

## ADJOURNMENT

## RAIL PASS

Mr HUGHES [9.58]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr McCARTNEY (Hamilton) [9.59]: I should like to speak on the adjournment on a matter of importance to one of my constituents in Newcastle. Unfortunately, he lost a leg—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Why could this not be dealt with in the Address-in-Reply debate?

Mr McCARTNEY: Because it is important to my constituent, an employee of a government department, who is on holiday and has lost his holiday pass. He is anxious to go away on holiday, and wants another holiday pass issued to him by the Commissioner for Railways.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member can deal with the matter in the debate on the Address in Reply tomorrow. The honourable member is in the same category as other honourable members who have not been allowed to speak on the adjournment while this debate is current.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 10 p.m.

---

## Legislative Council

Thursday, 22 August, 1968

---

Printed Question and Answer—Printing Committee (First Report)—Questions without Notice—Canterbury Municipality (Bazentin and Persic Streets Recreation Reserve) Bill (second reading)—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Seventh Day's Debate)—Special Adjournment—Adjournment (Business of the House).

---

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

## PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER

## PUBLIC HOSPITALS

The Hon. R. C. PACKER asked THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—Will the honourable gentleman obtain and supply to the House the following information regarding each of the general public hospitals situated within fifty miles of the Sydney G.P.O.? (1) The total number of beds and the number of public beds. (2) The average daily occupancy of public beds for the latest available period. (3) The number of out-patients treated in the last year for which figures are available. (4) The number of bed-patients admitted through the casualty department for the last available period. (5) The normal delay in admitting to a public ward patients who require treatment or surgery for illnesses that do not require immediate hospitalization. (6) The distance by road from the G.P.O., Sydney.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER replied—The attached schedule sets out the required information as at 30th June, 1967, in respect of (1) (2) (3) and (6). With regard to (4), statistical details of bed-patients admitted through casualty departments are not usually maintained. However, a survey is currently being conducted in respect of metropolitan hospitals and detailed information will be available later this year. In respect of (5), whilst individual hospitals do have waiting lists for both intermediate and public patients who require treatment or surgery, but who do not require immediate hospitalization, it is not possible to specify what is the "normal delay". The principle factor governing admissions of this kind is the degree of medical urgency and in turn is governed by the availability of medical services and special facilities for the treatment of the specific illness.

In view of the fact that most general hospitals have obstetric beds, the following women's hospitals have also been included: Royal for Women; Queen Victoria for Women; St Margaret's; Women's Crown Street.

General Public Hospital	Total Number of Beds	Number of Public Beds	Daily Average of Public Beds	Out-patients Treated	Distance by Road from G.P.O. Sydney
All Saints C. of E. ..	48	18	11.7	—	6
Auburn District .. ..	255	140	139.7	14,347	12
Balmain and District ..	220	172	122.0	29,479	3
Bankstown .. ..	301	154	139.9	37,116	12½
Benevolent Soc. of N.S.W.					
Royal for Women ..	257	163	102.3	17,650	2
Blacktown District ..	159	116	87.7	18,268	21
Bulli District .. ..	86	64	14.9	11,952	44
Camden District .. ..	88	51	25.0	3,009	39
Canterbury Dist. Memor.	211	153	101.3	32,883	8
Chatswood District Comm.	42	14	2.2	81	6
Eastern Suburbs .. ..	121	68	55.5	14,147	4
Fairfield District .. ..	141	83	49.0	24,642	17½
Gosford District .. ..	131	70	49.0	8,919	52
Hawkesbury Benevolent Society and Hospital	84	40	29.0	5,111	35
Hornsby and District ..	218	126	86.0	35,524	15
Lewisham .. ..	173	82	79.9	29,574	5
Liverpool District .. ..	222	154	105.1	34,239	20
Manly District .. ..	230	136	91.2	16,520	11
Marrickville District ..	105	91	55.4	14,257	5
Mater Misericordiae, North Sydney ..	246	203	134.1	25,443	3
Mona Vale District .. ..	151	57	56.8	13,919	17½
Nepean District, Penrith	173	86	69.8	24,158	34
Parramatta District .. ..	222	157	107.6	50,372	15
Prince Henry .. ..	723	400	416.3	19,902	9
Prince of Wales .. ..	287	210	147.1	33,684	4½
Queen Victoria for Women and Babies .. ..	41	25	22.8	318	3½
Rachel Forster .. ..	158	126	91.9	18,217	1½
Royal Alexandra for Children .. ..	630	544	349.0	36,326	1½
Royal North Shore .. ..	608	515	382.5	45,763	4
Royal Prince Alfred ..	1,347	976	717.7	72,146	2
Royal South Sydney .. ..	109	97	58.9	19,484	3
Ryde District Soldiers Memorial .. ..	229	117	74.4	19,990	10
St George District .. ..	429	320	209.4	38,940	9
St Ives C. of E. .. ..	30	10	4.2	90	2½
St Joseph's, Auburn .. ..	105	83	51.8	13,325	12
St Lukes, Darlinghurst ..	130	30	9.4	2,150	1½
St Margaret's for Women, Sydney .. ..	148	125	90.9	3,429	1½
St Vincent's, Darlinghurst	475	445	378.8	57,751	1½
South Sydney Women's ..	40	29	18.0	296	3
Sutherland District .. ..	292	133	100.4	24,051	15
Sydney .. ..	477	439	268.2	89,479	—
Sydney Homoeopathic .. ..	27	12	13.1	1,527	2
Western Suburbs .. ..	133	70	58.5	15,265	7
Women's (Crown St) .. ..	303	205	186.8	17,375	1½

## PRINTING COMMITTEE

## FIRST REPORT

The Hon. J. A. WEIR, as Chairman, brought up the First Report from the Printing Committee.

Ordered to be printed.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

## TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

The Hon. F. W. SPICER: I ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council whether he is aware that most city and suburban branches of the Totalizator Agency Board are supplied with a limited number of tables upon which patrons of the TAB can fill in their betting tickets. Is it a fact that very few country branches are supplied with tables and that patrons are compelled to place their tickets against the wall in order to fill them in? If these are facts, will the Minister take the matter up with the TAB authorities to see that desks or tables are installed in all country branches of this instrumentality, and particularly in the towns of Parkes and Forbes, without delay?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I do not know the situation with regard to fittings in city and suburban branches of the Totalizator Agency Board. I have walked past the agencies and noticed in many cases that people appear to be filling in the tickets on shelves along the walls. I am concerned with the possibility that facilities in country branches are not at least comparable with those in the city and suburban branches. I shall immediately refer this matter to the authorities and ask that particular reference be made to the position existing in the towns of Parkes and Forbes, to see that TAB facilities in those towns compare with those at branches in the Sydney area.

TAXIS: CENTRAL RAILWAY  
STATION

Major the Hon. H. P. FITZSIMONS: I ask the Leader of the Government a question referring to a subject I have mentioned previously—the control of taxis at Sydney Central railway station near the

country platforms. Will the Minister discuss this matter with his colleague, the Minister for Transport with a view to a scheme being devised to control taxis arriving at the country platform ranks and also the members of the public who are waiting there? Is the Minister aware that there is no attempt, except by some volunteer in the early morning, to keep intending taxi passengers in any sort of line, and that the moment a taxi arrives the people rush forward with no thought for women and children or who was there first? In amplification of my question, I understand that at a certain time there is a change of shifts for drivers, and that at this time no taxis at all go to Central railway station. Is it possible to have this arrangement altered so that there is a continual flow of taxis to meet incoming country trains? I ask the Minister to treat this matter as urgent and important to the convenience of the public.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I have some knowledge of the availability of taxis at Sydney Central Station because I probably travel by train more than most honourable members. If my train is on time it arrives at 6.26 in the morning, and I have seen the unhappy conditions that often prevail for taxi users, particularly elderly people who have difficulty in getting in and out of taxis. I think the situation at this busy point could easily be improved.

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: What about multiple hiring?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: That is another difficulty, and although it sometimes helps passengers, at other times it reacts against them. This matter is being considered by the Taxi Advisory Council at the present time. I am also concerned about the unavailability of taxis at the change of shifts. This means that Sydney is left without an adequate taxi service for a short period each day, and I have had personal experience of this. I shall refer the question raised by Major the Hon. H. P. FitzSimons to my colleague, the Minister for Transport, and I expect that he, in turn, will ask for a report from the Taxi Advisory Council on the two specific matters raised.

## TOURISM

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: I ask the leader of the Government and Vice-President of the Executive Council whether tourism has become a national asset. Does he agree that tourism brings in money for nothing and should be encouraged? Is the Minister aware that on Wednesdays Channel 10 has a half-hour session called *America*, which portrays different scenic beauties of the United States of America? Is it possible for the Ministry of Tourism to work in conjunction with local or overseas film makers and produce propaganda films of commercial value to publicize New South Wales? Since 1948 I have travelled throughout the United States of America on six occasions and I ask the Minister whether he would not agree that our advertising in that country through moving pictures is inadequate? Will the Minister consider recommending to the Minister for Tourism the value of making commercial films of New South Wales, which I believe could be produced profitably and shown throughout the United Kingdom and Europe. The half-hour series on local television is a marvellous method of propaganda; it would be good propaganda for this State if it were possible for our tourism authorities to produce for showing abroad films of our natural beauties.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: The honourable gentleman has raised a number of questions in regard to tourism. It is a fact that the tourist industry in the United States of America is about the second most important industry there. In Australia the tourist industry has grown to be one of our largest. The question of overseas tourism propaganda is now the basic responsibility of federal authorities under the new division of tourist activities. However, tourism within the State is the responsibility of State authorities, and the New South Wales Government has been active in producing films for distribution overseas.

The Department of Decentralisation and Development produced a film, which was released in the United States of America towards the end of last year, depicting industrial growth in New South Wales. To do that, of course, it had to take in some of the tourist attractions of the State. This

film is being widely distributed at the present time. For instance, it will be shown on most of the ships coming to Australia. I hope that in the very near future it will be shown on colour TV in the United Kingdom and in parts of Europe.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: The Minister's department published a very good book on it, too.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: That is right. I thank the honourable member. Also, I understand that the Department of Tourism in this State is in the course of producing a film which will depict the tourist attractions of New South Wales. It is expected that this also will have a very wide distribution overseas. The other aspect which I do not think I have covered relates to the reference by the Hon. A. A. Alam to the possibility of using commercial firms to publicize the tourist industry in the State by giving them certain rights so that they may get a profit from the publicity side and the selling of the services to which they have the rights.

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: That is the only successful way.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: This has a point, and I shall refer it to the Minister for Tourism to see whether there is any possibility of its being done in New South Wales. As the honourable member knows, Ansett-ANA is doing this with regard to its tourist facilities in Cooma.

## STAMP DUTIES OFFICE

The Hon. L. E. SCHOFIELD: Will the Vice-President of the Executive Council ascertain for me the number of fully qualified legal men who are employed in the Stamp Duties Office? Will he ascertain also the number of assessors who are employed in the Stamp Duties Office, and the qualifications for assessors?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: If the honourable member places that question on the Notice Paper I will obtain an answer to it.

RETAIL TRADE: GIVE-AWAY  
GIMMICKS

The Hon. R. S. JACKSON: Will the Vice-President of the Executive Council make inquiries into the fact that chain stores are engaged in rackets—much has been said in another place about rackets—by giving away money and other considerations and at the same time taxing the manufacturer huge sums of money in relation to the goods they supply? For instance, one small firm I know of has just lost a contract to a chain store because it did not supply \$18,000 for the give-away gimmick that the chain store is putting out, with the result that the people who got the contract—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must ask a question; he may not give information.

The Hon. R. S. JACKSON: Is it a fact, also, that the products served by these chain stores are cut down by from two to four ounces because of the give-away arrangements, as well as the manufacturers paying for them?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I do not know whether the matters raised by the honourable member are facts or not, but I do know that in another place allegations have been made and it has been suggested that they should be substantiated so that people can take action to wipe out any undesirable practices that may be becoming a habit in various parts of the State. I expect that legislation will be introduced later this session which will possibly give the Government greater power over undesirable practices. I do not know whether the matters mentioned by the Hon. R. S. Jackson will be covered by this legislation, but I expect that they will.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: We have the Weights and Measures Act.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: Also, it is expected that action will be taken under a packaging Act. The States would have to reach agreement on this to achieve a measure of uniformity, and when this has been done I expect that the States will be in a position to introduce complementary legislation.

CANTERBURY MUNICIPALITY  
(BAZENTIN AND PERSIC STREETS  
RECREATION RESERVE) BILL

SECOND READING

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY [4.46]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members will recall that this bill was introduced upon petition on 5th December, 1967, and referred to a select committee of this House for consideration and report. The proceedings of that committee were interrupted by the prorogation of the Legislative Council. The bill was re-introduced in the following session on 26th March, 1968, and again referred to a select committee which had completed its deliberations but had not submitted its report to this House when prorogation of the Legislature was announced. The bill was again referred to a select committee of this House on 8th August, 1968, and the committee's report, together with the minutes of proceedings and evidence taken before that committee, with the bill as amended, was tabled by me on 13th August, 1968.

The promoter of this bill is the Belfield Sub-Branch of the Returned Services League of Australia (New South Wales Branch) Incorporated. The Belfield Sub-Branch seeks by this bill to acquire from the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury a piece of land, described as a "recreation reserve", on the corner of Bazentin and Persic Streets, Belfield. This reserve adjoins the R.S.L.'s own property and club house. In exchange for this reserve, the R.S.L. is prepared to transfer certain of its other lands in Bazentin Street, Belfield, for a similar purpose—that is, a recreation reserve.

The objects of the bill are fully outlined in the various recitals in the preamble. It contains the history of the land which the Belfield sub-branch seeks to acquire. This land at the corner of Bazentin and Persic Streets, Belfield, was first acquired by the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury by a transfer from the War Service Homes Commission dated 30th December, 1925. The land was said to contain an area of

33½ perches, marked accordingly on the relevant deposited plan in the Lands Titles Office, and in addition, was described as "recreation reserve". A recent survey of the land by the Canterbury council revealed that the area was only 16½ perches. The Certificate of Title, duly altered and initialled by the Registrar-General, was submitted to the committee. It is dated 22nd January, 1968.

In obtaining this land from the War Service Homes Commissioner the Canterbury council gave no consideration other than to enter into a covenant that it would not use or permit the land or any portion thereof to be used "save for the purpose of recreation reserve, gardens, libraries or for any other purpose approved by the War Service Homes Commissioner". The land has been held continuously by the Canterbury council, subject only to that covenant and has been used as a recreation reserve. Evidence was produced from the Director of War Service Homes, the successor to the War Service Homes Commissioner, indicating that he was not averse to the proposals in the bill. He did not fear the consequences of releasing the council from its covenant provided that the exchange is approved, and that the exchanged land is held by the council upon terms which are not materially different from those on which they hold the present recreation reserve.

The Belfield sub-branch owns two adjoining blocks of land in Bazentin Street, Belfield. They are almost alongside the corner triangular-shaped block, which is the council land. The sub-branch has offered to transfer so much—in the Bill as amended, 17 perches—of those two blocks of land as the Canterbury council may select in exchange for the council recreation reserve area. Evidence was given, supported by documents, plans, and certified copies of minutes, that the Canterbury council raised no objection to the introduction of the bill to give effect to the proposals stated therein. The council also approved of the subdivision of the land offered in exchange by the Belfield sub-branch upon certain conditions. In this regard I quote from a true extract of the official minutes of the meeting of the

Council of the Municipality of Canterbury held on 18th April, 1968, and tendered to the select committee:

That the application for subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions—

1. The passing of the Canterbury Municipality (Bazentin and Persic Streets Recreation Reserve) Bill through State Parliament.

2. The compliance with the provisions of Sections 34A and B of the Metropolitan Water, Sewerage, and Drainage Amendment Act, 1963.

The second item, water board certificates under sections 34A and 34B, refers to the fact that should any alterations be made to water mains and sewerage mains in the locality affected by the subdivision, the cost of the work is covered by an amount of money paid by the applicant, whereupon these certificates are granted.

In the bill that was referred to the select committee the description of the land to be exchanged by the Belfield sub-branch was indefinite mainly due to the fact that at that time the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury had not defined which portion of the available land it desired for the new recreation reserve. The area was surveyed and defined on 8th February, 1968, following which it was submitted to the Registrar-General's Department for checking to ascertain whether it would be acceptable. By letter dated 29th April, 1968, the Registrar-General stated that the land so defined by the surveyor, Mr Procter, had been checked in his department and was an acceptable definition for embodiment in the bill. This definition is now set out in amended schedule II of the bill.

Evidence was taken from the solicitor for the Belfield Sub-Branch of the Returned Services League, from two trustees of the sub-branch, and from an officer of the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury. Only one letter of objection to the proposed transfer of lands was received by the promoters of the bill. It came from a resident of Bazentin Street, Belfield. He and two other residents in the immediate area in Belfield informed the committee of their objections. A petition from the members of the Methodist church in Belfield and another from the members of the Church of

England church in Belfield were also received by the committee. A further letter of objection was received from the Parks and Playgrounds Movement of New South Wales (Incorporated). All these objections were acknowledged and considered by the committee.

An inspection of the areas of land referred to in the bill was carried out in the company of a surveyor from the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury. Following this inspection by members of the committee, further evidence was taken from the Reverend Hayward, the Minister of the Church of England in Belfield, who had organized the two petitions from that area. The Reverend Hayward also appeared before the committee as the official representative of the Parks and Playgrounds Movement of New South Wales. He outlined the movement's three principal objections. The first was that the land in question is a children's playground; second, that it is an asset to the district as a playground and as a park; and third, that it provides clear visibility to the corner on which it is situated.

The committee had evidence before it to the effect that the traffic hazards mentioned and the allegation about visibility had been considered by the Police Traffic Branch and that inspectors of the Department of Child Welfare also had visited the sites. Neither body could support any objections to the proposed transfer. The committee is satisfied that the exchange of lands has been agreed upon by both parties—the Belfield sub-branch and the Council of the Municipality of Canterbury—and that the descriptions of each area are accurate. Further, the committee has been informed that the sub-branch is willing to give an undertaking that it will establish and maintain a children's playground in the proposed new recreation area, which will have longer hours of sunlight on it than the present triangular-shaped area which abuts the Belfield R.S.L. club building. Also the 6 feet high wire mesh fencing to be erected will provide some reduction of potential traffic hazards to children at the present recreation reserve. In its

*The Hon. J. J. Maloney]*

deliberation the committee gave due consideration to all aspects of the transfer, especially whether or not it will be detrimental to the children.

The bill has been amended to give effect to proper definitions of areas and dimensions of land. This involved an amendment of the preamble. The need for these amendments was proved to the satisfaction of the select committee. I commend the bill, as amended and agreed to by the select committee, to honourable members.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

#### COMMITTEE AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted, on motions by the Hon. J. J. Maloney.

#### THIRD READING

With concurrence, bill read a third time, and forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, on motions by the Hon. J. J. Maloney.

#### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY

##### SEVENTH DAY'S DEBATE

Debate resumed (from 21st August, *vide* page 417) on motion by the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers:

That the following Address be adopted and presented by the Whole House to His Excellency the Governor, in reply to the Speech which His Excellency had been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament, viz.:

*To His Excellency Sir ARTHUR RODEN CUTLER, upon whom has been conferred the decoration of the Victoria Cross, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Knight of the Most Venerable Order of St John of Jerusalem, Governor of the State of New South Wales and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.*

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Members of the Legislative Council of New South Wales, in Parliament assembled, desire to express our thanks for Your Excellency's Speech, and to assure you of our unfeigned attachment to Her Most Gracious Majesty's Throne and Person.

2. We beg to assure Your Excellency that our earnest consideration will be given to the measures to be submitted to us.

3. We join Your Excellency in the hope that, under the guidance of Divine Providence, our labours may be so directed as to advance the best interests of all sections of the community.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE [5.2]: Like other honourable members, I extend my congratulations to those members who earned them earlier in the debate. In particular, I congratulate the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller on his elevation to the leadership of this House. I wish him as pleasant as possible a time in his exalted position, subject, of course, to the abilities of the Opposition to harass him. I congratulate also the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers on his maiden speech, though I do not agree with what he said. I hope to be able to show that in one or two places his speech was somewhat like the speech by the Minister for Health in another place last night. I congratulate the Hon. H. D. O'Connell on his maiden speech. He impressed me by the honesty of his approach. He certainly liked to paddle in fluoridated water. It was an enjoyable experience to listen to him.

Let me now say a few things about the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers' speech and his advent to this Chamber. His speech should have been a very good one: he had many months in which to prepare it. About February, 1968, while he was still the member for Casino in the Legislative Assembly, he was offered a seat in this Chamber: we were told that he would adorn the benches of the Legislative Council. Of course, that seemed to be a fairy story in the context of the democracy in which we live. It is beyond comprehension that a member of one House can be promised a seat in another House while he is still a member of the former House and must be elected to the new House. I have another word for it, which I shall mention a little later. There is no doubt that the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers is the favourite son. This is in line with a typical Americanism.

The Hon. R. S. JACKSON: He has not his coat of many colours, though.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Perhaps not, but with a redistribution promised later in the life of this Parliament, he will apparently get kicked downstairs again to the lower House. There, perhaps, with the aura with which he came here, and the promise of all the good things that will flow from his brief stay here, he will play a similar role for the Government in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply in the lower House. If he can do that, he will go from here with all the good bidding and all the success that his colleagues can wish him. He will not need to have much luck. By the time I have dealt with some aspects of the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers' speech, I shall have lined it up with something that Dr Ritchie said about the speech by the Minister for Health last night.

I should like to know whether a senior Minister of the Crown is in a position to make an offer of an appointment to this Chamber by a government which at that time was not formed. Can a senior Minister of the Crown induce a member of his own party to retire to make way for a person who is not a member of this Chamber? If the Minister can conduct himself like that, carrying on his business in that fashion, then, Mr President, you are sitting in a Chamber that reeks of Tammany Hall tactics. It is a serious thought to be bandied about this Chamber, to think that a Minister can pull the strings in such a way as to bring this Chamber into the same disreputable condition as the other Chamber. Every member of this House should be very much concerned that the practices of Tammany Hall can come here in this modern age, bringing a result like the one before us now. It is astounding, to say the least.

My allegation of Tammany Hall tactics is borne out by the facts. No sooner were the general elections held in February this year than the Hon. J. M. Carter found it a convenient time to retire. The deduction from this is that the Leader of the Country Party in another place can put his finger on a member in this place and tell him that he must retire to allow an ex-member of

the Legislative Assembly to take his seat here. That ought to give rise to serious thought.

The Hon. ASHER JOEL: The Hon. J. M. Carter never had the finger put on him at any time in his life. He is not that type of man.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: It is a strange thing, but I thought the interjector's name was the Hon. Asher Joel. If he is running under an alias, he might tell us now that he is the Hon. J. M. Carter, for the Hon. J. M. Carter is the only one who can answer that kind of proposition.

The Hon. ASHER JOEL: The Hon. J. M. Carter's record in this House and in the service is too good to subject him to that allegation when he is not here to defend himself.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: The Hon. J. M. Carter's record in this House is excellent, but that does not absolve the Hon. C. B. Cutler from his action in putting the finger on the Hon. J. M. Carter for the benefit of the Hon. C. B. Cutler. That is what happened. We have now in this Chamber the very person who was promised the seat of a member who would retire—he remained unnamed until he retired—unless, of course, the Hon. C. B. Cutler made a mistake and meant to put the finger on somebody else. If he did, that was infinitely worse. If the Labor Party did a thing like that, there would be headlines of all description. The Liberal-Country Party Government did a thing like that and it smells as bad. I hope that it will be our last experience of this sort of political chicanery.

Let us see just how good the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers' maiden speech is. Like the curate's egg, it is good in parts. For instance, it reads well and it is nicely set out. For that we might have to thank the printer. Some of the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers' statements are as far removed from fact as it is possible for them to be. He says:

Much confusion about teaching services has arisen following many statements that have been made without due regard to the true position. Considerable discussion has recently occurred regarding the staffing position in the

public schools of this State. Problems do exist, particularly in such specialized secondary fields as science, but much of the discussion has been based on incorrect detail.

That is all very good. I wish now to refer to yesterday's issue of the *Sydney Morning Herald*. It is strange to see the *Herald*, in two different parts of the newspaper, bring its weight to bear in contradicting what the honourable member says. It took the *Sydney Morning Herald* a week to become conscious of this matter. Yesterday's edition contains this article:

A meeting of 400 parents, teachers, pupils and citizens last night called on the State Government to hold a public inquiry into the reasons for the proposed closure of North Sydney Technical High School.

The meeting, held at Lane Cove Town Hall, said an independent committee should conduct the inquiry. It said alternative proposals to the closure of the school were completely unsatisfactory to parents and children of the districts concerned and there would be inevitable overloading of staffing and accommodation at other schools in the area.

The meeting decided that the closure of the school at a time of increasing class sizes and accommodation shortage should not be countenanced because it would militate against the best interests of education in the northern area.

The secretary of the school's P. and C. Association, Mr R. Hill, said the Department of Education seemed determined to destroy the school whatever the cost.

It seemed that the site on which the school stood could be a valuable commercial site.

That report is up to date. Before the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers made his maiden speech it was known that the North Sydney Boys Technical High School was marked down for closure, but in spite of this he made the statements to which I have referred. These statements were not true. Honourable members should bear in mind that the deduction to be drawn from the speech made by the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers was that there was no teacher shortage, that there was the usual intake and retirement rate but nothing to cause any concern. I think he said that about twenty-one teachers had gone to Canada. The honourable member is not abreast of events. I turn now to the Drummoyne Boys High School. In the *Sydney Morning Herald*

published yesterday, under the heading "Teacher No. 11 for Class", these words appear:

A letter to the "Herald" from 38 students of 1A science class on Monday claimed they had had a succession of 10 teachers in the present school term.

The boys said that since their last teacher resigned on August 13, they were being taught for only three of their six weekly science periods.

#### EVERY EFFORT

An official of the Department of Education's central metropolitan directorate said yesterday a teacher would be sent to the class for the remaining two days of the term.

He said every effort was being made to find a permanent teacher for the next term.

The official said, that since the class's permanent teacher resigned in May, the pupils had a Bachelor of Science for two periods a week until he resigned on July 26.

He said the relief teachers had included a Master of Science and a former science mistress.

Teacher No. 11 says a permanent teacher retired in May of this year and there is quite a procession of teachers out to Drummoyne. On that basis, the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers must be right: there must be an over-supply of teachers, to keep marching around in a circle in this way. The fact is that the teachers are not there, and that they are filling the gap in this shoddy manner by giving a class two lectures a week instead of six. By contrast, the North Sydney Boys Technical High School is to be closed and the children from that school are to be transferred to another overcrowded school in overcrowded classes. It is just too crazy for words to tell the people through *Hansard* that we on this side are not *au fait* with the true position, that the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers is the only one who sees the true position, and that the details given by Opposition members are incorrect.

Our contention that there are shortages, malpractices and maladministration is supported by the *Sydney Morning Herald* news items published yesterday. The experiences of the North Sydney Boys Technical High School and of the Drummoyne High School

can be repeated all over the place. A year ago, during the previous debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, when the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers was a member of another place, I mentioned that the schools on the South Coast were being closed and that the Darlinghurst Marist Brothers School had been closed over a year ago. Some schools are being opened, but the nauseating facts of this Government's poor education policy can be substantially enlarged upon. Let us see what His Excellency says, keeping in mind what I have just said about what is happening at Drummoyne and North Sydney. The Governor's Speech contains these words:

The school population continues to increase and enrolments are now estimated to be in excess of 746,000 compared with 719,000 in August of last year.

As at June this year some 32,000 permanent, temporary and casual teachers were employed in government schools, and approximately 9,000 students were in training at teachers' colleges.

The number of new Teachers' College Scholarships taken up in 1968 was over 4,100.

During 1968 a record of more than \$42,000,000 will be spent on the construction of new school buildings and the provision of septic sewerage systems and items of equipment.

The school building programme for the current year includes the construction of new schools and major additions to existing schools at over 300 centres.

They are brave words. If they are there to hoodwink the public they can do so easily provided that the facts are not known. His Excellency said nothing to reassure Government supporters or people outside the House that what the Government is doing with education is what should be done. The next matter set out is that a new teachers' college will be constructed at Goulburn. We were told that a year ago, when it was stated in this Chamber that the Government had not even resumed the land on which the college was to be built or, if the land had been resumed, no plans had been drawn. Did the mover of the motion keep us informed on that basis or has he taken this statement as a glib promise? Has he taken it as fact? Are we to take it as fact? I am critical of

his maiden speech here, not only in this part but in a whole host of other parts as well. If a man becomes the favourite son he should bring himself into line with the facts. The Hon. R. W. Manyweathers had eight months to do so and should have been able to inform the House of the factual position instead of what the Government thinks might exist in a different set of circumstances.

His Excellency's Address must stand as the poorest effort of its type ever to be presented to Parliament. It is an innocuous document of six pages, five of them looking backward and only one looking forward. It contains not one matter of great importance. Perhaps the Government is hiding its knowledge under a cloak of anonymity. At the bottom of the first page the Government pats itself on the back about cotton production in New South Wales. It was the members of this very Government then in Opposition who criticized Labor when it got cotton production under way in New South Wales. It is like the Menzies crowd. They boycotted the opening of the Snowy Mountains scheme, but when, unfortunately for Australia, the Menzies administration was in office towards the end of the work it calmly proclaimed the undertaking as its own—very much as the Government is trying to tell the people of New South Wales, although without actually saying so, that it is doing a good thing for New South Wales by getting this bountiful cotton crop in an area of endeavour that it had not thought of.

His Excellency refers to Blowering Dam. This dam was started by Labor and would have been finished by it. The Government claims that the wall of the dam is completed, but had it been honest it would have stated that the dam was started by Labor. Most things that this Government has completed were started by Labor. The Pindari, Carcoar, Lostock, Toonumbar and Copeton dams are also dams that the Labor Government started. All the others were started or approved by Labor. The Government is talking in the same manner as it did when it claimed that it had been in office for only one year, two years, or three years, as the case may be. Now we are in the fourth year (of the Liberal-  
*The Hon. C. Colborne*)

Country Party Government, and it is still talking about the things that Labor got well under way before the coalition Government came into office. It has not moved far. It speaks of work on the Liddell power station. Liddell was well under way and Wallerawang power station is to have major extensions. They are all Labor works but the Government is patting itself on the back for them.

His Excellency refers to the fact that construction at the White Bay container berth is proceeding according to schedule and will be completed in time for the arrival of the first container vessel early next year. They are brave words but they must be examined. Container shipping is such a revolutionary technological change, especially for water transport, that in England the Tilbury Docks have been reconstructed. Acre after acre of docks, sheds and buildings, have been rebuilt for container cargo handling. The New York docks are in much the same state. We are a nation trading by sea and should be in a somewhat relative position to other nations that trade by sea. Instead, in Sydney we have 2,200 lineal feet of wharf space and 20 acres of land.

This is what the Government claims it has prepared for the first container cargo ship. When container shipping begins, as it will in the near future, 2,200 feet of wharf and 20 acres of land will not cope with the type of trading that we shall be involved in. Everything that can be shipped in containers will be shipped that way. It is estimated that the labour force on the waterfront will be reduced by half, so revolutionary is the container shipping technique. The railways are trying to do something about it but we are not told about that. The railways are trying to move containers by rail from Fremantle to Sydney. Does that make any difference to the Government? Does it care if ships do not ply between Sydney and other ports or if Western Australia takes the major part of container cargo to be carried overland on the new standard gauge line to be opened next year? The thousands of huge containers bringing goods into Australia will move quicker across the continent by rail than by sea.

This important aspect of government is covered by only 2,000 feet of wharf space and 20 acres of land at White Bay. Indeed, the fact that it is at White Bay is a condemnation of the thinking of the Government, which is shifting more ships into Sydney Harbour while Botany Bay is available. Botany Bay, which was handed to the Maritime Services Board in 1961, has been the subject of tests, but no firm proposal has resulted. Of course, some lip-service is being paid to the fact that Botany Bay could be the container port for Australia, but we must consider when containerization will come into effect. The Government apparently believes it will not come about until some time in the distant future. Suppose that it believes that it will come about in five or ten years. We know that the first container ship will arrive next year. Therefore, it is nearer than the Government thinks. If I am saying something that will assist the Government to blow away the cobwebs from where they are cluttering things up, I shall have done a good job.

I looked in His Excellency's Speech for some mention of container cargoes and found nothing but a few words—contained in three lines. Therefore, I consulted that fine publication *Port of Sydney*, the August, 1968, edition of which contains a good photograph of White Bay on which is superimposed the 2,000 feet of wharves and 20 acres of land about which I have spoken. Even a casual observer can appreciate the engineering problems which make the White Bay scheme so laughable. It would be necessary, in the first instance, to take the important container ships around the point. These are the vessels that will cut the labour force in halves and do all the things that have been claimed. These ships will not be able to turn round the point in order to get to this area.

We are told that at Botany Bay land is available and services can be provided. There is no doubt that hundreds of acres of land are available for development. In the issue of *Port of Sydney* to which I have referred is a report of what the president of the Maritime Services Board, Mr Broth-

erson, said at a symposium in July, 1967. Commenting on Botany Bay and its development as an ancillary port to the port of Sydney, he said:

We all look forward to its development in line with need and availability of funds but this is a major project and all will appreciate the heavy demands being made on the Government for finance for other costly development works.

The president of the Maritime Services Board, who has been charged with the development of Botany Bay, is concerned that the finances of the Government are being used by it on other work, and are not being used on the development of Botany Bay. Mr Brotherson is quite impressed by Botany Bay and says:

Botany Bay has a great potential as an industrial port and, subject to the current investigations proving that it is satisfactory for the purpose, it is the Board's view that once its development is commenced, industrial expansion would be self-generating.

If Botany Bay is developed as a container port he says that this will generate other industries in the area. In this way, the exploitation of the land there would continue. Mr Brotherson went on to say:

The very substantial new areas of land which would be brought into being by reclamation would be an invaluable asset to the State when looking to the future requirements for centrally located industrial land, especially where deep water access is necessary. Botany Bay would be particularly well suited for large scale activities processing high volumes of waterborne raw materials. Many people have spoken of Botany Bay as predominantly a container port.

I have indicated the extent to which container facilities may be needed to serve the Sydney area. If located at Botany Bay these facilities would represent only a small element in its potential overall development as a port. However, if Botany Bay was developed, this, in itself, would cause it to become progressively available for all port uses, including the needs of the container trade in the future.

The Maritime Services Board is very conscious of the development of Botany Bay not only for container cargo but also for general industrial purposes, but it cannot do anything because of lack of funds. The Government says, "We are looking after containerization, and we have in mind that White Bay will take the first container vessel in Sydney Harbour next year." But the

Government does not say that it has any other facilities for container ships. Later in the article to which I have referred are further comments concerning the board's proposals. Of course, the board is doing something, but not enough—and not quickly enough. The article states:

As the Board's original proposal concerning the overall investigation of the bay included provision of a model study in the phased programme, this aspect was reviewed in the light of progress and on the 4th April, 1968, approval was given, *inter alia*, for—

- (a) the construction and operation of an hydraulic model of Botany Bay; the cost of construction and any joint investigation work to be shared with the Commonwealth Department of Works; and
- (b) the Hydraulic Research Station, Wallingford, being retained to design, construct and install the control equipment for the model and provide a supervisory service as well as being responsible for interpretation of data from the model.

This discloses that they have got only to the stage of having made a hydraulic model of Botany Bay, in order that the essentials can be studied. The board cannot go any further, but I suppose we have to be thankful for small mercies—we have White Bay, in which the ships will not be able to turn, even when they get to White Bay.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: They cannot get there. The bridge has collapsed. It has been closed for three weeks. It is in the Leichhardt council area now. This is serious.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: If the bridge has gone and you cannot get into White Bay, it certainly is serious.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: It is possible to go round the other way.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: It is not as serious as the Hon. J. A. Weir is trying to make out.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: We are a trading nation, but are badly lacking in cargo handling facility. Even in a nebulous speech, a great deal more attention is warranted for this subject than three lines. It

is possible that we shall get into the same position with container cargo as the Government, through the Minister for Public Works, has reached with its administration or lack of administration of the comic opera house.

On page 4 of the Governor's Speech and in the address of the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers we are promised more teachers, to be trained at new teachers' colleges to be built at Lindfield, Shortland, and Goulburn. A teachers' college at Goulburn was promised two or three years ago, and only now are tenders to be called for the building. As a Parliament is elected for three years, it would not surprise me to see these statements repeated in two year's time. They are almost a repetition of what appeared in the Governor's speeches over the last three years. It appears that we are not going to get colleges at all at this stage, but merely to have tenders called for them.

We are told that regional hospitals are to be built. This matter was given five lines in the Governor's Speech. Then with a flourish of trumpets it was announced that Sydney Hospital is to be moved almost immediately from Macquarie Street to Parramatta, and that the Minister has found Parramatta Hospital to be inadequate anyhow. He planned to kill two birds with the one stone by closing Sydney Hospital and building a new and bigger hospital at Parramatta. Then somebody told him to behave himself, so he changed his mind. The Government decided to shelve the matter of moving Sydney Hospital. Did it do so because of the pressures that were being brought to bear? Did it do so because it lacked leadership? Did it do so because it promised something it had no intention of carrying out? Whatever the reason, shelve it the Government did.

The Minister for Health made a speech last night in another place. It lasted half an hour. Apparently Dr Ritchie, the chairman of the Sydney Hospital Board, was in the public gallery of the Legislative

Assembly at the time, and I have here the *Daily Mirror* report of his view of the speech. The report says:

He heard Mr Jago deliver a stinging attack on the hospital board in putting the Government's case for the transfer of Sydney Hospital's teaching facilities to a new \$40,000,000 medical centre at Parramatta. Dr Ritchie said today he could point out inaccuracies in about 80 per cent of Mr Jago's speech.

That is an awful indictment of a public figure. A Minister of the Crown is being told by somebody with whom he does not agree that 80 per cent of his speech is inaccurate: in other words, 80 per cent of the speech is false. If Dr Ritchie is right, the Minister is wrong. But if the Minister is right, then something ought to be done about Dr Ritchie. We cannot have a man in his exalted position advocating retention of an obsolete building when it ought to be pulled down and saying that the Minister is telling lies if the fact is that Dr Ritchie is telling lies. Sufficient has been said by Dr Ritchie, however, to cast grave doubts on the Minister's veracity. The Minister has to clean up the matter to the satisfaction of the public. As a member of the public, I am greatly disturbed that Dr Ritchie can say that the Minister is not telling the truth. This sort of thing just has to stop, and the quicker we get the truth, the better.

Then in inverted commas comes a further assault by Dr Ritchie on what Mr Jago told the Parliament about the eye hospital. It is better repeated in Dr Ritchie's words:

"Mr Jago said that from December, 1966, the Board showed no interest in rebuilding the Eye Hospital. In fact, we have created a planning scheme—

And this is Dr Ritchie speaking:

—for the Eye Hospital which has been in Mr Jago's hands for six months, and one month ago the Hospitals Commission directed the Board to consult with the Public Works Department to continue the second stage of planning for the hospital."

If Dr Ritchie is right, that is an indictment of the Minister for Health, for Dr Ritchie is saying just the opposite and giving alleged facts to substantiate his statement. These appear to make an ass of the Minister's statement, and so the matter is more than

just a debating point; it is one of serious concern for this Government, and the matter should be straightened out quickly.

Sydney Hospital should not be left where it is. The buildings are old and are in bad shape. Extensions cannot be made outwards from the existing structures; they will have to go upwards. If that is to happen, the present building will have to be pulled down first. In any event, it should be pulled down and moved; its present position is not one for a hospital. I am not saying that it should go to Parramatta, but it should be put where it can be used to the best advantage. There are places within metropolitan Sydney where a new Sydney hospital could be built.

The Hon. W. C. PETERS: It could be moved to the markets area.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: The floors of Sydney Hospital are old and the buildings are decrepit. A hospital should be a place of comfort, architecturally pleasing, and in no way disagreeable to a patient unfortunate enough to be taken there. Sydney Hospital should be a building to inspire pride. At the moment it is a public disgrace, as Parliament House is a public disgrace, though having the two together does not make one worse than the other; the disgrace is simply doubled.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: It might breed a new one.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: I take it that the Minister means, breed a new public disgrace. That would not surprise me. Already we have a big enough scandal over the opera house. I should hate to see this Government start The Rocks reconstruction as promised by the Hon. R. W. Manyweathers, because it will make a mess of that, too. As the Hon. W. C. Peters says, there is no reason why the hospital should not be moved to some other part of the metropolitan area. Perhaps it could be moved to the vicinity of the eye hospital.

The Government has no compunction in demolishing houses to make way for the eastern suburbs railway, so why not demolish more houses for a new site for Sydney Hospital? Although the Government

is taking a lot of credit for the eastern suburbs railway, they are still only driving the hole, and a hole does not give them a completed railway. The previous Liberal Government said Labor should have completed the eastern suburbs railway, but the new government is only just starting on it. I give the Government credit only for taking the eastern suburbs railway a step nearer completion.

People who are ill or injured and require hospital accommodation ought to get the treatment they are entitled to. The Government should alter its thinking about the removal of Sydney Hospital from the city area. I am wondering whether the Sydney Hospital board is telling the Government what to do or the Government is telling the board what to do. The Government should inform the board that its function is to administer Government policy. I am a very interested spectator standing on the sideline watching the contest for power between the Sydney Hospital board and the Minister. Soon we shall know where the real power is. Any further action relating to the removal of Sydney Hospital has been stopped pending an inquiry, but it has not been announced whether the inquiry is to be at Ministerial or Cabinet level. Dr Ritchie was the first to unsheath the knife. He said the Minister for Health did not know what he was talking about. It will be interesting to see whether Dr Ritchie is telling the truth.

In his Speech the Governor referred to the regionalization of the public hospitals system. That is a beautiful phrase, but it takes determined men to give teeth to a beautiful phrase; it may be that Dr Ritchie is such a man. At least he had the courage to say that the Minister for Health does not know what he is talking about. The hatchets are coming out. When the present Government was in Opposition its members asked terse questions about Sydney Hospital.

The Hon. R. R. DOWNING: They wanted a committee appointed.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: When a Labor government wanted to shift Sydney Hospital they were very concerned. The

hatchets really came out then. I am wondering whom the Minister for Health will go to see next. He has already been around the mulberry bush once. He told the Sydney Hospital board he would have nothing to do with them, but his own Government told him to go back and talk to the board, and so out come the knives. Earlier in my address I said there were about five projects referred to in the Governor's Address that were started and well advanced under a Labor government. I overlooked two others. On page 3 of the Speech His Excellency said that the first section of the Warringah Expressway was recently opened to traffic. That is very good, and I commend the Government for finishing something that Labor started and substantially completed.

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: The Liberal-Country Party only cut the ribbon.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Yes, at least they did that. If Dr Ritchie gets hold of a certain Mr Jago, there might be another type of cut. Another item in His Excellency's Speech which is worth mentioning is that the Sydney-Newcastle Expressway south of the Hawkesbury River is expected to be brought into use next December. That was the decision of Labor. That was planned by Labor. It was started by Labor, and Labor determined that it would be opened this December. However, this Government has now qualified the situation by saying that it is expected that the expressway will be opened in December; not that it will, but it might. That is the difference.

Let us look at what is proposed for the future. In a little more than one page of His Excellency's Speech we are told about twenty-four bills that are to be introduced. Of course, I am not presumptuous enough to expect to be told the contents of those bills, but look at the generalization. Speaking of the immediate future, His Excellency said:

During the session my Ministers propose to submit to you an extensive programme of legislation including measures to give effect to undertakings given before the general election held earlier this year.

I suppose that might mean the policy speech, but it might not.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: It is negative enough.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: It is general enough not to mean anything. In the second last paragraph of the Speech, after mentioning the twenty-four bills, His Excellency said:

Other measures will also be placed before you.

That gives a very wide charter. The programme is soul-destroying and absolutely devoid of leadership. We are to be asked to consider, for example, a bill designed to consolidate the laws relating to the University of New South Wales. That will be a magnificent effort of statesmanship. We are told that the Government will seek the approval of Parliament to a bill to amend the Library Act, and that kind of thing.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: What about the bananas?

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Bananas come into it, too, but it does not say anything about pineapples—they have rough ends. His Excellency said also:

Parliamentary authority will be sought for the reservation of three additional major areas as national parks.

If anything is a blot on this Government, it is what is happening in national parks and to national parks. The Government ought to be thoroughly ashamed of itself for even mentioning those two words, national parks. You will recall, Mr President, that the National Parks and Wildlife Bill was before this Parliament a few years ago. It might have been last year; it certainly was not a Labor bill. It was Labor that directed the Government's attention to the shortcomings of the bill, and how it would destroy the very things that the Government thought it would preserve, and how it would prostitute the very beautiful Mount Armour section of the Kanangra-Boyd reserve. That is just what is happening now.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: Do you know how many leases the previous Government granted in the Colong Caves area?

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: That is no way to vindicate the shortcoming of the Minister's Government.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: You are criticizing something that you did yourself.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Five years have passed. You flew out the flags and told us what was to happen with this magnificent National Parks and Wildlife Bill. Mr Weems was imported from America because he happened to have the know-how. Apparently we did not have it in this State; we did not have the capabilities. There was no potential here, so Mr Weems was brought out. However, I shall come to him in a moment. First, let me read this article from the bulletin of the National Trust of February, 1968:

The decision of the N.S.W. Government to permit the mining of Mt Armour, in the Colong Reserve, has two aspects which must cause grave concern to members of the National Trust and to all citizens (and their numbers are legion), who see the importance of conservation in the long-term interest of Australia and its people.

The first is the adverse effect on the proposed Kanangra/Boyd National Park; the second is the clear implication that the prime consideration of the Government is the immediate economic gain from exploitation of mineral resources and that conservation is a secondary concern.

They are not my words or the words of Labor criticizing a destroying government; these are the words of the people who form the National Trust, a body set up by the Government and by previous governments. This is a responsible body telling the Government what it ought to do in the way of preserving instead of destroying. They charge the Government with exploitation of the nation's heritage by private people for private profit, when the very stuff that is to be mined at Mt Armour can be got down here at Berrima. The Government was told this, but it can be exploited for friends of the Government—and Berrima apparently is not a friend of the Government. The Government gives to its friends that which they can exploit for their own private profit, though it results in the destruction of our national parks. What is happening to the red kangaroos? What is happening to the red and fallow deer in Royal National Park? Mr Weems is throwing his hands in the air saying, "Goodness gracious me,

what can I do about this?" He is in a fit of utter despair, but the Government is not in despair over what is happening at Mt Armour. It is assisting, aiding and abetting its own people to exploit this heritage, which is ours. The bulletin goes on to say:

The right and indeed the responsibility of the Government to resolve such matters is not questioned, but the history of the conflict between mining interests and conservation in the Colong Reserve forces the conclusion that once the mining project becomes big enough it will prevail with Government. It was this which influenced the Council of the Trust and the members present at the Annual General Meeting to express their dissatisfaction with the decision of the Government on Colong.

This happens to be in complete conformity with what the Hon. J. C. McIntosh said when he pleaded with the Government this week to preserve the beaches from the ravishing rutile mining firms, and spoke some words which left grave doubt about what he thought of Murphyores, which is making a pretty good thing out of beach minerals. Therefore, the Government's own supporters are querulous about its actions. Its own bodies are being critical of its actions. The National Trust says that a strong case for review of the decision to ravish Mt Armour was put to the Government.

In reply the Premier has stated that the Government, while "extremely reluctant" to approve the lease, considered that the removal of the limestone was *in the best interests of the State*.

What a wicked statement to make. Other limestone areas in New South Wales are closer to roads and other forms of transport than the deposits in the Mt Armour area. Moreover, it will be necessary to build a new road to provide access to the limestone deposits there, and a new sludge pipe will have to be laid. All this work will deface the natural beauty of a national park. Great swathes of timber will be ripped out, to be replaced with a few ugly steel pylons to hold high voltage transmission lines, ravaging the countryside still further.

Late last year a set of these power lines was to be taken through the Earlwood-Bexley area to tie in with the grid system. The proposed work would have been visible

*The Hon. C. Colborne]*

from the front of the home of the Chief Secretary at Earlwood. The Government, it was said, had made up its mind that this work would proceed come hell or high water. This was the position until one morning the Chief Secretary looked across the vista and realized where the transmission lines were to go. Those lines have been shifted elsewhere.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: What an awful error!

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: I should like to laugh about it, but I do not find it funny. If the Chief Secretary can get away with it, let him. What is to his advantage will obviously be to somebody else's disadvantage. He would not be concerned unless he were disadvantaged. Exactly the same sort of work is to be done in the Mt Amour area. However, this power transmission line will not pass the residence of the Chief Secretary so the pylons will be erected because the Premier says that in this area they are in the best interests of the State. To his statement I add that they will ravage for posterity the natural beauty of this national park. The Premier also said this about the matter:

Reports obtained by the Minister (for Mines) reveal that the deposits in the Colong area are the nearest to Sydney which can be worked on an economic basis.

That is as good an excuse as any. The article in the *National Trust Bulletin* contains this statement:

This is no more than to say that the deposits at Colong offer the most attractive proposition to the company concerned.

In other words, the beauty of the Colong area is to be destroyed so that supporters of the Liberal-Country Party Government may make profits. The Premier continued:

Ultimately it is a matter for the community to determine whether it wants unrestricted economic development, even at the expense of highly important elements of the national heritage, or whether it wants that heritage preserved.

Thus the matter remains with the people and the sooner the next three years pass the better. The people did not learn their lesson in the previous three years, but they

cannot continue to put up with this sort of treatment from the Government. At some stage the people will cry out loudly enough about what has been done to them.

I want to make one other point on the preservation of flora and fauna in national parks. In the Kinchega National Park of 188,000 acres, a recent count was made of forty kangaroos. One of the objects of this national park is the preservation of fauna. I had the unsatisfactory experience of seeing on television a documentary showing how shooters go out to destroy kangaroos for their hides and meat. The Government has done nothing to stop this. Incidentally, while talking of kangaroos, I might say that I am wearing a pair of shoes I bought in the United States of America, made of kangaroo skin.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: They might be Alaskan kangaroos.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: They happen to be Australian.

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: Would the honourable member say whether the area he mentioned, where kangaroos were shot in large numbers, is in the State of New South Wales? I rather thought it was in the Northern Territory.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: No; that was another documentary. This was in New South Wales. The kangaroo carcasses were being exported from here. I have not had the time to inquire whether they are still being exported. I am wearing a pair of shoes made from exported carcasses. There is no doubt that some shooters are engaging in wholesale slaughter: there will be no kangaroos left within a short time. There should be thousands of kangaroos in our national parks. Instead, there are perhaps a hundred lions or so at Warragamba. They will be protected. There are armed guards to protect the people, but at the same time they protect the lions. This brings me to the Royal National Park. On almost any night of the week anybody can go to the Royal National Park and find shooters destroying the red and fallow deer.

The Hon. A. A. ALAM: Where are the rangers?

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: There were five rangers at the last count unless some of them were shot in mistake for deer. I do not want this to be taken as a laughing matter. Leaving the Royal National Park aside, I must say that where shooting of this nature goes on, a chap with a pack on his back or a fisherman can be mistaken for an animal. A trigger-happy person with a gun in his hand will shoot at anything. One road sign in the Royal National Park has thirty bullet holes in it: the shooters could not find an animal to shoot at, so they shot at the sign. Red deer and fallow deer have been shot in the Royal National Park, which has only about five rangers.

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: This has been happening for many years, though.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Yes. Mr Weems was going to wave the magic wand, but what did he do? He merely said he is sorry, but he cannot help. I have not with me the report of what he said, but my understanding of his statement is that he said the authorities will prosecute any offenders they apprehend. He said that there were only about five rangers. I am using the word "about", but he used the word "about", too. He does not even know his staff. He says that there are about five rangers in the Royal National Park. He says, also, that he has not enough money at his command and that he wants more rangers. He might have about ten, but the exact count might be twenty or thirty. This is the man who was going to show us how to conduct our national parks. He says, in effect, "Well, we will do the best we can with the equipment at our disposal"—and the equipment is almost a minus quantity. It is in an extraordinary bad state.

I have spoken about Colong Caves and about kangaroos and other animals. I feel that this Government does not take sufficient interest in what is being said in this Parliament—at least in this Chamber—to cause it to make inquiries to ascertain what is going on. I say this very seriously. I am not trying to say that Labor government is

the beginning and end of good government, that it has a halo, that it is perfectionist, but may I say that when Labor was in office and in the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I posed a question, I always, without requesting it, got a reply from the appropriate Minister. The speeches were dissected and a reply was given to the member who had asked the question. I am referring not to a question asked at question time, but to one raised in debate. In contrast, I have not had one reply from any Minister in this Government or in the previous Liberal-Country Party Government. I hardly expect one from this Government at the moment, because it has not been in long enough. I should say that it has been in long enough, but that it has worked only nine days in six months and it will go on in its somnolent mood for just a little longer. This sort of thing makes me feel that this Government does not look at what a member says in his speech and does not make inquiries to ascertain the true position. We ought to be given the answers to the questions that we pose in debate and I hope that what I have said will be read by whoever looks after flora and fauna and that we will get back on to the work of preservation.

His Excellency's Speech displays a very poor record put up by a very lazy government. The speech could not be anything other than what it is, for the Government has no record. Its only record is of having won an election, and of having been re-elected, but it has nothing to back it up. An election was held in February and subsequently we met for nine sitting days. From February to August is six months. Though we sat for only nine days in six months, surely the Government must have had a tremendous amount of work on its hands. We have now started on this session which, I suppose, will go on until Christmas time. I put up the hypothetical proposition that if the Government's performance in the financial year 1968-69 is a repetition of its record in 1967-68, we are in a pretty bad way. Indeed, we are in a state of irresponsibility. I hope the Government does not continue like this. Previously I have mentioned that for a parallel we have to go back to 1934, to the Victorian Parliament under the leadership of Sir Stanley Argyle

*The Hon. C. Colborne]*

who, like this Government, governed by regulation. He was charged by the people, as I am charging this Government, with governing not by legislation but by regulation.

Sir Stanley, just like the Premier of New South Wales, tried to hoodwink the people by saying that he was governing and had regulations to say so. He thought that the people were foolish enough not to know the difference between regulations and legislation. No one has heard of Sir Stanley Argyle since 1934. At the beginning of that year he was in an impregnable position but because he governed by regulation rather than by legislation he went out of office in the middle of 1934 and has not been heard of since. Of course, he has been dead for some time but it is over thirty years since he was heard of. He has not left his mark on the statute book and this is something that the Government might well consider.

For six months no work has been done and now honourable members have before them a Speech that does not give any hope of action in the future. Just to let the Government know that what is set out in the Speech is not the beginning and end of everything, let me say that it was probably prepared in this way following the Government's record and its policy of least said, soonest mended. I invite attention to the way that some people will speak and so embarrass their colleagues and the whole structure of government. The Government could be excused for being so thoroughly embarrassed with its Premier that it prepared the Speech that His Excellency delivered here. The Premier made an after-dinner speech at the American Chamber of Commerce. He was in a happy and jovial frame of mind. He wanted to impress—and he did so. He impressed President Johnson when he was last here. We have it from the Premier's own lips that the President was impressed. President Johnson smiled.

The Hon. R. S. JACKSON: Will he get a purple heart?

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Probably. When the President came here there was, as was natural, a demonstration against the

Vietnam war. Unfortunately I was not in Sydney; otherwise I should have been with it. I have nothing but admiration for the demonstrators as members of the public who came out and demonstrated the way they did, then and since—since, with the police removing their identification badges. When the President was here we, as democrats, were telling him we did not think very much of his policy in Vietnam. We were telling him that we did not much like the way that the Askin and the Commonwealth governments were mixed up with it. We were protesting. The people are entitled to protest. The Premier may have been thinking of the Hon. R. C. Packer when he told the police, "Run over the bastards." That is supposed to be a word of endearment, but it does not put the Premier in a decent light if he uses the English language in that way. He has a poor grip of the vocabulary if he uses not the choicest phrases but the filthiest, dirtiest, and lowest words he can find. He said that he could tell, from the expression on President Johnson's face, that he was pleased with the remark. Probably he was pleased with the remark because he did not know what it meant. There are many things that he does not know—and I am not talking about the Premier, either. There are many things that the President is learning, too. But here is the rub: the Premier was talking at a dinner.

The Hon. R. C. PACKER: At a luncheon.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: It was somewhere where they were eating. The Hon. R. C. Packer might have been there, and he might have been the one who led the clapping and cheering for this anecdote. The Premier laughed too, and he thought it was funny—until the public reaction came out the next day. He is not laughing any more, but is saying that it was said as a joke, in a half-hearted, light manner. He is trying to excuse himself after embarrassing everybody and anybody who could be embarrassed. But he does not embarrass anybody who cannot be embarrassed. He embarrassed lots of people, including the clergy. Of course, he got funnier; he might have used even a four-letter word. He referred also to these people as the great unwashed.

That expression is not original. Bishop Moyes said, "That is good", because he happens to be one of the great unwashed. So am I.

The police officer did not take much notice of the Hon. R. W. Askin. Probably he did the same as we did—ignored him, as he ought to be ignored. Then the Government got back into the hole where it came from, and it has done nothing since. It has not even improved on the famous speech. As we cheer and clap and hurrah—probably the American Hurrah—we should be very pleased, I suppose, that this kind of exhibition will not be coming again.

I was hoping to say something about what the Government should do. I shall mention one matter, but not elaborate on it. We speak today of the affluent society, a phrase that has been bandied around and that makes people feel that they are well off. An affluent society does not exist for people who work to live. In another place last evening the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that 200,000 people are in pretty bad financial circumstances. I do not know what the count is—it could be 500,000 or 10,000—but a survey of poverty may disclose such a serious position that the Australian Council of Trade Unions is now launching a professional scheme for finding where the poverty exists throughout Australia.

Any person earning a wage of less than \$40 a week is experiencing the greatest difficulties. But unless we know where the poverty exists and who is suffering from it, we are unable to tackle the problem. It is no use in the meantime talking about the affluent society. The Sutherland Shire Council, which is not a Labor council, is to appoint an officer to attend to social welfare work. There is so much poverty in our community that at least one council is facing its public duty. At a later stage, and not of course during the Address-in-Reply debate, I may get an opportunity to develop this subject.

The last time the matter was mentioned here the late Mr Bridges expressed some surprise that soup kitchens were still operating in Sussex Street. The soup kitchens

are still there, as are the places providing beds farther up the hill. We cannot gild the lily by talking of an affluent society. There is nothing affluent about it. Those who are in fortunate circumstances apparently do not know what is going on. One of the first things the Government should have done was to make a survey of the extent of poverty in this State, and then to legislate about it. That is what we are here for. We have poverty in the midst of plenty, and ought to do something about it. I do not commend the Government on His Excellency's Speech. I think it is the worst speech I have ever read. It is the emptiest document ever presented.

The Hon. R. C. PACKER: You said that last year.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: And I am saying it again to you now, in case you are of the same quality as the rest of the Government and say nothing, know nothing, and do nothing.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. W. C. Peters.

#### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Motion (by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller) agreed to:

That this House, at its rising today, do adjourn until Tuesday next.

#### ADJOURNMENT

##### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER (Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Vice-President of the Executive Council) [6.33]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

For the benefit of honourable members I might mention that it is expected that the debate on the Address in Reply will be completed by next Wednesday night. This means that we may possibly have to sit after dinner on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. It is expected that we shall be able to present the Address to His Excellency on Thursday afternoon, following the

ballot in the morning. It is also expected that this House will not sit in the week commencing 2nd September, 1968.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 6.34 p.m.

---

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 22 August, 1968

---

Questions without Notice—Invasion of Czechoslovakia (Urgency)—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Seventh Day's Debate).

---

Mr SPEAKER (THE HON. KEVIN ELLIS) took the chair at 11 a.m.

Mr SPEAKER offered the Prayer.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### TRANGIE RESEARCH STATION

Mr MASON: I ask the Minister for Agriculture whether he has had the opportunity of inspecting the graphic expansion of irrigation projects in the Macquarie Valley following the completion of the Burrendong Dam and the Trangie research station. In view of the urgent need for the Department of Agriculture to undertake irrigation research in the Macquarie Valley, will the Minister take any action necessary to initiate such a research project at this research station at Trangie?

Mr CRAWFORD: Unfortunately, I have seen only a very small part of the tremendous expansion of irrigation in the Macquarie Valley but I am well aware that it is progressing and that it will make a tremendous difference to production in that very rich and fertile area. I have had the opportunity of inspecting the Trangie research station and I am sure that all members will be pleased to know that our research work there, which is done by about twelve research officers, has attracted worldwide recognition. A tremendous amount of work is being done there on sheep nutrition, sheep