

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 21 November, 1978

Representatives of Legislative Council on University Councils—Joint Committee upon Public Accounts and Financial Accounts of Statutory Authorities (Messages)—Joint Committee upon Parks for Mobile Homes and Caravans (Message)—Questions without Notice—Compensation for Members of the Legislative Council—Appropriation Bill (No. 2) (second reading)—Real Property (Crown Grants) Amendment Bill (No. 2) (first reading).

The President took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

The President reported the receipt of an acknowledgment from His Excellency the Governor of a communication conveying the terms of a resolution that the Hon. Joe Slater Thompson be elected as the representative of the Legislative Council on the Council of the University of New South Wales in pursuance of the provisions of section 5 of the University of New South Wales Act, 1968.

COUNCIL OF THE MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

The President reported the receipt of an acknowledgment from His Excellency the Governor of a communication conveying the terms of a resolution that the Hon. Kathleen Harris Anderson be elected as the representative of the Legislative Council on the Council of the Macquarie University in pursuance of the provisions of section 10 of the Macquarie University Act, 1964.

COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE

The President reported the receipt of an acknowledgment from His Excellency the Governor of a communication conveying the terms of a resolution that the Hon. Robert Gavin Melville be elected as the representative of the Legislative Council on the Council of the University of Newcastle in pursuance of the provisions of section 10 of the University of Newcastle Act, 1964.

COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND

The President reported the receipt of an acknowledgment from His Excellency the Governor of a communication conveying the terms of a resolution that the Hon. Jack Rowland Hallam be elected as the representative of the Legislative Council on the Council of the University of New England in pursuance of the provisions of section 10 of the University of New England Act, 1953.

COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

The President reported the receipt of **an** acknowledgment from His Excellency the Governor of a communication conveying the terms of a resolution that the Hon. Peter Francis Watkins be elected as the representative of the Legislative Council on the Council of the University of Wollongong in pursuance of the provisions of section 15 of the University of Wollongong Act, 1972.

SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

The President reported the receipt of an acknowledgment from His Excellency the Governor of a communication conveying the terms of a resolution that the Hon. David Paul Landa, LL.B., be elected a Fellow of the Senate of the University of Sydney as the representative of the Legislative Council in pursuance of the provisions of section 7 of the University and University Colleges Act, 1900.

JOINT COMMITTEE UPON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS OF STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

Messages

The President reported the receipt of the following messages from the Legislative Assembly:

Mr President—

The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council's message dated 16 November, 1978, concerning the appointment of the Joint Committee upon Public Accounts and Financial Accounts of Statutory Authorities, agrees to the proposal that, at any meeting of the committee, any five members shall constitute a quorum, provided that the committee shall meet as a joint committee at all times.

Legislative Assembly Chamber,
Sydney, 16 November, 1978.

L. B. KELLY,
Speaker.

Mr President—

The Legislative Assembly agrees to the time and place appointed by the Legislative Council in its message dated 16 November, 1978, for the first meeting of the Joint Committee upon Public Accounts and Financial Accounts of Statutory Authorities.

Legislative Assembly Chamber,
Sydney, 16 November, 1978.

L. B. KELLY,
Speaker.

JOINT COMMITTEE UPON PARKS FOR MOBILE HOMES AND CARAVANS

Message

The President reported the receipt of the following message from the Legislative Assembly:

Mr President—

The Legislative Assembly agrees to the time and place appointed by the Legislative Council in its message dated 16 November, 1978, for the first meeting of the Joint Committee upon Parks for Mobile Homes and Caravans.

Legislative Assembly Chamber,
Sydney, 16 November, 1978.

L. B. KELLY,
Speaker.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE STAFF

The Hon. R. B. ROWLAND SMITH: I address a question without notice to the Minister for Decentralisation and Minister Assisting the Premier representing in this House the Minister for Agriculture. Is it a fact that recently the New South Wales branch of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science expressed deep concern at the transfer of approximately 300 positions from the Department of Agriculture to other positions in the New South Wales public service? Is it a fact that eighty-eight positions at present occupied have been declared supernumerary? Is it further a fact that nearly half of those positions are occupied by highly trained people holding tertiary qualifications in science, many of whom are involved in important research work and extension of activities in the Department of Agriculture? In view of the considerable importance of agricultural production to the economy of the State, which was worth \$2,103 million in 1976–77 and which still offers the opportunity of further expansion, will the Minister ask the Minister for Agriculture to review the present situation within the department to ensure that there will be no adverse effect on the operation of the department, particularly on further agriculture production?

The Hon. J. R. HALLAM: I would have expected the Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith to be aware of some longstanding traditions in the Legislative Council relating to addressing questions to Ministers and the Leader of the House. I should like to quote his former Leader, the Hon. Sir John Fuller, on this subject:

Might I add that there is no representation of Ministers in this House as there is, possibly, in other parliaments. In this House questions without notice should be directed to the Hon. F. M. Hewitt as the Minister responsible for his department, and to myself on matters concerning the Department of Decentralisation and Development. They should be directed to me also as Leader of the Government if the questions are appropriate to that area of my responsibilities. Should I feel that my colleague the Hon. F. M. Hewitt has particular knowledge of matters involved in any questions, I shall refer them to him for a more detailed answer than sometimes I would be in a position to give.

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: I stand corrected.

The Hon. J. R. HALLAM: Therefore, questions directed to me should specifically relate to the administration of my portfolio. That longstanding tradition was pursued in recent times by the Hon. R. R. Downing and the Hon. Sir John Fuller. The honourable member should address this question to the Leader of the House.

The Hon. R. B. ROWLAND SMITH: I should like to rephrase the opening remarks of my question and direct it to the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am indebted to my colleague the Minister for Decentralisation and Minister Assisting the Premier for correcting the Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith on that matter of procedure. Staff retrenchments in the Department of Agriculture have been the subject of some interest in the Parliament in the past week or so. The matter is fairly clear and I am surprised that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and Leader of the Country Party in this House, notwithstanding his residential impediment, does not have some detailed knowledge of what is going on in the Department of Agriculture. The simple fact is that since 1976 there has been an increase in staff in this department. Rumours, no

doubt put out by the Opposition both in this place and in the other Chamber, that suggest the overall staff has decreased are quite incorrect. The staff in the Department of Agriculture has increased by 117 persons since this Government came to office.

Today the Government is criticized by baseless accusations for decreasing the staff in this department. No doubt next week or perhaps the week after it will be criticized for increasing the staff level. Consistent with this Government's policy of attending to the problems of rural New South Wales in a far more detailed and attentive way than the former Government, it was necessary to employ several hundred extra people for the brucellosis eradication campaign conducted last year by the Department of Agriculture. If the honourable member were to go to country New South Wales and talk to the people he would learn what a marvellous job has been done. As at 30th June the staff establishment of the Department of Agriculture was 4 210, with a ceiling of 3 900 and an actual strength of 3 811. The staff ceiling this year is 3 924. There has not been a reduction in the staff ceiling. In fact, there has been an increase.

It would appear that the Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith is confused in relation to the eighty staff members engaged by the Department of Agriculture on low priority programmes who have been informed by the Director General of Agriculture that their positions are supernumerary and that arrangements will be made to obtain alternative positions for them. Already fifty of those employees have been placed elsewhere, and the remaining thirty will soon be placed. Some cutbacks have occurred in the department's division of dairying because there is no longer a need for intensive supervision. Now that many Country Party members of this Parliament no longer have lucrative milk quotas some of them have moved to Sydney and several have expressed the view that they prefer to live in Sydney.

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: That is pathetic.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: All I can say to the honourable member in response to that interjection is that if he were to take his head out of the clouds at St Ives and go to rural New South Wales he would learn how pathetic the Country Party is regarded by the people there. At last the people in the country are seeing some real action towards alleviating problems of the man on the land and some real commitment by a Premier who has made more visits to look at problems first hand in country New South Wales than were made by the totality of leaders—and certainly there were enough of them—during the time when the coalition parties were in office. For the first time in many years the people have seen a real commitment to country New South Wales. The Government's contact with country New South Wales has revealed the necessity for a *staff* adjustment through supernumerary realignment.

Whereas the Government's actions have been viewed by members of the Country Party both here and in another place as being some kind of diminution in the role of the Department of Agriculture, this Government has increased the commitment to staffing in that department in preference to departments under the administration of other portfolios, particularly those relating to metropolitan areas. In fact, the Government's commitment to agriculture is bigger than some people in the community believe is warranted, but the Government is determined to maintain the balance between city and country and will ensure that the problems of the man on the land receive the attention that they deserve.

COAL LOADER FOR PORT KEMBLA

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I wish to direct a question without notice to the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council. Is it a fact that following the recent release of an environmental impact study of the

proposed extension to the Port Kembla coal loader, the South Coast Trades and Labor Council has placed a **ban** on **all** development until certain conditions have been met? Is it a fact further that these conditions are fourfold: First, that the time for public scrutiny of the environmental impact study be extended by three months from 1st October, 1978; second, that watertight guarantees be given for alternate ship repair facilities; third, that a guarantee be given that all associated rail facilities be completed before operation of the new loader may commence; and, fourth, that some assurance be given that parts for the coal loader be manufactured by local **firms**?

Is the Minister aware of the serious economic impact which delays in this project have had on the New South Wales coal mining industry, especially as they reduce the New South Wales industry's ability to compete against Queensland open-cut collieries? If the Minister is aware of these important problems can he inform this House what steps, if any, his Government is taking to ensure that the loader development proceeds as **quickly** as is possible?

The Mon. D. P. LANDA: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is nice to know that he is concerned about the coal loader at Port Kembla. We all have memories of his earlier concern for the coal loader at Botany Bay. I assure the honourable member that the Government is having detailed and ongoing discussions with the South Coast Trades and Labor Council. Last week the council had a lengthy conference with the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports on this matter. Certainly the council has an open view to put to the Government, as is its right. The environmental impact study is on display. Public comment is both called for and warranted. The Trades and Labor Council of the South Coast is an important segment of the community, and matters raised by it will be carefully considered by the Government.

The simple fact is that the department is confident that all matters raised by the South Coast Trades and Labor Council can be amicably settled. The discussions are being conducted, and the Government is looking for an early completion of a satisfactory environmental evaluation of the problems that can be foreseen in relation to the operation of such a big project. The Government and members of the Trades and Labor Council are taking a responsible view of the matter, and are satisfied with discussions at this stage.

RIVER MURRAY

The Hon. W. L. LANGE: I ask the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council a question without notice. Is the Minister aware that the Premier of South Australia is reported today as having claimed that the New South Wales and Victorian Governments were withholding agreement to draft legislation that would give the River Murray Commission control over the River Murray's water quality? In view of the deterioration of the quality of the water and the serious long-term environmental consequences of the lack of proper care of the river and the quality of the water, will the Minister, being responsible for the environment, take steps to expedite the New South Wales Government's agreement to the draft legislation?

The Mon. D. P. LANDA: The Minister for Conservation and Minister for Water Resources in the other House and I have had detailed discussions with representatives of the South Australian Government. On several occasions I have attended joint discussions with the Deputy Premier of South Australia, Mr Corcoran, and I know the Minister has attended recent ministerial inspection of the river and discussed the

matter. I can assure the honourable member that the problem as outlined in the newspaper report that I read is not so **clear-cut**. The control of the quality of water in the River Murray has never vested in the River Murray Commission.

The Hon. W. L. Lange: That is what the amendments are about.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The honourable member is complaining that the amendments have not been brought in. He was representing the people of Albury here when the member for Albury in the other Chamber was about to retire, and he **knows** that, although the amendments could have been brought in at that time, nothing happened. Since then there has been detailed interest displayed in the problem of water quality, but the Government does not want to duplicate facilities and organizations that are already charged with the duty of ensuring maximum water quality in the rivers of this State.

The Murray River differs substantially from other rivers in the State, in that it forms the border between New South Wales and other States. The Commonwealth, because of the involvement of the River Murray Commission, has long sought jurisdiction over water quality. That argument has some merit. In these times, when we do not want duplication of bureaucracies on a State to State or State to federal basis, one has to be careful to ensure that, if there is duplication, it is warranted. However, the Murray River has special problems requiring the special attention that has been given to it recently by Ministers from Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia and the Commonwealth. Whether jurisdiction over water quality should pass to the River Murray Commission is a matter that is still the subject of negotiation. South Australia wants to increase its influence over what is placed on the river banks of the Murray River in New South Wales and in Victoria, and I sympathize with the concern shown by the Premier of South Australia. But, the problem is not a simple one of handing over jurisdiction for water quality to the River Murray Commission. New South Wales **has** a State Pollution Control Commission that is charged with monitoring and investigating the quality of water of all rivers in New South Wales. No complaint could be made against the operations of that **commission** in this State.



COMPENSATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Consideration of Legislative Assembly's message of 16th November (*vide* page 405).

The Hon. D. P. LANDA (Minister for Planning and Environment and **Vice-President** of the Executive Council) [4.56]: I move:

That this House notes the report and recommendations of the Parliamentary Remuneration **Tribunal** in relation to compensation for members of the Legislative Council on termination of office following amendment of the Constitution, and **resolves—**

- (1) That in respect of compensation for loss of superannuation, it adopts the recommendations contained in paragraphs 34.A (1) and (2) of the report of the Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal tabled in this House on 21 November, 1978;

- (2) That in respect of compensation for loss of anticipated salary—
- (a) That non-continuing members of the Legislative Council (with the exception of those specified in sub-paragraph (b) hereunder) should be paid a capital sum equivalent to thirty per cent of one year's base salary payable to them at the date of their retirement, multiplied by the number of years of their unexpired term of office (fractions of years to be determined by completed months of service);
 - (b) That the Honourable Harold Gregory Percival, O.B.E., M.L.C., and the Honourable Ronald Bruce Raines, F.C.A., M.L.C., be not entitled to any compensation for loss of salary;
 - (c) That the principle outlined in sub-paragraph (a) above in respect of non-continuing members be also applied to continuing members but that, because the dates of expiration of their offices are indeterminate at this stage, legislation be introduced subsequent to each of the next two general elections to give effect to this resolution;
 - (d) That none of the above benefits should be available to any member of the Legislative Council who is re-elected to the Council at the election bringing about his compulsory retirement;
- (3) That legislation be introduced to give effect to resolutions 1 and 2 (a), (b) and (d).

The question of whether any special arrangements should be made in respect of retiring members of the Legislative Council as a result of the reconstitution of **the** House was referred to the Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal last year. This was done in accordance with the Government's clearly stated policy that the matter should properly be reviewed by that body before being debated in this Parliament. The Government made it equally clear as long ago as 22 June, **1977**, that if the tribunal's recommendations were adopted by the Government, they would, nonetheless, have to be approved by both Houses of Parliament and that, accordingly, it would be a matter for the Parliament to accept or reject any government proposal relating to compensation. The Government has given careful consideration to the recommendations of the tribunal and, in general terms, agrees with them. There are, however, two qualifications to this general agreement.

First, in relation to compensation for loss of anticipated salary, the recommendation has been slightly amended to ensure that the salary upon which the remuneration is to be calculated is the base salary, and does not include allowances payable to members. Second, the Government considers that neither the Hon. Greg Percival nor the Hon. Ron Raines should be entitled to any compensation. These two members were elected to the Legislative Council on **12** October, **1977**, some three months after the legislation to reform the House was introduced into this Parliament. These two members were well aware at the time of their election that their period of office must be shortlived, and that their period of office could only extend so long as the Legislative Council could delay the holding of the referendum and the subsequent first periodic election of members of the Legislative Council. Furthermore, both former honourable members voted on all motions in the Council on the bills for reform.

Some members of the Legislative Council consider that they have an inalienable, legal right to be recompensed for the total of the salary and allowances to which they would have been entitled had they continued to hold office for their original term. The claims of some members as indicated in paragraph **32** at page **34** of the report are absolutely incredible. Some members represented to the tribunal that they were

The Hon. D. P. Landa]

entitled to expect a sum equivalent to the gross salary allowance which would have been paid if all members had served their full term. Even more ambitious was the request for an increase of 20 per cent of the gross sum arrived at to compensate for loss of opportunity to obtain parliamentary office and to allow for anticipated annual increases of parliamentary salaries.

A further ambitious proposal was that retiring members should receive superannuation on the basis that they had completed their full term of office. This was subject to the rider that they not be required to make any capital contribution towards premiums that they would have paid if they had completed their full term. Of course, it was suggested that members should retain the title of the Honourable. Let me make it clear that honourable members of this Council forced into premature retirement by reasons of its democratic reform have no legal claim to any compensation whatsoever. This is not only the view held by the Government. I refer to paragraph 20 on page 12 of the report, where the tribunal said:

I do not consider that these provisions confer on a member a contractual right to payment. His right might better be described as a constitutional right. Such right may be varied by a valid amendment to the Constitution.

The report continues:

Should such amendment extend the term of office of a member but remain silent as to his remuneration he would be entitled to be paid the appropriate remuneration during his extended tenure of office.

Should such amendment curtail his period of office, his right to remuneration would be extinguished as from the date on which he ceases to be a member.

Accordingly, the electors having approved the proposed amendments, the right of a member to receive the specified remuneration ceases to exist on the day upon which the amended constitution provides that he is no longer a member. Having no right, in the strict sense of that word, to any further remuneration, he has no right to compensation for the extinguishment of his previously existing right.

The tribunal further considered all the relevant issues involved and reached this conclusion on page 15 of the report:

In all the circumstances, I consider that it is just and equitable that some compensation should be paid to members of the Legislative Council whose period of office has been curtailed by operation of an amendment of the constitution and I recommend accordingly.

The Government agrees with the conclusion reached by the tribunal and the reasons for that conclusion. For these reasons the Government considers that, with the exceptions I have mentioned, the recommendations of the tribunal are reasonable. They provide a fair and equitable basis upon which those members of the Legislative Council who have been, or who will be, retired prematurely by reason of the democratization of the Legislative Council should be compensated. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Message

Message forwarded to the Legislative Assembly advising it of the resolution.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 16th November, *vide* page 425) on motion by the Hon. D. P. Landa:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. VIRGINIA CHADWICK [5.7]: Just three years ago when speaking to a senior parliamentarian of my desire to enter Parliament his advice to me was, "Go home and forget it", because in his words I was, "The wrong age, the wrong sex, from the wrong place". In overcoming these externally perceived problems of age, sex and geography, I have at times been reminded of Lewis Carroll's observations in *Through the Looking Glass*:

"Well, in our country", said Alice, "you'd generally get to somewhere else if you ran very fast for a long time, as we've been doing".

"A slow sort of country?"—said the Queen. "Now, here you see it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else you must run at least twice as fast as that".

I am proud that the race has been run and won at this particular time and that I enter the Legislative Council as one of its first members elected by popular vote. Those who have actively sought change in the structure of this place feel it has been a long time coming. However, as a student, and one-time teacher of history, I am vitally aware of what I consider the dynamic ability of the House to adapt itself to changing attitudes and circumstances.

Historically, it is but a short time since 1823 when the Governor appointed a handful of residents to the Legislative Council. This body constituted the entire Legislature of New South Wales. What meagre lip service to self government we had such a short time ago. Councillors could only examine legislation proposed by the Governor, and though normally a majority assent was required—a difficult task I am sure since the members were all appointees—it was possible to enact laws with the assent of one member only or by the Governor in what he chose to call an emergency.

It has taken us only **150** years to develop our solid bicameral system where legislative power is clearly in the hands of the people's representatives in both Houses. **I am** delighted that in June this year the people overwhelmingly welcomed and accepted the responsibility of directly electing their representatives to this Chamber. I trust it will lead to greater public interest and community involvement in the interchange of attitudes and ideas that will give immediacy and relevance to our deliberations. It is my hope that despite the increasing party political nature of this House resulting from its new structure, this Chamber may still be able to function effectively as a House of review, not merely as a mirror image of the Assembly. Whether this is achieved or not rests now, not only on tradition and the past, but also on the quality and impartiality of our decisions.

My view of parliamentary duty cannot be better expressed than through the often quoted words of Edmund Burke who said that a representative should strive to:

Live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion, high respect; their business, unremitted attention.

It is not my way to raise expectations by the making of great promises. I promise only my sincere and persevering endeavours to fulfil this duty. Nowhere is this duty more clear to me than in relation to Newcastle, a city I love, not just with the pride of one whose family has called it home over many generations, but as one who is proud of its achievements and who believes that its future holds the key to recovery and future development of this State. Newcastle is the sixth city of Australia with over a quarter of a million inhabitants. It is the leading export port of New South Wales and the harbour deepening project will allow for ships of up to 120,000 tonnes deadweight. With this it is hoped not only to maintain our position in terms of exports but to improve on the 10 per cent of the import trade which we currently handle.

Newcastle in addition is the largest manufacturing centre outside Sydney, accounting for 30 per cent of the State's total production. This area needs encouragement to expand, not just to provide employment for the large number of people out of work, a disproportionate number of whom are young people and women, but also to broaden the industrial base of the area which is widely recognized as dangerously narrow and based on heavy industry. This need has more than parochial connotations. It is worth remembering that Newcastle has the largest non-metropolitan work force in Australia, or to put it another way, its work force is larger than that of Tasmania. Lack of balance will ultimately affect the entire State.

Newcastle generates 83 per cent of the total electricity from all sources in New South Wales and this will be greatly increased by the extensions at Vales Point as well as the Eraring project. Much of the development in this area is due to our rich and accessible coal reserves. Coal Board estimates reveal that the deposits in the Singleton measures alone, between Broke and Murrurundi, are about 45,000 million tonnes, excluding narrow seams. We look to the proper transport and port facilities that will facilitate the economic handling and marketing of this resource. In primary production the region presents the most diversified rural production area in New South Wales as a result of the wide range of climate and soil types and because of its proximity to urban markets.

Newcastle, like any area, is more than a checklist of industries and resources. It is people, the quality of life to which they aspire, and the standards they achieve, which provide in equal measure the litmus test of success and progress. For those who do not understand Newcastle it is often regarded as smog-ridden and strike-wracked. This is not so.

In the same spirit in which Newcastle led the State in the area of air pollution—achieving, *incidentally*, an improvement of 76 per cent in the fallout rate by the time the State Government introduced the Clean Air Act of 1961—the people of Newcastle are interested in self-help and self-achievement. We are the city which has led the State in regionalizing the arts and we look now to our own theatre, our own orchestra and proper housing of our Conservatorium of Music. Equally we look to the preservation of our heritage, whether it be the heritage built by man or the natural beauty of our beaches, lagoons, lakes, hills and valleys. Perhaps in this area the immediate challenge is the redevelopment of what is locally known as the East End. Once a city like Newcastle can achieve a happy marriage of industry and environment, of progress and respect for the past, then we shall have proved, not only to ourselves but also to people everywhere, that progress and conservation are not necessarily contradictory terms.

It is my hope to play some small part in meeting this challenge and through a public forum to make sure that Newcastle receives all necessary assistance to achieve its goals and the attention which is its right because of the contribution it makes to the rest of the State.

In the last decade we have certainly witnessed the folly of not heeding Burke's stricture on the nature of representation, whether it be in the grandiose plans of the Whitlam period which gave little thought to economic reality, with the resultant economic vandalism of our nation, or more recently a paucity of community consultation which has led to a backlash, astonishing to isolationist policymakers, and resulting in ad hocery and a vacillating band-aid approach to government. But equal to the duty to the wishes and opinions of constituents we surely owe people our judgment. To fail to employ reason and judgment leaves a member prey to the extremes of either servile compliance or wild popularity. Such attitudes, quite rightly, lower the community image and opinion of parliamentarians—leading to acceptance as the norm of current political figures who allow themselves to be packaged and marketed like a packet of cornflakes, making public life little more than the forum from which a self-made man can worship his creator.

Though I am not so young as to think I know everything, I **do** retain the idealistic belief that we here, though individuals, constitute a deliberative body of the entire State and that we share at least one interest in common—the good of the State and the welfare of its people. I believe that none of us would be here if we did not share this common purpose. The differences between us are the products of our individual philosophies—how we perceive that the good of the State can best be achieved.

My views are those of a Liberal—one who believes in toleration and mutual forbearance, in the freedom of the individual as far as public order will permit; one who believes in a social and economic system that will encourage and allow the individual to develop, grow, and be rewarded, in his pursuit of excellence and enterprise, not bound by the artificial barriers of class or race. Equally, I believe that within this framework we should retain flexibility of mind and a certain tentativeness of attitude. For without the capacity to adapt or allow that a view which we currently hold may in time prove mistaken or inappropriate, then how can we benefit from our increasing social and cultural diversity. How are imaginative concepts to be harnessed for the community's benefit? Without flexibility, we do not have the power to grapple with rapid technological change and the problems of an increasingly complex world.

In this context, I cannot support fanatical views at either end of the political spectrum, agreeing that politically "dogma does not mean the absence of thought but the end of it". Extreme and fanatical views of either left or right by definition involve persecution and hostility towards those who do not share such views—they inhibit human kindness in favour of systematic hatred. I wish I could say this from a study of history; unfortunately I know it to be true from personal experience. Even democracy, I maintain, if it becomes fanatical will ultimately make democratic institutions impossible.

While respecting the traditions on which our society is based I am out of step with those whose minds are implacably closed to change and who, like Bagehot, would feel that "one of the greatest pains in human nature is the pain of a new idea". This personal view was shared by the founder of the Liberal Party, Sir Robert Menzies. Speaking at the Canberra conference of 1944, which marked the beginning of the Liberal Party, he referred to political faith and warned, "There is no room in Australia for a party of reaction. There is no useful place for a party of negation."

I reject the creed of socialism because it makes no allowance for the richness and worth of the individual. A socialist welfare state smothers the fragile genius of man through a search for uniformity, and through the destruction of an incentive system which rewards the diligent and brilliant, surrounding us instead with government interference, regulation and bureaucracy which stifles incentive, slows down economic

The Hon. Virginia Chadwick]

growth, and creates inefficiency. This is clearly visible in New South Wales despite the fact that some would have us believe that we do not really have a Labor socialist government. We have, it would seem, a government formed by a new political party called the moderate party. In the exercise of their moderate policies, they have managed to lose 37 000 jobs in the private sector from May 1976 to June 1978.

To offset this figure, the Government has moderately increased the public sector by 21 000 at a cost to the taxpayer of \$250 million. Our prior investment levels were obviously not moderate enough and so have been reduced to such an extent that we now have the lowest level of all States at \$325 a head compared to Western Australia at \$4,273 a head. In terms of manufacturing investment alone, New South Wales is currently attracting only 13 per cent of new investment despite the fact that its traditional share has been 40 per cent. Population growth is the lowest of the mainland States. Migration is down and outwards migration, particularly of young working age males, is up. The figures tell their own tale. It is obvious that the State is stagnating—I guess we should just be grateful that it is such a stylish and moderate stagnation. The democratic, liberal, free-enterprise system, for all its deficiencies, has made us the richest, happiest and freest people who ever lived. Yet, it is under assault by those who would replace it with an economic system which is nowhere working effectively and, historically, never has worked. An adolescent yearning for the equal division of unequal earnings is so naive that I must agree with the observation that those who support such views are simply people who imagine they had an unhappy childhood.

One of the exciting challenges of today is in the field of ethnic affairs. I am proud that it was a Liberal Party government in this State which initiated a Ministry of Ethnic Affairs and that federally, it was a Liberal Party government which reintroduced the separate Ministry for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs after it was dismantled in the Whitlam period. The traditional and popular propensity to see Australia as immutably Anglo-Saxon in culture and heritage is an attitude with decreasing validity. Statistics show that well over 3 million people in Australia are postwar migrants and that the percentage of British born migrants has fallen by over 50 per cent in the same period. More than 60 per cent of the increase in the postwar work force is due to migrants constituting 27 per cent of the total work force. We should remember that 25 per cent of the population in Sydney was born outside Australia and that one in every three children in New South Wales schools is the child of a migrant family.

Without delving further into statistics it is clear that we are part of a multicultural society. The time has long since gone when there was sense or merit in any policy of total assimilation and integration which made no particular allowance for the special needs of migrants and which merely expected them quickly and quietly to fit into existing patterns and structures. This attitude, popular in the immediate postwar period, imposes undesirable pressure and strains by demanding acceptance of and conformity to existing institutions and a clean break from old bonds. Such an attitude is based on the belief that national cohesion and stability is directly related to social homogeneity and that a policy that has been described as Anglo conformity is the ideal. The statistics I quoted on our postwar population invalidate such a belief—cultural pluralism is a basic fact of Australian life.

I believe there is a need for government to consider seriously what is desirable in terms of policy direction. One could be pardoned for feeling that government policy, to date, regardless of party, though opting for a multicultural pluralist approach, has been lacking in a well-defined theoretical basis. Policy has simply developed as a knee jerk reaction to the resistance shown by ethnic groups to the loss of identity. We ignore this challenge at our peril. With the growing complexity and anonymity of modern life, particularly in a mass urban society, there is a search by the individual

for personal identity and a need to feel a sense of belonging. This is obvious throughout our society and is particularly relevant to ethnic groups. Ultimately cohesion must be dependent on social planning that encourages groupings at a series of levels, providing individuals with a sense of identity within a multicultural framework. A critical aspect of this approach would relate to race and ethnic origin.

The inherent problem facing social cohesion as a result of this policy is the danger of excessive separatism. What is needed is great interaction and interchange of attitudes at all levels in an atmosphere where tension is minimized and problems can be avoided through understanding. It is essential that such interaction be seen always as a two-way traffic, agreeing with the Prime Minister when he said:

A person can love Australia fully and participate productively and responsibly in Australia's national life while retaining his affection for the country of his birth, treasuring its memories, its culture and its language.

Because interaction and participation are needed at all levels, I deplore the fact that though we are a multicultural society, examination reveals undesirable stratification. For example, non-British subjects do not gain permanent employment in the New South Wales public service, because of section 28 of the New South Wales Public Service Act. Parliamentary representation in no way reflects the ethnic composition of the community. Overall, a need exists for greater consultation so that planning and development serves and reflects the nature of our population. In other words, we currently are not reflecting a multicultural approach at a level where power is held and decisions are being made.

I am appalled that research of the Ethnic Affairs Commission reveals that in the area of workers' compensation, migrant workers, on average, receive less compensation for the same injuries than their Australian born counterparts. Though problems of language and education must be taken into account, there is little room for pride that the majority of migrants are in unskilled work-making up 52 per cent of our manual work force—and that 75 per cent of all water and sewerage workers are migrants. Worse still, surveys reveal that the prospects of promotion and choice do not increase significantly in time, regardless of the length of time spent by the migrant in Australia. It is only when we have achieved a more equitable economic and social balance that we can feel that we have really met the challenge of a pluralist society.

I turn briefly to the field of education, an area beset at every level by problems of some magnitude. While conceding that the difficulties in this area have not, like mushrooms, sprung up overnight, one may be pardoned for thinking that this Government's policy to date could well share the simile. We are all acquainted with the ACER survey on literacy and numeracy in Australia which shows that 27 per cent of 10-year-olds cannot divide 56 by 7; that 13 per cent are unable to subtract 9 from 17; and, in terms of a purely mechanical function 82 per cent can not transcribe a passage of 48 words without errors in spelling or fact. Such figures indicate the good sense of a return to a more practical interpretation of the fundamental role of the school. Yet, instead, we find that the published aims of primary education in New South Wales are to "facilitate the development of perceptive understanding, mature judgment, responsible self-direction and moral autonomy . . ." so that "education provides relevant and enriching experiences which enhance the pupils' perspective of life". Our poor children.

To say that teachers should "de-emphasize exposition . . . while promoting understanding through pupil discovery", I find morally indefensible. Can we afford to wait until 27 per cent of 10-year-olds feel ready to discover how to divide 56 by 7? Though I applaud the aim of the well-balanced individual, I defy anyone to show me in this

The Hon. Virginia Chadwick]

complex society a well-adjusted illiterate. As a teacher I feel free to say that it is outrageous and appalling arrogance to suggest that teachers are somehow philosophers, psychologists and educationalists—though I understand the in term now is educators.

I reject the notion that the teacher is some sort of co-operative learner muddling his or her way through unstructured lessons with no goals other than some nebulous self-discovery. In terms of equipping our young for life this idea is about as helpful as throwing a drowning man both ends of a rope. It is imperative to emphasize the concrete before moving on to higher abstractions. The Government must come to grips with the problem of declining standards generally and must face the undeniable fact that the current educational approach has been, at the very least, inappropriate. Though there is merit in providing post-school remedial courses and pre-job training schemes, it is surely an admission that the education policy has failed in its most basic aims. The answer lies further back along the school chain in an effective learning process tempered with human understanding.

The tragic picture of youth unemployed is proof that we are not providing a satisfactory transition from school to working life. There is an abundant need for young men with **skills**, with a trade, with a disposition and **skills** to meet society's needs and yet there is no attempt by this Government to address this problem. Technological change has brought with it difficult and demanding social adjustments for people whose **skills** become redundant or for those whose primary skills are inadequate. Any Government which fails to meet these changing circumstances is betraying its youth. It is creating barriers to personal fulfilment and creating a cynicism about the role of government which will be detrimental in the end to society's well-being. Increased moneys may result in people being highly educated, but in terms of society's needs and the fulfilment of the individual this is not the same as being well or relevantly educated.

In this, my maiden speech, I am cognizant of the tradition that I should not mention matters too highly critical or controversial as a sign of my appreciation of the courtesy of being heard in silence. Consequently, I shall not speak of the Government's deplorable cut in education funding to beneath the **1975–76** level. I shall not speak of the broken election promises to non-government schools, receiving only 4 per cent of the total educational funding, shortchanged by \$10 million. Nor shall I speak of the heartless disregard for the handicapped children of this State, still waiting for promises of April **1976** to be fulfilled. And I shall not speak on a matter of grave concern to me—the broken election promise to employ the **1 500** unemployed teachers of **1976**, a number now in excess of **3 000**. In this area we see not just the hypocrisy of broken promises but a complete dereliction of duty to come to grips with the number of teacher trainees, teacher retraining, the nature of casual staff and the merit of a permanent part-time system. I shall not speak in such critical terms now but look forward to the opportunity to speak of these matters at another time, though perhaps not in the silence of today.

I thank members, not only for this courtesy, but also for the kindness shown by all in the short time I have been a member. I am grateful to those who have supported me, particularly that lost tribe—the Liberals of Newcastle. For us, it has been such a long, and often lonely time in the wilderness since the death of the Hon. Lester Saddington. With his fine example in mind, I hope that I may give account of myself in the words of Saint Paul "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith".

The Hon. J. S. THOMPSON [5.35]: I congratulate the new members on both sides of the Chamber on their election by the people. There is no need for me to remind them that it is an honour to serve in any parliamentary system. Almost daily

one reads in the newspapers details of problems encountered in oversea countries that have systems different to our parliamentary system, which makes laws and has a police and court system which enforces them. That is a far better system than those existing in many other parts of the world.

I congratulate also the Hon. D. P. Landa on his re-election to the Ministry and as Leader of the House. I congratulate not only the Hon. J. R. Hallam on his elevation to the Ministry and to the position of Deputy Leader of the House, but also the Hon. Clive Healey on his election as Chairman of Committees, the Hon. Kathleen Anderson on her election as Government Whip and the Hon. R. A. A. F. de Bryon-Faes on his election as Opposition Whip. Last but not least, I congratulate my friend and colleague for many years, the Hon. J. R. Johnson, on his election as President of the Legislative Council. We have, indeed, made an excellent choice in electing our President.

The Leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks in this debate described the Budget as dull. I remind him and other honourable members that this Budget was **first** introduced prior to the last elections. If Labor can continue to introduce budgets of that kind before elections and win a record majority, that type of budget will do me. For many years members of the coalition parties have said the people must decide. The Budget may have appeared dull to the Leader of the Opposition, but it was attractive to the people when they made their decision. The result of the elections was most satisfactory to the Government, and was certainly not dull.

Unemployment has been a principal topic of discussion in this debate. Government supporters deplore the unemployment that exists throughout Australia. It is disastrous. Members on this side of the House who deal with the grass roots of the workforce are acutely aware of the seriousness of the unemployment, for we see the real problems in circumstances not witnessed by members opposite. Unemployment is undoubtedly the worst feature of life in Australia at present.

Unemployment is primarily a federal matter. If the federal Government takes steps that wind down the workforce, the problems created can be sheeted home only to that Government. The Government of this State, by creating employment opportunities, has taken all steps possible to keep unemployment at a low level. It faces enormous problems but at least it is doing something about them. The Hon. Virginia Chadwick, in her maiden speech before this House, mentioned education. There has to be a dramatic change in the system of education in Australia. In particular I refer to education for those entering upon trades as distinct from education for those attending universities. I appreciate that many university graduates will have few job opportunities but, on the other side of the coin, those undertaking apprenticeships will have no opportunities for employment. Employers must take some of the responsibility for this. It is almost impossible for a boy leaving school to obtain an apprenticeship. Massive retraining programmes will have to be introduced, not only for those unable to arrange apprenticeships, but for the hundreds of thousands of graduates who will not be able to find jobs. The problems faced by young people whose expectations of employment will not eventuate must be solved by the national Government.

The people of New South Wales showed in the recent elections that they accepted as stable the Budget brought down by the Treasurer. Australians are crying out for the sound and stable government that they are not getting in Canberra. Many changes had to be made to the federal Budget before the ink was dry; indeed, there is now talk of introducing a mini-budget. The federal Government is the most unstable in Australia, with the possible exception of that in Queensland. For many years I have admired the social-democrat Swedish Government which, even though

The Hon. J. S. Thompson]

it is not in office at the moment, will return with an increased majority at the next election. The former ~~socialist-democrat~~ government was in office in Sweden for more than forty years, during which that country made great progress—not in massive attempts at change over a short period but gradually, as it should be made. That will be the process of government in New South Wales. The Labor Government of New South Wales will not be a dull government, but an **exciting** one, which **will** make changes that are acceptable to the people. With its policies of gradual change, I am confident that it will be in office in this State for the next forty years.

I have said many times in this Chamber that industry is the most important factor in our life style. If industry were destroyed, there would be no jobs. It is pleasing to see industries returning to New South Wales. This has been documented, chapter and verse. In the past month the Government has been advised that the Leyland Motor Corporation of Australia Limited intends to close its truck assembly plant at Footscray in Victoria and to return to New South Wales. During the term of office of the former Liberal-Country party Government the truck manufacturing industry was lost to New South Wales, but now the **flood** has been reversed. The return of the **Leyland** corporation will provide the first truck manufacturing and assembly plant in New South Wales. It will not only provide many with employment but will bring with it ancillary industries.

The Leader of the Opposition criticized the Budget because it avoided tax increases. What is wrong with that? By the use of good accounting methods and business sense, the Government has been able to avoid massive tax increases. It should not be criticized for that. The criticism by Opposition members should be levelled at the federal Treasurer, because some of the taxes he has introduced are a blot on Australia. The most controversial of these is the so-called embarkation tax on persons leaving Australia. Visitors from overseas are charged an extra \$10 when departing from Australia. The tax is already meeting resistance and can only bring Australia into disrepute in other parts of the world.

Recently when a reduction in taxation was announced by the federal Government it created newspaper headlines, but in a matter of months it was reintroduced as a surcharge. It is, nevertheless, taxation and its reintroduction broke promises that the Government had made. An embarkation taxation is in force in only those countries that have not yet reached Australia's stage of development; it is not used by the leading nations of the world. Members of the Opposition should not talk of broken promises, because the federal Government has broken more promises in the past twelve months than any other party since I have been interested in politics.

I have said previously that unemployment is a national disaster and a tragedy. I do not intend to play politics with this matter because it involves the lives of people, but many of the problems to be faced now, and also in the future, have been created by new technology. This is evident not only in the broad spectrum of secondary industry but also in the so-called white collar areas. Steps are now being taken to insulate the white collar workers from technology, but a country cannot entirely insulate itself from overseas technology. Even in the blue collar field that cannot be done. Technology has been advancing in other countries and Australia must use this new technology if it is to remain competitive. Tariffs of 47½ per cent were introduced to protect the motor vehicle industry, but those tariffs were jumped by the Japanese, and Australia now relies on 20 per cent quotas to keep out foreign competition.

It has been said that the Australian worker is to blame for some of the problems of industry. but I know that our employees work far harder than their overseas counterparts. However, the amount of technology is increasing and it is obvious that,

with the huge sums being poured into new technology overseas, Australia will face tremendous difficulties in the near future. It is not economically feasible for Australia to expend such huge sums on developing its own new technology.

In the next ten years technology will pose considerable problems for Australia. The layman finds it hard to comprehend the extent of this problem. We cannot insulate ourselves from what is taking place overseas for, if we do, our whole living standard will decline. As a matter of interest, in the United States of America a Pontiac Le Mans can be purchased for \$US4,200, which is the equivalent of \$A3,700. The point I am making is that the low price in America has been achieved by the use of technology. The worker building that car in America receives about four times the Australian rate of pay and has fringe benefits far superior to those enjoyed by the Australian worker. Nevertheless the United States of America can produce a motor vehicle and sell it at a price that is about one-third of what it can be produced for in Australia. That can be done purely and simply by using technology. People who say that the Australian worker does not work hard enough and is overpaid are doing this country a great disservice and are overlooking the lack of technology in Australia, which is the real cause of the problem. Over the next decade, unless this country uses the type of technology becoming available and employs it on huge volume runs, Australia will face major problems.

The New South Wales Labor Government, unlike the government in Canberra, has in the Budget honoured its promises. All governments should be obliged to honour their promises. In 1976, when the Labor Government was elected to office in New South Wales, one of its main objectives was to update public transport. There is general agreement that in the future public transport will play an increasingly important role. In April, 1976, the New South Wales Labor Party presented to the people an all-embracing five-year programme involving \$1,000 million, which was designed to update and revitalize public transport. The Government's objective was to modernize and rationalize public transport services and resources, and it decided upon what it termed the development of a viable transport system within financial, environmental and social constraints. The Government has done that.

An obvious problem was high fares. It is impossible in any part of the world for a public transport system to pay for itself. It must be accepted that the cost of running public transport carrying a handful of people is the same as for carrying a large number of people. In its wisdom the Government reduced fares by 20 per cent, thus arresting the dramatic fall off in numbers using public transport. From 27th June, 1976, public transport fares were reduced throughout New South Wales by an average of 20 per cent. During the 1976–77 financial year—the first full year during which the new fare scales operated—more than seven million extra passenger journeys were made on public transport in New South Wales when compared with the 1975–76 patronage figure. That was a clear indication that the policy of the Labor Party was right, especially when this increase is compared with a fall off of no fewer than 59 million journeys in the two preceding financial years. This demonstrates the poor state of the public transport system before the advent of the Labor Government.

People living in rural areas are the most affected by public transport charges. On many occasions I have said that, far from representing country people, the Country Party has sold them out at every opportunity. This applies particularly with transport. The Government in Canberra is the instigator of high petrol prices, which affect country people more than anyone else, because the shortage of public transport there obliges them to make great use of the higher priced petrol. The 1976–77 transport patronage upsurge was particularly evident in rural areas, where an increase of almost 17 per cent was recorded. The Labor Party assisted country people, unlike the Country Party, which continues to do nothing for them. At the time that the Labor

The Hon. J. S. Thompson]

Government reduced fares on public transport the fare structure in New South Wales was one of the highest of any State in Australia. The 20 per cent reduction effective from June 1976—and unchanged since—has resulted in New South Wales having one of the nation's lowest total fare structures.

The Hon. W. L. Lange: And the highest deficit.

The Hon. J. S. THOMPSON: I am glad that the honourable member has mentioned that. I shall refer to that later. When the Labor Government took office the whole of public transport, including the rolling-stock, tracks and signalling, was in a deplorable condition. It was rotting and falling to pieces. The former Government allowed public transport to run down, and it was necessary for the Labor Government to revitalize the system when it came into office. In conjunction with the reduction in public transport fares and the determination to attract the public back to public transport by improving dramatically transport services, the Government embarked on a programme of not only massive rolling-stock acquisition for both bus and rail services, but also replacement of ferries.

The Hon. W. L. Lange referred to the high deficit. The answer is that the Government has on order or has already received a total of 350 new double-deck passenger rail carriages worth in excess of \$105 million. Already 160 of these new carriages have been delivered, and the remainder are due for completion over the next two years. That represents a dramatic increase in rolling-stock. The building up of the public transport system has assisted to a degree to reduce unemployment in New South Wales. Carriages are coming off the production line at the rate of one and a half new carriages a week. Further, the Government has taken delivery of twenty-six new double-deck interurban carriages for use on the Gosford and Blue Mountains lines. The remaining four carriages of a total order of thirty are due for delivery over the next two months. These luxurious air-conditioned carriages, worth in excess of \$13 million, have resulted in a dramatic upturn in interurban rail services. This \$13 million has been spent on trains serving Gosford, the Blue Mountains and similar areas. This sort of expenditure is part of the reason for the deficit.

All honourable members will appreciate that freight represents an important part of public transport. The Government is well advanced on a massive programme of new freight rolling-stock acquisition. More than \$30 million has been committed already towards the replacement of the Public Transport Commission's ageing waggon fleet. Although the word ageing has been used, I would prefer to describe it as rotting and falling to pieces. This programme involves the acquisition of more than 1 300 coal, grain, cement and general freight waggons and more than 1 200 new bogies. That also represents a massive programme. One cannot have an efficient public transport system without proper locomotive power. When the Government came to office the locomotives of the Public Transport Commission were in a deplorable state. Little attempt had been made to revitalize them. The Government did not back away from its major tasks. It placed an order for forty new diesel-electric locomotives worth more than \$30 million.

New locomotives have also been delivered for service at the rate of one every two weeks. These will be used for the haulage of freight and passenger trains. The order is particularly significant because of the expected boom in the coal export market. The Government has plans for the acquisition of a further 150 mainline diesel-electric locomotives—a massive order—to ensure that adequate locomotives are available to cope with the increase in coal exports. New South Wales has such vast coal reserves that these locomotives are much needed to haul coal exports.

The Government has embarked on a massive bus acquisition programme worth more than \$54 million. The programme involves delivery of 750 new Mercedes-Benz buses for the metropolitan and Newcastle services by June 1980. Already the first order of 200 Mercedes-Benz buses has been delivered.

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: These are purchases, not leases?

The Hon. J. S. THOMPSON: They are purchases, but some have been leased too. Deliveries of a subsequent order for a further 550 buses have been commenced, and these will enter service at the rate of six a week. The delivery of the 750 buses within the first four years of Labor's term of office will result in half the Public Transport Commission's bus fleet being replaced. This will reduce the average age of the metropolitan bus fleet from the current 10.2 years to only 4.5 years. When the Government took office more than one-third of the commission's bus fleet was more than 25 years old, with spare parts and replacements almost impossible to obtain.

In line with the Government's balanced approach to public transport a further \$3.5 million contract was let in April for the construction of two new Lady class ferries for Sydney Harbour services. They are under construction at the Newcastle State Dockyard and are due for delivery in April 1979. The important part of that order is not only the revitalization of the fleet but also the creation of 160 new jobs in the Newcastle area. The Government has also purchased an additional hydrofoil for the Manly-Circular Quay service. Having been born in Manly, I know the area well. The people of Manly were fed up with the type of transport the previous Government had foisted upon them. The Labor Party won the seat of Manly at the last election because it increased to five the number of hydrofoils operating on the Manly run. Each vessel cost \$1 million. A third ferry of the Lady class, Lady Wakehurst, was reintroduced to the Manly run last January. The return to the three-ferry service on a trial basis has proved highly successful. Passengers increased by 23.5 per cent.

One of the most serious problems when this Government came to office was the condition of the rail tracks throughout New South Wales. Not only had the whole of the suburban, interurban and country rail fleet run down, but also the track was in a deplorable state. For a number of years, the maintenance had been cut to such a degree that much of the track was unsafe. Many people died in the disastrous accident at Granville. That was the beginning of the injection of a massive amount of money into the system in an endeavour to update it and bring the track to an acceptable standard.

In September 1976 the Government ordered a foil-scale evaluation of track throughout the State. Since the track upgrading programme commenced early in 1977 more than \$45 million has been spent on necessary track work throughout the State, excluding the normal annual investment of \$80 million. Special track upgrading has been carried out in stages. It involves massive amounts of restoration. It also involves a multi-million dollar programme of bridge upgrading and replacement throughout New South Wales, incorporating an allocation of \$20 million to replace all timber rail bridges on the North Coast line over the next seven years.

The signalling system was practically worn out when this Government came to office. Modern technology is needed to run a modern railway service. The signalling system had to be updated. As an integral part of the modernization programme, installation of sophisticated signalling systems has commenced at Central and Strathfield at a total cost of more than \$30 million. The computerized train describer system is scheduled for completion in the Sydney area in October 1978 and stage 2 at Strathfield in 1980. The operation of this most advanced signalling system will ensure ready identification of any problems within the Sydney area and will lead to more efficient operation. It is absolutely necessary to bring the rail system up to date.

It is useless having this equipment unless the commission is able to repair it. A massive programme is going on to upgrade the whole of the commission's workshops throughout New South Wales. The planned workshop development is now in accordance with properly defined projected needs and is proceeding as quickly as possible. Tenders are being called for new multimillion dollar workshops at Bathurst, Goulburn and Newcastle. New locomotive servicing facilities are being constructed at Lithgow this financial year. The Public Transport Commission is opening new freight centres, the first having been opened at Tamworth in May 1978 at a cost of \$2.4 million. Other centres are nearing completion at Glen Innes at a cost of \$200,000, Gunnedah \$200,000, Narrabri \$10,000, Coonamble \$100,000 and Moree \$200,000. Massive amounts of work are being done on electrification. The Sutherland—Waterfall electrification project will be completed in March 1980 at a cost of \$30 million. The electrification from Gosford to Newcastle is planned at a total cost of \$30 million, with an allocation of \$1 million this financial year.

When the Labor Government came to office serious doubts were held about the eventual use of the eastern suburbs railway. The Government had the financial side of that project closely analysed. It is impossible for the eastern suburbs railway to run at a profit, no matter what happens. The experts who advise the Government were asked to look at the matter and recommended that we go ahead with the system. The Government went ahead with the eastern suburbs railway, knowing that it cannot possibly pay. With the assistance of internal measures that were taken in the Public Transport Commission the final cost of the work is expected to be within the revised estimate of \$164.4 million that was provided by the board of review. The unfortunate part is that it should never have been started because it will continue to lose money at a fast rate. When the Government came to office it was so totally committed by the former Government that the work that had been commenced had to be continued. It will be a serious problem for the State in the future. The Government has done everything possible to re-vitalize the public transport system. The Budget is first-rate. I conclude on the note on which I commenced: If the Budget that was introduced before the Government's return to office was dull, it will continue to introduce Budgets just like that and, as I see the position, be in power in New South Wales for the next forty years.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING [6.11]: I join with the previous speakers in congratulating you, Mr President, on your election as President of this Chamber. There is absolutely no doubt that honourable members have the highest regard for your personal integrity. In those circumstances I am perfectly sure that you will bring great honour to the office for which you have been chosen. I wish you every success in that office. I congratulate also the Hon. Paul Landa and the Hon. Jack Hallam on their recent election to the Ministry. The Hon. Max Willis and the Hon. Bob Rowland Smith have been elected as leaders of their respective parties in the Opposition and I congratulate them. I congratulate also the Hon. Olive Healey on his election as Chairman of Committees.

I am particularly pleased to congratulate those members who have made maiden speeches during the budget debate. The quality of those speeches has been excellent. It augurs well for the quality of debate in coming years. Though I am reluctant to single out any member I should like to say that I was particularly proud this afternoon to listen to the Hon. Virginia Chadwick when she made her maiden speech. Her father was once my commanding officer. He has since passed away but had Major David Walls been here today he would have been exceedingly proud of his daughter.

At the commencement of this parliamentary session I was entrusted with the responsibility of reviewing legislation brought into the Parliament by the Hon. R. J. Mulock, Minister for Mineral Resources and Development. Accordingly, this afternoon

I wish briefly to address myself to some matters concerning that portfolio. On 7th November the Minister made his first public statement in relation to his new portfolio when he addressed the Institute of Mining and Metallurgy at the Sebel Town House. In that interesting address the Minister went to great lengths to explain that the term development in his portfolio was not restricted only to mineral development but covered any form of development in New South Wales. Honourable members will realize that the Minister has before him an enormous workload. During the past three years of Labor Party rule in New South Wales the State has experienced a dramatic downturn in capital development and continues to face the prospect of further downturn.

The Hon. J. R. Hallam: That is not true.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: Despite what the Minister has said, that is quite true. If the Minister will bear with me I shall produce facts and figures, unlike earlier speakers in the debate who have delighted in the use of generalities. The *Australian Director* is a journal which I am sure honourable members will agree is a prestigious publication. In an article titled "Outlook for Major Investment Projects", published in the August 1978 edition, a survey was conducted on a State-by-State basis of private capital investment projects in excess of \$5 million. The analysis is divided between mining and manufacturing development and is split up into three categories of development. The first type of development referred to is firm development. That includes capital projects which are definitely going ahead within the next year or so. The next category is defined as possible developments. They are projects which may commence within the next two or three years. Those projects are in the planning stage. The third category is long-term development. Those are developments which, though they are being thought about and planned, are unlikely to proceed before 1980.

If one analyses the figures one sees a quite remarkable situation. If one takes the total projected capital development, State by State, in all three categories put together and divides the amount of money by the population of the State so that one has a capital development per head of population—I am sure honourable members will agree that for the purposes of comparison, State by State, that is not an unrealistic or artificial comparison—

The Hon. J. R. Hallam: Yes, it is. Western Australia and Queensland are frontier States and the Hon. E. P. Pickering knows that.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: New South Wales is the lowest State, at \$498 a head of population. The Australian average is \$1,417. That is nearly three times the figure for New South Wales. Western Australia, the so-called frontier State, which has a Liberal Party government, has a figure of \$6,900 or fourteen times the figure for New South Wales. The figure for the Northern Territory is \$7,600 or fifteen times the figure for New South Wales. Lowly Tasmania, which I do not think falls into the category of a frontier State, has \$1,089 or twice the New South Wales figure. Admittedly those figures include all development.

The Hon. J. R. Hallam. It is a distortion.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I do not believe a *per capita* figure is a distortion when one is comparing States. I shall be pleased to hear the Minister for Decentralisation and Minister Assisting the Premier explain why he maintains that is a distortion. It brings the figures into relative comparability. The firm projects which are definitely going ahead show that New South Wales is the lowest State at \$268 a head with Western Australia having \$1,806 a head. Surely the Australian average figure is the important comparison at \$573. In other words, the rest of Australia is running at a rate of firm capital development at twice the level of the most populous

and most important State, New South Wales. That is bad enough, but a little while ago the Hon. J. S. Thompson suggested that the future for capital manufacture in the State was rosy. Honourable members heard about one or two projects that were going ahead, particularly projects in the motor vehicle industry. But, if we look at the analysis of projected development in New South Wales and in other States we find again that New South Wales is the lowest State, at \$268 a head. The figure for Western Australia is \$5,600; for the Northern Territory it is \$6,700. The Australian average figure is \$1,018.

The Hon. J. S. Thompson: That is a distortion based upon population. You are trying to fool people.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I am not trying to do that at all. In my opinion a *per capita* comparison is not dishonest. I shall be happy to listen to the honourable members on the Government side offer even one argument to support that interjection. Honourable members might suggest that these figures are distorted as Western Australia and the Northern Territory will enjoy some capital development associated with mining which is peculiar to that State and that territory with their rich resources and small populations. Let us examine capital development for manufacturing industry and eliminate mining from our consideration. On the figures I have given, the total expected manufacturing capital development in New South Wales is \$268 a head whereas for the frontier State of Western Australia it is \$1,806 and the average for Australia is \$573. In other words, in manufacturing development the Australian average is twice the level of the figure for New South Wales. The figures I have quoted were published in August 1978 in a most prestigious magazine. The article is freely available for honourable members to peruse. The facts are as I have given them. It is difficult to contradict them. If honourable members suggest that dividing the total figure by the population is a dishonest procedure I invite them to look at the aggregate figures. They will see that the result is almost the same. New South Wales is worse off than any other State.

I turn now from the private sector to an examination of the government sector in terms of projected capital development. Only a few weeks ago the New South Wales Government joined with other State governments at a Loan Council meeting. At that meeting, working under the new formula laid down by the federalism policy of the Government in Canberra, the States sought approval to raise certain loans.

The Hon. Kathleen Anderson: It does not work.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: It works well enough. The States got everything they asked for.

The Hon. Kathleen Anderson: It does not work for local government.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I am talking about the State governments.

The Hon. J. R. Hallam: That Loan Council meeting was held subsequent to the Ballarat by-election.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: That may be so but every single dollar asked for by the State governments was approved. When one analyses what the New South Wales Government asked for and compares it on a *per capita* basis with the requests of the other States, again New South Wales is worse off than any other State. The approval was \$60 a head for New South Wales compared with \$450 for Western Australia, \$260 for Tasmania, \$143 for South Australia, \$105 for Victoria and \$93 for Queensland. I suggest that the Government did not plan well enough ahead and

simply did not ask for the amount of money that this State demands in terms of capital development in order to take the steps necessary to reduce the unemployment level, particularly among young people about to leave school. This point was drawn forcibly to the attention of the Chamber by the Hon. Deirdre Grusovin who recently delivered her maiden speech. The Government could do well to ponder the cause of this remarkable situation.

Though the Premier's public relations machine extracts every ounce of coverage for every actual and dreamed up development in this State, the way things are heading no amount of cosmetic public relations will hide the sorry truth. If the Minister for Mineral Resources and Development is to make a significant impact upon overcoming the problem of decreasing capital development he should give attention specifically to the mineral resources portion of his portfolio. New South Wales is the repository of a vast wealth of mineral and fuel deposits. I am pleased to learn from the Minister's speech that he is aware of the importance of mining. He said:

I can assure you that I need no convincing about the importance of mining to Australia as a nation and to the economy of New South Wales in particular. There is just no room for doubt that the future prosperity of this State is tied up intimately with the way in which this government and future governments co-ordinate the production and marketing of our minerals, with coal in particular.

Despite this enormous potential wealth the mining industry in New South Wales faces many pressing problems to which I trust in the near future the Minister will address himself as well as exhibiting some success in influencing some of his more repressive ministerial colleagues. The Minister for Mineral Resources and Development, after speaking of environmental restrictions facing the mining industry, said:

In the light of these restrictions which the mining industry already faces, governments themselves must be sure that they do not add unreasonably to the industry's problems by further restrictions, by further restricting their capacity to operate by interfering unnecessarily.

In this contest, I would like to refer briefly to one matter that concerns me. It is the restriction which exists on mining under stored waters, and under roads, bridges and other structures. I am certainly not arguing here that such restrictions can be lifted. Obviously, they cannot for safety reasons. But I do feel that in looking at this question some account must be taken of the value of mineral deposits that can be locked away, possibly for all time, if the mining industry is forced to take a back seat in the planning processes undertaken by various Government authorities.

It is an unfortunate fact that in the State of New South Wales enormous deposits of coal have been completely sterilized through short-sighted government planning by many governments over many years. I should like to invite the attention of this Chamber to some simple examples of how the problem has developed. Recently the F6 expressway was extended from the metropolitan area to the Wollongong region. As part of that development a small bridge was constructed not far from my home south of Garrawarra hospital to allow the new expressway to cross the Princes Highway. That bridge is a small structure which would have cost the constructing authority little more than about \$1 million. However, because the design of that bridge was not adequate to allow for mining underneath it a quantity of coal has been sterilized. That coal is defined by an angle drawn into the earth from the bridge to the coal seam at 35 degrees. Relating to the Bulli seam alone it is estimated that 1 888 000 tonnes of coal have been sterilized. That deposit, in today's export market terms, could

The Hon. E. P. Pickering]

confidently be valued at more than \$40 million, even after making due allowance for the amount of coal that might be expected to be recovered using conventional mining techniques.

A further example of lost coal deposits involves the southwestern expressway now being extended from Campbelltown to Bargo. Five major crossings, each four-lane divided bridges, are to be built over the Nepean River. Consideration was given to building these bridges in such a manner that mining might proceed beneath them. However, for economic reasons that concept was dropped by the constructing authority. The proposed method of construction of those five bridges will effectively sterilize \$400 million worth of coal. Because five bridges, to be built at a capital cost of \$10 million, will not have the structural stability necessary to allow mining beneath them the State of New South Wales will lose a potential \$440 million worth of export coal.

[The President left the chair at 6.30 p.m. The House resumed at 8.15 p.m.]

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: Prior to the adjournment I had been describing, by way of two simple examples, how the lack of foresight of government authorities had resulted in the sterilization for all time of millions of tonnes of high grade, valuable coking coal in this State. If the constructing authorities had had the foresight to plan bridges capable of allowing mining to be carried out underneath them—and I assure honourable members that this is acceptable engineering practice—then, for a comparatively small additional outlay in terms of capital development, the export income of this State would have been enhanced by more than \$440 million. The problem that I have identified in these two examples can be multiplied hundreds of times throughout the State of New South Wales. Honourable members heard me speak in this Chamber during the debate on the Dams Safety Bill, under which the Government was determined to introduce legislation to ensure that 600 million tonnes of coal, worth more than \$20,000 million, would be lost to this State.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: That is absolute nonsense.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: If the Minister would listen, I assure him that when that legislation comes before this House again I shall have more to say about it. I suggest to honourable members and the Minister that there is a pressing urgency in this State for careful examination of developments that could dramatically reduce the potential energy resources from coal. In a world that is facing a major energy crisis, the government of a highly sophisticated society, such as that in New South Wales, should not flagrantly and ignorantly abuse the resources with which the State is endowed. To reinforce that comment, I shall quote from a report received recently from the Hon. J. S. Thompson entitled "Auto Workers and the Future of The World's Auto Industry 1980 to the Year 2000." I wholeheartedly concur with these comments made by the Hon. J. S. Thompson in the foreword to that interesting report:

To look at this Conference as one affecting the World Auto Industry alone would not give a clear picture of the real problems facing not only the Auto Industry but our society.

The Hon. P. McMahon: What conference are you talking about?

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: Auto Workers and the Future of the World's Auto Industry 1980 to the Year 2000, a report of a conference held in Detroit that was released last week to the Hon. J. S. Thompson. It continues:

It is quite obvious that our whole standard of living, our way of life is based upon massive uses of energy and if this energy becomes more expensive through scarcity and lack of foresight and planning by Governments in seeking alternative forms of energy our society will be heading for a catastrophe a magnitude of which it is difficult to envisage at this stage.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: That is the best part of your speech.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I agree totally with the Hon. J. S. Thompson, despite the comments of honourable members opposite. I am inviting attention to the abuse of the coal reserves of this State. This is a non-party problem, and governments of both political persuasions have been guilty of it. Given the present world energy crisis, the time has long since passed when responsible governments should look at the matter responsibly. I take umbrage at the sort of comment made by the Minister in this House on a matter that I believe to be of enormous importance, not only to this State but to Australia.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: So is the safety of dams.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I have not referred to dams safety in this speech. The Dams Safety Bill will be dealt with at a later date. I am speaking about the overall sterilization of many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of coal. The Dams Safety Bill deals with only one small part of the overall problem.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Surely the honourable member would not countenance mining being carried out under dams if there were a risk to the safety of the dams.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: The obvious answer to that is, no.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Neither does the Government.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: Another matter of major concern to mining companies in this State is the inordinate delay incurred by companies in their dealings with a multitude of government and semi-government departments during the development phases of their operations. I have in my hand a sequence chart prepared by the Department of Mines which graphically sets out all the steps necessary for a coalmining company to acquire a coalmining lease under the provisions of the Coal Mining Act. Although this most interesting document is far too detailed to read to the Chamber this evening, the Minister may be interested in looking at it. The chart shows that from the first step when a company requests the Minister for Mines that it be invited to apply for a lease to the last step when the lease is granted no fewer than twenty-seven procedures are involved, most of which must take place sequentially and result in delays which, naturally, vary in time. New leases can be expected to take up to two years to complete. An existing lease being extended may take up to nine months.

Honourable members should appreciate that prior to the development taking place, the mining company concerned has already been involved in a long and expensive drilling programme to determine whether there is a viable concentration of minerals below the ground. Given those costs already expended, the two-year delay is inordinate. If the colliery concerned has the capacity and receives approval of the Department of Mines to proceed with the development, its problems have only just begun. It is then faced with obtaining environmental approval for any developmental work it **may** wish to undertake. The mining industry is confronted with the need to obtain approvals from an incredible array of State, federal and local government departments.

The primary departments with which they will almost certainly need to deal are the Department of Mines, the local council, the State Pollution Control Commission, the Planning and Environment Commission including the new Heritage Council, the Joint Coal Board, the Soil Conservation Service of New South Wales and the Commonwealth Department of the Environment. Many other departments may have to be consulted on the particular development. These authorities are the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Water Resources Commission, the Forestry Commission, New South Wales State Fisheries, the Maritime Services Board, the Electricity Commission,

the Department of Main Roads, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Lands, the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, the Metropolitan Waste Disposal Authority, the Pastures Protection Board, the Australian Telecommunications Commission, the Pipeline Authority and the Public Transport Commission. I have not mentioned the multitude of trade unions that will also be involved in that development.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: As it is so difficult, one wonders why the mining companies wish to develop mines.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: That is what I was arguing before the dinner adjournment, when the Minister was unavoidably absent from the Chamber. In New South Wales not only mining companies but also manufacturing companies are doing just what the Minister has suggested: They are not developing in the State of New South Wales.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: There is a queue a mile long.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: Before the Minister makes that assertion I ask him to read in *Hansard* the facts and figures that I presented to the Chamber during his absence earlier this evening. At this stage of development there are enormous delays to mining projects and only rarely does any sizeable development take place under four years. Any of the departments that I have mentioned can delay a project or refer it to another department. Many government departments give piecemeal approval, on a step-by-step basis. It is time that the Government looked closely at these onerous procedures and endeavoured to streamline them so that companies are encouraged to invest funds in New South Wales. I understand that in Queensland a streamlined procedure exists. This is shown by the dramatic development of the mining industry in that State.

I am sure that the new Minister for Mineral Resources and Development is most anxious for the State's mineral resources to be developed sensibly and in harmony with the State's environment. I am equally as sure that the companies involved with these developments are happy to develop the mining industry in harmony with the environment. The West Cliff colliery that was recently developed on the South Coast received second prize in the State Pollution Control Commission's pollution abatement competition for 1978. Anyone who visits that new mining complex must be impressed by the wonderful development that has taken place there.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: The honourable member would agree that the coal industry presents serious environmental considerations.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I could not agree more. Obviously the coal-mining industry presents special environmental problems, but I suggest that modern coalmining development has substantially solved these problems. In fact, the new collieries are show places.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Although the honourable member says that, the highest fines imposed by the courts in New South Wales were imposed on a coalmine in New South Wales. We have the best and the worst.

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I do not doubt that some of the old coalmines that were developed prior to guidelines being set by the Government are an eyesore. However, modern coalmining developments are a tribute to the engineers who have established them and the companies are proud to develop this modern type of complex. As recently as last week I visited a colliery at Gunnedah that has just commissioned a coal preparation plant, which could not be seen from a distance of 200 yards because it was blended into the environment of the bush and was in harmony with its surrounds.

The Hon. D. P. **Landa**: That is why they have to seek approval before they start work.

The Hon. E. P. **PICKERING**: I am not suggesting that approvals are not important, but the system must be streamlined to make it more efficient. I am not asking for an open go for coalmining companies to **ruin** the environment; I wholeheartedly support protection of the environment, but there is a need to improve the onerous way in which it is applied by government. I say that in **all** sincerity.

The Hon. D. P. **Landa**: They are not held up by us.

The Hon. E. P. **PICKERING**: The delays I have referred to speak for themselves. The new Gunnedah coal preparation plant has a major problem: it has been painted to blend in with the trees and koala bears are coming out of the bush into the structure of **the** plant and action has to be taken to protect the bears.

Last but not least of the major problems facing the coalmining industry is coal transportation. Over the past two or three years there has been a controversial debate over the siting of a new coal loader. The Government has decided to locate the new loader at Port Kembla. For all practical purposes, that decision is clearly final. I have no desire to re-raise the original controversy here this evening. When the Government announced the original decision to extend the Port Kembla coal loader the decision was welcomed widely in the Wollongong region. Unfortunately since the recent release of an environmental impact study there has been much controversy in the Wollongong area concerning that development. It is indeed unfortunate that the Trades and Labor Council on the South Coast has effectively, at this moment, banned all **such** development. Much of the controversy emanates from a genuine concern by many local residents with regard to air pollution from this development and the transportation problems created by it.

A decision has been taken by the Government, after due consultation with its technical advisers, that the coal stockpiles at Port Kembla will be open stockpiles treated with a chemical surface reactive agent known in the coal trade as the **mecal** system. I should like to go on record this evening as informing honourable members that this system of dust suppression on open stockpiles was first introduced at the coal loader at Newcastle and, from my personal observations on a recent visit, it is remarkably successful. I admit that prior to my visit I was completely convinced that the system could not work.

There is a very genuine concern among local residents at the effect of increased road haulage of coal into the Illawarra region. Though I recognize that local citizens may have some genuine reasons for this concern, there is no doubt that if the mining industry is to survive in New South Wales, adequate port facilities must be developed quickly. To this end I was pleased that the federal Government authorized the raising of loans to finance the development. Accordingly, I suggest to the Government that it is vital that every effort be made to meet the people of the South Coast, to discuss their problems, to alleviate unfounded concerns and to get on with the job as quickly as possible. The **coalmining** industry has suffered far too long the delay on a loader development and it is imperative that the development now proposed at Port Kembla proceed with all haste.

Clearly it is the desire of residents of Wollongong, of the Government and, I suggest, of the coalmining industry generally, that as much coal as possible be transported by rail to our ports. However, it is difficult to understand why the Public Transport **Commission** charges haulage rates for coal, using 1 000-tonne-unit train systems, which are in excess of the rate offered by road transport hauliers using 30-tonne trucks each of which has to be manned by a driver. This is unfortunately the fact on

the **South** Coast and in the Burragorang Valley. I suggest, with the greatest respect, **that** **until** the railways are more realistic in pricing its services there will be a major impediment to railway development and rail haulage of coal in this State.

New South Wales has historically been the lucky, most wealthy State. As I said at the beginning of my speech that position has changed dramatically. If we are to enjoy the high living standard and low level of unemployment that we have had in the past, this Government must learn from its Warkworth disaster, adopt the correct attitudes towards development, and produce facilities to encourage development in this State.

The Hon. DOROTHY ISAKSEN [8.37]: Mr President, may I join with other honourable members in congratulating you on your unanimous election as President of this Chamber. The beginning of our association many years ago was a stormy one, being fellow members of the Australian Labor Party Youth Council. However, that valuable early initiation into the world of politics has, no doubt, accounted for so many of our associates now being members of both Houses of the New South Wales Parliament, including the Hon. Deirdre Grusovin and the Hon. John Ducker.

It is a great honour for me to represent the Australian Labor Party in the Parliament of New South Wales, particularly in the first session of the Forty-sixth Parliament, following the first democratic election of members to this Chamber. The electors of this State overwhelmingly supported reform and we, as pioneer members of this reformed House, have a tremendous responsibility to provide for the people of this State the representation that they expect of us. It is our duty to give our constituents another area of parliamentary representation, other than their Assembly member, and to give the people confidence and interest in the workings of this House.

As was done by my colleagues the Hon. Kathleen Anderson and the Hon. Delcia Kite in their maiden speeches, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of the Hon. Gertrude Melville who was the matriarch of the Australian Labor Party when I joined in the early fifties and who so influenced our lives. Gertie Melville joined the Labor Party not long after federation and was the first woman to win an Australian Labor Party pre-selection ballot when she stood for the State seat of East Sydney in 1923. She had a long and distinguished career in local government and the Legislative Council as well as carrying out her role as a wife and mother of five sons.

This kind old lady, whom Premiers and party officials both loved and feared, gave tremendous encouragement to women who showed an interest in politics. Her ability to combine successfully the role of wife, mother and politician was an inspiration to those of us who did not want to make choices. I should also like to pay tribute to the Hon. Edna Roper, the first woman in the history of the New South Wales Parliament to conduct proceedings from the chair of this House, being a former temporary chairman of committees. On her retirement Edna Roper was the Deputy Leader of the Government in this House. Though she may have left this Parliament after a term of twenty years, I am sure she will continue to serve New South Wales with the courage, dignity and great humanity she showed during her parliamentary career. The Australian Labor Party can look with pride and honour at the contribution she has made.

The Budget presented by the Treasurer has been given endorsement by the electors of New South Wales. Our nation is going through a difficult economic period and the Budget sets out to provide maximum employment opportunities while at the same time providing necessary funding for health and welfare programmes, despite severe financial restrictions imposed by the federal Government. It is easy for those of us who have jobs to overlook the plight of those for whom jobs are not available. Being a child of the depression, I was brought up to believe that the right to work

was one of the most important rights of our society. As young as I was, I remember the soul-destroying effect unemployment had on the men who could not provide for their families. I remember the lonely single men who could not marry because they could not support a wife on the dole. I remember the alcoholics who had lost all dignity in their boredom and sense of uselessness. No one referred to dole bludgers in those days, because just about everyone was in some way affected by the depression.

In the minor recessions of the fifties and sixties we would not accept that unemployment could reach 2 per cent and yet, today, almost 6 per cent of the work force is unemployed. Irreparable harm has been done to our young people who have worked diligently in our schools and universities only to find employment unavailable. The social consequences will be with us for a long time and yet so many of us adopt an attitude of "I'm all right, Jack", and are not willing to sacrifice our comfortable existence to help our young. We now have the prospect of children being born to parents who have never worked and whose expectations are, therefore, drastically different from ours. Their children will, consequently, have lower expectations. Even if full employment is restored it will be generations before the right to work is considered a necessity and not a privilege. We are so ready to blame the so-called "dole bludgers" and the drug-takers and yet they are the replicas of the alcoholics of the thirties. The tragedy is that they are younger and there are more of them.

The causes of present-day unemployment are so complex and diverse that the problem cannot be remedied by any one solution. However, the problem should be given top priority with full co-operation from all sections of the community. For the first time in twenty-five years, the federal Government has made no increase at all in the State's general loan allocation, the primary source of the Government's capital works funding. The New South Wales Government's attitude to capital works spending is in stark contrast to that of the federal Government. The New South Wales Government has consistently argued that public sector capital investment provides a controlled stimulus to the economy, particularly the private sector, without adding to inflation. The Labor Government's policy in the past two years, of allocating record amounts to capital works, coupled with a budget policy of holding and reducing State taxes, has greatly benefited the New South Wales economy. Over the past two years, unemployment has risen much more slowly in New South Wales than in any other State, and inflation has been reduced further in New South Wales than in any other State.

Drastic cuts imposed by the federal Government in funding for health and welfare services will bring about the dismissal of trained staff in these fields and the curtailment of some of the already existing services. For example, there has been a \$24 million cut to welfare housing, which will aggravate unemployment in the building industry; the abolition of the hospital building grants, which will prevent expansion programmes in newer areas where they are most needed; a cut in community health grants by more than half, which will curtail many innovative programmes particularly in the field of preventative medicine; a cut in pre-school funding by more than half, which will mean an increase in fees, placing an added financial burden on young parents; and a 33 per cent cut in the federal Government's share of the school dental scheme, which plays a very important part in the general health needs of our children and will greatly disadvantage the poor. The federal Government's contributions towards health capital works programmes this year will amount to only \$2.9 million, compared with \$20.3 million last year and \$41.5 million the year before.

The State has increased its own allocation for hospital and health facilities to offset federal cuts. The largest single expenditure this year will be for the Westmead hospital. The sum of \$48 million has been allocated for further construction work on the Westmead Centre which was officially opened last Friday week. The Westmead

The Hon. Dorothy Isaksen]

Centre will be a 925-bed specialized referral hospital for the western metropolitan health region. The region cover 5 **300** square kilometres, with a total population of 1.1 million people. This magnificent hospital, which is the largest medical complex under construction in the world, was the dream of a truly great Australian, Edward **Gough Whitlam**, who took the initiative by providing \$9 million to New South Wales so that a major hospital could be commenced in the western suburbs of Sydney. This funding was provided in the first budget of the federal Labor Government elected in 1972. It was his courage and determination that won the battle with the **Askin** Government and, hence, the neglect of medical services for the new and expanding western region was remedied.

Those of us who had the opportunity of inspecting the **Westmead** Centre could not fail to be impressed by this tremendous undertaking and also impressed by the dedication and commitment of the workers building this vast complex, and the medical and ancillary staff already involved in its operation. I take some pride, as president of the New South Wales Labor Women's Organization, in saying that we made continued representations over many years for the provision of a major hospital for the people of the western suburbs. A great burden was placed on thousands of young families living as far away as **Liverpool**, **Camden** or **Penrith**, who had to travel to the city for specialized health services. The question of health service has been much in the news over recent weeks, particularly in relation to the cost of medical services to the patient and his ability to pay. It is not difficult to understand the great anxiety that has been felt by the sick and the elderly over a further alteration to health insurance. The changes announced in the federal budget on 15th August and which took effect from **1st** November, could not have caused more confusion. The tragedy of it all is that this country was given a health system which was available to rich and poor alike—it was the greatest social achievement of any government for decades and it has been destroyed by the **Fraser** Government.

Medibank was the dream of men of great compassion who believed it was the community's responsibility to provide the best of health care for the sick, irrespective of their financial circumstances. You do not have to have a long memory to remember the years of unsatisfactory service given by the private health funds. Those funds built empires, luxurious buildings and extravagant transport facilities for their directors. The security of good health or the knowledge that the best medical service is available was the reason that the electors of Australia supported the introduction of a national health scheme. Of course, some members of the medical profession and private health funds opposed its introduction. If nothing else, it compelled the private funds to provide comparable benefits. Of course, there were those who exploited the system. We heard more of the poor who needed the service and very little about those who became wealthy by exploitation and greed. The recent action of the federal Government in again altering the health system, in abolishing the levy payment, has created the greatest confusion possible. The example of health funds denying benefits to the chronically ill takes us back to the bad old days pre-Medibank. A health care system is not there to provide a comfortable existence for its administrators or an exclusive insurance company for the healthy. It is there for the security and well being of the sick.

The intervention of the Premier against the callous, inhumane action of the Hospitals Contribution Fund is to be commended. The strongest possible action should be taken against any fund that does not honour its obligations to its contributors. After reading the **Selectplan** pamphlet issued by the HCF, one would need a Queen's Counsel to understand exactly what that fund's obligations were to its contributors. For instance, the budget cover for a family costs \$350 a year. However, it excludes medical benefits for confinements and related conditions. I presume this means miscarriages or terminations. One should advocate a life of total abstinence for those

insured on this table. It excludes nervous disorders which could range from hives to asthma. It excludes the first twelve consultations for dependent children. Only children with a chronic illness would require more than twelve consultations and they would probably be excluded anyway. Hospital benefits are not payable for the first five days hospitalization for dependent children, so **the** most common reasons for hospitalization of children, such as tonsilectomies or appendectomies, would be excluded. The **HCF's** 100 per cent ambulance cover for accidents and medical emergencies is claimed by the New South Wales Ambulance Service to cover only about **16** per cent of total ambulance usage.

The promise by the federal Minister for Health that private fund rates would be reduced has not happened. The giant Medical Benefits Fund notified paymasters making group deductions to transfer members to a higher rate—that is, to the one offering **100** per cent medical rebate. The cost of this amounts to about **\$1.45** extra each week. The fund told employers that if members wanted to remain in the lower tables—the 75 per cent rebate—they would have to fill out special forms to avoid being automatically put into the higher table.

Pensioners desiring private cover are now paying an additional \$2.40 each week for cover comparable to that which they had previously. The confusion that exists is exemplified by the notification by the Health Commission to major public hospitals **on 31st** October—the day before the new scheme came into operation—informing them of the changes to the health insurance scheme. The circular stresses the urgency of inviting the notice of the appropriate hospital staff members to the new conditions but, at the same time, apologizing for the inadequacy of the information and the fact that It had not been made available sooner.

The federal Government has done a complete about turn on Medibank. The present scheme is nearer the original Medibank mark I, introduced in **1973** by the **Whitlam** Government. The problem is that no one is quite sure how it is all going to work. The federal Minister for Health, the Hon. R. J. D. Hunt, refuses to give an undertaking that the level of subsidy payments in this year's Budget will be maintained beyond the end of the financial year. In addition to all this confusion, we now have the distasteful situation, both for doctor and patient, of classifying persons who are regarded as socially disadvantaged. Pride is not lacking in the poor. One wonders what type of person conceived the idea of identifying patients as socially disadvantaged. Undoubtedly one who was born to rule.

The Fraser Government still opposes the concept of Medibank on ideological grounds but its main reason for these budget actions is to fiddle the consumer price index. Abolishing Medibank will just about offset the consumer price index effect of higher prices for beer, spirits and cigarettes. That means there will be no flow through to wages from the higher costs. On those priorities the Fraser Government stands condemned.

I should now like to turn to another area which has received funding in the Budget and with which I have been closely associated, that is, the Women's Advisory Council and the Women's **Co-ordination** Unit. **An** outline of the activities of these bodies is given in their first report recently tabled in this House. In **1976** the Government appointed the fifteen-member council to advise it on issues of special concern to women. Within the Premier's Department the Government established a women's unit to liaise with other government departments, monitor legislation and provide research for changes in government policy as it affected women.

The council is a bi-partisan group. Some members represent major women's organizations and other represent ethnic and Aboriginal women. It has endeavoured to be accessible to as many women as possible in New South Wales. Regular visits

The Hon. Dorothy Isaksen]

are made to the country and outer metropolitan areas. It has visited more than thirty country centres, as far apart as Lismore and Tumut, or **Armidale** and Griffith. Contacts have been made by council members on behalf of country women who would normally not have access to the Government. Their isolation is no longer a handicap in having their views on certain issues or requests for assistance made known to the Government.

One of the most notable achievements of these bodies has been the establishment of special units within major hospitals in Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong for the care of victims of sexual assault. On the initiative of the Women's Co-ordination **Unit** a task force was set up comprising representatives of the Health Commission, the police force, the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, and the Premier's Department. For the first time priority was given to problems of the victim. Previously medical attention for the victim had often been **difficult** to obtain as medical staff wanted to avoid involvement in lengthy legal procedures. Police often interrogated the victim for long periods despite great physical and mental stress.

The recommendations of the task force were readily accepted by the Women's Advisory Council which, in turn, recommended their adoption to the Premier. These units, whose main concern is the care, comfort and well-being of the victims be they male or female, have now been established in a number of major hospitals and have encouraged victims to seek the expert medical attention that is available. There is no longer any obligation on the patient to take legal proceedings. As the law now stands in New South Wales legal procedures involved in rape trials can have an additional traumatic, emotional and psychological impact upon the victim.

The Women's Advisory Council sponsored a seminar, to which any interested parties were invited, to discuss proposed changes to the law. More than 200 people attended the seminar and examined differences in current ideas on methods to effect law reform. The Women's Advisory Council has informed the Premier that in its opinion crimes of a sexual nature should be dealt with under laws relating to assault, provided those laws are amended to encompass such crimes. It is hoped that this and other reforms will encourage victims to take legal action against their attackers under less harrowing circumstances than at present, when often one wonders whether the victim and not the accused is on trial.

In the area of anti-discrimination the council prepared a submission for the Anti-Discrimination Board's inquiry into superannuation. I should like to compliment the Hon. P. S. M. **Philips** for his interest in the board's report and his contribution to this debate in relation to certain discriminatory conditions prevailing in superannuation funds. The Women's Advisory Council submitted also a report to the Premier outlining areas of discrimination against women in licensed clubs. The Department of Corrective Services arranged for members of the council to visit Mulawa women's prison. For many of the council members it was the first opportunity they had had to inspect conditions under which women prisoners are detained. Because of the small female prison population certain facilities available to male prisoners were not provided. Recommendations were made for improved recreation facilities, vocational training and health services.

The council held an inquiry into prostitution and interviewed police, prostitutes and social workers. Members attended court hearings at which prostitutes were prosecuted. The fifteen-member council, representing many different points of view, was of the opinion that the present laws relating to prostitution were unjust, hypocritical and **discriminatory**. It recommended decriminalization of the law as it relates to prostitutes and the **strengthening** of the law as it relates to those who exploit prostitutes.

In recent weeks there has been much debate on this aspect of the council's report. If anything, the public's reaction has been overwhelmingly in favour of changes to the law.

Prostitution in Sydney is a fact of life. Massage parlours and escort agencies are flourishing. Now, most soliciting is done in the columns of newspapers. We **should**, however, be concerned with new problems that have arisen in recent times—the connection between drugs and prostitution. We should be concerned with the welfare of the young girls being recruited into massage parlours, where known prostitutes are not permitted. We can now ask the question, "Would you like your son to be a prostitute?" as an increasing number of young men are being enticed into the world of prostitution—some to finance their drug habit, others through the despair of unemployment. I believe the community is ready for changes to the law relating to prostitution. We, as legislators, would be failing in our duty if we were not prepared to bring about that change.

The Women's Advisory Council is organizing the production of a film to publicize and inform the community of the 1979 United Nations Year of the Child. The film will be available to schools and voluntary organizations. It is hoped that it will create interest and discussion on this most important year.

In another place there has been criticism of the work performed by the council. I hope I have given honourable members some insight into its activities. I commend the allocation of further funding in the Budget. It will enable both the Women's Advisory Council and the Women's Co-ordination Unit to carry on their valuable work.

Mr President, I should like to thank you and honourable members on both sides of the House for the warm welcome I have been given. I am aware of the great **responsibility** placed on the fifteen new members, being the first elected to the New South Wales Legislative Council. I look forward to participating actively in the business of this House during my **term** of office. In this, my maiden speech, I should like to thank my mother, husband and daughters for their support and encouragement over many years, thus allowing me not to have to make a choice between being a wife and mother or a politician.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS [9.0]: In this, my first contribution since the House resumed, other than on ancillary matters, I first congratulate the various office-bearers who have been re-elected. I congratulate the Minister in charge of the House, and sincerely congratulate the new Minister. I believe the dignity of this House warrants its having two Ministers, because the task that was set the Leader of the House in trying to cover the full field of all the portfolios was impossible and must have imposed a tremendous strain on him. I feel certain that he welcomes his **colleague** sitting **beside** him in this Chamber. The Hon. Dorothy Isaksen mentioned the Hon. Edna S. Roper. I echo what she said but I add that we on this side of the House regard it as a great shame that her period of service to the Parliament and to the party she served was not crowned by the granting of a portfolio. We believe that she would have enriched the Government of New South Wales. In many ways she was a remarkable woman, who possessed one characteristic that is rare in politics—she held her principles clear and shining but without rancour or ill will. One could argue with her, as I did on many occasions, on matters of politics, but immediately after any argument we parted as friends; we shall remain friends for as long as we both live.

I take the opportunity to welcome the new members who have taken their places in the House, and I congratulate all those who have spoken on the amazingly high standard of their maiden speeches. I well remember that shortly after I made my maiden speech in this House I was approached by a senior Labor member, the Hon. J. J. Moloney, who said that in his vast experience this was the most effective debating

Chamber of all the parliamentary systems in Australia. Whether or not that be so, it is clear from the contributions of the new members of this House that the standard will not be lowered. As the rough-and-tumble of debate **develops** one can see that from both sides there will be some doughty contributions.

Last, but certainly not least, might I say that it must have been a matter of tremendous pleasure to you personally, Mr President, to have observed the universal acceptance of your unanimous election to the ancient and honourable office of President of this Chamber. For one who has had a relatively short parliamentary experience it was perhaps even more remarkable. However, from my observation, that reaction was not accidental. I believe that you possess the qualities of communication and friendship that endear you to people as a whole. In the course of this debate your colleagues on the other side of the House have underlined what I have said. It is my view—a view I believe to be held by my colleagues on this side of the House and I am quite certain by members on the other side of the House—that the privileges of this House and its members will be well safeguarded during your tenure of office.

If I had been a visitor from Mars I should have been a little confused when listening to the debate on the Budget. I might well have thought that the city of Sydney was some 183 miles to the southwest. Very little has been said by members on the other side of the House about the Budget, but we have heard a paean about the dreadful treatment that this State has received from the Commonwealth Government. Much time and energy has been expended telling the House what a dreadful deal New South Wales has received from the federal Government. It is strange that, while that has been proceeding, the shrewd political commentators and financial observers have taken little time to observe that this Government has more money, practically and in every other way, than any government in the history of New South Wales. It is strange indeed to hear this **paeanic** poor mouth crying. I hope that this House will not hear much more of it. Honourable members would all know that, while it may be a good political ploy, it is not true. There is no better way to underline this than to remind honourable members of the words written by the economics editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* today. The article commences:

The New South Wales State Government continues to be embarrassed by riches.

That is a terrible state of affairs for this Government.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: In this debate we are discussing capital funds.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: I shall come to that when I begin to examine the Auditor-General's report. All honourable members would have read with interest Mr Gittins' shrewd and piercing analysis in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, but I shall read into *Hansard* the last few words, as they wrap up this argument once and for all. Before reaching his conclusions Mr Gittins sets out a priceless piggy-bank format to indicate how much money this Government has available. He lets out of the bag some beautiful secrets, such as the fact that the Government was able to get \$63 million from interest on investments. The mind boggles when one thinks of the sums that would have to be invested to produce that amount. Mr Gittins has fairly predicated the fact that all of the funds are not immediately available for expenditure. Honourable members would know that some funds are in tied grants, some are in trust funds for particular purposes, and a number of funds are collected for, and must by statute be retained for, particular purposes. I do not read this article in any spirit of criticism of the Government, but simply because I believe there is a lesson for all honourable members to learn from it. It states:

But to take account of all these problems is not to excuse the Wran Government from its responsibilities.

The fact remains that, during a period in which economic activity is depressed and **unemployment** is high, the Government has been paying out much less than it gets in.

It has been crying poor and building up its bank account at the same time.

There has certainly been poor mouth crying in this debate, and I have no doubt that it will be heard again. The article went on:

And despite the legal and political constraints, much of the build-up can be blamed on administrative delay in putting spending plans into action.

This is quite within the Government's power to correct.

As for the political problems, Mr Wran is in a strong enough position politically to risk putting through Parliament a few bills which might be open to misrepresentation by the unscrupulous.

I do not in any way intend to criticize the Government. As it did not have a majority in this House during the past three years, it may have been difficult for it to make full use of the vast volume of money available to it by way of rolling funds in the piggybank for all to see. That excuse will no longer apply, and I hope that the funds available to the Government will be put to use, as envisaged by the federalism policy of the Commonwealth Government. I hope we hear less of the poor mouth comments that have intruded into the debate, because a cursory look at the figures will indicate that this attitude is unjustified. I have two matters of complaint. The first is that it seems to have been a most unusual procedure, to say the least, for the Wran Government to introduce a Budget and then go to the people without anybody at that juncture having an opportunity to examine or criticize the Budget in a parliamentary way. I understand that it has never been done before in the history of Australia.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Premier Askin did it.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: If that is so I am open to that correction if what the Minister says is correct. Certainly he did not do it during my time in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: It was the 1967 Budget.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: It was well before my time. I assure honourable members on the Government side of the House that had I been a member of this House at the time I would have said precisely what I am saying now about that course of action. Further, the tradition in this State has been that, prior to the Budget debate taking place in this Chamber, the Auditor-General's report is made available to all honourable members. It is simply not practicable for a proper analysis of the activities of government unless one has that report. The 1977-78 report is full of matters which might, had they been available at the time of the election, have caused the Government some embarrassment. I do not accuse the Government of doing this deliberately, for I know well the problems that were associated with printing the Budget and with the industrial troubles at the Government Printing Office. I say only that I hope in the future we shall not be forced to enter upon a budget debate without any real opportunity to make an analysis of the budget position and the Government's financial accounting without the necessary time to make an accurate estimate of the Auditor-General's report.

During the course of the debate honourable members on the Government side of the Chamber congratulated the Government upon what it has done for public transport. Page 3 of the Auditor-General's report discloses that the 1973-74 deficit on the State's transport undertakings was \$152 million. This year it is \$393.5 million. One cannot say that there has been 100 per cent to 120 per cent inflation since 1973.

The Government's transport deficit is appalling. When one considers the press criticism that the former Government was subjected to for its transport deficits, which were far less than the present deficit, one wonders with what legerdemain the Premier manages his public relations. He gets away with the present enormous deficits that now occur. He appears to be congratulated. We wish we had his technique and his magic. Although I may not be believed, I assure the House that while I was listening with the greatest interest to the Hon. Dorothy Isaksen the Auditor-General's report fell open at page 22. I heard congratulations being offered the Government for its stable finances, no increases and moderation.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Did the honourable member say stable?

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: Yes. I shall talk to the Minister later about stability. The only stable that is relevant is the one with the door that was closed after the horse had escaped. At page 22 one sees the substantial increases received in the last twelve months from Maritime Services Board revenue, amounting to over \$10.5 million.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: That could be from increased operations and not necessarily an increase in fees.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: I shall give the Minister the benefit of that. That is only one on my list. The next item on page 22 refers to the fact that fees collected by the Registrar General increased by \$1,811,607 to \$13,218,704, which was attributed to the continued expansion in the volume of transactions processed and the higher rates, which operated from 8th August, 1977. This is indicative of the so-called financial stability.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Higher costs are involved also.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: Perhaps that is so.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: The Auditor-General said that there has been an increase in the volume of transactions.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: Then I ask the Minister to listen to this: fees received by the Corporate Affairs Commission increased by \$3,540,748 to \$1,395,471, reflecting higher fees introduced on 1st October, 1977.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Although there have been fee increases in the Corporate Affairs Commission, some of the trials with which it has been involved have cost millions of dollars.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: If some of the things that I hear are correct, in the near future some of those trials will involve the Government in a lot more money. The Auditor-General's report next refers to court processes, including fees collected by courts of petty sessions and other courts. They are all up.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: It does not say that they are up.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: Fees collected by the Supreme Court, the Sheriff and District Courts have the amounts set out. The Minister is correct; it does not say that they are up. The Public Trustee is up by nearly \$1 million.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: There has been tremendous growth. The State is in better shape.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: The few items that I have mentioned from page 22 amount to some \$13 million. The Hon. Dorothy Isaksen referred to moneys coming from the Commonwealth Government. According to page 7 of the Auditor-General's

report, the total payments to the State from the Commonwealth, including general revenue and all other payments, totalled \$1,506,756,000, representing an increase of \$199 million on the previous year.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: That is general revenue.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: Yes, that is all of the assistance, general revenue and all other payments. That is at page 7. It is not a bad little bagatelle to play with, being so close to \$200 million. A nice few shillings when looked at as interest.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: What percentage is that of a \$1,000 million agreement?

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: A lot more than the rate of inflation, which the Government says is the lowest in Australia. We are happy to agree with you, and we are happy that it is. Other people who have had more time and given more detailed attention to the figures will no doubt have more to say about them. I shall move to two other matters. I refer first to unemployment, which I shall discuss, as far as practicable, in a non-partisan way because I believe that this State and nation face perhaps the most cataclysmic social change in their history. I believe it is totally wrong for any political party to suggest any other political party or any particular group of policies is responsible for the present unemployment. Indeed, the unemployment figures throughout the developed nations in the western world disclose that this problem is universal and is on the increase.

The true nature of the problem was first drawn to my attention almost seven years ago when I was flying from Bombay to Athens and was sitting next to an IBM technician from America. Our thoughts turned to automation and technical redundancy that comes from automation. This gentleman, who is very high in the IBM hierarchy today, told me that even then in 1971 the world had the technology to make work a concept that would almost disappear from the face of certainly the western world. He did express this caveat: that this did not apply to the non-developed world. He expressed the horrifying concept, which has stuck in my mind ever since, that the world did not have sufficient resources, and still does not, to bring the undeveloped world to the standard of living of the developed world. That was a most sobering statement.

I shall describe to the House a personal experience I had recently in my own business. We found it necessary to install a computerized word-processing machine, which will make redundant the jobs of some three senior, highly trained legal stenographers. Lest I be thought heartless, I say at the outset that my firm has no intention of making anybody redundant but we will, in self-defence, not replace those people when a natural fall-off of employment takes place. I shall examine the economics from the viewpoint of an employer. The cold, hard facts are that to install and operate this machine will cost us less than the total wages and associated payments of those three employees for one year. In other words, the jobs of the three persons who will be replaced in due course by this machine are costing my firm as much as the entire capital cost of the machine, which should, if it is cared for, last for fifteen years.

I have described a minor problem, which is probably better and more poignantly known to gentlemen with trade union experience. However, I see no signs in the Labor Party, the Liberal Party or the National Country Party that we are trying to come to grips with this frightening and terrifying problem. When I listened to the Hon. Dorothy Isaksen I was mindful of the fact that I told this House in my maiden speech back in 1969 of my memories as a child coming from what was then a reasonably affluent household. I described how I saw people lined up in 1929, 1930 and 1931, on dole queues. I remember as a very small child being the only person in my school who had a pair of shoes, and how much I hated it when my parents made me wear them because I hated feeling different. Most poignantly of all, I remember that when

at lunchtime at school I ate the apple my parents insisted I eat, a number of my friends walked behind me, fighting to see who was going to get the core. I remember those days. They bred in me a security consciousness and a hatred of unemployment that will live with me as long as I live. However, I see at this juncture a **system** that is quite cataclysmic because advanced technology is here and people will use it.

Industry will be forced to use technology whether it likes it or not. Unions will be forced to grapple with it, as will employees and employers. What concerns me is that, although from time to time I hear people talking about the nature of the problem, little has been done about it. I sincerely hope that as the life of the House, in its newly constituted form, goes ahead, honourable members will have time to consider it. The House may, with the considerable expertise it has on both sides, because of the peculiar nature of its constitution, be able to do something to cushion the shock. Without trying to allocate the political blame, because I do not believe this is a political matter, we will have to restructure our society to get us away from the sacred nature of what has been called the Protestant work ethic. I believe that we can see the disappearance from our society of that particular sense of values now and yet we have at this juncture come up with absolutely nothing to replace it. That is a terrifying concept.

I wish to advert now to a most interesting publication of the Hon. J. S. Thompson. I read it with the greatest of interest. Since he became a member of the House he has won the respect of members on both sides. He has done that because he is able to argue his politics without rancour or ill will and yet with the shining security that he believes in what he is doing. I was interested to see that he had the opportunity to attend the IMF World Auto Conference at Detroit and took the time to try to distil from the considerable expertise gathered from all over the world at that conference in order to give us a few pointers. When one considers the pointers, there is some advice for the New South Wales Government. The advice is not tendered in any form of criticism, except perhaps that some time ago some of us may have spoken about it. I remember strongly agreeing with the Hon. J. S. Thompson during a debate about two years ago.

The first thing we have to realize—and this is strongly indicated by the Hon. J. S. Thompson—is that the motor car is here to stay. It is no good, from whatever dogmatic stand you take, whether you think it is perhaps elitism that you and I should want to drive a car, or by whatever form of approval is adopted, to say that we should stop the motor car and divert funds to public transport. That will not work. That is an experience which shines out from the document of the Hon. J. S. Thompson. He referred to a submission made by the Hon. John Dingell which commences by pointing out how much of the world's oil had been used in such a comparatively short time. It further pointed out that the Ford Motor Company had just celebrated the seventy-fifth anniversary of its founding. The company has plants round the world. That comment applies to many other major motor industries. The multinational companies in the auto industry have to bear a major responsibility for much of the decay of the environment and the world's oil supplies being depleted to such a degree. One has only to get into a traffic jam to find out how true that is.

A point strongly argued by the Hon. J. S. Thompson was that, irrespective of the expected oil shortage, the automobile is here to stay and by the year 2000 more automobiles will be driven by more people in more parts of the world than at the present time. Obviously that is a lesson with which the Hon. J. S. Thompson, from his clear reasoning, agrees. The honourable member dealt with public transport trends. It is clear that though public transport can be improved, of itself that will not do away with the use of the motor car in the cities. It is no good thinking it will; the history of the world's big cities proves otherwise. I shall not read at length from the booklet, because the Hon. J. S. Thompson has sent a copy to each honourable member.

I hope, with all sincerity, that honourable members have had the opportunity to read the document. It impressed me greatly and set me thinking. It made me think first about the present State Government's policy on freeways.

The plain fact of the matter is that one cannot hang on a sky hook the motor car that one knows people will use. One cannot transport the motor car on anything other than a road. If there are to be—as there must be in the great cities—arterial ways in and out of cities, there must be freeways to have free passage of traffic. I counsel the Government, particularly the Minister, who will have an opportunity to travel, as I believe Ministers should travel in the course of their duties, to look at Brussels where, in my opinion, the best system of traffic control in the world has been evolved. It is an integrated system of freeways which traverse the whole of the inner city area, with appropriate off road ways and an integrated system throughout the whole of the great city co-ordinating with a tramway system that runs underground in the main city and comes out about 2 or 3 kilometres from the centre of the city, where the trams run on their own freeway lines. As the Hon. J. S. Thompson points out in his booklet, it is absolutely clear from a study of public transport that the only really first-class method is a tram running on its own freeway without having to compete with the motor vehicle—

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: Together with a railway to the airport.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: Or a tramway.

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: That is so.

The Hon. L. A. SOLOMONS: At Brussels one goes to the airport by one of the tramways, perhaps three times the distance from the city of Sydney to Mascot, in only half the time. It was interesting to note that there is, as one would strongly expect, a detailed analysis of the economics of the motor industry in that work by the Hon. J. S. Thompson. I agree with him that, whether we like it or not, we have to take steps to protect our own industry. I was glad to see the reception for a new motor car recently built in Australia. I believe what the experts say is right, though I am not an expert: that motor car may do something to reverse the trend, which many Australians seem to adopt, of buying anything but an Australian car.

I have listened before to what the Hon. J. S. Thompson has said. I have agreed with him before and I agree with him now. I suppose the crunch comes on page 17 of the booklet where he deals with the future as it affects Australia. General agreement was expressed at the conference that the automobile is here to stay and that by the year 2000 a significant increase would occur in the number of motor vehicles on the roads of the world and the number of drivers. What shall we do? Should we not build freeways to carry those cars? We know that they are coming. Where do we put them when they come? I remember reading a horrifying science fiction story once. I cannot remember who wrote it, but I think it was Brian Aldiss who wrote about the day the last motor car filled the last part that was left on the road and all the cars were stopped because there was nowhere for them to go.

There is a lesson in that story and perhaps it should be learned. Whether one likes it or not and whether the environmentalists shout their heads off or not, freeways will have to be built lest this city of Sydney chokes in the cars that it will get and the people that will want to drive. One of the conclusions reached was most interesting. Even the most draconian methods—I adopt the word used by the Hon. J. S. Thompson—will not force people to use public transport. Even if the price of petrol were doubled, people would rather use their motor cars than public transport. The Hon. J. S. Thompson learned that from his experience at the World Auto Conference. The second of the honourable gentleman's conclusions was that the continuing rundown in the

world's oil supplies would intensify the search for alternative forms of energy for motor vehicles and all other forms of transport. He concluded also that world technology was already capable of producing these alternative forms of fuel.

When last in England I saw a most interesting experiment involving the wireless telegraphy of electricity. This experiment involved transmitting electricity by wireless beam. One could imagine the far reaching extent of that discovery. It could be refined so that a person could set the aerial of his car to pick up electricity out of the air so that it would become energized and motivated by that means. Bearing in mind the wonderful achievements of science in the lifetime of those present in this House, that sort of thing is certainly not beyond the bounds of possibility.

Another conclusion arrived at by the Hon. J. S. Thompson was that as the price of oil continues to escalate a similar escalation will take place in research to produce cheaper and better synthetic fuels. He concluded further that in the future the world would be paying far more for liquid forms of energy and that this would lead to dramatic changes in engine design, vehicle design and the types of motor vehicles which people would be using. Finally he concluded, after attending this conference, that in the quest for a better and safer motor car dramatic changes will take place in the materials used, the method of construction, the weight, the size and the effect of vehicles on the environment.

The main lesson to be learned from this excellent report is that the automobile is here to stay and that by the year 2000 there will be a significant increase in the number of motor vehicles and in the number of drivers on roads throughout the world. That prediction includes not only New South Wales but also the city of Sydney. The reason for the city of Brussels succeeding in its transport management—and I use this example to complete my submission—is that its authorities had the foresight to prepare for potential traffic before a heavy volume of traffic developed. When the traffic eventually developed to that stage Brussels had the facilities to handle it.

The situation into which the present Government was put—I believe accidentally through its support of some fringe groups of environmentalists—has set back by some years the achievement of the necessity of freeway development in this city's design. The Hon. J. S. Thompson has performed a timely deed in bringing to the attention of this House, and I hope to the attention of his colleagues in the Government, the concept that now is the time to start planning for the traffic that New South Wales and Sydney will have in the year 2000. If the Government does not do so the city of Sydney and the State of New South Wales will not be a fit place in which to live.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON [9.45]: Mr Deputy-President, I have a great deal of pleasure in joining in this debate on the Budget for the fiscal year 1978-79. Before I speak specifically to the Budget I wish to extend my personal congratulations to the President on his election to that exalted position and to yourself on your election as Chairman of Committees. As can be seen by your occupying the chair of the House, once one reaches certain rungs on the ladder there is often quick promotion. I congratulate also the Hon. D. P. Landa upon his re-election to the Ministry and as Leader of this House and also the Hon. J. R. Hallam upon his election to the Ministry and as Deputy Leader of this House.

I offer sincere congratulations also to the Hon. M. F. Willis upon his re-election as Leader of the Opposition and to the Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith upon his re-election to the position of Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I can say quite frankly that I wish them many years in those positions. I congratulate all the members who have recently been elected to this upper House of the Parliament of New South Wales, not only on their election to this Chamber but also on their being the first third of this House to be elected under the system as proposed by the Wran Labor Government about

eighteen months ago and ultimately approved in no uncertain manner by 84 per cent of the electors of this State. Certainly the people wanted a democratically elected upper House in the Parliament of New South Wales.

Might I end the congratulatory stage of my remarks by praising members who have already made their maiden speech in this debate upon the Budget. Truly their contributions have been wise and efficient. It is evident from those who have already spoken that the standard of debate will be at least as high as it has been in the past. It is evident, too, that the wide range of experience, knowledge and expertise brought into the Parliament by the new members elected by this democratic process is at least equal to what the House has enjoyed in the past.

The Budget introduced by the Treasurer is the third brought forward by the Labor Government since its election in May 1976. Further, it is the **third** successive Budget introduced without any increase in taxes. It is apparent that some members opposite question the veracity of that statement. Nevertheless, it is a fact that this is the third successive Budget submitted to the Parliament and the people of New South Wales that has not involved an increase in taxation.

I should like to refer to the background against which the Labor Party came to Government in this State in 1976. I shall speak only to two specific areas of interest. The first relates to the large amount allocated for education in the State Budget and the grave disquiet throughout the community about whether it will receive **value** for that money. The second relates to the public transport system. The Hon. J. S. Thompson has given details of the condition of the public transport system, of the large amounts the Government has had to make available to try to overcome the past lack of maintenance and the failure to provide adequate rolling-stock to enable the public transport system to **fulfil** its role in the State. While I agree with some aspects of what the Hon. L. A. Solomons said about public transport and the possible elimination of the motor vehicle, I do not agree with his suggestion that public transport should not play a bigger role.

The Hon. L. A. Solomons: If I said that, I did not mean to imply it.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: I thank the honourable member for his assurance, but I understood that he was using the necessity to increase the use of private motor cars to bolster an argument that this Government should branch out into the construction of freeways. I gained the impression that the honourable member was implying that public transport would gradually play a lesser part in the transport system in New South Wales. On the contrary, I am convinced that public transport has a major and increasing role to play. This year I also had the opportunity of visiting Brussels, and I agree with what the Hon. L. A. Solomons said about that city. The effectiveness of its public transport system is partially due to the fully co-ordinated public and private transport system.

I shall not refer to any extent to the public transport system, as this has been fully covered by the Hon. J. S. Thompson. However, I shall speak at some length about the education system. Before doing so, I would mention that the Hon. L. A. Solomons said that neither the Labor Party, the Liberal Party nor the National Country Party had taken cognizance of the technological advances that have occurred or are likely to occur in Australia, nor of the possibility of restructuring our society in view of those advances. The present Government has recognized the importance of the advances in technology. It has particularly done so by appointing the Hon. P. D. Hills as Minister for Technology, a portfolio which has been added to his other responsibilities as Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy. The prime reason for the addition of that portfolio was so that he would become aware of and take

advantage of technological advances in order to protect the community from any disadvantageous aspects of new developments. All honourable members would agree that this is likely to become the Minister's major portfolio. I concede that his portfolios as Minister for Energy and Minister for Industrial Relations involve major aspects of government in this State.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: That has always been his portfolio.

The Hon. H. J. **McPHERSON**: He now has the portfolio as Minister for Technology added to his other responsibilities. This Government is the first in the history of the State to act upon the necessity to have a Minister of the Crown responsible to the people of the State and to the Government for taking heed of advances in technology. I do not profess to refer to the education system as an expert, an academic or an educationist. However, I seek to bring to the attention of the House the concern of the community about education. In the past two years there has been a deal of controversy over the efficiency of the education system. Employers and educationists have expressed doubts about the way students are being educated in the schools of the State.

As a member of the community without the special qualifications of an educationist or an academic, I voice my concern along with thousands of other people about what is happening with education. Much trouble stems from the fact that the Department of Education is a bureaucracy that does not brook any interference in its particular field, and is unwilling to yield any of its powers of jurisdiction. Last week the *Sydney Morning Herald* said that the New South Wales branch of the Australian Medical Association was concerned that there were 7 000 doctors in excess of requirements. That association was concerned, further, that next year some 9 000 doctors would be surplus to requirements.

The actions of members of the medical profession throughout Australia are the subject of much comment, particularly in view of their opposition over the past four years to Medibank and to their treatment of patients classed as Medibank patients. Medical practitioners are refusing service to patients in country hospitals unless it is urgent. I mention the medical profession only in the context of education. In the opinion of most people in New South Wales doctors are too unreliable as a source of information for their opinion to be accepted on there being too many doctors. Doctors are more concerned with making \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year than with treating their patients. Criticism of the education system is justified when it continues to produce doctors, bookkeepers or other professionals or tradesmen such as mechanics, butchers or bakers when there is no opportunity available for them to obtain work.

At least once a week one reads of one expert or another commenting about unemployment. Most comments include the comment that within a few weeks large numbers of school leavers will not obtain jobs. For too many years too much money has been directed to universities and colleges of advanced education, and insufficient to technical colleges. The principals of regional technical colleges are in close contact with their various regions and the employer and trade union organizations within them. They have a rough idea of the courses, particularly for apprentices, in which their graduates can be reasonably assured of obtaining employment. For many years that aspect of education has been neglected. The Victorian system, with technical high schools, may be a little better. I do not intend to debate whether New South Wales should have similar technical high schools or whether we should keep to our technical college system. The fact is that there is a greater need for more money to go to technical colleges than to universities and colleges of advanced education.

In the early 1960's a State Labor government implemented an education scheme that was designed to help pupils who were not good at examination technique, and to help them qualify or choose the subjects they wanted to study, particularly those at which they considered they were best. That scheme ultimately became known as the Wyndham scheme. In about 1975 the former coalition Government commenced to phase out the Wyndham scheme. Whether that was a good scheme was clouded by the fact that the coalition Government did no planning or made no provision for any scheme to take its place. School pupils suddenly found they were without an adequate education system. In case honourable members opposite doubt me——

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: Never.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: That comment reminds me of the person who saw his mother-in-law driving his Jaguar single-seater car over the cliff: he had mixed feelings about it. I refer the House to the editorial in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of Saturday, 5th August, under the heading "Education Turmoil". The article states:

The latest complaints about the School Certificate examination in N.S.W. emphasizes the need for the Secondary Schools Board to complete its inquiry into the system as soon as possible. It is desirable, of course, that adequate time should be allowed for public submissions.

I do not wish to quote any part of this editorial out of context, when criticizing the education system. I shall not read the whole editorial, but I emphasize the words, "It is desirable, of course, that adequate time should be allowed for public submissions."

In its endeavour to right the education system, which was handed over to it by its predecessors in a depleted and tumultuous condition, the Government organized a number of seminars throughout the State. I understand the last seminar, number four, is to be held at Wagga Wagga next Saturday. There may be others being held in other parts of the State on that day. I think most honourable members would agree that the *Sydney Morning Herald* is a fairly reasonable paper both in its editorials and articles, although on many occasions I do not agree with it. About two-thirds of the way through the editorial states:

The abandonment of a full external examination for the school certificate may have had much to recommend it. Certainly it is true that many pupils have qualities which may not appear in the examination room, and that is why assessment by individual schools has its attractions. But the half baked system introduced three years ago is extremely unsatisfactory and has caused confusion among parents, employers, teachers and pupils.

I submit that the parent, employers, teachers and students are the ones who have become most concerned about any deficiencies existing in the education system. The teachers themselves are concerned at the allegations of deficiency in the teaching system, but they are also concerned that the bureaucracy in the Education Department has done nothing to contradict these statements. The department has let those criticisms generate in the media when they have come from the four groups of concerned people, but has done not one thing to contradict or try to justify the education system. Probably they cannot. Honourable members will probably agree that the rundown in the system started about three years ago when a start was made on phasing out the Wyndham scheme before an adequate replacement was found for it. It is difficult to know where the weaknesses of government start and finish, and where the bureaucracy in this particular department starts and finishes. But the real weakness was on the part of the Government at that time when it changed from the Wyndham scheme before any researched and approved replacement was instituted or even thought out.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: The Wyndham scheme proved to be such a disaster.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: It proved to be such a disaster only because people criticized it and claimed that the external school certificate examination should be done away with. Others argued that children should not be subjected to external examination. I personally believe that all people, especially children, need an incentive. Further, I believe a school teacher cannot adequately decide who passes or does not pass. I am paying the teaching profession a compliment; it is a profession for which I have a very high regard and I count a number of members of the profession as my friends. Many of them in conversation have agreed that it is an onerous responsibility to place upon a teacher when he is asked to decide who in his class has passed and who has not. I am well aware of the talent of two of our newly elected lady members in the field of education, and if I am radically wrong in anything I say tonight I realize that I shall hear about it later.

I shall summarize the points I have made. There is considerable concern about the standards of behaviour and achievements of students in the schools. This was prominently mentioned in the media, upon instigation by members of the Opposition, just prior to the recent State elections. The business world is saying they have lost confidence in the schools both in terms of quality of their product and the credentials and certificates they have been awarding. The certificate awarded to graduating pupils is not recognized, as it has no credence with employers. Concern is also being expressed by the experienced teachers and educators, including people such as Professor Sumner Miller, Professor Harry Messel and recently in Wagga Wagga, Professor Leonie Kramer. This comes under the heading of informed opinion of deficiencies in the education system.

Education in New South Wales was restructured in the 1960s when the Wyndham scheme was introduced. I have outlined broadly the advantages of that scheme. No incentive is given for a pupil to do well at school or to try his best. No prize is awarded. At one time at whatever school one attended at about this time of the year a prize was awarded. That may have been unfortunate for those who cannot do well and cannot win a prize but conversely it was bad for those who can do well, if they try, but do not try because absolutely no recognition is given to them for doing better. Education takes probably the largest slice of the State finances, as shown in the Budget. It is necessary that the people of New South Wales, the Parliament and the Government should ask some questions about education in this State. The first question ought to be whether the result is commensurate with the great expenditure incurred. Alternatively, are the taxpayers receiving their money's worth for the amount of tax spent on the education system. Can the Department of Education show that standards in our schools have not only been maintained but have also improved in order to meet contemporary needs?

I am aware that two schools of thought exist on this point. I am willing to concede that I have five grandsons who go to school. The eldest is 10. He can come up to me and say, "What is the square root of seventy-five?" and I do not know. He can give me the answer straight away. He has a broader field of learning than I had when I left school at the age of 14. Even the younger ones have a broader field of learning. In my opinion they are better equipped to go out into the world than I was when I left school. They are better equipped than other people of my generation were. For the sake of argument, when I left school it was not the done thing for a 14- or 15-year-old boy to talk about girl friends with his parents or school teachers. It certainly was not the thing to talk about sex and matters involving sex. Today the school-leaver has a much broader knowledge. The education is broader. What has the Department of Education done to publicize the fact that the student is better educated? I sat back and took the criticism that there is a deficiency in the

three R's. A few weeks ago a leading member of the Opposition made much of the deficiency in the three R's in the State education system but it did not do him a lot of good.

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith: I think the Hon. H. J. McPherson is wrong. He was **talking** about the importance of the three R's.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: Honourable members know what he was **talking** about. The aim was to try to influence the electors into thinking that the Government had done nothing about the education system and to think that the system had been allowed to run down to where it is. No mention was made of the fact that the former Government had aborted the Wyndham scheme without any research being done or acknowledged alternatives being introduced.

The Hon. J. W. Kennedy: The scheme came in that way, so it was a good thing that it went out that way.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: Before the Wyndham scheme came in it had been discussed throughout New South Wales for two and a half years or three years. I think the discussion may have gone on from before one election to just after the next election, a period in excess of three years, theoretically. Do not let us have this rot about the Wyndham scheme being introduced without research. I prefer to accept the statement in the *Sydney Morning Herald* that I read that was to the effect that the coalition parties must be held responsible for the present deficiencies in the education system.

The Hon. P. McMahon: They have no explanation for that.

The Hon. H. J. McPHERSON: No, and they have no answers. Some eight or nine questions were asked. I shall not answer specifically all those questions. Had it been earlier in the evening I might have gone through each question and given an answer. Suffice to say at this stage in the evening that the Government has recognized that many questions should be answered in relation to the education system in New South Wales. It has shown its recognition by the holding of a number of seminars in which the community as a whole can participate. People can ask questions and make suggestions as to what is required and what should be done in the education system, or what should be done to give pupils credence and standing when they go into the work force with a certificate that purports to be important. The Government has recognized the influence of technological advance on graduates from schools at present and in the future. The Government has made it the responsibility of one Minister to look into technological advances as they occur and even before they occur.

I have great pleasure in joining in support of the Government and congratulating it on its Budget. I congratulate the Government on having the courage of its convictions by presenting the Budget to the Parliament and to the State before going to the election. I congratulate the Government also on its honesty and steadfastness to its promise to resubmit the Budget to the new Parliament. In the Budget the Government has demonstrated above all else a desire to co-operate with the federal Government in the interests of reducing unemployment and inflation and in **making** the nation greater economically than it is now. The Government's record is in marked contrast with that of the Fraser Government with its broken promises.

Debate adjourned on motion by the Hon. J. W. Kennedy.

REAL PROPERTY (CROWN GRANTS) AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

First Reading

Bill received from the Legislative Assembly and, on motions by the Hon. D. P. Landa, read a first time and ordered to be printed.

House adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. P. Landa, at 10.32 p.m.
