.16): Madam Speaker, I move:

That the proposed expenditure for Division 20, ACT Corporate Management of the Chief Minister's Department, be reduced by \$10.

I do not move this amendment in order to raise any question of confidence in the Government. They may be aware of parliamentary procedure that such an amendment usually indicates some lack of confidence in the Government, but that is not my intention. Neither do I move to reduce the appropriation by \$10 frivolously. I do so, Madam Speaker, as a means of registering my concern about the lack of performance of the Labor Executive as expressed in this budget.

Madam Speaker, one might ask why I arrived at the value of \$10? Traditionally, it used to be one pound - one quid in the old days - and I figured that a 1964 quid in 1992 is probably worth about 5c, so it was hardly worth the trouble. I upped the ante and chose a nice round figure of \$10.

Mr Moore: So, you want it to be \$14,705,090, not \$14,705,100?

MR KAINE: That is right. Madam Speaker, the Government's record during the past year leaves me, at least, with considerable foreboding and trepidation for the well-being of Canberra for the next couple of years and beyond. There has been no performance to criticise. There has been no strategy to argue with. There is no financial plan to come to terms with. In fact, there is no long-term plan at all. Essentially, the Government has abdicated, for all practical purposes, and exhibits no desire to confront the real problems facing our community. The Ministers of the Government stand up day after day in this Assembly contemptuously lecturing the Opposition, in their patronising manner, about all manner of things; but it is all ephemeral. It has no substance, and you can see right through it.

The sick ACT economy cries out for remedies. Small business is suffering the effects of the worst recession in 60 years. Young people face long periods of unemployment - if they are lucky enough eventually to find work at all. Fifty-six per cent of our young people between 15 and 19 were unemployed in September, and the Government wrung its hands and said that they had training programs in place. In October the rate of unemployed youth was down to 42 per cent, and the Government congratulated itself on its successful policies that were, they claimed, improving the lot of our young people. I find no comfort, Madam Speaker, in a reduction of 14 per cent when it means that 42 per cent of young people are still without work, still relying on social welfare, not getting a start in life, but being driven to despair. I think that the 42 per cent of our young people out there still unemployed find no comfort in it either.

25 November 1992

Our economy needs real stimulation to create jobs. It does not need money thrown at make-work schemes to provide short-term jobs that reduce the unemployment figures for a while but leave, underlying that, a prolonged unemployment problem. Providing more training places without providing jobs at the end of that process will not help employment either, and I have said that before. Training is needed, but it is not a cure. Businesses need more real activity. Consumption needs to be responsibly encouraged, consumer confidence needs to be restored, and the Government has a major role to play in that task. But it is not playing that role. Rather, it is abdicating its responsibilities to the Federal Government, or avoiding the issue altogether and shifting blame to nebulous unexplained forces in the national and international economies. Business is not being created in the ACT, nor is it being attracted to the ACT.

I am delighted, of course, to see Optus and other new businesses coming here, but half a dozen businesses do not make a summer. It is a very modest result for literally years of work at great expense by a large division of the Chief Minister's Department, and a lot of this work started when the Chief Minister and this Government were not in place. It is not the product necessarily of their efforts, even if it can be claimed that it is a result of that work. I think Optus would have come to Canberra whether Rosemary Follett asked them to or not. We need a much greater volume of business creation and we need much more inward migration.

Where are the incentives to business to set up in the ACT? The States and the Northern Territory offer tax incentives, assistance with relocation, promotional schemes, land incentives and marketing incentives which we really cannot easily match. But they also offer firm planning, policy stability and bold expansionary vision which unfortunately we cannot match either while this Government is in place because this Government is simply moribund. The ACT merely provides, under this Follett Government, clean air, a nice environment and bright employees - not sufficient by themselves to attract business here.

Madam Speaker, those endowments are valuable and they are important to Canberra, but they are not the only incentives that business needs or values; nor will they compete with incentives provided elsewhere. Madam Speaker, there is cold comfort in having clean air if our economy is so constrained that business cannot establish itself with confidence and grow. Nor will business thrive in an economy that is highly regulated. Private enterprise, which the Government claims to support - although, as I demonstrated earlier, with some equivocation - requires flexibility and freedom to be innovative and enterprising. The value of such innovation and enterprise, so highly valued elsewhere, is stifled in the ACT under this Government. Business regulation continues to be a restriction to business growth, and the Government cannot regulate in the public interest as effectively as the market can, particularly in a city that boasts such an informed community as ours. Over-regulation is an inflexible approach.

In the budget, Madam Speaker, the Government has again failed to address unemployment and business development, and it provides no leadership in planning. Our major industry, housing and construction, has seesawed from month to month - a boom one month, a bust the next. There is no certainty and no consistency in the Government's planning policies. There has been paralysis

in respect of major developments. The greatest success the Follett Government has had in planning is to bring to fruition the process culminating in the \$19m casino premium and the opening of the interim casino, and even that was the outcome of a process set in train by the Alliance Government. Even that success, Madam Speaker, is no substitute for planned, broad-ranging development.

There has been vacillation about whether the Government will resume land development. That procrastination has produced uncertainty and is constraining private enterprise participation. If there is a return to public land development, the Government will impose considerable costs on the community, reduce the pace of development and drive both business and employment out of Canberra.

Major initiatives have been proposed for Gungahlin and elsewhere by the private sector, but they have been rejected - not for economic reasons, but for obscure reasons including, I am sure, party political considerations. The future of Acton and Kingston is similarly hostage to which faction is most powerful in the ALP at the moment. Inaction and lack of direction in planning and development have encouraged middle class, left wing radicals in the ALP to exert undue political influence that will be detrimental to the ACT. That group - I think we can call them the unthinking group - would stop all development, stop private development and turn Canberra into a world heritage theme park. The only activity in Canberra would be in the public sector, and the local government sector at that. Madam Speaker, Canberra needs and deserves better than that.

The Follett Government cannot continue to hide behind the illusion that they have a program of action. Their legislative program has been virtually non-existent. They have passed legislation that injures the community. They have passed legislation promoting the sectional views of small communities of opinion. I refer the Assembly to the rates and land tax amendments, the Animal Welfare Bill and the decriminalisation of drugs of dependence. It is this Government that has secretly promoted proposals to reduce the age of sexual consent to 13 years. The Government's program, if it can be given that title credibly, is ad hoc and without consistent direction. It cannot address the major issues in this Territory. They are unemployment, economic recovery and development. It reflects no long-term thinking. I hear some gurgling over there. Perhaps they will stop gurgling and start doing.

The Government cannot provide clear direction for the planning of a future Canberra that retains its pre-eminence as a better city, a beautiful city, when it pursues conflicting agendas and fails to endorse proposals that are clearly beneficial. I refer to the decision not to proceed with the Gungahlin urban village. It cannot even govern its own house, and I am not referring to the nine factions that exist in the eight-member Caucus. The separation of the ACT from the Commonwealth Public Service has not been given any impetus or direction. The Government appears to support the separate local service but cannot move its own public servants to produce the legislation to bring it about.

In the budget process we are asked to examine the performance of the Government and its policies. Those policies and programs that, through hard work, succeed efficiently and effectively in the public interest should, of course, be acclaimed; but those activities which are clearly ineffective should cease. No competent manager continues to pay for activities or programs that fail to deliver and fail to meet expectations. The same approach must be taken with government and its programs.

25 November 1992

I cannot, the Opposition cannot, stop the Government passing the Appropriation Bill, Madam Speaker. Convention determines that, and given the numbers I cannot stop the Government passing any program estimate either; but I can register a protest at the Government's failure, inaction, indecision and patronising self-indulgence by moving that program 2, the executive budget, be appropriated \$10 less for 1992-93 than the Bill proposes. This, at least, is a symbolic reflection of my view of the failure of the members of the Executive, the Follett Ministry, to meet their obligations to the community.

MS SZUTY (4.26): In responding to the Appropriation Bill 1992-93 I would like to comment once only and address my comments to the Chief Minister's ministerial statement on the Government response to the report by the Estimates Committee on the Appropriation Bill 1992-93 and to the Government's actual response to the recommendations as tabled by the Chief Minister. In general terms I regard both responses to the work of this year's Estimates Committee as encouraging and largely favourable, and there is ample evidence for these comments.

I endorse the Chief Minister's comments that the detailed examination of government expenditures carried out by the committee has, as in previous years, made a strong contribution to open an accountable government. As I said in my speech when I tabled the report of the Estimates Committee, the estimates process is important, and it is important that both members participating and Ministers and their officers participating regard the process as serious and an important and legitimate task of the parliament. If the process is approached in this way the wider community can have every confidence that the ACT Legislative Assembly is acting in its best interests.

Many particular positive comments have been made by the Chief Minister in her appreciation of the committee's comments about the improvement in the format of the budget papers and in the timeliness and quality of the explanatory notes. I am pleased to note the Government's commitment to continuing improvements in the standard of performance indicators which in themselves enable government performance to be effectively measured. I am also pleased to note the Government's commitment to improvements in the quality and format of information that will be provided to next year's Estimates Committee and agree that inconsistencies and overlaps between different papers must be eliminated.

I now propose to deal with the Government's response to particular recommendations in turn. It is pleasing to note that the Government has supported the committee's recommendations on the inclusion of corporate plans in material provided to the committee and the need for corrections to documents to be notified to members in writing before public hearings commence. This acknowledges the fact that members of the Estimates Committee need to be properly informed in order to perform what the Chief Minister has acknowledged is a time consuming and difficult task.

Several comments have been made about the committee's recommendations regarding the identification of administrative operational expenses. The most interesting of these concern the committee's request for information where the total actual expenditure or estimated expenditure is greater than \$50,000, and where individual items within those categories are greater than \$50,000. The Government's response seems to follow the reverse of the philosophy that if

you look after the pennies the pounds will look after themselves. The committee needs to be assured that these categories of expenditure do not become repositories where departments hive off smaller amounts of expenditure, knowing that they will not be examined in detail by future estimates committees.

The Government has acknowledged the committee's concerns about the use of the terms "consultants", "contractors" and "advisers". However, I do not believe that the Government should set an appropriate dollar threshold below which details will not have to be provided. All consultancies or contract work taken on outside of the ACT Government Service must be justifiable because it must be substantiated that ACT Government Service officers cannot themselves do the work involved.

The Government has agreed in part to the committee's recommendation regarding comparisons between budget estimates and actual expenditure for the previous year plus comparisons of the previous year with the current year's estimates on a subprogram basis. I agree that there are times when this information will be difficult to gather, due to structural changes within departments.

Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! It being 4.30 pm, I propose the question:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Ms Follett: I require the question to be put forthwith without debate.

Question resolved in the negative.

APPROPRIATION BILL 1992-93

[COGNATE PAPER:

ESTIMATES - SELECT COMMITTEE - REPORT ON THE APPROPRIATION BILL 1992-93 -
GOVERNMENT RESPONSE]

Detail Stage

Debate resumed.

MS SZUTY: However, it is no more detailed information than many companies and community organisations have to compile now to monitor and justify their operations. It needs to be remembered that we are dealing here with the moneys of the citizens of the Australian Capital Territory and that the accounting practices of ACT government departments need to be at their most rigorous.

In response to recommendation No. 5 about budget supplementation processes, the Government has spelt out in some detail its current practices, which the ACT Treasury also did during the Estimates Committee hearings. However, as the Estimates Committee recommended, the Public Accounts Committee of the

25 November 1992

Assembly has adopted a reference which will enable it to inquire more fully into methods by which supplementation to all agencies can be monitored by the Assembly. It is pleasing to note that the Government will cooperate fully with the Public Accounts Committee's inquiry.

The Estimates Committee spent some considerable time establishing the roles and responsibilities of the various industrial relations sections of ACT Government, and again it is pleasing to note that the Government will undertake a review of possibilities for the rationalisation of these functions and will report to the Assembly in due course.

Recommendation No. 7 covered the possible appearance of further non-budget-dependent entities before the Estimates Committee in future years, in addition to ACTEW. The Government has made the point that these entities will need to provide information in a form consistent with their commercial status. This is a fair point. However, the committee's request calls for consistency in the presentation of material which enables these non-budget-dependent entities to be, similarly to ACT Government Service agencies, effectively scrutinised.

It was noted that ACTEW provided committee members with a range of documents, none of which correlated easily with the subprogram information generally used as the basis for members' questions of government agencies. As a consequence, members' questions were based on various documents provided, including the corporate plan and annual report, and questions were difficult to coordinate. Where non-budget-dependent entities appear before the Estimates Committee in the future, members may need to decide well before the public hearings which primary or principal document will be substantively used as a basis for questions being asked. I welcome the Government's planned review of the program and subprogram structure of each agency.

The committee's recommendation No. 9 concerning staffing involved four separate components. The thrust of the committee's recommendations, I believe, Madam Speaker, involved the need for the Government to provide as much information about the numbers, function, location, classification of and salaries paid to ACT Government Service staff as quickly as possible. It is noted that only limited information can be made available prior to the implementation of the human resource management system. However, it is also noted that the system will not be operational until July 1994. By far the majority of the Government's expenditure is spent on staffing and I believe, Madam Speaker, that it is absolutely essential that major efforts be placed on acquiring the information requested with urgency. The Estimates Committee simply cannot be fully accountable to this Assembly and to the wider community if it is not able to more effectively scrutinise the staffing of the ACT Government Service.

I am pleased to note, Madam Speaker, that the ACT Government Service will adopt a strategic training plan for the training of its staff. However, I wonder what the sentence "the strategic training plan will be a guide to managers and staff, not a panacea" actually means. Perhaps the Chief Minister can enlighten me through her remarks.

The Estimates Committee's recommendation concerning the operations of the Adoption Unit bear repeating. I quote it:

A review be undertaken ... of the Adoption Unit to assess where efficiencies can be gained in its operations with a view to increasing the speed with which adoption applications and approvals can be processed; and the Assembly be advised of the results of the review.

Mr Connolly said in his speech to the Estimates Committee report last week that he believed a review to be unnecessary and that the introduction of the provisions of the Adoption Bill will place even greater demands on the Adoption Unit. If this will indeed be the case, then is it not, in fact, extremely timely that a review of the operations of the Adoption Unit is being called for? A review will enable the Minister to comprehensively assess the functions of the Adoption Unit, bearing in mind the Committee's view on increasing the speed with which adoption applications and approvals can be processed.

The Government is correct in pointing out that consideration of travel undertaken by the Speaker and her personal staff is a matter for the consideration of the Speaker and the Assembly in the first instance, and that if the Assembly so determines the issue could then be considered by the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedures.

I welcome an internal review of the processes involved in the construction of the special care units at the Belconnen Remand Centre. The Government has noted that medical practitioners have been notified of the changes to regulations regarding the notification of AIDS in all its stages. While I do not wish to pre-empt further debate on this issue, which will occur on Mrs Carnell's motion for disallowance, I would like to ask the Minister at what time medical practitioners were so informed.

I am pleased to see that the Government sought further advice from the ACT Government Solicitor's Office about its proposal for the dispensing of methadone from community health centres. The Government has provided a comprehensive response to the Estimates Committee's recommendations regarding postnatal depression, and I welcome the research and evaluation which is currently being conducted. (*Extension of time granted*)

I am disappointed at this stage in the Government's response to the recommendations concerning primary school size. I note, however, that the Minister, Mr Wood, has suggested that the Social Policy Committee examine the issue further, which I am sure my fellow colleagues will be only too happy to do in the new year, as I will.

Madam Speaker, in summary, I believe that on the whole the Government has responded fairly to the recommendations of the Estimates Committee and I look forward to the further information that has been promised to the Assembly over the next six months or so. I would also urge the Government to carefully examine my responses to its comments where I have found the Government's response wanting in some respects.

Before I conclude, Madam Speaker, I would like to take issue with one statement that the Chief Minister made in her ministerial statement, which was, "I refute categorically any suggestion that any Minister was unhelpful in this process", and I recall an interjection I heard in this chamber yesterday to the

25 November 1992

effect, "Well, how would she know? She wasn't there". Ms Follett is undoubtedly referring to the comments the Estimates Committee has made concerning Mr Berry's conduct. I would like to remind members of comments made by me last week about Mr Berry's conduct. I quote them: "However, at most times Mr Berry was obliging and cooperative in answering questions, as were other Ministers, the Speaker and senior officers".

I also note, as Ms Follett has done, that it is on the committee's record that the Minister for Health was able to provide responses to questions on notice within one-and-a-half days, well within the three working day timeframe set by the committee. The committee's comments on unresponsive answers need to be seen, I believe, in this positive context. However, I maintain that they were appropriately reported for what they described. I believe, Madam Speaker, that the committee would not have been seen to have done its job properly in the eyes of the community should such comments not have been recorded.

It remains for me, Madam Speaker, to thank the Government for its response to the report of the Estimates Committee and to indicate that I will be fulfilling the third of my pledges to the people of Canberra, taken before the election, by supporting the Government's Appropriation Bill 1992-93 without amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before any further members speak may I point out the process. By the time I had decided that Ms Szuty was out of order, I had decided that she had gone too far into her speech to interrupt it and I, in fact, allowed it. May I point out that any response to the Estimates Select Committee paper is coming up as the order of the day after this; at the moment we are looking first at the Schedule in the particular order set out, and the question before us is the amendment to the Appropriation Bill. From here on in, could we stay with the script. You may refer to matters relating to executive business, order of the day, No. 2, but stick to the matter in front of us, which currently is Mr Kaine's amendment to the Appropriation Bill.

MR DE DOMENICO (4.40): Madam Speaker, I am quite happy to stand up and speak to the amendment proposed by Mr Kaine. If fine words and good intentions were what was necessary to develop a sound budget strategy in difficult financial circumstances, the ACT in fact would be in a very good position. There is very little of what the Chief Minister says from time to time that I can disagree with. The difficulty the Liberal Party finds is that nothing is done. If one needs some clear idea about priorities and how they will be accomplished within the limited resources available, the ACT Government's budget strategy is, to say the least, a disappointment. Madam Speaker, the budget did nothing to create real long-term jobs by cutting business costs and encouraging business investment. In fact, the Labor Party has created massive social and economic problems - not just this Labor Party, but Labor parties all over the country.

Mr Moore: I think that is division 30 you are referring to at the moment.

MR DE DOMENICO: Mr Moore will get a chance to speak if he likes. Madam Speaker, Labor has created massive social and economic problems over the past 10 years and the best way for it to fix the problems is to stand aside. As Mr Keating says from time to time, sticking more salt on the swaying carcass - - -

Mr Moore: Who would take over?

MR DE DOMENICO: Certainly not you, Mr Moore. You have to enjoy the last three years you have in this place, because it is ta ta after that. Madam Speaker, this budget does not take action against unemployment in any real or meaningful way. It creates temporary jobs and training schemes. It does not attack issues which affect the businesses in the ACT which employ people, issues such as payroll tax, business regulations, the cost of labour, workers compensation, Federal policies like superannuation guarantee levies, industry training levies, penalty rates, leave loadings, unrealistic occupational health and safety legislation, and financial institutions duties. It is costs like these that make it very difficult for business to employ more people. Madam Speaker, action on these areas was non-existent. Real help for the people who employ people was non-existent. Real employment growth will correspondingly be non-existent. We are already seeing the results of the Federal budget in the highest unemployment figures ever recorded, according to the ABS figures.

Madam Speaker, there is no real way of reinventing wheels to do all this. There is only one way to create lasting wealth in Canberra. There is only one way to create lasting jobs in Canberra. That is by rebuilding the business sector. Business and wealth are not dirty words, of course; they are the building blocks of a progressive vital community. In creating wealth and prosperity you automatically create jobs. Welfare should be a safety net. One million people, Madam Speaker, do not need a safety net; they need jobs. One million unemployed, 15,000 of those in Canberra, say clearly that Labor Party policies, both in the ACT and federally, are failing. In fact Labor has failed the community. We have known that for some time.

Madam Speaker, unless the ACT Government achieves significant economies and increases in efficiency in the next two years the ACT will face a severe budgetary crisis in 1994-95. Yesterday we heard of the ACT Government attempting to cut its costs with the ACTION buses situation. We heard union leaders say, "Oh, listen, the only way for us to get around a table and talk to you is if you give us higher salaries". When the Government's power base depends on protecting vested interests in trade union movements or elsewhere, the probability of making significant economies and increases in efficiency seem remote.

Madam Speaker, the budget did nothing, in our view, towards making the cuts it should have done. What will be made will come too late to save any government, I believe. I mentioned before our financial situation in 1994-95. There is a \$73m shortfall, and by 1994 the transitional funding of \$80m, or around that figure, will cease. The Government faces, without solutions, the prospect of a \$153m gap, and that is only if the current rate stays steady and does not increase.

This year will be remembered as pivotal in the history of the ACT. We go forwards or backwards from here, and this budget, in its lack of vision, direction and strength, puts the ACT behind before even beginning to meet the challenges which lie ahead. We see or we are told about 2 per cent overall cuts, but that lacks the specifics to ever be remotely successful; and many government agencies have been exempted - the Tourism Commission and ACTEW, just to mention two.

25 November 1992

Madam Speaker, people on this side of the house have been saying for a long time that we have the simple view that if you get the economics right, in politics, then the politics follow pretty soon after that. I think I am not the first one who has said that. I think there is a very short lag, Madam Speaker, between good economics and good politics, although you would not know that from the way people have approached the issue of policy making in Australia in the last couple of decades and the extent to which they have focused really on politics to the exclusion of economics. I do not say that only Labor governments have done that; I can recall Liberal administrations at a Federal level that have put politics before economics, and that was fatal to them.

This pretty much, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, summarises the approach taken by the ACT Government - politics first, economics second. In the short term, of course, there are short-term sweeteners and let somebody else clean up the mess. If you want to know what happens next, Madam Speaker, you need look no further than Victoria, where the Liberals are now cleaning up the Labor mess. If you do not get it right around the countryside you lose government. The Follett Labor Government's lack of determination this year will be remembered because it was vital that this Government set in train the right kind of economics at the beginning. They failed to do this; they took the easy option for now. Unfortunately, for a lot of people, the price is being paid now in human suffering, with individuals without jobs, families without breadwinners, businesses closing their doors. Madam Speaker, this year was the year of opportunity and hard decisions, and the Government, over the other side of the chamber, has missed the boat on both counts.

I will finish my brief remarks by quoting from the annual report this year of the Canberra Business Council. In two paragraphs, it summed up some sort of vision that perhaps we could all be aspiring to. These paragraphs are headed, "A Vision that can be Implemented". I quote:

It is important that Canberra and the surrounding region soon establish a shared vision for its future that can be understood and accepted by the broad community and is capable of being implemented through the political process.

We need to have the pride and discipline of Singapore, the financial and social skills of the Swiss, the establishment of a common purpose like the Japanese, in an Australian context. All of those incredibly successful island societies or enclaves have used their brains and social skills to harness limited resources for the benefit of their citizens.

Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, it is very difficult to disagree with what the Chief Minister says about the importance of the private sector. The thing that we on this side of the house say to the Chief Minister is, "The time for talking has now stopped". You had a wonderful opportunity in this budget to actually do something to alleviate the situation that we find ourselves in; you have not done that. We do not believe that you have the policies to enable you to do it in the future. As Mr Kaine has said, we do not have the numbers to oppose the Appropriation Bill, but I am quite happy to second Mr Kaine's amendment and commend it to the Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: I remind members that we are discussing division 20, and an amendment to division 20, which covers ACT Corporate Management.

MR MOORE (4.47): It will be my pleasure to change the tone of the debate, Madam Speaker, and speak about the amendment moved by Mr Kaine and division 20. In this instance I am not oscillating at all; I am quite happy to support the Government in this matter and therefore vote against the amendment. I have made it very clear - - -

Mr Humphries: His true colours are coming out at last.

MR MOORE: I hear an interjection that it is coming out at last. Actually, it has been coming out for quite some time that I would not support any amendments to the budget Bills. That has been made quite clear.

It is very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition proposed a reduction of \$10. I listened very carefully to his argument as to why he chose \$10. I heard him mention the quid. I wondered why he had not chosen half a quid because it seems to me that there is evidence of the half quid around him. Therefore, that may have been more appropriate. However, it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that it is an appropriate - - -

Mr Kaine: Are you saying that I am half a quid short or something?

MR MOORE: I hear an interjection about whether I am saying that the Leader of the Opposition is a half quid short. I did not actually say that; but, if he insists on using that term, who am I to fight it? Madam Speaker, having weighed up the evidence very carefully and realising the difference between the \$14,705,100 and the \$14,705,090, I will support the Government and will oppose any further amendments that are moved by anybody as far as this budget goes.

MR HUMPHRIES (4.49): The question before us is Mr Kaine's amendment to division 20. This amendment is predicated on a concern by members on this side of the house that this Government has not exhibited the kind of vision and fortitude which is essential for any government in a position of one such as this to deal with the ACT's fundamental problems. Madam Speaker, we acknowledge that the Government is going to get its budget passed today; that the Government is going to keep governing in the ACT. No-one is about to hold out hopes of another change of government, much as it might suit many people in the ACT for that to happen.

Acknowledging that certainty of the budget getting through, I think that we, on this side of the chamber at least, should be permitted some despair at the Government's absence of inspirational leadership on the question of the ACT's problems. We have a government which is not a majority government; it is admittedly a minority government. But it does have at the present time the vestiges of goodwill generated by the last election. It does have a mandate of sorts, tatty as it may be in some respects, and it has the capacity to put in place strong measures.

We have seen in Victoria the sort of thing that happens when a government gets into power and needs to make sure that it deals decisively with the problems that it faces. I think the people of Victoria will forgive and indeed expect that the Government there will face promptly and decisively the problems that it

25 November 1992

has inherited. I personally would be prepared to forgive some latitude on the part of the present ACT Government if it were to discard a policy here or there if it were at the same time to be dealing decisively and directly with the Territory's problems, but I do not see that.

I do not see a government that is committed to change in the sense of making things better for the Territory, building a stronger base for the Territory's economy and, in particular, building a stronger private sector for the growth of jobs into the future. I do not believe that job growth can happen unless we do more than pay lip-service to job growth. There has to be a sustained injection of confidence and security to the private sector in the Territory to make it believe and achieve the level of growth that will provide real security to our young people and not offer the spectacle of one in three young people at that age level being unemployed.

Madam Speaker, the Government has outlined a number of programs which it hopes will create jobs. I do not have the confidence that the programs the Government has specifically announced, for the most part, will create those jobs. I think initiatives like the Youth Conservation Corps, the new enterprise incentive scheme, the employment and training grants program, Jobskills and all those sorts of things obviously can contribute something to the overall morale of those that enjoy the benefits of those programs, but at the end of the day they are no substitute for real and permanent jobs in the private sector. That is where the Territory's future in job growth lies.

Madam Speaker, I see no vision on the part of this Government to make that happen. I see no indication of its determination to force that level of change in the Territory at the earliest opportunity. This was the budget to make those sorts of things happen. This was their best window of opportunity. Next year it will be harder because the Government will be that much tired, that much closer to the next election and that much more hemmed in by the problems of reducing grants from the Commonwealth; and the year after it will be impossible because it will be only a matter of months before the next election. So, this is our window of opportunity, and sadly it is closing rapidly without any opportunity being taken. Our fingernails are well and truly hurting from the slam that we have had come down upon them.

Madam Speaker, I think this amendment by Mr Kaine is an appropriate way of indicating to this Government the Assembly's concern that we expect more and that if it takes stronger action it will get the support it needs. If it sits on its hands and does nothing it will get today the condemnation of the ACT Opposition, but tomorrow or in 1995 the condemnation of the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

MS FOLLETT (Chief Minister and Treasurer) (4.54): Madam Speaker, Mr Kaine, in moving his amendment, indicated very strongly that he was doing so pro forma; in other words, that he was not serious in his intent. I believe that the speakers from the Liberal Party have spoken pro forma, from purely symbolic intentions. What they have said is what they have always said.

Madam Speaker, I think that what has stung the Liberals is the fact that this Government has performed extremely well on the economic front and they cannot face that. They really find it difficult to accept that fact. Madam Speaker, it is a matter of public record that the recurrent budget in the ACT has been balanced.

Mr Kaine: Not according to the Auditor-General.

MS FOLLETT: Mr Kaine finds that difficult to accept because, as we know, in his term as Treasurer that recurrent budget was not balanced. It came out with a deficit. Madam Speaker, Mr Kaine and his colleagues also find it difficult to accept the fact that this Government has not increased to any great extent the taxation burden, particularly on business. The reason they find that difficult to accept is that they did. In government and as Treasurer, Mr Kaine did substantially increase the tax burden on business. He finds it a little bit hard to stomach that at the moment. Mr Kaine also finds it difficult to accept, Madam Speaker, that the independent ratings agencies have given the ACT a AA+ rating with a positive outlook. That was the first rating we had ever had, Madam Speaker. It was given while I, not Mr Kaine, was Treasurer, and again he is smarting.

Members opposite, Madam Speaker, in their zeal for the business sector, completely fail to mention what the Government is doing to foster business in the ACT. Mr Kaine, although his remarks were extremely contradictory, said that he did not believe that business was being created in the ACT or stimulated in the ACT. He then went on to mention a few businesses that in fact had started up in the ACT and - - -

Mr Kaine: I mentioned Optus, and it would have come anyway.

Mr De Domenico: He mentioned one, not many.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS FOLLETT: Madam Speaker, in their usual fashion, members opposite have been extremely selective even in the criticisms that they have levelled at the Government. They have given no indication of whether they support or do not support, for instance, the increased funding for the Tourism Commission. We have not heard from any of the Liberals whether they believe that tourism is a valuable industry in the ACT and that that ought to be reflected in the budget. We have not heard from them whether they believe that there are jobs to be created in the tourism industry and related industries, and whether they believe that that would be of value to our community. They left out all of that.

I have not heard from members opposite whether they believe that expanding the capital works program is useful to the ACT economy. I presume that they think it is not, but I happen to think that it is, Madam Speaker, and that it will create many more jobs than would have been the case had this budget not taken that action. Madam Speaker, I believe that as a government we have taken a very responsible approach not just to the ACT's economy but also, of course, to the questions that are facing us in the ACT's budget.

I do rather resent the kinds of comments made particularly by Mr De Domenico and Mr Humphries which indicate to me that we should be taking the same sorts of actions that are being taken in Victoria and/or South Australia. I cannot imagine, Madam Speaker, that they think that the ACT is in the same sort of crisis as those States. It is simply not the case. Madam Speaker, for that reason I believe that drawing comparisons between those two States and the ACT is really, as I said in the beginning, purely symbolic. The ACT economy is quite different and we have not inherited the dreadful problems that those States do have.

25 November 1992

Madam Speaker, I would like to say, in looking at the question of business in the ACT, that there are a couple of actions that the Government has been undertaking which I believe will add to our budget initiatives and will further stimulate business in the ACT and foster the development of business. I have the Economic Priorities Committee of the ACT developing a business development strategy for the ACT. They are currently working on that project. I very much look forward to seeing their conclusions on the matter. The Economic Priorities Committee, Madam Speaker, is a body that comprises business, union and community representatives who, in consultation, in a spirit very much to their credit, get together and work on these issues and advise me of their conclusions.

I am looking forward to their business development strategy and I am also looking forward to their consideration, which they have under way, of business regulation in the ACT. This matter has been before successive governments here and, I have to say, very little progress has been made other than by way of the Mutual Recognition Act which we passed in this Assembly a little earlier. At a local level, on business regulation, I do not think we have made much progress. I do not think Mr Kaine made any progress. I would be very interested to know what it is that EPACT believes ought to be done about that business regulation environment.

Madam Speaker, I do not know whether the Liberal Party got a job lot on the speeches, but they were very similar. I really do not think that they offered us anything new at all, other than, as I said, sheer symbolism and a reiteration of their high-blown ideology. Moving this amendment was, I think, a fairly childish exercise.

Madam Speaker, Ms Szuty took the opportunity to respond to the Government's response to her Estimates Committee report, and I accept that, as chair, she has the prerogative of having the last word. I will certainly be looking more closely at her comments, Madam Speaker, to see which issues we need to take up again as a result of her addressing the issues again. Overall I think that I have made it quite clear. I thought the Estimates Committee report was, in general terms, a fair comment. I regard the work of the Estimates Committee as extremely important to the accountability exercise and the accountability of due processes of government, and so I welcome the thoroughness of her report. I did not agree with every recommendation, although I did agree with the majority of them. We can perhaps continue the debate on those recommendations which were not agreed, to see whether there is another way of addressing what appears to be disagreement.

Madam Speaker, to wrap up the debate on the ACT budget, it has been the Government's intention and our stated intention to adopt a very responsible attitude to budgeting for the ACT. In many ways we have had events forced upon us, particularly the continued reduction in Commonwealth funding - events which are, of course, largely beyond our control. In looking at the need to

continually address that reducing environment, the strategy that this Government has adopted has been quite clear. Our strategy, to reiterate, is to continue with the balanced recurrent budgets. I put that very high on my priorities because I think it is extremely irresponsible, Madam Speaker, to have to borrow money to meet the day to day expenses of government, and I will continue with my intention of balancing that recurrent budget.

We have also, as part of that strategy, continually sought efficiency in the way that we deliver services in the ACT. Members of the Liberal Party have made light of that efficiency drive. I think they are very wrong to do that. It is a difficult matter indeed to demand efficiencies from organisations and agencies year after year, and, as we have done, to say to them, "Here is a strategy for three years and you know that you are going to have to get efficiencies for each of these three years". That is a difficult process and it places a great burden on managers. I think that for members opposite to dismiss that as nothing is to demonstrate their own ignorance of just how difficult it is to continually reduce your expenditure, deliver the same level of service, ensure that the quality of your service is intact, and know that you are facing that same situation year after year.

Madam Speaker, a further part of our strategy has been urban renewal, and our stated goal of moving towards having 50 per cent of our housing delivered in urban renewal sites and 50 per cent in greenfield sites is an important part of that strategy. I have said that we will keep borrowings to a reasonable level and I am very pleased indeed that this year we were able to keep new borrowings well down. I think, again, that that is a responsible action to take. As I am sure members are aware, borrowings have to be serviced, and when a government indulges in major borrowings, large borrowings, it has to find the money to service those borrowings on the recurrent side of its budget and that means that it has to deliver fewer services.

So, that is the strategy we have adopted. I know that it is not exciting for members opposite. It is just plain good management, so there is nothing there for them to really kick and scream about. There is no great drama about it. It is a reasonable and balanced approach and I know that they find that difficult. Madam Speaker, it is an approach that I will continue to take because I think it works and because I think it continues to reassure the community that this Territory is in good economic shape; and it particularly reassures the people that the Liberals apparently want reassured, namely, the business community, that this is a good climate for investment, a good climate in which to do business. They do not want to face economic pyrotechnics; they want a good, sound, predictable, solid environment, and that is what we are providing them with here in the ACT. I expect that over time even the Liberals might see the advantages of that approach.

25 November 1992

Question put:

That the amendment (**Mr Kaine's**) be agreed to.

The Assembly voted -

AYES, 5

Mrs Carnell
Mr Cornwell
Mr De Domenico
Mr Humphries
Mr Kaine

NOES, 9

Mr Berry
Mr Connolly
Ms Ellis
Ms Follett
Mr Lamont
Ms McRae
Mr Moore
Ms Szuty
Mr Wood

Question so resolved in the negative.

Proposed expenditure agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 30 - Economic Development, \$10,870,200 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 40 - Audit Services, \$1,507,900 - agreed to.

ACT Treasury

Proposed expenditure - Division 50 - ACT Financial Management, \$88,290,600 - agreed to.

Department of the Environment, Land and Planning

Proposed expenditure - Division 60 - Environment and Conservation, \$32,557,700 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 70 - Territory Planning, \$5,301,800 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 80 - Land, \$14,944,400 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 90 - The Arts, \$9,868,400 - agreed to.

Office of Sport and Recreation

Proposed expenditure - Division 100 - Sport and Recreation, \$10,390,100 - agreed to.

Attorney-General's Department

Proposed expenditure - Division 110 - Legal Services to Government, \$11,762,900 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 120 - Community Legal Services, \$7,338,000 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 130 - Administration of Justice, \$9,880,200 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 140 - Maintenance of Law and Order, \$53,044,500 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 150 - Housing and Community Services, \$91,065,600 - agreed to.

Department of Urban Services

Proposed expenditure - Division 160 - Public Transport, \$65,983,300 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 170 - City Services, \$90,681,900 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 180 - Fire and Emergency Services, \$11,306,200 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 190 - Government Corporate Services, \$55,956,300 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 200 - Public Works and Services, \$166,749,500 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 210 - Corporate Development for the Department of Urban Services, \$2,866,300 - agreed to.

Department of Education and Training

Proposed expenditure - Division 220 - Technical and Further Education, \$47,233,600 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 230 - Government Schooling, \$188,345,000

MR WOOD (Minister for Education and Training, Minister for the Arts and Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning) (5.14): I will be brief, but I will be as persistent as Ms Szuty has been on the question raised in the Estimates Committee report on the size of schools. In three brief sentences the Estimates Committee report suggested quite clearly that there was a problem with large school size. I said then that that was no way to proceed in a committee report - to go on and make recommendations, in this case quite substantial recommendations, on an unfounded basis - and I want to repeat that point. I have not gone back to check exactly what I said at the time, but it is my clear memory that I said that I do not think this needs to be or ought to be referred to the Social Policy Committee; rather, that if someone had a worry about it, then it might be referred to the Social Policy Committee. I want to put that on the record.

Proposed expenditure agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 240 - Non-Government Schooling, \$56,274,700 - agreed to.

Proposed expenditure - Division 250 - Higher Education and Training, \$1,877,900 - agreed to.

25 November 1992

Department of Health

Proposed expenditure - Division 260 - Health, \$230,730,600 - agreed to.

Advance to the Minister Administering the Audit Act 1989

Proposed expenditure - Division 270 - Treasurer's Advance, \$12m - agreed to.

Remainder of Bill, by leave, taken as a whole, and agreed to.

Bill agreed to.

ESTIMATES - SELECT COMMITTEE Report on the Appropriation Bill 1992-93 - Government Response - Ministerial Statement

Debate resumed from 24 November 1992, on motion by **Ms Follett**:

That the Assembly takes note of the papers.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mrs Kate Carnell

MR KAINE (Leader of the Opposition) (5.18): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to take the opportunity in this adjournment debate to inform the Assembly that last night my colleague the Opposition spokesman on health, Kate Carnell, was made an honorary life member of the Pharmacy Guild of Australia. Mrs Carnell was rewarded by the guild for her outstanding service to pharmacy. Madam Speaker, Kate Carnell graduated as a pharmacist in 1976 and has had extensive experience in the pharmacy industry ever since. She purchased the Red Hill Pharmacy in 1981 and still owns and operates it, as well as having a holding in a pharmacy in Queensland where she was raised.

Madam Speaker, her experience in pharmacy industry representative groups is extremely diverse. Between 1982 and 1991 she served as chairman of the Canberra and Southern Districts Pharmacists Company. She was a councillor of the Australian Institute of Pharmacy Management from 1990 to 1991. She served on the ACT Pharmacy Board from 1985 to 1991 and, in 1989, she was appointed to the Federal Government's expert committee to provide advice to the Commonwealth Minister for Health Services on pharmacy matters. She also currently is the president of the ACT branch of the Pharmacy Guild of Australia

and national vice-president of the guild. I thought the Government would love to hear this. I believe that I have demonstrated that not only is Mrs Carnell a pharmacist, but also is a leading industry representative with demonstrable experience. Her experience as a pharmacist and, just as importantly, an industry representative gives her a substantial background in issues affecting health.

She joined the Liberal Assembly team at the February 1992 election, having been preselected as a candidate in July 1991. Madam Speaker, I asked her then to take on responsibility for health, and she has worked hard since then to ensure that the Liberal Party finds the solutions to the problems facing the ACT health system. When we take government in 815 days from now, the Liberal Party will be fully informed, ready and able to undertake the long process of fixing the system which has deteriorated so badly under Labor.

Madam Speaker, Mrs Carnell can be justifiably proud of her award. I understand that she is the first woman in the 60-year history of the Pharmacy Guild of Australia to be honoured with life membership. It is not only a great honour for her, Madam Speaker; it is also an historic moment for her profession. I am pleased that Canberra, the Parliamentary Liberal Party and even the Labor Party can benefit from her experience. Madam Speaker, I join with Mrs Carnell's professional colleagues in congratulating her on behalf of the Parliamentary Liberal Party on receiving this honour.

Floriade Display : Taylor Primary School Fete

MS ELLIS (5.20): Madam Speaker, several months ago I brought to the attention of this Assembly the work of City Parks and the Koomarri workers employed at the Kambah City Parks Depot in creating the beautiful floriade display at the corner of Drakeford Drive and Marconi Crescent in Kambah. I am pleased to inform the Assembly that this display of flowers will now be a permanent fixture in Tuggeranong. I am looking forward, as I know many Tuggeranong residents are, to once again seeing that display in bloom next year.

Madam Speaker, City Parks have taken this innovative community minded project one step further. When the flowers had finally finished in that display the students from Taylor Primary School in Kambah were asked whether they would like to take the plants to sell at their coming fete. With guidance from City Parks staff, the students dug the flowers out and repotted them. Many of the pots were supplied by the students, but a substantial number were donated by Revolve. Funds raised from the Taylor Primary School fete will be used to purchase computer equipment and new mathematics books. Madam Speaker, this operation ensured that the flowers were used as fully as possible and for the benefit of the community. Next year, I am told, a similar suitable use will be found for those flowers at the end of the display. I cannot praise the City Parks service highly enough for their innovative and generous support of the Tuggeranong community, in both the aesthetic and the practical sense. This is truly a fine example of many aspects of the public service working with our community.

25 November 1992

On a final note, Madam Speaker, the Taylor Primary School fete will be held this Saturday, 28 November, from 3 to 7 pm at the school located in Marconi Crescent, Kambah. Madam Speaker, I find it quite refreshing to see that there is such an innovative way of using a project that started out simply as a bed of flowers. It is now going to have ramifications for a lot of other people in the community. I commend the display put on by the City Parks people in that area.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Assembly adjourned at 5.23 pm