

the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government under its external affairs powers.

Immigration matters which come within the State sphere are possibly only those relating to British citizens—people who have come to Australia principally from the United Kingdom. Those persons who have come to Australia from foreign countries are principally the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. In this matter there must be a great deal of co-operation between Commonwealth and State authorities. On more than one occasion, as the Minister in this State responsible for immigration matters, I have acted in liaison with the Commonwealth. I intimate to the honourable member for Murrumbidgee that I will look into this particular case. I am as anxious as he is that we should get into Australia as many immigrants as possible, particularly those whose skills will be of help to us in improving our national resources and our general standards.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 18 September, 1968

Companies (Transfer of Domicile) Bill (third reading)—Local Government (Regulation of Flats) Amendment Bill (third reading)—Local Government (Elections) Amendment Bill (first reading)—Government Guarantees (Amendment) Bill (first reading)—Supply Bill (first reading)—Printed Question and Answer—Questions without Notice—Softwood Forestry Agreement Bill (second reading)—Fisheries and Oyster Farms (Amendment) Bill (second reading).

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Hon. F. W. SPICER) took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

COMPANIES (TRANSFER OF DOMICILE) BILL

THIRD READING

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Assembly without amendment, on motions by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (REGULATION OF FLATS) AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Assembly without amendment, on motions by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ELECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

FIRST READING

Bill received from the Legislative Assembly and, on motions by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, read a first time and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLY BILL

FIRST READING

Bill received from the Legislative Assembly and, on motions by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, read a first time and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES (AMENDMENT) BILL

FIRST READING

Bill received from the Legislative Assembly and, on motions by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, read a first time and ordered to be printed.

PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. C. J. CAHILL asked THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—(1) Did the Forbes Municipal Council, as a water authority, recently cease fluoridation for the purposes of maintenance operations? (2) Did that council request the Department of Health to make an analysis of corroded and rusted out pipes and equipment? (3) Did the Department of Health refuse to carry out an analysis on the grounds that it was "time consuming and a waste of time"? (4) When the council insisted, did the Department of Health further reply that it would cost the council \$500 for them to do an analysis? (5) Finally, did a private firm carry out an

analysis at a cost of \$25 of a Forbes washing machine pipe, which showed 39,000 parts per million of fluoride in the corrosion?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER replied—I am advised by the Minister for Health as follows: (1) Yes. (2) Yes. (3) The Department of Public Health did not refuse to carry out an analysis. In a letter dated 5th July, 1968, the Government Analyst informed the town clerk, Forbes Municipal Council that, after consideration of the request for analysis, he was of the opinion that nothing useful would be achieved by this time wasting and time consuming procedure. As a more effective alternative he intimated that a controlled study comparing fluoridated and non-fluoridated water supplies would be carried out. (4) On 15th July, 1968, the department's analyst-in-charge of fluoridation visited Forbes. During discussions with council officers he mentioned that a thorough analysis of the samples submitted by council would cost, including labour and materials, about \$500. (5) On 19th March, 1968, the Department of Public Health received a letter from the Forbes Municipal Council enclosing a photostat copy of a report from R. K. Newman & Company Proprietary Limited, public analysts of Sydney, reporting on an analysis of scrapings from a washing machine. The report stated "the scrapings weighed 0.792 g. and, on analysis, were found to contain 3.9 per cent fluorine". This is equivalent to 39,000 parts per million of fluoride in the corrosion. This however bears no relevance to the amount of fluoride in the reticulated water supply. The department is not aware of the cost of this analysis.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: I ask the Minister for Child Welfare and Minister for Social Welfare a question without notice. Is the Minister aware that many authorities give as a basic cause of juvenile delinquency the lack of community social and athletic facilities, and subsequent boredom? Is the Minister aware also that there

is a growing tendency on the part of the Housing Commission and private developers to establish satellite towns and villages without the necessary provision of these amenities? If these are facts, would the Minister confer with his colleagues the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Housing, with a view to evolving some scheme for the compulsory provision of basic approved amenities for successful community life in all developing satellite areas?

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT: I have been advised by my department that statistics seem to indicate that the incidence of juvenile delinquency is, generally speaking, greater in areas in which children do not have the type of facilities referred to by the honourable member. I shall certainly take up this matter with the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Housing.

FILMS

The Hon. H. D. O'CONNELL: I wish to ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council a question without notice. Is it a fact that the American film industry is considering embarking on a policy of elimination of sexual and delinquent films? Is it a fact, also, that the proposal will bar children under 16 from attending classified films? Further, is it a fact that Portugal for many years has not allowed children under 16 to attend the usual films, permitting them to attend only educational, geographic, cultural and music-inspired performances? If these are facts, will the Minister have inquiries made through the appropriate State and federal sources with a view to immediate action being taken here on similar lines? Will he also refer this question to the committee of this House currently inquiring into violent sex crimes?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I know that the producers in the United States film industry have had a self-imposed censorship, which I understand has for many years worked very effectively. I do not know what approach is made in the United States of America or Portugal at the present time in relation to showing films or to restricting to persons above a certain age the

viewing of films classified as undesirable. However, I shall consult my colleague the Chief Secretary to see whether I can obtain some details of what is happening in this regard in other countries, and whether there would be any application in this State. I shall also ask my colleague whether he feels it would be suitable for this matter to be referred to the committee on violent sex crimes that was referred to by the honourable member.

SOFTWOOD FORESTRY AGREEMENT BILL

SECOND READING

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER (Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Vice-President of the Executive Council) [4.47]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this bill is to ratify the agreement made between the Commonwealth and the State of New South Wales relating to the increased plantings in this State of softwoods. This Commonwealth-State agreement had its genesis in the deliberations of the Australian Forestry Council, which was established in July, 1964, to deal with forestry and timber problems on a national basis. The Australian Forestry Council consists of the Minister for National Development, the Commonwealth Minister for Territories and the six State Ministers responsible for forestry development. The Minister for National Development is the chairman of the council, which is assisted by a permanent standing committee of State and Commonwealth forestry officers.

One of the first major problems dealt with by the council was an examination of the developing world timber shortage as related to Australia. At the outbreak of World War II the annual value of forest products consumed in Australia was in the vicinity of \$60,000,000. Of this sum, native forest products represented about \$40,000,000, and \$20,000,000 was accounted for by the value of imports. Along with the general development of industry in Australia during

the twenty years that followed the end of the war, there was a striking increase in the annual value of forest products consumed. The figure rose to \$700,000,000. The products from our native forests are valued at \$500,000,000, and the forest products imports bill has now reached \$200,000,000. It was apparent to the Australian Forestry Council that effective steps would have to be taken to increase local production of timber.

After a thorough investigation, the council recommended an increase in the Australian softwood plantings rate from 28,000 acres annually to 75,000 acres annually. This figure includes 10,000 acres of which the council considered the planting should be undertaken by private companies and individual landholders. The increase in the rate of softwood plantings was essential to both the Commonwealth and to the States, first, because of the need to ensure a greater degree of self-sufficiency in the production of Australian timber products so that this country will be able to meet demands in the event of a world timber shortage occurring; and second, to reduce the large annual timber import bill which adversely affects our balance of trade. As in all plantings programmes, finance is the critical factor.

Within Australia, and exclusive of territories under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth, forestry development is the constitutional responsibility of the States. New South Wales was already undertaking, in accordance with its constitutional responsibilities, a substantial forestry programme within the limits of finance available to the Government. Other States were in somewhat similar positions. This State's representative on the Australian Forestry Council, the Minister for Conservation, received strong support from our sister States in claims for a Commonwealth grant of at least half the cost of additional plantings that the council had recommended. However, the Commonwealth would agree to make finance available to the States only for the purposes recommended by the Australian Forestry Council, in the form of loans for plantings additional to those established in

the base year. Following negotiations between the Commonwealth and the States, agreement to the scheme was reached in principle.

The Softwood Forestry Agreement Act was passed by the federal Parliament and came into operation on 25th May, 1967. At that time agreement had not been reached with any of the States, and the Commonwealth Act provided for the execution of an agreement between the Commonwealth and any State, substantially in accordance with the form contained in the schedule to that Act. An agreement was signed on 2nd June, 1967, between the Premier of New South Wales and the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia. In the agreement the Commonwealth undertook to provide special loans to the State of New South Wales to finance increased softwood plantings.

I shall now explain the provisions of the bill and the agreement to the House. The bill itself contains only three clauses. The first is the short title; the second ratifies the agreement, which is set out in the schedule; and the third validates any action taken by the State, the Minister or any person specified in the agreement. The preamble to the agreement makes a number of provisions. The first is that the Australian Forestry Council has recommended that the rate of softwood planting should be increased to an annual average of 75,000 acres within the next thirty-five years. Second, the Commonwealth and the States have agreed on specific programmes, subject to funds being available, for a five-year period, which commenced on 1st July, 1966. Third, the State is desirous of undertaking its share of the proposed programme. Fourth, the Commonwealth Government has agreed to request the Commonwealth Parliament to authorize the granting of financial assistance to the State for softwood plantings purposes in accordance with section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Fifth, the Commonwealth Parliament has, in fact, authorised the grant of such financial assistance.

Clause 1 of the agreement deals with definitions. The expression "base year planting" means that the 1965 calendar year

softwood planting in New South Wales, assessed at 8,100 acres. "Cost of planting" means those costs incurred by the State and calculated in a manner approved by the federal Treasurer and is to be directly attributable to (a) planting, (b) tending planting, and (c) replanting failed planting. It was envisaged that the State would receive loans for all normal planting costs, including land clearing, road work, protection, tending the crop and acquisition of land where necessary. "Additional planting" means the area by which the net area of planting in any year of the currency of the programme exceeds the base year planting.

Clause 2 is the vital clause of the agreement. It provides for financial assistance in the way of loans to New South Wales. The loans are to be repaid over a period of twenty-five years. The loan repayments and the payment of interest will commence on the expiration of ten years after each advance. The financial assistance to be granted to this State in any one year will be in proportion to the total cost of new plantings incurred by the Government in that year up to the acreage limit set out in the agreement. Clause 3 provides for payments by the Commonwealth and for the State to furnish evidence as required by the Commonwealth in support of its claims. The Auditor-General of New South Wales is required to certify the correctness of a claim to the Commonwealth.

Clause 4 authorizes the Commonwealth Treasurer to make advance payments to the State. Incidentally, advance payments in respect of the first two years' operations under the agreement have been received from the Commonwealth. Clause 5 is a machinery clause relating to the use to be made by the State Government of payments and advances. Clause 6 relates to interest. Loans will be free of interest and repayments of instalments for the first ten years. The current rate of interest is 5½ per cent per annum, but the rate of interest is defined as that which is equivalent to the rate of yield to maturity of the long-term loan last raised by the Commonwealth in Australia for public subscription, prior to the date on which the relevant payment or advance was made. Clause 7 provides for

the repayment of the loan to the Commonwealth by fifty equal half-yearly payments, commencing in the eleventh year after the advance was made to the New South Wales Government. Clauses 8 to 12 are also machinery clauses relating to the execution of the programme, annual estimates, supply of information, audit and notices between the parties. The agreement does not specify the type of softwoods to be planted. This is left to the discretion of the States.

Softwoods have been grown in Australian plantations with considerable success in suitable soil and climatic conditions. It is true that in New South Wales some forty years ago, some planting of softwoods was undertaken where the soil and climatic conditions were not all that they might be. However, the Forestry Act was amended to overcome this. Section 13 (4) now provides that no plantings with exotic species of timber shall be undertaken except with the written approval of the Minister, which approval shall not be given unless evidence has been produced to the effect that the soil, site and climate are such as to ensure the success of the planting. By far the greater part of the plantings under the agreement will be undertaken with *pinus radiata* or Monterey pine. Provision is made in the agreement for the carry-over of planting from one year to another during the term of agreement. Thus the scheme is given a degree of flexibility in arrangement in that it permits a carry-over when plantings in any one year do not, because of drought or otherwise unfavourable seasonal conditions reach the target acreage. The carry-over is at the discretion of the Minister for National Development.

The New South Wales programme as outlined in the schedule provides for the acreages of annual softwoods plantings in this way: taking the base year with plantings of 8,100 acres, the figure for 1967 will be 12,500 acres; for 1968, 16,000 acres; for 1969, 17,500 acres; for 1970, 18,300 acres; and for 1971, 19,600 acres. During the first two years of the agreement the target acreages were not achieved because of the extremely dry weather conditions. However, the Forestry Commission will

The Hon. J. B. M. Fuller]

take advantage of the carry-over provisions and most of the leeway will be made up in the present planting year. Next year should see this State a little ahead of the programme. The target set for New South Wales provides for more than double the programme of the base year over a period of five years.

Under the agreement, this State will receive loans totalling about \$6,000,000 over a five-year period, towards a \$12,500,000 softwoods planting programme. In fact, the State programme over the five-year period will total \$14,500,000 to cover expenditure not allowable by the Commonwealth. The intention is to review the position prior to June, 1971, when the agreement expires, and to consider a renewal of the programme to provide for plantings after that year.

There are two aspects of the bill that I wish to emphasize. First, a renewal of the programme is essential if this State is to achieve its recommended objective. Second, the years between the eleventh and the fifteenth years are critical years to the States so far as finance is concerned. The States have to take the risk during these critical years. No worthwhile returns will be received from thinnings, yet the State must find finance to pay interest and repay capital to the Commonwealth. In fact, when the Government introduced the farm woodlot scheme two years ago, it provided for a fifteen-year period free of interest and repayment of capital. However, the Government regards this agreement as a most welcome break-through in the provision of finance for native forestry development, despite the fact that the Commonwealth assistance falls somewhat short of what was sought by the States.

This agreement has not arrived any too soon, because forestry is essentially a long-term business. Hand in hand with the expanded softwood plantings programme, the Forestry Commission will be undertaking, on behalf of the Government, the accelerated development of our native timber stands. During the three-year period prior to 1965, 185,000 acres of indigenous forests were silviculturally treated. In the following three years, 226,000 acres of native

forests have received silvicultural treatment. This silvicultural programme will greatly increase the output of native timbers. Private forestry has not been overlooked and farmers are being encouraged to establish farm woodlots on their properties. Loans up to \$5,000 to establish woodlots on areas up to 100 acres are available to landholders. These loans, as applying to pines, are free of interest for the first fifteen years and repayments are made over the following fifteen years. Loans for native species and poplars are also available under varying conditions. From this outline of the bill and the general picture which I have given regarding both the present and the future timber position, it will be seen that everything reasonably possible is being done to ensure that this country does not face a timber shortage. I commend the bill to the House.

The Hon. R. R. DOWNING (Leader of the Opposition) [5.1]: The Minister has given an explanation of this agreement that has been entered into with the Commonwealth. The purpose of the bill is to ratify that agreement. As the Minister said, the production of softwoods is important to the economy of Australia. According to the last figures I have seen, the value of timber imports to this country is about \$200,000,000 a year. With the possible exception of oil, I think timber is our greatest and most expensive import. With the discovery of oil off the Australian shores, I suppose that, if not now, it will not be long before timber is the most costly import item in Australia. Therefore, anything that is done to encourage softwood production in this country is to be commended.

The scheme of this agreement follows the scheme of many other agreements, and I am sure that the Hon. H. D. Ahern and others will find the objection to it which I have mentioned on other occasions when we in New South Wales have been obliged to enter into such agreements. It is another example of the Commonwealth dictating to the States what they are to do. This is an exercise of the Commonwealth's powers under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. The Commonwealth gives money to the States conditional upon the States using the money in the way directed

by the Commonwealth. In saying that, I am not suggesting that softwood planting is not a proper and commendable thing to be undertaken in New South Wales. However, this is another instance of New South Wales not being able to determine its own policy and not being permitted to work out how it would expend the money if it got a proper allocation of loan funds.

The effect of this, as has happened on other occasions with the exercise of section 96 of the Constitution, is really that the Commonwealth determines expenditure priorities for the States. As the Minister said, New South Wales will be called upon between the eleventh and fifteenth year to meet the interest charges plus repayments which will extend from the tenth year for the next following twenty-five years. After fifteen years there will be a return from the plantings, but until that time there is no likelihood of the State receiving any return from them.

The Commonwealth has been doing this sort of thing for some time, and continues to do it. The States are in the position where they often feel that other matters have greater priority, but they are compelled, because of the advantage of the Commonwealth grant, to accept it. It was mentioned either by the Minister here or the Minister in another place that, though the Commonwealth grant will have to be repaid, the State will be relieved of interest for the first ten years, amounting to about 33 per cent of the total cost to be incurred.

Subject to those remarks, the bill cannot be objected to. It is a necessary priority, though it is a priority that has been determined for the States by the Commonwealth. I emphasize again that the planting of softwoods is essential in the interests of Australia. I have seen figures which suggest that by the year 2000, 3,000,000 acres under softwood will be required to meet Australian needs. This is not a problem that is peculiar to this country. The only thing that would obviate the need for this vast quantity of softwood planting by the year 2000 is the invention of some substitute for timber which would be just as effective and cheaper. I have thought that

some of the money coming into Australia might with advantage be invested in private plantings of softwood.

I know what the Minister has said about giving encouragement to landholders to plant softwoods. The plan envisages an acreage of up to 100. The landholder can get an allowance of up to \$5,000, which is free of interest for fifteen years, and he will have another fifteen years to repay it. I feel, having regard to the profits that can probably be made from a long-term capital investment in timber, that something might be done by the Commonwealth to encourage investment in this industry by giving incentives, such as taxation allowances. The Commonwealth could, for example, give taxation concessions covering the full amount or a large proportion of the initial cost, as happens in other rural activities. With the incentive of a taxation rebate, the softwood deficiency in Australia could quickly be overtaken. The Commonwealth must act quickly along these lines. This is not unreasonable. The Commonwealth gives taxation concessions in respect of mining; it has done so for some years. It has allowed capital contributions towards mining ventures. It is not unreasonable to expect the Commonwealth to make some taxation concessions available in respect of private investments in the planting of softwoods in this country.

The problem of softwoods is not peculiar to Australia. I think most of the eastern countries, particularly Japan, have an acute shortage of softwoods. Japanese plantations are being planted at the rate of 1,000,000 acres a year. I appreciate that in Japan, a country small in area, a large part of the land under softwood cultivation is not suitable for many other uses. Altogether, the agreement is of advantage to the State. However, as I have said when in office and on other occasions in this House, I much prefer a programme such as this to be adopted by the States themselves rather than at the behest of the Commonwealth.

All honourable members would agree with that view. I am sure that the founders of the Constitution never envisaged that section 96 could be used in such a way as to destroy in many instances the rights of a State to determine its own policy. I might

conclude by saying that one of the examples of this exercise of power under section 96 occurred some years ago when Labor was in office. The Commonwealth offered \$800,000 for sealing a bitumen road between Canberra and Jervis Bay. This was a desirable work but we had a number of other roads in New South Wales which in our view had a much greater priority and more urgently needed to be tar-sealed. What could be done? We could not refuse \$800,000 contributed by the Commonwealth but we had to involve ourselves in another \$2,000,000 of expenditure. I hope this agreement which expires in 1971 will be reviewed in that year. I do not expect that our timber requirements can be met by then and I hope that when the agreement is renewed, the Commonwealth, if it has to use section 96, does so on more favourable terms than it is now doing.

The Hon. F. W. SPICER [5.12]: I support the bill which should be endorsed by every member of the community. If this great country of ours grows as we hope it will we shall in the future need considerable timber resources. I should like the Minister in reply to clear up one point. He said that advances could be made to farmers to put areas on their property under timber. This is good indeed but I should like to ask the Minister whether any provision is made—I cannot see any in the bill—to provide some assistance to local-government bodies that wish to plant areas of timber. Many country municipalities have quite large areas held for water-catchment purposes. The council in my own home town has two areas, one about 70 squares miles of catchment area, and another somewhat smaller. In addition the council has under its control a small forest area. I know that it is anxious to develop the forest that it already has and to protect it. I should like the Minister to clear up whether assistance can be given under the bill to local-government bodies.

It has been my experience, driving through country areas particularly in the Central-west, to find that since the outbreak of myxomatosis we have had quite a remarkable regeneration, in State forests and along stock routes, of cypress pine, which I believe to be second to none as a building

The Hon. R. R. Downing]

material. Certainly it is largely used in country areas. The planting of softwood is good but I do not know whether we could refer to cypress as a softwood. Possibly not; but it is an excellent building timber and something could be done to look after the timber that has been regenerated after recent rain and as a result of the virtual extinction of the rabbit pest.

I have always been interested in timber and indeed in trees generally. I remember that when Mr Swain was Commissioner of Forests I was in his office when he showed me a 6-inch board cut from a cypress pine. He assured me that the tree had grown within seven years but he admitted that it had been grown under cultivation and not in normal conditions. He said that he had had this done to show what could be done with proper care. This measure is a move in the right direction but I cannot see why the Commonwealth would want to charge the State and its citizens interest on the money that it has advanced—which came to the Commonwealth from taxation of our citizens and various other means affecting the people of this State. I support the bill and I hope the Minister will give some information on whether it is possible to subsidize the activities of local-government bodies which agree to establish pine forests.

The Hon. W. J. GERAGHTY [5.16]: I support the measure. It is a wonderful gesture to develop forests in any shape or form, but I have a couple of matters to which the Minister might refer in his reply. I am glad to see that the programming of types of timber will be the responsibility of the State. Radiata pine and Monterey pine are both mentioned. Though I appreciate that with modern treatment radiata has improved and is more suitable as a building material, we know that it has been struck from the specifications of war-service homes and refused by other authorities. Since the treatment technique has been developed I understand that it is a much better timber than it was before. It appears from investigation and research that Monterey is superior to radiata as a building material.

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT: They are the same tree.

The Hon. W. J. GERAGHTY: I see by some specifications that some authorities will allow the outside cladding to be of Monterey pine.

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT: It is used as Monterey by New South Wales manufacturers.

The Hon. W. J. GERAGHTY: I thank the Minister for that information. People who built through war-service, the Rural Bank, and building societies some time ago had terrific trouble with borer infestation in radiata and incurred great cost in re-planning buildings. It was made out that we had a superior timber in Monterey but doubtless this was because of the publicity given to this timber. I have now had that point clarified.

The Hon. F. W. SPICER spoke about cypress pine and hoop pine. I am concerned about the production level of this wonderful cypress pine—an indigenous timber, by the way, which could properly come within the category of the softwood. I know there is some dispute on this but in my opinion cypress is a softwood timber. Honourable members on both sides might be interested to know what action has been taken to develop the protection of this splendid indigenous timber which I believe is becoming more and more difficult to reach. I should hate to see this species exploited to the point where it was no longer available for general building purposes, especially flooring, in which it has a resistance to white ants that other timbers do not have. I should like to know if it is possible for the Minister to say what action has been taken towards re-forestation and protection of cypress pine.

The Hon. R. W. MANYWEATHERS [5.20]: I am happy to have the opportunity of supporting this measure, especially as at the present time in the city of Lismore more than 250 delegates from all parts of Australia are meeting to discuss important questions concerning the timber industry.

Indeed, I understand that the Hon. J. A. Weir is in the district for the purpose of bringing to these discussions the benefit of his knowledge.

Australia's import bill for timber is \$200,000,000 per annum, and it is expected that by the turn of the century this will have increased to \$600,000,000. In view of this we must do everything we can to improve our own timber industry. To this end, it is planned to increase our annual plantings to 75,000 acres in the next twenty-five years, and naturally this is of national importance. Looking at the matter from the State viewpoint, the New South Wales Forestry Commission in 1965 planted 7,700 acres and in 1968 this will have increased to 16,000 acres. Last year in New South Wales I believe that private landowners took advantage of the Government's scheme and planted 2,000 acres of pine forest.

On the North Coast, of which I have some knowledge, the Casino forestry district covers about 3,500,000 acres. Of this area 500,000 acres, mainly hardwood, is forest country. In 1967-68 the mills in the area cut 65,000,000 super-feet of timber. Honourable members are aware that most hardwood timber is self-sown and is not cultivated. In the Casino forestry district there are 7,500 acres of *pinus radiata*, which has been planted and cultivated by the Forestry Commission. Last year the commission planted only 500 acres, but the programme for the next forty years is designed to raise the total to 25,000 acres of *pinus radiata* planted in this district. When in full production, this will produce 25,000,000 super-feet of timber, and it must be borne in mind that during the growing period there will be thinnings and timber will be taken out. Already in the Casino district a pine mill has been established and is cutting these timbers. Naturally, as the timber gets larger each year, there will be increased cutting and wider use for the timber.

When the select committee of the Legislative Assembly on timber resources visited the North Coast last year I accompanied it when it inspected the hoop pine being grown in the Kyogle district, where plantings were commenced in 1939. These

The Hon. R. W. Manyweathers]

plantings were discontinued in 1953 due to lack of finance; at that time it was said that *pinus radiata* could be grown more profitably in other parts of the State. The Government had to take into account the financial aspect of pine production, but I understand that the plantings made in 1940 and 1941 in the Kyogle area have shown a growth rate equal to the growth rate of *pinus radiata*.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: Can the honourable member say how long it must grow before it can be cut?

The Hon. R. W. MANYWEATHERS: Thinnings can be cut after about five years, when they start to thin out. The thinnings are used for various purposes including the manufacture of matches. However, a poplar industry has been established at Grafton to supply a match factory there, and therefore there is not the same demand for the hoop pine thinnings, which nevertheless can be used in the manufacture of pineboard. Consideration is being given to the establishment in this area of a pineboard factory, using machinery imported from Germany. Such a pineboard factory could make use of the hoop pine thinnings. Just across the border in Queensland, 116,000 acres of softwoods have been planted, including 57,000 acres of hoop pine.

It is interesting to note that the timber industry in the Kyogle area, which is only a portion of the Casino forestry district, employs 600 people. Throughout the Commonwealth timber, pulp and paper production produce an annual income of \$500,000,000, providing employment for 40,000 workers and a living for 100,000 people. At present a New Zealand delegation is visiting this country. New Zealand produces softwoods, and we export a certain quantity of hardwoods to New Zealand. Indeed, a monthly service from the North Coast takes exports of hardwood to New Zealand. Our New Zealand friends cannot, by and large, grow hardwoods but, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is now possible for them to treat some of their local timber in such a way that it can be used as an alternative to some of our Australian hardwoods. The New Zealand

delegation is concerned with Australian imports of oregon, and it is hopeful that there will be established in this country a timber that is comparable with oregon. The tremendous strength capacity of oregon timber is well known; this makes it popular in construction work. However, there is a suggestion that under this scheme we can cultivate Douglas fir, which has been proved throughout the world as probably the equal of oregon. Douglas fir has been grown successfully in this country, and I hope that its development will be undertaken. I commend the bill to the House.

The Hon. ASHER JOEL [5.28]: As I have said before in this Chamber, any bill that makes a contribution to the general welfare of the people should receive the earnest support of all sides of the House and all sections of the community. I know of no bill brought before this Chamber that has been of greater importance, especially to the future, than the measure we are now considering.

I am prompted to speak primarily because when I spent some weeks last June in Israel I saw what can be done by reforestation if a concerted plan, backed by a government that is determined to bring life to desert areas, is implemented. In Israel, which is not much longer than 260 miles and in some parts less than 15 miles in width—at least it was until a certain event altered the situation—more than 95,000,000 trees, many of them exotic, have been planted in a period of twenty years. We can see how this problem has been tackled in Israel, and similar techniques could be applied on a broader basis in a country like Australia. Although we could probably attack the problem on a bigger and better scale, it will need more than mere government enthusiasm and the injection of government funds; it will need the support of all sections of the community. In this regard a tremendous amount is being done throughout the world in reforestation by enlisting the aid of the public, especially school-children, in planting trees.

I commend to the House inculcating youngsters everywhere in Australia with an understanding of the absolute need to encourage forestation. We in this country

have been completely ruthless in the way we have denuded our forest land. There is a saying in Australian folklore that, "If it moves, shoot it; if it doesn't move, chop it down". I doubt if this approach to a wonderful gift of nature is seen more clearly anywhere than in Australia. The late Sir Warren MacDonald, Chairman of the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, summed up the Australian timber position when he said:

We are not developing our timber resources as we should. We are lagging, and we will continue to lag unless we produce as soon as possible a new, streamlined policy of afforestation.

Subsequently, in February, 1966, a well-known authority on the timber industry, Mr C. A. Lembke, managing editor of the *Australian Timber Journal* said quite significantly:

The timber industry at this very moment I liken to a giant volcano of unsolved problems that over the years through our own neglect and lack of positive thinking we have attempted to stifle or put aside.

The measure before the House makes some contribution to alleviating the problem of the lack of forest areas in the Commonwealth of Australia, but it does very little towards making us self-sufficient in timber production in the light of the demands on our timber resources by the modern society in which we live.

Some figures, which may or may not have been quoted in another place, are necessary to demonstrate the future dire need of this country for timber. Over the past thirty years the *per capita* consumption of forest products in Australia has risen from a log equivalent of 34 cubic feet to a current consumption of over 48 cubic feet. Although relatively high by world standards, this figure is not extraordinary considering our increasing standard of living. In comparison with the United States of America, upon which so many of our living standards are modelled, our consumption is extremely low. The current U.S.A. annual *per capita* consumption of 66 cubic feet is vast, but the Australian figure will be greater if paper and pulp consumption continue at their present rapid rate.

Some time ago the *Financial Review* published two excellent reports dealing with the subject that the House is debating. They stated that by the year 2000 the Australian standard of living, short of nuclear war or a catastrophic decline in the terms of trade, should have more than doubled. It is generally considered by world forestry authorities that the consumption of forest products tends to vary directly with the standard of living, which could give a *per capita* yearly consumption in Australia of 103 cubic feet by the year 2000, assuming that the timber is available. Based upon the rate of forestation proposed by this bill, we will be nowhere near meeting the increased demand.

Timber in a modern society is not only required for and reflected in new houses, for which there is a great demand, but also is in strong demand in the packaging and the pulp and paper board industries. As the Minister knows so well, these demands are increasing so quickly that unless a substitute is found there will be an incredible short fall, notwithstanding the objectives of this measure. One of the problems confronting us is the slow rate of growth of trees. This is accentuated in Australia particularly by the fact that even the fast growing *pinus radiata*, which is now the dominant exotic softwood grown in Australia, takes something like forty years to reach full maturity, before it can be harvested for complete utilization. I understand that at fourteen years the trees can be used to produce some material for the manufacture of paper pulp, hardboard, impregnated fence posts and for similar purposes. At eighteen years the first small logs are obtained. At twenty-two to twenty-four years when more small size lumber is obtained, some use can be made of the timber, but no really big lumber is available for forty years. I understand that it is not profitable to harvest a plantation for large size logs until four decades have passed. So again I say that notwithstanding the contribution to be made by the implementation of this legislation, we shall still be faced with a serious situation in the year 2000.

If we consider also what will take place at the end of the century in relation to demands in South-East Asia, of which we
The Hon. Asher Joel

are a part, we shall understand why further consideration must be given to developing our timber resources. I commend to the House a study made jointly by the secretariats of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East on timber trends and prospects in the Asia-Pacific region. This book is well prepared, completely attested, well documented, full of statistics and yet so simply written that it gives anyone who reads it an opportunity to understand the vast and wonderful area available to us for exports if we can continue to develop our forest lands at an accelerated rate. The report mentions various things that I shall refer to later, on which I do not believe sufficient emphasis has been placed so far in the debate, to encourage even greater production.

If I recall correctly, in February, 1966, when the Minister for National Development, Mr David Fairbairn, announced plans to lend \$20,000,000 to the States on a long-term basis, as set out by the Minister in his second-reading speech, he indicated that the rate of growth would be from the present 40,000 acres a year to 75,000 acres for the next thirty-five years, but the population in the year 2040, for whom the trees will be planted at the end of the thirty-five years mentioned, could be between 37,000,000 and 47,000,000. A planting rate of 75,000 acres a year in the year 2000 would be completely inadequate to meet the needs of Australia's population quite apart from consideration of any export opportunities that present themselves.

If one assumes a continuing population growth at a rate of 1.87 per cent per annum, and this is modest, and if 75,000 acres is the correct annual planting rate for 1973, planting should be stepped up to 85,000 acres in 1980, 103,000 acres in 1990 and 124,000 acres in 2000, including the replanting of areas harvested in the meantime. I take those figures from the splendid articles in the *Financial Review* to which I referred. This presents an entirely different picture from that which we hopefully expect from the legislation before us. I join with the Hon. R. R. Downing in criticizing

the fact that the Commonwealth once again exercises a form of financial control in the scheme presented to us. The State may have chosen to use the money differently if it had been a direct grant, allowing its own inestimable Forestry Commission to handle the situation.

The seriousness of Australia's position is that the consumption of the products of the forest industries absorbed in timber, plywood and particle board, and especially pulp and paper, has been running at over \$600,000,000 a year, of which over \$200,000,000 already has had to be imported. Again, it is predicted that by the year 2000 these imports at constant prices will rise to over \$600,000,000 as the population continues to grow, unless the present rate of plantings is substantially speeded up.

The situation, therefore, is that we in Australia are attempting to deal with something in a piecemeal way. The total Australian forest area of 102,000,000 acres should be compared with the 624,000,000 acres in the United States of America and the 845,000,000 acres in Canada, where so much attention is being given to the problem. The accessible forest area of about 37,000,000 acres covers only 2 per cent of Australia's total land area, which is incredibly low by world standards. One point I should mention is that if the money which has been given to the State for the planting of softwoods had been given direct, without any strings attached, New South Wales might have used it to develop some of the 50,000 acres of abandoned farm land in the area around Dorriggo, where we could introduce our own form of planting and control, and above all, look to a future development which, notwithstanding the advantages of the bill, will not be derived from it. Let me quote again from the United Nations report, particularly the recommendations, which I feel should be placed before the House. They are significant. This report should be used as a basis for further development in this area. The report states:

Four major fields of action are recommended:

- (1) Establishing basic conditions for stepping up production.

- (2) Increasing the supplies of forest raw materials.
- (3) Developing forest industries.
- (4) Developing trade.

Specific steps in each of these fields will be discussed below.

I was particularly interested in the emphasis given to the allocation of certain lands as permanent forest areas in future, the development of forest service staffs, and the adequate training of staffs with particular attention to bushfire control, which is one of the most serious reasons for the loss of vast forest areas. The recommendations also urge various types of legislation for dynamic forest policies. Again, I think there is much to learn from this report. I think that much more could have been contributed to the debate. I say this with no disrespect to preceding speakers. Nor do I intend any disrespect to the Commonwealth or to the States which co-operated in the introduction of the measure. The House knows that from time to time I finish a speech with a quote. May I do so on this occasion, quoting from "The Prayer of the Forest", which appears in a special Arbor Day number of *Unser Wald*, a German forestry publication. In almost every country of the world, irrespective of the country's development, an Arbor Day is held. All countries attach great importance to the development of forest lands and the need to grow trees. This is the quotation:

Man! I am the Warmth of your home in the cold winter night and the protective shade when summer's sun is strong.

I am the Framework of the roof to your house and the Top to your table;

The Bed in which you sleep and the Timber with which you fashion your boats.

I am the Handle to your hoe and the Door to your hut.

I am the Wood of your cradle and the Boards of your coffin.

I am the Bread of kindness and the Flower of beauty.

Hear my prayer: destroy me not!

I feel this aptly sums up our utter dependency upon timber. Though I believe the measure has everything to commend it, I trust it will merely be a forerunner of further and greater developments to

meet Australia's growing timber needs, which cannot be met by the mere adoption of the policy for which this bill provides.

The Hon. H. D. AHERN [5.45]: I rise to make a few comments on the bill, which I think has been very well handled by the Minister and our other forestry experts. My main reason is to support the Hon. R. R. Downing, though I do not agree with everything he said. This is not unusual. I do not think the Hon. R. R. Downing understood the position in regard to the operation of section 96 of the Constitution. I believe that section has been completely prostituted by the federal Government over the past few years. Unfortunately, I must bring the blame for this prostitution largely back to the Labor Government of 1944 and Dr Evatt's interpretation of section 96. He was followed by people of equal ability. I do not make any apologies for the Labor Government or for the Menzies Government. The only thing I point out is that Dr Evatt wanted to go a step further and use the external affairs power in a similar way.

The Hon. R. R. Downing said enough about the use of section 96: he gave an example of its use some years ago. I shall now give the House another example of the use of section 96. Recently an education grant was made to one of the States. It included money to build a hall for a high school—not money to build a high school. The State concerned has been asked to provide detailed plans of the hall for submission to Canberra. I do not know what could be more absurd. I forecast that the next move will be for the Commonwealth Department of Works to take over and build the hall. That is the current operation of section 96 of the federal Constitution. I blame the Senate entirely for this implementation of section 96 of the Constitution. In my book, the blame goes right back to the Senate. I believe section 96 was originally intended to provide for the financial integrity and security of the States, not for financial control from Canberra. So far as I can learn from reading about the Constitution,

that was the intention. Those of us who are sufficiently interested might go back to a debate in support of the gold-mining industry in 1907. We find that the Senate voted very definitely against the use of section 96 on a gold-mining bounty. That was one occasion in which section 96 was not allowed to be used for other than the purpose for which it was intended.

I come back to the Senate when attaching blame, though I do not excuse our own Government entirely for the development of the misuse of section 96 of the Constitution. I think this Government has a responsibility to pursue the use and interpretation of section 96. I could ask this Government what it has done to take any action on the way in which section 96 is being interpreted and employed by Canberra. One thing I suggest the Government could do—I wonder whether it has done so—is to ask New South Wales senators their attitude to some of the restrictions imposed by this legislation. I leave the House with the thought that section 96 is at the moment the responsibility of the Senate. I believe the State Government should use New South Wales senators to have the position further explored.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER (Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Vice-President of the Executive Council) [5.49], in reply: There have been many useful contributions to the debate, which has ranged over a wide field. A number of members touched on the need to extend softwood plantings to a greater extent than envisaged in the bill. I might say we are endeavouring to interest private investment in softwood planting and our efforts are having some success. An honourable member referred to some of the marginal country around Taree on the North Coast. We have encouraged a company in the mid-North Coast region to plant flooded gum. Later we hope an inventory will be made on plantings that have taken place recently and will take place in the future. About seventy or eighty marginal dairy farms are now planted with flooded gum, probably to the surprise of the descendants of the original dairy-farmers who worked so hard to get rid of flooded gum in that country. It has been

worked out that the return from the planting of flooded gum on this marginal country would possibly be comparable over a twenty-five-year period with the return from dairy activity.

The Hon. F. W. Spicer asked whether the local-government bodies could under the bill receive assistance for plantations. Under the bill they cannot; unfortunately at the moment under the State Government assistance to farmers scheme they cannot do so either. If interest were shown by local-government bodies in plantations outside towns or country centres the Minister for Conservation would look sympathetically at including them in schemes that are operating so well in the State at the present time. The Hon. Asher Joel said that the annual planting rate is expected to reach 75,000 acres by the year 2000. This is not correct; under this plan we expect to reach 75,000 acres per annum by 1974. Even with government planting we shall be well ahead. People such as the Hon. Asher Joel are taking a realistic approach to the need for timber, bearing in mind the growth of population in this State in the years ahead.

The Hon. R. R. Downing referred to large-scale private forestry and thought that we might encourage the federal Government to give taxation incentives to those who undertake private forestry. The Australian Forestry Council, which consists of the appropriate Ministers from the Commonwealth and the States, is looking at the present time at the possibility of putting a case to the federal Treasurer along the lines that the Hon. R. R. Downing has suggested, which would lead to increased plantings and induce private capital to come into the industry. I used to have a lot of trouble, just as the Hon. W. J. Geraghty had, with the various types of timber, but if we remember that Douglas fir is also oregon and *pinus radiata* is also Monterey pine, it makes things considerably easier. The native white cypress pine is hard to encourage to grow outside its natural area, but it does regenerate fairly readily in the cypress belts of the State. It is really only a matter of keeping stock and rabbits away from cypress forests to

get a tremendous regeneration in suitable areas. The Forestry Commission is doing considerable work in this regard as it regards the native cypress as one of the most valuable timbers in the State. I thank the House for its support of this measure.

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. B. M. Fuller.

FISHERIES AND OYSTER FARMS (AMENDMENT) BILL

SECOND READING

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT (Minister for Child Welfare and Minister for Social Welfare) [5.56]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a short bill and a forerunner to a much longer bill which it is expected will be submitted to Parliament next year, incorporating the results of a major review of the Fisheries and Oyster Farms Act. The bill is designed to help reorganize the system of licensing of anglers fishing in inland waters. Section 25B of the Fisheries and Oyster Farms Act, the authority for the present licensing system, which has been in operation since 30th December, 1957, makes no provision for the issue of short-term licences or for the issue of licences to women at a reduced rate. The sole object of this bill is to remedy this situation.

The Act provides that all persons—other than licensed commercial fishermen, holders of permits and authorities under the Act for scientific and other special purposes, aborigines and persons exempted by regulation—who fish by means of a line in inland waters are required to hold an inland angling licence. Children under 16 years are exempted by regulation from the licensing provisions and invalid, age and service pensioners can obtain a licence at a reduced rate of 50c. The licence remains in force for a period of twelve months from the date of issue and the fee payable is the same for

men and women. Over the years there have been numerous complaints because a person had to pay the full licence fee even though he wanted to fish for only one day. This particularly applied to the tourist and the casual angler. Consequently these people and their representatives, such as local tourist agencies and councils, have requested that the burden of having to pay the full licence fee be alleviated by providing a short-term licence at a concession rate.

I might add that the recently formed New South Wales Amateur Fishermen's Advisory Council, which was established to advise the Chief Secretary on matters relating to amateur fishing, has endorsed the principles contained in the bill. The object of the inland licensing system is to raise revenue for the purpose of protecting and improving the inland fisheries. All licence fees are paid into a special fund to meet the salaries and expenses of the scientific, technical and field staff employed on the development and protection of inland fisheries. In addition the fund meets the cost of operating the research station and fish hatcheries and the carrying out of stream improvement works. Country people have recognised that the inland licensing scheme has brought to their districts real financial advantages, as well as improved fishing and an increasing number of tourists. This feature of the scheme is particularly pleasing to this Government which is keenly interested in promoting decentralization and development in country areas.

Approximately two-thirds of the Inland Fisheries Fund is raised from people who reside in the city or interstate, but the major part is spent in country areas. For example, funds from the scheme have paid for the establishment of an inland fisheries research and experimental station at Narrandera, where there are facilities for three biologists. These biologists, assisted by other technical staff, have supplied information which has resulted in fishing laws being liberalized, for the benefit of inland fishermen. The station received world-wide attention when it induced Murray cod to spawn under pond conditions: Another seven native species have also been induced to spawn in similar circumstances.

The Hon. F. M. Hewitt]

In addition to work at Narrandera, two biologists assisted by technical assistants are engaged in investigating trout fisheries in the Snowy Mountains area and the bass fisheries of coastal drainages. Fourteen inland fisheries inspectors are stationed at widely separated parts of the inland for the purpose of enforcing the fishing laws in these areas. The trout hatcheries at Ebor and Jindabyne, now under the control of the Chief Secretary's Department, are financed entirely from the Inland Fisheries Fund. Each has a manager and assistant and as well as breeding fish for stocking public waters they sell as a service to people on the land fry and fingerlings for stocking private dams. Besides their primary purposes the research station and hatcheries have proved notable successes as attractions for tourists.

I come now to the provisions of the bill. The Government, being conscious of its duty to encourage tourism, now proposes to meet the needs of tourists by making provision for the issue of a short-term inland angling licence at a fee substantially less than the fee applicable to a full season licence. This will be achieved by clause 2, which provides for the issue of different classes of licences instead of the one at present prescribed. The casual once-a-year angler will also appreciate this concession. The Government is aware that many women who like to accompany their menfolk on fishing excursions are discouraged from fishing because they have to pay the full licence fee. To remedy this situation the Government wants to be able to issue licences to women at a reduced rate. Clause 2 will also make this possible by providing that different fees may be prescribed for the different licences issued.

As already announced, the Government has reluctantly come to the conclusion that it must increase the fees for full season licences. This has become necessary to ensure that the advances made in developing the inland fisheries will continue and so that the Government will not have to restrict or curtail the services already provided through the finances of the Inland Fisheries Fund. Fees have not increased since 1957 despite the expansion in inland fisheries activities and the steady rise in all

costs associated therewith. Although the Government could have raised fees long ago, it has delayed such action so that it could simultaneously introduce the concessions for anglers as set out in this legislation.

Upon the passing of this legislation and amendment of the regulations, the different licences and the fees intended to be charged will be as follows:

	\$
(1) Male—Full Season—in force for a period of 12 months from date of issue	4.00
(2) Male—Short term—in force for any period of 21 consecutive days	2.00
(3) Female—Full Season—in force for a period of 12 months from date of issue	2.00
(4) Female—Short term—in force for any period of 21 consecutive days	1.00
(5) Age, Invalid and Service Pensioners' Licence in force for a period of twelve months from date of issue will continue to be available at the reduced fee of	0.50

The question of reduction or elimination of the licence fee charged to pensioners has only recently been referred to the Chief Secretary who I understand is now examining it. If either proposal is found to be practicable, it can be brought into effect by alteration of the regulations, without further legislation. The only other State of Australia providing a short-term fishing licence is Tasmania where the fees are as follows:

	\$
Full season licence	6.00
Pensioners' full season licence	2.00
Short term licence for 14 days, male or female	2.00

It is hoped that the new scheme of licensing will commence from 1st October. In these amendments, an attempt has been made to eliminate some shortcomings in the Fisheries and Oyster Farms Act which are unsatisfactory to a large number of people, and so I believe the measure will be enthusiastically supported by the tourist industry, anglers, and the general public. I commend the bill to the House.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [6.5]: I take this opportunity to congratulate the Hon.

F. M. Hewitt on his appointment as a Minister in this House and also to sympathize with him for having to present, as his first measure, this bill which, although minor, is an imposition on the people who go fishing. It is all very well to say that this measure will facilitate the enjoyment of inland fishing. Licensing was introduced about ten years ago, and since that time people have been able to get an inland fishing licence for \$2. That licence lasted for twelve months and a fisherman could not get a licence for a shorter period. It is now proposed to overcome this situation, following complaints made by holiday-makers that they are compelled to take out a licence for twelve months although they can use it for only a much shorter period. Local authorities in the country areas where inland fishing takes place have stated that they agree with the principle of short-term licences, and suggested that these would encourage tourist activities in their areas.

The Act at present provides for the issue of licences annually. This amending bill proposes not only annual licences but also short-term licences for a period of twenty-one days. Also, the bill authorizes the prescription of a new scale of charges. Under the present scheme an annual fee applies to everyone—men, women, boys and girls. This scheme is to be changed, and provision will be made not only for an annual fee and a short-term fee, but also a fee for females of any age, and a fee for certain qualified pensioners.

At present the annual fishing licence is available to anybody on the payment of \$2. When this amending bill is approved, the fee will be increased to \$4 from the 1st October. This is an increase of 100 per cent. Provision is to be made for a short-term licence, which will be effective for twenty-one days. If a man goes on holidays for four weeks, he will have to take out a second short-term licence or break the law in the fourth week of his holiday. It is said, of course, that his wife will get a concession, and that she can get her short-term licence for \$1. But if she wants to take out a licence for the whole year she will have to pay the same fee as she would pay now—\$2.

It is true that provision is made for a licence fee of 50 cents annually for a pensioner. This was provided for in 1960 by a Labor government, which made special provisions for concessions to pensioners of certain types. To say that this bill will increase tourist activity is so much humbug. The bill is in conformity with and in keeping with the practice of this Government, which was returned to office on a policy of no increase in taxes. Under this measure it is increasing the cost of inland fishing licences by 100 per cent and more; the cost could be doubled or trebled if a man takes out short-term licences. Indeed, the fisherman will be paying the same for a short-term licence as he paid formerly to fish for twelve months. I fail to see how this will assist tourist activities. The new licensing scheme will hit families that go on holidays. Children, as we know, like to fish, and this new scheme will hit families, especially if they take more than one holiday a year.

If a man, his wife and son have more than one holiday a year, they must pay the equivalent of the amount they would pay for a year's fishing. It is just too bad if they are on a four weeks' holiday; they must take out another licence. It is all very well to say that the Fisheries Department has to breed fish and pay fourteen inspectors. What are the fourteen inspectors doing? They are policing the fishing of inland waters. One can assume that few people fish the inland waters without a licence if the inspectors are doing their job.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: They would be all right if they were aborigines: they do not require a licence.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: Although it is not provided for in the bill, the intention is that instead of paying an annual fee of \$2 for a licence, a man will now have to pay \$4. A woman will have to pay the present rate of \$2, but if she wants a licence for only three weeks, she will have to pay \$1. If she goes back later in the year to fish for another three weeks, she will pay another \$1. She will be paying the same amount as she pays today, and she will have the trouble of getting two licences.

Last year's fisheries' report does not contain much information about receipts and expenditure in this respect because it deals with the whole fishing industry, both salt and fresh water. Under the heading "Amateur Fishing Activities: fresh water" the report says that there was a drop of 2,700 in the number of licences issued in the year ending June, 1967. The report attributes that decrease to the drought, which no doubt is perfectly true: it has not been much good fishing in Burrinjuck, for example, while the level of the water is so low. In the previous year 78,000 licences were issued to anglers at \$2 a head. That represents \$156,000, an amount that would pay for the services of many inspectors. We know that money has to be spent on hatcheries and on financing the activities of experts who are developing different varieties of fish for inland waters, but, after all, the fish are sold in large quantities to various societies in the State. Fish are sold also to individuals to be placed in streams and dams on private properties.

I have no objection to a charge being made to compensate the department for producing the fish. But they do not have to go to much trouble these days to stock fisheries. I agree that Burrinjuck is affected by the drought, but at Eucumbene and in other places fish are breeding normally. I suggest seriously that this proposal is an imposition on the inland angler. I have had an inland fishing licence every year for a number of years. That has not been expensive to me, but the new fees will be expensive for the ordinary worker. We must recognize that in country areas where inland fishing is done, the majority of fishermen are workmen, and they are to be hit by increases in fees of up to 100 per cent. There is no justification for this increase.

The unfortunate part of the proposal is that, even if we throw out the bill, the Government can still increase fees under the present Act. The Government may prescribe whatever fees it wishes, but has to do so annually. This bill is an imposition on inland anglers and is in keeping with the Government's policy of increasing taxation wherever possible. It is further evidence of the bungling of the finances of this State by the present Government.

The Hon. A. A. ALAM [6.16]: I take this opportunity to congratulate the Hon. F. M. Hewitt on his elevation to the Ministry. It is a privilege to be taking part in the debate on the first bill that he has introduced. I wish the honourable gentleman every success and contentment in his term of office. I should like to make an observation about our indigenous fish. It has been shown in the United States of America that it is best to have hatcheries on the rivers in which it is proposed to release the fish. For example, we could have a hatchery at Tamworth for the Namoi, at Dubbo for the Macquarie, at Wagga Wagga for the Murrumbidgee, at Coonamble for the Castlereagh, at Broken Hill for the Darling, and at Condobolin for the Lachlan. I remember my grandfather catching 40 lb Murray cod in the Warrego. Like the gardener with green fingers, he seemed to have the right touch at fishing. Unfortunately, that sort of fishing seems to be disappearing.

There may be a solution to the problem. In the United States fishing in certain rivers is prohibited at times to allow the fish to spawn and grow. Too many fishermen in some areas were depleting the numbers of fish. I would ask the Minister to give consideration to making this sort of approach in our own inland rivers. My other suggestion is that, as it does not seem to be successful to bring fish great distances from the hatcheries to the rivers, consideration might be given to establishing hatcheries on the rivers. In saying this I appreciate that the recent drought has caused the water levels in many inland rivers to drop, and for this reason it may be necessary to prohibit fishing at certain times.

In my opinion the Government would derive more revenue by encouraging women to go fishing, because where women go, men also go along. I suggest that the licence fees for women should be \$1 and 50 cents instead of \$2 and \$1. I emphasize the importance of our Murray cod, jewfish and trout. Unfortunately, trout have disappeared from the Snowy River. Fishermen from the United States of America are particularly keen on fishing for trout in this country.

The big problem is how the Snowy streams can be restocked with trout. It is a pity when lovely rivers like this are depleted of their indigenous fish. I again emphasize the importance of our Murray cod and jewfish.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON [6.21]: I join previous speakers in congratulating the Hon. F. M. Hewitt on his appointment as deputy leader of the Government in this House. On this bill, I agree in principle with what the Hon. J. J. Maloney has said. Seventy-eight thousand licences have been issued. Obviously this is another piece of legislation that has been designed by a Parliament with a majority of city members or members residing on the sea coast, most of whom do not use our inland waters. The Hon. J. J. Maloney gave his opinion of the increased fees. I agree with him, and I shall not repeat his views. The Government has overlooked one section of our inland fishermen. I refer to those fishermen who fish on the State border rivers, the Murray in the south and the Darling in the north. Most inland fishermen like to fish on both sides of the river. To do this on the Murray, New South Wales fishermen must have a New South Wales licence, the cost of which will be increased to \$4, to fish on the New South Wales side, and a Victorian inland fishing licence to fish on the other side.

The Hon. C. COLBORNE: Where is the line of demarcation?

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: The signpost is 12 feet on the other side of the bank across the bridge. Be that as it may, I think a fisherman must be diplomatic when he is approached by a ranger. Many fishermen, unlike us, are not in a position to tell a ranger that he is wrong. In many land titles, the landowner himself is uncertain where the boundary of the river starts and his own property finishes, except in titles granted before 1908 when the boundary went to the middle of the river. Now the land titles stipulate that the boundaries of the land go to within a certain distance of the water's edge, say, 13 or 14 feet, or even 20 feet. I should like the Government to reconsider the licensing system at border rivers in particular. I shall leave it at that.

It is important that a fisherman living at Albury or Wodonga and fishing in the Murray River should be able to fish on either side of the river when holding only one licence. I have been informed by members of the Albury Anglers Club, who would know whether they need a Victorian licence to fish on the other side of the river, that they must have a current licence issued by each State to fish on both sides of the river. I should like the Government to consider this matter and to ensure that fishermen do not have to pay a double licence fee.

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT (Minister for Child Welfare and Minister for Social Welfare [6.26], in reply: The point raised by the Hon. H. J. McPherson is one that I myself inquired about in relation to the Murray River. I am sure that the Murray River is in fact in New South Wales. I shall certainly refer the matter he raised with regard to boundaries to the Chief Secretary's Department; obviously there is some confusion. The Hon. A. A. Alam referred to the Murray cod that his father used to catch. All I can say is that they must have been beauties. I used to fish the MacIntyre River at Warialda. We certainly caught bigger fish in those days than it is possible to catch now. One matter that will please the Hon. A. A. Alam is that the department has been able to propagate the spawn of Murray cod. Biologically, this is a tremendous breakthrough and will result in a much better stocking of streams with this magnificent fish, which is one of the world's greatest freshwater fish. The Hon. J. J. Maloney had a good deal to say about the cost of licensing. I point out to him that if he has fished in New Zealand—

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: It takes me all my time to catch them in New South Wales.

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT: When I fished in New Zealand last Christmas I was charged a much higher fee for a one-day licence than is proposed in New South Wales for a year's licence. The Hon. J. J. Maloney will know from the figures I gave that Tasmania, which has a short-term licensing system such as we propose, charges a higher fee for the licence. Admittedly there will be some increases in the cost of licences, but I believe the short-term licence

will be useful, particularly to holiday makers. I think the Government fixed a term of twenty-one days with a view to covering the large number of holiday fishermen.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: They can get a licence for twelve months now for the same price.

The Hon. F. M. HEWITT: As there will be an increase in licence fees, I feel the introduction of short-term licences will be of benefit to inland fishermen and women. I commend the bill to the House.

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. F. M. Hewitt.

THIRD READING

With concurrence, bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Assembly, on motions by the Hon. F. M. Hewitt.

House adjourned, on motion by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, at 6.33 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 18 September, 1968

Printed Question and Answer—Questions without Notice—Government Guarantees (Amendment) Bill (third reading)—Increases in Fares and Parcel Rates (Adjournment)—Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Superannuation) Bill—Bursary Endowment (Amendment) Bill—University of New England (Sale of Property) Bill (second reading)—University of New South Wales Bill (second reading)—Public Roads (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Organized Crime—Surveyors (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Wild Dog Destruction (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Bill Returned—Farmers' Relief (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Adjournment (Ferry Stoppage).

Mr SPEAKER (THE HON. KEVIN ELLIS) took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

Mr SPEAKER offered the Prayer.