



DEBATES

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

HANSARD

22 FEBRUARY 1996

Thursday, 22 February 1996

Motor Vehicles (Dimensions and Mass) (Amendment) Bill 1996	151
Motor Vehicles (Dimensions and Mass) (Amendment) Bill 1995	151
Administration and Procedure - standing committee	152
Workers Compensation Provisions - select committee	163
Planning and Environment - standing committee	168
Public Accounts - standing committee	172
Planning and Environment - standing committee	176
Recording and broadcasting of proceedings.....	178
Authority to record and broadcast proceedings	179
Questions without notice:	
Industrial relations - comments by Catholic nuns.....	179
Truck parking - residential areas	180
Consultancies - expenditure	181
Public Service - enterprise bargaining	184
Business expenditure	186
Public Service - enterprise bargaining	187
Teachers - enterprise bargaining	190
Kippax Health Centre	191
Jindalee Nursing Home.....	192
Public Service - enterprise bargaining	193
Public Service - enterprise bargaining	194
Eco-office funding.....	195
Public Service - enterprise bargaining	196
Answers to questions on notice	196
Canberra Region Campaign.....	197
Suspension of standing orders	199
Papers.....	203
First year of Liberal Government (Matter of public importance)	203
Public Service - enterprise bargaining	222
Law Reform (Abolitions and Repeals) Bill 1995.....	222
Adjournment: Recording and broadcasting of proceedings	225
Answers to questions:	
Lands acquisition - Belconnen (Question No. 84)	227
Meteorological monitoring (Question No. 85)	228
Water quality monitoring (Question No. 86).....	229
Environment education strategy (Question No. 87).....	230
Soil quality data (Question No. 88).....	231
Wood products - purchases (Question No. 89)	232
Urban Services portfolio - consultancies (Question No. 93)	233
Emergency Services and Environment, Land and Planning portfolios - consultancies (Question No. 94).....	240
Leasehold administration - Board of Inquiry costs (Question No. 97)	244
Noise pollution - motor sport (Question No. 102)	246
Parking meters (Question No. 103)	248

Visiting medical officer payments (Questions Nos. 104 and 105).....	250
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 106)	251
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 107)	252
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 108)	253
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 109)	254
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 110)	255
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 111)	256
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 112)	257
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 113)	258
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 114)	259
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 115)	260
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 116)	261
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 117)	262
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 118)	263
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 119)	264
Visiting medical officer payments (Question No. 120)	265
Workers compensation - return to work programs (Question No. 129)	266
Griffith preschool (Question No. 131)	268
Austouch project (Question No. 134).....	270
Government schools - capacity and enrolment statistics (Question No. 135)	272
Floriade - wildflower seed packets (Question No. 137).....	281
Appendix 1: Government legislation program - Autumn sittings 1996	283
Appendix 2: Leasehold administration.....	287

Thursday, 22 February 1996

MR SPEAKER (Mr Cornwell) took the chair at 10.30 am and asked members to stand in silence and pray or reflect on their responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (DIMENSIONS AND MASS)
(AMENDMENT) BILL 1996**

MR DE DOMENICO (Minister for Urban Services) (10.31): I present the Motor Vehicles (Dimensions and Mass) (Amendment) Bill 1996, together with its explanatory memorandum.

Title read by Clerk.

MR DE DOMENICO: I move:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

Mr Speaker, this Bill is exactly the same as that introduced in December 1995. Due to a technical error, it requires reintroduction. As it is the same, I refer members to the comments I made on 14 December 1995 when I moved that the Bill be agreed to in principle. Mr Humphries, as manager of Government business, will be moving a motion to withdraw the 1995 Bill.

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

**MOTOR VEHICLES (DIMENSIONS AND MASS)
(AMENDMENT) BILL 1995
Discharge from Notice Paper**

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

That order of the day No. 26, Executive business, relating to the Motor Vehicles (Dimension and Mass) (Amendment) Bill 1995, be withdrawn from the Notice Paper.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURE - STANDING COMMITTEE
Reference - Order in the Assembly

MS McRAE (10.33): Mr Speaker, I move:

That the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure inquire into and report on the application of standing order 207, with particular reference to:

- (1) the definition of “grave disorder”;
- (2) the manner and timing of instructions given by the Speaker to occupants of the gallery in the Chamber; and
- (3) whether Assembly Members should give or deny leave to the Speaker to suspend Assembly sittings.

Mr Speaker, this motion is simply a way for us to consider in calmness, away from the hurly-burly of the activities that have beset the Assembly in the last couple of days, some of the issues that arise when standing order 207 is put in place. Standing order 207 allows the Speaker to act if there is grave disorder. Grave disorder usually refers to activities within the house, not without the house, as we well know, and comes from a tradition of parliaments quite different from ours where, in effect, the general public does not sit under people's noses but is usually well away in galleries. It is by no accident that the general public has been kept a little further away than is the case here.

In modern parliaments the general public is much closer. It is a more deliberate process. Parliaments have changed over time, so different pressures are put on parliaments that perhaps were not envisaged in the original standing orders and therefore involve the Speaker in far closer eyeballing of the general public, let us say, than most parliaments do. The consequences of a Speaker then being involved in judging grave disorder within the gallery are very serious for a parliament. It does not take much thinking to get to the next stage and to say that anybody or any group, who wants to come in and clap loudly, can come in any day of the week and close down the proceedings of a parliament. Quite clearly, we cannot be in a situation where we are held to ransom by any group that wants to come in if they feel that every time they can create a bit of noise in the public gallery the Speaker is duty bound to close the Assembly.

That leads to a whole range of questions. How should a Speaker react? What are the requirements that ought to apply? Who does in fact control the gallery? What are the requirements of the general public, and are there different measures that we should put into place so that the Speaker is not the one put on the spot every time? Perhaps there should be a different form of security or a different form of management of the crowd. Quite clearly, if grave disorder becomes management by the Speaker of the general public, that is way beyond the bounds of what I see as the Speaker's duty. The Speaker's duty is to manage the Assembly. The general public are invited guests and should be managed in a different way. So there is a range of questions that come up about grave disorder.

Mr Hird: What other parliament does that?

MS McRAE: Every other parliament, Mr Hird. Every other parliament has attendants in far greater number and a far greater level of security than we have here. This is a completely different style of parliament from any other parliament I challenge you to find in Australia.

Mr Kaine: Oh, is it?

Mr Hird: Do you want to do away with the Speaker?

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MS McRAE: No. Grave disorder does not require the Speaker to manage the general public. That is what I wish the Administration and Procedure Committee to have a cool-headed look at, and also a good look at the definition of grave disorder. Within that comes the whole nature of the Speaker's involvement with the general public. I think there is plenty of scope for the Administration and Procedure Committee to have a look at that because, if it is the general feeling that the general public can come in and engage with the Speaker, then it is a quite different process from parliamentarians engaged in debate through the Speaker, asking questions and being involved in their day-to-day work.

If it is the general impression that anybody can wander in, comment and interject and have the Speaker respond, then we are not dealing with a parliament with a Speaker in charge of the parliament; we are dealing with a Speaker in charge of anybody who happens to walk through the door, and I do not think that brings any credit to us, it does not do the general public any good, and it does not do the workings of the Assembly any good. We are then the captive of the Speaker's decisions as to when the Assembly should be suspended under the current standing order, and I think that the Assembly ought to have a bit of a say in that.

There are differing opinions about what happened yesterday and I am not going to canvass those. The Administration and Procedure Committee can have a look at that; but, quite clearly, it was with the Government's agreement that the Assembly was suspended yesterday. In this situation I do not find it acceptable. I think the rest of the Assembly ought to have a say, and in some circumstances it is appropriate that the Assembly ought to have a say about when its proceedings are closed.

This Assembly is not here for the good health of the Chief Minister or the Government. It is here for 17 members, and the Speaker's role is to interpret the will of 17 members, not six, not one side. I make by that no accusatory comment; I am saying that that was the impression that was given yesterday. I think that it is beholden on us, through the Administration and Procedure Committee, to look at the standing order so that our Speaker is protected from the requirements of the Government. If a government is feeling testy about proceedings, all it needs to do now is to call in 10 people to applaud Rosemary Follett and they can close down the Assembly. That was the impression that was given yesterday.

22 February 1996

Mr Kaine: You are joking.

Mr Humphries: That is a gross exaggeration.

Mr Moore: You just said that you were not making an accusatory comment. That is an accusatory comment.

MS McRAE: That was the clear impression that was given yesterday and it is now open for people to take that as they wish. The impression was created that with a little bit of noise in support of the Leader of the Opposition, hey presto, we do not need to work. I think there needs to be a good look at that as well, and whether in fact, when the standing order is applied, it can be done with or without the leave of the Assembly.

This is our Assembly for 17 members. The Speaker works at our will, the majority will of the Assembly. A good look at the standing order is required for circumstances where the general public is disruptive, not the members. It is quite clear that the Speaker has the overriding right if there is grave disorder among the members. If he or she cannot control the house it is quite clear in my head that the Speaker has the right. Where it becomes quite grey is when the general public gets involved in our proceedings. The impression is given that our standing orders mean that with a bit of noise in the general gallery, hey presto, that is the end of the morning's work.

Mr Humphries: That is a gross exaggeration.

Mr De Domenico: That is a gross exaggeration - "a bit of noise".

Mrs Carnell: It was not a bit of noise.

MS McRAE: I am talking about a general impression.

Mr Berry: No more noise than you people make when you are interjecting.

MS McRAE: In my head it was no more noise.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Ms McRae has the floor.

Mr Hird: You crossed the picket line this morning, Mr Berry. You are a member of the union.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MS McRAE: I am talking about general impressions. I am talking about - - -

Ms Follett: I think you had better close it down, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: I may have to clear somebody out.

MS McRAE: I am talking about the testing of a standing order that has not been tested before. I am talking about a situation that has never happened before. I am talking about a very new parliament with a very different seating arrangement from virtually any other parliament in Australia. This standing order comes from a different tradition, a different place, a different building and a different time. If our parliament is going to be closed down every time a group comes in and makes what is in some people's heads, not everyone's, excessive noise, then I think that we have a right, as members, to ask our representative committee to have a good look at the standing order, review the situation and come forward with recommendations. It may well be that nothing at all needs to be changed. I suspect that there is a bit more to it than we have ever seriously considered. A thorough look by the Administration and Procedure Committee may result in a smoother working of the parliament, a better set of instructions for the general public, a better set of instructions for the Speaker so that he cannot be accused of working to the whim of one group or another, and a guarantee that we are running a proper parliament that is welcoming of the general public, but welcoming in a way that is understood by all, and does not fall over at the merest breath of a bit of unnecessary noise.

MR MOORE (10.43): I noted that Ms McRae, in putting what I think is a quite sensible motion, said that she was not making any accusatory statements. She then went on to make statements that contained a light form of accusation of the Speaker favouring the Government and acting in a way that was designed to protect the Government. She gave that impression. I am going to support this motion, but not for those reasons. I have a view about whether yesterday's actions were effective or not. Having watched three Speakers in this house, I know that there are times when the Speaker makes a decision at a moment's notice, when something is going wrong, and the whole reason for having a position of Speaker is so that the Speaker can use his or her judgment at such times. Right through those six or seven years, including the time when Ms McRae was Speaker, there were times when I felt that that judgment was not done particularly effectively.

The situation yesterday, as Ms McRae has correctly pointed out, highlights the fact that it is appropriate for us to talk this through and to try to have in all of our minds a strategy on how we deal with it. If there was genuine and very strong disruption in the area next to us, I suppose Ms Tucker and I would be some of the people feeling most vulnerable, particularly if there was any suggestion of violence near the chamber and in the gallery.

Mr Osborne: I will protect you.

MR MOORE: Mr Osborne has just indicated that he would protect me, which makes me feel significantly better in terms of the physical nature of the situation. I wonder what the quid pro quo would be - not that we ever talk about quid pro quos; it does not happen. Mr Speaker, we should not consider this issue in the light of yesterday's situation. I think the fundamental line of argument that Ms McRae has taken is that yesterday's situation is a catalyst for us to say, "Let us reconsider the situation". Looking back, I would have felt much happier if the Assembly had not closed down twice in the one day. It concerns me that it could become an obvious tactic for lobbyists to use.

22 February 1996

They could get the Assembly to close down simply by coming in and heckling a little. We have to balance that against a situation where emotions are running high and people feel particularly intensely about an issue, as indeed is the situation in terms of the industrial strike at the moment. I can understand why it is that people are inclined to heckle.

Mr Speaker, I will support the motion. I do not want to comment on the action you took yesterday. Rather, I want to ensure that the Standing Committee on Administration and Procedure has the opportunity to discuss possible strategies for dealing with such situations in the future.

MR HUMPHRIES (Attorney-General) (10.46): Mr Speaker, I rise to indicate that the Government will not oppose this motion. I also think it is most important that I put on record very clearly that in my view you, as Speaker, acted entirely appropriately yesterday in dealing with the situation you found yourself in. On occasions the step that you took yesterday has been necessary. In my memory, this is not the first time that this has occurred in the life of this Assembly.

Ms McRae: Hector was punching somebody out, for heaven's sake. It is completely different.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, Ms McRae obviously is moving this motion in the context of having a go at you for yesterday's events, and that is why I put on - - -

Ms McRae: You said that, not me.

MR HUMPHRIES: No, it is clear from what you said before and what you are saying now that that is the case. The unfortunate thing about referring things to committees in this place is that we all tend to lock ourselves into positions before the motion is put to a committee and the issue is debated on the floor of the committee, so we end up with a position already determined. For my part, I think it is always important to have a discretion on the part of the chair of a committee or the Assembly as a whole to be able to deal with a problem from that position as manager of the meeting, so to speak.

To the extent that this has come forward the day after this event, constituting some kind of casting of aspersions on the handling of the matter, I think that is quite wrong. I think it is most important, and it will always be the case, that the Speaker exercise judgment about, and take decisions about, the management of both the chamber and things occurring in the galleries. If this inquiry by the Administration and Procedure Committee can help to assist in that process, that is fine. I am not particularly sure that there is a great deal of value in having the committee confirm that there is ultimately only one person who is responsible for these decisions, and that is you, the Speaker. However, if members feel that there is some better way of preparing guidelines to assist other members, or members of the gallery, to understand respective obligations and rights in these situations, then perhaps there is some value in the inquiry. I sincerely hope, however, that it does not become an exercise in bashing Speakers who act in the interests of defending the capacity of this place to do its work.

I, for one, felt that yesterday's events were intimidating. I certainly did not believe that it was appropriate to continue to operate in that environment.

Ms McRae: Ha, ha!

Mr Berry: Rubbish! They were no more intimidating than your behaviour at question time.

MR HUMPHRIES: Members opposite laugh. They think it was funny to have members in this place - - -

Ms McRae: What do you call me in question time? You never intimidate me; no, no, no! Oh, Mr Purity!

MR HUMPHRIES: In question time our numbers are nicely balanced. There are six of us on this side of the chamber; there are six over there usually, and we are able to slug it out under the regime of the standing orders. When people behave in an untoward way in the gallery the situation is very different. I do not believe that it is appropriate for that to continue. I think we have to have mechanisms to protect the operation of the Assembly when that occurs. That, Mr Speaker, ought to be the objective of this inquiry.

MR KAINE (10.50): Mr Speaker, I note that the Attorney-General has indicated already that the Government will not oppose this motion. I must say as a longstanding member of this Assembly that I find it rather bizarre that a former Speaker of this house brings forward this motion. I am sure that she would not have tolerated the sort of behaviour yesterday had it occurred while she was Speaker, and at the same time she sits there and laughs when a member of this Assembly expresses concern at being intimidated. I know that at least one member of this chamber yesterday was quite intimidated.

Mr Berry: Who?

MR KAINE: I do not think that she thought it was funny at all. If you do not know, Mr Berry, perhaps you should take the time to find out. Do not question me when I tell you that a member of this chamber was quite intimidated by what happened yesterday and was concerned. Yet you, Mr Berry, and the former Speaker sit there and laugh when the Attorney-General makes reference to members of this Assembly being intimidated in the course of their duties. I do not find it funny at all. Mr Speaker, I find the whole matter quite bizarre.

The standing orders that are in place have been in place for a long time and they have been adopted by three consecutive sessions of this parliament. At no time previously did anybody question the validity of standing orders 207 and 209. Now something has changed, and I do not know what has changed. I submit that the previous Speaker would no more have tolerated the behaviour yesterday without doing something about it than you did yesterday. From listening to Ms McRae, she seems now to be defining the Assembly as consisting only of this bit of this room in which we sit when we debate.

Ms McRae: Yes.

22 February 1996

MR KAINE: That is the first time I have ever heard the Assembly defined so narrowly. In fact, if you read standing order 209 - and I would submit that you must take the two standing orders together and not in isolation - it refers to the precincts, and we have had debates before and the precincts of the Assembly have been defined. If the former Speaker is serious in her contention that only this part of this building is the Assembly, the rest of her argument becomes logical; but, of course, that is not logical. So the rest of her argument fails as well because if that is accepted you can have a pitched battle going on where the visitors gallery is. If you take the third part of her motion as being serious, what happens? We sit here and we debate the question of whether the Assembly ought to adjourn and whether we should give you a direction on the matter while there is a pitched battle going on in the gallery or perhaps out in the lobby. That is an absurdity that even Ms McRae must surely acknowledge as being an absurdity. I find the whole thing quite peculiar.

I do not mind the Administration and Procedure Committee looking at the question. Perhaps the word "grave" ought to be removed from the standing order. Then you would not have to define what constitutes grave disorder because you are simply talking about disorder. I think that any member of this Assembly, and particularly the Speaker, is quite competent to decide whether there is a state of disorder in the house or in its precincts. You do not need a definition to tell you what constitutes disorder. Quite frankly, I do not think you need a definition of what constitutes grave disorder either. If people can be so pedantic that they think they need one, and if the Administration and Procedure Committee can come up with a definition of what constitutes grave disorder, I will be interested to see it. Perhaps the word "grave" ought to be removed. Perhaps that is what the Assembly's committee ought to be considering.

I personally would find it quite offensive that we elect a Speaker and then set about telling the Speaker, whose duties are clearly defined, that he cannot act until we have a little debate about whatever is the problem and give him an instruction as to how to act.

Ms McRae: Ha, ha! Look who is talking. For heaven's sake! You spent three years telling me what to do.

MR KAINE: I submit, Mr Speaker, that the person opposite who is laughing yet again would have found it quite offensive if the Assembly had pulled this stunt on her when she was the Speaker. It is very strange how your perspective changes when you have been booted out of the chair and you are no longer in control of the chamber. Now she wants to start changing the standing orders that she thought were fine while they protected her.

Mr Speaker, I did not find the events of yesterday amusing; I do not find them amusing today. I think this is a bizarre motion that is being put to the Assembly. I hope that the members of the Administration and Procedure Committee, since it is clearly going to be referred, will treat it with the attention that it deserves. I will finish on that note.

MS TUCKER (10.56): As a member of the Administration and Procedure Committee, I suppose this is something that I support. I do have some concerns about whether or not you can ask Assembly members to enter the discussion if the situation is as it was yesterday, but I will not say any more. I will wait to see what comes up in the discussion in the Administration and Procedure Committee. Mr Humphries inferred that committees

often are thwarted because members start off with a position. I am certainly not starting off with a position on this. The Greens never have started off with a set position, and I understood that that was one of the values of committee work. I would like to make that quite clear. The topic of grave disorder would lead to an interesting discussion. Yesterday I sought from the Clerk clarification on the proceedings and how it would normally go. It obviously does not come up very often. I share Mr Kaine's concern about trying to define "grave disorder" because there is a lot of value judgment in that. Anyway, I think it could be a worthwhile discussion and I am happy to support the motion.

MR BERRY (10.58): As a member of the committee, I want to make it clear that I consider this to be a fairly serious issue. I wish Mr Kaine had stayed in the Assembly and not left the chamber, in order that I can raise a few issues about his speech. I think Mr Kaine's speech on ABC radio was far closer to the mark when it comes to the behaviour in the Assembly. I think his speech was a rather shallow attempt and I think it needs to be examined in quite close detail.

It is clear from the standing orders that there is a distinction between the Assembly and the chamber. Yesterday it was a question of interpretation. I think the committee has to look at these issues and find some way to resolve the question. Yesterday I felt that the Assembly was not in any grave disorder; in fact, it was operating reasonably smoothly. Yes, there was some pressure in the chamber arising from the gallery. That pressure would have been felt by the Chief Minister, and that can happen from time to time. That is the name of the game. In so far as the operations of this Assembly were concerned, I would not have regarded the operations of the Assembly as being impeded by that behaviour any more than by the sort of interjections that we get across the chamber during question time. I have seen the situation arise in this chamber, when there is a constant barrage of interjections from one side or the other, when the Assembly would have been more justified in closing down than it was yesterday. That is my interpretation of the matter.

The issue that worries me most is the relationship between what I saw yesterday and the well-known rule of law that justice not only has to be done but also has to be seen to be done. For an ordinary member of the community sitting in the gallery yesterday, watching the Chief Minister urging the Speaker repeatedly, watching her walk up to the Speaker, whisper in his ear, and then resume her seat - - -

Mr Moore: You can do that yourself, Wayne. I do it occasionally.

MR BERRY: That is fine, I accept that; but it is never - - -

Mr Moore: I like to see whether I can influence the Speaker.

MR BERRY: Indeed, but not about stopping the proceedings in the chamber. I do not know whether or not the Speaker took any notice of Mrs Carnell in making his decision. I would not have a clue. But that is not the issue at large. The issue at large is that the appearance was that Mrs Carnell was trying to urge the Speaker to do certain things. At the time of the second suspension Mrs Carnell gave one signal to the Speaker and the Speaker then suspended the Assembly. For the ordinary person sitting in - - -

22 February 1996

Mr Humphries: Mr Speaker, I am raising a point of order. Would you resume your seat, Mr Berry? It is the courteous thing to do. Thank you.

MR BERRY: Thank you. It was a mere oversight, Mr Speaker.

Mr Humphries: To assert that the Speaker is biased or receives instructions from a member on the floor - - -

MR BERRY: No, no.

Mr Humphries: That is directly what you said, Mr Berry. You said that Mrs Carnell gave a signal and then Mr Cornwell cleared the chamber. Mr Speaker, Mr Berry quite clearly said that. I think that is unfair to you. It is making an issue of yesterday's proceedings, which Ms McRae a moment ago claimed that she was not doing. If they are going to make an issue of that, let us have a debate about what happened yesterday; but I think, with respect, that that is most unfair to you and it should be withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Berry, I am not in a position to comment or to defend myself in this circumstance, and I would ask you to withdraw any imputation on the speakership.

MR BERRY: There was none, Mr Speaker. Mr Humphries is a crafty wordsmith and - - -

MR SPEAKER: Would you please withdraw?

MR BERRY: There was none to withdraw. If you took it that there - - -

MR SPEAKER: I did.

MR BERRY: If you take it that there was one, I am happy to withdraw it.

MR SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR BERRY: Mr Humphries is a crafty wordsmith. What he did not tell you was that I made it clear, in the course of that discussion, that I do not know whether you made your decision on the basis of that or not.

Mr Humphries: Yes, but you implied that he did.

MR SPEAKER: You have withdrawn, Mr Berry. Continue.

MR BERRY: Mr Humphries says that I implied it. I had no intention of implying it. What I did say was that the ordinary member of the public sitting in the gallery there and watching Mrs Carnell trying to urge the Speaker could draw the conclusion that something was not quite right.

For those reasons, I think we need to look at whether there are any other standing orders which might be able to be crafted and which might allow for the Assembly to be regarded quite differently from the rest of the chamber. For example, it seems to me that, if there is some upset in the chamber as a whole which threatens somebody with imminent danger, perhaps the Speaker must act quickly. There was no such danger yesterday. If there is some sort of a fracas in the chamber, that is a matter for the attendants to sort out. If the Assembly can proceed when there is a disagreement in the chamber while attendants deal with it, it should proceed. That is the point that I think needs to be thought about in the course of consideration of this issue.

I think that for the Government to pretend that something happened yesterday that would cause concern shows them to be turning a deliberate blind eye to the issue, and I think that is unfortunate. No, Mr Speaker, I did not say that you made the decision on the basis of Mrs Carnell's signals. I merely drew attention to the fact that she was making the signals. I think the people in the chamber could quite fairly come to a conclusion that something was amiss. In all of those circumstances, I would welcome the opportunity to look at this group of standing orders. Hopefully, we can come up with an interpretation of those standing orders which people can tolerate or think is appropriate; otherwise, some new standing orders might be drafted which would cater for consideration of various occurrences within the chamber.

Mr Moore: Mr Speaker, could I take a point of order under standing order 47 to explain a couple of words that I think have been misunderstood? We have been talking about the words "chamber", "gallery" and "Assembly". It seems to me, Mr Speaker, that the term "Assembly", from the way all the standing orders are crafted, covers the whole area; the word "chamber" this area, and the word "gallery" that area. When we are talking about standing order 207 and the word "Assembly", that would be my interpretation of it. If members look at standing order 206, it distinguishes between "chamber", "gallery" and "Assembly". It becomes much more obvious where the Speaker does have control in terms of the Assembly. That is an interesting point for members to keep in mind.

MR STEFANIAK (Minister for Education and Training) (11.06): This is an interesting point. As a former Deputy Speaker, like Ms McRae is now, I have some knowledge of the tradition in relation to parliaments and what is acceptable behaviour and what has happened in the past. I would strongly urge the committee members to look to what happens not only in this little parliament but also in other Australian parliaments and other parliamentary democracies in terms of this type of action.

I think there is a fair bit of hypocrisy in this motion by Ms McRae. I doubt very much whether she, as a former Speaker for three years and a Deputy Speaker now, would have acted terribly differently from the way you, Mr Speaker, acted quite properly yesterday. I doubt very much whether Ms McRae, had she been the Speaker, would have tolerated what occurred yesterday.

Ms McRae: That is not the debate, mate. You miss the point.

MR STEFANIAK: No, I do not miss the point at all, Ms McRae. There are certain rules of behaviour in relation to assemblies and parliaments that go back for over a century. If people even clap in the House of Representatives they are evicted.

22 February 1996

Some of those procedures may be a little bit too draconian, but what happened yesterday in this Assembly in the public gallery was extensive disorder, which made it very difficult for this Assembly to continue. I think the point raised by Mr Moore yesterday, when he suggested that you take a certain course of action, Mr Speaker, which you did, was eminently sensible. What occurred after that, just to refresh members' memories, was that we resumed, and when further interjections came from the gallery you very politely but firmly cautioned the gallery on several occasions, and then you again suspended the sitting. In fairness to the members opposite who were in the middle of private members business, we continued with that after lunch. I would submit that that was a satisfactory and proper course of action in the circumstances.

I do think the committee has to look at what occurs elsewhere, and members opposite need to consider, and consider honestly, what they would have done in that situation. Whilst the crowd yesterday was certainly supportive of them, what would be the situation in a few years' time if they are the Government again and they have an equally hostile crowd trying to interrupt proceedings? I think they would not like to be restricted by what could turn out to be excessively restrictive constraints placed on a Speaker and an Assembly if this inquiry goes off the rails. There is appropriate behaviour. There are traditions that need to be observed. People in the public gallery may not agree with anything that is being said, they may vehemently oppose what is being said; but the tradition is they sit there in silence. They have other avenues to voice their concern. They probably have members who support their view and who will voice their concern on their behalf, and that is what parliamentary democracy is all about. They have representatives who will express their concern, as the Opposition were doing yesterday, and doing in proper parliamentary fashion.

Perhaps one of the best examples, Mr Speaker, compared with what happened yesterday - and I suggest that the action you took was quite proper and appropriate - is the situation today. We have some ladies up the back who, I take it, are nurses and who no doubt have some very strong views in relation to what is occurring at present. They are sitting here listening to this debate. They are listening in silence, which is entirely appropriate, entirely in accordance with accepted convention in this country and in other parliamentary democracies. I think people need to have regard to what occurs elsewhere. Whilst they might have supported what some people in the public gallery were doing yesterday, what would happen if the boot were on the other foot? I think these things need to be looked at by the committee. I support comments made by other members of the Government in this debate. Some of the comments made more recently by Mr Kaine are certainly quite relevant there.

MS McRAE (11.10), in reply: In closing the debate, I am very pleased to hear that there is general support for the motion. What is fascinating in all these debates is how it is always turned around to a personal attack and to a misrepresentation of the issues that are - - -

Mr Moore: You started it.

Mr De Domenico: Look at who is talking.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MS McRAE: One day we might actually talk about the issues. I hear the interjection, “You started it”. People do not listen carefully to what is said. Both Mr Berry and I have said that the impression could have been gained. The impressions that are gained are the ones that are of the utmost importance, the ones that govern our activity and the ones that leave people with the conclusion as to what does and does not happen in this chamber.

The issue may well be resolved exactly as Mr Stefaniak has said, with no change at all. That does not mean that the issue should not be addressed. The points that I make are extremely valid and have not changed all through the course of the debate. The fact is that we can be held hostage by a noisy range of interruptions, and, if it is generally known that an entire morning's work can be stopped by seemingly too rowdy a group, then that is not the way forward for this Assembly. We lost an entire morning's work. Why did the second shutdown have to go on for the rest of the morning? Did any of us get a say in that? No. That is why this issue is so important. We cannot have our work stopped by what is seemingly a subjective decision. We have to put up objective courses of decision-making that we are all happy with, so that it does not end up being an accusatory, “Oh, he did that, but she would have done that had she been in the chair”.

That is wonderful, Mrs Carnell - leave. You do not have to listen. That is the beauty of this place. The ultimate good running of this Assembly must be on the basis of standing orders that are objective, that can be interpreted by all fairly, that have the appearance of objectiveness and that have the appearance of fairness when applied. Yesterday one could interpret a certain level of subjectivity and a certain level of bias, and because that possibility is there this motion is of importance.

I am looking forward to the deliberations of the Administration and Procedure Committee. There may well be no change at all, I grant that; but I hope sincerely that change will be forthcoming. Perhaps the jobs of the attendants and the people who run the Assembly on our behalf may be made easier if our standing orders are a little clearer as to when people should be ejected, as to when the Assembly may be shut down, and as to what exactly is the range of powers of the Speaker.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

WORKERS COMPENSATION PROVISIONS - SELECT COMMITTEE Report

Debate resumed from 17 October 1995, on motion by **Mr Berry:**

That the report be noted.

MR DE DOMENICO (Minister for Urban Services) (11.14): Mr Speaker, I ask for leave of the Assembly to speak again so that I may present the Government's response to the report.

Leave granted.

22 February 1996

MR DE DOMENICO: Thank you. Mr Speaker, I am pleased to table the Government's response to the recommendations of the Assembly Select Committee on Workers Compensation Provisions, chaired by Mr Berry, copies of which have been circulated to all members of the Assembly. The Government continues to be most concerned at the high cost of workers compensation for its employees, in both human and financial terms, and is committed to improving the situation. The recommendations made by the select committee are welcomed and, in the main, accord with those of the Government's own review.

Over the last six months, through reports prepared as a result of the select committee inquiry and the review conducted by Tillinghast, the Government has taken action to commence addressing the underlying issues that are resulting in high injury and illness rates and increasing costs. Action has already commenced to implement many of the recommendations made in the select committee report, which was reinforced by our own review.

Development of a strategically integrated injury prevention and management model has already begun and the Government is working with the assistance of Comcare Australia to bring this about. Mr Speaker, you might be aware that Comcare Australia agreed to lend a senior manager to the Chief Minister's Department for 12 months from November 1995. This officer is already well advanced in developing a framework in conjunction with the agencies. Once the framework is completed, refinement and implementation will be a joint undertaking, with agencies and unions having a major role. Discussions have also been held with Comcare Australia about the premium process for 1996-97 so that this will reflect current administrative arrangements and so that the costs are known in time to be fully accounted for in the budget process. These discussions will also involve examining the premium setting process to ensure that it best reflects our needs.

Mr Speaker, getting our workers compensation under control is not an easy task, and it is one that cannot be achieved overnight. To achieve the premium levels we believe we should be paying will take three to five years of concentrated and consistent effort. We have to reduce the number of injuries and illnesses that our employees suffer, and get injured staff back to work quickly. Achievement of these goals will involve changing attitudes and work cultures, and it will require commitment from all parties. Focusing attention on reducing the number of injuries and illnesses does not mean, however, that we are not examining other aspects, such as the best long-term arrangements for public sector workers compensation. The Government is looking at all the elements, not just the obvious ones, in searching for the best method of managing our workers compensation arrangements and providing coverage for our employees.

Mr Speaker, the Government remains fully committed to putting in place the best possible working environment for its staff, and our response to the select committee recommendations is an indicator of that. The Government is committed to providing a safe and healthy workplace where injuries and illness are minimised and where employees are assisted, in whatever way is needed, to return to work following an injury or illness. Mr Speaker, I commend the Government's response to the Assembly.

MR BERRY (11.17), in reply: In due course, I suspect, there will be more debate about this issue because the Government has mentioned that it has an amendment before the Assembly in relation to this matter, and that is indicative of its response. It is a great disappointment to me, as the chair of that committee, that the Government has taken the attitude that it has in relation to this matter, because the key recommendation of the report, which was unanimously endorsed, was the establishment of a statutory authority.

MR SPEAKER: Order! It being 45 minutes after the commencement of Assembly business, the debate is interrupted in accordance with standing order 77.

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

That the time allotted to Assembly business be extended by 30 minutes.

MR BERRY: Mr Speaker, that key recommendation being ignored by the Government is one - - -

Mr De Domenico: No, it has not been ignored. You will be briefed tomorrow on how it has not been ignored.

MR BERRY: The Government does not accept this recommendation, but it does talk about giving the responsibility to the Occupational Health and Safety Council. The difficulty I have with that is the power of the council. This is a Government that likes to see the public sector performing the same way as the private sector - in a businesslike fashion. I would think that the Government therefore would like to have the same regulatory independence from policing authorities when it comes to its employment activities. For example, in the private sector WorkCover deals with OH and S matters and is very clearly independent of the private sector.

Mr De Domenico: So will the Occupational Health and Safety Council.

MR BERRY: It is only an advisory council to the Minister.

Mr De Domenico: But we are changing the legislation. You should read your stuff before you come in and say things.

MR BERRY: I know that there are some more amendments coming. I am yet to be briefed on the matter.

Mr De Domenico: You are being briefed tomorrow. You were invited to be briefed yesterday, but you refused.

MR BERRY: You have had weeks to do that and you want to do it in the middle of a sitting period.

Mr De Domenico: You were not here.

MR BERRY: What did you say? I was not here?

22 February 1996

Mr De Domenico: Some of the time you were not here. That is right.

MR BERRY: Yes, I went home to bed at night. Everybody does that.

Mr De Domenico: No, not all of us. Some of us stay here and work.

MR BERRY: Some of you sleep around the place, I suppose, but I do not. I go home to bed. That key recommendation is a matter of some concern to me as the chair of that committee. Mr Speaker, Labor will be working to ensure that there is an appropriate policing authority in place to ensure that the Government does the right thing for its employees. Clearly, from the committee's examination of the issue, the problem here is not Comcare. The problem here is the management within the Government. Of course, what the Government says is that we still should rely on those managers to do the job rather than have some sort of competent and proper - - -

Mr De Domenico: Yes, that is what the report said. That is what the experts said, too.

MR BERRY: I beg your pardon?

Mr De Domenico: That is what the experts said, too, not just the Government.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR BERRY: Which experts?

Mr De Domenico: The ones who do it every day, all day - Tillinghast, Marsh and McLennan - - -

MR BERRY: Your experts.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

Mr De Domenico: No, not our experts. The experts, Mr Berry - Tillinghast. Did you read the Tillinghast report?

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Berry, this is not a dialogue.

MR BERRY: This was an Assembly committee inquiry which came to an informed view about a situation that needed to be controlled. It is obviously out of control under this Government. This Government has demonstrated by its handling of the recent industrial dispute that it is not across industrial issues. This is clearly an industrial issue concerning its employees and the Government does not have a perception about how to deal with workplace injuries.

The first reaction by the Minister for Industrial Relations in this matter was to attack Comcare. Clearly, Comcare are not the problem here. They never have been. The problem has always been what has been going on in the ACT Government.

It has been known for some time and it has been addressed. The need for a committee of inquiry into the matter became quite urgent as Mr De Domenico continued to chant the mantra in relation to Comcare.

Mrs Carnell: As a result, things have happened.

Mr De Domenico: And as a result, things have happened.

MR BERRY: It was not Comcare, and Mr De Domenico has been exposed on that score.

Mrs Carnell: As a result, we have a senior manager of Comcare working with us.

MR BERRY: Of course, it is the old, fashionable States' rights argument that you hear from the conservatives about attacking the Commonwealth if you need an excuse to attack them.

Mr De Domenico: Have you spoken to Gary Johns about this? You have not, obviously. You have not spoken to your own people.

MR BERRY: Mr Speaker, I refer you to standing order 207. It may give you cause to listen to the level of interjections and the extent to which they may be disrupting the Assembly and compare them to what happened yesterday. Mr Speaker, I raise that point again. I am concerned about the Government's rejection of that recommendation. I think it was a sensible recommendation. It would have tidied up the situation. It would have taken the power out of the hands of the Executive. I think we have seen in recent weeks the power to police these things. The power of the Executive has not been used well in industrial relations. It has not sorted out the problems in the industrial relations area. I think that the statutory authority recommendation would have gone a long way towards assisting the situation.

A further recommendation was in relation to Comcare. It went on to say that the Government should retain Comcare as the compensation and rehabilitation provider for the ACT Government Service. I have to say, reading the response by the Government, that I can read between the lines. There is still some antagonism towards Comcare there. It just goes on to mouth the Federal Act and the requirement for the Government to give 12 months' notice, and so on and so forth. There is no commitment to the recommendation. It merely says, in a weasel-worded way:

The Government supports the objective of this recommendation.

I think, Mr Speaker, that the Government's response to this recommendation has been weak. I do not think it guarantees - - -

Mr De Domenico: Have you read it yet?

MR BERRY: I know the ground well and I have all your responses in my hand.

Mr De Domenico: You have not read it yet, but you think it is weak.

22 February 1996

MR BERRY: Yes, I have read them. The Government's response to this is weak. There will be further argument about what the Government intends to do in relation to the issue. I can tell you that Labor will be working to ensure that the conditions for people on workers compensation improve, as we did when we were in government, rather than attack the service provider. You have to attack the problem rather than the service provider, and that has been the theme that has come from the Government from day one.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT - STANDING COMMITTEE
Report on Draft Capital Works Program

Debate resumed from 21 September 1995, on motion by **Mr Moore:**

That the report be noted.

MR HUMPHRIES (Attorney-General and Minister for Arts and Heritage) (11.27): I want to enter this debate briefly to comment on two recommendations of the committee in the area of the arts. The committee, in recommendation 4.14, has commented on proposals to expend half a million dollars on the replacement of the roof at the Canberra Theatre. The committee noted in its report that there had been conflicting advice given to it about the basis on which the costing figure had been arrived at and, not surprisingly perhaps, expressed some concern about the differences in the approaches taken by different areas.

I want to assure the committee that it is not the intention of the Government to proceed with work on the theatre if the basis of the costing has not been properly carried through or there has not been a full assessment of the alternatives to that work and the options in terms of whole-of-life costing that particular approaches that might be taken could result in. I might say that it does leave us having to be very careful about the way in which we choose how to replace that roof. There are different materials that might be available. Copper is a material used, I understand, on a number of buildings in this area. It is obviously a more expensive material but would be in keeping with the roofs of other buildings in this area. I will indicate to members that the Government will not proceed to do that work unless it is very clear that that is the best approach to fixing the problem of a leaking roof and that the most cost-effective alternative is taken up.

I also feel that it is important to comment on recommendation 4.17 concerning the Canberra Cultural Centre, as it is now called. The committee asked me, as the Minister, to explain the basis for what it described as my unilateral decision to relocate the proposed Cultural and Heritage Centre from the North Building. Point one is that the Government has not decided to relocate it from the North Building; it has merely drawn attention to the fact that there is a very considerable potential cost associated with proceeding with the North Building, which it feels that it needs to address. It is therefore proposed that there be an exploration of alternatives.

Mr Berry: You just wanted to hold your budget together and put it off.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Berry interjects that we want to hold it up. If we held it up for as long as the former Government did, we would be pulling a very extraordinary confidence trick. The money was available in 1992. As of the change of government in March 1995, not one stone had been laid on another; not one sod had been turned; not even one plan had been drawn up. The question remains: How can we not do better than that?

We do intend to do better than that, but we do have the little landmine left for us, in a sense, by the former Government. Apparently, shortly before it left office, it commissioned a report by consultants Renfree and Hanrahan into the costs associated with proceeding with the North Building site. That report suggested that, on top of spending \$7m for the actual building of the Canberra Cultural Centre, there would need to be an additional \$3.8m spent on the isolation of levels 2 and 3 of the North Building and the maintenance of access and use of those floors during the period that the building was going on; as well as a sum of \$5m to be spent on relocating staff in those areas to temporary accommodation.

Obviously, it depends on which of the two options you choose to take, but let me say that the Government certainly was not prepared to let this particular report stand in the way, necessarily, of the North Building proceeding. But let me make it quite clear also that the Government simply cannot proceed with the North Building site without coming to terms with that report. The report may well have - and I say this purely on the basis of my own gut feeling - an element of exaggeration in it. That may be the case. Even if it is exaggerated to the extent of a trebling or a quadrupling of the amounts entailed in using that site, we retain the problem that we still have to expend a considerable sum of money to be able to use the North Building site for the Canberra Cultural Centre. I, for one, frankly am not prepared to spend one cent of the \$7m set aside for the Cultural Centre on work which will not see any permanent exhibition of that expenditure after the work itself is completed. Spending money on relocating public servants or on temporary works associated with the building is such work.

That is a major issue in front of the Government. But let me assure members of the Assembly that the North Building is not excluded as an alternative site; we will press ahead to have that work begun as soon as possible. I hope that the Planning and Environment Committee will assist the Government in the process of trying to identify what those options are and, if we can proceed with the North Building, managing the process of having that happen as soon as possible.

MR WOOD (11.33): Mr Speaker, I will add a little to this debate since it relates to a matter of long and considerable interest to me. I regret that it has had to be such a long interest. It goes back to the time of the First Assembly when I chaired a committee which was looking at facilities for arts activities. This centre grew out of that. I did not have any copyright on it; it had been mooted at various times well before that. Part of the delay that Mr Humphries mentions about the allocation of the casino premium to that work was due to the fact that the Second Assembly decided that it wanted to get its hands on that decision-making. Another committee was set up to look at the distribution of that money from the casino. Inevitably, that took a very long time.

22 February 1996

I claim, as I always have, that the only place for that Cultural Centre is the North Building across the square. I did not commission a report about the cost of establishing the centre there. There was a report, no doubt. I believe that it was ordered by the ACT Treasury or bureaucrats. They may have had some concerns, but I did not commission that report. To the best of my knowledge, it was not a government report. Mr Humphries was kind enough to send a copy to me so that I could be better informed. I have to say that I sent it back to him with thanks and unread, because I did not place any credence in that report in the sense that it should have disqualified the North Building from consideration. Apparently - and I say "apparently" because I did not read that report - it talks about long-term costing of relocating public servants and the like, which may be some form of accounting; but it is in no way, I believe, appropriate to use that to prevent the proper use of the North Building.

In recent times, Mr Humphries has been continuing the thrust that I had to revitalise Civic Centre and make it some better form of a cultural heart for Canberra. I applaud that; please continue with that work. But you cannot continue seriously with that if you are not going to put the Cultural Centre in the North Building. If you want to dispatch that to a forlorn foreshore at Kingston, as it will be for many years, you are running against the policy that you espouse about a brighter heart for Civic. There is only one place for it, and that is the North Building. Public servants will need to be relocated, and you will need to find the place for them. So be it; but do not use that as an excuse to shift the Cultural Centre to where it should not be. I think all you need to do is confirm the decision that was already made that it was going in the North Building and get on and do it.

MS HORODNY (11.37): I seek leave to speak again on this subject.

Leave granted.

MS HORODNY: I would like to say that I am disappointed in the Government's response to this committee's report on the draft capital works program. My particular disappointment covers many issues, particularly the issue of the infrastructure in our natural areas - in our nature reserves. It seems that the Government does not have a commitment at this stage or at any time, I understand, to a management plan for Namadgi that is up to date. The management plan that we have at the moment is eight years old, and it is completely inappropriate as a basis for the sort of infrastructure that is planned in this draft capital works program for an area that does not have an up-to-date management plan. That is a real issue, and this Government has to address that very soon. It is very disappointing to see a real go ahead attitude with all sorts of infrastructure and tourist development in areas that have not been assessed for the appropriate level of impact. It seems to me that that amounts to a misuse of public funds and an abuse of the community's trust in this Government to do the right thing by those areas. I will speak more about that at another time.

The other recommendation that also was ignored was the issue of the eco-office. I believe that the eco-office is not really funded at all; it is quite a joke to - - -

Mr Humphries: Which office?

MS HORODNY: The eco-office.

Mr Humphries: The Commissioner for the Environment's office?

MS HORODNY: No, the eco-office.

Mr Humphries: The Environmental Defenders Office?

MS HORODNY: No. You do not know about your own eco-office? That is very interesting. I am not surprised; it hardly has a budget. Perhaps you need to talk to one of your advisers, Mr Humphries, because we do have an eco-office set up. It is funded, as I recall, to the tune of something like \$4,000, which does not enable it to do any real work.

Mr Berry: You should not have told him about it; he will close it down.

MS HORODNY: Yes, that is right.

Mr Humphries: If it does not do any work, what a waste of \$4,000!

MS HORODNY: The eco-office obviously could, if it were properly resourced, do a really good job in looking across the board at all public offices; looking at all materials that are used, like in photocopiers and fax machines; looking at purchasing policy; and looking generally at best practice. This Government claims to operate on ESD principles in all its areas and to have a commitment to ESD, but I do not believe that you understand what ESD is about. If you would like a briefing at some stage, I would be very happy to give you one.

Mr Berry: I tell you what; the eco-office is out the window now that you have told him about it. It was a big mistake.

MS HORODNY: Yes, it probably is. I should not have brought it up. The other thing that the eco-office should do, as well as look at environmental issues, is look at health issues so that we do not have again the sick building syndromes. That is a really important role that that office could play as well, again, if it were adequately resourced. At the moment it is a bit of a joke because it does not have the resources and certainly does not have the staff to allow it to do any of those sorts of things.

I am generally disappointed that the Government ignored all the recommendations of the committee. I believe that the committee is a good cross-section of this Assembly. The committee did a lot of work to call in and listen to individuals and organisations from the community who made some very good suggestions and had some very good ideas to input. We certainly took on board those recommendations and ideas that we thought were good. We scrutinised them very carefully. Yet it seems that none of those ideas have been taken on board. That is a shame; it is a great shame. I would urge the Government to look more closely at recommendations that committees do bring forward, because I believe that the committees do a much better job of consulting with the community and pulling together ideas and suggestions from the community that are important.

22 February 1996

MR MOORE (11.43), in reply: Mr Speaker, it is important to correct a perception that I think Ms Horodny put across that the Government had completely ignored the recommendations of the committee. There were a number that she was quite specific about and I think made valid points about; but, in fact, the vast bulk of the recommendations that the committee made were accepted by the Government. One of the things that have actually been pleasant in our current hearings on the capital works program, which I will make a statement to the Assembly about in a short while, is that there have been quite a number of clear benefits in terms of the material supplied. The Government was actually particularly responsive in terms of the structural things that the committee had asked to be achieved, the timing of the capital works and the preparation of the material.

This time it is far, far easier for the committee to understand what is going on. All-of-life costings are included. With the exception of one or two areas, the general preparation of the material has been particularly convenient and exceptional. That process, the committee felt, has actually led to far better outcomes. No doubt the committee will still seek to improve those outcomes again this year and, I imagine, in the coming years; but I think it is fair to say that the Government has responded quite positively to the general bulk of those recommendations.

This is an unusual situation, in that we are responding to last year's capital works program at the same time as the committee is looking at this year's capital works program. I hope that by this time next year we will have even better outcomes from the work that is being done in the committee and from the particularly positive work of a number of public servants involved in ensuring that the work is prepared appropriately.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS - STANDING COMMITTEE **Report on Review of Auditor-General's Report No. 3 of 1995**

Debate resumed from 26 October 1995, on motion by **Ms Follett**:

That the report be noted.

MR STEFANIAK (Minister for Education and Training) (11.46): Mr Speaker, I present the Government's response to the Public Accounts Committee Report No. 5, "Review of the Auditor-General's Report Number 3, 1995 - Canberra Institute of Technology - Comparative Teaching Costs and Effectiveness". On 22 June 1995 the Auditor-General's Report No. 3, "Canberra Institute of Technology - Comparative Teaching Costs and Effectiveness", was tabled in the Assembly. The audit aimed to compare the costs of teaching services in CIT with TAFE institutes in other States to determine whether CIT's education delivery teaching activities, operations and resources have been effectively and economically managed. It also assessed whether CIT was providing an effective vocational education and training system in the ACT.

The Auditor-General concluded that the CIT was less efficient than the New South Wales institute but more efficient than the Western Australian and Tasmanian institutes and that the CIT was generally as economic as the New South Wales institute but less economic than the Tasmanian and Western Australian institutes. The audit also concluded that CIT is generally an effective institution which is performing well in meeting the needs of its clients.

The Public Accounts Committee sought my comments on the report and, following consideration by the CIT Advisory Council, I responded to the committee in September 1995. The Public Accounts Committee tabled its review of the report on 26 October 1995. The Public Accounts Committee noted the positive response to the audit by CIT and the CIT Advisory Council and welcomed the actions already under way or planned to be undertaken by the institute either as a result of its participation in the audit or in response to its findings.

The committee recommended that the Government monitor progress with the CIT response to the audit and inform the Assembly on outcomes within 12 months. I therefore present the action plan as the Government's response to the Public Accounts Committee. The action plan includes the recommended future actions, action officers and action required. This version also provides an up-to-date progress report for each recommended future action.

MR SPEAKER: Order! The extended time for Assembly business has now expired.

Motion (by **Mr Humphries**) agreed to, with the concurrence of an absolute majority:

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent the debate continuing on Assembly business, order of the day No. 3.

MR STEFANIAK: Mr Speaker, many of the actions recommended in the Auditor-General's report are consistent with the top structure review initiatives taking place in CIT, especially the restructure of the education delivery program into fewer faculties and schools and the development of an enhanced human resource management capability.

I will outline the highlights from the action plan of Government initiatives taken to make improvements at the CIT. Firstly, regarding improvements in efficiency and economy: A review of the level of payment to part-time staff and the possibility of introducing the use of non-teaching staff to assist or replace teachers as demonstrators and technical assistants in practical sessions has been undertaken and is also being pursued in the ongoing enterprise bargaining process. Efficiency and economy performance indicators for schools based on the ratios used in the analysis in the report are being introduced, with performance agreements being drawn up for heads of faculty schools.

Implementation of flexible methods of delivery is being encouraged. The cost of flexible delivery at Tuggeranong Flexible Learning Centre will be analysed early this year to establish the relative efficiency of this approach. Depending on the outcome, a centre may be established at Reid. With respect to improving effectiveness, the Government highlights these points: The quality and range of student services will be improved through collaboration with the CIT Student Association, CITSA, to develop a joint program for improving student services, drawing on the 1993 national client follow-up survey of graduates, the 1994 CITSA student opinion survey, the 1995 internal review of student services and the findings of the student services workshop held in December last year. The program will consist of an action plan and implementation strategy.

A graduate placement service is also to begin this year. Additional performance indicators will be developed where there are presently deficiencies in existing ones, to enable assessment of the achievement of the goals in CIT's corporate plan. A project resulting from the top structure review is being conducted to develop a benchmark of performance measures and identify continuous improvement strategies. The first stage will report to the Deputy Director (Academic) shortly. Arrangements to monitor the quality of teaching performance and develop improvement strategies where necessary are currently being made through an analysis of the potential of a formal system of student evaluation of teaching modules and also courses. This will result in a program of action to improve the quality of teaching and learning in CIT. I present the action plan, Mr Speaker.

MS TUCKER (11.51): Having gone through this report, I would like to make a few comments. I note with interest, Mr Stefaniak, that you have just stated that additional performance indicators will be developed where there are presently deficiencies in existing ones. I would like to stress that I think that is important work, because it is quite clear from this report that efficiency and effectiveness are defined in very narrow economic terms. While I would not want to pre-empt anything coming out of the competition policy committee, it is quite clear that there are grave concerns about this micro-economic reform agenda being applied to education and training. I think we always need to remember that education is an investment, not just a cost.

We should look at the objectives and goals - for example, to attract, retain and develop skilled staff committed to the institute's goals, et cetera. Yet we see also, somewhere else in the report, that it is cheaper to employ part-time staff. But there may be an impact on quality if you do that too much. These sorts of statements can contradict each other unless you do have very clearly defined performance indicators. When you are contracting out, the old issue of how you specify what needs to actually be the result of a particular tender is also coming up a lot from the community in regard to competition. When you are using contestable funding for education, there is a danger that there might be some social good or benefits lost in the attempt to save money once again. I am sure that there is a place for further efficiencies being found, as the report states, but there is a serious concern that these must not be at the cost of quality. We will be watching with interest how these performance indicators are developed.

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (11.53), in reply: Mr Speaker, I have noted the Government's response to the Public Accounts Committee report on the Auditor-General's Report No. 3 on the Canberra Institute of Technology. I thank the Government for their response. In looking at the Auditor-General's report and the committee's own examination of that report, the one thing that struck me in a very favourable way was the degree of cooperation that appeared to exist between the CIT and the Auditor-General in the quest for greater effectiveness and efficiency in the CIT's operation. I do believe that there has been an enormous amount of goodwill and that the CIT is very much to be commended on the steps that it has taken.

I do want to put on the record yet again that the Auditor-General actually found the CIT to be a very efficient and very effective organisation. It is delivering a high-quality service to the community in a way that, overall, is extremely efficient. In particular, the Auditor-General did note that the CIT was more efficient than both the Western Australian and Tasmanian institutions and as economic as the New South Wales institution and that it was generally a very effective organisation in performing the task for which it has been set up and which is clearly valued by our community.

I do echo what Ms Tucker said. It is very important that we never lose sight of the fact that, as an educational institution, the CIT is serving the very real needs of our community. Very often, though, the educational needs that are being met by the CIT have not been met by any other institution, including our schools; and we often see that the CIT is making up deficits for people who have not been well served by other areas of our education system.

I do believe that we must always have the focus on quality in what the CIT is delivering. In the Select Committee on the Competition Policy Reform Bill we have been looking at some issues to do with the CIT, in particular the possibility of, in effect, contracting out the teaching or education work of the CIT. It is my view that if ever that were to be considered - and I sincerely hope that it is not - the quality of what we do here in Canberra should never be underestimated. There are sometimes more important issues than just the cost. The value of the service has to be considered. I echo what Ms Tucker said.

In my view, as the chair of the Public Accounts Committee, the progress that is being made by CIT on the Auditor-General's report is most satisfactory. If we can see a continuing evolution of change that does not affect either the quantity or the quality of service delivered to our community, then that would be a very good outcome. Again I would commend the CIT. I think the Auditor-General's report has been a useful exercise, but we are talking here about much more than dollars and cents and bricks and mortar. We are talking about a very valuable service that often affects people's entire lives. I think we should always keep that in mind in any debate on the CIT.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

22 February 1996

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT - STANDING COMMITTEE
Inquiries - 1996-97 Draft Capital Works Program and 1995 State of the Environment
Report

MR MOORE (11.58): Mr Speaker, as chairman of the Standing Committee on Planning and Environment, I wish to inform the Assembly, pursuant to standing order 246A, that on 2 February 1996 the Standing Committee on Planning and Environment resolved to inquire into and report on:

- (1) the Government's 1996-97 Draft Capital Works Program; and
- (2) matters raised in the 1995 State of the Environment Report, including the Government's response (when it becomes available), and any related matter.

I ask for leave of the Assembly to move a motion in relation to the reporting of the inquiries into the 1996-97 draft capital works program and the 1995 State of the Environment Report.

Leave granted.

MR MOORE: I move:

That:

- (1) if the Assembly is not sitting when the Standing Committee on Planning and Environment has completed its inquiries into:
 - (a) the 1996-97 Draft Capital Works Program; and
 - (b) the 1995 State of the Environment Report

the Committee may send its report to the Speaker or, in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, who is authorised to give directions for its printing, circulation and publication; and
- (2) the foregoing provisions of this resolution have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the standing orders.

I think the actual motion about circulation of the reports is a fairly standard motion that we put, but I thought it was worth while to take the opportunity to say a few words about these two separate matters. The first one relates to the 1996-97 draft capital works program. The committee, in adopting that reference on 2 February, did so at the request of the Treasurer, who had written to us and asked us to report by last week. That was impossible, for two reasons. Firstly, we had not been able to look carefully enough at the draft capital works program; and, secondly, at that stage and until this motion is passed we would not have permission to report out of session anyway. It is important that this motion goes through and allows us the opportunity to report.

The committee has already held three public hearings and has scheduled a fourth public hearing for tomorrow. We have heard the issues from the Government, and we look forward to hearing now from some of the people who put in the submissions that were received. We hope that we will be able to report within a couple of weeks, because it is the committee's intention to do so as quickly as possible so as not to delay the Government's program in preparing their budget.

However, there are a number of issues that have been highlighted and continue to be highlighted. One of those issues is the one that Mr Wood raised earlier today about the North Building. It was part of the previous recommendations on the capital works program as well. This committee is looking even further into not only the North Building and the development of the Playhouse but also the whole precinct of Civic Square. It seems to us that the issue of whether or not this is an integrated cultural program is something that ought to be taken on. The committee will be reporting on that issue, amongst others, in time.

I would also like to comment on a separate reference that we adopted on the same day, and that is matters raised in the 1995 State of the Environment Report, including the Government response, when the Government response is completed. The committee formally adopted this reference after we had spoken to Dr Joe Baker. Most members no doubt have perused, at the very least, the State of the Environment Report. It is an outstanding publication. It does warrant being pursued by a committee rather than becoming one of those reports that effectively wind up on a shelf, with some fairly broad, general responses that actually do not mean that there are some concrete changes.

I think credit goes to Mr Wood for creating the position and appointing the Commissioner for the Environment. I think it was a very important environmental initiative which set an overview for how environmental issues should be dealt with. I think there are opportunities that we will have within this Assembly to use the Commissioner for the Environment for a whole range of issues. As members come up with environmental issues, they should actually think, "How should we use the Office of the Commissioner for the Environment to improve the environment?", and seek to increase the funding if indeed that is necessary. The resolution of appointment of the Planning and Environment Committee charges it with the scrutiny of environmental matters. I think the analysis of that report from the Commissioner for the Environment is an analysis of not only what we see as positive and what we see as negative but also, more importantly, what we see as the highest priorities for the Government to pursue now. This is an appropriate stage.

At a later stage, the committee will formally invite the public to lodge submissions to the inquiry and then schedule the usual round of public hearings. In the initial instance, we are awaiting the Government's response to that report on the environment so that we can assess what sort of attitude is being taken by the Government and then whether this Assembly considers that it is adequate. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

(Quorum formed)

22 February 1996

MR WOOD (12.05): Mr Speaker, I am pleased that Mr Moore's committee has undertaken the task of monitoring the implementation, if you like, of the report of the Commissioner for the Environment. It is a most important report, and I do think there needs to be as strong an oversight of how that is accepted and put into practice as possible. Certainly on this side of the house, we will do that; but I think an Assembly committee that has the power to call people in and ask questions face to face, to challenge and to get down to the great detail that is there will be a very effective way of proceeding. I congratulate the committee on doing that.

Not so long ago the present Minister brought down a report on how he was dealing with the commissioner's first report, and I think it agreed with the report in almost every instance. It agreed, but it was a very deceptive agreement. In fact, there has been no action flowing from it. It agrees that all sorts of things should happen but does not provide any resources for any future action or does not get down actually to showing that there will be action flowing from the commissioner's report. Agreement is one thing, but that agreement is of no use unless it is backed up by some money and by some serious intentions. I believe that the committee interest in this matter will go a long way to ensuring that that happens.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

RECORDING AND BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS

MR SPEAKER: I remind members that question time will be filmed today, as the television crews wish to update their file footage.

Mr Wood: They are going to have to do it again in a couple of weeks when we get someone else here.

MR SPEAKER: Mr Wood, I appreciate what you are saying.

Mr Wood: That is ridiculous.

MR SPEAKER: You may think it is ridiculous, but that is what they have asked for.

Ms McRae: Mr Speaker, the normal custom is to approach both sides with a formal inquiry. May I take a point of order on that?

MR SPEAKER: Yes, you may.

Ms McRae: The normal process is for a formal approach to be made to both sides of the house and for approval to be sought.

MR SPEAKER: I am sorry. You were not approached on this matter?

Ms Follett: We have had no notification.

MR SPEAKER: I will make inquiries about that.

Ms McRae: It may have been an inadvertent oversight in regard to our side, I do not know; but at the moment we have not been informed.

MR SPEAKER: I will have to make inquiries on this matter then.

Mrs Carnell: Does it matter?

Ms McRae: Yes, it does. We will have a new member next month. It is stupid.

MR SPEAKER: Yes, we will. I will make inquiries.

Sitting suspended from 12.09 to 2.30 pm

AUTHORITY TO RECORD AND BROADCAST PROCEEDINGS

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

That the Assembly authorises:

- (1) the recording on video tape without sound by television networks of proceedings during question time today, 22 February 1996; and
- (2) the use by any television station of any part of the recorded proceedings in subsequent news, current affairs and documentary programs and not for the purposes of satire or ridicule.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Industrial Relations - Comments by Catholic Nuns

MS FOLLETT: Mr Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr De Domenico. Minister, this morning on ABC radio Mr Paul Monagle from Confact stated that Catholic nuns should refrain from commenting about industrial relations. In fact, he said that they had never been employees or employers and that they knew nothing of industrial relations. Given that Catholic nuns in this Territory run one of our two major hospitals, our only hospice, one of our universities, dozens of our schools and many community services, does the Minister for Industrial Relations agree with Confact's position that nuns should not comment on industrial relations?

22 February 1996

MR DE DOMENICO: I thank Ms Follett for her question. I do not listen to the ABC, so I did not hear what was said by Mr Monagle. I have no reason to doubt that Ms Follett's rendition of what was said on that august radio station is true. I do not agree with Mr Monagle. I do not know whether he was reflecting Confact's view. As Ms Follett said, I think the Catholic nuns in this community do more than just what nuns were used to doing. They run hospitals; they run schools; they do a lot of community work. I do not agree with Mr Monagle; I do not agree with Confact.

MS FOLLETT: I ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Given the apparent ignorance by Confact of some very significant businesses in our Territory, will the Minister reconsider his decision to sell to Confact the Canberra Region Campaign logo? I remind you that that logo is the property of the ACT Government and is only on licence to the campaign.

MR SPEAKER: That is a very tenuous supplementary link, but I will allow the question.

MR DE DOMENICO: I will answer it anyway, Mr Speaker. I think that even Mr Monagle and Confact are allowed at least one mistake during their lifetime. I do not think it is a hanging offence. The Government will not reconsider its offer to lease the logo to Confact.

Truck Parking - Residential Areas

MS HORODNY: My question is to the Minister for Urban Services, Mr De Domenico. At the beginning of the life of this Assembly the Minister undertook to address the problems arising from truck parking in residential areas. Over the past year we have heard many times that a decision was imminent. In the meantime many residents continue to suffer. I have been informed that, following consideration of an application by a resident of my electorate of Ginninderra to have the unimproved value of his land reduced, the ACT Revenue Office recently agreed to reduce the value by more than 17 per cent. The reason for the reduction was that a neighbour of this resident has a large truck parked next-door. Given that the community has patiently waited for the Minister to make a decision, when will he finally make a decision?

MR DE DOMENICO: I thank Ms Horodny for the question. Ms Horodny would be aware that consultation with industry and community representatives has taken place by way of a working party. She would also be aware that a set of rules have been developed to be used as the basis to manage this issue. She should also be aware - I will tell her now - that a policy paper is being developed for submission to Cabinet. It will identify what legislation is required. Ms Horodny, whatever the Government does, it will require amending legislation, so we are now getting that under control to see what legislation is required to be amended. Once that has happened, the Government will act. I am sure that it will be in the very near future. I cannot say that it will be next week or the week after, but before the end of this financial year you will have a decision made by this Government.

MS HORODNY: I have a supplementary question. You did not actually answer the question about devaluing property. Does this mean that properties in the ACT with trucks parked next to them will all be devalued?

MR DE DOMENICO: Unfortunately, I am not a valuer. It is a hypothetical question which I will attempt to answer. It depends on the size of the truck and it depends on the property concerned, so I do not know.

Consultancies - Expenditure

MR KAINE: Mr Speaker, I direct a question to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, I think it was only yesterday that I heard the Leader of the Opposition assert that this Government had spent more on consultancies than any other administration had. I think that is a fair restatement of what the Leader of the Opposition said. Chief Minister, can you advise the Assembly whether this claim by Ms Follett is accurate or whether it is simply yet another case of misrepresentation by the Leader of the Opposition?

Ms Follett: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think the word "misrepresentation" must be withdrawn. I did not make a statement anything like that asserted by Mr Kaine. I merely referred to the fact that amongst the Government's expenditure was some \$6m to \$7m on consultants. I think "misrepresentation" must be withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER: You are making a personal explanation.

Mr Kaine: Speaking to that point of order, Mr Speaker: Since the Chief Minister has not yet answered the question, I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition was misrepresenting the facts or not.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I think Mr Kaine's presentation of this issue suggests that the Leader of the Opposition was - - -

Mr Hird: On a point of order - - -

Mr De Domenico: What point of order is it?

MR SPEAKER: One at a time. Are you taking a point of order, Mr Hird?

Mr Hird: He has not, so what is he doing up on his feet, sir?

Mr Berry: I think the suggestion was that the Leader of the Opposition was misleading the house.

MR SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I have not yet heard the Chief Minister's response.

22 February 1996

Ms Follett: Mr Speaker - - -

MR SPEAKER: Neither have you, if I may say so, Ms Follett.

Ms Follett: And, if I may say so, Mr Speaker, the clear - - -

Mr De Domenico: Which point of order are you talking to?

Ms Follett: A point of order which I am now raising.

Mr De Domenico: Which one?

Ms Follett: I am raising one. Mr Kaine's question contained a clear - - -

Mr De Domenico: Which one in the standing orders?

Ms Follett: Standing order 113.

Mr De Domenico: Could you rule on that point of order, Mr Speaker?

Ms Follett: I have not made my point of order yet. Just hold your horses.

Mr De Domenico: Just sit down and let the Chief Minister answer the question.

Ms Follett: Just hold your horses. I will sit down when I have made my point of order, thank you.

Mr De Domenico: What point of order?

Ms Follett: My point of order, Mr Speaker, which I know you are dying to hear, is that Mr Kaine's question contained a clear imputation that I had misled the house in a statement which I made. I made no such misrepresentation and I want that imputation withdrawn.

MR SPEAKER: You are not making a point of order under standing order 113.

Ms Follett: Whatever it is.

MR SPEAKER: Standing order 113 states:

Questions may be asked orally without notice or placed on the Notice Paper for written reply.

Mr De Domenico: That is what she is doing.

Ms McRae: Mr Speaker, under standing order 55 the Leader of the Opposition can raise that point of order at any time at all.

Mr Berry: The point at issue, Mr Speaker, is that Mr Kaine implied that Ms Follett had misled the chamber, and I think that is out of order.

Mr Humphries: I wish to speak to that point of order, Mr Speaker. If the inference you draw from what Mr Kaine said is that Ms Follett in her statement may have been misleading the Assembly, you should be consistent with your ruling yesterday on the statement by Ms Follett that Mrs Carnell had made a claim which was fraudulent. You allowed that to be put to this chamber; you did not require it to be withdrawn. Consistent with that ruling, you should allow the statement by Mr Kaine to stand.

MR SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

MRS CARNELL: Mr Speaker, we certainly have heard Ms Follett preaching around this Assembly of recent days that this Government could reduce our spending on consultancies; that we got in consultants for all these things that the ACT Public Service could do anyway. It is interesting, Mr Speaker, that recently Ms Follett placed on the notice paper a question about the expenditure of this Government on consultancies, to which question I provided an answer; but what Ms Follett forgot to ask about was what her Government actually spent on consultancies during their term of office. I can see that Ms Follett is looking a bit uncomfortable over there. I would be as well if I were her. Mr Speaker, from the time that Ms Follett resumed as Chief Minister in mid-1991 until she lost her job in March last year, she spent some \$31m - - -

Mr De Domenico: How much?

MRS CARNELL: She spent \$31m on consultancies. To be precise, it was \$30,931,306m on consultancies. In fact, in 1993 - - -

Mr Wood: I do not think so. You had better read that again.

Ms McRae: I do not think so. Try that again, Mrs Carnell. Try that one again.

Mr Wood: You missed that one badly.

MRS CARNELL: It was \$30,931,306. In fact, in 1993-94 alone Ms Follett spent some \$10.2m on consultancies - just during that one year. Who is kidding whom, Ms Follett, in terms of consultancies? This Government certainly does use consultancies because, exactly like you, we need skills that at times simply are not available in the ACT Public Service. We seek those skills from consultants outside the Public Service. It is absolutely hypocritical for you opposite to say, and to continue to say, that somehow the money we spend on consultancies is unreasonable, when you yourself spent \$10.2m in one year. In fact, from July 1994 to March 1995, \$7.58m was spent. Compare that to the \$6m spent between July last year and the present by this Government. It shows quite categorically that it is important for government in the Territory to use consultants, but it certainly shows who used more - not us.

Public Service - Enterprise Bargaining

MR WOOD: My question is to Mrs Carnell in her capacity as Chief Minister. I refer to staff circular No. 15, which sought to clarify the offer to unions about the capacity for the Liberal Government to sack public servants. I quote from page 2 of that document:

The proposed reforms are summarised as follows:

...

reinstatement of the use of involuntary retirement provisions -

that is, sackings, and -

establish a cap of 100 on involuntary retirements.

How generous! Remember that the work force of the ACT includes a large number of teachers. Mrs Carnell, is it true that Mr Michael Moore brokered this new deal with you, and is the same Mr Moore who voted with you three years ago to prevent 80 voluntary redundancies now supporting up to 100 involuntary redundancies, that is, sackings?

MRS CARNELL: Unfortunately, Mr Wood has drawn the longest bow that I have ever seen on this one. There is no doubt that, as part of the enterprise bargaining approach that this Government has taken with the Trades and Labour Council, one of the offers we have made is a one per cent pay increase related to the full implementation of the triple R award - as, by the way, is the case in the Federal Parliament. Those opposite love to talk regularly about what happens in the Federal Parliament. The reality is that the triple R award works, as similar operations work right around this country.

What we have said is that if we can implement the triple R award under very specific conditions - all that was spelt out to the Trades and Labour Council last Friday - that would be worth an extra one per cent for all workers all the way across the ACT government service. Remember that one per cent is equal to \$6m. That is what we are talking about here - not sackings but the implementation of the triple R award. The triple R award does provide for involuntary redundancies under very specific circumstances after going through all of the machinery of the Act which requires staff to look at redeployment and a number of other approaches. Yes, we want to implement the triple R award - there is no doubt about that - and, yes, we are willing to give an extra one per cent, \$6m worth of pay increases, right across the ACT government service in response to that. Equally, we are willing to take that off the table and willing to take the one per cent off the table, because this is enterprise bargaining. We are willing to give one per cent for the triple R award. If the unions do not want that, that is fine; we will take it off the table, and take the one per cent off the table with it. There are a number of areas across the ACT government service where involuntary redundancies could be used, but one of those areas is certainly not full-time teachers teaching in our schools.

MR WOOD: I ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. I think the Chief Minister has been stumbling around here. She said, "This is enterprise bargaining". Is the Chief Minister aware that under the current Commonwealth enterprise bargaining agreements that she has been talking about a lot in this Assembly there are no involuntary reductions? Does she intend to follow what she said yesterday that she was going to follow, or not?

MRS CARNELL: The triple R award provides for involuntary retirement, but only after all redeployment and voluntary processes have failed.

Mr Wood: What about the Commonwealth enterprise bargaining that you were quoting yesterday?

MRS CARNELL: We are willing to offer an extra one per cent pay increase for every ACT Government employee, whether they be teachers or others - - -

Mr Wood: No. That is just a repetition of what you said a minute ago.

Mr Hird: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would like to draw your attention to standing order 39 in respect of our colleague opposite, Mr Wood.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to standing order 207. The Chief Minister is under pressure. You may wish to close the house.

Mr Hird: You may wish to deal with him, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: I may have to do exactly that. Continue, Chief Minister.

MRS CARNELL: Mr Speaker, I am very willing to talk about the Australian Public Service in this area, because the fact is that we are willing to go substantially further than what has happened in the APS. We are willing to negotiate with the unions on a set of protocols on the use of involuntary provisions. In fact, we provided those protocols last week. Not only are we looking at the triple R award, but we are looking at a set of protocols on how that would be implemented - an agreed set of protocols, hopefully, if we can agree on anything. That is a substantial step past the triple R award which is available in the Australian Public Service.

Mr Wood: Mr Speaker, I table the document I was referring to.

MR SPEAKER: You will have to get leave to do that.

Mr Wood: I am sure I will get that, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

Business Expenditure

MR MOORE: Mr Speaker, my question is to the Chief Minister. Chief Minister, in the last budget you provided over \$10m in one way or another to business. Can you explain for this Assembly what productivity gains you demanded before agreeing to the expenditure of about \$10m, which is equivalent to an average of \$100 out of each person's rates per year?

MRS CARNELL: I am more than happy to, Mr Moore. Mr Moore, the ACT Government has already achieved the sorts of productivity returns that it expected from the extra money that we have spent on business. The \$10m is actually a figure that only a couple of days ago Ms Follett suggested was not the case, so thank you very much for backing that up. That is an amount of money, as you rightly say, across a three-year budget. What we have got in return for that sort of money is 5,300 extra jobs, created since this Government took office, which compares to 700 extra jobs in the previous 12 months, under Ms Follett. We have an extra 5,300 jobs. Also in response to that money, a number of business incentive packages have been paid, probably the most notable of those being the AOFR arrangement - a deal by which the ACT now will be the centre of a major information technology or high-tech manufacturing entity which will employ between 300 and 400 extra people in this city. What we have here is more jobs. A number of businesses have set up under our business incentive packages for the ACT, and I believe that business generally is starting to get a move on.

Under the previous Government there were reductions in building approvals in every single month of the 12 months prior to Ms Follett losing office. For the last six months we have ended up with improvements in building approvals. We all know that the building industry is one of the basic industries in the private sector in this city and one of the biggest employers. We are starting to see a turnaround at that sort of level. We have more jobs; we have more building approvals. Certainly, the economy still could get a lot stronger, and that is the reason we have to continue to spend. That is the reason we have to continue to inject money into the private sector. Mr Moore, there is no way at all that there will be more jobs in the public sector in this town under whichever Federal government we have in place or whatever government we have here. That means that jobs have to be created in the private sector. The only way we can get jobs created in the private sector is to have incentive schemes to make this city a good place to do business in, a place that attracts tourists, a place that attracts business generally. The only way we can achieve that is to change the image of this city from being a government city that simply cannot make decisions, that does not attract business.

MR MOORE: I ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. The hard negotiations that led to some of these, I must say, outlandish claims you have just made you no doubt documented very thoroughly. Would you table for this Assembly a range of those negotiations that you have documented?

MRS CARNELL: Certainly, Mr Moore. In terms of the business incentive scheme, which I assume is one of the areas you are talking about, there are actually quite strict guidelines which I am more than happy to table for this Assembly. The other areas that we have spent extra money on in the business arena are quite obvious when you document them. There are simply more jobs. More jobs have been created - - -

Ms Follett: That is not true.

MRS CARNELL: That is true. The Australian Bureau of Statistics will show you that there are 5,300 more jobs since we came to office. I am very happy to show you the basis upon which we use business incentive schemes. I am very happy to show you the sorts of proposals that are going to CanTrade at this stage. In the very near future we will have a strategy for the year 2000 Olympics. All of those things are part of the money that you have spoken about here. It is not handouts to business. In fact, a very small amount of it - \$800,000 - is the amount in the business incentive package. The greatest percentage of the rest of it goes into things like promoting Canberra, tourism - all of those sorts of areas, which of course have a very specific strategic plan approach to how we are actually going to achieve outcomes. In fact, Mr Moore and the rest of the Assembly will be very pleased to see in the next budget approach some very specific performance indicators for all of these areas of government.

Public Service - Enterprise Bargaining

MR BERRY: My question is directed to Mrs Carnell in her capacity as Chief Minister. I refer to this morning's editorial in the *Canberra Times*. Probably more Canberrans noticed the Pryor cartoon next to it and had a bit of a chuckle. The editorial said:

The various trips to the Industrial Relations Commission have not made this end-stage any closer, perhaps particularly because the Government has seemed not to understand the way that industrial-relations dispute-resolution processes work. The Government is either not getting good specialist industrial-relations advice, or it is ignoring it.

Mr Speaker, given this, will the Government refrain from seeking advice from people like Mr Houlihan, Mr Kaufman - Kennett advisers both - and take some advice from competent industrial relations practitioners, to ensure that this sort of chaotic industrial relations environment that you have created here does not persist?

MRS CARNELL: Thank you very much, Mr Berry, for that question. It is interesting to note that the people we take advice from and the people who have represented us in the commission on almost every occasion are the same ones who represented you. They are identical people. The industrial relations advice that comes to me at the meetings we have every night comes from the same people who would have sat down and given you advice too. When I actually had a look at some of the background of the previous Government and Mr Berry in this area, it was really interesting to see the huge change-around, Mr Speaker. The other day when I was having a flip through *Hansard*, as I am sure we all do at times when we have nothing else to do, I noticed that on 8 December 1992 Mr Berry told this Assembly that the Chief Minister - that was Ms Follett at the time, obviously - made it clear that it would be inappropriate for ACT Government vehicles to be used for the purpose of making a point in a protest. What has happened now? He has turned around. Now it is quite okay for that to happen. It was hopeless then. It was simply not going to happen.

22 February 1996

Mr Berry has said constantly that we should be conciliatory; that we should say all those nice little fluffy things and not make any comments about thugs. I notice that on 15 December 1993 Mr Berry said that he was taking a big hammer approach to the VMOs. I wonder what has happened to the hammer now. The reality is that we are taking advice from exactly the same people the previous Government took advice from. It is interesting also to notice that under Mr - - -

Mr Berry: Mr Houlihan and Mr Kaufman never worked for us.

MRS CARNELL: Mr Houlihan did a consultancy and has not been working for the ACT Government for quite a period of time. It is true that - - -

Mr Berry: And Mr Kaufman? How much did he cost?

MR SPEAKER: Order! The question has been asked. It is being answered.

MRS CARNELL: It is interesting, Mr Speaker, that when I looked through the list of industrial disputes that happened under the previous Government, fascinatingly, I saw things like a nurses rostering dispute. Funny about that! In fact, there were quite a number of rostering disputes at Woden Valley Hospital under Mr Berry. There was the dispute on access to government cars by medical officers. The salaried doctors were in the Industrial Relations Commission, and so on. When you look at the results of all of those Industrial Relations Commission hearings, I tell you what - if I were Mr Berry, I would shut up.

MR BERRY: I will not be. Mr Speaker, Mrs Carnell might advise us how much it cost her to have Mr Kaufman represent her in the cases that have been before the commission. I know that she failed to accept that he indeed did advise her and act for her in relation to a matter that was in the Industrial Relations Commission.

Mrs Carnell: No. We did. We had him.

MR BERRY: It would have been nice for you to admit that in your answer to the question. His name was indeed raised. It seems to me that you have been ignoring the advice of experienced public service advisers.

MR SPEAKER: What is your supplementary question, Mr Berry?

MR BERRY: Have you been ignoring the advice of experienced public service advisers and listening to the Kennett advisers? They are the types - - -

MR SPEAKER: If that is your question - - -

MR BERRY: I am not finished yet, Mr Speaker. May I conclude?

Mr Kaine: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. Mr Berry is entitled to ask a supplementary question, but he is not entitled to make a statement. I think that he has asked his question. He should be invited to sit down and let the Minister answer it.

MR SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I thought you wanted to ask a supplementary question, Mr Berry.

MR BERRY: I am asking a supplementary question, Mr Speaker.

MR SPEAKER: Ask the supplementary question.

MR BERRY: Have you been ignoring the advice of experienced public service advisers and listening to the Kennett advisers like Kaufman and Houlihan, and is this why industrial relations in this Territory is in such a mess?

Mr Kaine: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Mr Berry is not asking a supplementary question; he is making a statement. I suggest that you call him to order.

MR SPEAKER: Have you asked your supplementary question, Mr Berry?

MR BERRY: Indeed I have.

MR SPEAKER: Then be seated and let the Chief Minister answer it.

MRS CARNELL: Mr Speaker, I can guarantee that the approach that we have taken to this industrial dispute has been totally in line with the advice given to us by the same people who gave - - -

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker - - -

MRS CARNELL: I thought that was exactly the question.

MR SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Mr Berry: Indeed it is, Mr Speaker. It is in relation to the supplementary question that was asked. I asked Mrs Carnell whether she was listening to Kennett advisers or not. Will she tell us whether she is?

MR SPEAKER: The Chief Minister is answering the question.

MRS CARNELL: The advice that I have taken on this issue - and we do have a meeting every evening to discuss tactics and the approach that we will take - is from exactly the same people who gave advice to the previous Government. That advice has been taken. On one occasion, we have employed an external person to represent us in the commission. It was on the issue of the triple-eight nurses' rosters. If Mr Berry would remember, he also took that issue to the Industrial Relations Commission and lost.

Teachers - Enterprise Bargaining

MR HIRD: Mr Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Education, Mr Stefaniak. I ask the Minister: Can he inform the parliament of how the revised pay offer put to the Canberra teachers this week compares to an offer, currently on the table, by the Labor Government to the teachers across the border in the State of New South Wales, where I understand a State-wide stop-work meeting by teachers is being held today?

MR STEFANIAK: I thank the member for his question. Mr Speaker, I can confirm that teachers in New South Wales are indeed holding a stop-work meeting today in support of a 12 per cent pay claim. In fact, major industrial campaigns by the Australian Education Union are under way in a number of States at the moment in support of substantial pay increases. Of course, the ACT is surrounded by New South Wales, and it is interesting to compare what is happening across the border. In response to the teachers' 12 per cent claim, the New South Wales Labor Government has offered 3 per cent.

Mr De Domenico: How much?

MR STEFANIAK: Three per cent. I will repeat that, Mr Speaker. The New South Wales teachers are demanding 12 per cent and the New South Wales Labor Government has offered 3 per cent. In fact, the Labor Premier of New South Wales, Mr Bob Carr, said today that the teachers' claim would cost something like \$400m. To quote Mr Carr directly, he said, "We cannot conjure that kind of money out of midair". The position taken by the New South Wales Government - - -

Mr De Domenico: What party is he from?

MR STEFANIAK: He is from the Labor Party. It is a Labor government. The position taken by the New South Wales Government is that - - -

Mr De Domenico: What faction, though?

MR STEFANIAK: The right-wing faction, I think. Mr Speaker, the position taken by the New South Wales Government is that in order to pay for it there will have to be trade-offs by teachers. Mr Speaker, that is not a Liberal government we are talking about; it is a Labor government. A Labor government is requiring productivity improvements to fund a pay increase, just as the Federal Labor Government requires productivity improvements to fund pay increases for Commonwealth public servants. Mr Carr, a Labor Premier, is confronting the very same problem that we are confronting here in the ACT with a claim for a substantial pay increase. It is interesting to see the headlines in the papers today, Mr Speaker - in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, "Trade-off call in teacher pay fight" and, in the *Daily Telegraph*, "Teachers told to find the money".

Mr Humphries: What barbarians they are in New South Wales!

MR STEFANIAK: Yes. Here in the ACT, of course, our teachers, along with the other public sector unionists, want a 9 per cent increase. Our teachers and our other public servants want a 9 per cent increase. This Government's offer is 7.5 per cent, not 3 per cent as offered in New South Wales. It is 7.5 per cent, with part of that funded - - -

Mr Whitecross: Over three years.

Ms Horodny: Over three years.

MR STEFANIAK: No, 18 months. Part of that is funded through efficiency trade-offs. Indeed, 4.3 per cent is not and 3.2 per cent is. I think it demonstrates clearly that our offer to our teachers is a significant one and demands very careful consideration by our teachers. Of course, the real significance of the situation in New South Wales is that it shows up just how misleading the ACT Trades and Labour Council's campaign has been throughout the current enterprise bargaining dispute. This is not about right-wing ideology, as the TLC claims; it is simply about making sure that any pay increase can be afforded by the people who pay for it, the Canberra community.

Kippax Health Centre

MS TUCKER: Mr Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Health and Community Care, Mrs Carnell. Mrs Carnell, last year you gave a guarantee to this Assembly that you would not sell the Kippax Health Centre for at least 12 months in order to "give it another go", but in the same answer you said that you could not guarantee that ancillary services would remain at existing levels. What action has the Government taken to improve the Kippax Health Centre and get more services into that centre, and how will services be improved if ancillary staff, including administration staff, have been moved out, if they have been?

MRS CARNELL: What we have done is exactly what we said we would do. We need better management for Kippax Health Centre. We need a professional property manager, basically, to get new services in there, to encourage people to take up tenancy in the building, so that we can make the health centre work for the people of Kippax. Under the previous Government the number of services went down substantially. In fact, as Ms Tucker would know, there are already only private practice doctors in the centre in Kippax. We are attempting to fill the centre with tenants, having inherited it as a half-empty centre with horrendous on-costs. To do that we have determined that, as Health does not have any particular expertise in property management and letting space, we will get in somebody who is an expert in that sort of area.

We are looking at what sorts of changes need to be made to the centre to make the space more appealing to health professionals who would like to operate out of that area. We hope that inside 12 months we can do what I made it clear to the Assembly we would do and actually get tenants in the Kippax Health Centre and have a centre that is not half-empty and costing precious health dollars. I want to see health dollars spent on services, not on empty buildings.

22 February 1996

MS TUCKER: I ask a supplementary question. Have you involved the community of Kippax at all in this discussion so that it can communicate with the so-called professional management team?

MRS CARNELL: I think that potentially that supplementary question is out of order under standing order 119, Mr Speaker, but I am very happy to answer it.

MR SPEAKER: Did you hear it? I was not sure whether you heard it, to be honest, Chief Minister.

MRS CARNELL: Yes, I had trouble hearing it, but I am very happy to answer it anyway. We believe quite strongly that what we have to do with Kippax Health Centre is get somebody who knows about renting space so that we get people into the centre. Certainly, we are more than happy to speak to the community, and have spoken to the community, about what sort of services should be in the centre; but in the past we have seen what happens when we do not have professional property managers. You have half-empty centres costing a large amount of community dollars, health dollars, and for nothing. We do not want that to happen in the future.

I gave an undertaking that we would put off the sale of Kippax Health Centre for 12 months while we see whether we can - I am not sure that we can yet - make something of the health centre, which is badly planned and has horrendous on-costs. Last year the cost of repairing the air-conditioning system at Kippax alone was some \$50,000. Those health dollars could be spent on an extra person, an extra community nurse. I would much rather spend \$50,000 on actual health services than on propping up a building that does not work in its current form; but, because this Assembly determined that they did not want Kippax Health Centre sold, I am willing to give it a go to see whether we can stop that sort of drain on health dollars and channel those dollars back into health services, where they should be. The only way we can do that is to let substantially more of the floor space at Kippax and get rent for it to cover the on-costs - for the information of those people who do not understand these things. If we can achieve that, then those precious health dollars can be spent on services.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I would like to raise an issue. Mrs Carnell may have inadvertently misled the Assembly - - -

MR SPEAKER: You will do nothing of the sort. Would you sit down. We are in the middle of question time.

Jindalee Nursing Home

MR OSBORNE: My question is to the Chief Minister, Mrs Carnell. Now that the new owner of Jindalee is about to take over, can you advise what action has been taken in relation to the casual nursing staff who have been working there for longer than six months?

MRS CARNELL: Mr Osborne may not be aware that most of the casual staff currently at Jindalee Nursing Home have actually taken up employment since we announced the sale, but I am very pleased to say that I understand that virtually all of those casuals who have been there for longer than that have been offered jobs by, or are picking up employment with, the new owners and that those who are not are being offered employment at Lower Jindalee.

Public Service - Enterprise Bargaining

MS McRAE: Mr Speaker, my question is to Mrs Carnell in her capacity as Chief Minister. Chief Minister, I refer to Mr Kaine's comments on ABC radio this morning. He said:

I think it's time both the Government and the unions had a close look at where they're going and what their objectives are.

He went on to say:

But the bottom line is that it's the ACT community that's at issue here. It is not a federal issue.

Further he said:

What they are going to have to do is to get down, get together, sit down over a long period of time, sort out the wheat from the grist and deal with the issues one by one until they are resolved.

Mrs Carnell, will you now take advice from your most experienced backbencher, whose opinion is well respected in the community and which incidentally is free, and sit down with the unions and negotiate in good faith?

MRS CARNELL: I am more than willing to sit down with the unions and negotiate in good faith. In fact, over the last two days we have made three enterprise-based offers to the teachers, to the TWU and to the AWU - offers that I think are very reasonable. The offer to the teachers is about \$60 extra a week. We are also very happy to sit down with the Trades and Labour Council any time that they show any interest in moving just a little bit. We have moved. We have moved again in this situation. We started with an offer of 1.3 per cent per year. We moved to 4.3 per cent over 18 months. We are now back to just over 4 per cent over that period of time.

We started off with the view that all bans had to be lifted before we would negotiate. We have now said that as a sign of good faith we are willing to remove that requirement and require only six bans to be lifted. They need to be lifted. They are affecting the community really badly. In fact, Mr Speaker, this dispute has now cost the people of Canberra \$1.5m. In buses alone, \$870,000 has been lost to the taxpayer; tip fees, \$148,000; parking inspectors, \$230,000; the ban on the issuing of tickets, \$80,000; motor registry, \$58,000; commercial services, \$56,000. Mr Speaker, I could go on.

22 February 1996

We now have over 200 bans in place in the ACT. We are willing to sit down and negotiate if the Trades and Labour Council shows just a smidgin of interest in moving on this thing. Six out of over 200 is not a lot.

Certainly, the thing I would like to do more than anything else is to get back to the negotiating table, but to do that I have to be convinced that the Trades and Labour Council is willing to negotiate. They are still saying to me quite categorically that it is 9 per cent fully budget funded, to quote a fax that was sent to me last night, with no trade-offs - no agency-specific productivity and none of the approach that Bob Carr is taking in New South Wales and that others are taking everywhere else. Just a tiny bit, a tiny movement, and I will be at the negotiating table in exactly one second.

MS McRAE: Mrs Carnell, I really think you have chosen the wrong profession. You have learnt your lines and you repeat them and repeat them. May I say that you would be brilliant on stage. But no-one believes them, least of all you, and it is time that you stopped trotting out this ridiculous mantra about giving a shred. The shred has been the four concessions. When are you going to listen to competent advisers who are telling you that your rhetoric is not making any sense and stop this charade that four out of six is not enough? No-one believes you and you are taking this Territory into horrendous conflict for no reason. When are you going to listen to competent advisers?

MRS CARNELL: The competent advisers we are talking about, as I have already said today, are exactly the same competent advisers who were in place for the previous Government. They are the same people. They are people I have an enormous amount of faith in. I am fascinated that those opposite are more than willing to get stuck into competent ACT public servants who have worked night and day since this dispute started, who have given their all in attempting to come up with a solution. I believe that they are doing a very good job, as I am sure they did for the previous Government.

Public Service - Enterprise Bargaining

MR WHITECROSS: Mr Speaker, my question is to Mrs Carnell in her capacity as Chief Minister and de facto Minister for Industrial Relations. Chief Minister, during the present industrial dispute you have repeatedly stated that the Government will not negotiate with the unions while six specific bans are in place, and you repeated that requirement only a couple of minutes ago in answer to Ms McRae's question. In particular, on Monday night you refused to negotiate with the unions because two of those six bans had not been lifted. Why, then, have you sought to enter into negotiations with the two unions responsible for those two bans - the Australian Education Union and the Transport Workers Union?

MRS CARNELL: What we are attempting to do is to find a solution to this whole situation. The Trades and Labour Council have made it clear to me that they are not willing to negotiate on an agency-specific basis. They have said that there will be no trade-offs; there will be no agency-specific productivity measures. I believe that the workers in Canberra deserve a decent wage increase. As long as this goes on, they do not get it. So our approach has been to offer decent and very good wage increases directly to the workers, directly to the people out there who are providing services to the ACT.

We have offered to the teachers a \$60 a week wage increase - productivity based, certainly. To the bus drivers we have offered 9.7 per cent over 30 months - a very decent wage increase based upon productivity. We have also offered, I think, a very reasonable deal to members of the Australian Workers Union. What we require, or what we would like in return for those offers, is a rank-and-file meeting. I want the workers to determine whether they want pay increases. It certainly seems to me that centralised union power is more important to some people than decent wage increases to the people out there doing it.

MR WHITECROSS: I ask a supplementary question, Mr Speaker. Given that clearly you have now abandoned your requirement to lift these bans, because you are negotiating with the two unions that have imposed those bans, and given that those two unions still want to participate in a common bargaining position with the Trades and Labour Council, will you now show some good faith, for a change, and negotiate with the chosen negotiators of those two unions, namely, the Trades and Labour Council, and stop this charade of refusing to negotiate with their chosen negotiators when you are willing to negotiate with the two unions who have the bans which you say are the obstacle?

MRS CARNELL: The basis of the offers that we have put in place is totally at odds with what the Trades and Labour Council are willing to negotiate. What we have offered is enterprise-based specific increases for agencies. To say for one moment, as the Trades and Labour Council continue to do, that the sorts of efficiencies that occur for bus drivers can be used for teachers and that those for teachers can be used for nurses, grass cutters and so on is patently ridiculous. We can achieve significant pay increases if they are agency specific. There are some increases that affect everybody in the ACT government service. We have already put those on the table. They were the basis of our initial 4.3 per cent increase. One per cent of that certainly was to do with implementation of the triple R award. About 0.5 per cent was other specific across-the-board improvements that could be made right across the ACT government service. Interestingly, 2 per cent of that offer was the \$1m we have saved through the changes in our SES structure. One million dollars has been saved in upper management, top management, and ploughed straight back into pay increases for people at the lower end of the ACT government service. I would have thought that was industrial democracy at its best.

Eco-office Funding

MR KAINE: This is a question from the Assembly's most experienced backbencher to the Government's most experienced Minister, Mr Humphries, the Minister for Planning and the Environment. Minister, I was appalled to hear this morning that the ACT Government is funding the ACT eco-office to the tune of only \$4,000. I thought that was a remarkably small sum of money for such an important office. Can you tell the Assembly when the Government is going to do the right thing and fund this office appropriately?

22 February 1996

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Speaker, despite the hardening of the shells of members of the Government over the present industrial dispute, it is clear that some arrows can still get through, and Mr Kaine's question is one such arrow. I must say that I was quite ashamed at the neglect of my portfolio, which in a sense Ms Horodny's speech today indicated was the case. Mr Speaker, it is true. I have not yet been to the ACT eco-office. I have not yet spoken to the officers who work there. I have not yet talked about the work that it does. I feel deeply ashamed about that, Mr Speaker. I can indicate that, as a result of discussions I have had with the Treasurer today, I am prepared to triple the funding available to the ACT eco-office from \$4,000 to \$12,000. In light of the very serious Government neglect of that office over the last little while, we are even prepared to offer a 9 per cent pay rise to the workers who work in that office. There is only one small requirement that I have before I do that, Mr Speaker, and that is that Ms Horodny actually take me to the office. Take me to the office and I will hand over the cheque and advise of the pay rise.

Public Service - Enterprise Bargaining

MS FOLLETT: Mr Speaker, I direct a question to Mrs Carnell. It relates to Mr Whitecross's question. We heard from Mrs Carnell that she had made an offer to the teachers union of some 7.5 per cent and an offer to the TWU of 9.7 per cent. She intimated also that she had made an offer to the AWU. My question is: What is the amount of the offer to the AWU and what period do all three of those offers cover?

MRS CARNELL: The offers are all over different periods of time and are based upon different parameters. The offer to the TWU, as I have already said, is for 30 months and comes out at about 9.7 per cent. My memory of the offer to the AWU is that it is over 15 months, the normal 15 months of the whole-of-government approach, and runs in at somewhere between 7 per cent and 8 per cent, from memory. The teachers' offer is for 15 months and is 7.5 per cent. The efficiencies, the productivity bases, for each of those offers are totally different. What we have is the basic amount we have offered to all agencies - and that is right across the ACT government service - plus, on top of that, productivity-based increases that are specific to particular areas. I am very happy to come back to this Assembly later on today and give full details of all of those offers. I do not have them with me. If I did, I would table them right now. To make sure that the Assembly has absolutely accurate information, I am happy to table details later.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MS FOLLETT: Mr Speaker, I have a question under standing order 118A. My question is to the Chief Minister. I would like to know why the Chief Minister has not answered question No. 123, which was asked on 6 December and for which an answer was due on 5 January.

MRS CARNELL: Ms Follett would be aware that I wrote to her on that particular question on 28 December 1995, advising her that the answer to the question would be late simply because of the amount of detail involved. I understand that that is the approach that is supposed to be taken. I understand that the answer is being finalised now. We will certainly get it to Ms Follett as soon as possible. I certainly did follow procedure. I wrote to Ms Follett. I told her that it was a question that required significant detail and significant research. That research is almost completed.

CANBERRA REGION CAMPAIGN Paper

MS McRAE: Mr Speaker, I wish to follow up on an answer that was provided to me yesterday. This is a point of order in relation to that answer. Mr De Domenico did as was requested by the Assembly; he provided me with details of the members of Canberra Region Campaign Board. I fear that, in receiving this answer, both Mr De Domenico and the Assembly have been treated with contempt. I will seek leave shortly to table this answer. I seek your ruling. Specifically, I am concerned that I was given this answer:

Our discussions with the provisional liquidator indicate there were a number of changes to the board in late 1995.

I requested details of members of that board, and the Minister acceded to that request. The answer further says:

Any further enquiries -

to find out who these people are -

need to be lodged with Ferrier Hodgson, the official provisional liquidator.

It is not correct that I should be asked to make a telephone call to find out an answer that I have asked for in the Assembly. I ask for leave to table this. I would like you to follow that up and perhaps issue instructions to all people who provide answers to Ministers that it is simply not acceptable to not provide an answer.

Leave granted.

MR DE DOMENICO (Minister for Urban Services and Minister for Business, Employment and Tourism): Mr Speaker, I seek leave of the Assembly to speak on this matter.

Leave granted.

22 February 1996

MR DE DOMENICO: Had Ms McRae known anything about business, she would have realised that the Canberra Region Campaign Inc. is a private company.

Mr Berry: Well, go and ask them.

Ms McRae: It does not matter.

MR DE DOMENICO: Just quieten down and you will hear the facts. It is a private company.

Ms McRae: No, you are not the problem. I asked the Speaker to rule; not you.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR DE DOMENICO: If Ms McRae had known anything about business, she would have realised that Canberra Region Campaign Inc. is a private company. From a search of the company records, the advice provided to Ms McRae was correct. I am advised that there was another board elected by the private company - - -

Ms Follett: Tell us who they were.

MR DE DOMENICO: Hold on a tick. This was at the annual general meeting in late 1995. However, that new board was never officially lodged with the ACT Registrar-General's Office and, therefore, has no legal status.

Ms McRae: It does not matter. Then why was I asked?

MR DE DOMENICO: It does matter. If you know anything about the law you will know that it matters. It has no legal status. As discussed yesterday, the previous board remains the officially registered board.

Ms McRae: That is not what your answer said, Mr De Domenico.

MR DE DOMENICO: It did, Ms McRae.

Ms McRae: Your answer said that I should ring the liquidator. It is outrageous.

MR DE DOMENICO: If you want any further information, Ms McRae - I do not know what further information you would require - as is normal practice with a private company, ring the provisional liquidator. The provisional liquidator is the only person that knows.

Ms Follett: It is a private company.

MR DE DOMENICO: It is a private company.

Ms McRae: That is exactly my point of order. It does not matter.

MR DE DOMENICO: It does matter. If you want any further advice about a private company that is in liquidation, ask the provisional liquidator. I do not know any more about it because I am not involved in the private company. If you want advice on the private company, ask the provisional liquidator. That is what the companies and securities law is all about.

Ms Follett: What do you have to hide?

MR DE DOMENICO: I have nothing at all to hide, Ms Follett.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

MR BERRY (3.28): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion circulated in my name. It is in relation to a possible misleading of the Assembly.

Leave not granted.

MR BERRY: I move:

That so much of the standing orders be suspended as would prevent Mr Berry from moving a motion concerning the services available at Kippax Health Centre.

This would give Mrs Carnell the opportunity to apologise for misleading the Assembly on this matter. My reason for moving this motion is that at question time Mrs Carnell clearly said that there were only private doctors at Kippax Health Centre. It was in response to a question from the Greens in relation to ancillary services. I think Mrs Carnell has, maybe inadvertently, misled the Assembly. She should be given the opportunity to apologise. I have moved that motion so that I can explain the full details.

MRS CARNELL (Chief Minister and Minister for Health and Community Care) (3.29): Mr Speaker, for the benefit of the Assembly, rather than waste time on this sort of thing, I could do a quick run over the services that are available at Kippax Health Centre, what is happening to them, where they are going and so on. I am very happy to make sure that - - -

Mr Berry: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The argument that we have entered into now is whether or not standing orders ought to be suspended. I know that Mrs Carnell is a little nervous about this because I think she knows that she has been caught out. She should stick to the relevance of the debate; that is, whether or not we should suspend standing orders to consider this issue. You could apologise straightaway.

MR HUMPHRIES (Attorney-General) (3.30): Mrs Carnell has offered to clear up by way of a statement whatever misunderstanding Mr Berry feels has resulted from something which she may have said at question time. With great respect, we do not need a - - -

22 February 1996

Mr Berry: To assist, Mr Speaker, I will list the services available at Kippax and Mrs Carnell can say whether or not they are still there.

MR HUMPHRIES: Mr Berry, I am speaking.

MR SPEAKER: There is a point of order by Mr Humphries.

MR HUMPHRIES: No. I am speaking to this motion. We have been sitting now for three days. The first item of Executive business on the agenda is the Law Reform (Abolitions and Repeals) Bill, which was there on Tuesday morning. We have not yet reached it. With great respect, all of Tuesday was taken up by an abortive motion of censure of the Government. All of Wednesday was taken up with matters, which flowed over from the morning, concerning the industrial dispute. We had other matters on this morning. Can I say, very simply, that, if Mr Berry wants to get Mrs Carnell to clarify what she said today, then allow her to rise in this place and talk about these things. We do not need a speech from Mr Berry, a speech from Mrs Carnell and a debate on the floor of the house. It can be sorted out simply, without wasting more of the time of the Assembly.

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (3.32): Very briefly, Mr Speaker, in response to Mr Humphries: I think Mr Humphries's own party whip will confirm that I offered to go on with business before lunch today, in particular the Law Reform (Abolitions and Repeals) Bill and the Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill. I was told that they would rather go to lunch. Do not tell me that I was not willing to go on with the business. I was perfectly prepared to go on with it. The fact of the matter is that this Government has no business. They have been trying to drag out those two little Bills for a whole week. So far the Opposition has managed to do that for them. They ought to be very grateful that we have not left the running of the Assembly to the Government this week. The Opposition has done it for you. I would sit in your place and keep quiet about it because by anything that you say about it you will embarrass yourselves further.

MR MOORE (3.33): Mr Speaker, it seems to me that the suggestion here is that at question time Mrs Carnell said something to the effect that the Kippax Health Centre has only private doctors. That can be interpreted in one of two ways: It has only private doctors, meaning that it has only private doctors and does not have public doctors.

Mr Whitecross: Are you speaking to the suspension, Michael?

MR MOORE: Of course I am speaking to the suspension. Or it can mean that the Kippax Health Centre has only private doctors and nothing else. That is open to interpretation. To have a motion that calls for an interpretation at this point seems rather silly to me. If Mrs Carnell is willing to give an explanation of what she meant, that is fine. I do not recall her exact words at the time or exactly how she put it. I would have to read *Hansard*. If Mrs Carnell is prepared to give the Assembly a very brief explanation as to what she means and what is at Kippax Health Centre, as a rough overview, then I would certainly be happy for that to proceed.

Mr Berry: I am happy.

MR MOORE: Mr Berry indicates that he would be happy for that to proceed as well, so that we do not have to muck around any more with this.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to read out a list and see whether they are all there. That will clear up the matter. Mrs Carnell can say whether or not they are still there.

MR SPEAKER: Order! The question has been asked of Mrs Carnell, not of you, Mr Berry.

Mr Berry: Would you mind if I handed them a list? She can tell me whether all these services are still there or not.

Mrs Carnell: I am happy to give you a breakdown of the services, what is happening to them and where they are going, if that is what you want.

Mr Berry: No, I want to know which ones are still there.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Carnell: I am happy to do that.

Mr Berry: That is fine. We will see what the answer is.

MR SPEAKER: If you are happy with the arrangement that Mr Moore has outlined, then, by all means, indicate.

Mrs Carnell: I am happy.

MR SPEAKER: It might seem as though we are wasting a lot of time, but I will call on Ms Tucker while the rest of you reflect on the matter.

MS TUCKER (3.35): I asked that question. It would have been quite clear if Mrs Carnell had answered the question that I asked. I was asking whether or not all the ancillary services had been moved. There has been a misunderstanding because the question was not answered properly. I personally am happy if she actually answers the question as I asked it.

MR SPEAKER: Is leave granted for Mrs Carnell to clarify that?

Leave granted.

MRS CARNELL (Chief Minister and Minister for Health and Community Care): Certainly, as Mr Moore rightly said, the point I made at question time was that the only doctors that were available at Kippax Health Centre were private doctors. Obviously, there are other services available. There are child health clinics. The clinics will continue to operate, although hours may vary depending on routine assessment of demand. That happens in child health clinics across
Canberra.

22 February 1996

There are immunisation clinics. These will continue, based on the planned 1996 program. The lactation clinic will continue. However, the postnatal review has recommended co-location with a family care centre. As the review recommendations are implemented, there could be some changes to the lactation clinic; but at this stage it is still there.

The nurse hearing clinic was relocated in November last year to a purpose built facility in Moore Street, Civic. This enabled a wider range of services to be provided, because the facility is purpose built. The nurse oncologist specialist service was located at Kippax because of a lack of space at a more appropriate location. No service was ever provided at Kippax by this staff member. The nurse has now been located near the palliative care and inpatient services. The stoma therapist, wound, continence nurse specialist service will be relocated in Civic with the Stoma Association. I think that is an appropriate co-location. The centralised continence clinic in the Civic location is more accessible to a wider range of people across Canberra.

There is the maternal and child health team. The administrative base of this team of nurses is located at Kippax. These nurses provide service at various locations throughout North Belconnen. There are plans to relocate the administration to Kaleen. This is to provide for reduced travelling time to Gungahlin and co-location with child and health development services. This change will not have an impact on actual services provided at Kippax at all. There is a speech therapy or speech pathology service. This service is provided by the child health and development service, which is establishing a multidisciplinary service in Kaleen as well. This new arrangement will come into effect over the next six months, although clinical sessions for speech pathology are still expected to be provided at Kippax.

There are sessional nutritional clinics. These will continue to be provided at Kippax by a health professional from the central catchment primary health care team. Physiotherapy services will continue to be provided at Kippax on an outreach basis from the Belconnen primary health care team. It is certainly true that central switchboard and reception services will no longer be provided from this building. Private tenants will provide their own reception staff, as they should. It would seem to me that that gives a fairly good run-down of the services and what is happening to them. Certainly, as well, the Government is currently attempting to negotiate new lease arrangements with the private practitioners who are located at Kippax Health Centre, unlike the previous Government that lost a lot of their private operators simply because they would not offer a lease.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, does that amount to an apology?

MR SPEAKER: Mr Berry, you will have to seek leave of the Assembly to withdraw your motion.

Mr Berry: Mr Speaker, I seek leave to withdraw my motion now that we have a full and complete answer to the question.

Leave granted.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

PAPERS

MR HUMPHRIES (Attorney-General): Mr Speaker, for the information of members, I present the Woden Valley Hospital Information Bulletin on Patient Activity Data for December 1995.

MS McRAE: Mr Speaker, I ask for leave to present a petition which does not conform with the standing orders as it does not address the Assembly or contain a request.

Leave granted.

MS McRAE: I present an out-of-order petition from 315 residents concerning care for children with disabilities.

FIRST YEAR OF LIBERAL GOVERNMENT Discussion of Matter of Public Importance

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

The disastrous impact on the Canberra community of the first year of the ACT Liberal Government.

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (3.41): Mr Speaker, in the year since Mrs Carnell's Government took office, the Canberra community has been subjected to reduced services, increased costs, industrial chaos and a diminished quality of life for all of our citizens, especially the most disadvantaged. Over the past year this Government has in fact deserted the Canberra community. It has broken 32 specific promises. Many other promises have not yet been fulfilled, and there is little indication that this Government is likely to deliver over the next two years. In fact, I have given them the benefit of the doubt on that. The track record to date does not give the community a great deal of confidence that the Government will keep those promises either. Broken promises, in fact, are the hallmark of this Government. It is a result of waste and mismanagement. It is ironic indeed that the Liberals promised better management and that they would use commonsense, not ideology. Yet they have delivered the most secretive and most ideologically driven government that this Territory has ever seen.

A little later, I will detail some of the promises that this Liberal Government has broken, but first I would like to comment on the objective evidence available of the impact of the Liberals on the Canberra community. Some of the economic indicators show how the Canberra community is being made to pay for this Government's waste and mismanagement. The ACT economy, as measured by state final demand, has shrunk, and you have to look only at the Bureau of Statistics information to realise that that is the case. These are the hard facts. Business confidence has fallen. I quote from the *Canberra Times* of Monday, 19 February:

22 February 1996

According to one participant, Denis Page, chairman of the Canberra Business Council, business confidence in the ACT was at its worst, with falling residential property values a big worry.

That was what Mr Page said on 19 February - Monday of this week.

In the past year, unemployment has risen from 7.1 per cent to 7.4 per cent. In fact, figures published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics yesterday show that over the past 12 months unemployment in the ACT has actually increased by 7.6 per cent, while nationally unemployment has fallen by 3.1 per cent.

Mr De Domenico: What has happened to the participation rate and the number of jobs?

MS FOLLETT: Mr Speaker, you may well have to invoke standing order 207 any minute now.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MS FOLLETT: Over the same period, the number of unemployed has risen by 5,400 - that is, 5,400 more real people are unemployed under your Government - and teenage unemployment has risen from 32.4 per cent to 43 per cent, the highest in Australia. For the past three months the number of people employed has actually fallen. In fact, we have lost 600 jobs since last October.

Mrs Carnell: What happened in the months before that?

MS FOLLETT: You will get your chance. Award wages have been static for six months - there has been no movement there - and, not surprisingly, retail trade growth in the ACT is the lowest in Australia, at less than half the national average and only one-third that of New South Wales. I think that is a disgraceful record for any government to have to look back on after only one year in office.

The Government has downgraded many of the services to the Canberra community, to the detriment of Canberra citizens. Bulk-billing local doctors have been sacked. The mammography unit at Woden Valley Hospital is to be closed. The nurses themselves are in uproar over the lack of consultation. The Government has forced the Canberra community to bear the cost of Liberal Party ideology. There is plenty of money for consultants, plenty of money for business tax breaks and plenty of money for overseas trips for the Chief Minister and for consorts. But health centres are closed; bulk-billing doctors are sacked; labour market programs and community group funding are slashed; workers have been threatened with lockouts and with the removal of their payroll deduction facilities; and, in the case of Charnwood High School, schoolchildren have had their school closed.

I would now like to detail some of the promises that this Liberal Government has broken, under the Liberals' own policy headings. I am quoting from the Liberals' own documentation. At election time Liberal policy on the ageing promised 50 new hospital beds. In fact, we have not seen a single one of those hospital beds; nor are there any private bulk-billing doctors in health centres. In fact, the bulk-billing doctors have all

been sacked because they were salaried doctors. The Melba Health Centre has been closed. There are no new nursing homes in Tuggeranong and Belconnen. That was a promise to the ageing people of Canberra. Is it any wonder that those nursing homes have not been provided, given that they were to be funded from the sale of Jindalee which was privatised for the abysmally low return to the Canberra community of \$210,000/

There has been no increase in funding for policing, despite the promise and also despite the rhetoric and scaremongering of Mr Humphries. His excuse was that the Police Commissioner had not asked for any extra money. I would ask: What sort of a way is that to run the government? You make a promise at election time and then you blame the public servants because they did not actually come to you and ask you to implement your own policy. As I said, I believe that this is gross waste and mismanagement. The Liberals' arts policy for the election has been dumped. Again, it was Mr Humphries who did the big dump. Mr Humphries promised \$3m over three years to the arts community. The *Canberra Times* writer, who is normally quite a fan of Mr Humphries - that was my impression anyway - says that the arts community will be lucky to get \$1m over three years. Groups are already being told to seek funding from the Health Promotion Fund. There is a clear recognition that the Government has no intention of fulfilling its commitment.

In the Liberals' promises on the ACT government service, the Government promised to "guarantee security of tenure for all public servants not employed on a contract basis". But what they have done, of course, is put involuntary redundancies in the new enterprise bargaining packages; that is, the Government wants the right to sack public servants. So much for security of tenure, which was the election promise. Staff newsletter No. 15 of yesterday says that there will be 100 involuntary redundancies.

In the business and economic development policy document at the last election we saw the real George Bush promise, the read my lips promise. The exact wording was, "No tax or charge will exceed their New South Wales counterparts". That was the promise from the Liberals in their own words. The club industry has learnt that a Liberal promise is not worth the paper that it is written on. Poker machine tax in the ACT is now one per cent higher than it is in New South Wales. Worse still, the industry was forced to accept this broken promise by being threatened that, if they did not, the casino and pubs and taverns would be given poker machines in order to force the clubs into submission. That is what the Liberals call consultation; that is their idea of consultation.

Even the business community cannot rely on the party that many of them regard as their own. In the Liberals' election promises, payroll tax was to be reduced from 7 per cent to 6 per cent. This never happened, and of course it never will. The Liberal Government in fact adopted the ALP policy - and a good move, too - of increasing the threshold on payroll tax. It implemented the previously announced ALP policy of raising the threshold from \$550,000 to \$600,000 on 1 January this year. There is a further promise to the business community that the threshold will go to \$800,000 on 1 January next year. Frankly, if I were a business operator in Canberra, I would certainly not base my cash flow and profit projections on that promise.

22 February 1996

The entire community is paying more for petrol under the Liberals. Let us get back to basics and look at what has happened with petrol. The Liberals postured endlessly when Labor actually took action that brought prices down. The Liberals promised in their written document “a reduction in the ACT petrol tax by 3c a litre”. No ifs, no buts, no maybes. Those were their precise words - “a reduction in the ACT petrol tax by 3c a litre”. Of course that never happened, and it never will. There was \$5m a year promised for marketing Canberra. In fact, less than \$2m was delivered, and the Canberra Tourism Commission had to cancel a proposed advertising campaign because the Government did not give them sufficient funds.

In education policy, this was the list of promises from the Liberals. Schoolchildren were promised free buses to and from primary and secondary schools and colleges. That one was thrown straight into the garbage bin by the totally discredited Education Minister. Students still have to pay to get to school - unless of course they go to Charnwood High School, because that one has been closed. Not even the unanimous opposition of over 200 members of the school community could stop Mr Stefaniak rattling on another Liberal promise. That promise was “not to close any ACT school without the demonstrated support of that school's community”. The closure of Charnwood High School was opposed absolutely by the Charnwood school community.

With the Liberals, consultation means making the decision, maybe letting the community have their say - on a good day; not always, not invariably. Regardless of that, they then ignore them and proceed with the decision anyway. The school community was told:

A Liberal Government will guarantee to maintain current levels of ACT education funding indexed for inflation over the next three years.

This was simply not delivered in the 1995-96 budget. The Government argues that it was. I think they are the only people in this community who are in any danger of believing their own propaganda. The only people who think that, as I say, are the seven Liberals opposite. It is not even unanimous in their own party room, I happen to know.

On the environment, the Liberals, in their election promises, said that the community would get “a register of contaminated sites in the ACT”. The Minister has now declared that there will be no register of contaminated sites. When I say that this Government is the most secretive that the ACT has ever had, I can demonstrate it as a fact. There are about 150 known sheep dip sites in the ACT, but the Minister will not tell the Canberra community where they are, what they contain, what testing has been done on each site or anything else. If you think freedom of information might help, you can forget it. They have in fact closed the FOI office. If you look at where it was, there is the most confusing list of phone numbers, which many people in our community could not read, on a locked door. That is their idea of freedom of information.

Let us look at the Liberal policies in the area of health, the one area that Mrs Carnell has made her own. What she promised was that operating theatre efficiency would be improved by extending their use to evening and weekend sessions. In fact, theatre time is down. Health services were to be devolved closer to the people; that was the promise.

Bulk-billing doctors have been sacked; Melba Health Centre has been closed; services at other centres have been downgraded. They have broken promises that impact most severely on families, the aged, the sick of course, and those who need local community health services. That demonstrates just how little regard this Liberal Government has for the Canberra community.

Mr Hird, a so-called Belconnen member of this place, had the gall to tell Belconnen residents that it is only a short walk from Melba to Florey or Hawker. I bet Mr Hird has never walked it, especially not pushing a pram, holding a toddler by the hand or using a walking stick. In fact, that is the way that many of the people in our community have to get around. I bet that not one member of the Government has ever walked the distance between those points. Clearly, if they had, they would not have shut down the health facilities. I could go on and on. As Mrs Carnell says, the list goes on. In the area of planning, there have been promises broken directly. Mr Humphries did not even apologise for it. He just said, "We are promising it".

In the area of youth, our young people last year might have thought they would get a better deal under Mrs Carnell. In fact, they have not even been consulted. The promise was to maintain and enhance the role of the ACT Youth Advisory Council. That promise has been broken in the worst possible way. The Advisory Council has been allowed to lapse. There is certainly no council at present and no consultation either. The Liberals, of course, also promised to improve late night bus services as one of their youth initiatives. Not only has that not been delivered but the existing Nightrider bus service was cancelled.

I could go on at great length and detail all of the promises broken by Mrs Carnell. I will instead seek to table the document which lists the 32 promises broken so far. I have not included the ones where I have given you the benefit of the doubt and which have not yet been delivered but which could still be delivered in the two years remaining to you. I seek leave to table that document. Even my own list is far from exhaustive. I do believe that it is correct to say that the Canberra community has had a disastrous result from its flirtation with a Liberal government and that the Canberra community has been treated with the utmost contempt, with disastrous consequences for our community.

MR SPEAKER: Did you seek leave to table a document?

MS FOLLETT: I did, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

MRS CARNELL (Chief Minister) (3.57): Mr Speaker, I think we need to understand that Ms Follett just did the greatest amount of selective quoting of figures that I have heard her do since she was Treasurer, when she used to do it as well. The reality of the situation is that the ACT economy is still very sluggish. We inherited a Consolidated Fund with a count of zero. We inherited a situation where building approvals had fallen for, I think, 17 months in a row. We inherited a situation where only 700 jobs had been produced in the previous 12 months. We inherited a situation where business believed that the ACT was simply not the place to be. What we have done - - -

22 February 1996

Ms Follett: Now they think it is the worst ever. That is what Denis Page said - the worst ever.

Mr De Domenico: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker, under standing order 39. Albeit with difficulty, even I did not interject when Ms Follett was speaking. I suggest that Mrs Carnell be given the same courtesy.

MR SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I remind both sides of the house that we do have standing order 39 and it says:

When a Member is speaking, no other Member may converse or make any noise or disturbance to interrupt that Member.

Continue, Chief Minister.

MRS CARNELL: Mr Speaker, the growth in the ACT economy, expressed in gross state product, increased by 0.4 per cent during the September quarter 1995, as Ms Follett, if she really wanted to know, would know. Growth in the ACT economy, though, has been hindered by a number of problems, one of those being the decrease - - -

Ms Follett: It is dead.

Mr Berry: One is Kate Carnell.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MRS CARNELL: Thank you. One of those is the decrease in building approvals for 17 months straight prior to this Government coming to office. But we have turned it around at least to some extent. For the last six months we have had increased - - -

Ms Follett: No, you have not. It is the worst ever.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MRS CARNELL: For the last six months we have had increased building approvals - - -

Ms Follett: Ask Denis Page.

MR SPEAKER: Continue, Chief Minister.

MRS CARNELL: Thank you. We have had an increase of 5,300 jobs since we came to office, which you can compare with 700 in the previous 12 months. We do have the highest participation rate now in Australia, by a country mile. In fact, the ACT's unemployment rate did increase marginally, as Ms Follett said, to 7.4 per cent in January 1996, but it still remains substantially below the national rate of 8.5 per cent. The relatively low unemployment rate is quite remarkable, given the ACT's extremely high participation rate. If it had remained at its March 1995 rate, if it had remained where it was when we took office and more people were not encouraged to get back into the job market by improved - - -

Mr Berry: When you went to Brazil did you find a higher youth unemployment rate?

Mr De Domenico: Mr Speaker, I again remind you of standing order 39.

Mr Hird: Try standing order 61.

MR SPEAKER: The interjection is out of order; it is also irrelevant. Continue, Chief Minister.

MRS CARNELL: If the participation rate had remained at the same level as it was in March 1995, the unemployment rate in January 1996 would have been 4.7 per cent, Mr Speaker, and I think that really says it all. What has happened is that more people are in the job market force. The participation rate has gone up to an all-time high because people believe that there are jobs out there, Mr Speaker. People believe, quite definitely, that they can get a job, and 5,300 of them have actually done that.

Ms Follett commented about retail turnover. Actually, retail turnover in the ACT increased by 0.3 per cent in the December quarter. Only Western Australia recorded an increase in the rate of real growth in retail turnover during the quarter. That does tend to fly in the face of Ms Follett's own comments. We have a situation where the key indicators of activity in our tourism industry point to solid activity in the year to the December quarter 1995 compared with the previous year.

Mr Wood: Whose data is that?

MR SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear that comment, Chief Minister. Would you mind repeating it?

MRS CARNELL: If those opposite do not believe that our tourism industry and our building industry are important to us, then they are absolutely wrong. Compared to the previous year hotels, motels and guesthouses recorded a 5.2 per cent increase in takings and a 5.1 per cent increase in the number of guest arrivals. We do not think this is good enough. We do not believe that the current situation in the ACT is good enough. That is the reason, Mr Speaker, why we believe - and we put our money where our mouths are - that we have to encourage more businesses to this city. We have to encourage people to employ in Canberra.

Ms McRae: That is what you told Mr Howard, too. We heard that.

MR SPEAKER: Order! What was that again, Chief Minister?

MRS CARNELL: If we have extra employment in Canberra we will have extra money, we will increase the retail turnover, and the list goes on; but, if you do nothing, as the previous Government did - it did absolutely nothing - sit on your hands, do not make a decision, allow union bosses to dictate where you are going in this city, you end up with an economy that comes to a screaming halt and with no money in the bank. That is what we inherited. We inherited a situation where waiting lists had increased more than 2½ times, from 1,789 in June 1991 to 4,569 in February 1995.

22 February 1996

Mr Berry: What is it now?

MRS CARNELL: Mr Berry asks, "What is it now?". It was 4,569 in February last year and it is now 4,462. There are 107 fewer people on the waiting list now.

MR SPEAKER: Order! How many fewer did you say?

MRS CARNELL: There are 107 fewer.

Mr Berry: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker. Mrs Carnell might tell us in her speech how many were put through the hospital as well.

MRS CARNELL: I am happy to do that. You only have to ask.

Ms McRae: And how many have died?

MRS CARNELL: I could probably tell you that if you would like to wait.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MRS CARNELL: We have 107 fewer people on our waiting list at the moment; but, again, I do not believe that having 4,462 on our waiting list is acceptable. That is the reason why we have gone into major restructuring in our health system. That is the reason why we need to spend more money on patients and less on administration.

Mr Berry asked about activity levels. I am happy to tell him that activity levels at our hospitals are up 4.5 per cent on the same time last year. We have seen an extra 900-odd patients in comparison to the same time under the previous Government. Again, I do not think that is good enough. I think we have to improve substantially from there. We still have a hospital system that costs us probably as much as 30 per cent more than similar hospitals in other places. We still have, I think, 413 clerical staff at Woden Valley Hospital. We still have a situation where the cost of running our hospitals is simply out of control. That is the reason why we have to implement the Booz Allen approach to our hospitals, but at this stage we have not been able to do that. Why have we not, Mr Speaker? We have not been able to do it simply because those unions who claim to be doing the right thing by the people of Canberra simply will not let us implement important changes. Under the previous Government 200 hospital beds were cut out of the system to give us the lowest number of public hospital beds per capita in Australia.

As I said earlier, Mr Speaker, we inherited a Consolidated Fund that was zero in February 1995. In July 1991 when Ms Follett took office it stood at \$180m. There was \$180m in the bank when Ms Follett came to office and there was zero in it when the people of Canberra kicked her out. That has to be a really wonderful deal! During that time, as well, rates went up by 30 per cent in Canberra - 30 per cent at a time when inflation was somewhere in the vicinity of 6.6 or 6.7 per cent. Is that a good deal for Canberrans? What did we do? Rates went up by the CPI, and the CPI alone.

One of the most telling points for a previous government that believed that they did the right thing by public servants is that a total of 1,019 ACT public servants - - -

Ms Follett: We are talking about your Government, Mrs Carnell, that you never want to talk about. You never want to talk about your own performance.

MR SPEAKER: How many was that, Chief Minister?

MRS CARNELL: A total of 1,019 ACT public servants were retrenched under the previous Government, at a cost of \$38m to the Territory. And guess what, Mr Speaker? The number of people in the ACT government service decreased by 350. So we paid for 1,019 public servants to leave the public service at a cost to taxpayers at \$38m for a reduction of only 350.

Ms Follett: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order. This is an opportunity for Mrs Carnell to address the issue which is before the Assembly, which is the performance of her own Government.

MRS CARNELL: Which I have done.

Ms Follett: I think that relevance does arise here. So far we have had over 10 minutes from her on the previous Government. Has she nothing good to say of her own Government, or does she share the view of her Ministers who have fled?

MR SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Chief Minister is addressing her remarks on this matter of public importance the way she sees fit.

MRS CARNELL: Mr Speaker, just to clarify what I have already said, I have spoken about waiting lists going down by 107 since we took office. I have talked about building approvals going up for the last six months. I have talked about an increase of 5,300 jobs. I have spoken about a situation where more people are being treated in our hospitals than were treated previously. It strikes me that that is a quite definite addressing of the principles here. I have spoken about our tourism industry recording a 5.2 per cent increase in takings and a 5.1 per cent increase in guest arrivals. I have also said, Mr Speaker, that we do not think it is good enough. We simply have to do better than this if we are going to have jobs for our kids in this city.

We have made some very difficult decisions as well - something that never happened under the previous Government. Certainly, it is not fun to have to close a health centre. Why did we close it? Because there were no services in it. We were not in the business of keeping half-empty or three-quarters-empty health centres open. We want to spend the precious dollars that this community has for areas such as health, community services and others on services, not on half-empty buildings. Certainly, the easy part for any government is spending more money. The reality is that we inherited a situation where we had to spend less, and we have done it. We have taken the bull by the horns on this; we have made the hard decisions that should have been made under the previous Government.

22 February 1996

Certainly, we have yet to implement all of our promises. Heavens, we have been here for 12 months. Ms Follett, in her document, has made some absolutely fascinating statements like, "You naughty government, you did not implement 50 per cent betterment". Let us; we will do it. We will do it tomorrow, if this Assembly will let us do it. Comments about the police budget are simply misleading, and I am sure that Mr Humphries will talk about that later.

The comment about nursing homes suggested that we promised two new nursing homes. We did. One will open in Page later this year. Instead of getting rid of Jindalee and selling the land, as Mr Connolly wanted us to do, for residential purposes, and building a new one, we determined, in the interests of the residents who are there at this stage and who treat Jindalee as their home, after consulting with them, that it was a substantially nicer idea to keep the current site. So, yes, we do have two nursing homes. There is one at Page, and we are keeping Jindalee rather than relocating it somewhere else. Why did we do that? Because it was in the interests of the community to do so. We have organised the sale of Jindalee Nursing Home. That had been suggested and recommended by Assembly committees, by any number of groups, all the way through; but it was a tough decision, Mr Speaker, and that is why those opposite never took it.

Coming to government with zero in the bank, with no money whatsoever, with reducing funding from the Commonwealth and with ACT taxpayers already paying at the same sorts of levels as in other States is difficult, but we are making those decisions. We are not sitting on our hands. It is not easy, as we see right at the moment with the industrial situation, but we will continue to do it. We will continue to create jobs. We will continue to encourage business into this city. We will continue down the track of revamping our health system so that we can do something better than just 107 reductions in the waiting list since we came to office and so that we really can address those issues; but to do it we need the cooperation of this whole Assembly. We need to take the hard decisions and we need to stop being wimps.

MR WOOD (4.12): Mr Speaker, let me acknowledge that I have no doubt that the Chief Minister and the Deputy Chief Minister are in regular contact with the ACT business community. They are, after all, fellow travellers, and fair enough. They will not talk to the unions, but they will talk to the business community. I wonder whether the chief and her deputy would get up in this Assembly and tell us all what that business community is saying to them when they come through their door or when they meet them at social functions.

Rosemary Follett said, and the Chief Minister also said it a short time ago, that this is a very sluggish economy. That is not just Rosemary Follett's view. It is not just Mrs Carnell's view. It is the view, as we read, of Denis Page. I expect that the people opposite know Mr Page, the chairman of the Canberra Business Council. He said that business confidence in the ACT was at its worst.

What about the business confidence survey the results of which were issued in December 1995 by the same Canberra Business Council after a very long survey of Canberra businesses? The results showed a noticeable decrease in business confidence since the previous survey in January 1995. Forty-two per cent of respondents believed that the business environment was either marginally or considerably worse in comparison

with the same time last year. Mr Page said at that time that the results indicated the need for continued development of an economic and social environment conducive to business growth. We are not seeing that environment. What about the small business index issued by *Yellow Pages*? Their report concluded that confidence in the ACT is below the national average, that activity levels in the past quarter to November 1995 were subdued, with more businesses reporting decreases in sales and employment than increases, and, further, that there is a decline in capital expenditure. They are all matters that are being reported.

The people who talk to the Chief Minister and her deputy are saying that this town is absolutely in the doldrums. They probably use more descriptive terms, and they would be right. After one year of this Government we are in the doldrums. We are going nowhere. We could face a double whammy if the Federal Liberals are elected to government. I do not believe that that will be the case, but if they are it will be a double whammy and this place will go from merely being in the doldrums to a severe depression or worse.

The Government simply has to stop using words. We hear words, empty rhetoric, all the time. They have to start doing something. I remember that some six months or so ago - it might have been a bit longer - the Chief Minister, as though she was personally responsible, jumped up and down when the March 1995 quarter figures showed a fairly steep increase in population growth. I think it was 600 or so. She was very proud about that. Will she also take the same level of responsibility for the fact that our population now is quite static?

Mrs Carnell: It has not gone down, though. It has still kept that increase.

MR WOOD: It is static. Is it going up, Chief Minister?

Mrs Carnell: We maintained that increase.

MR WOOD: It is at the one level. It is a sign that people are not interested in coming to the ACT. If you look at the comparison between - - -

Mr De Domenico: It went down under you, though, Bill. Have a good look.

MR WOOD: No, it did not. You go and look at those figures. We have been having a continual increase in natural growth - that is, births over deaths is giving us an increase.

Mrs Carnell: Net migration loss.

MR WOOD: Over a number of months there has been a decrease in net migration. More people are leaving Canberra than are coming to Canberra - I think Mrs Carnell was saying this - and you ought to be asking yourself why that is.

Mrs Carnell: That is what happened under you.

22 February 1996

MR WOOD: No; look at the last few months. Two or three of the last six months have shown that result, and you should look at that. If you want to claim credit for 600 people in the March 1995 quarter, you should then accept the responsibility for subsequent quarters. We have a severe problem with the image of the ACT around Australia. Rosemary Follett mentioned a number of figures. She referred to the retail figures - we quote from the ABS data, but Mrs Carnell would not indicate where her figures came from - and those figures are static. We would have expected to have some growth in the December quarter.

Mr De Domenico: There was some growth.

MR WOOD: There was a very small amount compared with the - - -

Mr De Domenico: And it was pretty good in comparison to the rest of the nation.

MR WOOD: No, it was very poor in comparison. That is the point I make, Mr De Domenico. If you examine these figures, if you get a brief from some of your officers on these figures, you might begin to get a little bit concerned.

Mrs Carnell said something about housing activity. Again she was not citing figures. That has been in the doldrums for a long time. That preceded the current Government; but, if you look to the forecast by your officers, it is going to go down. It is not going to go up. You are not projecting any great increase. There are only 2,200 commencements proposed in this year, and 2,300 in 1996-97 - that is after 2,800 in 1994-95 - so you are not projecting any increase. I do welcome the very slight rise over the last few months. I hope that is an indication that something may happen; but, given that population figure, it is difficult to see how that might be sustained. We are all concerned about house prices. What are you doing about that?

Mrs Carnell: What would you do?

Mr De Domenico: Yes, what would you do? Would you release some more land like you did before?

MR WOOD: I would generate some activity around this town.

Mrs Carnell: In the private sector?

MR WOOD: If I were in government - - -

Mr Berry: If I were you, I would resign. Just resign.

MR SPEAKER: Order! Mr Wood has the floor.

MR WOOD: If there were a Labor government on those benches over there, we would have regenerated the capital works program, for example. A little while ago Mr Moore asked a question about the \$10m or so that you put into the business sector, if indeed you have spent that; but it appeared to bring no gains in terms of generating any activity in this community. It does not seem to have been very productive. What has it delivered,

for heaven's sake? There is nothing there. This Government is simply taking us backwards. We are not getting anywhere. I want to repeat my concern about the dual impact if we get a Federal Liberal government. That is when the alarm signals would have to ring very loudly in the ACT. With the incompetence and the mismanagement of this Government and the Federal Liberals, the ACT would be in great trouble.

MR DE DOMENICO (Minister for Urban Services) (4.21): Mr Speaker, I am delighted to stand and to speak on this matter of public importance. It is interesting to note what happens when politicians become members of the Opposition. There is a book around called "What you should do when you are in opposition", especially a Labor opposition, and what you should do is misquote, knock, knock, knock, knock, knock all the time, and say nothing positive. I must say, though, that Mr Wood went close to being a bit positive; but, then again, he is different from most of his colleagues on the other side of the house.

Mr Speaker, I think some of the figures that Mrs Carnell referred to need to be repeated. The most classic figure, the one that really hangs in the craw of anybody on the other side of the house, is this one: Whether people like it or not, in one year under the Carnell Government 5,300 new jobs have been created, mostly in the private sector, here in the ACT. When we couple that with the highest participation rate in the country - not the highest by just a little margin, but 10 percentage points higher than the national average - it tells me that people have confidence in wanting to get jobs here in the ACT. Whether people like that or not, they are what the ABS figures show. Compare that with the number of jobs created in the previous 12 months under the Follett Labor Government. I think it was 700. We got 700 under Follett and 5,300 under Carnell. I rest my case on that point. So much for statistics.

Let us have a look at the reality, because the other parts of Ms Follett's and Mr Wood's speeches consisted of a so-called litany of broken Liberal promises. Let us have a look at some of the ones that have been delivered, though, because we did not hear any positive stuff. We heard negative stuff all the way through. Let us have a look at some of the ones that were delivered - and after only 12 months, by the way. Workers compensation costs for the public sector in this town grew from \$20m when I first asked a question in the Estimates Committee three years ago, I think, to about \$43m two years after. They grew from \$20m to \$43m. What was the reaction to that by the previous Labor Government? It is an easy answer. It is the same answer as the amount of money we found in the coffers - zilch, nothing, a big fat zero. What have we done? We have had two inquiries - one by Tillinghast and one by Marsh and McLennan - conversations with Comcare, and Comcare agreeing to put somebody into our Public Service to try to get rid of some of those 400 people in the Public Service permanently on Comcare and not rehabilitated. That was under a government that supposedly was the worker's friend. They had complete control and dominance over things like workers compensation, occupational health and safety, social justice and compassion. Nothing was done. That is one promise that we have delivered.

We also went to the community saying that there is too much red tape in the way business is done here in the ACT. That was not something that we brought out of left field or right field. It was just commonsense. We listened to the community and listened to business, and that is what they told us. What did we do? We promised a red tape task force.

22 February 1996

Have we delivered on that? Yesterday, Mr Speaker, as members of this Assembly will recall, I set out the guidelines of the red tape task force after we had the red tape task force review.

We also talked about trading hours. Trading hours are perhaps the most difficult issue that any government of any political persuasion is going to face in this Territory. Did we sit on our hands and do nothing? No, of course we did not. Notwithstanding that hard decisions need to be made, we still established the trading hours review. That issue is now being looked into in conjunction with the Ibecon study and in conjunction with the social impact study, and there will be more said about that very shortly. Did we sit on our hands and do nothing? Of course we did not, because we made the community a promise, and what we promise we deliver.

Let us have a look at payroll tax. Ms Follett stood up and said that it was a Labor Party policy. What nonsense!. Who can recall what Labor Party politicians, State and Federal, said about payroll tax when the former leader of the Liberal Party, Dr John Hewson, was trying to get rid of it? They all screamed and jumped and shouted and said, "Of course you cannot do that". What did this Government do? On election to office we made a promise that the threshold would go from \$500,000 to \$600,000 from 1 January this year. It goes up to \$800,000 the year after. That was not done by this mob either. Why? Because they sat on their hands. They did not know what to do about anything.

Let us have a look at business incentive. I recall that three years ago, when we were in opposition and this mob over there were in government, they did not know what the IT industry was about. We had to send former Deputy Chief Minister David Lamont to a place called Auspace in Mitchell which he did not even know existed. Mr Lamont at least did some forward thinking and, to his great credit, he saw their potential and gave them a grant. Well done! What was the grant? It blew out the total incentive scheme, \$200,000, all in one go. What have we done? We have increased that to \$800,000. On top of that, we have provided a business incentive package. What has that done, Mr Speaker? AOFR, a company of international repute in the high-tech area, is coming to town and taking 11 blocks of land in our industrial estate at Symonston. There is the potential for 200 to 300 new jobs right here in the ACT. That was done within 12 months of being elected to government - another promise delivered.

We talked about CanTrade. We were blasted all over the place, with out opponents saying, "You cannot deliver on that". We have delivered. CanTrade has met three or four times, given out some money and some grants for things like international golf tournaments, international hockey tournaments, all sorts of things bringing in money and tourists; attracting people to the ACT in the private sector and attracting business to the ACT. That is another promise that we delivered. Let us have a look at the tourism development strategy. We said that we would develop a tourism development strategy. We have done that. We said that we would produce a new high-class commercial to advertise the ACT. We have done that as well. We talked about the potential we have in our airport. Notwithstanding the fact that it is difficult for people opposite to do deals even with their own mates up there on the hill, we have sat down with even the Federal Labor Government. We now have a task force headed by Air Marshal Jim Bomball looking into the potential of the Canberra Airport for the future of the people of the ACT.

Let us look at what we did about the fast train proposal. I saw the press releases before. What has this Government done about the fast train? We got together with the New South Wales Labor Government and the Federal Labor Government, and we took the initiative right here in the ACT to establish once again a task force to look at the very fast train. That was another promise that was delivered by this Government. Let us have a look at other things. Let us have a look at Athllon Drive. Who could ever forget Athllon Drive? This Liberal Party said, "Listen, when in government we will open that lane and make it a transit lane". For years and years we were told by the former Government that it could not be done. I think, Mr Speaker, it was done within three months of our being elected. They are the grassroots issues, by the way, that people opposite do not want to worry about.

Let us look at compulsory third-party insurance. We said that we would introduce competition for compulsory third-party insurance. That is about to be done as well. What else did we promise to the people of Tuggeranong, in particular, or the people of Brindabella? We said that there would be a refurbishment of the Erindale Leisure Centre. That is going to be done in this year's public works. An indoor sports facility is going to be built as well.

Ms Follett talked about money for police. My colleague Mr Humphries announced a couple of weeks ago \$5.9m for a new police station for the people of the Tuggeranong Valley as well. That is another promise that was delivered, Mr Speaker. Let us have a look at some other things as well. Who can recall Mr Berry saying soon after they were shoved onto the opposition benches that the only time there was a graffiti problem in the ACT was after a Liberal government took over? What arrant nonsense! What did they do over the past four years when they were in government? Zilch. Again, nothing was done. What did we promise? We said that we would have a progressive shifting of graffiti, and we will do it in a coordinated way, Mr Wood - not with a bucket of hot, soapy water and a brush. It has to be done in a coordinated way. We have the Can It Squad. We have a strategy in place in cooperation with the private sector and it is working very well.

The Greens talk about heavy vehicles. I can recall, before the Greens were elected to this place, what the Labor Government's reaction was to heavy vehicles. They said, "Let us ban them all". Who could ever forget the trucks parked in the street? The longest queue was the waiting list queue under the Government formed by those on the other side. What have we done? We have a strategy. We get together with the unions, with the home owners and with the truck drivers.

Mr Whitecross: With the unions?

MR DE DOMENICO: Yes. Mr Whitecross is smiling.

22 February 1996

Mr Whitecross: I have not seen you negotiating with the unions over pay increases.

MR DE DOMENICO: Mr “I want to be”, but he never will be, Mr Whitecross, comes in and interjects. I will take that interjection on board. Yes, we are sitting down with the unions and all the interested parties and we are coming up with what you will find will be a unanimous decision. That is the way to negotiate.

We talked about waste management, too. We made all sorts of promises about waste management. All have been delivered. We did not sit on our hands. I can recall Mr Connolly saying, “Yes, we have to introduce tip fees”, but would the Labor Party do it?

Mr Hird: No.

MR DE DOMENICO: Of course not. Has it been successful? It will be successful. We will plough the money back into areas of waste management, such as doing some research on worm farms.

Mr Berry: It has been a great success. Nobody is collecting.

MR DE DOMENICO: Mr Berry interjects, “No-one is collecting it”. Mr Berry, you tell your mates in the union movement to go back to work and collect it and then we can plough that money back into waste management control.

So, Mr Speaker, in 12 months this Government has delivered most of its promises. There are a few more to go. I suggest that Mr Berry and his mates on the other side sit back, relax and watch. Wallow over there in opposition and you will see a government that knows what it is doing. You have no leadership over there, Mr Berry. You have no direction and you have no policies. That is reflected in the fact that you made no decisions. This Government has leadership, it has direction, it has policies, and they are all being implemented. I have to tell you, mate, that what we promise, we deliver. What we have promised we have delivered and will continue to deliver.

Mr Berry: You are great on industrial relations!

MR DE DOMENICO: You can sit over there, and you can go white and blue and purple in the face; but the people in the community of the ACT realise that they have a good government. They will continue to have a good government.

This matter of public importance is nonsense. They got it in on time today. They could not get it in yesterday because they were not allowed through the car park. They could not get through the car park and arrive here at 8.30 am. It is a nonsense. We have had 12 months of a Carnell Liberal government. What we have promised we have delivered. If we have not delivered yet, it is because either this Assembly will not let us or we just have not had the time. Mr Berry, sit back and relax, and you will see what good government is all about.

MS TUCKER (4.32): This MPI does offer an opportunity for a stocktake of the broad directions that this Government has taken in its first year of office in the ACT. I have to say that there are a few on the list of broken promises that we are not too worried about. We are quite happy with the fact that they have broken the promise on increasing the gambling tax, not limiting betterment tax to 50 per cent, not reducing the petrol tax and giving less than was promised to business. It is not that there is anything wrong with supporting business, of course, but there is a lack of a holistic approach to what sort of business we want in the ACT. That was very clear right through the Estimates Committee hearings.

I think that this MPI does provide an opportunity to look at some of the big picture issues about this Government's approach to managing the ACT, although I would have to say, and it has been pointed out by the Liberals a few times today, that the Labor governments do not have a particularly different direction in other States, or federally either. One of the concerns about these general directions is the focus on outputs as a measure of success and the introduction of a number of reforms to the way government and community services are delivered. That has been coming up clearly over and over again in the inquiry into competition policy, and it is also coming from the community generally.

There are real concerns about introducing contracting out, tendering and contestable funding right across the system, because of the way that it is being introduced. There has never been any real attempt to model possible negative impacts of the introduction of these kinds of initiatives. Through contracting out, we are losing contact with the community's needs. If you want to provide money and see it used efficiently, and if projects are going to be relevant, there needs to be that grassroots beginning of projects. That is how the grants system has worked. What is happening now - there are real examples of it right now in the ACT - is that we are getting situations where the job description is being decided from above and it is not necessarily appropriate to the needs of the community. For that reason, it is inefficient and, as well, the needs of the community are not being met.

There is also the amalgamation of services. Community services are another example of this. There is a very broad definition made from above of what a service is, and there seems to be, from above, duplication; whereas, in fact, there are quite specific and special attributes to different community groups or different organisations that are very important. It is going to be the community that suffers when these services are forced to amalgamate. The red tape task force identified the huge duplication of services within the Government bureaucracy, and I am pleased that the Government is looking at this duplication. Of course, there are some concerns about the very strong emphasis on business impact assessment that comes out of that red tape task force report. I would not say that I am totally negative about what is coming out of that, because I think there are some very useful recommendations.

There is the question of who is going to be suffering most. I know that I have said this before; but we all seem to repeat ourselves here, so I will not be afraid of doing that. It is the vulnerable in the community who are the ones most likely to be at risk as a result of this not thoroughly thought through approach. This fiscal responsibility that you want to attain is fine to a degree, but it is not fine when you have not worked out the consequences.

22 February 1996

I talked to Mrs Carnell this week about the statements that you have put out regarding the budget and budget consultation. She says that you do not have the CSOs developed yet but you will soon. We are looking forward to seeing those. I think you have made it quite difficult, in a way, for the community to have real input into the budget if this sort of information is not put down as well. There is the overall question of the growing inequities in our community, the rich and the poor. We are hearing John Howard talk about it; we are hearing Paul Keating talk about it; everyone is talking about it. But where do you see strategies put in place to address these issues? I would like to see much more focus being put on that, and I have not seen it this year so far. The whole idea of community service obligations and how you cost them is part of the work that needs to be done this year, I suggest, and that has not yet been done.

Professor Quiggin, who has made a lot of very influential comments on the Hilmer reforms or the Competition Policy Reform Bill, points out quite a few very good examples of where social capital, if you like, has not been acknowledged as what will suffer from the imposition of this sort of blanket competition policy. It is part of the same concerns that I have just been talking about.

As people here who are speaking strongly for the environment, right through the Estimates Committee hearings we were concerned about the lack of concern for an overall assessment of the implications for the environment of business policy. That is why we were asking questions such as, "Where are the performance indicators here about the environment?", and, "What does sustainable mean?". You might remember, Mr De Domenico, that we had a few interesting exchanges on tourism and the impact on the environment, et cetera. The basic concern of the Greens is that we be able to develop a strategy which is longer than a three-year strategy. We have to develop, if you like, our own agenda 21. If you are not familiar with what that is, that came out of the Rio Earth Summit. It originated from agenda 21 of the United Nations document. It says this:

Local authorities -

I am sure that that is what we would regard ourselves as, to a degree -

construct, operate and maintain economic, social and environmental infrastructure, oversee planning processes, establish local environmental policies and regulations ... As the level of governance closest to the people, they play a vital role in educating, mobilising and responding to the public to promote sustainable development ... and by 1996 most local authorities in each country should have undertaken a consultative process with their communities and achieved a consensus on a Local Agenda 21.

I do not think that we are heading anywhere towards doing that yet in the ACT. I think it is a good challenge. I will get a copy of this to Mr Humphries because I think it is a very good basic document. It is actually a manual, if you like, for local government. It was put together by local governments, as well as the Department of the Environment, Sport and Territories. Perhaps we can have a more positive input into the work that you

are doing here to develop something that shows a much longer term strategy. There was some discussion yesterday about adversarial government, whether or not it was a good thing, and how it was referred to in the government reform paper. If you could all agree, within the adversarial system, on a long-term strategic plan, that adversarial system would not necessarily have to always cause negative impacts on the development of strategies which are absolutely essential for all developing countries if we are to have a decent environment for our kids.

MR SPEAKER: Order! The time for the discussion has now expired.

Motion

MR BERRY (4.41): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion to allow Mr De Domenico and Mrs Carnell to apologise to this Assembly for misleading it.

Leave granted.

MR BERRY: I move:

That this Assembly grants Mr De Domenico and Mrs Carnell the opportunity to apologise for misleading the Assembly during discussion of the matter of public importance.

This will not take a great deal of time. I was listening intently to the debate. One of the things I have learnt in this place is that there are some eagle-eyed people around trying to discover where people may have misled the Assembly, and I know that they have strong feelings about this issue. Mrs Carnell, in relation to the Melba Health Centre, tried to create the impression that somebody else removed the services from the health centre and then she had to close it. Mrs Carnell was the one who decided that there would be no bulk-billing doctors there and it was Mrs Carnell who decided to close it as a result. Mrs Carnell was the initiator. She tried in her speech to create the impression that it was somebody else's fault. This Assembly deserves an apology from her for trying to create the impression that she has had nothing to do with the removal of services. It was her Government's idea entirely.

In the case of Mr De Domenico, he made a strong point about the promise they had made to increase the threshold on payroll tax. He made that point firmly and he said, "We made that promise and we implemented it". Well, he lied. What the Liberals promised was to decrease the percentage, and they never did that; so he lied. What he ought to do is apologise to this Assembly, and he should be given the opportunity to apologise to this Assembly for recklessly or deliberately misleading it.

22 February 1996

MR HUMPHRIES (Attorney-General) (4.44): Mr Speaker, I do not know what to say about this. We have these petty kinds of actions by Mr Berry all the time. People are not stupid. They can see what the tactic of this Opposition is. It is to take points of order, it is to make personal attacks, it is to cast insinuations and aspersions of a personal nature, it is to make points of this kind on the floor of the place. The argument is as thin as a wafer, Mr Speaker, and I do not think the Assembly should entertain it. I would suggest that Mr Berry put the matter to a vote.

Question put:

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

The Assembly voted -

AYES, 6

Mr Berry
Ms Follett
Ms McRae
Mr Osborne
Mr Whitecross
Mr Wood

NOES, 9

Mrs Carnell
Mr Cornwell
Mr De Domenico
Ms Horodny
Mr Humphries
Mr Kaine
Mr Moore
Mr Stefaniak
Ms Tucker

Question so resolved in the negative.

PUBLIC SERVICE - ENTERPRISE BARGAINING Papers

MRS CARNELL (Chief Minister): Mr Speaker, during question time I said that I would provide copies of the three offers to the three unions involved today. They are here to be tabled.

LAW REFORM (ABOLITIONS AND REPEALS) BILL 1995

Debate resumed from 7 December 1995, on motion by **Mrs Carnell**:

That this Bill be agreed to in principle.

MS FOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) (4.49): I think Mr Humphries is going to be disappointed here on two counts. First of all, we have actually got to his legislation. I am sure that he was hoping to spin it out for another week, to pad out an otherwise absolutely empty Government business program for these sittings. I am also going to disappoint him because the Labor Opposition will be agreeing with it, and I am sure that that is not what he wanted.

Despite Mr Humphries's orgy of self-congratulation when the Government introduced this Bill, it is part of a process that was started by Labor in government - in fact, when I was Attorney-General back in 1989. The process I speak of is one of tidying up the laws that stand on the statute books of the ACT. The Bill the Government has presented seeks to delete 51 Acts from our books, most of them archaic, some of them feudal, some of them imperial Acts - a whole range of items of legislation that have no further application in the Territory. Clearly, it is something we would support. I repeat that it is a process that was started by Labor. In fact, during the previous Assembly the Labor Government, as it was then, repealed 34 Acts as part of this continuing process of law reform. We will, of course, support any Bill that brings about progressive law reform and makes a sensible move towards making the law more understandable, more readily accessible, to our community. As I say, we will be supporting this Bill.

MR MOORE (4.51): It is a pleasure to rise to support this Bill, as indeed I did for those Ms Follett mentioned under her Government. Unusual old redundant Acts have been replaced. There is one group of legislation that I think is of some interest, and that is the laws relating to the egg industry, which are repealed. They are the Egg Industry Act 1975, the Egg Industry (Amendment) Act 1979 and the Egg Industry (Amendment) Act 1982. I am surprised that Ms Horodny was not very rapidly to her feet here because she has certainly made a number of public statements about the egg industry. My understanding is that at the moment she is preparing some legislation on the egg industry and particularly on the way chickens - chooks, hens, layers, however you want to describe them - are kept. I am very interested to see that legislation because the industry is one that I have always considered very questionable. Before we deal with Ms Horodny's legislation, I hope to go and visit the egg farm out past Mr Berry's place, on the outer side of that electorate, and have a look.

The other Act I found interesting is the Police Offences Act. The section referred to in the presentation speech deals with the place of public resort where liquor is sold and with somebody who knowingly permits or suffers persons of notoriously bad character to meet together and remain therein. I can imagine the pub at Kingston having to shut down, the tradies club having to close down; all the places where I normally go to drink would be forced to close down or at least I would be booted out. So this is an interesting one.

When we did the report on prostitution, at that stage I think it was within the same Act, and we removed it when we did our new prostitution Act. There was an offence, I think punishable by a fine of 10 shillings or something of that order, of serving a known prostitute. So with the known prostitutes and the persons of notoriously bad character, we had a situation where it was the publican or the person serving who had to make the decision, and that is hardly the way our laws operate at this stage. We certainly do not expect that kind of decision-making because we have so many different views about what is notoriously bad character and what is not. There are some people, advocates of an end to battery chickens, whom I imagine some would consider as characters who are notoriously bad, and the very same people would probably consider their opponents to be characters who are notoriously bad.

22 February 1996

This is an opportunity for us to remove some of these bits of legislation that are redundant and in fact pose questions about the way we should operate in law anyway. I think it is an appropriate step forward, and I take delight in supporting the legislation.

MR HUMPHRIES (Attorney-General) (4.56): I thank members for their support for the Bill. Obviously, legislation such as this does take time. I do not think it takes quite seven years, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. This may have been a process begun by Labor in 1989, but it took a hell of a long time to get to doing much about it. Most of the Bills repealed in the previous parliaments have been Bills - - -

Ms Follett: We have done it twice already. It is a continuing process. This will not be the last time you do it, either.

MR HUMPHRIES: If you just listen, Ms Follett, you will hear what is going on. Just listen very calmly and you will hear what is going on.

Ms Follett: Stop misrepresenting me.

MR HUMPHRIES: I am not misrepresenting. I am saying that the process that goes on is a continuing one. The sorts of Acts we are talking about here are generally very old Acts that generally in the past have not been part of the process of reviewing legislation. One might say that they do not necessarily, therefore, take up a lot of room, a lot of attention, on the statute books in a legal sense; but with a process of updating the laws of the Territory, and particularly making those laws available in electronic database form - there are a number of quite exciting proposals in that process that are coming forward and that I hope to tell the Assembly about quite soon - there is a need for us to be able to summarise succinctly what the law is on a particular subject. If the database is asked to call up, for example, laws relating to eggs and the egg industry or police offences or laws relating to estates in land or whatever it might be, at the present time the sorts of laws we are repealing today would need to have been called up on the database to give a complete picture of what the law is like in the Territory. Naturally, we do not want that to be the case, because these laws are effectively obsolete or the principles they were enacted under have been superseded by other more contemporary principles and they need to be replaced by other legislation.

I thank members for their support for this Bill. To comment on the point made by Ms Follett about lack of Government business, first of all, there are 30 items on the Executive business program under orders of the day. I think there is plenty to get through, and I am quite looking forward to being able to do that. Let me say something else about that. If we end up with very little legislation brought forward over a period of time, except perhaps for Bills to repeal Acts, I for one will be very happy with that state of affairs. You should not measure the effectiveness of a government or a parliament by the number of pieces of legislation that are churned through the Assembly. Laws impose on somebody somewhere a burden of some kind, as well as, hopefully, assisting people,

and the more laws put on the statute book the harder it is for those people on occasions to know where they stand in terms of the law and the harder it is for people who are searching the law to know succinctly what is the law. Therefore, we do our citizens in this Territory a service by being able to reduce rather than increase the total volume of legislation. For my part, this Government would rather be judged not by the number of new pieces of legislation it has introduced in the time it has been in government but, in a sense, by the volume and the clarity of the total legislative corpus that is there when we leave office.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT
Recording and Broadcasting of Proceedings

MR SPEAKER: Order! It being 5 o'clock, I propose the question:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

I would like to correct a matter that arose before lunch in relation to the presence of the television cameras. I have made inquiries and I understand that all parties were advised yesterday that the cameras were coming in. There appears to have been a glitch in terms of the Opposition and I understand that an apology has been tendered on the matter. I want to clarify the record on that.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Assembly adjourned at 5.02 pm until Tuesday, 27 February 1996, at 10.30 am

22 February 1996

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 84

Lands Acquisition - Belconnen

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning - In relation to the variation of the pre-acquisition declaration on Block 1267 Division of Belconnen (Fassifern Investments Pty Limited) -

- (1) Has agreement been reached on the price for this acquisition; if so, what is that price.
- (2) What offers have previously been made for acquisition of all or part of Block 1267 Division of Belconnen.

Mr Humphries - the answers to the Member's questions are as follows:

- (1) No agreement has been reached on the price of this acquisition under the Lands Acquisition Act 1994.
- (2) Two offers were made by the former Department of the Environment Land and Planing to purchase the property and improvements for \$622,000. Discussions continued with the Lessee and a further offer was made to the Lessee in December 1993 which included the following options:
 - . offer to purchase the lease and improvements for a sum of \$660,000; or
 - . offer to purchase approximately 1.8 hectares plus the access road for a sum of \$132,000; and an additional sum of \$150,000 would be paid at the time of the surrender and regrant of a lease over Block 1267 to compensate for the difference in the basis for valuation of improvements between the existing lease and any new lease granted.

The Lessee did not accept the above offers and negotiations continued.

As no resolution could be reached on valuation, the Government had no option but to acquire the land under the Lands Acquisition Act 1994. Negotiations on compensation are continuing.

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 85

Meteorological Monitoring

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning - in relation to meteorological monitoring in the ACT -

- (1) What stations operate (a) within the ACT and (b) under what agencies.
- (2) Which of these are not accredited in terms of world meteorological standards.
- (3) Which agency co-ordinates the recording of the data collected.
- (4) When will all stations be brought up to the world standard.
- (5) What further stations, or improvements to existing stations, were recommended.
- (6) What additional facilities are required to ensure compliance with the ACT Greenhouse Strategy.
- (7) What improvements are necessary to provide comprehensive monitoring to the accepted standard for particulates less than 10µm in diameter.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) At present there are 44 meteorological stations dispersed throughout the ACT. Of these, 40 stations register rainfall data only, whilst the remaining four stations measure full meteorological data. An additional full meteorological station will commence operation in Monash towards the end of January 1996.
- (b) Ecowise Hydrology and Environmental Services, a branch of ACTEW Corporation, operates 40 rain gauge stations and two of the full meteorological stations. The remaining two full meteorological stations are operated by the Bureau of Meteorology, which will also operate the new station in Monash.

**MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION**

QUESTION NO 86

Water Quality Monitoring

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning -

In relation to the ACT -

- (1) At what sites is monitoring conducted to assess the quality of groundwater.
- (2) What are the results of this monitoring.
- (3) What controls exist on the extraction of groundwater, and which agency gives approval.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) Groundwater quality monitoring is conducted at a number of sites around the ACT with most measurement being done at the Belconnen and Mugga landfill sites to ensure that waste from those areas does not enter the groundwater system. In the past, extensive monitoring has also been undertaken by the Commonwealth's Australian Geological Survey Organisation.
- (2) Monitoring of groundwater quality to date has shown an area of about 150 hectares in the ACT known to be affected by groundwater pollution. This includes at least three cases of contamination by hydrocarbons from fuel storage tanks and leaching from an old landfill site in Pialligo.
- (3) To date no controls exist on the extraction of groundwater in the ACT. Consistent with its commitments under the COAG Water Reform Agenda, however, the Government intends to introduce controls in 1996. We will ask the Assembly to put in place a licensing system for all water use, including groundwater, which will protect the rights of existing users while ensuring that the resource is not over-used. The licensing system will also maximise the return to the ACT for this valuable resource.

I understand that an examination of quantities currently being used indicates that groundwater in the ACT is not over-exploited and implementing a licence system will be relatively easy. The introduction of a licensing system will provide the opportunity to review groundwater monitoring to ensure that the resource is properly protected.

22 February 1996

**MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NO 87**

Environment Education Strategy

Mr Wood - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning -

In relation to the environment education strategy -

- (1) When will the strategy as a strategic guide to all sectors of the ACT community be complete.
- (2) Where is this document being prepared.
- (3) What budget has been allocated to this task, and what agency will have responsibility for promoting the programs developed.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) Consistent with the Government's emphasis on the delivery of services, an increased emphasis has been given to the production of public education and awareness material addressing specific environmental concerns, rather than the development of a general strategy to improve environmental awareness. This approach is also consistent with national trends to make environmental information and awareness an integral component of ongoing environmental management activities. The Government will consider the need for the development of a formal strategic plan following community consultation regarding the implementation of the integrated environment protection legislation.
- (2) The Office of the Environment in the Environment and Land Bureau is responsible for general environment education matters.
- (3) Future budget requirements and responsibilities relating to a broadly based environment education strategy will be determined at the appropriate time.

While it is not practicable to separate the costs of the public information and education components of ongoing activities, significant resources are devoted to Environment Division programs which have substantial environment education components. Examples include Waterwatch, community landcare activities and interpretation activities associated with nature reserves and parks. In addition, other areas of the ACT Government Service contribute to environment education. This includes the environment education requirements in school curriculum material provided by the Department of Education and Training and the promotion of recycling by the Waste Management area of the Department of Urban Services.

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 88

Soil Quality Data

Mr Wood asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning - in relation to soil quality -

- (1) What data is collected, and by whom, to assess soil quality.
- (2) What work is being done further to develop indicators for more accurate and comprehensive information.
- (3) When will the Government provide the resources necessary for collected data to be electronically stored.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) Soil quality data for the ACT has been collected by many organisations over many years. Recent soil profile and landform data have been collected for selected rural areas of the ACT. Data collected from these surveys includes soil depth, horizons, texture, colour, pH and classification, as well as slope, terrain type, degree of rockiness and evidence of erosion. From this data an indication of soil quality can be obtained. This survey data has been collected by the ACT Parks and Conservation Service. Other agencies within the Government also collect soil data for various purposes such as to determine the presence of contaminated sites.
- (2) The 1995 Land Reference Group for the ACT State of the Environment Report (SOER) commenced development of indicators for the ACT which would provide a basis for determining changes in land quality. A summary of these indicators is contained in the 1995 SOER (page 112). CSIRO and other organisations are also developing indicators to measure sustainability which may be useful for future assessments.
- (3) Data is being transferred to electronic form as resources permit. The Government is keen to speed up this process and is looking at cost effective measures to expedite the process.

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 89

Wood Products - Purchases

Ms Tucker - asked the Minister for Environment Land and Planning: In relation to the purchase of woodchips and other woodproducts for use by the Government -

- (1) What quantity of woodchips was used in 1994-95.
- (2) What was the source or sources of the woodchips.
- (3) What, if any, quantity did not come from plantation based timber and what was the source or sources of the timber.
- (4) Were any woodchips obtained from non-plantation sourced timber and if so, why.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) Approximately 4 000m³ of softwood woodchips, pinebark and wood shavings were purchased for use in landscape maintenance and playgrounds in 1994/95. These purchases are augmented by the in-house production of 12 000 m³ of woodchips from the waste generated by municipal tree maintenance activities.
- (2) The purchased wood products are sourced from suppliers in the ACT and nearby districts. The municipal tree maintenance sourced product comes from the entire variety of species of trees growing in Canberra.
- (3) The forest sources of the timber from which the wood products are processed is not defined in the purchasing contract. The majority of these wood products from all sources is understood to be mill wastes and by-products of the production of sawn timber. As almost all softwoods are plantation grown, it may be assumed that this softwood is sourced from commercial plantation timbers.
- (4) Maintenance of the urban tree population results in large volumes of loppings and a smaller volume of whole trees, which are recycled as woodchippings and used for mulching in landscaping works by staff and urban landcare groups.

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 93

Urban Services Portfolio - Consultancies

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Urban Services: In relation to consultancies for each and every Ministerial portfolio held by you -

- (1) What are the current consultancies let or proposed to be let within each Department/Agency in your portfolio.
- (2) What is the cost of each consultant.
- (3) Why could the work of each consultancy not have been performed by public servants within the Department/Agency or elsewhere in the ACT Government Service.
- (4) Is any consultant exercising any delegation in relation to public servants.

Mr De Domenico - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) The employment of a consultant is proposed to assist in the preparation and presentation of purchasing awareness training to ACT Government staff. The aim of the awareness training is to improve the skills of ACT Government purchasing officers and to maximise the business opportunities for local suppliers.
 - (2) The cost is expected to be approximately \$40,000.
 - (3) The use of a consultant to assist in the project is necessary due to the lack of in-house resources to deliver the training in a timely manner and the specialised skills are not available within the ACT Public Service (ACTPS).
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu was commissioned on 12 and 13 December 1995 to facilitate two workshops with industry on Pre Qualification in Construction and Quality Assurance in Purchasing, as part of the review requested by the Minister for Urban Services.
 - (2) \$6,000.
 - (3) High level of facilitation required with an expert knowledge of the quality industry. Independent facilitations were required to bring greater objectivity and independence to the task.
 - (4) No.

22 February 1996

- (1) Oxley Corporate Finance Ltd was commissioned in September 1995 to provide advice on alternative financing options for passenger and light commercial vehicles.
- (2) \$50,000.
- (3) Oxley was commissioned as the level of expertise required was not available within the ACTPS and the ACTPS should benefit from the experience and practices employed in the private sector.
- (4) No.

- (1) Det Norske Veritas (DNV) has been commissioned on an ongoing basis, since 1993, to provide 3rd Party Auditing services to Works and Commercial Services on a branch by branch basis.
- (2) The annual fee for the periodical audits in each quality certified section is \$2500. Since 22 November 1995 \$2,500 has been paid to the consultant.
- (3) A requirement of Quality Assurance Certification is that mandatory 3rd Party Audits are carried out by an independent, recognised accredited agency twice a year. Such an agency (certifying body) has to be accredited by the Joint Accreditation System of Australia and New Zealand (JAS-ANZ). There is only a limited number of these in Australia (approximately 15). Therefore DNV is used as these specialist skills are not available within the ACTPS.
- (4) No.

- (1) It is proposed to commission the Australian Organisation for Quality (AOQ) to provide auditor training to Commercial Services Branch staff to allow staff to meet the internal audit requirements of a Quality Assurance system.
- (2) \$4,600 for 20 participants on a two day course specifically designed to suit the needs and businesses of Commercial Services.
- (3) This is specialist training utilising the work environment and processes used in individual business units. There is a lack of in-house specialist resources which could be diverted to the particular project.
- (4) No.

- (1) Chris Adams and Associates will be commissioned to develop and deliver financial management training to staff of Works and Commercial Services. Eight courses will be conducted for 160 staff in January to April and in June 1996.
- (2) \$27,000.
- (3) There is a requirement for specialist financial management skills generally not available in the ACTPS, and there is a lack of appropriate in-house resources which could be diverted to the particular high priority project. The ACTPS will benefit from the experience and practices employed in the private sector and the training will also facilitate the acquisition of specialist skills by staff associated with financial management reforms.
- (4) No.

- (1) Ross Begbie and Associates has been commissioned on an ongoing basis to undertake work analysis throughout the Works and Commercial Services Group.
 - (2) The consultant's charge is \$1,200 per day.
 - (3) The consultant was commissioned as the specialist skills required were not available in the ACTPS and their use brings greater objectivity and independence to the task.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Q Research and Marketing is commissioned on an ongoing basis to undertake an annual Works and Commercial Services Staff Attitude Survey.
 - (2) The cost for the 1995 survey, undertaken in December 1995, is expected to be approximately \$8,500 depending on the number of returns by staff.
 - (3) The consultant was used as the specialist skills required were not available in the ACTPS and their use brings greater objectivity and independence to the task.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Market Attitude Research Services for market research, particularly the running of focus groups.
 - (2) \$10,000.
 - (3) It is imperative that market research, specifically market focus groups, are conducted without bias or interference from the organisation's personnel.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Indec Pty Ltd to provide assistance with AS/ISO 9000 Quality System implementation.
 - (2) \$8,336.
 - (3) Specialised knowledge of AS/ISO 9000 Quality certification to level necessary is not available within the ACT Public Service.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Proposed consultancies include several to assist with organisational reform measures.
 - (2) Estimated cost \$160,000.
 - (3) There is a requirement for specialist knowledge not available within the ACTPA. Their use brings greater objectivity and independence to the task. There is a lack of in-house resources which could be diverted to the particular high priority project. The ACTPS will benefit from the experience and practices employed in the private sector. They enable the prompt availability of a range of appropriate skills, knowledge and resources to participate in the tasks. They facilitate skills transfer through the acquisition of particularly relevant knowledge by ACTPS staff associated with the project.
 - (4) No.

22 February 1996

- (1) Clancy Computing - strategic issues for information Technology in City Services Group.
 - (2) Cost to date \$19,250.
 - (3) Lack of in-house resources and expertise.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Barbara Davis & Associates - each year since 1988 Floriade has been the subject of studies to investigate its success and to assist the Floriade Board of Management in their planning of future events. The purpose of the study is to:
 - Estimate visitor numbers; and
 - Determine a visitor profile, including demographic and geographic details.
 - (2) \$12,400.
 - (3) Due to limited funds it has become accepted practice to conduct a smaller scale survey every alternate year, as in 1995. Barbara Davis & Associates have conducted the survey for the last four years this allows for consistent application of methodology. The firm requires minimal management resulting in a cost saving. It would cost between \$3,000 and \$4,000 for Strategic Development to manage the tender process for Floriade (cost recoverable from Floriade).
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) CMPS&F Pty Ltd - the purpose of the consultancy is to undertake the 1995 Parking Survey. The consultancy involves a comprehensive survey of ACT parking facilities at Civic and the three Town Centres as well as analysis and preparation of a report. The survey provides critical data for planning future parking requirements and information on existing supply problems.
 - (2) \$17,738.
 - (3) The surveys are conducted approximately every 2 years and all previous surveys have been contracted out. Existing staff are already extended and are inappropriately qualified for the design and analysis of surveys.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Ross Patterson - assessment skills with families - initial caseworker training.
 - (2) \$1,900.
 - (3) The use of a consultant to assist in the project is necessary due to the lack of in-house resources to deliver the training in a timely manner and the specialised skills are not available within the ACT Public Service (ACTPS).
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Cameron and Associates - presentation of winning the next job workshops.
 - (2) \$8 600.00.

- (3) The use of a consultant to assist in the project is necessary due to the lack of in-house resources to deliver the training in a timely manner and the specialised skills are not available within the ACT Public Service (ACTPS).
- (4) No.

- (1) Lyne and Lowe Consultants - preparation, delivery of workshop and Evaluation Report for the Workshop "Child Protection and Supervision" and "Family Assessment".
- (2) \$4,750.
- (3) The use of a consultant to assist in the project is necessary due to the lack of in-house resources to deliver the training in a timely manner and the specialised skills are not available within the ACT Public Service (ACTPS).
- (4) No.

Stormwater

- (1) Gutteridge Haskings and Davey for South Fyshwick Stormwater Investigation.
- (2) \$13,545.
- (3) No in-house resources available with expertise required.
- (4) No.

- (1) Sinclair Knight for Preparation of Stormwater Brochure.
- (2) \$4,025.
- (3) Follow-up from Evaluation Study.
- (4) No.

- (1) Dinkum Data for Quality Assurance Database Development.
- (2) \$6,380.
- (3) Specialist technology.
- (4) No.

- (1) ARC Systems for ARTC-DOS and Licences.
- (2) \$47,060.
- (3) Specialist technology.
- (4) No.

- (1) Gutteridge Haskings and Davey for Central Canberra 1-8 - Data Capture.
- (2) \$23,000.
- (3) No resources available in ACTPS with required skills.
- (4) No.

- (1) Manuka Drafting Services for Central Canberra 11-14 Mapping.
- (2) \$3,498.
- (3) No resources available in ACTPS with required skills.
- (4) No.

- (1) Manuka Drafting Services for Central Canberra 15-19 Mapping.
- (2) \$12,174.
- (3) No resources available in ACTPS with required skills.
- (4) No.

- (1) Willing and Partners Central Canberra 20-25 Mapping.
- (2) \$10,800.

22 February 1996

- (3) No resources available in ACTPS with required skills.
- (4) No.
- (1) Willing and Partners for Tuggeranong 2-7 Mapping.
- (2) \$10,600.
- (3) No resources available in ACTPS with required skills.
- (4) No.
- (1) Willing and Partners for Hackett Cut-Off Drain Remedial Works.
- (2) \$1,735.
- (3) No in-house resources available to meet job priority.
- (4) No.
- (1) Willing and Partners for Barry Drive GPT trash Rack Repalrs.
- (2) \$9,500.
- (3) No in-house resources available to meet job priority.
- (4) No.
- (1) Gutteridge Haskins and Davey for Farrer floodway.
- (2) \$14,500.
- (3) No in-house resources available to meet job priority.
- (4) No.
- (1) ARC Systems for Pilot Study for Acceptance of New Assets into ACT Stormwater Asset Management and Information System.
- (2) \$18,200.
- (3) Specialist technology.
- (4) No.

Traffic and Roads

The following consultants provide technical, specialist and professional advice and skills not available within ACTPS. No delegations are being exercised by these consultancies in relation to public servants.

- (1) Arup & Partners for Traffic Impact Assessment B1 Development.
- (2) \$15,000.
- (1) Austroads for Traffic and Roads portion of User Satisfaction Index Project.
- (2) \$9,200.
- (1) Australian Road Research for ACT Accident Costing & Coding Advice Board.
- (2) \$9,500.
- (1) ECOWISE for Automatic Traffic Count Surveys.
- (2) \$34,500.
- (1) CSC Australia Pty Ltd for ad hoc computing for Accident Database.
- (2) \$13,000.
- (1) Datacol for various intersection traffic count surveys.
- (2) \$84,000.
- (1) Datacol for miscellaneous intersection traffic surveys.
- (2) \$80,000.
- (1) RJ Naim & Partners for study brief for traffic modelling SATURN training.
- (2) \$20,030.
- (1) RJ Naim & Partners for Lyneham, Turner, O'Connor local area traffic study.

- (2) \$75,000.
- (1) Software Intelligence Aust Pty Ltd for ad hoc computer consulting services for traffic signals.
- (2) \$20,000.
- (1) Opticon Australia for implementation of computer aided drafting design systems.
- (2) \$5,000.
- (1) Daedalus for configuration of digital multi PC workstations.
- (2) \$4,900.
- (1) Bill Guy & Partners for review of road verge design standards.
- (2) \$60,000.
- (1) ESRI Australia for technical assistance for implementation of ARC Geographic Information System.
- (2) \$79,200.
- (1) NTL Reinholt Pty Ltd for Federal Highway pavement rehabilitation.
- (2) \$88,028.
- (1) Hughes Trueman Ludlow for design assistance for pavements, stormwater and geometrics.
- (2) \$15,000.
- (1) Coffey & Partners for geotechnical engineering advice and laboratory testing.
- (2) \$20,000.
- (1) Eric Taylor Acoustics for ad hoc traffic noise studies.
- (2) \$12,000.
- (1) Coffey & Partners for Hindmarsh Drive rock face stabilisation consultancy for design/construction supervision.
- (2) \$23,329.
- (1) SMEC for upgrading of road resealing Hall Stage 3.
- (2) \$53,575.
- (1) Arup Transportation Planning for traffic signal asset maintenance and operation review.
- (2) \$17,800.

**MINISTER FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES
MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT LAND AND PLANNING**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 94

Emergency Services and Environment, Land and Planning Portfolios - Consultancies

Ms Follett - asked the Minister for Emergency Services and Environment Land and Planning:
In relation to consultancies for each and every Ministerial portfolio held by you -

- (1) What are the current consultancies let or proposed to be let within each Department/Agency in your portfolio.
- (2) What is the cost of each consultancy.
- (3) Why could the work of each consultancy not have been performed by public servants within the Department/Agency or elsewhere in the ACT Government Service.
- (4) Is any consultant exercising any delegation in relation to public servants.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

EMERGENCY SERVICES BUREAU

- (1) Dr Heather Lopert provides medical advice to the ACT Ambulance Service.
 - (2) \$6 200 per annum.
 - (3) The specialist expertise are not available within the ACT Public Service as specific experience in ambulance procedures is required.
 - (4) No.
-
- (1) Amos Aked Swift Pty Ltd have been engaged to establish strategic options to replace current Automatic Fire Alarm (AFA) System.
 - (2) The consultancy operates on a per hour rate with current year to date expenditure being \$22 722 and expected expenditure for the year being \$55 000.
 - (3) The technical expertise required for this function is not available within the ACT Government. The consultancy operates expenditure for the year being.
 - (4) No.

LAND DIVISION

The following consultancies have been engaged due to lack of in-house resources and/or to benefit from the different perspectives brought to bear by

private sector practices, procedures and knowledge. No consultants exercised any delegations in relation to public servants.

(1) Annabel Mcgurie for statistical and administrative assistance.
(2) \$4 041.25

(1) Fahmida Eshan for statistical advice and support services.
(2) \$8 387.50

(1) Colin Nicholas for residential field survey
(2) \$2 546.10

(1) Walker Engineering for engineering services
(2) \$28 623.92

(1) Badger Consulting for Engineering Services
(2) \$27 213.75

(1) Nicholas Appleyard for Engineering Services
(2) \$8 791.12

(1) Angela Brown - process server
(2) \$234.00

(1) Kim Hare for financial/accounting services
(2) \$4 002.89

(1) Debbie Rogers for financial/accounting services
(2) \$2 633.58

(1) Bernie Relf for financial/accounting services
(2) \$10 495 34

(1) Random Computing for computer supports services
(2) \$4 500.00

(1) Random Computing for development of FRMS
(2) \$40 605.00

(1) Fearons for financial/accounting services
(2) \$59 961.00

(1) Mike Sedwick for strategic and planning advice
(2) \$18 599.15

(1) Pam Velzen for administrative support
(2) \$10 208.04

(1) Grounds for Living - Gungahlin Golf course supervisory services

22 February 1996

- (2) \$1 725.00
- (1) Leonie Keal for programming assistance
- (2) \$13 389.78
- (1) Wizard Information Services for programming assistance
- (2) \$47 896.50
- (1) Rob Jansen for IT support services/assets register
- (2) \$13 045.50
- (1) Dawn Martin for IT support services
- (2) \$1 818.00

ENVIRONMENT DIVISION

Conservation and Wildlife Section Consultancies

- (1) David Freudenberger CSIRO - Kangaroo Survey
- (2) \$5,500
- (3) Specialist task
- (4) No

- (1) Graham Coulsen - *Delma impar* management directions
- (2) \$9,205
- (3) Specialist task. Staff unable to be freed from other tasks.
- (4) No

- (1) Isobel Crawford - Vegetation descriptions of *Delma impar* sites
- (2) \$7,654
- (3) Specialist task, insufficient staff available when task was required.
- (4) No

- (1) Williams Barber Archeological Services Boboyan Pines cultural survey.
- (2) \$6,200
- (3) Specialist task
- (4) No

National Estates Grants Program Funded

- (1) Freeman Collett & Partners London Bridge Homestead Conservation Strategy
- (2) \$5,000
- (3) Specialist task
- (4) No

Agriculture and Landcare Consultancies

- (1) Catchment Management Educator
- (2) \$41,804pa (half paid by C'wealth)
- (3) Specialist task
- (4) No

- (1) Landcare Catchment Facilitator
- (2) \$54,800pa (half paid by C'wealth)
- (3) Specialist task
- (4) No

Office of the Environment Consultancies

- (1) Coffeys Partners - Assessment of contamination - Tuggeranong Homestead
- (2) \$31,300
- (3) Requirement for specialist skills not available within the ACTPS. Use of consultants brings greater objectivity and independence.
- (4) No

- (1) Coffeys Partners - Assessment of contamination - Ngunnawal
- (2) \$26,170
- (3) Requirement for specialist skills not available within the ACTPS. Use of consultants brings greater objectivity and independence.
- (4) No

- (1) Woodward-Clyde - Assessment of contamination - Lyneham
- (2) \$41,565
- (3) Requirement for specialist skills not available within the ACTPS. Use of consultants brings greater objectivity and independence.
- (4) No

- (1) Woodward-Clyde - Assessment of contamination - Holder, Chapman, Isabella Plains
- (2) \$97,000
- (3) Requirement for specialist skills not available within the ACTPS. Use of consultants brings greater objectivity and independence.
- (4) No

- (1) Woodward-Clyde - Assessment of contamination - Phillip Depot
- (2) \$7,760
- (3) Requirement for specialist skills not available within the ACTPS. Use of consultants brings greater objectivity and independence.
- (4) No

CHIEF MINISTER FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

Question No. 97

Leasehold Administration - Board of Inquiry Costs

MR WOOD - Asked the Chief Minister upon notice on 23 November 1995:

In relation to the Board of Inquiry into the administration of ACT Leasehold -

- (1) What fee was paid to each member of the Board.
- (2) What were the costs of travel, accommodation, meals and other expenses of each member of the Board.
- (3) What salary (or salary component) was paid to each member of the secretariat.
- (4) What were the costs of travel, accommodation, meals or other expenses of each member of the secretariat.
- (5) What fees were paid to Counsel, research assistants and consultants or other people involved.
- (6) What were the costs of travel, accommodation, meals or other expenses of Counsel, research assistants, consultants and others.
- (7) What is the assessment of the cost of the time of ACT public servants in responding to the requests of the Board and in appearing before it.
- (8) What was the cost of office accommodation occupied by the Board and of all office expenses such as photocopying, telephones, postage, etc.
- (9) What was the cost of advertising, printing, cars, and any other expenses of any nature related to the Inquiry.

MRS CARNELL - The answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) The NSW Attorney General's Department was reimbursed \$107,720.00 for:
 - the salary of Justice Stein while he chaired the Inquiry for the period 12 July 1995 to 15 November 1995; and
 - the salary of Justice Stein's Associate and his Tipstaff for the periods in which they assisted the Judge in this task.

Professor Patrick Troy:	\$64,800.00
Mr Robert Yeomans:	\$68,400.00

(2)	Justice Stein/Associate/Tipstaff:	\$39,584.34*
	Professor Patrick Troy & Mr Robert Yeomans:	Nil
(3)	Secretary to the Board:	\$31,450.03**
	Administrative Service Officer Class 4:	\$2237.72**
(4)	Nil	
(5)	Counsel Assisting the Board:	\$83,750.00
	Consultants:	\$57,000.00
(6)	Counsel Assisting the Board:	\$12,087.67
(7)	Agencies have assessed the cost of public servants' time based on person hours and officer levels:	\$124,653.00
(8)	Office Expenses:	\$5022.09
(9)	Advertising:	\$6061.52
	Printing of Report:	\$5430.00
	Public Hearing Transcript:	\$12506.50
	Computer System:	\$12725.50
	Hire of Furniture:	\$1053.00

It should be noted that the above expenditure is based on actual expenditure to 17 January 1996.

* This amount includes two-thirds of the Inquiry cabcharge/taxi costs - the other third has been included in the amount for the Counsel Assisting (Answer to Question 6)

** These amounts are for salary reimbursement to the Cabinet and Policy Coordination Office for the Secretary and the Office of Public Sector Management for the ASO 4.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, LAND AND PLANNING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 102

Noise Pollution - Motor Sport

Mr Moore - asked the Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning -

- (1) How, if at all, does the situation of people affected by noise pollution from the ACT's motor racing site near the NSW border differ in principle from the situation of residents affected by chemical pollution on the sites of former sheep dips.
- (2) Will you give the NSW residents long affected by motor racing noise the same "reassurance" that their pollution problem will be "fixed up," and the same undertaking that "they'll be provided with compensation for any long term damage they've suffered?" (WIN TV 20 September 1995).
- (3) In the case of the sheep-dip problem the actual pollution source was removed as the first step towards solving the whole problem. What is the Government planning to do in the case of the racing noise problem.
- (4) If the Government still has thoughts of removing racing from the site, do you acknowledge that five years (as recommended by the Commissioner for the Environment) is an unacceptably long period for phasing out the activity, given that the problem has been occurring at a serious level for eight years already.

Mr Humphries - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) In the case of chemical pollution on former sheep dip sites, action is taken where the contamination levels are found to be in excess of recognised health investigation levels; that is, a level of potential hazard to human health that warrants investigation.

In the case of noise from the ACT's motor sports site near the NSW border, the levels to which NSW residents are exposed are substantially below the occupational health and safety standards recommended by Worksafe Australia based on work by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

Thus, the two situations are quite different - the former sheep dip sites represent a potential health risk, the noise from motor sports does not. This noise should properly be regarded as an issue of environmental nuisance.

- (2) As stated above, the situations are not comparable and there is no case for contemplating compensation. Noise from motor sports should be put in perspective. Background noise levels at the affected areas of NSW are generally 40 dB(A) and the maximum exemptions granted are for 15 dB(A) above background, yielding a noise level during motor sports of 55 dB(A). Such exemptions generally apply for a maximum of seven hours during which time noise levels would only reach 55 dB(A) intermittently. By way of comparison, the World Health Organisation has set a long term goal for traffic noise, expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level (Leq24hr), of 55 dB(A). Clearly, noise from motor sports is an issue of nuisance in this circumstance, rather than a health risk.
- (3) The report into possible alternative sites for motor sports has not been finalised. The Government will not be making any decisions on relocation before the report is completed.
- (4) The Government is still considering the Commissioner's recommendations on noise from motor sports. I intend to review noise policy in general during 1996 as part of the development of the Integrated Environment Protection Legislation.

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 103

Parking Meters

Mr Moore - asked the Minister for Urban Services

In relation to parking meters:

- 1) How many different styles of meters operate in Bunda Street, Civic, at present?
- 2) Are meters tested for accuracy?
- 3) What effective redress does a person have when a Parking Infringement Notice has been issued on a meter that is defective?
- 4) When a fault in a meter is reported, is the meter (a) replaced; (b) taken away and repaired (and tested); or (c) fixed in situ?
- 5) What safeguards are currently in place to ensure that people can rely on the meters allowing the time that has been paid for?

Mr De Domenico - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

1. Bunda Street, Civic has three styles of parking meters installed:
 - (a) multibay meters - 3 of these service 4 parking bays each and 1 services 6 parking bays;
 - (b) electronic meters which are battery powered; and
 - (c) Mechanical meters.
2. Meters are tested for accuracy in response to queries from users and when serviced or repaired. Only one per cent has shown any inaccuracy.
3. Should any person be issued a Parking Infringement Notice issued on a meter that is believed to be defective, representations, in writing, must be made to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles within 28 days. This is stated on the reverse of the infringement notice as is required under Section 162(5) of the Motor Traffic Act. Once representations have been made, the matter will be investigated and the meter checked. Should any defect be found, the infringement notice will be withdrawn, and the person notified in writing.

4. When a fault in a meter is reported, the meter is:
 - (a) fixed in situ if minor repairs such a coin jams occur; or
 - (b) taken away, repaired and tested; or
 - (c) replaced if repairs cannot be effected in situ.

5. All parking meters purchased must meet rigid specifications concerning accuracy and have a built-in mean time between breakdowns. In addition to all meters being checked for accuracy before being installed or as part of the repair process, they are visually checked every morning by parking officers for damage, jammed coins and flat batteries.

AUTHORISED
Director, City Services
14/12/95

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTIONS NOS 104 AND 105

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Gynaecology Surgery/Obstetrics (Specialist and GP)?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Obstetrics & Gynaecology:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$1,100,000.
- (b) Actual expenditure as at the end of November 1995 is \$479,094.

Please note that the specialties of Obstetrics and Gynaecology are grouped together and Woden Valley Hospital does not maintain separate payment histories.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 106

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Ophthalmology?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Ophthalmology:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$417,603.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$172,991.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 107

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Clinical Psychiatry?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Clinical Psychiatry:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$102,800.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$48,352.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 108

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Nuclear Medicine?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

There is no Visiting Medical Officer expenditure recorded for Nuclear Medicine.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 109

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Radiology?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Radiology:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$482,190.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$228,002.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 110

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Anaesthesia?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Anaesthesia:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$2,769,254.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$1,157,836.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 111

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Dental Surgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Oral Surgery?

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$180,980.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$79,896.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 112

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of General Surgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of General Surgery:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$741,900.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$321,920.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 113

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Urology?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Urology:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$536,356.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$194,622.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 114

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Orthopaedics?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Orthopaedics:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$595,245.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$237,832.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 115

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Thoracic Surgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Thoracic Surgery:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$183,234.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$71,514.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 116

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Vascular Surgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Vascular Surgery:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$146,371.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$64,155.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 117

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Neurosurgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Neurosurgery:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$454,195.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$185,348.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 118

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Plastic Surgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Plastic Surgery:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$378,242.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$144,515.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 119

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Paediatric Surgery?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Paediatric Surgery:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$400,000.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$168,208.

MINISTER FOR HEALTH AND COMMUNITY CARE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO. 120

Visiting Medical Officer Payments

Mr Connolly - asked the Minister for Health and Community Care:

As at 1 December 1995 what was (a) the projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments; and (b) the actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments, for the specialty service of Paediatrics?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's question is:

For the specialty service of Paediatrics:

- (a) Projected expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments for 1995-96 is \$650,000.
- (b) Actual expenditure on Visiting Medical Officer Payments as at the end of November 1995 is \$348,709.

MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NUMBER 129**

Workers Compensation - Return to Work Programs

Ms Tucker - asked the Minister for Industrial Relations - In relation to *the Workers' Compensation Act 1951* -

- (1) What assessment have you made of the success or otherwise of the amendments made in 1994 and what are the results.
- (2) (a) Are you aware of the practice of insurance companies of rejecting claims in the 21 day period as prescribed in section 26B while at the same time advising the claimant that the claim will be reassessed when further information is received; (b) what is the frequency of this practice; (c) does the Government consider this practice undermines the intention of the legislation to ensure speedy implementation of return to work programs; and (d) what is the Government doing to address this practice.
- (3) Would you provide details on any information you have on the use of section 26C and any problems with the implementation of this section.
- (4) What assessment have you made of the success or otherwise of return to work programs.

Mr De Domenico - the answer to the Member's question is as follows:

- (1) In May and June 1995, ACT WorkCover conducted a random survey of 215 businesses in the ACT to ascertain the level of awareness with the rehabilitation provisions on the *Workers' Compensation Act 1951*. The survey found that only 15% of the businesses that had employees were aware of the requirements to have a rehabilitation policy and to appoint a rehabilitation coordinator. In recognition of this, the Workers' Compensation Monitoring Committee has planned a promotion campaign for early 1996 to alert all parties in the workplace to their responsibilities.
- (2) (a) Section 26B of the Act obligates insurance companies either to commence making weekly payments or to reject a claim within 21 days of receiving it; (b) I have no information on the frequency of this practice; ACT WorkCover has written to all approved workers' compensation insurers in the ACT seeking information on just this matter and I shall inform the Assembly when I have further information; (c) the requirement to determine claims within 21 days of receipt by an approved insurer is intended to assist the rehabilitation process. Section 15C(2) of the Act specifies that occupational rehabilitation can commence before there is an admission of liability in

the case; (d) the Government will be reviewing the operation of the *Workers' Compensation Act 1951* with a specific view to bringing arrangements, particularly premium levels, into line with NSW. The Government also intends to bring workers' compensation and occupational rehabilitation within the purview of the Occupational Health and Safety Council in early 1996, and I expect that this body will advise me on the operation of the Act including the rehabilitation, claims processing and termination provisions.

- (3) Notices of termination under s26C are required to be notified to the Nominal Insurer. To date the Nominal Insurer has only received 7 notifications; this compares with an expected 6000 to 6500 claims per year. Section 26D of the Act allows workers who have received a termination notice to apply to the Magistrates Court to have their weekly payments continue or recommence.
- (4) As rehabilitation programs are typically provided to the most seriously injured workers, it is still too early to determine whether the return to work programs are successful or not. ACT WorkCover has anecdotal evidence to suggest that they are successful, and the literature on rehabilitation programs suggests that they are worthwhile.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NUMBER 131

Griffith Preschool

MR WHITECROSS - asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 12 December 1995:

In relation to the removal of a structure from the Stokes Street preschool -

- (1) Who (a) originally asked for the structure to be removed or repaired; and (b) carried out the inspection on the structure to determine if it should be repaired or replaced.
- (2) Did the person who inspected the structure and found it to be unsound have any formal qualifications to enable him or her to carry out such duties.
- (3) Was the Department of Urban Services notified or involved in the removal of the structure.
- (4) Was the structure recorded on an assets register.
- (5) When was it noticed that the structure was made of asbestos cement sheeting.
- (6) Who notified the Department of Urban Services that the structure was made of asbestos cement sheeting.
- (7) Was the structure used as a store room or a cubby house.
- (8) How was the contractor who removed the structure selected for the task.
- (9) Was the contractor one of the five contractors licensed to remove asbestos on behalf of the Government; if not, why not.
- (10) What safety procedures were put in place to protect the contractor removing the structure and students and staff from asbestos fibres.
- (11) What processes have been put in place to identify and monitor all those who were exposed to asbestos over a period of days.
- (12) Who will accept liability for possible health problems which may arise as a result of staff and students being exposed to asbestos fibres.
- (13) Have all the parents of students who attend the Stokes Street pre-school been notified that their children may have been exposed to asbestos.

MR STEFANIAK - the answer to Mr Whitecross' question is:

- (1) (a) The department, following receipt of a safety hazard report from the OH&S representative at Forrest Primary School; and (b) The maintenance contractor, Norfolk Maintenance and Electrical Pty Ltd. Advice from the contractor was that such were the problems with the sub floor area and roof structure, repair was not practicable and that it posed a risk for use by staff and children due to subsidence in the floor.
- (2) The employee of the contractor who inspected the structure is a qualified carpenter. The contractor is well regarded by the department based on performance over two years.
- (3) No.
- (4) The preschool is recorded on the department's asset register but individual structures are not.
- (5) On 24 November 1995 when the structure had been demolished and removed.
- (6) Department of Urban Services were not advised that the structure was made of asbestos. Department of Urban Services were contacted to inspect the site on one occasion to advise whether there was any material remaining to be cleared.
- (7) The structure was used as a "home area" for dramatic play and contained a child sized table and chairs, cupboards, sink, oven and a stand holding dress up clothes.
- (8) The contractor has a current maintenance contract with the department for various trades (carpentry, handyman, plumbing, painting, electrical and gas fitting) and has previous experience removing similar structures.
- (9) No. The contractor is required to use a licensed asbestos removalist when asbestos is present. The contractor had concluded that asbestos was not present. Once its existence had been established, the contractor used a licensed asbestos removalist to clean the site.
- (10) The contractor is responsible for the management of the work and the safety of his employees. Normal precautions with students is for staff to keep them indoors while such work is progressing.
- (11) OH&S advice is that danger from AC sheeting would have been minimal. The sheeting material was removed from the site on 1 November 1995. Attendance at preschool each day is routinely recorded in the roll book.
- (12) The department accepts liability for staff. Students would need to sue the Territory as no automatic insurance cover exists for students.
- (13) No. As mentioned above, OH&S advice is that the danger from exposure to asbestos cement sheeting would have been minimal. As also mentioned above, during the demolition of the structure, the usual precaution is for staff to keep children indoors while a tradesperson was on preschool grounds.

22 February 1996

**MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION
QUESTION NO: 134**

Austouch Project

Ms Follett - asked the Chief Minister - In relation to the project known as AUSTOUCH:

- (1) What arrangements have been made for the continuing provision of this service to the Canberra Community?
- (2) Is it true that Telstra (Telecom) has withdrawn its expression of interest in operating the system?
- (3) What arrangements have been made to ensure that information of interest to the community will be provided and maintained in an up to date format?
- (4) What requirement did tenderers have to meet in relation to the provision of information from Government and other sources?

Mrs Carnell - the answer to the Member's questions is as follows:

- (1) The AUSTOUCH service was trialled for six months starting 1 January 1995. The trial set out to evaluate the costs and service improvement aspects of AUSTOUCH. At the same time, this Government explored options for the effective management of the service.

A Request for Proposals and Tender Process was conducted between May and November 1995 for managing and operating the AUSTOUCH information kiosk system. This process has now been finalised and arrangements for the future provision of AUSTOUCH services is currently with the Government for decision.

A decision regarding the future arrangements of this service is expected in early 1996.

- (2) Yes, Telstra (Telecom) withdrew its expression of interest in operating the AUSTOUCH kiosk systems prior to tenders closing on 17 August 1995. This was an internal decision for Telstra based on a reassessment of their corporate priorities.
- (3) The AUSTOUCH project has developed a network of information providers throughout the government and community groups to ensure information is useful and interesting to the community. Reporting mechanisms are in place on each of the AUSTOUCH kiosks to monitor daily usage rates on all information content.

AUSTOUCH has in place published information management control processes to ensure information is correct and up-to-date for public access. This has involved government and community group discussions, thereby delivering a more efficient service to the community.

The AUSTOUCH project has engaged the Community Information and Referral Service of the ACT Incorporated to provide an electronic version of the community information handbook, "Contact".

- (4) Tenderers were required to provide an information kiosk service which is at least equivalent to AUSTOUCH, which includes all existing government and community information. The tendered service will also include payment facilities to allow the public to make payments to the government such as rates, electricity and water.

The key tender criteria were:

- . technical and service specifications;
- . marketing and sales;
- . benefits to the ACT economy; and
- . cost reductions.

Negotiations will be held with the service provider to put in place a system that effectively encourages community organisations to provide their information to the service.

22 February 1996

MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NUMBER 135

Government Schools - Capacity and Enrolment Statistics

MS McRAE: asked the Minister for Education and Training on notice on 14 December 1995

-

For each and every school in the ACT what (a) is the capacity; (b) is the current enrolment and (c) are the projected enrolments for (i) 1996; (ii) 1997 and (iii) 1998.

MR STEFANIAK - the answer to Ms McRae's question is:

Information on capacity, current enrolments and projected enrolments from the ACT Department of Education and Training and Children's, Youth and Family Services Bureau publication "*Projected Enrolments 1996 to 2000*" is attached: Primary Schools (Attachment A), High Schools (Attachment B), and Colleges (Attachment C). The attachments show the February 1995 enrolment and the projected February enrolment to the year 2000. A government schools census will be conducted in February 1996 and an updated five year projection document will be released in July 1996.

The school capacity figures do not account for space currently occupied either by tenants or other ACT Department of Education and Training occupants. Attachment D, page 3 of the publication mentioned above, contains more information on capacity calculations.

ATTACHMENT A

FEBRUARY ENROLMENTS

A.C.T. GOVERNMENT PRIMARY SCHOOLS

ACTUAL 1995 - PROJECTED 1996-2000
As at July 1995

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

SCHOOL	1995 Capacity		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
	M C	Sp T	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp
NORTH CANBERRA												
Ainslie		382 410	11	390	14	400	14	400	14	385	14	370
Campbell	14 340 320		340		350		350		340		330	
Co-operative (1)		70 50		70		70		70		70		70
Lynham	416 525	6	405	6	390	6	380	6	380	6	380	6
Majura (2)	375 710		355		340		355		370		390	
North Ainslie		300 470		280		270		270		270		270
N.Ainslie - IEC			59		59		59		59		59	
Turner (3)(4)	325 320		320		315		310		300		300	
Total	79	2208 2805	76 0	2160	79	2135	79	2135	79	2115	79	2110
SOUTH CANBERRA												
Forrest		457 470		460		460		460		460		460
Narrabundah		157 290	18	150	19	150	19	150	19	150	19	150
Red Hill	19 481 710		485		490		495		490		485	
Telopea Park (5)	424		420		420		420		420		420	
Yarralumla	380 245 265		255		250		250		250		250	
Total	19	1764 2115	18 180	1770	19	1770	19	1775	19	1770	19	1765
WODEN VALLEY												
Curtin		288 415	12	280	12	280	12	270	12	260	12	250
Farrer		406 380		405		400		400		380		380
Garran		411 410		410		415		410		400		390
Hughes	224 565		215		200		190		190		180	
Hughes - IEC		100		100		100		100		100		100
Lyons		109 205		100		105		100		100		100
Mawson	228 320	7	225	8	220	8	215	8	210	8	200	8
Melrose		187 410		175		175		170		160		160
Torrens		372 410		370		350		345		340		320
Total	120	2225 3115	119 30	2180	120	2145	120	2100	120	2040	120	1980

M Mainstream students (does not include special students)

Sp Special students
Student capacity to current standards (refer to page 3)
transportable capacity
preschool students.

(2) Projected figures include students from new development in North Watson.

(3) Hartley Street Centre for special school students is a part of Turner Primary School (refer to special schools - primary level).

(4) Capacity does not include capacity of Hartley Street Centre (refer to special schools - primary level).

(5) Telopea Park School also has a high school component - see high school enrolments.

C
T Additional
(1) Does not include

PRIMARY SCHOOLS (CONT)

SCHOOL	1995 Capacity		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
	M C	Sp T	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp
WESTON CREEK												
Arawang	444 410		450		445		435		420		415	
Chapman	358 470	90	350		340		340		330		320	
Duffy	13	237 440	14	230	13	230	13	225	13	220	13	200
Rivett	15	150 560	15	130	15	120	15	120	15	110	15	100
Weston	14	229 475	14	215	14	210	14	200	14	180	14	170
Total	42	1418 2355	43 150	1375	42	1345	42	1320	42	1260	42	1205
BELCONNEN NORTH												
Charnwood (1)		285 525		285		295		320		340		350
Evatt	14	357 530	13	345	14	335	14	320	14	315	14	300
Flynn		321 350		300		270		250		240		260
Fraser (2)	293 320	150	280		305		335		360		380	
Giralang	308 500	16	275	16	265	16	255	16	235	16	220	16
Kaleen		456 555		440		430		420		415		400
Maribyrnong	221 650		195		185		170		145		135	
Miles Franklin		338 320		315		280		265		250		240
Mt Rogers												
- Melba campus		220 560		210		200		190		180		170
- Spence campus ²³⁴		655	220		210		200		180		175	
Total	30	3033 4965	29 420	2865	30	2775	30	2725	30	2660	30	2630
BELCONNEN SOUTH												
Aranda		370 410		360		355		350		355		365
Cook		142 145		135		135		130		130		120
Florey		423 460	120	420		410		400		390		375
Hawker		252 415		250		245		240		230		220
Higgins	248 620		250		245		240		230		230	
Holt		273 525		260		240		230		225		210
Latham	283 380	60	260		245		230		225		215	
Macgregor (3)	25	307 525	25	290	25	270	25	255	25	275	25	300
Macquarie	190 355		190		180		180		175		170	
Southern Cross	24	278 380	24	270	24	265	24	260	24	250	24	240
Weetangera	257 415	7	265	7	260	7	250	7	240	7	230	7
Total	56	3023 4630	56 180	2950	56	2850	56	2765	56	2725	56	2675
	5815	86	5625	86	5490	86	5385	86	5305	86	6056 9595	85 600

M Mainstream students (does not include special students)

Sp Special students

C Student capacity to current standards (refer to page 3)

T Additional transportable capacity

(1) Projected figures include students from new development in West Belconnen.

(2) Projected figures include students from new development in West Belconnen from 1997.

(3) Projected figures include students from new development in West Belconnen from 1999.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS (CONT)

SCHOOL	M C	1995 Capacity		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
		M	Sp T	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp
TUGGERANONG NORTH													
Fadden		558		545		535		520		500		480	
Gowrie	14	465	180	370	14	350	14	325	14	300	14	275	
Monash	489 465	389	14	370	14	350	14	325	14	300	14	275	
Mt Neighbour		350	180										
Taylor	26	14	500	14	490	14	500	14	500	14	490	14	
Urambi		267		250		235		215		200		185	
Village Creek	46	470											
V.Creek - IEC	28	230	25	220	26	215	26	200	26	190	26	180	
Wanniassa	452 495	500		330		310		300		280		265	
Wanniassa Hills		343											
Total	128	585	46	270	46	260	46	260	46	250	46	240	
		287	90										
		500											
		28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	
		452	425	405	385	355	335	315	295	275	255	235	
		495											
		90		370		355		320		300		280	
		615											
		3424	127	3280	128	3155	128	3025	128	2875	128	2725	
		4445	660										
TUGGERANONG SOUTH													
Bonython	342 350		370		405		425		440		450		
Calwell		467		475		485		500		510		510	
Chisholm	468 310	460	90	475	14	445	14	425	14	400	14	380	14
Charles Conder		210		530		580		630		670		690	
Gilmore	602 460	439	610	21	590	21	570	21	550	21	520	21	
Gordon	454 460	460	270										
Isabella Plains	454 460	14	520	14	560	14	600	14	640	14	670	14	
Richardson	313 465	60		460		450		440		430		420	
Theodore	324 350	469	150	330	38	345	38	340	38	330	38	320	38
		35	330	38	345	38	340	38	330	38	320	38	
		14	335	14	350	14	370	14	400	14	415	14	
		120											
Total	101	3878	97	4105	101	4210	101	4300	101	4370	101	4375	
		3775	900										
Total Tug'nong	229	7302	224	7385	229	7365	229	7325	229	7245	229	7100	
		8220	1560										
GUNGAHLIN													
Palmerston District (1)	342		370		400		460		450		495		
Nicholls (2)	460		210		260		410		460		460		
Ngunnawal (2)						250		400		480		490	
Amaroo (2)									285		490		
Casey (2)											200		
Total		342		580		910		1270		1675		2135	
Total Urban	21315 28205	565 2520	21265	575	21295	575	21415	575	21490	575	21600	575	

M Mainstream students (does not include special students)

Sp Special students

C Student capacity to current standards (refer to page 3)

T Additional transportable capacity

(1) The Primary School in Palmerston opened in 1995.

(2) The Primary School in Nicholls is planned for 1996, Ngunnawal for 1997, Amaroo for 1999 and Casey for 2000.

22 February 1996

PRIMARY SCHOOLS (CONT)

SCHOOL	1995			1996		1997		1998		1999		2000
	M	Capacity	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp
	C	T										
RURAL												
Hall		145		145		145		145		145		145
		120	90									
Tharwa		29		30		30		30		30		30
		35										
Uriarra (1)	13		10		10		10		10		10	
	30											
Total Rural (2)		187		185		185		185		185		185
	185		185		90							
TOTAL PRIM. (1)		21502	565	21450	575	21480	575	21600	575	21675	575	21785
(urban and rural)	575	28390	2610									

SPECIAL SCHOOLS - PRIMARY LEVEL

SPECIAL SCHOOLS	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
AND CENTRES						
Cranleigh (1)	35	35	35	35	35	35
Malkara (1)	59	60	60	60	60	60
Woden School		19	20	20	20	20
Hartley Street (1)(3)	94	95	95	95	95	95
Total (1)	207	210	210	210	210	210
TOTAL PRIMARY	22274	22235	22265	22385	22460	22570

(Urban, rural, special schools, special classes, other special, some preschools)

(1) Does not include preschool enrolments.

(2) Excludes Jervis Bay Primary School (71 students in February 1995).

(3) Hartley Street Centre for special school students is a part of Turner Primary School.

ATTACHMENT B

FEBRUARY ENROLMENTS

A.C.T GOVERNMENT HIGH SCHOOLS
ACTUAL 1995 - PROJECTED 1996-2000
As at July 1995

HIGH SCHOOLS

SCHOOL	1995 Capacity		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	Sp	
NORTH CANBERRA												
Campbell	713 836		730		710		700		690		670	
Lynham	704 969	30	660	32	640	32	610	32	570	32	550	32
SWOW (1)	27 19		27		27		27		27		27	
Secondary IEC (2)	59		59		59		59		59		59	
Total	91	1444 1824	89 0	1417	91	1377	91	1337	91	1287	91	1247
SOUTH CANBERRA & WODEN VALLEY												
Alfred Deakin		547 912		540		525		520		490		480
Melrose		737 1045		740		720		680		660		640
Telopea Park (3)	642 589	6 19	610	6	610	6	610	6	610	6	610	6
Total	6	1926 2546	6 19	1890	6	1855	6	1810	6	1760	6	1730
WESTON CREEK												
Stromlo		910 1007	29 38	900	31	850	31	820	31	780	31	740
Total	31	910 1007	29 38	900	31	850	31	820	31	780	31	740
BELCONNEN NORTH												
Charnwood (4)		255 741	19	230	17	220	17	230	17	240	17	270
Kaleen		715 760		725		740		680		620		570
Melba		612 779	18	640	19	660	19	610	19	570	19	540
Total	36	1582 2280	37 0	1595	36	1620	36	1520	36	1430	36	1380
BELCONNEN SOUTH												
Belconnen	753 912		750		730		670		630		600	
Canberra	788 931		780		780		740		700		680	
Ginninderra (5)	465 21	19 950	430 57	21	420	21	400	21	390	21	370	
Total	21	2006 2793	19 57	1960	21	1930	21	1810	21	1720	21	1650
Total Belconnen	57	3588 5073	56 57	3555	57	3550	57	3330	57	3150	57	3030

M Mainstream students (does not include special students)

Sp Special students

(1) SWOW also has a college component (35 students in February 1995).

(2) SIEC also has a college component (39 students in February 1995) and includes full fee paying overseas students.

(3) Telopea Park School also has a primary school component - see primary school enrolments.

(4) Projected figures include students from new development in Gungahlin from 1995 and West Belconnen from 1996

(5) Projected figures include students from new development in West Belconnen from 1998

C Student capacity to current standards (refer p. 3)

T Additional transportable capacity

HIGH SCHOOLS (CONT)

SCHOOL	M C	1995		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
		Sp	T	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp
TUGGERANONG													
Calwell		839	31	750	32	700	32	665	32	640	32	620	
	32	760	152										
Caroline Chisholm		722	32	740	32	770	32	740	32	730	32	710	
	32	760	38										
Kambah		687	30	620	32	580	32	545	32	520	32	480	32
	722	114											
Wanniassa		699	20	655	20	635	20	615	20	600	20	570	20
	836	38											
Lanyon (1)			230		380		530		640		700		
Total	116	2947	113	2995	116	3065	116	3095	116	3130	116	3080	
		3078	342										
GUNGAHLIN													
Nicholls (2)							250		500		820		
TOTAL													
HIGH SCHOOLS		10815	293	10757	301	10697	301	10642	301	10607	301	10647	
	301	13528	456										

SPECIAL SCHOOLS - HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

SPECIAL SCHOOLS	2000	1995		1996		1997		1998		1999		
		Sp	T	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M		
Koomarri (3)		53		53		53		53		53		53
The Woden School		60		60		60		60		60		60
Total	113		113									

M Mainstream students (does not include special students)

Sp Special students

C Student capacity to current standards (refer to page 3)

T Additional transportable capacity

(1) The high school in Conder is planned to open in 1996.

(2) Gungahlin students to attend Charnwood and other Belconnen high schools until the first Gungahlin high school is built.

Projected enrolment assumes that the high school in Nicholls will open in 1998 with Year 7 and 8 students only.

(3) Koomarri also has 37 college level enrolments.

ATTACHMENT C

FEBRUARY ENROLMENTS

A.C.T GOVERNMENT COLLEGES
ACTUAL 1995 - PROJECTED 1996-2000
As at July 1995

COLLEGES

COLLEGE	1995 Capacity		1996		1997		1998		1999		2000	
	M C	Sp T	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp	M	Sp
NORTHSIDE (1)												
Copland (2)	567 874		530		520		500		540		570	
Dickson	23	611 1045	22	600	23	580	23	600	23	630	23	650
Hawker		913 912	38	920		920		905		890		890
Lake Ginninderra (2)	865 893		850		860		870		880		880	
SWOW (3)	35 57	19	35		35		35		35		35	
Secondary IEC	39		39		39		39		39		39	
Total (4)	2991 3781	61 57	2935	62	2915	62	2910	62	2975	62	3025	62
SOUTHSIDE (1)												
Erindale	853 931		870		885		900		900		900	
Lake Tuggeranong		890 893		890		890		880		880		880
Narrabundah	895 912	76	890		890		890		890		890	
Phillip		684 912	30	650	30	640	30	625	30	620	30	610
Stirling	30	395 836		380		360		355		340		340
Total (4)	3717 4484	30 76	3680	30	3665	30	3650	30	3630	30	3620	30
TOTAL												
COLLEGES (4)	92	6708 8265	91 133	6615	92	6580	92	6560	92	6605	92	6645

SPECIAL SCHOOLS - COLLEGE LEVEL

	2000		1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
SPECIAL SCHOOLS							
Koomarri (5)		37	40		40	40	40
Total	40		37	40	40	40	40

M Mainstream students (does not include special students)

Sp Special students

C Student capacity to current standards (refer to page 3)

T Additional transportable capacity

(1) See notes on college enrolment projections on page 2.

(2) Projected figures include Gungahlin students.

(3) SWOW also has a high school component (27 in February 1995).

(4) Some colleges also have mature age and older students - these are not included in enrolment projections.

(5) Koomarri also has 53 high school enrolments.

Special classes include a variety of units each having a specific maximum size. Units include: Learning Centre, Junior Assessment Class, Introductory English Centre, Communications Disorder Class, Hearing Impaired Unit and Physically Handicapped Integrated students. Special class enrolments shown may include a single unit or a combination of units. Classes are not usually at their maximum at the start of the year when the schools census is conducted.

School Capacity

School capacity figures are dependent upon educational/curriculum needs, building and architectural design constraints and calculations based on the assumption that colleges and high schools accommodate an average class size of 19 students per teaching space and in the case of primary schools 30 students per teaching space (with additional space requirements for special class).

Thus, analysis of the capacity of individual schools must take into consideration an extensive range of design factors and specific educational needs as well as considering demographic projections for the priority enrolment area.

School capacities are monitored to ensure they reflect changes in building or design arrangements and the operation of special programs in schools. The capacity figures included in this document indicate current capacities and additional student accommodation available in transportables.

Holding School Arrangements

Projections take account of the following holding school arrangements:

- (1) Gungahlin - Charnwood High will cater for students from Gungahlin from 1995, pending provision of local schools. College holding arrangements include Lake Ginninderra, Copland and Dickson Colleges.
- (2) West Belconnen - Charnwood, Macgregor and Fraser Primary Schools, Charnwood and Ginninderra High Schools and Copland College will cater for West Belconnen students.

For further details concerning this document contact Facilities Planning and Projects Section on 205 9126.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
and CHILDREN'S, YOUTH & FAMILY SERVICES BUREAU
JULY 1995

MINISTER FOR URBAN SERVICES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY QUESTION

QUESTION NO 137

Floriade - Wildflower Seed Packs

Ms Horodny - asked the Minister for Urban Services:

What is the name of the distributor who provided the mixed wildflower seed pack sold in the Apprentices Tent at the 1995 Floriade?

Mr De Domenico - the answer to the member's question is as follows:

- . The seeds were imported from the United Kingdom and distributed locally by a Mr Gordon Perry of 8 Read Place, Evatt.
- . The seeds were withdrawn from sale when Floriade staff were alerted to the presence of the invasive weed species St John's Wort in the mix.
- . The Australian Quarantine Inspection Service has been notified of the problem and has advised that St John's Wort is a prohibited import under Commonwealth quarantine legislation.

22 February 1996

22 February 1996

APPENDIX 1: Incorporated in Hansard on 20 February 1996 at page 67.

TABLING STATEMENT

GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION PROGRAM

1996 AUTUMN SITTING

To be delivered by

Kate Carnell MLA
Chief Minister

20 February 1996

Mr Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to table the Government's Legislation Program for the Autumn 1996 sitting period.

The Program provides an overview of the legislation the Government intends to introduce into the Assembly in the first half of this year.

In order to reflect the Government's commitment to having an achievable and focused Legislation Program, we have considered it timely to modernise the organisation of the Program.

The Program will still contain two main sections, to be referred to as Category One and Category Two.

Category One consists of those legislative initiatives which have been accorded the highest priority for political, legal, financial or administrative reasons by the Government.

It is intended that as many as possible of these initiatives be introduced and, hopefully, passed by the Assembly before the end of the Autumn sitting.

Category Two consists of those items that the Government envisages will be introduced into the Assembly during the Autumn sitting.

Members will be aware that, apart from providing information to the Assembly about forthcoming proposals, the Legislation Program also assists the Public Service with progressing longer term legislation proposals, and also provides guidance to the Parliamentary Counsel's Office in organising its resources.

In this context, the Government has added another category, Category Three, as an adjunct to the Program.

Category Three items are proposals for which business planning has commenced but underlying policy has yet to be settled.

Category Three will be used for internal planning purposes.

This will assist the Parliamentary Counsel's Office in organising competing priorities on drafting resources including the drafting of Bills for non-Executive Members.

As members would be aware, there are a large number of routine amendments being developed and researched at any given time.

These proposals represent very much preliminary work.

And, whilst I am happy to share these with members, you would appreciate that these projects are not appropriate to be part of the Legislation Program which should focus on outcomes for the Autumn session.

This approach reflects the Government's commitment to an achievable and focused Legislation Program.

This Program, I believe, is outcome driven rather than being an unwieldy and unresponsive document, reflecting imposed timeframes.

For example, Category One will no longer include a lot of technical proposals simply because they are ready.

Mr Speaker, members are aware that in order to accommodate emerging issues, legislative proposals may also be added to the Program through the course of this sitting period.

Similarly, the categorisation of initiatives presently listed on the Program may be subject to change.

Turning now to the direction of the Autumn Legislation Program, Mr Speaker, the Autumn sittings will have a distinct financial flavour.

This will begin with the introduction of the legislation that sets up the Government's Financial Management Framework, and concluding with the tabling of the 1996/97 Budget.

The package of legislation will include the Financial Management Act 1996 which will replace the Audit Act 1989 and will introduce the Government's Financial Management Reforms; and the Auditor General Act 1996.

Mr Speaker, this legislation underpins the Government's reform agenda.

I tabled the proposed legislation on 14 December 1995 in line with this Government's commitment to broad and effective consultation with the Assembly and the wider community.

The proposals promote greater transparency in budget decision-making at all levels - the Assembly, the Executive and the Public Service.

The legislation recognises the primacy of the Assembly's role in the parliamentary budget process and enables enhanced and better focused accountability to the assembly and to the Canberra community.

Mr Speaker, these reforms will improve the quality of public sector management and accountability.

The Government intends to introduce this legislation as early as possible in the Autumn sittings.

Apart from these financial reforms, Category One reflects key structural reforms central to the Government's reform agenda.

22 February 1996

4

Making available the Government's legislation initiatives for the forthcoming Assembly sittings is intrinsic to our commitment to accessible government.

I trust that Members and the public will find the document informative and a useful guide to the new directions the Government is taking.

22 February 1996

APPENDIX 2: Incorporated in Hansard on 21 February 1996 at page 121.

Chief Minister

Treasurer
Minister for Health and
Community Care

Member For Molonglo
Australian Capital Territory



Kate Carnell MLA

Mr Bill Wood MLA
ACT Legislative Assembly
London Circuit
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Mr Wood

I am writing with regard to Question on Notice No. 97, which you placed on the Notice Paper on 23 November 1995. The question relates to the costs dealing with the Board of Inquiry into the Administration of ACT Leasehold.

I am advised that we are currently in the process of finalising various costings involved with the Inquiry, and as a result, there will be some delay in providing answers to the questions you have sought advice on. I am sure you will appreciate that I would prefer to provide you with exact figures rather than estimated costs.

I apologise for the delay in answering the question, and anticipate that an answer will be provided to you by mid-January.

Yours sincerely

Kate Carnell MLA
Chief Minister

28 DEC 1995

ACT Legislative Assembly
London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601
GPO Box 158 Canberra ACT 2601

Phone (06) 205 0101 Fax (06) 205 0399