

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 22 November, 1978

Industrial Arbitration (Reinstatement Awards) Amendment Bill (first reading)—
Sessional Committees—Questions without Notice—Appropriation Bill (No. 2)
(second reading)—Valuation of Land Cognate Bills (first reading)—Forestry
(State Forest Revocation) Bill (first reading).

The President took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION (REINSTATEMENT AWARDS) AMENDMENT BILL

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.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Standing Orders

Motion (by the Hon. D. P. Landa) agreed to:

That the Standing Orders Committee for the present Session consist of the following Members, viz.—The President, Dr Bryon-Faes, Mr Ducker, Mrs Isaksen, Mr Kennedy, Mr McMahan, Mr Rowland Smith, Mr Thompson, Mr Willis and the Mover, with leave to sit during any adjournment and authority to confer upon subjects of mutual concernment with any Committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Assembly.

Library

Motion (by the Hon. D. P. Landa) agreed to:

That the Library Committee of this House for the present Session consist of the following Members, viz.—The President, Mrs Anderson, Dr Bryon-Faes, Dr Freeman, Mrs Grusovin, Mrs Kite, Mr Lange, Mr Solomons, Mr Thompson and Mr Watkins, with leave to sit during any adjournment **and** authority to act jointly with the Library Committee of the Legislative Assembly in accordance with Council's Resolution of 26 November, 1968.

House

Motion (by the Hon. D. P. Landa) agreed to:

That the House Committee for the present Session consist of the following Members, viz.—The President, Mr Burton, Mr Connellan, Mr Duncan, Mr Healey, Mr Kaldis, Mrs Kite, Mr MacDiarmid, Mr Melville and Mr Sandwith, with leave to sit during any adjournment, and authority to act in matters of mutual concernment with any Committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Assembly.

Printing

Motion (by the Hon. D. P. Landa) agreed to:

That the Printing Committee for the present Session consist of the following Members, viz.—Mr Baldwin, Mrs Chadwick, Mrs Fisher, Mr King, Mr Melville, Mr Orr, Mr Pickering and Mr Unsworth, with the following duties and powers, and to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, and all Papers laid upon the Table. It shall be the duty of such Committee to report from time to time which of the Petitions and Papers referred to them ought, in their opinion, to be printed, and whether in full or in abstract; and it shall be in the power of the Committee to order such Petitions or Papers, or abstracts thereof, to be prepared for the Printer by the Clerk in attendance upon such Committee and such Papers or abstracts shall be printed, unless the House otherwise order.

Subordinate Legislation

Motion (by the Hon. D. P. Landa) agreed to:

(1) That this House do appoint a Committee to be called the Committee of Subordinate Legislation.

(2) That the Committee shall consist of seven Members.

(3) That the following Members shall comprise the Committee, viz.—Mr Baldwin, Mr Burton, Mr French, Mr Holt, Mr Philips, Mr Solomons, and Mr Turner.

(4) That it shall be the duty of the Committee to consider all Regulations, Rules, By-laws, Ordinances, Orders or Proclamations (hereinafter referred to as "the Regulations") which under any Act are required to be laid upon the Table of this House, and which are subject to disallowance by resolution of either or both Houses of Parliament.

If the Regulations are made whilst the Council is sitting, the Committee shall consider the Regulations before the end of the period during which any motion for disallowance of those Regulations may be moved in the House.

If the Regulations are made whilst the Council is not sitting, the Committee shall consider the Regulations as soon as conveniently may be after the making thereof.

(5) The Committee shall, with respect to the Regulations, consider—

- (a) whether the Regulations are in accordance with the general objects of the Act pursuant to which they are made;
- (b) whether the Regulations trespass unduly on personal rights and liberties;
- (c) whether the Regulations unduly make the rights and liberties of citizens dependent upon administrative and not upon judicial decisions;

- (d) whether the Regulations contain matter which in the opinion of the Committee should properly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament;
- (e) whether the Regulations appear to make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the Statute under which they are made;
- (f) whether there appears to have been unjustifiable delay in the publication or the laying of the Regulations before Parliament;
- (g) whether for any special reason the form or purport of the Regulations calls for elucidation.

(6) If the Committee is of the opinion that any of the Regulations ought to be disallowed—

- (a) it shall report that opinion and the grounds thereof to the House before the end of the period during which any motion for disallowance of those Regulations may be moved in the House;
- (b) if the Council is not sitting, it may report its opinion and the grounds thereof to the authority by which the Regulations were made.

(7) If the Committee is of the opinion that any matter relating to any of the Regulations should be brought to the notice of the House, it may report that opinion and matter to the House.

(8) The Committee shall have power to act and to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses, whether or not the Council is sitting, and all papers and documents referred to, and Minutes of the Proceedings, reports and records of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation appointed on 17 August, 1978, shall be referred to the Committee hereby appointed.

(9) The proceedings of the Committee shall, except wherein otherwise ordered, be regulated by the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council relating to Select Committees.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

DRUG REHABILITATION GRANT

The Hon. W. L. LANGE: I desire to ask the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council a question without notice. Is the Minister aware that the New South Wales Drug and Alcohol Authority on 4th October, 1978, announced various grants of funds for drug rehabilitation work? Was **\$30,000** granted to the Church of God of Prophecy in the North Albury–Lavington **area**? Is the Minister aware that the part-time minister of the church, who is to **administer** the funds, is one Phillip Morton? Is he the same Phillip Morton who was recently an electrical discount salesman and who has now assigned his estate to a trustee in bankruptcy? Is the Minister aware that following the **grant** Mr Morton stated publicly that he knew nothing about drug rehabilitation work? Is the Minister aware of concern by officers of the Health Commission of New South Wales and others in the Albury area that the funds have been granted to an organization under the control of a person with no experience in this field? Will the Minister ask his colleague, the Minister for Health, to review the grant with a view to making it **available** to persons or organizations experienced in this important work?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: As the honourable member would understand, I am not familiar with the detail of the matters he has raised. I undertake to refer the matter to the responsible Minister in another place and to advise the honourable member of the reply in due course.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE

The Hon. F. CALABRO: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council. Is it a fact that on 12th April, 1976, the Premier, in presenting the Labor Party policy statement to the electorate, said that during the first three years of a Labor Government local government in New South Wales would be relieved of its obligation to contribute to statutory bodies? Did the Premier say further that those contributions related to functions which benefit the community as a whole and that it was no longer appropriate that the burden of their payment should be shouldered by ratepayers alone? Has provision been made in the 1978–79 Budget to honour that important promise to local government and ratepayers and, if not, why not? Further, will the Minister inform the House as soon as possible what will be the cost to local government in 1979 in contributions to the State Planning and Environment Commission, the Cumberland Development Fund, the Board of Fire Commissioners, the Bush Fires Fund, the Department of the Valuer-General, the Metropolitan Waste Disposal Authority and the Argentine Ant Eradication Campaign?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The honourable member has had a long experience, in local government and would be aware that this Government was the first in the history of New South Wales to do anything realistic in relieving local government of financial responsibilities to State authorities. One might have thought that the honourable member would have given this Government some credit for what it has done. Previous governments had ample opportunity to demonstrate concern for the financial plight of local government but failed to do so.

The Hon. F. Calabro: The former coalition Government abolished the statutory payments to the Department of Main Roads which was much more significant than what this Government did in relation to the State Planning and Environment Commission.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The Hon. F. Calabro says that, but I assure him that when I, as Minister, relieved local government of the responsibility of payments to the State Planning and Environment Commission general fund to the extent of about \$6 million a year I received much commendation from local government.

The Hon. F. Calabro: It was more like \$2 million, rather than \$6 million.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: I ask the honourable member to listen, even though it might hurt him to hear what the Labor Government has achieved. I shall have those figures checked, but this Government, under my own administration, has relieved local government of its financial obligation in relation to open spaces to the tune of tens of millions of dollars. Under the former administration relief was provided only in selected areas on the North Shore and in Country Party electorates. Under the Wran Government that relief has been extended on an equitable basis, and relief provided to urban electorates, at a cost to the Government of more than \$2.5 million. Additionally, the Government has made concessions with regard to open space, coastal land projects, corridor acquisitions, roads contribution and so on. Therefore, let us hear no more talk about the Labor Government not honouring its 1976 election promise. The fair-minded people in local government—and I exclude the honourable

member from that group—know that this Government has done more to relieve local government of its financial obligations than any other government in the history of New South Wales.

I shall attempt to ascertain the information sought by the honourable member by referring those matters to the Ministers responsible in another place. If the information is readily available, I shall advise the honourable member in due course, though I believe he could obtain it quite easily from the Parliamentary Library.

SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. E. P. PICKERING: I desire to ask the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council a question without notice. Is the Minister aware that recently the Women's Electoral Lobby submitted to the Government a draft bill and recommendations related to sexual offences? Does the Minister agree that this facet of our statute requires a general review? If the Minister agrees with that statement can he indicate when amending measures might be brought forward for debate? In the preparation of the draft legislation will the Government have regard to the submissions made by the Women's Electoral Lobby?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The honourable member's question relates to bills that will be introduced by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice in the other place in the normal course of events. I assure the Hon. E. P. Pickering that in the preparation of any social legislation, especially that relating to the rights and liberty of individuals and the criminal law, the Government will consider any reasonable submission made by sensible bodies. I see no reason why the submission made by the Women's Electoral Lobby would not be considered in the preparation of such a measure. I ask the honourable member to show a little patience. He will get ample opportunity to debate the matter.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: Yes, but when?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The Government will not forget to tell the honourable member when the debate is coming on, just in case he is away in the south getting his orders from the coal companies. The honourable member will be given an opportunity to contribute to the debate on this subject when the bill comes before the House.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 21st November, vide page 532) on motion by the Hon. D. P. Landa:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. J. W. KENNEDY [4.48]: May I offer my congratulations to the Government upon its re-election; to the two Ministers in this Chamber; to the members **who** have been elevated or reappointed to the various offices in the Legislative Council, and to you, Mr President, on the honour bestowed upon you by unanimous vote of this Chamber in electing you as our President. I also welcome new members to the Chamber. I have been most impressed with the maiden contributors made over the past few days. The samples we have heard certainly augur well for the standard of debate over the next three years. When speaking in the Address-in-Reply debate on 22nd

August, I discussed the manner in which the Government was deploying its funds. Therefore, this is the second time within a few months that I have debated the State's fiscal arrangements. I shall not repeat what I said on the previous occasion, but shall comment on some figures that indicate the huge increase in Government income over the past decade not only in New South Wales but in the Commonwealth.

In 1967–68 New South Wales received \$36 million from property taxes, whereas in 1976–77 it received \$111 million from that source. In 1967–68 liquor tax amounted to \$14 million, whereas now it is \$50 million. When payroll tax was introduced in 1971–72 \$126 million was received by the Government; now it receives \$522 million. The total taxation levied by New South Wales public authority finance sections was \$299 million in 1967–68, but it is now \$1,567 million. It has multiplied almost six times. In 1967–68 Commonwealth taxation was \$4,951 million and is now \$19,770 million.

Members on the Government side rarely speak without criticizing the financial arrangements between the federal Government and the State Government. They voice a lot of nonsense about double taxation and about the Government getting insufficient money from the federal Government to carry out its proper functions. Yet almost half of the New South Wales Budget moneys come from allocations to the State by the Commonwealth Government, and this year the allocation is higher than it has even been in history. In an article of 13th November, 1978, Ross Gittins, the economics editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* said, in part:

Of the \$6 million set aside for the purchase of motor vehicles in New South Wales only \$2.7 million was used.

The Hon. J. S. Thompson told the House about the number of buses and motor vehicles that had been bought by the Public Transport Commission in the past year, yet Mr Gittins states that out of a provision of \$6 million only \$2.7 million was used. Another glaring instance of an unspent allocation was the \$33 million for the three-part programme to promote employment. That was highlighted in the 1977 Budget, but Mr Gittins comments that the whole of the \$33 million was unspent. Reduction in employment is an area in which the Government should work strenuously. Government speakers have said that the fault lies with the Commonwealth, which is accused of adopting methods that cause unemployment. The same speakers claim that the State is helping to alleviate that unemployment. If Mr Gittins is right, their contentions cannot be correct. He also states that of the \$15 million allocated for welfare housing, \$2.5 million remained untouched, and that less than half of the \$8 million for grants to councils was unspent. The story is not as good as the Government would have the House believe. In the same article Mr Gittins said:

The Government has been quite proud of the fact that the PTC kept to its budgeted deficit for 1977–78 of \$394 million. But it is now clear that it did so only by providing for long service leave and transferring to special reserve almost \$8 million less than required by its budget.

At times during this debate it seemed that Government members were telling the House quite a different story. In an article headed "How the State's pennies pile up" in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 21st November the same gentleman, who is certainly delving into State Government spending, said that the Government's holding of cash and securities amounted to \$259 million in 1973 and to \$519 million in 1978. I fail to see how any speaker in this debate could say that the Government had not received from the Commonwealth sufficient money from the new income-tax sharing system. It has received the highest allocation of any State Government in the history of federation.

I followed the Hon. Joe Thompson in the Address-in-Reply debate on 22nd August, and I was interested to hear what he had to say about the Budget last evening, especially when he dealt with employment and transport. I am aware of his interest in these areas and the amount of expertise that he has developed during his long association with the motor vehicle industry. There are a few matters that were mentioned by the honourable member on which I wish to concentrate this evening. I do not regard unemployment as a purely federal matter, for I believe that it is the responsibility of every parliamentarian and of every government in Australia. As I said when I spoke in the Address-in-Reply debate, it is far too easy to play politics and to attempt to sheet home to the federal Government the responsibility for all our problems, whether they be at State or local level. The federal Government has no magic wand; it is not a dictatorship; it has to rely on the co-operation of many people in order to obtain the best possible life for all Australians.

This country has a group of people who are unprepared to play the game according to the rules of the industrial courts. Indeed, they are unwilling to put Australia first, and do not seem to care about ruination of secondary industry; they are unconcerned that their actions are a direct cause of much of our unemployment in this country today. Today's *Daily Mirror*, hot off the press, in an article headed "It's high noon in petrol prices", states:

Sydney's petrol supplies depend on a High Noon confrontation in the Australian Arbitration Commission today between two sections of the one union. A dispute over whether some refinery operators at Caltex should be in the federal or State section of the Australian Workers' Union threatens to create the latest crisis . . . A stoppage by Golden Fleece storemen has cut off supplies to 150 stations. Oil storemen at other companies will stop work tomorrow to consider a new award offer, setting back supplies even further.

It saddens me to have to speak in this way about some members of the trade union movement. I acknowledge that there are faults on both sides of the industrial spectrum, and I acknowledge the dedication and the effort put into the union movement by many of its leaders, such as the Hon. Joe Thompson, the Hon. Fred Bowen, the Hon. Ralph Marsh, and many others too numerous to mention. However, I cannot stand those who have no respect for the law—those who strike, go slow, work to regulation. They take this action on practically any pretext, irrespective of whether it involves multi-national companies, big business, inter-union disputes, on all manner of claims.

The people of Australia are fed up to the back teeth with industrial unrest, which is sapping the confidence of this country and draining away the very lifeblood of our communities. I know honourable members opposite will try to refute what I am saying by quoting statistics of man days lost because of strikes and other figures purporting to show that the situation is not as bad as it seems. I should like those honourable members to explain the new strike technique that has been developed in this country of pulling out key personnel in order to disrupt the particular industry and hold the country to ransom.

In the Telecom dispute everybody was at work and practically everyone was still on the payroll. However, no maintenance was being done to vital equipment, and the whole community was disrupted. The same can be said about the almost constant disruption in the fuel industry, the transport industry and of the flight controllers. The list is endless, but the method of disruption is the same. It is costing this country millions of dollars in lost production, time wasted, increased costs and the confidence of the community. The Australian public has been browbeaten into accepting this type of operation as normal, and no one must stand up and criticize the trade union movement, which is sacrosanct. I am certain that the trade union leaders in this House are aware of this great problem.

The Hon. J. W. Kennedy]

I shall read to the House part of an article that appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of Friday, 10th November, under the heading "Trade-unions and the future". It is by Mr Frank Chapple, general secretary of Britain's Electrical Electronics Telecommunications and Plumbing Union, who was addressing a seminar organized by Enterprise Australia in Sydney on Wednesday, 8th November. Among other things, Mr Chapple said:

The growth of the notion that the State will provide everything, ought to provide everything, or will provide anything if only you support this, that or the other policy, in my view is an illusion.

Later he said:

The unions have to improve their membership, communication and participation. We can't have full employment and collective bargaining. We have to take our fair share of the responsibilities if our society is to survive in the foreseeable future.

Most significant in the issue of trade-union power, in my view, has been the growth of shop floor power. That is, the growth of shop stewards.

That trade union leader in Britain when addressing a seminar in Australia echoed my views about some of the problems of unemployment. I recommend that all honourable members obtain a copy of the speech of Mr Frank Chapple of the electrical trades union in England.

I am certain that unemployment would be reduced if industry were not bedevilled by industrial unrest and frustration. We should get together as parliamentarians and help solve this problem. We should not blame the federal Government. One cannot say that it is Fraser's fault, Street's fault, Anthony's fault or someone else's fault. We should establish a select committee of members of this House to consider the problems of unemployment, looking at the matter from all angles, particularly education, industrial relations and employment opportunities. Those three areas should be studied by the committee, which should then present to this House a report for discussion. I refer now to the Teachers Federation. One hears discussion about education in the trade union movement and among the general public.

The Hon. H. J. McPherson: The Prime Minister has cut down on the funding of education in the trade union movement.

The Hon. J. W. KENNEDY: Last night the Hon. H. J. McPherson told the House what he thought of the New South Wales education system. I do not disagree with all he said. As the Budget Papers reveal that federal funding of the New South Wales education system has been increased by 10 per cent, one cannot say that those funds have been cut back. I dislike immensely the method the Teachers Federation uses to achieve gains for its members. It calls upon teachers to strike, often over petty grievances, and its activities are no example to set our youth. In effect, it says to teachers, "Do not worry about reasoned argument, arbitration or the effect on your country, your parents, your friends or upon the productivity of this great nation; if you do not get from your country what you want, then strike."

One wonders what kind of citizen we will have in the future when our educationists set this example for those whom they are paid to teach and in whose tender care every parent places his children. By their precept and example they are indicating to the youngsters that it is right to strike. The Government, with taxpayers' money, pays the salaries of teachers to educate our children. With the Teachers Federation maintaining its record of the past five or six years, it is no wonder that standards have

fallen and attitudes have changed. The attitude that prevailed in schools when honourable members were pupils is much different from now. I conclude by again asking the Government to set up a committee of this House to look at the three major areas, education, industrial relations and employment, which I see as problems at the moment.

The Hon. P. F. WATKINS [5.9]: I join with other honourable members in conveying to you, Mr President, my congratulations on your election to the office of President of this House. I am sure you will carry out your duties with dignity and distinction. I wish you every success. I congratulate also the Hon. D. P. Landa on his election as Leader of the House, the Hon. J. R. Hallam on his election as Deputy Leader, the Hon. M. F. Willis on his election as Leader of the Opposition, and the Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith on his election as Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

After listening to the Hon. J. W. Kennedy I am a little hesitant to say that I am a trade union secretary. Nevertheless, my remarks will be on the subject of unemployment, which I am sure is of major concern to all of us here. The scourge of unemployment probably does not touch many of our lives in a personal sense. This phenomenon of massive unemployment co-existing with prosperity is a social evil and is the most compelling political, economic and, most importantly, social problem of our time. I consider myself particularly well placed to discuss this issue as I have the honour and privilege of leading a trade union covering an industry that has experienced some of the largest declines in employment in the whole of Australian industry over the past five years. I refer to the clothing industry where in that period over 20,000 workers have lost their jobs. No other industry in Australia has experienced more severe social dislocation as a direct result of unemployment.

As all honourable members are no doubt aware, those out of work and registered as unemployed with the Commonwealth Employment Service totalled 358 158 persons at the end of October or 6 per cent of the work force. Even internal federal Government experts do not discount the possibility of this figure rising to 500 000 during 1979. However, the real situation is by no means as straightforward as this.

Not only is this figure likely to be an extreme underestimation of the real numbers of unemployed, but also it camouflages the different rates of unemployment between different classes of unemployed people. The key words in our most often used measure of unemployment are "registered unemployed". Thus, those who are out of work but for a variety of reasons do not register as unemployed with the Commonwealth Employment Service, are not counted. Married women who are not eligible for unemployment benefits, school-leavers who cannot register for several weeks after they leave school, migrants who are unaware of the existence of the Commonwealth Employment Service and youths and adults who are discouraged from seeking work and withdraw from the job market, are all ignored in these figures; yet they are genuinely unemployed. It must be stated categorically that to reduce unemployment figures is not the same as reducing the level of unemployment and, as the Department of Emuloyment and Industrial Relations has recently admitted, some stabilizing in the current employment rate in Sydney is just this; it has found that workers have in fact withdrawn from the job market. It would be nothing short of inviting social disaster to take this as a genuine reduction in the level of unemployment.

This method of quoting unemployment statistics also hides the quite different levels of unemployment between different classes of unemployed persons. Unemployment affects certain groups differently. To illustrate: in February this year 23.5 per cent of women and 20 per cent of men under the age of 19 were unemployed, whereas 5.8 per cent of women and 3.7 per cent of men over the age of 24 were unemployed; 10.2 per cent of migrant women and 6.6 per cent of migrant men were unemployed;

and 10.4 per cent of women overall were unemployed. Thus youths are **affected** more than adults, migrants more than those born in Australia, and women more than men. Just think of the plight of the young female migrant. She faces a situation full of misery and despair.

In addition, the use of a simple rate of unemployment figure ignores the marked level of structural unemployment which exists. On the one hand, we are faced with a situation where employers in the clothing and metal industries, for example, are crying out for experienced skilled tradesmen and tradeswomen and yet, on the other hand, there exists a huge pool of inexperienced youth and other unskilled workers whom employers are simply not willing to train in times of economic recession.

To give an example, recently I asked a leading builder in the Sutherland shire whether he had taken on any apprentices. He informed me that he did not intend to take on any apprentices, because he did not have the time to train them. When I asked him whether he was aware of the subsidy available from the Government for training young people or apprentices, he said he was aware but he did not have any time. Business came before the training of young people. He was prepared to take on a builder's labourer with a little more experience who could get on with the job. The point is that employers are simply not willing to train these people in times of economic recession.

It is about time that self-appointed commentators on unemployment acknowledged one simple truth, that is, that certain workers are not substitutable. The game of "find the scapegoat"—for example, blaming married women for taking youth jobs; or "blame the victim"—for example, blaming the unemployed for their predicament and calling them dole bludgers, avoids the central economic and sociological problems of unemployment. These notions are, at best, fanciful and, at worst, extremely destructive.

It is an undeniable fact that one of the principal economic problems facing Australia is the severe imbalance between skilled and semi-skilled persons in the work force. Years of neglect with the resultant failure even to attempt the development of a suitable manpower planning policy is one of the principal causes of the present dilemma. Very often claims are made that companies willing to offer employment are unable to obtain sufficient suitable applicants. Undoubtedly there is some truth in some of these assertions. At the same time I must add that I have personal knowledge of this situation being exaggerated for cheap and miserable political purposes. I have only contempt for those whose economic policies are causing the unnecessary **extension of** unemployment and who insist on adding insult to injury by senseless and callous name calling.

There are two factors that are causing obstacles to the speedy employment of **at** least some of the unemployed. I must preface my further remarks by saying that the basic problem is that there are simply too few jobs to go around. Of that there is simply no doubt at all. Nevertheless there are some who are at present unemployed who might obtain useful jobs and make a contribution to economic growth if some changes are made. Those who are still at school and considering their future training needs should be able to obtain reasonably accurate advice concerning future employment prospects in the careers to which they are attracted. The federal Government has made no attempt to give this basic and essential economic assistance to our youth. Each year, thousands of young people commence training and study for their chosen career

with little or no information available about the prospects of being able to gain employment in that field. Had we told our young people ten years ago that we needed only a very limited number of geologists and many more motor mechanics, we may have had fewer unemployed geologists and a lesser shortage of skilled motor mechanics.

The second difficulty to which I wish to refer is the apparent inability of the Commonwealth Employment Service to come to grips with the problems of matching applicants and available jobs. The methods used by the Commonwealth Employment Service are outdated and inefficient. It is an extraordinary situation that the federal Government uses the most advanced form of computer technology to count the numbers of unemployed persons but does not use the same technology to assist them to find jobs. It is a peculiar set of values which gives a higher priority to the production of unemployment statistics than to actually reducing the number of persons who are unemployed.

We have all heard of persons who are registered as unemployed whilst there are jobs available. When this situation is highlighted it is used as evidence to support the contention that the unfortunate unemployed are unwilling to work. In many cases the available jobs are never known to exist by those seeking them. Our history has shown that we must have a strong, well organized and efficient manufacturing sector if we are to avoid the scourge of unemployment. If manufacturing industry continues to decline, unemployment will continue to grow. The long-term social consequences of a large and permanent pool of unemployed persons are ludicrous. We need the active co-operation of all to prevent the lunacy of a pool of unemployed becoming a permanent feature of our economy. The right to a job is basic to freedom and liberty. Those who restrict the right to work take away the basic liberty of some persons in our community. Their actions are undermining our way of life.

Unlike the ivory tower policymakers in Canberra who seem always willing to experiment with other people's lives and welfare on the grounds of economic rationality, it is impossible for me, as a union secretary, to avoid the social implications of unemployment. The hardship inflicted on those who have no say in the economic policymaking process is enormous. I am frequently confronted with factory closures or cutbacks and retrenched employees, many of whom are given almost no notice of the firm's intention to stand down or close, and who do not receive any retrenchment compensation in the form of severance payments. Some employees do not even receive their accrued entitlements.

I consider it part of my role to concern myself with the re-employment of these displaced workers. Attacks have been made on our Government and the Premier. Mr Wran, in this Budget debate about the so-called do-nothing for unemployment in this State. I am happy to inform the House that 900 new jobs have been created in the Newcastle area as a result of negotiations last November between the Premier and the Government, together with the Department of Decentralisation, two clothing manufacturers—Osti and Katies—and my union. Incidentally, in November last year approximately sixty people were employed at one of these establishments. Further, I believe that notices of termination were to be given to those sixty people by the end of December last, which would have brought about the total closure of that factory. As honourable members would doubtless know, this is an area which has been experiencing acute job shortage for quite a long period. The State Government and my union have been most active in attempts to get at least one section of the manufacturing industry back on its feet. I mentioned a factory with sixty people working at it. It now has 435 employees. By February the two firms of Osti and Katies will have 1 000 workers. That is good news for the people in the Newcastle district. That is what the Government is doing.

The Hon. P. F. Watkins]

A survey has been undertaken of 340 firms in non-metropolitan areas of New South Wales, which have been in receipt of financial assistance because of their decentralized location. This survey reveals that overall, between June 1977 and June 1978, an increase of 2 per cent has occurred in the total employment of such firms. The sample is considered as substantially representative of firms in receipt of grants, subsidies and low interest loans through the various incentives provided to decentralized industry by the New South Wales Government. It is significant to note that, though a decline of 34 000 in manufacturing employment in Australia in the past twelve months was identified by the federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, the Hon. Tony Street, M.P., there was a significant and encouraging contrary trend in employment in secondary industry assisted by the Department of Decentralisation in New South Wales. It is most encouraging to look at the recent trends in the New South Wales building industry. On figures supplied to me by the Department of Decentralisation, unemployment fell marginally in September, but if allowance is made for seasonal factors, the underlying trend is still upward. Although the building industry remains depressed, the indications are that the outlook is improving, particularly in New South Wales.

I could not conclude without telling honourable members of the concern I hold for the future of this and other labour-intensive manufacturing industries. I cannot accept the economic equation that specialization in highly capital intensive industries equals prosperity for all Australians. If we use the criterion of productivity as measured by unit output for labour input, the level of capital intensity becomes all important and, of course, by definition, the more capital intensive an industry, the lower proportion of workers it employs. Thus, we are faced with a situation where ardent free traders expect our mining industry to provide the cure-all to our export situation and, hence, balance of payments problems, and the services sector to take up those people displaced from the dismantled manufacturing sector. However, this ignores one elementary factor intervening into the otherwise simple mathematical formula. That is, not all workers possess the same skills or even the potential to learn these skills—in the unlikely event that facilities for such training became available.

Nowhere is that more apparent than in my industry where many of the employees are migrant women with a poor command of the English language, a lack of understanding of Australian institutions, because certain interests have ensured they do not find out, and extremely rigid skill and geographic mobility. My fear is that these employees could not be transferred to the services sector, and would withdraw from the work force, as so many of them already have, and form part of the pool of permanently unemployed, suffering in silence.

I wish to thank honourable members for affording me the opportunity of addressing the House without interruption and also to thank the staff of Parliament for their time and assistance which they have given me since my election to this Council.

The Hon. F. M. MACDIARMID [5.25]: I join with other honourable members, Mr President, in congratulating you on your elevation to the Presidency of this august Chamber. Knowing you as I do, I am sure that you will perform your tasks in the great traditions of the Chamber and with impartiality. Perhaps I should remind you, Mr President, that in the history of the House of Commons nine Speakers have met with violent deaths. Seven other Speakers were beheaded. I hope that honourable members on this side of the House will not suffer that sort of political fate under your Presidency.

I congratulate also those new members who have made their maiden speeches. I missed a couple of them because I had to go somewhere else, but I was impressed with the quality of the addresses given and, more important, the sincerity of the people who made the speeches. I do not know whether in racing parlance one can break his maiden twice. I am one who has been re-elected to the House under the new system. Having been in the House first in 1972 I suppose that in a sense I **can** claim that this is my maiden speech on this occasion.

The Hon. Kathleen Anderson: You will not get away with that.

The Hon. F. M. **MACDIARMID**: Be that as it may, I sincerely hope that even though honourable members are now elected under a different system that was designated by the people of the State this place will remain a true House of review. I hope that all of us in the role of members of the upper House will, from time to time, consider it our duty to buck the party line. Perhaps that prediction will not come true very often.

I was interested to hear the maiden speech of the Hon. Barry Unsworth particularly as it dealt with the drug scene in which the honourable member has become involved. The Hon. Kathleen Anderson, the Hon. Clive Healey and I have had a great insight into this problem in the community. I submit that the drug scene claims no boundaries as far as politics are concerned and certainly claims no class distinction. It is a problem that goes right across the broad spectrum of society. I view it with the greatest **alarm** because it is the most insidious thing in which one could ever be involved. It is far worse than the alcohol problem, which is bad enough. It was quite frightening to see what has happened to the lives of young people.

Like the Hon. Barry Unsworth I should like to make some comments about Mr Walter McGrath who has been known to me for more than thirty years. He suffered the same type of horrendous experience as did the Hon. Barry Unsworth. He lost a son **because** of an overdose of drugs. I commend him for setting up the James McGrath Foundation. I had the opportunity to go through Odyssey House at Campbelltown which is situated on land leased by Walter McGrath from the Land Commission. The building was a disused seminary for seven or eight years but has now become a fine institution for rehabilitating young people on drugs. In conjunction with Dr Judianne Densen-Gerber he set that programme going.

I shall tell the House of some experiences brought to my notice when I went there and that led up to something I want to emphasize this afternoon. When the party of people with whom I went to Odyssey House arrived we were met by a staff member and an attractive young lady whose name was not known to me at that time. She happened to be the first person who had been enrolled, if that is the right term, at Odyssey House.

This young lady was at stage IV and had beaten her drug problem. She had been brought up in the Sydney home of a well-known professional man. She had attended a good school. Her parents were staggered that their daughter was so popular with the boys that she could get about twenty telephone calls each evening, but it turned out that she was an agent for the supply of marihuana. Later, this young lady used hard drugs. That story illustrates that the drug problem **affects** all strata of society.

A second example relates to a young lady who started using drugs at school when only 15 years old. She came from an **affluent** Sydney family, and her father was the managing director of a company. When the family adopted another child this young lady felt that perhaps she was not as loved and wanted as she had been. **She** started using pills at school and gradually moved on to harder drugs. In an attempt to get her away from temptation, her mother took her abroad. At Bangkok, on the way

back to Australia, the girl told her mother she wanted to stay for a few days. **The** mother said she had responsibilities to the other members of the family and would have to return home. The girl refused to accompany her. Within a few days she was using heroin.

Eventually she found her way back to Sydney but would not live at the family home. She lived with her boy friend. One morning, soon after he had gone to work, the police knocked on the door; they were looking for her boy friend who, they alleged, had shot a policeman the previous night. I have told honourable members this story as background to some information that this young lady gave me. She was not under oath and I cannot divulge the names of the people involved. She told me that in her community were four doctors who, for a payment of \$30 cash, would write a prescription for drugs. If that allegation is true—and I have no reason to disbelieve this girl—it casts a dark reflection upon a section of the medical profession. In generations past the medical profession and the legal profession have enjoyed a top-echelon status.

If some doctors are guilty of doing what this young lady has alleged, they are in the same category as **drug** pushers, and should be brought to heel. I do not know the names of the doctors who allegedly were involved in this sort of practice, but this is a most serious matter.

I commend the people who are doing something to alleviate the insidious drug problem. I should like to see all governments allocate more money to overcome the scourge of drug use. Some young people living in such places as Odyssey House have crammed into their fifteen or twenty years more experiences than most people have in a lifetime. Governments should get together, come to grips with this problem, and deal with it effectively.

I was most impressed by the contribution of the Hon. P. F. Watkins, whose sincere concern for unemployment is undoubted. No matter what might be one's political faith, everyone should be concerned about unemployment in Australia. The finger cannot be pointed at any one government for bringing about the unemployment crisis. Many salvos have been fired across the table here and in Canberra, with one government accusing another of creating unemployment. The truth is that in Australia labour has priced itself out of the market.

Last week I received a pamphlet from a bankers' union, which is concerned that within the next five years banks might have automatic tellers. The machine age has been with us for a long time. Each year between 200 000 and 300 000 young people leave school. How are they to find jobs? This problem is above politics, and is of national concern. The time has come for all governments, at all levels, to form an advisory committee to assess this problem as far ahead as the turn of the century. I have real concern for young people. Youngsters leaving school today are probably better educated than those of any previous generation, yet most of them are subjected to the horrendous experience of not being able to find employment. I reiterate that this problem is beyond politics. It is one with which we should all be concerned. I am pleased that the Leader of the House is present. In Labor Party circles he is regarded as a man with great perception. I intend to raise a subject in which the Minister is most interested, but before doing so I shall refer to another problem that **affects** the nation.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Is the honourable member referring to the shadow over the cricket pitch at the Sydney Cricket Ground?

The Hon. F. M. **MACDIARMID**: The Minister has been in the dark for so long that the lights there might help him to find his way.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: The honourable member lost his match on that wicket.

The Hon. F. M. **MACDIARMID**: Unfortunately, **Australia** is losing its initiative and reputation as being a great sporting nation. I do not mean that necessarily in the sense of winning cricket matches or games of football. In modern times most people want to engage only in what they regard as the good things in life. No longer does there seem to be a challenge for people to perform well in sport as there was in days gone by. Unfortunately, the mighty dollar has become an influencing factor. At one time sportsmen made great sacrifices to represent Australia in their chosen sport, but the pattern nowadays has been demonstrated by someone—colloquially known as **Thommo**—who decided not to play cricket but to go fishing when he could not get his own way when chasing the mighty dollar. That is a sad reflection upon sportsmen.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: He wanted to play but the court would not let him.

The Hon. F. M. **MACDIARMID**: I understand that when he was being questioned in the Equity Court his barrister said——

The Hon. D. P. Landa: On a point of order. The Hon. F. M. MacDiarmid is well aware that this matter is the subject of an appeal and is therefore *sub judice*.

The Hon R. B. Rowland Smith: He has not said anything yet.

The Hon D. P. Landa: The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith might laugh, but this is a serious matter. The Hon. F. M. MacDiarmid should not talk about a case that is the subject of an appeal and refer to matters that were raised in court.

The Hon. F. M. **MacDiarmid**: On the point of order. I do not believe I was impinging on the appeal rights of Mr Jeffrey Thomson. I was merely giving an example of **what I** consider a sportsman should set out to achieve, rather than just chase what is termed the mighty dollar.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: On the point of order. The honourable member is referring to the litigation and to what a barrister said in the lower court. The honourable member must know that the matter is on appeal, and is therefore *sub judice*.

The Hon. F. M. **MacDiarmid**: On the point of order. The Minister had not heard what I was going to say about the barrister's question. My remarks were to be facetious and not really to do with the point of law.

The **PRESIDENT**: If the honourable member intended to say something about the Equity Court proceedings, having in mind that it is on appeal, I am sure he will not now say it.

The Hon. F. M. **MACDIARMID**: I should like to see a greater allocation of funds to encourage sport in the State. As a nation Australia is becoming less healthy, perhaps through **affluence**. This is evidenced not only by performances in international competition. Although many joggers are to be seen round the streets of Sydney, people living in the country, because of their work, get more exercise than city dwellers. Recently when I attended a first-class cricket match at the Sydney Cricket Ground I was appalled to see what have been termed the asparagus spears waving in the breeze. I refer, of course, to the new lighting towers round the ground. Some overseas pressmen who are reporting the English cricket tour also were critical of the lighting system. The problem was highlighted in the Sydney press this morning, when it was said that during the coming Test series afternoon shadows from the towers will fall across the pitch.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: There will be bigger shadows when World Series Cricket starts there.

The Hon. F. M. MACDIARMID: The lights were installed at the ground to satisfy the whim of Mr Kerry Packer and World Series Cricket.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: They are there to cater for all nighttime activities.

The Hon. F. M. MACDIARMID: I realize, of course, that Sydney Cricket Ground will no longer be simply a cricket ground, but pop concerts will be staged there as well.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: World *Series* Cricket will be able to play there.

The Hon. F. M. MACDIARMID: I do not object to teams from World Series Cricket playing on the cricket ground, but I previously criticized the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust when it put the igloos on the Hill. They were supposed to provide shelter for the paying public, but they represent a desecration of the Sydney Cricket Ground. The light towers are in the same category.

The Hon. P. McMahon: Do you want a grandstand on the Hill?

The Hon. F. M. MACDIARMID: No. I have said before that, aesthetically, the two igloos and the small stand on the Hill are not in the best architectural taste.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: Surely the honourable member will agree that night cricket will allow more people to see the game. It is all right for you businessmen to take a day off to see the game, but a few of us would like to see cricket at night.

The Hon. F. M. MACDIARMID: Mr President, is the Minister making this speech, or am I? He is getting to the stage where his interjections are becoming a speech. I have said already that I should like to see more money allocated to sport in the State. Cricket has blossomed in New South Wales as a result of the efforts of the New South Wales Cricket Association and not the efforts of any commercial organization, I should like the Minister for Sport to immediately allocate \$40,000 to the association for its coaching programme. In New South Wales, Labor is riding on the crest of a wave. When the results of the recent elections were announced, I congratulated the Leader of the Government in the tally room; I shall not do so again in this House. We have seen democracy at work, and honourable members on this side realize that it is a new ball game. However, when a person is on the crest of a wave, he must realize that often a dumper is coming from behind.

The Hon. J. KALDIS [5.45]: Mr President, immediately after the elections a friend, who holds a prominent position in our society, gave me this advice: "Be careful of the first steps you will take in this House. Don't allow your background to become the focus of attention. Try to be like your other honourable colleagues". I considered his advice, but I confess that I find it difficult to follow, for it would not have been worthwhile for me to come here and pretend to be Anglo-Celtic. I cannot do that. I am a citizen of this country and this State, and I might go so far as to say that your aspirations and interests are also mine. However, the issues of this State are also of concern to the millions of migrants of the postwar era—people who came here for a better life and helped to build a better Australia, binding their fate with the fate of those who came before them.

Mr President, please accept my congratulations also on your election to your high office. Be assured, Mr President, that from me you will receive assistance and co-operation. It would be a great error if, in my first speech to this House, I did not refer to issues that are of great concern to migrants. If I do not speak of the people whom I know so well, of the people who, with tears and with joy, toiled to build this nation, that they made their own, for whom shall I speak? I do not wish to create

a ghetto of ideas within this House—first because I am against any type of ghetto and, second, because to create such a situation would only isolate me from the rest, and I would be lonely. After all, there are but a few migrants in such institutions as this.

I wish to make it clear from the start that my interests are not confined to the previously stated issue. If that were so, I would be disappointing the people who consider me one of them. Therefore, all that was mentioned by the previous speakers is also of concern to me. It is also of paramount concern to those who have become the victims of the current unemployment, and to those who came to this land to fulfil their dreams. Can any honourable member name a single issue that does not concern the migrant, whether it be education, transport, social security, the environment, child care, the arts, the care of the aged, health—to name but a few? These issues concern all of us, whether we are Australians of many generations or first generation Australians such as myself.

I have listened with great interest to every speech, and I agree that they dealt with serious matters. I agree also with the Leader of the Opposition in this House that unemployment is the greatest problem facing the country today. However, I would like him to convince Prime Minister Fraser that this is so. These are all important issues, but there are many others. On the occasion of the budget debate, allow me to expose these other issues, even though it may shock some honourable members.

First, I should like to point out that, even after so many years in Australia, I still consider myself a migrant. I came from Greece and I am very proud of my origin. The origins of a migrant should not be considered as an obstacle in the process of his integration. On behalf of these migrants, who came from fifty different lands and who made Australia their home, I say that we linked our life with yours, for better or for worse, till death do us part. I cannot understand the reasons, therefore, why we cannot make this land of opportunity the best in the world. Honourable members may consider this a Utopian attitude, but as a migrant, I had to learn to be an optimist. If migrants were not optimists they would not have become proud citizens of this land. This, of course, is of benefit to Australia.

However, things were different in the past. I wish to draw the attention of honourable members to this past, not so that I may express any bitterness, but to illustrate the struggle of the last thirty years—the struggle which forms, after all, part of the history of this modern nation. I am not the first to say that the history of this nation is actually the history of migration. I remember when I arrived in this State and in this city, disembarking from that rotten ship which, nevertheless, was better than the hulks that transported the convicts. Circular Quay was not as it is today. There were fewer cars on the roads and our city—our beautiful city—did not have the impressive buildings it has today. There was none of the hydro-electric projects of today on the Snowy Mountains; nor was Canberra so impressive. The contribution of the migrants to these changes must be emphasized.

Wherever you tread on the Snowy Mountains you must realize that the earth has been toiled by the sweat and tears of Italians. On looking upon the grand buildings of our cities, you must not forget the thousands of Greeks who have manned the scaffolds. When you sit behind the wheel of any Australian made car, do not forget that it was assembled mainly by migrants. Please do not think that I am implying that only the migrants of the post-war period have been responsible for these creations. No; I am not so foolish as to suggest such a thing. On the contrary, I hold in great respect the people who came before us. I appreciate the hardships of the pioneer Australians. I have been very much influenced by Australian literature, to the point where I feel that I, too, have experienced these hardships, such as that of the depression through which some of you, or your fathers, have lived.

The Hon. J. Kaldis]

I have come to love the Australian people and I am proud that I have become a part of them. Not for one moment have I thought to disregard the struggles of these people. My only complaint is that we do not receive the same respect. Should not there have been, at least at government level, full recognition of the contribution made by migrants? Until recently, not only was there no assistance given, but discrimination was shown openly. Regardless of their skills migrants were given the worst jobs and the lowest wages. There was, of course, the infamous dictation test. Do honourable members remember this? The authorities were given the right, according to this law, to arrest you and give you a dictation test in whatever language they chose—Gaelic to a Greek, for example. If you failed you were deported.

In previous years I worked mainly as a journalist for the ethnic press. Did you know that it was illegal to print an article in any language without having an English translation beside it? Did you know that there were many such laws which actually reduced the migrant to the status of a second-class citizen? Our society was not tolerant then. It was afraid to take the steps towards being tolerant. Yet these steps would have led to its earlier development. It is true to say that such a society that does not recognize the equality of its citizens, that wants to engender second-class citizenship, that does not give equal opportunities to all, cannot progress. It is impossible for it to survive for too long.

In making these points, I do not refer to the prejudices of laymen only. The problems start at the top—at government level and in parliament. A good example of this occurred no more than four years ago at the time when the former federal Labor Government discussed the matter of establishing an ethnic radio station. In the course of the discussion, a senator—and I fear he was a member of the same party to which the Hon. M. F. Willis belongs—asked the responsible Minister: "What did you say? We will let them speak in their own language, without checking them?" "Yes, that is our intention," answered the Minister. The senator was horrified. Yet, there were none of the horrors that some imagined would occur after both stations 2EA in Sydney and 3EA in Melbourne began broadcasting—without censorship, of course. No revolution took place. There were no subversive activities. On the contrary, ethnic radio stations have proven to be of great service, not only to migrants, but to the whole of society in general.

It is a lot of rot that some wish us to believe that the ethnic radio only tends to isolate the migrant even more from the life of the nation. As I was involved with that radio since its origin, I can prove that it is the best medium through which we can help the integration of the migrant. That is so because they are informed in their own language, every day, about what is happening. They are made more aware of their new environment. After all, what is a language but a form of communication. If I knew that you could all understand Greek, for example, I would prefer to speak to you in Greek, since it would be easier for me. An interesting thing is that I studied carefully the standing orders and rules of this House, and nowhere could I find stated that honourable members must speak in English. I hope the Leader of this House will not rush out with new legislation to block this loophole.

One-third of the State's population does not have English as its first language. As a symbolic gesture to that one-third, with your permission, Mr President, I should like to say a few words in Greek, in Italian, in Spanish and in Serbo-Croatian. I wish to apologize at this point to the other ethnic communities whose language I am unable to use.

MR PRESIDENT: Is permission granted? There being no objection, the honourable member may proceed.

The Hon. J. KALDIS: So that you do not think that I may say anything improper, I shall do what Bertoldt Brecht did in his plays. I shall first warn honourable members of what is coming. In the languages mentioned I will quote the philosophy expressed by our Premier, the Hon. N. K. Wran and adopted by the Labor Party Government. The Premier said:

. . . It is a basic human right that no individual or group in the community should be discriminated against or excluded from the fullest participation in the social, economic and cultural life of the community or from the fullest share of all the opportunities the community offers.

If he had spoken in Greek, the Premier would have said:

“ . . . αποτελεί βασικό ανθρώπινο δικαίωμα κάθε άτομου ή όμιλου στην κοινωνία να μή γίνεται όψμα διάκρισης, και να μή παραμερίζεται από την πλήρη συμμετοχή στην κοινωνική, οικονομική και έκπολιτιστική ζωή της κοινωνίας, ή από την πληρεστάτη συμμετοχή σε όλες τις εύκαιρίες που προφέρονται από την κοινωνία.”

In Italian, the Premier would have said:

“ . . . é un diritto umano che nessuna persona o gruppo nella comunità venga sottoposto a discriminazione, o venga escluso dal partecipare alla vita sociale, economica e culturale della comunità stessa o venga escluso dalla possibilità di avvalersi di quelle prospettive e opportunità che la comunità ha da offrire”.

If the Premier had spoken those words in Spanish, he would have said:

“ . . . es un derecho humano básico que no se deberá discriminar contra ninghn individuo o grupo de la comunidad ni se les deberá excluir de su total participación en la vida social, económica y cultural de la comunidad o de su completa participación en todas las oportunidades que ofrece la comunidad.”

Finally, the Premier's words, translated to the Serbo-Croatian language, were:

Temeljno je ljudsko pravo, pojedinaca ili grupa iz neke skupine naroda, da ne budu diskriminirani ili isključeni iz potpune ili djelomične prakse u socijalnom, ekonomskom ili kulturnom životu zajednice ili bez punog učesća kojeg zajednica može pružili.

In the past few years many changes have occurred in our ethnic communities. The spirit of co-operation has prevailed and this co-operation is in agreement with the aims of the nation. Four years ago, within this same framework, the Ethnic Communities Council was formed. I am one of the foundation members and am able to say that the Ethnic Communities Council has served our society well. Within this council 400 ethnic organizations have been able to overcome political and other differences to work responsibly towards enriching our society. I am pleased, therefore, that the Government of my party has recognized the services of this council and that it encourages the continuation of its work.

Within our ethnic communities there is much cultural wealth, but society has yet to recognize its worth and to recognize the talent and the people who are able to broaden our horizons. Even within the cultural sphere there is discrimination—not that there are written discriminatory laws, but there is the unwritten one that the migrant must suffer more than the rest to prove his worth. To give a prime example, I shall isolate one particular case so that honourable members may understand clearly what I mean. Within the Greek community there is a young composer. He migrated to Australia with his family when he was a small boy. He studied at the New South

Wales Conservatorium of Music and later went for further studies to Rome and to Athens, returning to Sydney four years ago. He felt that there was much he could give to Australia, but whichever door he knocked on he experienced disappointment. A few of us encouraged and helped him to stage a concert of his music at the Sydney Town Hall in October 1976. He directed an orchestra of forty musicians and a twenty-member choir. It was a magnificent concert. There were many non-Greeks in the audience, including some journalists from the Australian press who openly expressed their enthusiasm.

However, with the exception of one weekly newspaper, there were no reviews. The press—which headlines such news items as: "Greeks cheat the Department of Social Security", or "Italians grow marihuana", sensationalizing every word, in headlines bigger than my head—did not consider it worth while to mention the work of this migrant, who received standing ovations which rocked the Town Hall. This artist has given four other concerts to packed theatres, but still remains well known only within the Greek community. Does not Australia lose when she buries her talent, disillusioning artists such as the one I have mentioned?

I am not sure whether commercials are permitted within this House, but I shall give you his name. He is Themis Mexis and I use his example to show that, although much is said to the contrary, the migrant is still to this very day a disadvantaged citizen. Some people talk of ghettos and say that migrants cling to their own communities, but who is to blame for this? Who is responsible? Themis Mexis is ready to give himself to Australia and to the world. But how can this happen when society itself builds the walls to segregate her migrants?

The Government of my party understands the problems and has an impressive record to show in the area of ethnic affairs. The Budget speaks for itself. In his speech last week, the Leader of the Opposition called the Budget the do nothing Budget. He has been answered on various points by previous speakers from this side of the House. On the matter of ethnic affairs, however, I should like him to ask migrants, and especially those who are friendly with his party, what they think of the Budget. I believe they would answer that they are disappointed with the little their party has done for migrants.

We can show the difference between the two parties using but a few points. In the past year of the coalition Government, \$125,000 was allocated for this area. The present Budget appropriates \$1.9 million. This sum does not include allocations for services to migrants in education and health, which are separate. For the first time in the history of Australia, there is a free interpreter service for migrants in the courts. For the first time in the history of this State, there is a free interpreter service within hospitals. I can draw on many more examples of what this "do-nothing" Government has done in the past two years. The setting up of the Ethnic Affairs Commission and its report, which I have here, shows how seriously and responsibly the matter has been considered by the Government.

What have we received from the other side? The Opposition would learn a lot if it asked migrants what they think of the Fraser Government and of the Wran Government. Ask them what they think of the new immigration policy, the points system which Mr McKellar announced. This policy is an insult to the earlier migrants who arrived without points, and have been able to contribute greatly to the development of this land. In essence, this discriminatory policy is designed to limit the intake of migrants from Southern Europe and South America, and thus open the doors for the intake of white Rhodesians to complete the immigration quota. It is clear hypocrisy on the part of the federal Government. Why did it not simply and clearly state from which countries it preferred to take migrants?

Ask the migrants what they think of the unfulfilled promises of Mr Fraser. **Ask** them about Medibank. Ask them about the Department of Social Security or, as it is better known, the Department of Social Insecurity. It is a known fact that the Fraser Government has let down the Australian people. If we were to use Mr **McKellar's** points system to assess the Fraser Government in the area of ethnic affairs, I am sure it would receive the lowest possible points.

The Fraser Government presented to us the Galbally report, as if this was something of great importance. We read in the newspapers that the federal Government has allocated \$50 million for ethnic affairs. Great enthusiasm was expressed over this report and the federal Government tried to enthuse us as well, but we now discover that this declaration was nothing but a fraud. In reality, it was offering nothing more than peanuts. Think of this: it was considered that this \$50 million was to be given over three years. In the first year, \$7 million would be given; in the second, \$16 million; and in the third, the election year, \$27 million.

The coalition, in both Canberra and New South Wales, has unsuccessfully tried to win over the migrants with such gimmicks. On the one hand, it dishes out Galbally reports and, on the other, it parades in Greek national costume, for instance. Do honourable members recall the situation presented by the coalition candidate at Earlwood? Even the stones laughed in the Greek community.

I have read that the Opposition has appointed a committee to specialize in ethnic affairs and that the Hon. Virginia Chadwick is to chair it. I congratulate her but at the same time I warn her of the mountainous problems she will face, especially as her party is considered an anathema to some of the migrant communities,

I am proud and lucky that I belong to this side of the House. My party has a straight face within the migrant communities, and the support it receives from migrants is not one gained by chance, or through gimmicks. It has been gained through the untiring work of its leaders and members. That was work which was not done in one month or in one year prior to an election. For the past ten years it has been one continuous effort. My selection as a candidate to this House, at its first democratic elections, is yet another example which illustrates the close ties between the Labor Party and the migrants. I wish to express my gratitude to the Labor Party for this honour bestowed upon me. I wish to thank the Australian people for helping me to attain this office and I promise that I shall do all that is possible to carry out its tasks honourably. From the moment that a migrant decides to step forward and **demand** rights for a group of people, he takes on great responsibilities. For two decades, I have done all that was within my power to help the Australian community understand its migrants and, similarly, to help the migrant understand the Australian way of life. It was necessary for me to take on certain roles, such as those of bush lawyer, social worker, diplomat and even father confessor.

Many times I have been disappointed and I have asked myself if it was all worth it. I do not hide the fact that during the difficulties of the past seventeen years it was the help and encouragement of my wife which kept me going. In all my work she became my ardent helper; the unpaid secretary and telephonist, working day and night, seven days a week. After the election I asked myself what my new responsibilities would be. I do not think they will be any different from those I have had in the past. I consider my new position as a continuation of my previous work. I know that I will receive the support of my colleagues and the understanding of my party. And so, Mr President, according to the points which I have outlined, I state that this Budget is a good one. It can become the basis for further work in those areas neglected for so long. The **Government** has undertaken to fulfil its responsibilities to the migrant community. I am certain it will succeed.

The Hon. J. Kaldis]

The Hon. D. D. FREEMAN [6.14]: I wish to record my congratulations to you, Mr President, on your election to one of the highest offices in the State. The words spoken in the House on your election are endorsed generally throughout the community. I wish you well in the difficult but responsible position. Honourable members are sure that you will carry out the tasks required of you in a fitting and proper way. I extend my congratulations to the Hon. D. P. Landa on his re-election as a Minister and to the Hon. J. R. Hallam on his election to the Ministry. I congratulate also the new members of the House. The maiden speeches delivered so far have shown that some vigorous members have been added to the House. I look forward to future debates. I am appreciative of the dedication of the Hon. D. P. Landa in preserving the heritage of the State and its traditions. As he is Leader of the Government in this House I am sure that dedication will extend to the traditions of this place. Honourable members are extremely proud of the traditions in this House. I am reminded that it has been said that the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly sound like a barroom brawl in a local pub on Christmas eve. I hope that such a description cannot be applied to this House.

I wish to confine my remarks to matters related to motor vehicles. In recent days members of the community have recoiled in horror at some of the tragedies that have occurred. Headlines have appeared about the reaction in the community to the senseless and terrible destruction of an 8-year-old Yugoslav girl. Also there was the man who was an innocent bystander who was shot when police were trying to arrest the man who held him hostage. A girl was repeatedly stabbed at Bondi Junction because she would not apologize to her attacker. Also, there was the girl who was found dead at Sydney university. Every day honourable members hear of similar tragedies. I am greatly shocked by these tragedies. People are funny creatures and are mostly illogical. If deaths resulting from drunken driving were marginally reduced by strong action, more deaths would be prevented and more grievous injuries avoided than result from the combined consequences of all the murders and assaults about which one hears. But, the people largely disregard that.

The Government is totally gutless in relation to its attitude to drunken drivers. Emotional imagery guides us but as lawmakers we need a much more rational approach on how to deal with these matters. As lawmakers, more is expected of us. I am firm in my belief, as borne out by questions I have asked in the House, that the law should be changed and implemented to make every driver of a motor vehicle aware that at any time he may be examined to determine whether drink is impairing his own safety or the safety of others. If so, he will be firmly punished. If, as legislators, we balk at anything less than the two factors of an increase in the likelihood of detection of drinking drivers and penalties that hurt, we are not to be taken seriously. If we settle for anything less than those two basic requirements we are utter hypocrites, as we piously mouth the usual platitudes in the House about the safety of the citizens of New South Wales. For too long we have treated drunken driving as a social crime and tolerated it because it was thought to be devoid of the immoral or premeditated wrongdoing taken to be characteristic of other crimes of violence. That thinking is specious because, as Gordon Hawkins said:

Drunken driving has a reckless indifference to a known risk to the life and safety of others for a selfish and transient pleasure and therefore is a criminal act. It is only because so many of us can identify with the drunken driver that our critical judgment is stayed.

When I raised in the House the question whether random breath tests and meaningful penalties could not be introduced, when the Liberal Party and Country Party held office in New South Wales, I was told that such a move would be unpopular and an infringement of civil liberties. I reject that totally. I am extremely keen to safeguard

civil liberties. I am so keen that again I raise the matter to preserve the liberty of my wife and children, and the wife and children of every honourable member, to walk over a pedestrian crossing or to go about normal activities without being killed or injured by a drunk driving a lethal weapon he cannot control. People talk about civil liberties but they ought to get them in proper perspective. Let me remind honourable members of what happened when legislation relating to compulsory wearing of seat belts was introduced. Initially many people said that they would defy the law and would not wear seat belts. Seat belts have now been accepted and the wearing of them has resulted in a considerable reduction in death and injuries to drivers of motor cars. People become lost in the cry for civil liberties. In New South Wales we drive on the *lefthand* side of the road. That might be an infringement of the liberty of someone who wants to drive on the other side of the road but any one in his right mind would be willing to accept such a thing. In the community there are other matters on which one has to weigh the balance between the good of the community and the civil liberty and welfare of the individual. Compulsory immunization may be one of those areas.

In the past few months smallpox has been virtually eradicated from the face of the earth through immunization. That is marvellous and a tremendous advance in medical science. Many other advances of this nature occur from time to time. We must weigh them up and balance what we lose in liberties against what we gain in other ways.

When random breathtests were introduced in Great Britain an immediate marked improvement in the road toll was achieved. The number of people killed at weekends—the heaviest casualty period—dropped by 35 per cent in the first year after the legislation was enacted. Death resulting from drunken driving cannot and must not be swept away under the euphemistic term of traffic accident. Undeniably, it is unpremeditated murder. It must necessarily receive attention as the crime that it is. It has been said as an apology for weak governments that random breathtests and harsher penalties are not socially acceptable. In relation to that my former colleague the Hon. T. S. McKay once said in this House:

Does this mean that the community finds injury and death by the thousands each year more acceptable?

I do not believe so. It is estimated that for every death on the roads five persons are seriously injured, many for life. We must find a balance between loss of liberty and loss of life. We must make a clear distinction in our minds that this is not merely a social crime. Recently it came to my notice that police use their discretion in a most unusual way to help certain persons involved in motor accidents where injury has been caused by someone suspected of drunken driving.

Honourable members may be aware that if a person involved in an accident of this nature is shown to have been under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time, the insurance company is not liable. In these circumstances the injured party, who may have a claim for damages, must look to his own insurance company or take court action to recoup his damage. That person loses his no claim bonus. Many of us guard such things jealously. They are an economic inducement. In any case, the excess payment must be met. That is a further loss to the person injured.

I have been informed that in some cases where the driver of a motor car involved in an accident is suspected of being affected by alcohol or some other substance police have not charged him with driving under the influence. This course has been adopted even when there is a high likelihood that the charge would be substantiated. The police believe they are doing a favour for the person injured. This sort of approach

The Hon. D D. Freeman]

should be examined closely by both the Government and insurance companies working together. It is quite wrong that this should happen or even that there is a need for it to happen. A person injured in this way should not be disadvantaged. Inconsistencies in the law encourage this sort of action.

Within the past few days the Premier, by way of *ex gratia* payment—and quite justifiably in my opinion—compensated from public moneys the widow of a man shot in a most unfortunate incident involving a criminal. But, where does this sort of thing start and finish? Already under the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act payments to a maximum of \$4,000 may be made to persons injured in certain circumstances. However, those payments do not extend to the families of those victims.

The *ex gratia* payment made to this unfortunate lady was headline news. A person who is minding his own business and injured in unfortunate circumstances such as this should not be disadvantaged. The family of a person killed in these circumstances should not be precluded from receiving compensation. Some members of this House may not be aware that the Motor Traffic Act refers to persons driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor or a drug. The appropriate section provides:

Any person who whilst he is under the influence of intoxicating liquor or of a drug—

- (a) drives a motor vehicle; or
- (b) occupies the driving seat of a motor vehicle and attempts to put such motor vehicle in motion,

shall be guilty of an offence under this Act and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding four hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or to both such penalty and imprisonment.

Figures I have obtained indicate that between 30 per cent and 50 per cent of motor car crashes resulting in death have an alcohol-associated content. Though that is quite a wide range, to my mind it is an untenable situation. It is far too high. Unfortunately there are no standard breathalyzer type tests that can be used by police to detect whether a person is driving under the influence of a drug.

I should like briefly to relate an incident that occurred recently outside my own home. At about 2.30 a.m. two cars collided. One car was parked and the other had been driven by a young girl who was on her own. When the car door was opened she fell out. She was unable to stand and was quite incoherent. All she could say was that she had been to an outrageously great rock party and had been smoking pot. Several nearby residents gathered round and the police were called. The tow trucks arrived at the scene within three minutes. The police arrived in forty-five minutes. When the police arrived the girl, who was sitting on the bonnet of her car, got up to say hullo, but immediately collapsed in a heap. The police sergeant picked her up, put her back on the car and said, "You should not move, Missy; you are not in a condition to stand." The crash had severely damaged her car as well as the parked car which belonged to people who lived in that street.

The police gave the girl a breathalyzer test which proved negative. The girl claimed to be 17 years old and said she had misplaced her licence. Next day the owner of the parked car inquired what had happened about the crash. The police said that as the breathalyzer test had proved negative all they could do was charge the girl with negligent driving. That young girl could have killed you, me, herself or anybody. She was totally oblivious to what she was doing. I noticed that the side of her car which had not collided with the parked car was almost totally demolished. Obviously she had hit something else on her way to this crash.

Great difficulty is experienced in determining whether people are driving under the influence of some substance other than alcohol. It is a real problem. There does not seem to be any simple scientific test such as the breathalyzer detection of alcohol. The detection of drugs in these circumstances is a most difficult and complicated procedure. I have researched the matter and all I can find out is that a mass spectrometer or gas chromatography may be used to analyze blood and urine. However, the procedure is quite expensive and takes about an hour. Further, the only place that carries out these tests in New South Wales is the Department of Forensic Science at Lidcombe. Further research is being undertaken in this sphere of medicine. I understand that Queensland has been toying with the matter.

I believe that the policeman who attended the scene of this event was guilty of a dereliction of duty. I recall that before the breathalyzer was introduced police applied simple tests to determine whether a person was under the influence. They took into account any admissions made by the person concerned about consumption of alcohol or drugs, they gauged whether the person was unsteady on his feet, coherency and other matters. In circumstances such as the case to which I have referred the police should use those methods. This must be looked at carefully by the authorities. It is a sad and sorry situation. The main thing against marihuana or pot smoking is not so much its addictive qualities—which do not seem to have been proved—or its long-term physical effects but rather the fact that anyone who is under its influence should not be permitted to be in charge of any mechanical device.

I should like briefly to give a summary of thefts of motor vehicles in New South Wales. The frightening statistics for **1978** are that approximately **30 000** vehicles will be stolen. Last year only **80** per cent of stolen vehicles were recovered. The value of the **20** per cent of stolen vehicles not recovered exceeded **\$20** million.

In the past two years payments by the NRMA in respect of motor vehicle thefts have risen by **30** per cent. It is estimated that each year in Blacktown stolen cars worth **\$500,000** are burnt. Often vehicles stolen by persons for the purpose of joyriding are blithely set alight in order to avoid detection of offenders by fingerprints. The time spent by police officers in trying to recover stolen vehicles is a tremendous drain on the community. Although it is difficult to obtain statistics of the penalties imposed for car stealing, so far as I have been able to ascertain they are surprisingly light. Joy riding is not regarded as a serious crime, but it is no joy for the owner whose expensive motor car is stolen and either damaged or not recovered. A woman convicted of shoplifting small items might be sent to gaol for months, but if someone steals a car worth **\$30,000**, the chances of his being sent to gaol are extremely small.

There is a disparity in the way that courts approach these matters. In almost every case of car theft the owner considers that, as the vehicle is insured, he need not make a fuss. Indeed, many owners leave cars unlocked or leave the keys in the ignition, and in that way contribute to the number of thefts of motor vehicles. Since 1st January this year it has been mandatory for car manufacturers to include steering locks in vehicles to inhibit car thefts, but this has proved to be only a slight discouragement. If someone really wants to steal a car, he will steal it.

The Hon. J. S. Thompson: Steering locks are no longer effective.

The Hon. D. D. FREEMAN: That is so. This is a difficult problem. Motor vehicle owners should be made more clearly aware of the requirement to secure vehicles against theft by joy riders or young persons who do not want to wait for public transport. If it could be proved that a recovered stolen car had not been broken into but left unlocked, a penalty could be imposed on the owner by impounding the

vehicle for a week. If the keys had been left in it, a penalty of another week could be imposed. But, above all, I am concerned about the cost to the community, involving the employment of police time and the physical destruction of property.

An associated but comparatively minor matter concerns the issue of drivers' licences. There is no point in a policeman checking drivers' licences, as there is little difficulty in obtaining a licence in someone else's name. Many people use drivers' licences to obtain credit or when hiring goods, but surely the people who accept a licence as a credential should regard it as useless unless it includes a photograph. Photographs on licences have been suggested for some time, but nothing has been done about them. This practice obtains in other countries, where it is an extremely serious matter for a person to be convicted of driving whilst under the influence of drugs or alcohol. In some Scandinavian countries these offences involve an automatic gaol sentence. Harsher penalties would help to reduce the road toll. The tally of road deaths for the year is recorded in the newspapers almost as a matter of pride, but it is disturbing to notice that the toll increases continually and is soaring in New South Wales. Many people are seriously injured and maimed in what I euphemistically call accidents that are caused by the consumption of alcohol. It is time that governments stopped taking the attitude that drunken driving is a social crime. With the number of people involved in the misery caused by road accidents and the cost to the community, it requires far more action than is taken at the present time.

[The President left the chair at 6.35 p.m. The House resumed at 8 p.m.]

The Hon. MARIE FISHER [8.0]: Before beginning my remarks on those sections of the Budget of particular interest to me, I join with previous honourable members who have expressed a sense of pleasure as well as deep humility at being one of the first group of Legislative Councillors elected to this House by popular franchise. It is an historic occasion. I express also my determination, again as have other honourable members, to work for the constituents of this State as well as representing in this House particular groups of interests.

When speaking on the budget allocations for this financial year, I propose to deal only with some sections in, first, the education estimates, and then in the area of expenditure in the primary sector. As regards the education estimates, I am sorry to add to the paean of complaint about cuts in federal spending; but I must. I commend the New South Wales Government for keeping its priorities right in a year when federal moneys for education to this State have increased by only a miserable 3 per cent. Facts are facts, so I do complain that the federal funding of government schools was cut by \$7,151,000 and, worse, that this sum was transferred to the non-government education sector which, all told, received a total increase of \$13,501,000 this year.

The federal Government has formulated a policy clearly designed to protect those already advantaged. I gather it is not in the interests of those born to rule to produce a well-educated majority that tends to question decisions made by those in authority and not meekly to acquiesce in them. However, I commend the New South Wales Government for its expenditure in a difficult year on education, especially for its allocations to the research and guidance divisions within the Department of Education and in assistance to country disadvantaged areas. It is most regrettable—and I say that with feeling as a member of the Teachers' Federation in this State—that many more teachers cannot be employed at the present time. Reduction in face-to-face teaching in the infant and primary school areas is highly desirable in improving the quality of education offered there. On the other hand I note that the Government's commitment to reduce class sizes is being met. That commitment is of equal importance to the reduction in face-to-face teaching. Of course next year more teachers will be employed than at present. The last group of bonded teachers is emerging from the training systems and is assured of employment.

I commend the Government also for the increased allocation of some \$400,000 to the Teacher Housing Authority, to bring to a total of \$2.7 million the amount to be spent on the acquisition and improvement of housing for teachers in country areas. This increase in expenditure is welcomed as the lack of suitable housing has been one of the greatest disadvantages that teachers in country areas have had to face. Poor living conditions have been a major reason behind the refusal of experienced teachers to serve in some isolated areas. Certainly bad housing has been a major reason for the rapid turnover of staff in country centres.

Customarily every three years, the period that teachers are obliged to give at one school, whole staffs have moved from some schools to be replaced by inexperienced staff straight from teacher training establishments. This is to the detriment of school discipline and consistency in educational policy in those schools. I confidently expect, with an improvement in teacher housing, that the reluctance to serve in some school areas will begin to disappear, especially if the authority itself will match the Minister's priorities and work with more efficiency and expedition than it has displayed in past years.

In another section of the education estimates I have already commended the present Government for its allocation to country disadvantaged areas. I proceed now to discuss a current educational problem in the far Western Division, from which area I come. I am afraid that again I must discuss it in the context of cuts in federal funding to public education. I refer to the itinerant teacher programme currently funded by the disadvantaged country area programme of the Schools Commission, which was one of those estimable bodies dating from the Whitlam years.

In brief explanation, itinerant teachers, as the name suggests, travel to visit pupils receiving their education by post from the correspondence school. Their function is, naturally, to help the pupils solve any education difficulties they may have, and refer any children requiring specialized diagnosis and aid to that splendid institution, the remedial centre at Queenscliff in Sydney. This is a most valuable help to the pupils, most of whom are in the infant and primary classes—the really vital years of learning—and who do not receive leaflets providing education, in my view, of comparable quality to that given in the class situation in the public schools. For instance, all leaflets provide the same work for all pupils in each grade, regardless of the pupil's ability. This opens a fascinating new field of research. How can it be that we country women always produce an average child? The correspondence schools everywhere seem convinced that this is so. I would insist, however, that we do not do so but, rather, produce children with the same scatter of abilities as city women.

I have educated two children from infants through to the upper primary under that system. I find the correspondence system works well for the bright child who can work at his or her own pace; only fairly well for the child of average ability; and the result can be disastrous for the slow learner and the pupil with learning difficulties. Given this situation, I am sure the House can appreciate the value of the itinerant teachers to such pupils.

Their work is also invaluable to the supervisor—in an overwhelming majority of cases, the mother. It is a long time since there were kings in grass castles in my area. Governesses have been a scarce commodity—one we could not afford—for a long time. The mothers have an enormous load to bear. Like women everywhere, they are wives and mothers, performing the common functions all women do, though under more difficult physical conditions than most. For those of us beyond rural electricity, the slow-combustion stove is an advance on a camp oven, as the kerosene fridge is an advance on the drip-safe. Neither could be labelled a labor-saving device.

The Hon. Marie Fisher]

Added to this commonplace role, however, the women in these areas have other roles acquired as a direct result, first, of the wool bust, and then of the beef crisis. They are also bookkeepers, shearers' cooks, yard and station hands on frequent occasions and, above all, supervisors of correspondence lessons. In this State each mother-supervisor has an average of two children at lessons, plus two pre-school children to tend as well. In fact, the numbers can be daunting. Last year, two mothers in this State supervised lessons for eight children apiece; five had four pupils each, and fifteen supervised three. Ninety per cent had pre-school children as well.

The task of supervising correspondence lessons would not be easy at the best of times. Swapping from the role of mother to teacher has its emotional difficulties for both parent and child, and the strain is increased by the economic circumstances of many families. The multiplicity of roles required of the mother ought to receive more understanding and sympathy than it does. In addition, the vast majority of them have had no training as teachers, and thus experience the greatest difficulty in solving any school problems their children might have. It is difficult, indeed, to rephrase work or set more examples, graded in difficulty, when one has only one's own educational experience to fall back on.

In this context, the work of the itinerant teacher is invaluable to the mother-supervisor, for they provide her with advice, back-up, and relief from bearing the sole responsibility for her children's education. This scheme is a new adjunct to correspondence schooling in this State. It was suggested by the local community at public meetings and then through elected community delegates when the area was first designated by the Schools Commission as one of the two disadvantaged areas. I regret its newness and feel, as one who has been a supervisor of my own children's work, that the system should always have been an integral part of the correspondence school system. However, it does exist now in the 2840 postcode area—a wide stretch of country around Bourke—with two teachers serving about 120 children, who are forced by isolation and distance from schools to pursue their education at home. However, the itinerant teacher scheme after one year only is now threatened, because we have been warned that federal funds are likely to be withdrawn. Should that miserable exercise in penny-pinching occur, I would strongly urge a takeover of this scheme by the New South Wales Department of Education. Indeed, given the present Labor administration's concern for country people, which has been demonstrated in many areas, I do expect that this would occur.

In this debate I have only a few more remarks to make on education. I shall be brief in my comments on the expressed desire of some to see a return to a more rigid education system, featuring the one-hit public examination. I shall not deal in detail with the arguments of the back-to-the-three R's lobby, but I warn against accepting, on their face value, arguments that standards have fallen. Given the lack of use of the same standardized tests over a long period of time, it is impossible, objectively, to prove this assertion. Standards is one of those English words that does not have a precise meaning and, indeed, in the education debate on quality of education is being tossed around with abandon so that it is rapidly coming to have very little meaning at all. If the present system is so poor, I wonder that we do not have a lack of university graduates in the arts, the sciences and the professions such as medicine. On the contrary, it appears that the system has produced surpluses in these fields as one would gather from the comments of previous speakers during this debate.

One of the familiar laments of those decrying public education is that school-leavers cannot spell. Employers have bewailed this lack in their employees for as long as I can remember. It was common when I was attending both primary and secondary schools, yet in those good old days spelling lists had to be learned by heart

and students were tested weekly on all subjects. I emerged from that system to achieve a measure of academic success, but I freely confess to this House that not only do I use a dictionary frequently to check spellings but also could not score 100 per cent in a spelling test on words that involve common errors. I do not wish to impugn the spelling abilities of other members of this House but, as an ex-English-history teacher, and speaking from experience, I doubt if most honourable members could score 100 per cent either.

I have just finished teaching an English course to a group of young women, aspiring to become secretaries. I observed the same range of ability in spelling and a development to the same level of proficiency in English as a group I taught at higher school certificate level some eight years ago. Further, on numeracy, having taught my own children in the new mathematics syllabus through the infant and primary stages, I believe their skills far exceed my own. With average mathematical ability, their speed in solving problems is much greater than my own, and is a much less traumatic experience. In regard to general literacy in the community, I have noticed that some of the exponents of the "back-to-the-three R's" can deliver themselves of some remarkably inept grammatical constructions. This is surprising in view of their fond recollection of the rigid education they experienced during their good old days. I have in mind a speaker at a speech night I attended not so long ago. He extolled the system under which he had been educated, and after deriding the present system, went on to describe it as a "real good" one, then make five more glaring errors in grammar and two in usage.

I suggest to honourable members that the reason so many people, including myself, experience difficulty in articulating and writing clearly arises from not the present system of education but two other factors. First, the nature of the English language, which has great breadth and vitality but, unfortunately for us, is a living language that has never been systematically ordered, as, for example, the French language. Rather than complain that the young cannot spell, it would be a great deal more sensible to reform the irrational spelling of the English tongue. For instance, there is nothing inherently virtuous in spelling plough as p-l-o-u-g-h, instead of the simpler Anglo-Saxon p-l-o-w.

The second reason for the decline in the clarity of expression in English is the increasing use of jargon, euphemism and Americanisms—termed vulgarisms by some pedants—in the spoken form of the language by people of our generation. Many television and newspaper journalists are guilty in this respect; this applies also to many of the professional people they interview. Many examples of jargon expressions that do not aid clear expression spring to mind: I shall content myself with pointing out some common examples. The attachment of the suffix "wise" to many nouns, such as health, money and economy, to which it does not properly belong; or the use of must instead of necessity, and escalate instead of increase. None of these aid clarity of expression; indeed, frequently they tend to obscure it. Our generation is often guilty of this. My advice to parents who are worried about their children's lack of reading skills is not to blame the public school system. First, they should turn off the square box. There is a high correlation between inability to read well and hours spent watching television. Second, they should set an example to their offspring, by reading and trying to achieve clarity in the written and spoken forms of a very difficult language.

The House will have gathered that, in general, I support the present system of education, with its faults, over the more rigid one it succeeded. To confirm that impression, I now declare my full support for the proposed Education Commission in this State, and wish to read into the public record my admiration for the dedicated, hard work performed by members of the working party for the establishment of the

The Hon. Marie Fisher]

Education Commission. I commend here Professor Hogan of Wollongong University; Messrs Swan and Watson, Directors of Education and Technical and Further Education respectively in this State; Mrs Brown, representing the New South Wales Federation of Infants' School Clubs; Mrs Cohen, president of the Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations of New South Wales; Mr Marler of the New South Wales Technical Teachers' Association and, last but not least, Mr Manefield and Mr Rennie of the New South Wales Teachers' Federation.

Turning now to other areas of concern to me and those in my area, I can again find much to praise in the Budget's treatment of primary producers for, as in education, the Government has resisted the temptation to prune expenditure in several important fields. I commend here the continuing grant by the Lands Department to the scrub rehabilitation scheme in the Cobar-Byrock area and the allocation of \$100,000 for the pilot programme for the eradication of feral pigs—the new pest of vast stretches of this State and a noxious threat beside which increasing kangaroo and rabbit numbers pale by comparison. I further commend the Government for its continuing refusal to raise passenger fares, which is a boon to the long-distance travellers in my area, and for the forthcoming aid in travel and residential costs we have to meet when bringing our children to Sydney for specialized medical care.

As one involved in cattle-raising, I fully support the increased grant in the Budget of \$250,000 to the New South Wales Meat Industry Authority, that splendid initiative of this year by the first Wran administration. In that connection, I wish to sound a warning on the future of the beef industry, one of the industries affected by the Meat Industry Bill No. 2. My concern arises from two reports—one in the *Sydney Morning Herald* last Friday, 17th November, and another in the current edition of the *National Farmer*. Incidentally, I was again pleased to read into the public record the name of a truly impartial and comprehensive rural paper—a rare and pleasing occurrence in the field of country journalism, long dominated by the Country Party and big rural business interests.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* reported an address by Mr R. G. Jones, chairman of the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation, to the 1978 meat industry conference. Mr Jones forecast higher prices for beef. As a producer, I am, of course, quite pleased about that, but I found his next remarks not quite so pleasing. He went on to remark that factors to be considered in this rise were that most income earners were better able to afford higher prices, and that the price of meat in Australia, as a share of the weekly income, was less than almost anywhere in the world. He said:

Please take note of these facts. Let us not have any more hysteria about rising prices.

Another member of the corporation, Harry M. Miller, said at that conference that an intensive advertising campaign would be conducted to promote meat. I believe the field in which Mr Miller has some expertise is entertainment. I cannot feel amusement at that suggestion. The best advertisement for meat is a reasonable price to the consumer and, given the high level of unemployment and the cuts in real wages for those employed, I deny that consumers will be able to continue even current levels for meat consumption should prices rise markedly. Indeed, cheek by jowl with that report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* was a column devoted to the October rise of 1.6 per cent in the consumer price index, a rise directly attributable in part to a sharp rise in beef prices. Even the Fraser Government has shown a concern over food price rises, and I look forward to the publication of the report of the Prices Justification Tribunal inquiry into beef prices, which is due in December.

All told, Mr Jones' comments were disturbing, not because he forecast that the beef industry could look forward to a profitable immediate future but because he went on to say:

What we are facing is a situation in which, given stable local and overseas demand, supply may not be sufficient to meet the ultimate demand.

He named as future markets, whose expectations we might not be able to meet for beef, the United States, Europe and Japan. But those countries expect considerable increases in their own beef herds in the near future. According to the Third World Meat Conference, called by the OECD, and reported by the National *Farmer*, in 1982, United States cattle numbers are confidently expected to be up by 10 per cent on present levels, which will certainly enliven their cattle lobby to resist our imports. In the EEC the rise will be in the order of two million head. In Japan, the increase in the beef herd is forecast to be 13 per cent. Therefore, the scenario for growers is in reality, rising prices and falling local consumption and unless prices to the consumer are checked—as they can be, at least in New South Wales—increasing beef production will produce by 1982 a beef glut more catastrophic than the one from which we have just emerged.

The size of the national beef herd—and any future increase—is of concern to not only me but I am certain also the New South Wales Meat Industry Authority, which is devoted to achieving stability of income to the grower and reasonable pricing to the consumer. It seems that one way of reducing the New South Wales beef herd, thus helping to stabilize supply, is for woolgrowing to become a more attractive proposition than it is at the moment. The major reason why the beef herd is so large, particularly in New South Wales, is the extent to which traditional woolgrowers have diversified into beef. There was really little else many of us could do following the "bust" in wool in the sixties, for the aridity of large areas of this State prevented us from diversifying into farming. Many of us were forced into beef production.

Wool returns look better than they have for some time, though if growers care to analyse current price a bale, I think they will find, as we have, that wool is now back up to 1961 prices. That was the year in which prices started to slide so badly. The improvement is comparative only, and it is still impossible for the bulk of growers to rely on wool alone as a source of income. I urge the present Government to go-it-alone, if necessary, and to aid the wool industry in the same way it is attempting rationalization of the meat industry in New South Wales. There exists, as I have pointed out, a real connection between the beef and wool industries, which are the two halves of the grazing industry. I go further and urge this action along the lines suggested by the Australian Wool Corporation; that is, along lines of acquisition of the New South Wales clip by a corporation transmuted into a single buyer as well as single seller, and using present technical innovations such as scientific sampling. Also, as the corporation has proposed, the scheme should allow initial payment to the grower within, say, fifteen working days of presentation of his wool for sampling, based on a schedule equivalent to that of the current minimum reserve price scheme. To sum up, this would extend to the woolgrower the benefits and stability of income that were conferred on the wheatgrower by the wheat stabilization scheme.

I do not expect the present federal Government to accept these proposals from the Australian Wool Corporation. It will, as usual, listen to the views of the big business wool brokers and, as usual, ignore the fact that the last time woolgrowers were asked their opinion in a referendum, the growers were strongly opposed to the retention of the wool auction system. Many of us then regarded that as a vote of support for acquisition. The New South Wales Government would, then, very likely have to take independent action. I believe it could safely proceed to this. In the latest

The Hon. Marie Fisher]

interim annual report of the Australian Wool Corporation, I see that the corporation has this year completed repayment of funds loaned to it by the federal Government under the Wool Marketing (Loan) Act, 1974—another fine initiative of the Whitlam years in Canberra. Indeed, between late 1974 and 30th June, 1978, the corporation paid to the federal Government \$74.8 million in interest, at commercial rates. The New South Wales administration could, therefore, confidently expect to recoup any loans and interest, should such single-State action be necessary. Given the nexus between the sheep and beef industries, and the future world beef glut predicted, I urge such a step.

In concluding my remarks, may I join previous speakers in extending my congratulations to you, Mr President, to the Hon. Clive Healey, to the Hon. Paul Landa, to the Hon. Jack Hallam, and to their opposite numbers on the other side of the House, on their election to office in this Chamber.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN [8.30]: Mr President, you have my respect and support as our President. I agree with all other honourable members of this House that you will uphold the great traditions of your high office. I have experienced quite a few years in public life and politics. I have seen many sides of the coin. Not infrequently I have been in a minority position, in opposition *as* I am now. That has not meant that I have been unable to contribute to the well-being of the people of this State. In this Parliament the Labor Party, in opposition, has made great contributions. Over the past two and a half years the coalition Opposition has contributed to the well-being of the people.

If Government supporters are fair thinking they will agree that Opposition amendments to several bills assisted Labor to retain office at the recent elections. Had the Opposition allowed the Government to enact the Anti-Discrimination Bill in its original form the people would have suffered. Had the Opposition not amended the Energy Bill and two or three other bills inimical to the interests of the people, the Premier could not have gone to the electors and described himself as the head of a moderate and stable government. Indeed, the Opposition helped the Labor Government to create that illusion. I trust it will prove to be a reality. I do not oppose change. However, in view of experiences in the past I suggest that even if there does exist a certain euphoria the Government should not throw out willy-nilly and holus-bolus proposals that the Opposition might put forward from time to time. I ask the Government to accept and consider constructive criticism that will come from members on this side of the House.

Last week in his maiden speech the Hon. B. J. Unsworth emphasized certain areas of social concern. Those problems must be handled with great care and consideration. They are not matters which could be described as hard political lines. There is no need for that sort of thing to happen in this Chamber. I have no intention of trying to exceed the performance of some Government supporters but as the father of eight children and the grandfather of twelve children, with every possibility of some more grandchildren, I am not unaware of the very real and sometimes distressing problems that confront young Australians. In some ways they face greater burdens than we older people did in our youthful era. I left school in 1929, in the midst of the great depression. In spite of the great difficulties of those days the children of today do not get things easily.

I have had a good look at what has happened to my own children and their children and I am proud of the general tone and attitude of our youth. I am aware of the many problems that exist in our community but to my mind the youth of today handle problems even better perhaps than we would have done. I agree with the Hon. Marie Fisher who suggests that today's children are better educated than we were and additionally have the advantage of living in what we call a modern world.

Over the past few years people have been made acutely aware of what is happening throughout the world. Television, radio and the modern news media have enabled even the youngest of our children to be aware in detail of what is happening all around the world, often as it actually happens or within minutes of it occurring.

I congratulate all honourable members who have made their maiden speech in this debate. I have been most impressed by the calibre of the new members. The Hon. J. Kaldis spoke at length on ethnic problems. I am pleased to say that I have a number of ethnic people in my family. In spite of what the Hon. J. Kaldis said in his maiden speech, one of my daughters married an Italian lad from Calabria. I am proud to have him as a son-in-law. I am pleased to say that they met—and this is why they ultimately married—at a Liberal Party meeting. They are staunch supporters of the Liberal Party. This young fellow is an engineer with General Motors—Holden's Limited. He did so well that the company sent him to the United States of America for some years as its representative from Australia. I am in no way ashamed of him. Indeed, I am happy and proud to have him as part of my family. He, too, can speak several languages. I have but two—English and Strine.

I have another son-in-law who is of Greek descent. Government supporters might not be surprised to learn that he is a supporter of their party. It has been said earlier in this debate that most Greeks are Labor supporters. That is not true. I know of many Greeks who are strong Liberal supporters. Three of my children are not yet married. They will make their own decisions. They may broaden the ethnic bounds of our family. In fact, my family originated as immigrants to this country, when in 1848 a 20-year-old girl and her 16-year-old twin brothers were sent to Australia from Limerick, Ireland, by their father, who was a land surveyor. They came to this new country on their own. Their descendants now number more than 1 400.

Recently in Ballarat, Victoria, we held a family gathering and 400 descendants of that original trio attended. Seven generations of Australians have descended from that girl and those two boys. They were pioneers as have been the Greeks, the Italians and others who have come here since World War II. We are all Australians together, including the Aborigines. I have made many good friends among Aborigines. Any attempt to divide us by saying who fits in where and who supports which party is not helpful to the ethnic concept. I am willing to work with all peoples of all colours and all creeds. That is what living is all about. It is our responsibility as members of Parliament to consider how best we can assist ethnic people and young Australians. We must not adopt a dictatorial attitude. We must respect the rights of all people.

Last week the Hon. J. P. Ducker made a sound speech in this Parliament. He has the standing and ability to do so. He could have led the people to work and live harmoniously side by side in our society. Unfortunately, he chose to be personal and to use snide remarks about individuals and political parties. He reminded me of the words of a former carpenter. It would seem that the Hon. J. P. Ducker has forgotten the words that this young man spoke quite a while back. He said, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone . . ." That may have been said 2 000 years ago but it is as true today as it was then.

The coalition parties, whether in opposition or in government, do not pretend that they have done all they should have done. This applies in both the State and federal spheres. Casting doubt upon the credibility of the Opposition parties and their intent might give some Government supporters a warm glow for a short while and it may enable them to forget some of their own mistakes but they would be better advised to adopt a more sober approach to the problems of government, as illustrated in this Budget, and to lead constructive debate on the bills that will come before this

The Hon. L. P. Connellan]

House. The approach of members of the Opposition will be not to seize on **personal** and topical matters for a mean or temporary advantage, which would be easy to do. This House should leave that approach behind and thereby create a record of progress.

In the past six years there has been almost a revolution in local government, with which I have been closely associated. In this House I have expressed appreciation time and again of the part played by the **Whitlam** Government in its approach to local government finance. There is now a more satisfactory and permanent policy towards the status of local government in the **community**. Last year \$65 million was allocated from federal taxation revenue sharing. Next year the allocation will increase by at least the amount of the increase in government revenue from taxation.

The Hon. Kathleen Anderson: The percentage allocation has decreased.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: Not the percentage; the percentage was 1.52.

The Hon. Kathleen Anderson: But the promise was 2 per cent.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: It has not decreased. The promise was that in the life of the federal Liberal-Country party Government it would increase to 2 per cent. The percentage increase was 8.52, because of the increase in income tax revenue sharing. There was no increase this year and there may not be one next year.

The Hon. P. McMahon: It will not be an election year.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: If it were tied to an election, it would have to be the following year. It will then go to 2 per cent plus the increase in income from taxation revenue, which would give a substantial increase of funding to local government.

I assure honourable members that the Local Government Grants Commission has not done or suggested anything on party political lines. The commission was established ten years ago by a State Government grant of \$4 million. It has not been a party political exercise and it has been able to work for the benefit of ratepayers. The Hon. Marie Fisher spoke strongly about problems encountered in the education of children by correspondence. My children were educated under the correspondence system in the Western Division of the State. That system is not novel.

The Hon. Marie Fisher: I did not say it was.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: I agree. I support any move that is made to improve the standard of education. The comments made by the honourable member in regard to brighter children, average children and slow learners were sound. Children who are slow learners need the benefit of the assistance given by itinerant teachers. Twenty years ago the local council in the area where I live sought from the government of the day, a Labor government, the establishment of an itinerant baby health sister. With the assistance of the Hon. P. D. Hills, the Balranald shire established the first itinerant baby health service in Australia. The sister employed in that centre visits mothers and babies 130 miles or more out of town. I would support the appointment of itinerant teachers along the same lines.

The areas of the State near the Victorian border have additional problems. The Hon. Marie Fisher said that there were transport resources in the northern and mid-western areas of the State to enable children with special learning **problems** to come to Sydney. There are no means of transport to Sydney from many areas along the Murray River. I commute from the area to Sydney through Melbourne as it is the most practical route. People in the area who have **subnormal** children or children

with physical disabilities have to overcome enormous problems. I shall read to the House an extract from a letter received from the Minister of Health in Victoria which accentuates the problem I am speaking about:

I am sorry for the delay in replying to your letter of the 14th April, 1976, concerning John McDonald and your request for his admission to the Bunwood Blind Babies Home. It was necessary to obtain a report on John's case from the Royal Victorian Institute for the Blind and to acquaint myself with his history.

In essence, John McDonald is not only blind but is also mentally retarded. The Bunwood Blind Babies Home takes blind children and uses special skills to promote their development as normal children and to help them cope with their disability. Medical assessment of John has shown that because of his mental retardation he will not benefit from the Bunwood School.

The Institute for the Blind has, however, taken John for short periods to assist the family and give some relief from the continuous care. It also referred him to the St Nicholas' School at Carlton run by the Mental Health Authority. Unfortunately St Nicholas was unable to help because of the limitation on accommodation since John is normally domiciled in New South Wales.

The McDonald family has all my sympathy and I clearly understand their problem with two blind children to care for. I feel that the Royal Victorian Institute for the Blind has been most anxious to help and I respect the Institute's opinion that John would be best served through the Mental Health Authority.

The parents of that child cannot afford to bring him to Sydney and they have no means of transportation. They are left high and dry. That is an illustration of the lack of co-operation between the two States. I do not intend to be overcritical of the Victorian Government, for New South Wales has done the same sort of thing. There should be **much** more co-operation between the States to overcome the anomalies that exist in the border areas. I have had to wear those anomalies for the whole of my lifetime.

I have not given merely an isolated case. I could give more examples. There are great problems with the movement of stock between the States. In the past twelve months Victoria has adopted different standards. With due respect to the Minister for Agriculture, New South Wales has but a limited brucellosis campaign. Some months ago that Minister said that he did not recommend that people pursue having blood tests carried out on their cattle in the western areas of the State as the State was not ready to go ahead with the campaign.

The Hon. J. R. Hallam: It is being done in stages.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: I appreciate that. The main outlet for stock is to Victoria and that is where the problem is created. Nine years out of ten the movement of stock is from the north to the south. The fattening of stock is done in the Riverina and other southern areas, so that it is available for Victorian markets. The beef producer has many problems selling stock interstate at great cost to him. I shall not take up the time of the House detailing them, but I am willing to inform the Minister of them if he is interested.

Another problem occurs over licensing to fish and to shoot. Many Victorians do not appreciate that the Murray River is part of New South Wales. If they are caught fishing, particularly at weekends, they run the risk of being fined for not having a New South Wales licence. It is most difficult for a Victorian who lives in

Swan Hill or Echuca to obtain a New South Wales licence. He may be required *to* travel 50 miles to obtain it. A young man and his lady friend who both work on week days may decide to go fishing together on the Murray River. They cannot obtain a licence conveniently during their **working** hours. At Moulamein, some 50 miles away, no business place is open of a weekend from which a licence could be obtained. These problems should be resolved.

I know of a young lad who purchased a motor bike in Victoria, where they do not have the learners plates that New South Wales requires. He decided to go for a run on his motor bike across the river. As soon as he reached the bridge at Swan Hill he was in New South Wales. On crossing the bridge he fell off the bike through inexperience and broke a leg. He was sent by ambulance to Melbourne, where he was in hospital for a couple of weeks. If he were injured in Victoria in those circumstances he would be entitled to compensation and thus covered for his medical and hospital expenses. When he applied for compensation in Victoria he was asked **where** his accident happened. When he told them it was across the bridge at Swan Hill some bright person in the insurance company said that as the accident happened in New South Wales he was not entitled to compensation. This lad of 17 years received medical and hospital bills totalling a couple of thousand dollars. These types of problems have existed for a long time, or have even worsened. I am willing to work with the Government to examine these problems and highlight them. The Government should approach the Victorian Government and try to resolve these difficulties. Neither State can **afford** to keep feuding and fighting about problems that are created to **the** detriment of citizens living close to the border.

I refer now to education. I do not know whether other honourable members have spoken about the system of book allowances in Victoria. Compared to Victorian children, New South Wales children are entirely disadvantaged in this matter. I refer to pupils attending the Swan Hill Technical School and those attending the Tooleybuc school, which many people do not know is in New South Wales. Victorian pupils have advantages over New South Wales school pupils. I am proud of the fact that the technical school at Swan Hill takes New South Wales pupils. One outstanding pupil I know from New South Wales is an example of the high standard of pupil in that area. Many of them have gone on to bigger and better things as a result of the high school and technical school training that they received from the Victorian Government. We must work with that government and not adopt a dog-eat-dog attitude.

Another problem brought to my attention recently concerned people owning property, stock, wool or other assets, large or small, in Victoria at the time of their death. This is subject to Victorian death duties. Although Victoria has dispensed with probate duty on property passing from spouse to spouse or from children to children in other circumstances the assets to which I have referred are subject to death duty at the rate applicable for the whole estate. I understand that the same condition applies to Victorian citizens with property or assets in New South Wales.

The Hon. L. A. Solomons: In New South Wales the spouse to spouse exemption applies only when a person domiciled in New South Wales dies.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: Yes. Many people who live in New South Wales have assets in Victoria. They might have only a small bank account, as Victoria is their trading place. These people's estates are being unfairly charged this duty. **At** the time of the last elections, and even before, the Premier made a great fuss about double taxation. The death duty problem to which I have referred is equal to a double taxation. I ask the Minister for Decentralisation and Minister Assisting the Premier to rectify this unfair position.

The Hon. J. R. Hallam: Death duties will be abolished over three years.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: Yes, but I am pointing out that some people are being seriously disadvantaged by being charged at the Victorian rate, which is a big impost. I am concerned particularly about people who are not rich. Another problem to which I refer the House concerns the housing of schoolteachers. Teachers at Tooleybuc central school cannot obtain sufficient teacher housing accommodation. They are able to rent a house across the river in Victoria. After living in that State for about six or eight weeks the local police may say to them that they cannot continue to have a car registered in New South Wales as they are domiciled in Victoria. It costs them about \$200 to have their motor vehicle registered in Victoria. Although I could continue for a considerable time identifying the many problems that exist in New South Wales, Government supporters and even my own colleagues may not appreciate my embarking upon lengthy debate. Suffice to say that some of the problems are increasing, particularly the teacher housing.

The Hon. Marie Fisher: Tooleybuc is No. 1 priority.

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: However, like Balranald, there is accommodation in Tooleybuc for only a small percentage of the teaching staff. The Teacher Housing Authority would provide accommodation for only about four teachers.

The Hon. H. J. McPherson: What is the population of Tooleybuc?

The Hon. L. P. CONNELLAN: Approximately 300 people, although it has a central school with 600 pupils. I shall check the number, but I am quite sure the number of pupils would be of that order. It is a small village with one pub, one store and a few houses dotted about. It has a good bowling club that was opened recently by the Hon. R. J. Mulock, the Minister for Mineral Resources and Development.

I am glad that the Leader of the House is in the Chamber because I intend to refer to his reply yesterday to my leader's question about the Department of Agriculture. In this connection, I refer to what was said last week by the members of the Public Service Association who are employed in the Department of Agriculture. They moved a motion in which they said they want the Government to rethink its poor attitude towards the importance of agriculture and the Department of Agriculture in this State. I could not agree more. Perhaps the Premier and members of Government think they can pin all their hopes on coal and manufacturing industries, but they should be realistic and accept the facts. The future of agriculture, if it is properly nurtured, is closely allied to the future of New South Wales.

Other States, like Queensland and Western Australia, have great mineral deposits—I am not jealous of them, but we can do much better in New South Wales if we look after our primary industries. We have the land and the people, but the Government should not take away from them the expertise, research and advice they need from the Department of Agriculture officers, who are without peer. The next resolutions moved by the staff of the departmental staff were:

- (2) Recognise that the Department of Agriculture is an efficient service to producers, manufacturers and consumers of agricultural products in this State. A service vital to the well-being of not only isolated and geographically disadvantaged rural people but to consumers of:
 - (a) high quality, competitively priced foodstuffs free of disease;
 - (b) all people in this State who benefit from monitoring and quarantine services which prevent financially crippling disease problems erupting within or entering the country; and

- (c) the recipients of valuable advisory services, particularly those located in the cities.
- (3) That the Premier should be reminded that the maintenance of rural export income is of extreme importance to the development and welfare of this State and should be given due recognition.
 - (4) That the Labor Government should not regard their poor following in rural electorates as a directive for their attitude towards agriculture. Moreover the Labor Party should recognize that former Labor Agricultural Ministers, specifically Mr Nott and Mr Graham, were held in the highest regard due to their firm commitment in having the importance of agriculture recognized.
 - (5) That the Premier and the Government be made aware again that staff cuts within the Agriculture Department will severely hamper the efficient operation of the Department and in the immediate and longer term will lead to a downturn in the economy of this State.

That downturn, if and when it comes, possibly will not affect me personally in my lifetime, but it would be a great tragedy if the Government imposes these restrictions on the State, thus encouraging a downturn in agricultural output. I emphasize that we have great assets in our rural areas. We have people who have generations of experience behind them, and we have newcomers who have expertise and knowledge of farming practice. They are willing to learn and need assistance.

We are living in an age of technology, and we must keep on improving our techniques. Unless we increase our productivity, we cannot survive in the farming and rural areas. We have done this successfully, to the amazement of many people in many other countries, but we must continue to do so if we are to survive in these days of additional costs and other problems.

My next comments are directed to not only the Government of New South Wales but also the federal Government. We in the rural agricultural areas can assist to solve the unemployment problem to a major degree if we get the backing that we should be getting from State and federal governments. We need backing in marketing and handling our products, and much work has still to be done on the farm because the owners and the farmers cannot afford to pay the wages. For instance, we cannot afford to pay people to improve our properties; we cannot afford to pay them to fix up the fences and to do all the many jobs that are required on the farm.

If the State Government is dinkum about its attitude to agriculture, and forgets all this nonsense of trying to cut down and curtail departmental staff in this area, we on the land can become even more efficient and provide products that Australia, and in New South Wales particularly, can sell abroad and supply to the consumers at home at a reasonable cost.

The Hon. W. J. HOLT [9.7]: Mr President, I congratulate you on your translation to your present high office. I am sure that you will occupy it with the same dignity and fairness as did your esteemed predecessor. Also, I congratulate the Leader of the House on assuming control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, with which he knows I have been closely associated since its inception in 1967. I trust that my remarks this evening will be heeded more than was my plea for the preservation of the Crescent in Parramatta Park. Perhaps the worst environmental decision made by this Government relates to the Border Ranges National Park. Now that the Government enjoys a substantial majority in the lower House, and also holds the seat of Casino, it behoves the Minister to reopen this matter in the interests of our national heritage.

The **MacPherson** Range was first explored by Captain Patrick Logan in August 1828; by the late 1800's little was left of the lowland rain forest in the area and timber getters were moving into the hills. Following a visit in 1878 to Yellowstone Park in the United States of America, Robert Collins settled near the Border Ranges and began campaigning for national parks. In 1906 the Bunya National Park was dedicated. A step backward resulted from the granting of leases to one, **O'Reilly**, on the Larnington Plateau in 1911, but it caused Romeo Lahey, the undergraduate son of a Canungra sawmiller, to join the fight. With the aid of his own photographs, he enlisted support at meetings and by simple door knocking. After drawing a map of the park, he helped obtain a petition that induced the Government to proclaim the 47 000-acre Lamington National Park in Queensland in 1915.

When politicians in New South Wales paid little heed to this border outpost of the State, the forests were ransacked at random. In 1917 the New South Wales portion of the Border Range became state forest and since then not only has logging continued but only four flora reserves have been proclaimed, one being the token Mount Lindesay flora reserve of 117 hectares, at the request of the Kyogle shire council which was prompted by a series of public meetings in Kyogle in 1948. After further public outcry the Forestry Commission yielded 1 500 hectares and the Gladys Creek flora reserve was proclaimed in 1973, by virtue of section 25A (1) of the Forestry Act, about which I shall have more to say in due course.

Two other minor flora reserves are Sheep Station Creek of 162 hectares and Levers Plateau of 55 hectares. Thus in the three relevant State forests, namely Mount Lindesay, Roseberry and Wiangaree, which total some 33 000 hectares, there are but 1 800 hectares the subject of a flora reservation. Against this background, and with the **clamour** of the conservationists, in 1976 the Government set up an interdepartmental committee to report to Cabinet on the future management of the Border Ranges. This committee comprised one nominee each of the Minister for Conservation and Water Resources, the Minister for Lands, the Minister for Decentralisation and Development, and the Minister for Planning and Environment.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service conducted a survey into the area and concluded that only 20 per cent of the original areas of rain forest in the Tweed and Richmond valley areas remained, and that the largest areas of each of the four major rain forest subforms—namely subtropical, warm temperate, cool temperate and dry—occur in the Border Ranges. They urged that the three state forests that lie within the restricted zone of overlap between tropical and southern flora and fauna be declared a national park to supplement the existing Lamington National Park and Limpinwood nature reserve, as this is the sole opportunity of preserving in one cohesive unit an adequate sample of this critical biogeographical zone. The service concluded that there were a number of habitat types that are well developed in the Border Ranges which are not well represented in existing national parks. The mammal fauna is extremely rich and varied, and from Levers Plateau alone twenty-five species of native mammals have been recently recorded. Preservation of large contiguous sections of land to sample adequately the range of habitat present is necessary to maximize the probability of preserving this fauna in the long term. The service further submitted that logging is not compatible with retention of high nature conservation values; that the scenery was outstanding, and that only under the National Parks and Wildlife Act can the quality of this scenery receive full recognition. The service also noted that existing facilities at Lamington National Park are under extreme pressure due to heavy visitation.

The interdepartmental committee also received submissions from the Forestry Commission of New South Wales which predictably favoured continued logging. The Department of Decentralisation and Development submitted that the maintenance of

The Hon. W. J. Holt]

job opportunities was the primary consideration and that about 180 timber mill employees relied on timber from the Kyogle management area for their jobs. This area included the three state forests in question. The interdepartmental committee then proceeded to state that it was unable to agree on any recommendations for the future use and management of the area in question, but announced seven options that were available, ranging from conversion of the three state forests into a national park—being option one—to the replacement of selective logging by complete logging of all three parks with replanting—which was option seven. The only practical use of this report is the collation of facts about the area contained in the background papers appended to it.

The next chapter in this sorry story was the Government's decision to refer the matter to the State Pollution Control Commission in February, 1978. Submissions were invited from the public, and round-table discussions were held at Kyogle on 21st and 22nd March, 1978, and at Sydney on 28th and 29th March and 3rd April, 1978. I am informed that an overwhelming majority of these submissions favoured the park. An economic and environmental evaluation was prepared by a committee headed by Dr Schaeffer of the University of New South Wales school of town planning. This is contained in a detailed report of 181 pages, and gives economic solutions that would prevent unemployment in the area, and recommended that the park include Roseberry and Wiangaree state forests and various other areas. The Forestry Commission rejected these solutions and said they were unduly optimistic.

Dr Newman, who previously held professional and senior lecturing positions in the field of plant morphology, concluded that under the commission's current logging methods it would take 1 000 years or more for the forest to recover fully. Having taken all this evidence, the commission produced a printed report on 5th April, 1978—oddly enough, only two days after the last evidence was given. This report recommended a truncated park, varying in width from one to four kilometres, and the logging of Grady's Creek flora reserve. It was clear from the report that the commission's consideration of the matter had been completely fettered by the terms of reference which, while inviting it to consider the management options for the Border Ranges area, concluded by saying that recommendations were to be made having regard to the need to ensure the maintenance of employment within the area.

The conservationists had lost the battle before it had begun because of the Government's sensitivity to Mr Day's precarious hold on the seat of Casino. In its report the commission said:

There is an abundance of evidence that the outstanding attributes of the Border Ranges for scientific, educational, recreational and conservation purposes are not adequately sampled or preserved within the existing flora reserves.

Then the axe fell upon the hopes and aspirations of those who sought to preserve for this and future generations this remaining sample of luxuriant rain forest, as the report continued:

Clearly were the conservation of natural values the sole criterion option (1) (i.e. a national park comprising Mount Lindesay, Roseberry and Wiangaree State Forest) would emerge as the preferred option of the seven described by the Inter-Departmental Committee.

The conservation of natural values is, however, not the sole criterion. Social and economic criteria also apply and the whole issue is governed by the requirement in the terms of reference to have regard to the need to ensure the maintenance of employment in the area.

The commission then proceeded to prefer the Forestry Commission's views on future employment to those of Dr Shaeffer, and **recommended** a park *so* narrow in width that it is now known as Snake Park. Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of this **abysmal** exercise in political compromise was the recommendation to log Grady's Creek flora reserve. In a fit of unctuous enthusiasm the Forestry Commission had Grady's Creek flora reserve proclaimed in **1973**, being then, I am told, the largest flora reserve within a state forest. It thus preserved in perpetuity this area of beauty and natural values.

In a background paper the Forestry Commission of New South Wales stated it would strongly resist any proposal to log Grady's Creek flora reserve. In its subsequent submission to the State Pollution Control Commission it did a complete *volte face* and intimated its intention to log the area. No flora reserve under the Forestry Act is safe if the authority entrusted to protect that reserve proposes its destruction. One wonders, is this Government sincere in its much vaunted conservation proposals such as the Heritage Act when it endorses this sort of destruction? Last week I read in the *Sydney Morning Herald* that the Government's working plan for Grady's Creek was to preserve for all time the flora and fauna of the reserve because of its particular scientific value and interest, and further that the Forestry Commission had made application to log the reserve. The Minister has a last chance to prevent the final desecration of this timeless and defenceless reserve with all its pristine glory.

A submission by Dr Webb, a senior principal research scientist with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and a Mr Tracey relating to logging unfortunately arrived too late to be considered by the State Pollution Control Commission. That submission concluded:

In any highly supervised and sophisticated logging system, such as that proposed by the New South Wales Forestry Commission, even the short-term economics are in doubt. Large inputs of labour and skill are required before, during, and after the logging operation. Who supports the costs of this intensive management, and who profits in the short and long term? Leslies, a world authority on forestry, in the article quoted above states in relation to selective logging which relies on natural regeneration that "the evaluation of the economic implications is sheer guesswork. The same could be said for the other non-commercial values".

In conclusion, we believe that there can be no question that the Border Ranges represent a precious and irreplaceable part of the national forest estate and of the Australian heritage, and of what is now being acknowledged as a significant part of the world heritage of biological resources.

We therefore consider that further logging of this area can no longer be justified.

The eyes of those concerned with the conservation of our national heritage are turned to the Minister for Planning and Environment, who has administrative control of national parks in this State. Is the Minister willing to use his endeavours to prevent plunder of this irreplaceable natural resource? Is the Minister willing to join those of us who for many years have had the conservation of our natural heritage close to our hearts? Will the Minister harken to the words of G. R. Bauer, the Forestry Commission's rainfall authority, who has concluded that managed rain forests will be impoverished shadows of the virginal primaeval stands? Will the Minister use his endeavours to prevent the logging of the Grady's Creek area? I should like to remind the Minister of words used by the Premier in 1973 when discussing a proposal by an Olympic Games committee to excise a portion of Centennial Park and incorporate in it an Olympic complex.

The Hon. W. J. Holt]

The Hon. J. R. **Hallam**: The honourable member has quoted this before.

The Hon. W. J. **HOLT**: That is right and I shall quote it again and again until I get some result. The Premier said:

Under its standing orders and procedures, the Legislative Council of New South Wales is admirably equipped to conduct a public inquiry in the public interest, into the pros and cons of this sort of proposal.

Under the standing orders of this Chamber, members have power, indeed the right, to move for a select committee. A select committee could examine Sydney's needs for a major sporting complex.

It could examine what such a complex should contain and where it should be situated to be of the optimum advantage to the citizens of Sydney.

A select committee of this Chamber could receive evidence from the public and from experts.

I repeat—and it is a digression in this context—that this Chamber, with its procedures and orders, is ideally suited for consideration of subjects such as that which I have been discussing, namely subjects which in the immediate future and in the long-term affect town planning and the environmental welfare of particular sections of our community.

Will the Minister set up a select committee of this House to consider all aspects of the management of the Border Ranges area and the proposed desecration of Grady's Creek flora reserve in order that this silvan treasure might be preserved for this and future generations?

The Hon. R. B. **ROWLAND SMITH** (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.25]: I should like to congratulate all the new members on their election to this House. I congratulate particularly you, Mr President. I have already extended to you the best wishes of the Country Party. I congratulate the Hon. D. P. Landa upon his re-election to the Ministry and as Leader of the House. I congratulate also the Hon. J. R. **Hallam** upon his election to the Ministry and as Deputy Leader of the House. I offer him best wishes in his new office. I am sorry that the portfolio is not still decentralisation and development. Nevertheless I know he will do a good job. He has always been interested in matters pertaining to decentralization. I extend my congratulations to the Hon. C. Healey on his election as Chairman of Committees. I trust he will be a little more impartial in the performance of his newfound duties in this House than he is at Lidcombe oval when a referee penalizes the Western Suburbs team for a scrum infringement right in front of the goal posts.

It is a great honour to be a member of this illustrious Chamber. I wish all honourable members success in the future. I extend my congratulations to those new members who have made their maiden speeches in this debate. I shall have more to say about those speeches as I wind up this debate on behalf of the Opposition. Making one's maiden speech is a nerve-shattering experience. In 1974 when I was preparing to deliver my maiden speech I was given some particularly good advice by a wonderful woman, the Hon. Eileen Furley. She asked me, "Are you worried?" and I said, "That is the least of it; I certainly **am**." She said, "Just take a deep breath before you speak and you will be all right." I did just that, got a fit of coughing and almost lost my nerve altogether.

The House is considering the Appropriation Bill which was first introduced early in September in another place by the Treasurer. The Treasurer read his Financial Statement and the debate was adjourned on the motion of the former Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly. That was the beginning and the end of any

discussion on the Budget in that Parliament. The Parliament adjourned on 7th September with the intention of resuming later in the month. In the meantime, on 10th September, the prorogation of Parliament was announced. One wonders, why was the Budget introduced in the first place? The Government was aware that it would not be debated and passed prior to the elections. There was no reason for those events of early September to have occurred. The Government still had six months to run before going to the people. The Government deceived the people.

In the election campaign Government supporters said that the Opposition had had the opportunity to debate the Budget but had chosen to adjourn the debate. Of course, that was so much hogwash. How could the Opposition possibly debate the Budget when the Treasurer had only just read the Financial Statement? The Opposition needed time to study the Financial Statement and its accompanying papers. It has always been tradition that after the Treasurer introduces the Budget the Leader of the Opposition seeks to adjourn the debate for several days in order that he and his followers might have an opportunity to study the Budget Papers in full. A few days ago we saw the sorry spectacle in this House of the Hon. J. P. Ducker saying that whether members of the Opposition liked it or not the Budget was considered by the electorate before 7th October. He said it was considered in its own right and in the context of the performance of the Wran Government. Surely the honourable member was not serious when he made that statement. Proper consideration of the Budget by the electorate could be undertaken only after it had been given due consideration by the Parliament and the media.

It is absurd to say that this Budget was considered by the electorate. It is interesting to recall the reaction of the news media to the so-called Budget. The *Australian Financial Review* said:

The rag bag of handouts contained in the Budget Speech and the Loan Speech by Mr Renshaw can hardly be considered as a respectable exercise in responsible government.

It went on to say further:

There has been no attempt to establish priorities, no attempt to evaluate any of the spending commitments, in other than vote buying terms.

Other sections of the news media were more flattering towards the Budget, describing it as a responsible and moderate Budget, yet they had little opportunity to look in depth at its content or to hear what the Opposition had to say about it. The former Leader of the Opposition, Mr Coleman, was well aware of the situation and indeed in his policy speech during the election campaign stated that there would be a rebate on income tax in New South Wales. This was pooh-poohed and rubbished by the Labor Government which said that it was impossible to do this. Mr Wran has made no attempt. All he can do is look at the situation of taxes in this State. He is on record as saying there have been no increases in taxes, yet even as far back as 30th June this year the editorial of the *Australian Financial Review* contained this statement:

The Premier is clearly concerned with making an election issue of the slogan "no double taxation".

The Premier went ahead with double taxation. for what else is an increase in State charges, to which other honourable members have referred? In the two years from June 1976 to June 1978 average weekly earnings in New South Wales rose by 18.5 per cent. At the same time tax revenue increased considerably, stamp duty rose by 34.5 per cent, payroll tax by 24 per cent, land tax by 23.5 per cent, racing tax by 26 per cent, liquor licence fees by 43 per cent and tobacco licence fees by a massive 83 per cent. Further State charges which really are horrific, and include some twenty-five

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith]

different charges, have been increased, some by as much as 900 per cent, to produce **an** additional \$100 million in revenue in the past financial year. The Premier has been highly critical of the federal Government for not releasing more funds to the States to create more jobs. Yet here we have the pitiful situation of the Government ending the financial year with a considerable sum of money that could have been put into circulation to endeavour to create more employment.

The Premier has been critical of the federal Government for not spending more and **increasing** the deficit, which currently is about \$3.2 thousand million. Yet he ends the financial year with a meagre budget deficit of just under \$700,000. What hypocrisy. The huge deficit in the federal sphere was due to this mad spending spree that occurred in the Whitlam era. The Fraser Government has been careful to try to whittle this down, but it is impossible to do more than it has to keep inflation down and try to help the economy recover. Here we have a man who is critical of what the Fraser Government has done, yet ends up with a meagre predicted deficit of \$700,000 outwardly, but yet, as I have explained, kept up his sleeve about \$300 million that would certainly have helped to create more jobs in the community. The Treasurer in the second paragraph of his Financial Statement speaks of the heavy financial restrictions imposed by the federal Government. As that Government has been forced to impose these on itself, why would it not impose them on State governments?

I shall make reference to several aspects of the Budget that I find disturbing. The first is the increase in the number of people in the police force. In this State, and particularly in the city of Sydney, crime is rife. There are not nearly enough police to **handle** the problem and it is absolutely disgraceful to think that crimes can be committed during the day or night. The fact that, in a well-lit section of Hunter Street, Fairfax & Roberts, the jewellers, have been broken into recently highlights the need for more patrols. The shocking events of last Friday are a dreadful indictment of what is going on in this city today. In 1976 the total number of people in the Police Department, including constabulary and general establishment, was 10 498. In 1977-78, it increased to 11 040, or 542 over the two year period, representing an increase over two years of only 5.15 per cent. This is utterly unbelievable. In the Premier's Department there has been a considerable increase in staff, yet where people's lives and property are at stake a miserable 2.55 per cent increase per annum has been allotted to the police force.

The **Premier** said on television on a recent Sunday night that crime was on the increase, **that** there is a vicious, violent criminal element in the city. He declared to the citizens of this State that something must be done about crime. However, when it comes to hard, practical facts, there is a general increase of a mere pittance in the number employed in the Police Department. The police have received much criticism and I imagine the morale of the force is not particularly high. It is incumbent on the Government to do everything in its power to protect the safety of citizens and their property.

The number of police currently in New South Wales is 8 per cent below the Australian **average**. There are 176 police per 100 000 population in New South Wales; in Victoria the number is only slightly above—180 per 100 000. But in Queensland it rises to 191 and in Western Australia to 202. The total average in Australia is 192 per 100 000. In the United States of America there is one policeman to 476 persons or 2.1 police per 1 000 population, and in the United Kingdom 1 policeman to 500. It is absolutely imperative that the Government increase the number of police to ensure the maximum safety of persons and property.

The Public Transport Commission's deficit in this financial year is estimated to be \$442 million. It is interesting to reflect on what the Premier had to say in May 1976, prior to coming to office. He stated that his first priority was to reduce the \$300 million deficit and that if he did not do this he would regard himself as having failed. "I do not intend to fail", he added. On 8th October, 1975, as Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said in another place that he did not allow the truth to get in his way in search for power: "At the core of the State's financial problems is the public transport system. Any system that loses \$240 million can barely be said to be running successfully. Any system that estimates it will lose \$270 million in the current financial year can hardly be said to be a successful enterprise." It was not losing \$240 million a year. The transport deficit increased from \$204 million in 1974-75 to \$244 million in 1975-76, an increase of \$40 million. Then it rose under Labor in its first year of office by \$87 million, by \$62 million in its second year of office, and by \$44 million during the past year. If that is not an account of failure, I do not know what is. The services have not improved as promised by the Government. On 9th November, 1976, I said when speaking on the Appropriation Bill:

I remind honourable members of some words concerning public transport used by the Labor Opposition when we were in government.

The Hon. J. S. Thompson said when contributing to the debate on the 1975 Budget:

Looking at the position State by State, I have no doubt that New South Wales has the worst possible public transport bearing in mind the years over which it has been operating. Let me quote some figures. Some Government supporters are business people. If I were in business I would be terrified to think that I lost \$204 million in one year but that is the amount lost by the New South Wales public transport system in the last financial year. We are told also in the current financial year the loss will be \$235 million and in the following financial year it will be \$300 million.

He went on to say:

I must say that unless a government, and I mean any government, can solve the public transport problem, the State will cease to function properly. I am convinced that at the next election, without doubt, public transport will put this Government out of office. However, I qualify that statement by adding that unless the incoming Labor Government takes the appropriate action it will face the same problem. I am happy to be able to say that Labor knows the problem and has the answer.

He qualified that statement by adding that unless the incoming Labor Government took appropriate action it would face the same problem. He concluded by saying that he was happy to be able to say that Labor knew the problem and had the answer.

The Hon. D. P. Landa: We did know the problem and had the answer.

The Hon. R. B. ROWLAND SMITH: Obviously the Minister has not been listening to what I have been saying. Another matter that has concerned me for a long time, which I shall dwell on but briefly, is the question of oversea offices of the New South Wales Government which, over the years, have come in for a lot of rubbishing.

The Hon. H. B. French: The honourable member did not say this before.

The Hon. R. B. ROWLAND SMITH: Obviously the honourable member does not listen to anything I say. Every since I became a member of this House I have spoken about this matter. I do not wish to repeat what I have said for the past three years. Although it is imperative that the State have strong offices in London, Tokyo,

New York and now I am pleased to say in Los Angeles, a miserable amount of money is spent to upgrade them. Only an additional sum of \$89,000 is being spent in the United States of America. When the Premier was in that country he spoke about the importance of investment in New South Wales. If we hope to encourage people to buy our goods and invest in this country, New South Wales should have more oversea offices and be spending more money on them. We have the people who can do the job.

Although I appreciate the cost of a ground floor office, I recommend that the Government obtain this type of accommodation. I recall the time when New South Wales had its office in Fifth Avenue just above 54th Street. Notwithstanding that it was only small, it was visible to all who passed by. Fifth Avenue is a great thoroughfare. People could enter that New South Wales office and inquire about all sorts of things concerning New South Wales. The New South Wales daily papers were available several days after publication, I often visited that office. Many people were genuinely interested in knowing more about New South Wales. In London there is the exceptional New South Wales House. Although the new office in Los Angeles is most pleasant, as I observed when I was there in May, it is on about the twentieth level in a high rise building. It is unable to present a shop window front, which is most important if we wish to sell the advantages of our State to oversea people.

I ask the Minister to inform me of what literature is available for interested persons. I appreciate that through the auspices of the Department of Decentralisation an excellent handbook for industrialists is published. It sets out clearly and concisely what the State is willing to do for people who come here. The Government should make available more literature in the form of filmsies or small papers that can be distributed.

The function of the commissioner and his staff is to move round the country and attend meetings to discuss the potential of investment in Australia and New South Wales. I well recall the tremendous job that Sir Davis Hughes performed when he was our Agent-General in London. He set up a number of seminars throughout Europe in principal cities with the help of the countries' leading banks. It cost the State absolutely nothing, apart from travelling expenses. These seminars, which were attended by important people in industry, did a tremendous amount of good to propagate the message about this State. It is interesting to note that in the London office the allocation of funds is down \$74,000 in rents and down \$54,000 for travelling. The London office, as I have observed over the years, has been hardworking and energetic. It is able to create the stimulus needed to sell our goods there as well as to encourage people to invest.

As the Treasurer said, the \$2.6 million that has been promised for the operations of the New South Wales Government's oversea offices is an increase of only 1 per cent. We have large Japanese companies investing money in New South Wales. I am a partner in a Japanese company in Orange. I am aware of what we have been able to produce. Last year we exported wool tops to the value of \$19 million. We hope to exceed that this year. Nevertheless the New South Wales office in Tokyo is still small by any stretch of the imagination. I believe many Japanese wool processors are considering coming to Australia. We want them in New South Wales and not in Victoria, Western Australia, or any other State. I am delighted, as I said before, that an office has been opened in Los Angeles. I am pleased that the commissioner, Mr **Fulton Muir**, who used to be resident in New York, has moved out to take control of that office. I still believe we must be spending more money in our oversea offices to encourage investment in this State and the sale of goods in the countries concerned.

The Government shows its little concern for small businesses in this Budget by the lack of feeling in respect to payroll tax exemptions. This year the payroll tax exemption level will be raised by 10 per cent so that employers with payrolls below \$66,000 will be totally exempt from payroll tax. Partial exemptions will apply to employers with payrolls below \$165,000. I refer the Government to the Small Businesses Agency which covers small business in service industries having less than 20 people, and manufacturing industries with less than 100. The full exemption would apply to approximately 6.6 persons employed and the partial exemption to 16.5 persons. This is not a small business but a tiny business.

I applaud the Government's action last year in allowing a full payroll tax rebate for approved manufacturing industries in decentralized environments. This great boon will encourage more people to look at setting up manufacturing industries in country areas. At the same time the Government must look much more closely at the question of raising the level of exemption to something realistic. I suggest it should be about \$200,000. In 1978–79 payroll tax is estimated to be about \$682 million or an increase of approximately \$39 million on the receipts for 1977–78. This is a huge amount of money and surely leaves it open to the Government to increase the level of exemption to stimulate business. Although payroll tax is an objectionable tax at any time, I appreciate that it does raise a lot of revenue. As it has had an adverse effect on small businesses, I ask the Government to look closely at this matter.

Far too much criticism has been levelled at Government and Opposition for lack of attempts to overcome the problem of unemployment. The main theme that has emerged in this Budget debate has been the terrible problem of unemployment. There is no easy way to overcome this objectionable and terrible problem but I believe that it can be overcome by everybody working closely together. It is not the Government's problem; it is the problem of every individual person in the community—it is useless to say that a government is not doing enough. What are we individually doing to help the Government of the day to create a greater stimulus in the economy or to help our fellow man obtain a job? Instead of the greed that is apparent throughout the community, let us have a little more give and help to those unfortunate people who are unemployed. It is wrong for the Premier to criticize the Leader of the Opposition in another place when he asked that an all-party committee be set up to look into ways and means of reducing unemployment and stimulating the economy.

Indeed, colleagues of mine in this Budget debate have raised this very point—the establishment of an all-party committee. What is wrong with that? Many of us in this place as well as the other place can give expert opinion to help in some way to cure the malaise which is rampant today in the community. We must look at all types of employment—full-time, casual, and now one that has come up and is rearing its head, permanent part-time. I was most impressed with the contribution to the Appropriation Bill debate made by the new member for Vacluse in another place, Mrs Rosemary Foot. She spoke of the committee that had been set up to look at all aspects of permanent part-time work. She pointed out that permanent part-time work is not casual work. It is permanent work offering regular but shorter working hours than the accepted pattern of full-time work. It can include a variety of flexible working patterns, for example, full-time hours for less than five days a week, less than full-time hours on five days a week, a regular number of hours each week in a varying daily pattern making less than full-time hours, and job sharing where a full-time job is divided between two or more persons who share responsibility for the total workload. Permanent part-time work carries the normal benefits applied to full-time work. Holiday pay, sick leave, long service leave and superannuation accumulate in proportion to the time worked.

The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith]

There is a tremendous amount of merit in this type of work pattern. We must look at other aspects which are damaging the economy at the moment in respect of the work force. I refer specifically to penalty rates. I do not believe it is right to say that penalty rates are enshrined in our way of life in this country. More particularly, we must look at the principal reasons for the high level of unemployment in Australia and in New South Wales today. Contrary to what the Hon. J. P. Ducker says, we in the Opposition are vitally concerned. We are extremely worried about this problem.

I now turn to some of the contributions that have been offered during this debate. This is a House of review, and I believe this Appropriation Bill has been well and truly reviewed in this debate. Speeches given by the new members were extremely interesting and, as I said at the beginning of this speech, I am looking forward to their contributions in the future. I do not wish to dwell too much on what the Hon. J. P. Ducker has said, because I have referred to this before, but I plead with him not to be cynical in respect to what we in the Opposition feel, especially in respect to the needs of the ordinary citizens of this State. To use such words as "contempt for people" does the honourable member little good.

The Hon. B. J. Unsworth gave the House a most interesting insight into what the Wran Government has done in respect to cultural activities in this State. I would agree that the Government has really moved to ensure that more assistance has been given and will be given to cultural activities. He spoke with deep feeling on the question of drugs. I sympathize very much with him and his family in the tragic loss incurred in the death of his son through the use of hard drugs. The community must do much more to educate and not, certainly not, penalize by putting into gaol young people who are drug users. The people who should be put into gaol—indeed I would go even further than that and say I would get rid of them permanently—are those who are pushers of these terrible and dreadful killers of young people.

The Hon. Deirdre Grusovin's speech was a delight to listen to. She spoke particularly well and with great feeling, especially in respect to the Government's home health service and the assistance that this service gives to old people, helping them with housework and things of this nature. We must do much more in the community to help those who are aged and infirm; indeed since I can recall I have been a great supporter of this type of social work. I look forward very much to her further contributions in this House.

The Hon. Virginia Chadwick spoke extremely well, emphasizing that it is essential that this House remain a House of review and not be a mirror image of the other place. She spoke of the needs of the country and the duties of the representatives of the people. In another part of her speech she said:

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.

I certainly look forward to her contributions in the future. The Hon. Dorothy Isaksen's refreshing contribution highlighted the great work of the Women's Advisory Council and the Women's Co-ordination Unit. The question of prostitution is one which will be raised in this Parliament some time in the future.

The Hon. Peter Watkins spoke of the great work this Government is doing about decentralized industries. I agree with him entirely but I remind him that it was a Liberal-Country party government that set up that department in 1965 and moved very strongly and created countless numbers of decentralized industries. Mine is one of them; I speak from some experience. However, I compliment the Labor Government on what it has done since it came to office. It has carried on the good work that we commenced and is doing a good job at the moment in that regard.

I congratulate the Hon. James Kaldis on his contribution. However, I suggest that many people of Greek origin are supporters of a free enterprise system; I emphasize "free". I just add that in Orange we have a fairly large Greek community and I am very happy to inform the honourable member that most of them are members of the Country Party. I have been to Greece on many occasions and remember well the civil war of 1949. I suggest to the honourable member that people of all races, irrespective of the country they come from, who have come to Australia, must acknowledge and take up Australian citizenship. They must recognize that Australia is their country and they must not be half Greek and half Australian, or half Italian and half Australian. I look forward to the contributions of the honourable member in the future.

I was most interested in all that the Hon. Marie Fisher said about country problems, especially out in the far west with respect to educational problems. I should take umbrage at the fact that she believes that we on this side are born to rule; in part we may be, but not wholly. I was interested to hear her comments about the beef industry and also particularly about the wool industry, which is my industry. We shall have to talk at some time about her suggestion that the State Government could take up the acquisition scheme and be the one seller: it would be extremely difficult for New South Wales to have one system and all the other States to have other systems.

The Hon. Marie Fisher: I did not say that.

The Hon. R. B. ROWLAND SMITH: I think you did.

The Hon. Marie Fisher: I was referring to the corporation.

The Hon. R. B. ROWLAND SMITH: We shall talk about it later. It has been a most interesting debate. I repeat what I said before—I look forward to the further contributions of the new members. In conclusion, we certainly have problems in the community, the largest and greatest of which is unemployment. It is incumbent on us all to do everything we can, as a joint effort and not separately, to overcome together this insidious and terrible scourge in the community. I say to the Hon. D. P. Landa, let us get together on an all-party basis to see what we in New South Wales can contribute. I am sure that something can come of that.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA (Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council) [10.1], in reply: First, Mr President, may I join all other honourable members who have expressed their congratulations and good wishes to you on your election to the office of President of the Legislative Council. I extend to you that which needs no statement on behalf of the Government—full support and co-operation in the carrying out of your most difficult task. I am confident that you will acquit yourself in all the best traditions of the parliamentary system. I should like also to extend my congratulations to all new members, especially as honourable members have heard in this debate, so soon after their election, the substance of their mettle and found it to be of really high calibre.

On the budget debate I should like first to deal with the contribution by the Opposition. It was a sad spectacle, for those of us who value the parliamentary system as it has been enshrined in this nation, in which one looks to a vital, alive, vibrant Opposition fulfilling its duty under the Westminster system. Honourable members could not be other than disappointed, indeed depressed by the dejected contributions made by the coalition to which the people of New South Wales had entrusted the Treasury benches of the State at one time. The Budget deserved better than it got from the Opposition not only because of its inherent fiscal wisdom but also because it received the ultimate imprimatur in a democratic system of the people of New South Wales at the last election. It was a resounding vote of confidence not only in the Government and its Ministers but also in the management, expertise and competence of the Wran administration. I have listened to a few budget debates in my short career in this Chamber but I have never seen such a lacklustre, disinterested performance than that given by the Opposition in this debate. Honourable members on both sides of the House who have been here a lot longer than I have, doubtless will rely on their own memories and will declare that this performance stands out amongst the more abysmal.

The Hon. F. M. MacDiarmid: You were in opposition for a long time.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: After the period that the present Opposition spends on that side of the House the Hon. F. M. MacDiarmid will be thinking of our period in opposition as a short vacation. I found more sense, and found infinitely more understandable, the contribution of the Hon. J. Kaldis in Serbo-Croatian than the totality of the contributions made to the debate by the whole Opposition; I refer in particular to the double Dutch and figure-twisting indulged in by the gurus of finance on the benches opposite. The whole argument of the Opposition boils down to the suggestion that the new Fraser federalism set New South Wales awash with funds, that the Government has never had it so good and, searching as the Government has so diligently done, into the hollow logs, combined with the new Fraser beneficence, it was in such a good position that it could not help but bring in this kind of Budget.

Not all honourable members are as vacuous in their understanding of budgetary factors in the economy. Honourable members who have taken the time to look at the figures with some scholarship, instead of the facile gloss that was applied by the Opposition, have come up with a few basic facts that honourable members, even at this late hour, would be well served in imprinting on their memories. I shall state some statistics though it is late. Statistics are bad enough when one is wide awake without having been rendered into an almost completely soporific state by some of the members opposite.

The Hon. F. M. MacDiarmid: The Minister should look behind him.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: They are the ones who have had to endure it. With an impeccable sense of fairness, I assure the Opposition that its members are about to endure it now. In looking at the new Fraser federalism I shall quote a few figures that I think are slightly relevant to us all as taxpayers and citizens. Let us look at the generosity of the new Fraser federalism. The Hon. M. F. Willis—and I use the term reservedly—led for the Opposition but completely overlooked the fact that the *per capita* tax reimbursements received by the most populous States of New South Wales and Victoria under the much vaunted new deal is dramatically less than that received by the other States. I shall give the 1977–78 figures. New South Wales received \$266 and some cents *per capita*; Victoria \$259; Queensland \$361; South Australia \$396; Western Australia \$432; and Tasmania \$519.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: When I sought to use them, your own assistant suggested to me that *per capita* comparisons were unfair and dishonest.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: That was because your comparisons were so dishonest. Under the arrangement, New South Wales has received **31** cents out of every **dollar** paid by its citizens in personal income tax, and the tax share represents only 35 per cent of the total budget expenditure, including the business undertakings. I shall **not** reply on those figures alone, but shall take comfort in the Government's assessment of the new Fraser federalism from another quarter that has looked at the problem fairly. A well-known identity said:

. . . this is the fifth budget I have had the honour to present to Parliament. It is also the most **difficult** and challenging budget which the Government has had to prepare since it came to office.

It has been framed against the background of the smallest percentage increase in estimated revenue for a decade, further reductions in real terms in funds provided under some Commonwealth financed programmes and a reduction in real terms in general purpose capital funds available to the State.

This State's share of personal income tax under the tax sharing arrangements is estimated at \$581.4 million in 1978/79, an increase of \$61.5 million. Our entitlement under the tax sharing formula is \$573.4 million which is less than the amount we would have received under the old Financial Assistance Grants formula and the guarantee that we shall not receive less than the latter amount in any year therefore comes into operation.

Honourable Members will recall that our tax sharing entitlement in any year is now based on actual receipts by the Commonwealth in the previous year. The effect of the taxation concessions granted last year has resulted in a reduction in the amount the States would otherwise have received in 1978-79 which demonstrates the value of the guaranteed "floor" amounts calculated on the Financial Assistance Grants formula.

At the June Premiers' Conference the Prime Minister announced a further reduction in the proportion of the costs of these programmes to be met by the Commonwealth. As a result, the State is faced with meeting an additional share of the current costs of the programmes as well as the extra costs arising from the scheduled expansion of the services.

The frequent changes in cost sharing arrangements in recent years have been of great concern to the Government, both with respect to the manner in which the changes have been effected and the additional burden that has been placed on the State's finances.

The review will extend over two years and will involve close comparison of all States' expenditures and revenue efforts.

In 1978-79, the Commonwealth will meet 50 per cent of the recurrent wsts of Community Health Services provided under the scheme instead of 75 per cent in 1977-78. Capital expenditure on new projects is also subject to the 50 per cent funding arrangement.

Until 1975-76, the Commonwealth met the full capital and operating costs of training facilities for dental therapists, as well as the full capital costs and 75 per cent of the operating costs of school dental clinics. It was on the basis of these funding arrangements that the State agreed to participate in the scheme.

Since then, the Commonwealth share of funding has been progressively reduced and this year that Government will provide only 50 per cent of operating costs of training facilities and clinics and 50 per cent of the capital cost of new facilities.

That was not the Hon. D. A. Dunstan of South Australia complaining about new federalism. That was not the Hon. J. H. Lowe of Tasmania complaining about the new federalism. That was not the Hon. N. K. Wran complaining about federalism. That was none other than the Liberal leader from Western Australia, the Hon. Sir Charles Court, who was brought to New South Wales to help the coalition parties at the elections. That speech demonstrates how much Sir Charles Court thinks of new federalism. Never mind about the huff and puff of what went on in Canberra. When Sir Charles Court returned to Western Australia and brought down his own budget he was forced to admit that the new federalism was the greatest sellout of Western Australia in the history of that State. It is a sellout also of New South Wales.

I shall not canvass all the other cuts that have been made by Canberra. One would have thought that the Hon. M. F. Willis would have tried to be at least a little honest when looking at what has happened with Commonwealth revenue as compared with the State revenue. He might have studied the figures to see whether there were any real grounds for the application of Draconian principles to the States. The Commonwealth's revenue in 1977-78 from person income tax increased by 17 per cent over the figure for 1976-77. That increase was more than \$1,500 million. On one hand the Commonwealth was receiving more revenue from the taxpayers and on the other hand it was cutting down capital works programmes and funding to the States with not the slightest hint of economy in some of its disastrous schemes. The Commonwealth did not give the slightest hint of cutting back on its own bureaucratic monoliths. All politicians are used to hypocrisy from various quarters but I must say that it has been the real coin of the realm for the Opposition in this debate.

Another complaint made ad *nauseum* in this debate was that the Government said it was the only government in the history of New South Wales to present three consecutive budgets to the people without a rise in taxes. The Opposition sought to prove the Government's assertion to be false by listing fees and charges that have risen over the past three years. It is undeniable that there have been increases but they have not been tax increases in the budgetary sense. The Hon. W. L. Lange is aware of the difference between fees and charges on the one hand and budget taxes on the other hand.

The Hon. W. L. Lange: It is all revenue for the Government.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The people became used to what the coalition government did. It did it both ways. It raised fees and charges outside the budget and increased taxes within the budget.

The Hon. W. L. Lange: That was before federalism.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: When Labor came to office the Hon. W. L. Lange said that the former Government had left the incoming administration with a huge budget surplus. The Opposition cannot have it both ways. On one hand the Hon. W. L. Lange says that the new federalism caused the former government to increase fees and taxes but on the other hand he said that the new Labor Government was awash with money through the good housekeeping of the coalition Government. It is most interesting to compare some statistics from the Liberal-Country Party era with those of the present. For instance, the Hon. M. F. Willis complained about an increase in fees charged by the Registrar General. Those increases must have affected his conveyancing practice and so caused him to look at it. The Registrar General's fees rose by 12 per cent in August 1977 and by 6 per cent in June 1978. The Leader of the Opposition said that it was terrible that these charges should rise in this way.

Let us recall what Sir Robert Askin did when he was Treasurer. He did not increase fees by 6 per cent or 12 per cent. In 1974 he increased charges by 20 per cent and in 1975 he increased them by 333 per cent. Sir Robert was not backward in coming forward when it came to increasing fees and charges. The Opposition said nothing about the disastrous rail and bus fare increases that it introduced. Those savage rises drove people away from public transport and made it almost economically imperative that they should use their own motor car to travel to and from work. That action of the former Government caused a mammoth loss of passenger journeys in the public transport system. This Government is still working in an endeavour to come to grips with the problem. It has made remarkable inroads into gaining a resurgence of confidence in the Public Transport Commission. Every commuter in this State would be proud of the Government's achievements in upgrading both road and rail transport services and facilities.

The Hon. W. L. Lange: Who was it that ordered the new buses?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: By the time the coalition Government got around to signing the order it was almost out of office. It was a case of too little too late. The facts are that this Government is proud of its record of bringing into service three or four new buses each week. It has engendered much confidence in the commuting public. That has been indicated by the mass return to using public transport by the travelling public. We have heard about freight increases of 7 per cent. We were told what a terrible effect that had. When one compares that 7 per cent increase with the 20 per cent increase applied by the Askin Government in 1975 one sees that the Opposition is hypocritical.

For a long time the Hon. W. L. Lange had me fooled. I thought he was an impartial expert on accounting and finance matters, establishing for himself a reputation as an independent thinker and a person who would not pick up shonky figures to bolster an argument. For a while he really had my colleagues and me fooled. We thought he would look at Government activities from a distance and in the interests of all the people. Though he is a Liberal we thought he was endeavouring to establish himself as a person with an air of independence. However, when one considers his contribution to this debate, especially his criticism of the method of accounting in statutory authorities, it is obvious that he works on the premise that most of us do not have accounting expertise. His colleague, the Hon. L. A. Solomons, opened the Auditor-General's report and read figures at random. When Government supporters traced through what he was doing they exposed him as a fraud.

The Hon. L. A. Solomons: I invite the Minister to read page 7. That will destroy his argument.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: I assure the honourable member that I have already done so. The honourable member suggested that the Government had raised charges though they had not been altered for some years. He said the Government had increased fees for certain services, though those fees have remained static for some years. The Hon. R. B. Rowland Smith asks me to be specific. The honourable gentleman must have been dreaming of the sheep he is grazing at St Ives and missed what was said by Government supporters who have been reciting the Government's achievements throughout this debate. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition ought to be more attentive to what is taking place in this Chamber.

I shall not bore honourable members with details of the accounting absurdities used by the honourable member. However, I shall mention one so that it can be put on the record and the honourable member may check it. He conceded that the increase in budget expenditure for the financial year would be 63 per cent, which would be zero or even negative in real terms. He proceeded to describe it as unabated growth.

The Hon. W. L. Lange: Over a period.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: Over a period, but unabated growth, nevertheless. At a time of even 9.6 per cent inflation, 6.5 per cent is really zero or negative growth, if I may use the language of the columnists. The honourable member calls that unabated growth. All honourable members are aware that the Government has set a firm ceiling on the growth of employment within the public service and has ordered priorities to keep expenditure within the bounds of its limited resources. The Hon. W. L. Lange's clarifying and purifying of the Government's accounting methods leaves much to be desired. He alleged that the Maritime Services Board of New South Wales had somehow cooked the books in its appropriation to the renewals fund. This matter is again very technical, and I do not want to take too much time to explain it to honourable members, who would be aware that we do not have the resources of accountants and officers to check all that has been said. However, some honourable members may believe it to be the fact, so from now on I shall take time and use the officers to demonstrate to the House that the honourable member does not know what he is talking about, but is being selective and critical.

The relationship of the appropriation to the renewals fund is that section 24E (2) of the Maritime Services Board Act requires the board each year:

To prepare a statement showing the amount it proposes to transfer from the revenue of the Board to the credit of the renewals fund. Such statement, after having been submitted to the committee of review appointed under this Act for investigation and report shall be forwarded together with a report to the Governor, who shall determine the amount to be so transferred, and such amount shall be carried to the renewals fund without further appropriation by Parliament than the Maritime Services Board Act.

Despite the honourable member's claim, there has been no secrecy by the board in following the provisions of the Act. If he had taken the time to look at the Act, he could have worked out what was required of the board and ascertained that it had complied strictly with the letter of the Act. There are many unknown factors that are beyond the control of the board and cannot be satisfactorily assessed or prudently allowed for in framing its estimates for inclusion each year in the Budget. This is taken into account in the legislation and allows for direct appropriation to the renewals reserves. The budgeted transfer to the renewals fund in 1977-78 was \$7.4 million. The subsequent transfer of a further \$4.3 million at the end of the financial year came as a result of a more buoyant revenue position than had been foreseen when the board's budget was formulated. This increased revenue comprised mainly an additional \$1.6 million from increased coal exports, together with the \$1.5 million payment from the Department of Main Roads as compensation for land resumption in Darling Harbour. Had the additional transfer of \$4.3 million not been made, the board's surplus for the year would have been increased by this amount to approximately \$4.4 million, and not \$6 million as stated by Mr Lange.

The fact that it was made reflects the board's statutory obligation to ensure that the renewals fund is kept sufficiently buoyant to enable it to meet its commitments in the replacement of wasting assets. The demands in recent years of port development throughout the State have caused the renewals fund to be drawn upon to such an extent that at 30th June, 1978, the balance was less than \$5 million. I remind honourable members that the Port Botany project alone will cost \$150 million by its completion. Statistical confirmation is available of the fact that the honourable member **has** been pulling the wool over the eyes of lay members of this House for too long. I serve him notice that from now on when he makes authoritative expert comments,

honourable members on this side will be checking them with the department. The facts will be put on the record and published for the financial community to see what they think of the expertise of the fiscal gurus on the Opposition benches.

This House's treatment of the Budget is governed by tradition. This is a House of review, and it does not have the power to change the Budget. It can raise matters of public concern that are tangentially referable to it. This Budget debate has been no exception. In the interest of brevity and having in mind the hour, I shall severely censor my remarks, but I shall take issue on certain facts raised by Opposition members.

Together with my congratulations to the new members of this House, I wish them well. I was sincere in the remarks I made about their contribution by way of maiden speeches. However, while honourable members were restrained from interjecting during those speeches, I am afraid that luxury must be denied to the Hon. Virginia Chadwick in reply. At times honourable members on this side were interested, indeed fascinated, by her remarks relating to Newcastle, an area that we on this side of the Chamber know only too well had been neglected in the decade or more when it was in the parlous position of being a Labor stronghold during the term of a Liberal-Country party government. But if the honourable member is to contribute to these debates, she should be sure of her facts. She has exhausted the luxury of speaking uninterrupted. I realize that in her maiden speech the honourable member found it difficult to restrain herself from being provocative. Indeed, in her attempt not to criticize or to be provocative she succeeded in achieving the opposite. The least that honourable members on this side of the Chamber expect is that, if she is going to be provocative in a maiden speech, she should attempt to be accurate. One example will suffice to indicate the sloppiness of investigations and research that was behind the *carte blanche* criticism that she made of the Government. In her maiden speech she said:

The deplorable cut in education funding to beneath the 1975-76 level . . .

That quotation is taken from *Hansard*, but her contention is not true and it should have been checked by the honourable member before she said it. The recurrent expenditure from consolidated revenue in 1975-76 was \$798.3 million and in 1978-79 \$1,136.7 million, an increase of \$338.4 million. The capital general loan funding in 1975-76 was \$183.8 million and in 1978-79 \$191.7 million, an increase of \$7.9 million. The figures the honourable member gave were wrong and unwarranted, especially in a maiden speech. I urge the honourable member, as she has exhausted the luxury of uninterrupted speech in this Chamber, in the future to exhibit a modicum of more detailed research. On a matter as fundamental and ascertainable as education funding between 1975-76 and 1977-78, honourable members of this House expect not only a degree of exactness but perfection.

The selective use of erroneous figures occurred with other matters raised by the Hon. L. A. Solomons. He said that the public transport deficit had skyrocketed and was unprecedented under the Labor Government administration, which contrasted with the good management of the former Government. He linked the deficit to the consumer price index. He said that the deficit had risen by a far greater percentage than the inflation rate. I thought that was worth checking. I ascertained that in the last three years of the Liberal-Country party administration in New South Wales the Public Transport Commission deficit rose by 159 per cent and the consumer price index by only 48.6 per cent. In the three years of the present Labor administration, the public transport deficit rose by 79 per cent and the consumer price index by 30.3 per cent.

The Hon. D. P. Landa]

The Hon. L. A. Solomons: That is about what I said; I said approximately double.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The honourable member was selective in his culling of figures from the transport section of the Budget. One should look at this largest single economic problem facing the Government for a period longer than the first three years of its administration. It would be infantile for anyone to suggest that in a period of three years any business organization anywhere in the world could come to grips with the problems of an organization of the complexity of the Public Transport Commission and turn a deficit into a surplus. The Hon. W. L. Lange would well know that one should look for trends and whether one is turning the corner with the deficit and rise in costs. This Gargantuan problem requires macro thinking in the economic sense.

I shall refer to one matter to demonstrate the shortcomings of the so-called experts on the Opposition benches. The Hon. E. P. Pickering had his brief on the coal industry, which must pay him overtime to attend here. For a long time Government supporters thought that there was not much about the coal industry on which he would not be correct. He was in the industry and should know what he was talking about. I checked one small matter that he raised. The House heard from him *ad nauseam* about the great amount of investment in the Queensland coal industry and of how easy it was to obtain mining approvals there. He said there was a tremendous amount of money plunged into mining as a result of that State's free enterprise system. He said further that there was no investment in coal in New South Wales.

I extracted figures of investments in capital expenditure in coalmining in Queensland and in New South Wales. In 1974–75 \$57.7 million was invested in New South Wales and \$39.4 million in Queensland. In 1975–76 \$80.6 million was invested in New South Wales and \$67.2 million in Queensland. In 1976–77 investment in New South Wales amounted to \$105.2 million and in Queensland \$69 million. In the recent wonderful years in Queensland development investment in Queensland has gone up by \$2 million compared with \$25 million in New South Wales. That is just the beginning. All honourable members are aware of the great oversea interest in investing in the coal and mineral wealth of New South Wales and of the aid to investment at a personal level by the Premier and at an administrative level by the Department of Mines in New South Wales.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: All I said was that Queensland gave approvals more quickly than New South Wales. That was the only comparison I made.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: Even those honourable members who do not earn their living from coalmining companies have a reasonable knowledge of mining in New South Wales. They know that mining in New South Wales, particularly coalmining, is not in the same topographical or geographical locations as in Queensland. This involves completely different costs and approval structures. New coalmining activities opening up in Queensland are not in heavily populated or urban areas. The opposite position prevails in New South Wales.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: Generally in Queensland it is open-cut mining.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: Yes. That State can carry out open-cut mining. If an attempt were made to start to open-cut mine in some areas of New South Wales where coal is located the approval process would appear insignificant when compared with the protests of citizens. The honourable member in his wish to take coal from underneath dams as quickly as it can be got out does not care whether the State's water supply is threatened.

The Hon. E. P. Pickering: I gather that the Minister does not mind **mining** under Lake Macquarie; salt water apparently makes a **difference**.

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: The honourable member's comment about whether salt water or fresh water makes any difference will go down in the history of this Parliament. He is the only person to have said that coalminers do not mind whether they are killed by fresh water or by salt water. He would extract coal from underneath the foundations of the Sydney Harbour Bridge if the coal companies said that it could be done. Similar considerations apply with the safety of dams. The Government has taken the view that before one mines under stored waters all safety factors **must be** paramount. I should have thought that was axiomatic. Even other honourable members on the Opposition side of the House who think that investment return is sacrosanct share that view.

If **the** Government is being a bit cautious about mining under dams, probably the coal will not come out as soon as it might and the State will miss out on a few royalties and investment in mineral resources. If the honourable member is wrong and coal is taken too quickly, the very existence of the cities of Wollongong and Sydney in particular will be threatened. I hate to think of the consequences if there were a mistake made about mining under stored waters. It is a problem to be solved by engineers. I assure the honourable member that the **Government** will proceed with **all** due caution. If the Government errs it will err on the side of safety and caution in relation to mining under dams.

All honourable members, especially those on this side of the Chamber, have emphasized various vital factors that a budget must be directed towards.

The Hon. P. S. M. Philips: Does the Minister intend to comment on any of the matters that I raised?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: No. I regret to say that my answer is in the negative. I assure the honourable member that my regret and disappointment at not answering him on this occasion is matched only by the joy that is felt by every other member of the Chamber.

The Hon. P. S. M. Philips: Does the Government propose to spend more of the taxpayers' money re-investigating matters that have already been investigated over and over again?

The Hon. D. P. LANDA: I shall give the honourable member an undertaking along those lines if he will reciprocate with an undertaking that he will desist from making the superannuation speech that he makes on most bills in this Chamber. The honourable member should appreciate that if any group of members has suffered in this Chamber from my failure to comment on their contribution, it has been the members from within the Government ranks, who understand, as I do, that it is not possible—without being tedious to the point of excruciation—to answer every contribution made in a debate of this length. As I said, the underlying theme of concern throughout this budget debate was the overriding concern of all members of good will, both in public and private life, about the problem of unemployment. I place on record the warmth with which this Government receives the contribution of all honourable members who express their concern about this problem. All of us—even the most hardened political cynics—realize that it is ultimately a problem that requires a national solution. It requires economic policies that emanate from Canberra. But we in New South Wales do not propose to stand idly by when we find those policies lacking. To the extent of our limited resources, despite the savage and heartless cut backs of programmes that would have been incentives to employment in this State, we propose to commit as much as is feasible of our funding to employment-stimulating works.

This Budget, as I said at the start of my remarks, is the Budget that the Wran Government presented to the people prior to the last elections. It did not change one iota of it, despite the prognosis that we would do so by Mr Punch in the other place. It is a budget, as I said, that the people of New South Wales clearly gave a mandate to this Government to implement for the next year. It will be implemented with the compassion that is required for the unemployed, with the understanding of the hard economic realities of the 1978–79 fiscal year and it will, we hope—and I am sure our confidence is not misplaced—go some real way in coming to grips with the great economic problems that beset this nation as a whole.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Committee and Adoption of Report

Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted, on motions by the Hon. D. P. Landa.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Assembly without amendment, on motions by the Hon. D. P. Landa.

VALUATION OF LAND (AMENDMENT) BILL

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (VALUATION OF LAND) AMENDMENT BILL

Bills received from the Legislative Assembly.

Suspension of Standing Orders

Suspension of so much of the standing orders as would preclude these bills being considered simultaneously, except in Committee, agreed to on motion (by consent) by the Hon. D. P. Landa.

First Reading

Bills read a first time, and ordered to be printed, on motions by the Hon. D. P. Landa.

FORESTRY (STATE FOREST REVOCATION) BILL (No. 2)

First Reading

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

House adjourned, on motion of the Hon. D. P. Landa, at 10.52 p.m.
