

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 12 August, 1971

Question without Notice—Municipality of Hurstville (Wolli Creek, Kingsgrove, Public Reserve Land Sale) Bill—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fourth Day's Debate)—Special Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### STUDENT BEHAVIOUR AT UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

The Hon. N. K. WRAN: I ask the Vice-President of the Executive Council and Minister for Decentralisation and Development whether, when he replied to a question asked of him on Tuesday this week by the Hon. H. D. O'Connell in regard to an incident that occurred on Monday at the University of New South Wales in which police and students were involved, he recalls saying among other things, "I have no doubt that the vice-chancellor will be conferring with the police on the matters raised by the honourable member." Is the Minister aware that on the same day the vice-chancellor said that he had not been consulted when police were called to the university on Monday, and that his practice has been to refrain from calling in the police on domestic matters? Is the Minister able to indicate whether he supports the vice-chancellor in his practice not to call in the police on domestic matters within the university?

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: I feel that the honourable member is a little confused about the situation. If my memory is correct, the vice-chancellor explained that he was not consulted about calling in the police for protection within the university, but the assistance of the police was requested by the warden of the particular university college. In the light of that knowledge I said that I would confer with the vice-chancellor on what had happened, and no doubt he would confer with the police about the events of that day. Lest there be any confusion about what I said and what the

present situation is, let me point out that I know it to be the policy of the Council of the University of New South Wales that police shall not be called to the university unless that action is taken by the vice-chancellor or by other servants of the university who have authority to do it. As the representative of this House on that council I perfectly agree with its determination. I am sure that the honourable member realizes that this action was taken by the warden of the particular college and that as these premises are rented from the university the tenants of the college have their rights also.

The Hon. N. K. WRAN: That is the very point that I sought to make—that it was not the vice-chancellor who called the police.

#### MUNICIPALITY OF HURSTVILLE (WOLLI CREEK, KINGSGROVE, PUBLIC RESERVE LAND SALE) BILL

##### INTRODUCTION

Motion (by the Hon. M. F. Willis) agreed to:

That leave be granted to bring in a bill to enable the Council of the Municipality of Hurstville to sell certain lands adjoining Wolli Creek, Kingsgrove and transfer the same free of all trusts affecting such lands; to amend the Local Government Act, 1919; and for purposes connected therewith.

Bill presented and read a first time.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE

Motion (by the Hon. M. F. Willis) agreed to:

(1) That the Municipality of Hurstville (Wolli Creek, Kingsgrove, Public Reserve Land Sale) Bill be referred to a Select Committee for consideration and report, with leave to sit during any adjournment of the House and power to take evidence and to send for persons and papers; to make visits of inspection to such areas as the Committee may deem expedient and, if necessary, take evidence thereat.

(2) That such Committee consist of the following Members, viz.—Mr Fuller, Mr J. E. Cahill, Mr Calabro, Mr Coulter, Mrs Furley, Mr O'Connell, Mr Riley, Mrs Roper, Mr Serisier, and the Mover.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN  
REPLY

## FOURTH DAY'S DEBATE

Debate resumed (from 11th August, *vide* page 205) on motion by the Hon. M. F. Willis:

That the following Address be adopted and presented by the Whole House to 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, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, 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. ANNE PRESS [4.38]: I want to take this opportunity of expressing my sympathy to the families of Major-General John Stevenson and the Hon. Jack McIntosh in their loss. I knew these two fine men extremely well. On Thursday of last week—only a week ago today—it was my privilege and pleasure to have afternoon tea with the Hon. J. C. McIntosh. Indeed it was an hilarious half-hour. Little did I know that I would not see him again. I am deeply moved by his passing. I have the same feelings about the death of Major-General Stevenson. We were dear friends, and when I came to town early in the morning I would find him sitting in his office. On those occasions we would have a little talk about things that happened. I miss him

very much, and I know how much these two men must be missed by their wives. I express my sincere sympathy to them.

I congratulate the Hon. M. F. Willis on his maiden speech, and I believe that he will be upholding the Willis tradition and will add to the stature of the Legislative Council in the State of New South Wales. I congratulate also the Hon. L. P. Connellan on his contribution to this debate. He is well versed in the problems of the rural economy and, therefore, any contribution he makes to debates in this House are listened to intently by everyone who is interested in country affairs.

I congratulate the Hon. W. G. Keighley who in this House last night said something that had to be said; indeed, it was only a matter of finding someone big enough to say it. At this stage I should like to point out that I have been misquoted by someone who suggested that I had stated that the Hon. Edna S. Roper supported the Hon. W. G. Keighley's remarks. I did not say that. I was asked who were the women members of the House, and I mentioned that the Hon. Edna S. Roper was on the telephone and that they could get in touch with her: I did not know whether the Hon. Evelyn Barron and the Hon. Amelia Rygate were. That is all I had to say about it.

The matter discussed by the Hon. W. G. Keighley is a humanitarian and social problem. In this State and in all other States except one we are perpetuating a scheme of things that can do nothing but harm to many women. It is a dreadful thing that a woman cannot visit the doctor who has attended her for years—probably ever since she was born—and cannot speak to him about a problem such as this. He would have the best idea of the psychological effect this problem would have on her, but he could do nothing for her. He would simply say that she must go away and bear her children. Alternatively, she must go to a backyard abortionist. Backyard abortionists should be stamped out, for they are a danger to our community. By the same token, I believe that our abortion laws should be liberalized to enable a woman, if she needs, to take this step.

A couple of years ago I attended a conference where discussion centred around a motion opposing legalized abortion; the motion was proposed by a couple of young men from a university. Among the women at the conference was a mother of six children who stood up and told these young men that it was like their impertinence to interfere in a woman's affairs. She said: "I know what would happen to me if I were going to have another child. I would be looking around to have the pregnancy terminated."

Unless a proper, hygienic means is open to women for having unwanted pregnancies terminated, they will be forced to seek out a backyard abortionist. I was talking to a well-known businesswoman this morning. She said: "Do you know how girls have abortions today? They are given a name and told to wait on a street corner. They are picked up in a car, blindfolded and taken to an address they do not know where. A certain act is performed on the girls, and then they are driven back to the corner, dropped off, picked up by their families or someone else, and then go home and take the consequences." This lady said: "The job is not done correctly. I know this to be a fact". She told me other stories of grim consequences of illegal abortions. She told me of a neighbour of hers who was always ill; she was the type who could not take very much and could not face up to things. She rang my friend and said, "Come quickly, I am dying." My friend said, "No, not again." She replied, "I am." My friend went over. She said: "I shall never forget the sight that met my eyes. There was a double bed saturated in blood. This woman had had an illegal abortion and she was clawing the wall in pain. I could do nothing but send for a doctor, but unfortunately she died." These things are happening right before our eyes, but no one is making any effort to do anything.

We have had some ridiculous laws in this State, and the police, to the best of their ability, have tried to see that those laws were kept. We all remember the old starting-price betting law, under which it was the business of the police to arrest someone every so often over a given period. They would come to a town, and there had

to be someone there for them to catch. The authorities could not waste time and money to have this squad coming along without making an arrest, so someone had to be caught. I know a dozen people in my little town who were taken to the court and fined a few shillings or a few pounds for starting-price betting. It did not do them much good, but they were not doing much harm. Of course, the big fellows were never caught.

The next unsatisfactory law to which I should like to refer was the law that prevented the sale of alcohol to aborigines. The claim was made that aborigines should have the right to go into a hotel and have a beer. When they had worked hard all the week they were entitled to this right but the law denied it to them. But the law did not deprive them of the opportunity of going to some wine bar or the back of the hotel, getting cheap wine, taking it away somewhere and becoming blind drunk and inflamed on the stuff. Fortunately that law was amended, and now in the towns that have many dark people there are far fewer drunken dark people than there have ever been.

Those two laws that needed amendment have been amended, and I believe that the abortion law also requires amendment, and requires it quickly. Any man who opposes the amendment of the abortion law would keep a woman chained to the double bed and the kitchen sink. I love children. I have four of my own and, also, nine grandchildren, of whom I am very proud. I would do anything in the world for any child, but there is nothing in the world as sad as an unwanted child. I only hope that within the next year or so we shall have in Australia a government that is courageous enough to go ahead and do something about things like this. I am proud that the Hon. W. G. Keighley has opened the door, and I am proud to push in behind him, to see if I can do something in the fight that he has started. I believe that he will get more support than anyone dreamed of. This House might have nothing to do with the making of policy in this State, and there are no women members in another place. However, the women in this

House can stand up and say something on behalf of other women in New South Wales. That is what I have been doing.

The Hon. P. M. M. SHIPTON: Would all women be with you?

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: In answer to that interjection, I say that any women who was subjected to an unwanted pregnancy would definitely be with me. Any woman who has ever come in contact with a woman in this unhappy situation would be with me. Any woman who has ever known a girl to be driven to the point where she has committed suicide because of the unfortunate position she has been in—and I have known them—would be with me. Any woman who has sat and watched a mother's hair turn grey because her daughter was having an illegitimate child, or has watched that mother nurse that child, would be with me.

I could cite hundreds of cases that I have seen in my short life where a termination of pregnancy would have been preferable to the events affecting the unfortunate mother, other members of the family, and most of all the unfortunate child. When standing on a railway station during the second world war I heard a very rough looking woman, seeing her young daughter off on the train, say to her, "If you are not careful, you know what will happen to you." It happened to her. That woman's daughter had a most beautiful child, but she grew up in such bad conditions that it was pitiful to watch her. She was a beautiful little fair-haired girl and an ordinary school girl, but she went on to become the town prostitute. That is what happened after one unwanted pregnancy.

The Hon. J. A. WEIR: Is that not the fault of society rather than of the girl?

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: I do not blame the girl. While women are built as they are and while they are susceptible to the blandishments of men, they will get into trouble. When I was a girl it was common for girls to say "He led me astray." I think very often the man was led astray. This is a social problem. Members have reared daughters. I have reared two daughters, thank goodness successfully. I have a grand-

daughter on the brink of growing up, and I hope to be as lucky with her as I was with my own family. All families have that wish. If any of my grandchildren or friends needed financial help to keep a child, or something of that nature, I should be the first to offer help.

I do not attach any stigma to an illegitimate child. Rather, I think it is society's fault that a girl should be forced to have a child she cannot afford to keep, though it might break her heart to part with it. When watching *Chequerboard* on television the other night, I was saddened to see a 17-year-old girl who had just given away her baby. In a close-up, I could see the tears in her eyes, and there were tears in mine. It was tragic to see a lovely little boy about 2½ years of age with his mother, who is paying \$30 a fortnight for one room and trying to keep the child, though she has only \$8 a fortnight left on which to live. It was just as tragic to see another girl with the little boy who had no father. I believe it is just as important for children to have a father as it is to have a mother. Children should have a father.

We are on the verge of Education Week. I do not suppose there has ever been more controversy about education than there is at the present time. I have been associated for many years with education in this State, having known Ministers such as the former Premier, the Hon. R. J. Heffron, the Hon. Ernest Wetherell, and the present Minister. I pay tribute to all of them for doing a grand job. They were dedicated to their task, and they performed it remarkably well. I should be the last to say anything in criticism of their efforts on behalf of school children in New South Wales. The present Minister is doing excellent work in very difficult circumstances.

The Hon. N. K. WRAN: Much of which he has created for himself.

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: Many people are willing to express that opinion, but I do not agree. I think the present Minister has done excellent work in very difficult circumstances. We have never had a more irascible teachers federation to put up with

than we have at the present time. Teachers have never been better paid or better looked after.

The Hon. EDNA S. ROPER: We have never had such an irascible Minister.

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: I did not intend to be controversial, but if the Opposition continues to heckle me I shall have to be. I do not take things too easily. I do not agree with members of the Opposition on this. They talk about dialogue. Dialogue comes from both sides. When one group sits with a blank face and will not co-operate, the department or the Minister cannot be expected to co-operate. That is precisely what has happened.

The Hon. N. K. WRAN: But the department and the Minister do not co-operate with each other.

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: I think the Hon. N. K. Wran is trying to have me on, or perhaps he is making the most of a weak case. Consequently I shall not take too much notice of him. One of the major problems in education is that only about 35 per cent of students who embark on teachers college scholarships go out into the schools as teachers. A member of another House said to me yesterday morning when talking about this, "I am very much ashamed to say that my daughter, who is just concluding her teachers scholarship course, has never had any intention of becoming a teacher." The maximum bond is \$1,000, but it costs between \$5,000 and \$6,000 to train a graduate teacher, whether the course be arts, science or economics. Students can take advantage of a teacher's scholarship to obtain a degree. Private industry finds it cheaper to pay the \$1,000 and get graduates than to pay for their education. The Department of Education is the bunny.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: The honourable member is not suggesting that private industry pays them \$1,000 to get them?

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: I am not suggesting it—I am saying it, though I do not know as much about private industry as the majority of people think they know.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: Industry can get them much cheaper than that.

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: That is a cheap way of getting graduates. If the bond were increased to \$5,500 or \$6,000, graduates would teach for at least a few years. I believe this is the only way to ensure that young people accept their responsibilities and do not take something for nothing.

Much play has been made on the department's decision to drop compulsory sport in high schools next year. Sport is not physical education. People who play sport will continue to do so. Those who do not engage in school sport either sit in the classroom or go home. That is all there is to it. Except for pupils who take sport, there is a free afternoon for all. Many people are under the impression that if children do not take sport at school they will miss out on all the opportunities for games. I have grandchildren who spend all the weekend chasing around in sporting activities. I am proud to say that my grandson has been selected to play for country soccer during the holidays. His father takes him and his team mates all over the place in a station waggon. They get their sport. It is ridiculous to say that children need this sport and that sport at school. Above everything else, what they need today is face-to-face teaching.

Some criticism has been levelled at teachers in various schools. Every morning as I come to the city I pass one of the nicest primary schools in the northern suburbs—Beecroft. I remember when it was a broken-down old school and I was asked whether I could get the Hon E. Wetherell, a former Minister for Education, to do something about it. This fine school, which the teachers are making a fuss about today, is one that every parent in New South Wales should see. We have many schools like it. Schools in many areas have been in a bad condition for varying reasons. I know of one school that twelve months ago had fourteen teachers in fourteen classrooms. Because a new school was opened about a mile away it now has six teachers in six classrooms with eight empty classrooms. Most of the children could easily have been brought the one and a quarter miles to the school. I consider that a waste.

I recall that when I first entered this Chamber I was trying to get a high school for Condobolin. The existing high school was conducted in the MUIOOF hall, which had one door and high windows. The children there were in danger of their lives. Had a fire broken out they would have had to try to escape through that one narrow door. The children were in that hall for about three years but it was able to be used as the means of getting a new Condobolin high school. Good things come out of bad. We are well served in Condobolin for schools, as are the surrounding districts. I have had no complaints from teachers themselves about the conditions under which they work. Members of my family are teaching in various parts of the State and I have heard no complaints from them. I have read in the newspapers of complaints from the Teachers Federation, but I have not heard a complaint from any teachers about the conditions under which they work. If they are complaining, they have an axe to grind.

The Government has tried to do everything possible in the circumstances to help education. It is spending about twice as much money on education as was ever spent before. For the first time children have free travel to schools more than two miles from their home. The schools have been provided with ancillary staff and teaching aids are available. Most of the schools are beautiful and the pupils are well accommodated. A few classes are overcrowded and these are emphasized. Many schools have classes at the right level or below it.

I know of one teacher who, when the Teachers Federation issued an edict that teachers were not to teach classes of more than thirty-five pupils, went to her federation representative—a good political person—and said: "I have 39 children in my class and so-and-so has 40. What are we going to do about it?" The representative said that he did not intend to do anything but that the teacher should ring the federation. The Teachers Federation said: "We are going for an award, and we are not going to prejudice that with a complaint that you have four or five extra pupils. If you have four or five extra pupils, teach them."

*The Hon. Anne Press]*

The Hon. C. HEALEY: Where was the school?

The Hon. ANNE PRESS: I shall not tell the honourable member that. I could give numerous examples to show that teachers do not get from the federation the support that they deserve. Today country areas of New South Wales are beset with many problems—low wool prices, wheat quotas and various other troubles. Fortunately, in some areas the seasons have been kind this year and this has helped considerably. Not only the farmers and the workers are affected by the problems of the rural industry; indeed, every country town in New South Wales is seriously affected from a business point of view. Country business people have never since the depression found things harder than they are now. Anything that can be done to alleviate the problems of the rural producer must help everyone.

Many casual and itinerant workers have set up their homes in country towns. It is a tragedy to the State that these people should have to leave the country and bring their families to the city thus adding to the housing, schooling and other problems in the metropolitan area. The Government is doing its best to do something about the problem but these people must be encouraged and assisted to stay in the country. I believe in country life. I do not care where country people come from; there is something about them and their way of life that is worth keeping. I felt compelled to speak about these problems and I hope that what I have said will be of some help.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER [5.8]: Might I first express my regret to this Chamber and offer my sympathy to members of the family at the death of Major-General John Stevenson. Over the past fifteen months I have not had the opportunity or the necessity to become closely associated with him but periodically I have been appreciative of the assistance that he and members of his staff have given to me as a member of this Chamber. I recall Major-General Stevenson most probably not for what happened while I have been a member of this Chamber but for something that occurred some years ago. At that time he made a

statement about Australia's defence opposed to the view held by the leader of the Australian Labor Party at that time. It disagreed with the policy of the Australian Labor Party. I recall the shock that at first I felt when I read the statement that he, the Clerk of the Parliaments in New South Wales had made. I recall that after the shock had died away I felt some admiration for the man who believed that what he had to say should be said and that what he had to say was the truth.

While in disagreement with him then, and now, with regard to the defence policies that he expressed—which I regard as more related to the first half of this century than to the last half—I can recall the admiration that I felt for this man who was prepared to attract to himself the disapproval and perhaps the unfriendliness of many people with whom he had been associated for many years in circumstances that amounted to something more than just the association between a servant of this House and a member of the House. Probably one of the greatest qualities that important people have in terms of the history of the world is that they do as they feel they must. One of the great problems in our community today is that there are so few who do speak as they feel they must.

I express my sympathy to the family of the late Hon. J. C. McIntosh. Though, like the rest of us, in time he will be replaced in our community, his death is an irreparable loss to his family.

I take the opportunity of congratulating the Hon. M. F. Willis on his maiden speech during the debate on the motion before the House. Even the most primitive of societies in mankind have a man-making or initiating ceremony. We have it here in the form of the maiden speech. I know that some members of this House and people elsewhere expressed some disdain or took some offence at the subject matter or the mechanism of part of his address when he attacked certain members of the Chamber, who in the circumstances felt constrained by tradition and by natural generosity not to interject. I personally was not offended and I sincerely look forward to a development among all members of this House of a spirit in

debate that does become aggressive and abrasive from time to time. I believe the circumstances in which we live today are such that without belief and without conviction in the things for which we say we stand, we would talk without the aggressiveness or abrasiveness that I feel should be present.

The man-making ceremony, though it initiates the man, provides only the basis from which the man is made. I look forward to many years here in this House with the Hon. M. F. Willis and to his being made a man for all seasons within the political community. I did not agree with many of his arguments and in particular I disagreed with what appeared to me to be the central theme of his speech—that the prime justification for the Askin-Cutler Government of New South Wales is his assessment of a comparison between it and prior Labor governments in this State. If that is his opinion and if that is the opinion of the party to which he belongs and the party that is associated with it, I predict that this State might well stand prepared for a period of legislative and administrative quiescence and neglect. I sincerely hope that in the interests of the community this is not so.

I was interested to hear the Hon. M. F. Willis express a desire for a latter-day constitutional convention. I also think, as do the members of my party in this House and elsewhere, that the time has arrived when there should be a fresh constitutional convention and when the errors and mistakes that led to the Commonwealth Constitution Act of 1899 might be remedied. As I understood the arguments that he put forward, he supported making stronger, and even increasing, the concept of the colony State, which was imposed by the Imperial Parliament in the United Kingdom at that time, rather than imposing upon us a constitution that was then necessary and is now necessary for the development of a vibrant and effective Australia that can legislate and administer for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth of Australia.

What should be done at this time is to free up rather than to tie down the power of the Commonwealth Government. The

criticism that we so often hear about Commonwealth-State relationships is a criticism that is directed to the adjectival or machinery parts, rather than to the spirit or the substantive parts, of the constitutional life of the Commonwealth of Australia. The great tragedy in the statements of these people who oppose centralism is that they do not see that in the freeing up of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia—in the granting of further though not necessarily exclusive powers to the Commonwealth—we shall establish a true constitution within which we can establish a localized form of government, in the sense that it brings government to the needs of the people as they arise in all walks of life and in all patterns of organization.

It amazes me when I come into this Chamber or any other place to hear members of the Country Party attacking what they call the centralism of the Australian Labor Party in its constitutional philosophy and policies. If ever there were a section of our community that has been destroyed by the present Commonwealth Constitution in the handling of industrial products, it is the Australian farmers, whom the Country Party for so long has claimed to represent. This lack of plenary powers in the Commonwealth, the obstacles that have been created by section 92 of the Constitution, have done more to destroy the economic prosperity of the Australian farmer than has any other single function or aspect of Australian constitutional or political life.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Hon. W. G. Keighley on the remarks he made concerning the need to reform the law on abortion. This is indeed a controversial subject. It is an area in which most people have strong opinions—views that, in essence, are the man or woman who holds them. They are opinions which in most instances are formed, not as result of experience with an unwanted pregnancy, but from an attitude of mind, or from a lesser extent of experience of abortion. Questions arise whether abortion is child-murder, whether there are two human beings to be considered, and as a result there is confusion

*The Hon. L. D. Serisier]*

between the social requirements of the community and the moral standards of the individual.

One of the great problems in dealing with law touching what persons consider to be their morality is that there is no confinement of that law in the practical sense to the philosophy of the individual. The matter has become confused because generally abortion is associated with tragedy, and with the wish of the average person concerned that this sort of thing should never involve him. In my experience as a country lawyer over the years I have come in contact with cases where advice had to be given to persons directly or indirectly concerned with an unwanted pregnancy.

Those who have had an actual experience of an unwanted pregnancy, as opposed to persons who make a theoretical or purely philosophical approach, have come to the conclusion that there are circumstances in which abortion is right and necessary, and that in all circumstances it is an area in which the individual should be given an opportunity to make a decision in accordance with his conscience, untrammelled by the law. Difficult though it is for many of us to come to that conclusion, the question whether the law should be reformed to permit abortion upon request is essentially one involving the problem whether or not we should permit others to do this even though we do not require it for ourselves. If it is something that we require ourselves, the morality of the issue still arises: it is a decision upon morality that the individual must have the opportunity and the right to exercise.

However, where it is a question of amending the law to permit others to practice abortion on request, then the concept of the toleration of the rights of others and the appreciation of their individuality which entitle them to make their own decisions on moral questions, immediately arises. One of the difficulties in the law as it now stands is that, although it was stated fairly clearly in *Rex v. Bourne* to which the Hon. W. G. Keighley referred yesterday that abortion is lawful where the person undertaking it honestly believes that what he is doing is right, one of the difficulties in applying the law is that when



one comes to the acid question in a court of guilt or innocence, so much depends on the summing up of the judge.

This being the sort of subject in which there has been great personal involvement over the years, of necessity it brings with it the considerable involvement of the opinions of any judge in implementing his function and summing up on such an issue. Tone of voice, the use of a positive instead of a negative, or a negative instead of a positive—things that occur not by any deliberate act of the judge, but as a result of the involvement of his personality in the issue—change the nature of the summing up that he gives. That will continue until the position is made clear by the introduction of the abortion law reforms suggested by the Hon. W. G. Keighley. I believe any law that is open to such a wide area of discrimination in implementation is a bad one. I believe this is an area of legislation which, despite the embarrassment that it may cause to many sections of the community, this Parliament has a responsibility to examine at some time soon.

I want to deal in more general terms with the remarks made by the Hon. T. P. Gleeson, the Hon. L. P. Connellan and the Hon. Anne Press in regard to the rural areas of New South Wales, and in particular with the situation that confronts the woolgrower. It is important to realize that most of our problems with wool—which have become particularly evident as a result of the selling prices achieved in the 1969–70 and 1970–71 wool selling seasons—have been thrown up in the context of a recession in the textile industry throughout the world rather than in the wool-producing industry itself, although, I concede that the wool-producing industry has had pressures imposed upon it by the cost-price squeeze, as it is so frequently called.

It is fair to acknowledge that woolgrowers today are producing approximately one third more wool than was produced ten years ago, and their income is substantially less, at \$467,000,000, than it was ten years ago. The woolgrower seems to have reached what, on the face of it, amounts to over-production for the market as a result of policies encouraged by State and federal

governments throughout that period. Those policies in themselves were certainly not bad. They were policies of greater efficiency in production and of the relation of greater turnover to cost in an endeavour to reduce costs. For the recent wool selling season the top price was slightly more than 31½ cents a pound, the closing price was 31 cents a pound, and the average price was slightly less than 29½ cents a pound.

The Hon. H. J. A. SULLIVAN: Did the honourable member say a top price of 31½ cents a pound?

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I meant the top average price. The average price for the whole of the season was slightly less than 29½ cents a pound. That is important when one considers that as recently as February this year the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics predicted that the average wool price in Australia throughout the 1970's would be 40 cents a pound with a 10 per cent variation either way. When one considers the plight of the woolgrower today the importance of those figures is the relationship they bear to the Commonwealth Government sponsored support price plan of 36 cents a pound average.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: The honourable member is speaking about what he has read in the press.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: Although I am talking about what I read in the press, members opposite are so representative of the many news media that one tends to accept what they have to say.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: The Commonwealth Government has not made a statement in that regard. It is understood by the press that it will be 36 cents a pound.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I accept what the Minister says. It is understood the Commonwealth Government proposes an average price for wool of 36 cents a pound. The federal Government is playing it safe, keeping its cards close to its chest. The prediction that the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics made in February of 40 cents a pound as the average price

of wool seemed a little wrong at the close of the wool selling season in mid-1971. The figure the Commonwealth has taken is the minimum that the prediction indicates, which means that it will cost the Commonwealth Government nothing. As it will cost the Government nothing it is open for the woolgrowers of this State and of the other States of the Commonwealth to say to the Commonwealth Government, "Thanks for nothing, because essentially it is nothing that you are giving". That prediction has been supported by the individual members of the National Council of Wool Selling Brokers to such an extent that only recently many of them advocated to their members throughout the country areas of this State that in no circumstances should they sell to private growers, as the price was certain to be an average of 40 cents this year, either because the Commonwealth Government would support it or alternatively, and more important, because this was the indication the market had given.

It was the indication the market had given because at that stage Japan had announced that it was coming back into the market this year and would purchase approximately 10 per cent more wool than last year. The recession at the Bradford mills had been substantially overcome. In almost every other part of the world, with the exception of the United States of America, the problems of the textile industry which were so pronounced during 1969, 1970 and early this year had been overcome. When one is considering the help that is to be given—and that is the term used by the Commonwealth Government to describe it—to the farmers and graziers, to the orchardists, and to members of the entire rural industry section of the Australian community, one must consider carefully the sum of \$100,000,000 which is to be made available over a period of years not as grants but as loans.

Translated into terms of the sovereign State of New South Wales, where the major interest of honourable members is centred, this means that the Commonwealth Government has said that it will make a loan of about \$32,000,000 to the farm industry section of the community of this State over

a period of years. The paucity of this amount and its irrelevance are clearly indicated by the fact that the pastoral houses of Australia have lent to the industry some \$350,000,000, and that the non-bank financial houses, the non-pastoral houses, solicitors' trust funds and so on have lent to this section of the community the sum of \$1,000 million. When one looks at those two figures one sees that over \$1,350 million has been advanced by the pastoral houses and private lending authorities in this country. Relating that to the Commonwealth Government's \$100 million for the whole of Australia, one sees the paucity of the effort that it is making and one sees this help in its true perspective.

I mentioned that the sum for New South Wales was \$32,000,000. Another test of the value of that amount for this State is the fact that in his recent policy speech the Leader of the Opposition announced that it was the policy of the Australian Labor Party to implement the immediate underwriting of a guaranteed loan for New South Wales of \$50,000,000, with not only an underwriting of part of the interest but also a subsidy of part of the interest. One of the great problems that the farm industry section of our community has to face today is not only that it has substantial debts but also that they are substantial when related to the income that it can make in any period. The security in livestock and land that has been offered over the years has disappeared because of the circumstances that have developed in this country. When one appreciates that sheep could be conservatively valued at \$3 a head or more only a few years ago, and one sees that the people who lend are cautious of placing a value on them of more than \$1 a head, one begins to appreciate the problems that confront the farm industry section of the Australian community.

In 1959 the Commonwealth Government was warned that, in time, the United Kingdom was likely to enter the European Economic Community. That warning went unheeded for ten or eleven years. Is it any wonder that there are problems in the farming industry?

*The Hon. L. D. Serisier]*

The Hon. R. C. PACKER: What has that got to do with the price of wool?

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: The entry of the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community has little to do with the price of wool. As the honourable member knows, the European Economic Community is still a purchaser of Australian wool and is likely to remain a purchaser of Australian wool. The generalities I was referring to were aimed towards the farming section of primary industry rather than the wool industry.

The Hon. R. C. PACKER: The farm industry has not yet been affected by Britain's entry into the European Economic Community.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I agree wholeheartedly with what the honourable member has said. The farm industry section of our community has not been affected by Britain's entry into the European Common Market. However, I would disagree that it has not been affected by the common agricultural policy of the European Economic Community. The time the Australian farm industry will be affected in this way will be 1973. By that time the fruit growing industry, the sugar growing industry and the dairy industry in Australia will be substantially affected, and other areas of primary production will be affected to a less extent. At present it is not clear what effect this will have on export of Australian livestock as meat, as opposed to livestock in the form that the Government's colleagues in another place have allowed to be exported from Australia.

It is in the context of those general remarks that I wish to refer to the development in New South Wales of a selling centre at the Yennora wool village. I should like to look at the situation so far as it affects the general future of wool handling in New South Wales. Whatever the general economic problems of the Australian community might be in many respects I realize we shall get a confession and an avoidance from the Government in this debate—the confession being that the Government concedes that the situation exists and the avoidance being that it says this is an area

of responsibility of another section of the three tiers of government in Australia. The development of the Yennora wool village is of the utmost importance to the future of wool handling and wool selling in New South Wales. At present wool is sold in Sydney, Newcastle, Goulburn and Albury. Wool sold in Sydney and Newcastle is handled by eight wool brokers who carry on their business in those centres. Wool sold in Goulburn and Albury is handled by three firms.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: Wool selling at Albury is controlled by brokers based in Melbourne. The other brokers are based in Sydney.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: That is true. The principal questions involved in the establishment of the Yennora wool village are whether there ought to be decentralization or centralization of wool handling and selling. This is confirmed by the second term of reference of the interdepartmental committee on centralized wool handling and containerization which was:

To examine the practicability of centralized wool handling; to examine the financial implications involved; assess the most appropriate location for such an undertaking if decided upon; and prepare a proposal for consideration of the industry.

It is fair to say that when we consider an industry the size of our wool industry we must look at more than the social conditions likely to follow decentralization of handling and selling this commodity. We must look at the economic factors that govern it just the same as those factors govern any other industry in New South Wales or elsewhere. Although the social implications of decentralization of wool handling and selling are significant of themselves they are not sufficient to determine the location of the centres for handling and selling. They are important to the consideration and, other things being equal or nearly equal, they become the determining factors. The main bases for deciding the location of these centres of handling and selling are the ordinary economic criteria that apply to industries of any nature anywhere within our community. Traditionally these have been the desire to locate an industry close to the source of raw material,

close to the source of labour, close to the consumer market or close to the point of distribution.

In the past the determining factors in New South Wales and indeed in Australia have largely but not altogether been the location of the wool handling and selling industry close to the point of distribution. Ninety-five per cent of wool produced is exported and only 5 per cent is used locally. As a means of supporting the establishment of the Yennora wool village an artificial economic factor has been introduced. I do not criticize this in any way. Indeed, this sort of thing should be done constantly and in relation to other industries. I refer to the artificial factor of 65 cents freight rebate allowed by the Department of Railways on each bale of wool handled through the Yennora wool village. In recognizing this and naming it as an artificial factor it is important to note that it is something that might be applied just as well to a wool handling and selling centre elsewhere in New South Wales. This was one of the important factors for consideration in developing the Yennora wool village and without a doubt it would be an important factor in launching a wool handling or selling centre elsewhere. The primary matters for consideration in deciding where wool handling and selling centres should be located in New South Wales are affected largely by the future that the industry is likely to enjoy.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: In selling methods?

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: More than selling methods is involved. Methods of appraisal and other factors are involved—matters that are beyond the industry after the time the wool has come off the sheep's back. An example is the three-port concept proposed by shipping authorities for the shifting of the Australian wool clip of the whole of the Commonwealth of Australia. To return to what I was saying, certain economic criteria have to be determined including a proper location point for wool handling and selling centres, but one of the most difficult questions is whether the public

auction system as the means of determining price and disposing of our wool clip is likely to continue.

A recent statement issued by Sir William Gunn, chairman of the Australian Wool Board, on broad policy advocated by the board for the wool industry in 1971 and 1972, contains every indication that the board itself has grave doubts about the likely continuation of the public auction system for the sale of wool. The best the board is willing to say at this stage is that there should be an acquisition system to replace auctioning. I believe that the board means a compulsory acquisition system, but the board certainly believes that even now an acquisition system should be superimposed upon the public auction system. The only reason for this view is that at this stage the board does not believe that the wool appraisal system and the wool measurement system have advanced sufficiently at the technological level to provide the best alternative to the existing system. It is fairly obvious that the board's opinion is that it is only a matter of time before the public auction system will disappear and give place to a more up-to-date and efficient mechanism for disposing of wool based on wool appraisal, sale by sample, sale by description and sale by valuation—by a system more adequately aligned with recent processing changes in the textile industries.

One aspect that could well be considered in regard to the Yennora wool village is whether the project should be constructed to handle as many as 1,750,000 bales a year. Though no official statement has yet been made on the matter—I am seeking one—it seems that the present stage of construction envisages a wool-handling capacity of not more than 800,000 bales a year, which approximates the total wool clip that is handled in Sydney. I sincerely hope that those associated with Yennora wool village, the State Government or the Australian Wool Board, will give an assurance that this complex will not be designed to handle more than 800,000 bales, for it seems to me that at best the public auction system for wool sales has a future of only two or three years.

During recent years the advantages of new methods of wool handling and selling have been subjected to careful assessment. Some of those methods have been adopted for use at the Yennora wool village. Their adoption for the handling of Australia's total wool clip could result in a saving of at least \$20 a bale, with a resultant benefit to the industry and the nation. It should be borne in mind that I am talking in terms of a saving of something in the order of \$100,000,000 or more a year for the total wool clip. Though we can look forward to a rise in the price of wool over the next ten years and to a stable price of about 40c as predicted by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the brightest note for the industry is that additional savings are envisaged from improved handling and selling methods.

The figures on which I am basing my argument come from a variety of sources. It would seem that in the more economic use of greasy wool a saving of between \$3 and \$9 a bale can be effected. Also, savings in inventory and mill labour cost can yield between \$3 and \$6 a bale. Moreover, a saving of \$7 to \$10 a bale can be effected in the cost of transport.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: At which stage of transport?

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: Transport until time of sale. Another \$1 a bale can be saved from reducing wool-buyer costs, and another \$2.50 a bale can be saved in shipping charges.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: Do those figures agree with those of the Australian Wool Board?

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I do not know whether they do, but I shall give the Minister my authority for my figures. One set comes from an article by B. G. L. Killen in volume 3 of *Report and Recommendations on Wool Marketing*. This figure was again given on 31st October, 1967 and a recent examination of these statistics reveals no change since that time.

The sixth factor concerns a reduction in claims against the buying broker. That has been assessed at \$3. The range in the

figures I have read is between \$19.50 and \$26 a bale. I have taken \$20 a bale, which is slightly above the minimum in the range, and have related it to the Australian wool clip of more than 5,000,000 bales a year. That gives a total saving of the order of \$100,000,000 a year. The industry itself could make this saving. It is a saving of private moneys essentially, and is not a saving of government moneys. It involves government moneys in the first instance, in the establishment of the machinery through which it can operate. Further, it is an area in which certain things should be done by the State of New South Wales as part of this State's contribution.

The relevance of the figure of \$100,000,000 is that, when one contemplates raising the Australian average wool price from 29.35 cents achieved in 1970-71 to the 36 cents that has been suggested by the newspapers as the likely government compromise figure of price support for wool, one is talking in terms of about \$120,000,000. Of course, if one speaks in terms of 40 cents instead of 30 cents a pound in a price support scheme, this involves a proportionate increase of about 60 per cent. On these figures the industry itself, given an opportunity to work out its own destiny, has in its own hands an opportunity to effect a saving largely equivalent to what can be achieved by government price support schemes. At this stage certainly neither I nor the Australian Labor Party would knock government price support schemes. On the contrary, we believe that, in the emergency conditions that apply now, every effort must be made to enable the Australian woolgrower to regain the stability that has been his heritage over many years.

Returning now to the location of wool handling and wool selling, the wool community has this amount of money available, and one can see this as a prime consideration for first savings. The first saving that has been indicated by the inter-departmental government committee, by the people who have examined the problem in the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and by the people from the Australian Wool Board who have

examined it, relates to the transportation of wool. The advantage of centres such as Goulburn and Albury is that they are closer to where the wool is produced.

When wool is taken to the wool handling centre and dumped under high-pressure dumping, its bulk can be reduced to such extent as to bring about an increase of 150 per cent in efficiency of rail handling. The inter-departmental committee in this State has found that rail waggons carrying wool are now used only to forty per cent of maximum efficiency. Some people have suggested that minor savings can be made in bulk handling of wool, but I do not agree. I believe such an assessment applies only in wool production areas that are highly concentrated in the geographical sense.

It is important to understand that under a system of acquisition of the wool clip and country wool handling, Goulburn would be able to handle 300,000 bales of wool a year whereas it can now efficiently handle only 179,000 bales. Members will appreciate the benefits when they realize that comparable improvements in wool handling can be made at Albury, and that there are natural centres for wool handling at Parkes and Werris Creek, and perhaps somewhere farther to the north. In this context, the relevance of locating wool handling centres in these areas rather than at Newcastle or Sydney becomes strikingly apparent.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: Is the honourable member envisaging a change in the selling methods of wool when he offers these observations or is he not?

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I am talking of either. The display of wool is a relevant factor. The indications are that this change has come about.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: The honourable member must recall the trouble in Goulburn some years ago when buyers refused to go to the wool centre.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I remember it only too well. If it had not been for the work of the State Labor Government, Goulburn would have been destroyed as a wool-selling centre.

The Hon. J. B. M. FULLER: Others too. Many people were prepared to put their money into Goulburn.

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: Many people were prepared to support the New South Wales Government then. Many people would support this Government now if it had the courage to set up wool-handling centres at Parkes, Werris Creek and perhaps farther to the north. This ought to be done whether or not there is a change in the method of selling. There is every reason to do it if Australia adopts the three-port concept for the distribution of Australian wool. Why should there be enhancement of both Sydney and Newcastle as the selling centres? It is obvious that the people who will determine the port centres under the three-port system will select one somewhere to the north: the indications are that they want Brisbane. It is a matter of conjecture whether, having regard to the ravages of drought and recessions in the Queensland pastoral zone, they will continue to want Brisbane.

The other two ports that have been suggested are Fremantle and Melbourne. Of course, a three-port system that involves Melbourne, Fremantle and even northern New South Wales or Brisbane means that wool-selling centres in Sydney and in Newcastle become largely redundant. Whatever the arguments are that may have been advanced in the past for the location of those centres in those two areas, they disappear. Putting those two facts together we see that even without the change from the public auction system, the time has come for the New South Wales State Government to make up its mind to act effectively and quickly for the establishment of wool handling and selling centres in at least two other places in New South Wales, and at the same time do something further about wool handling itself.

It is interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition when delivering his rural policy speech in February, 1971, before this year's State election, made it quite clear that a Labor government in New South Wales would do something about establishing woolhandling and wooselling centres in country areas and would do something

to bring about an early advancement of the technological expertise necessary in this State for the adoption in the wool industry of the improved methods of handling and selling our wool production to which I have referred.

In summary, I may say that looking at the wool industry in this State alone and separating it from the farm industry sector as a whole—though what I say applies in the other States as well—woolgrowers can say to the Commonwealth Government for its suggested price support plan, “Thanks for nothing.” For the Commonwealth’s loan support plan woolgrowers can say: “You are giving us only 60 per cent of what a New South Wales Labor government would have given us. The Liberal-Country party Government over the next three years will give us nothing by way of improvement in wool handling and wool selling, whereas we have every prospect of an alternative being achieved under a New South Wales Labor government.” In that context, I repeat the comment that I made on what the Hon. M. F. Willis had to say about the motivation behind the philosophy of the Liberal-Country party Government—that this State is confronted with a period of legislative and administrative quiescence and neglect.

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY [6.15]: I should like to begin my remarks by saying how pleased I was, and, I am sure, every other honourable member in this House was, at having His Excellency with us once more for the opening of Parliament. It is always a happy occasion and this time it was just as happy as it normally is, except for the sadness that we all felt at the loss of our old friend and mentor Major-General John Stevenson. I had very little to do with him except as an ordinary member, but one of the things for which I shall always be grateful to him is that in all my public life he was the first man in a high position that I ever met who said unequivocally to me, “Here you are a member of Parliament, equal in all respects”. This was a heart-warming thing to me when I came into this House, for it was not at that time a generally held view about women in public life.

Though I am happy to say that attitude has changed considerably since then, I have always been grateful to John Stevenson for his heartening welcome to the House, and for his help and patience about all the things that I should have known but did not know and that he knew so well. These are memories of him we shall all carry in our minds and hearts forever. Unfortunately, it was not until he left us that many of us, like myself, were wholly aware of his great work and the fine man that he was. We admired him in many ways, but did not know the depth of his heart and the extent of his service to the community and to Australia generally. I should like to express to the family my sympathy and sorrow at his passing from among us.

I sympathize deeply also with the family of our old friend, the Hon. Jack McIntosh. He was such a happy man and such a good companion that we shall miss him greatly.

I offer my warm congratulations to the Hon. M. F. Willis on his maiden speech. It encourages us all to look forward to many fine and thoughtful speeches from him over the years.

I turn now to something different. At the beginning of my remarks I want to criticize the Opposition once more for a habit that it has indulged ever since we won Government five years ago. My comment applies to members of the Opposition almost exclusively. I cannot remember an occasion when the House has been debating the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply when members of the Opposition have not reiterated, “Your Government has done nothing”. We heard the same old catchery this year. I submit this is unworthy of members of the Opposition. I know they have a harder line to follow than we do, but when we were in Opposition we gave credit where credit was due. It would be a nice thing if honourable members opposite were to do the same thing.

The Hon. R. R. DOWNING: The occasion never justified it.



The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: On the contrary, it has been very much justified, but there are none so blind as those who will not see. I feel it is a pity, because in my view the Government deserves a good deal of praise and also a good deal of commiseration in respect of circumstances that are beyond our control. There are other things that are new, different, and really matters for congratulation, and I shall touch on those a little later. I should like to comment first on some remarks made by the Hon. F. W. Bowen yesterday. I give him full marks for being a dedicated trade-union leader. I know that he does tremendous work, that he is in complete charge of all the ramifications of the trade-union movement and is a very good leader. However, I was sad to think that he would describe the trade unions as pressure groups that go out regardless, come what may, after what they want. He said:

There has not been a strike in this State where, the proposition put forward by the workers having been rejected, the strike has not resulted in their obtaining what they wanted, or part of it.

That means that if their proposition is rejected, they will go ahead like a steam train to get what they want, and are willing to crush anybody who stands in their way. That does not seem to be in character for the honourable gentleman. He went on to say:

... whether it is regrettable or not, strike action has resulted in an improvement in wages for workers who have been strong enough to do something about their position.

I believe there is a great responsibility attached to strength. If one is strong, one must use strength in a way that protects the weak. That is where I clash with honourable members opposite on the strike movement, which has no regard for the weak persons in our community, who are not organized like the trade-union movement, and are not able to stand up for their own rights. I am thinking of a person plodding home during a transport strike; I am thinking of people who are unable to buy the things that they want or to travel interstate or elsewhere because of various strikes. They are affected by the misuse of strength, which does the trade-union movement no credit.

The Hon. F. W. Bowen went on to say that these strikes have come about under a Liberal-Country party government. Of course they have, because the rulers in the trade unions—Labor or Communist—dominate the whole movement, and it is in their interests to try to destroy the Government that I support. Therefore it is logical to believe that strikes will occur to try to break down or to discredit any government that is opposed to the political philosophy of honourable members who sit opposite me. That is the thing I do not like, and I am sure that the average person in our society does not like it either. It is all very well for the Hon. F. W. Bowen to say that he has received no complaints about strikes. Of course he has not. People are sick of complaining. He should stand somewhere near a bus stop when a transport strike is threatened, and he will soon find out what people are thinking. I feel deeply about these matters.

I must comment on at least one other point, which is new to us, and that is the action of the president of the ACTU and his council in pushing retail firms and others—in fact, standing over them—to bring in compulsory unionism among their staffs. The Hon. J. J. Maloney knows that I have always been a supporter of the trade-union movement. That movement does much good, and trade unions are the right sorts of organizations to represent persons working in industry. However, I remember a few years ago travelling about the country speaking against the imposition of compulsory unionism. To me this is a complete abuse of the United Nations declarations of right to freedom of assembly.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: You do not understand the industrial set-up in this State. Those who are not contributing one cent to the support of the unions are getting the benefit of wage increases and improved conditions won by the unions.

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: In the past unions have discriminated against persons who did not want to join their ranks. I do not think that such persons should have the same benefits as others if they do not want to join the trade unions.



The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: If you applied that principle, you would smash all awards.

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: I find compulsory unionism objectionable. Applicants for jobs or workers are told that they will not be employed unless they join a union and pay it dues.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: You have to pay taxation in order to live in Australia.

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: When talking of paying union dues, the Hon. J. J. Maloney should not overlook the thousands of people who do not support the Australian Labor Party, which is the backbone of the union movement, but are obliged to contribute to the activities of Labor and left-wing leaders through those unions. To me that is a wrong way of dealing with the situation.

The Hon. J. J. MALONEY: Do you contribute to Liberal Party funds?

The Hon. EILEEN FURLEY: If I do not want to join the Liberal Party, I do not have to do so, but that is not the point I am making. I am speaking about the freedom of assembly. It is a basic principle that people should not be forced to belong to an organization that they do not want to join and be forced to pay these dues.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. Eileen Furley.

#### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

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

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

House adjourned, on motion by the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, at 6.26 p.m.

### Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 12 August, 1971

Printed Question and Answer—Petitions—Questions without Notice—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fifth Day's Debate)—Personal Explanation (Statement by Hon. Member for Corriimal)—Adjournment (Clutha Development Proprietary Limited).

Mr SPEAKER (The Hon. SIR KEVIN ELLIS) took the chair at 11 a.m.

Mr SPEAKER offered the Prayer.

## PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER

### TENANT EVICTIONS

Mr EINFELD asked the MINISTER OF JUSTICE—(1) How many cases were heard by the courts between 1st July, 1970, and 30th June, 1971, inclusive, for the eviction of tenants of controlled residences under the Landlord and Tenant Act? (2) Of these, how many resulted in decisions that the tenants were to be evicted? (3) Of these decisions, how many evictions were ordered under section 62 (5) (w)?

Answer—(1) 1,153 cases came before the courts. Of these 57 were withdrawn. (2) 791 orders were made in favour of landlords. (3) Of the 791 orders, 522 were based on ground (w).

### PETITIONS

#### CLUTHA DEVELOPMENT PTY. LIMITED AGREEMENT ACT

Mr J. J. T. STEWART presented a petition from certain citizens of New South Wales praying that the Clutha Development Pty Limited Agreement Act be repealed.

Petition received on motion by Mr J. J. T. Stewart.

#### LURNEA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr PACIULLO presented a petition from certain citizens of New South Wales praying that the Legislative Assembly make the necessary provision to ensure that Lurnea high school shall have a full complement of qualified permanent teachers.

Petition received on motion by Mr Paciullo.

#### GOVERNMENT TRANSPORT: INCREASED FARES

Mr O'CONNELL presented a petition from certain citizens of New South Wales praying that the railway fares be re-examined to avoid hardships that will be caused by fare increases.

Petition received on motion by Mr O'Connell.