

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

### Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 12 August, 1971

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

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

Mr SPEAKER offered the Prayer.

## PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER

### TENANT EVICTIONS

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

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 Of these 57 were withdrawn.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

### PETITIONS

#### CLUTHA DEVELOPMENT PTY. LIMITED AGREEMENT ACT

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

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

#### LURNEA HIGH SCHOOL

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

Petition received on motion by Mr Paciullo.

#### GOVERNMENT TRANSPORT: INCREASED FARES

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

Petition received on motion by Mr O'Connell.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE****EASTERN SUBURBS RAILWAY**

Mr HILLS: I ask the Premier and Treasurer whether yesterday the Minister for Transport was asked about a substantial increase in the estimated cost of construction of the eastern suburbs railway from \$85,000,000 to approximately \$135,000,000. Is it a fact that the capital debt of the Department of Railways exceeds \$590,000,000, on which last year about \$35,000,000 was paid in interest and sinking fund charges? Is it further a fact that the Commonwealth provides no assistance for the construction of the eastern suburbs railway? Did the Commonwealth recently decide to make capital grants to the States of about \$200,000,000 of which about \$69,000,000 is available to New South Wales? Will the Premier make some of these interest-free loan funds available as grants to the Department of Railways rather than insist that the department continue to incur interest payments on loans? Will the Premier make another approach to the Commonwealth Government to assist in railway construction works, and transport construction works generally, to ensure that capital indebtedness will not further increase the need for additional charges on rail passenger and freight traffic.

Mr ASKIN: The Leader of the Opposition is quite correct about an increase in the estimated cost of building the eastern suburbs railway. We do not know for sure, of course, but on present indications the cost has risen from about \$85,000,000 in 1965 when the Government came to office, to about \$130,000,000. This has been brought about by increased costs all along the line, not only with the eastern suburbs railway, but with every public work that is undertaken. Where any cost estimate for a project was made six years ago, and the work is not yet finished, the cost must now be much higher. That is the answer to the first part of the honourable gentleman's question.

In reply to the second part of the question about the capital debt of the Department of Railways, I agree that interest payments on the capital debt are a heavy

burden. Some years ago our predecessors in office transferred a certain amount of the debt, or took action that amounted to a transference of part of the capital debt, from the Department of Railways to the Treasury. I think that the amount involved was \$72,000,000. The Government is examining the possibility of taking similar action to transfer an additional part of the capital debt of the Department of Railways, but this is only Peter paying Paul.

There is no way in which the State Government can write off the interest payment that is due by the Department of Railways on its capital debt: all it can do is to take some of the burden off the railways and thus help the persons who have to pay freights and fares. The burden must be met by the rest of the community. There is no way of writing it off: our predecessors found that, as we have. What was done to a limited extent, and what we contemplate doing again to a limited extent, is to transfer part of the burden to the general community. However, there is a limit to what can be done in that regard. I shall have more to say about this when we know exactly what we intend to do.

Interest-free capital grants come to the State from the federal Government, as they have always done. As a result of strong pressure put on the Commonwealth for assistance to overcome problems caused by heavy interest commitments, the Commonwealth agreed to give some money to the States interest free. This relieved the burden on us to some extent, but not sufficiently, of course. All States would agree with that. Just how we should dispose of those grants is a matter for consideration. It is premature to say yet, for we have not concluded our budget discussions or made our decisions on the use of loan funds, but the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition is worthy of consideration and will be taken into account when we are preparing the Budget. However, I should add, so that the honourable gentleman will not be under a misapprehension, that there is no easy way of writing off these interest commitments. Whether they are borne by the Department of Railways or by the Treasury, interest payments

have to be made by somebody. All we can do is to shift the responsibility from one place to another. If it is desirable to do that to some extent, it will be done.

#### CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN COUNTRY AREAS

Mr MASON: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Cultural Affairs. Is he aware that one of the criticisms of living in the country is that it deprives people of access to cultural activities? Is the Minister aware that many country people are anxious to partake in all the cultural activities, such as painting and acting, normally and easily available in city areas? Has the Minister any particular plans in mind that will enable country people to share more readily in these activities?

Mr FREUDENSTEIN: The honourable member for Dubbo invites attention to a growing interest in cultural activities, and makes a comparison between access to these activities in country areas and their availability in the cities.

Since 1966, when the Government made available from the proceeds of an opera house lottery some \$200,000 to support cultural activities, there has been a growing interest in the subject throughout the State, not only in country areas but also in the city. Particularly has this been noticed in the growth of various arts centres and the establishment of various committees and musical and opera groups. Through the arts advisory committee we make available some \$47,000 for the encouragement of amateur art and music touring groups throughout country areas. The most recent such group presented *Figaro* in various country schools, and later this year I understand a group from the Conservatorium will tour rural areas under the guidance of the Arts Council of New South Wales to present *Madam Butterfly*. Instructors in painting and pottery are sent out to these areas, and recently at Young I met a number of people from the Spinners and Weavers' Guild who were giving instruction supported by an advisory committee grant.

Grant applications closed on 30th June this year and consideration is now being given to them by the Cultural Grants Advisory Committee. This year over \$208,000 will be spent by way of assistance to these bodies throughout New South Wales. Unfortunately, there is an impression that the Government should provide assistance from capital funds for the construction of buildings, and that should be corrected immediately. With the tremendous needs in the education and health fields, no capital funds are available for the building of cultural centres. I trust that when we come back to a full programme of building assembly halls for our schools, they will be available for cultural purposes, and I intend to discuss this with the Minister for Education so that instead of a school using a costly hall for only a few periods a day, it can be used at night for the greater development of cultural activities. Some complaint has been made in respect of eisteddfod grants. We have some twenty eisteddfodau operating in country areas and these are supported to the extent of \$2,850 a year. In answer to the honourable member for Dubbo, therefore, I would point out that cultural activities are being given this encouragement, which the Government intends to continue.

#### CLUTHA DEVELOPMENT PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr MALLAM: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Mines. Will the Minister tell the House whether the agreement with Clutha Development Proprietary Limited has been signed? If so will he table in this House the draft of that agreement? Will he table also his correspondence with Mr Ludwig and his representatives in Australia and submissions or reports regarding this project made by the Department of Railways, the Maritime Services Board, the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, the State Planning Authority, the Department of Health, the Department of Local Government, the Department of Mines and any other government authority?

Mr FIFE: The agreement to which the honourable member refers was signed by the Premier and Treasurer on 9th February. The draft agreement was put before the Parliament and approved so it is quite unnecessary to table a copy of it. Copies of the agreement are freely available from the Clerk of Bills. If the honourable member would like a copy or even several copies of the agreement I shall be happy to make them available to him. With regard to the honourable gentleman's request for the tabling of correspondence, reports and advisings that have come from various departments to Ministers, particularly to me, and in regard also to the matter raised earlier this week by the Leader of the Opposition in the Address-in-Reply debate, the documents to which the honourable members have referred contain advisings and comments from senior officers of various government departments and instrumentalities to Ministers and to the Government in general. It would be quite wrong and indeed contrary to past practice for me or any other Minister to accede to the honourable member's request.

Mr MALLAM: When the Minister appeared on television he said he would make them available.

Mr FIFE: I did not say I would make available these papers. I have a transcript of what I said on television, which was that I would make available freely at any time information that would show clearly that the officers of the various departments, the sub-committee, the Cabinet subcommittee and indeed the Government rejected the Clutha company's initial proposal. It is widely known that the Government rejected that proposal. For the information of the honourable member for Campbelltown that proposal was that the Clutha company would provide funds to enable the Government to construct two coal loaders, one at Port Stephens and the other at Coalcliff, with connecting rail links to several coal-mines.

For a number of reasons the Government rejected that proposal. The Government did not believe it was in the best financial interest of this State to accept it. So far as the northern area was concerned the

Government thought the proposal would give one company a monopoly and we were not prepared to permit that. As to the south, the Government decided that the financial implications were not in the best interests of New South Wales. The Government considered the initial proposals put forward by the Clutha company and rejected them. Subsequently Cabinet made a clear decision of policy to permit the Clutha company to build its own facility on the South Coast. Every member of Cabinet was party to that decision. The position on the South Coast was quite different from that prevailing in the Hunter Valley, where a number of companies were involved. As a matter of policy the Government decided to permit the Clutha company to set up its own plant under conditions laid down by the Government. Before deciding on these conditions we sought advice from the various departments and instrumentalities involved. Those conditions have been incorporated in the agreement and in the draft mining purpose lease which has been before this House. I am not willing to accede to the request by the honourable member for Campbelltown and the Leader of the Opposition to table the papers, correspondence, advisings and comments of senior government officials.

I am not going to bring them into the centre of public controversy; I should be neglectful in my duty as a Minister if I were to do so. The decision to permit this company to construct its own facility was a government policy decision taken clearly by the Government, and it laid down the conditions.

A few moments ago the Leader of the Opposition referred to the capital debt of the railways. I do not know whether his figure is correct, but I shall accept it. He said that the capital debt of the railways is about \$590,000,000. The Opposition is asking that we add to this capital debt by providing a railway for one company. It would for all time saddle the taxpayers of New South Wales, the Government and its successors and the Department of Railways with the financial responsibility for servicing the capital debt and in due course repaying the capital involved. We are unwilling to bleed the other essential services

of government by diverting a large sum of money, almost \$80,000,000, for this purpose.

### NOISE POLLUTION

**Mr BARRRACLOUGH:** I ask the Minister for Environment Control whether I have made constant representations to him regarding the problem of noise pollution in residential areas, and requesting the introduction of some form of limiting legislation. Does the Minister agree that a need exists to find some measurable standard of community comfort in this regard, having in mind that noise causes discomfort to residents and is injurious to health? Can the Minister inform me and the House what action he is taking to combat the serious problem of noise pollution?

**Mr JACK BEALE:** The honourable member for Bligh has shown continuing and commendable interest in the protection of the environment, particularly from noise pollution. I agree that practical controls of noise are needed, for noise can be detrimental. It can be a health hazard and a nuisance to individuals.

In answer to the final part of the honourable member's question, New South Wales took the lead in Australia by implementing a comprehensive and co-ordinated attack upon pollution problems. This was done by the appointment of a full-time Minister; the establishment of the Department of Environment; the establishment of the State Pollution Control Commission, which had its first meeting about ten days ago; and the recent establishment of the Waste Disposal Authority. Also, the Parliament has passed clean waters legislation, and new clean air regulations are being prepared. By taking these actions and by co-ordinating effort over the whole range, New South Wales is in line with the foremost thinking in the world in this field. This was confirmed by two senior officers who returned recently after going overseas on behalf of the Government. They were the guests of the British Government for about a month and they have informed me that they found that everywhere in the world noise pollution is emerging as a vital problem, whether

it be industrial or occupation noise or transport or residential noise. Of course, the honourable member for Bligh is particularly interested in transport and residential noise.

The information obtained by the two officers overseas is still flowing into the department, and as it is collated it will be forwarded to the State Pollution Control Commission. The Standards Association of Australia has prepared a draft document, which is specifically an assessment of the effects of industrial noise on nearby residential areas. Moreover, under my colleague the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Highways an interdepartmental committee that has been functioning for some time has just provided the Minister with an interim report. From now on it will be concentrating on residential noise. This most important committee consists of representatives of the Department of Local Government, the Department of Health, the Chief Secretary's Department, the Department of Motor Transport, the Department of Justice and the Police Department.

In addition to the aspects to which I have referred the Department of Health has been conducting surveys into vehicle noise. In other words, the noise problem has been concentrated upon extensively and the Government regards it as most serious. It is considering proposals for strengthening legislation and when this is done the amendments made to regulations will permit all levels of government to take action to mitigate the degradation of the environment from noise pollution.

### COLLEGES OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

**Mr KEARNS:** I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Education whether all teachers colleges will become colleges of advanced education on 1st September of this year. Has the Minister stated that this will result in an upgrading of teachers colleges? If so, what does the Minister mean by his statement and how will the upgrading operate? Will the Minister give an assurance that salaries, conditions and other

entitlements of the staff of these colleges will not suffer as a result of any change of status?

Mr CUTLER: The answer to the first two parts of the honourable member's question is in the affirmative: the teachers colleges will be declared colleges of advanced education from 1st September next. My view is that in so doing the training of teachers in this State will be upgraded. Initially when I put this view forward some considerable time ago the Teachers Federation opposed the proposal, but it has now come to support it. However, the federation has raised the possibility of some difficulties that might arise over the transfer of staff, and its fear that some staff might be downgraded. No trouble will arise over the colleges that will remain under departmental control, for the staff employed in them will be controlled by my department. The only possible problem that might arise will be in relation to the advanced college of education that has already been established in the Riverina at Wagga Wagga, which of course is already council controlled. I have no direct control over the council in the appointment of staff. Due to the rather complex nature of the problem I prefer to give a more considered reply to this part of the honourable member's question.

#### SCHOOL CHILDREN: AWAY-FROM-HOME ALLOWANCE

Mr FISHER: I ask the Deputy Premier and Minister for Education whether he is aware that in country areas a number of children are obliged to board in the nearest town as no school bus is provided for them. Will the Minister acknowledge that on a number of occasions I have made representations for the families of these children to be assisted? Will the Minister consider giving assistance to the families of children who have to board away from home in places where no school bus subsidy is available to assist them?

Mr CUTLER: I am aware of the problems confronting children living in isolated areas of the State. Probably the largest number of them would be in the Western Division of New South Wales but there are

other areas where children live in isolation. Provision of a school bus or subsidy for private transport is not really an answer to the problem. I know personally that many children in the Western Division and other parts of the State have a specific problem of transport. The honourable gentleman himself has made representation in this matter. Representations have been made from the Western Division in particular. The honourable member for Broken Hill led a deputation to me on the matter only a few days ago, and the honourable member for Castlereagh also has discussed it with me.

I have visited a number of Western Division towns and met people with school transport problems, the last town being Brewarrina. I know that the problem exists in other parts of the State, even on the North Coast where some families live in the mountains and have difficulty in getting their children to school. Some proposals have been put to me by deputation. They mainly relate to provision of a subsidy in respect of each child who is defined as an isolated child. It is difficult, of course, to arrive at this definition. That would be my difficulty in overcoming the problem, though I know the federal Government has defined an isolated child in the Northern Territory. However, the problem is different there.

Expenditure of at least \$500,000 would be needed to meet the requirements of deputations on this matter, and even then it would be extremely difficult to be sure that the money was being spent properly. The proposal put to me, in broad terms, was that a fairly large subsidy be paid and that it be left entirely to the family to determine its use. For instance, it might be used to send a child away to boarding school, or it might be used to provide a governess for a family, particularly in the Western Division. With many fathers now going away from their property to work, particularly in the western part of the State, mother is virtually running the property and has no time to act as governess. It was put to me that in this situation the subsidy might be used for employment of a housemaid to assist with the housework while mother runs the property and supervises the child's school work.

All these proposals are under consideration. I am aware of the problems. I think the Education Advisory Commission is looking into this matter today. I hope the commission decides to visit some isolated areas to take evidence from affected persons, though of course I cannot tie it down in any way. I assure the honourable gentleman and the House that this aspect of school transport is receiving active consideration.

#### GOVERNMENT TRANSPORT: PATRONAGE

Mr CRABTREE: I ask the Minister for Transport whether since the heavy increases in fares, there has been a serious decline in the number of passengers using government transport. Is the Minister aware that in addition to the savage increase in bus fares, night services on the Rockdale-Sans Souci government bus route have been reduced and these buses now run at thirty-minute intervals instead of twenty? Does the Minister agree that the policy of increased fares and reduced services will not encourage patrons to use government transport services, and has he any proposals to win back patronage? If he has no proposals, will he inform the House whether he agrees with the Premier that the public of New South Wales should walk?

Mr MORRIS: The change in the timetables for buses in the area referred to by the honourable member—and I know that the department advised him of this some little time ago—has nothing whatever to do with the recent increase in fares charged for rail and bus journeys. Over the past few years these buses have been carrying  $1\frac{1}{2}$  persons on each trip; that is an average figure, of course. I had no hesitation in supporting the decision of the Commissioner for Government Transport to reduce the service in these areas from every 20 minutes to half-hourly. During the past six and a half years the prosperity of this State has increased so much that the people of St George and other areas of the State are making increased use of the private motor vehicle.

#### INTIMIDATION OF TEACHERS

Mr CAMERON: I address my question to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Education and Minister for Science. Has information been given to the Minister indicating that numbers of teachers, especially young female teachers, who refused to vote for strikes have since been the subject of intimidation from extremists within the teaching service? Does this information indicate that numbers of such teachers have either resigned from the service rather than face the continuation of intimidation or have decided in future to support strikes rather than face the intimidation? If these are facts, will the Minister say whether he is aware of any proposals under consideration which might provide protection for teachers facing such difficulties and slow the creeping "politicalization" of teaching?

Mr CUTLER: I have heard of several cases of intimidation. I do not know exactly the degree but I have heard that in most cases young female teachers are involved. There is no doubt that as a result of this sort of thing young teachers, especially young women teachers, resign from the teaching service rather than put up with such treatment. I have received considerable correspondence from parents and parents and citizens organizations to the effect that students in teachers colleges are being brain-washed—that is the phrase used by the complainants—by people who find their way into the teachers colleges. I intend to ask that this matter in respect of teachers colleges be thoroughly investigated by the Director of Teacher Education, but I intend to take action in any case to ensure that students in teachers colleges are given proper and responsible advice rather than being left open to the irresponsible advice that is being given by some union organisers.

The difficulty with the matter that the honourable member for Northcott raises is to obtain evidence. Naturally enough, young people are disinclined to come forward and give evidence to the effect that they are being intimidated. Some may be peculiar people like the honourable member for East Hills who would be happy to do so, but most would not like to leave themselves

open to unpleasant and distasteful experiences and to the extreme abuse that would be heaped upon them by some irresponsible person who engaged in this sort of action.

#### AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL OF PACIFIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr BOOTH: Is the Deputy Premier, Minister for Education and Minister for Science aware that the training of teachers at the Australian School of Pacific Administration at Mosman is in danger of being phased out this year? Is he aware that this is the one institution in which the training of teachers is directly financed by funds made available by the Commonwealth Government through its Department of Territories? Is the Minister aware that at the time when the Commonwealth Government is considering abandoning this school as a teacher training facility for the Territory of Papua and New Guinea and the Northern Territory, the education administration of the former is pirating teachers from the States, as exemplified in the advertisement published on 19th June in the Australian press? Since 1958 have about 600 teachers been trained wholly at Commonwealth expense at this school?

Mr COLEMAN: On a point of order. I submit, Mr Speaker, that as this question deals exclusively with the administration of the Commonwealth Office of Education and with Commonwealth education institutions, it is not in any way a matter for this Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should finish his question before I rule.

Mr HEALEY: On a further point of order. The honourable member for Wallsend, in phrasing his question, is asking the Minister whether he is aware of something. I submit that this is an incorrect form and that the honourable member for Wallsend is giving information rather than seeking it from the Minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have said previously that I abhor the use of the word aware. It implies the giving of information. Honourable members seem deter-

mined to use it, despite the feeling of the Chair that it is not a proper word to use, and I do not propose to prevent them. The honourable member will complete his question.

Mr BOOTH: Almost all of these trained teachers after service in the Commonwealth territories have come back to enter the State service. The phasing out of teacher training at this school means that the facility built up over the years at great expense is to be abandoned.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member seems to be giving a lot of information.

Mr BOOTH: I have only one sentence to go.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member may complete the question, and then I shall rule on it.

Mr BOOTH: If abandoned, will this facility continue in use as a State teacher training institution?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the Minister to answer the last part of the question at any rate.

Mr CUTLER: In relation to the last part of the question, if the rest of it is factual, the answer is yes. I will look at that proposal because it could be attractive to us. In relation to the first part of the question, the honourable gentleman asked me whether I was aware that the particular school he mentioned was being phased out. I was not.

*The honourable member for Heathcote interjecting,*

Mr CUTLER: If you keep quiet I will get on with my answer.

Mr JACKSON: You are going against Mr Speaker's order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JACKSON: You are completely ignoring Mr Speaker's order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Heathcote to order.



Mr CUTLER: I was not aware that the school concerned was financed by the Commonwealth Government. I should hope that the honourable member would share my belief, and it is the belief of this Government, that there is a responsibility on the States of Australia, which have always in the past trained teachers, to share in the development of the territories of Australia, including particularly the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. We in this State have accepted that responsibility over a long period of years. Not only has this Government accepted it, but also it has been accepted by previous governments as far back as I can recall in this House. The Commonwealth is taking action at this stage to train its own teachers. In fact, the college of advanced education at Canberra is training teachers to replace State teachers in Commonwealth territories. I think it is only reasonable to continue to provide teachers for the territories until the Commonwealth teachers are fully trained. It seems that members of the Labor Party in New South Wales support the Whitlam plan to throw Papua and New Guinea to the wolves.

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr TAYLOR: My question is addressed to the Chief Secretary and Minister for Tourism and Sport. Has the Government recently announced that during the summer months it intends to introduce daylight saving on a trial basis? Has the Minister been informed that a number of country people are deeply concerned about this announcement, especially the parents of children who are travelling to and from school? Is the Minister aware, also, that some people have expressed great concern about the effect that this will have, especially during harvest time? Will the Minister assure the House and the community that these problems will be examined very carefully when the trial is being undertaken?

Mr WILLIS: The questions raised by the honourable member for Temora are indeed matters that have caused considerable concern among sections of the rural community and have in fact been brought to my notice as the Minister responsible for the preparation of the legislation which will provide for

a trial of daylight saving this summer. These matters were considered by the Government before it made the decision to provide for the trial this year, but it was felt that a trial was nevertheless desirable because, at the same time as this criticism was offered, a great body of opinion was expressed and many representations were made in support of the introduction of daylight saving. However, because there were differing opinions on the question, the Government felt that it would be best if this year daylight saving were introduced only on a trial basis.

I assure the honourable gentleman that the legislation to be introduced soon will provide for just that. I should perhaps point out, though it is hardly necessary to do so, that the four-months period during which daylight saving will be introduced this summer on a trial basis will cover the entire school vacation period. This means that for six or seven of the seventeen weeks, or nearly half of the total time of the trial, the children to whom the honourable gentleman referred in his question will not be going to and from school but instead will be on vacation. Also, as the honourable member will appreciate, the period of daylight saving does not cover the entire harvest period for the whole State, though I concede that a great quantity of the harvest will be garnered during this time.

Towards the end of the trial period I propose to invite comments from the community as a whole—particularly from those who feel that it has been directly advantageous or disadvantageous to them, so that a proper assessment can be made of the trial period. We shall want to know the feelings not only of those able to get recreation because of the longer afternoon hours of sunshine, but also of those who are perhaps inconvenienced in some way in regard to their employment, such as farmers who are engaged in harvesting. In this way a proper assessment can be made next March or April, after which it is proposed that there should be a further conference of Ministers representing each of the governments in Australia, at which a decision can be made on whether a recommendation for the continuation of daylight saving or its termination will be put to the respective governments.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH:  
ADDRESS IN REPLY

FIFTH DAY'S DEBATE

Debate resumed (from 11th August, *vide* page 270) on motion by Mr Viney:

That the following Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech be now adopted by this House—

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

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

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

2. We beg to assure Your Excellency that our earnest consideration will be given to the measures to be submitted to us, and that the necessary provision for the Public Services will be made in due course.

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

Upon which Mr Hills had moved:

That the Address be amended by the addition of the following words to stand as paragraph 4:

We also desire to inform Your Excellency that the Government does not possess the confidence of this House, because of its unjustified action in imposing unnecessarily heavy increases in public transport fares and because of its failure to take any positive, practical measures to alleviate and effectively cope with the rural crisis.

To which proposed amendment Mr K. J. Stewart had moved:

That the proposed amendment be amended by adding after the word "crisis" the words "and its imposition of unnecessarily high and unjustifiable increases in hospital fees".

Mr DUNCAN (Lismore) [11.50]: In rising to take my part in this debate I should like in the first place to refer to the

fact that when on 4th August, His Excellency the Governor delivered his speech in the Legislative Council Chamber, among others who listened with intense interest was the Hon. J. C. McIntosh, who was a member of another place. Sadly, he died less than a week later. With the indulgence of the House I pay tribute to Jack McIntosh, who could be described as a native son of Lismore and a man who left his mark on the community and on the professional, political and sporting life of the Richmond-Tweed district. Throughout his years he was a loyal supporter of the Country Party. As a member of Parliament I pay tribute to his outstanding loyalty and the friendship he offered, and I acknowledge the advice that he gave as one with a sound knowledge of both rural and city problems.

At the same time I should add that Jack McIntosh was a conservative person. He never sought popularity. He never sought the limelight. He was a sound adviser, and I know of many people who went to him and were given a helping hand. I recall that when I was a youth, his name was held in high respect in my household. I learnt in more recent years as I served with him in Parliament, that he was held in the same high respect throughout the electorate of Lismore. Finally, I would say that he had a stabilizing influence on every field of human endeavour in which he was engaged. The gap that he leaves in the city of Lismore and district, in the commercial and community life of the area, will be hard to fill. On behalf of my constituents, I extend sympathy to his widow and family.

My next duty is to congratulate the honourable member for Wakehurst and the young member for Sturt upon the way in which they moved and seconded the Address in Reply. Both made worthwhile contributions to the debate and I wish them well in their activities in this Chamber. Likewise I offer my congratulations to all new members of Parliament, one of whom is the honourable member for Clarence, who won that seat for the Country Party. I congratulate also my electoral neighbour, the honourable member for Casino, on his achievement in the last election. In doing so, I acknowledge the right he exercised last

night to be critical of the parties that oppose his political views. That is the right of every member of Parliament, but I reiterate that I sought endorsement from the people of Lismore in 1965 because of an abiding faith in the Country Party as one political instrument that could truly sponsor the needs of the people who live in country cities and towns, and in rural areas generally.

Mr DAY: The Country Party has done nothing for them.

Mr DUNCAN: I go on record as saying to the honourable member who interjected that in the six years that I have been a member of Parliament my faith in the Country Party has by no means declined. The carping criticism made from time to time does not in any way lessen my faith in the party. In fact, that faith has been increased by the results achieved by the Government in the past six years. Last night honourable members heard criticisms of the activities of the Country Party on the North Coast. They heard that strange word that is used from time to time—gerrymander. I have heard the word used in the electorate of Casino. In fact, it shocked me, for I suppose no section of the community in New South Wales was more disappointed than the people of the electorate of Casino when in 1967 a decision was made to abolish the seat. No section of our community has worked harder to have a seat re-established, and the people of Casino do not believe that the reconstitution of the electorate was a political gerrymander. They believe it is their right to have a voice in this House, regardless of the political party representing them. I wonder what the position would be if the Labor Party got back to the Treasury benches. Would it claim that the reconstitution of the electorate of Casino was a gerrymander? How long would the electorate of Casino last in such a situation?

Let me look back on the achievements of the Country Party since 1965. Much has been said about communications, roads and bridges. Take bridges. In this one field of government activity, in the Richmond-Tweed area no fewer than twenty-seven bridges have been completed or are under

construction. This has been done though the Government's bridge subsidy scheme at a cost of \$1,400,000. That does not include the ferry that was replaced with a bridge costing more than \$250,000 just south of Lismore at Wyrallah.

What about communications work undertaken by the Department of Main Roads? Granted, the former administration commenced building the bridge at Harwood. Granted, it built a bridge at Wardell, and good luck that it did. But no mention was made of the work that has been done on the Pacific Highway, say between Grafton and the Tweed, an important artery in that area. The facts are that \$9,461,000 has been spent on that highway since 1965. Is that any mean sum? What about the Bruxner Highway? From Tenterfield to Ballina, which I regard as the most important artery in the development of the tourist industry, the Government has spent \$5,075,000. I can recall that during my election campaign in 1965 the Leader of the Country Party had some choice words to say about the road between Casino and Lismore. That road is now a credit to the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Highways. An amount of \$2,619,000 has been spent on trunk route 83, or Sommerlad Way, as it is known, from Grafton to the Mt Lindsay Highway, in the period from 1965 to 1970. Do not tell me that roads and bridges in the area have been neglected. There has been a bigger injection of funds for such works than ever before.

What is the position with education? Consider the years that the people of the North Coast have looked for a university or a teachers college. Today teacher training is a reality that was ignored during the Labor administration. A new high school has been built at Lismore. Tremendous development has taken place at the Richmond River high school. A site has been acquired for a third high school, at Goonellabah. This policy is reflected in Ballina and in the field of technical college education. The Government has provided more free buses and other things that were said to be impossible during the twenty-four years of so-called

good Labor government. For the first time, education facilities are being made available to country people as they are needed.

I make no apology in this House for the work that has been done by the Askin-Cutler Government in the field of decentralization. A number of industries have been assisted in Lismore. The Commonwealth Government has been criticized over its attitude to decentralization, but at Wollongbar, as a result of government grants from the Commonwealth and with State co-operation, a new diagnostic centre has been established, as well as a new agricultural regional laboratory and new facilities for tropical research. The sum of \$1,000,000 has been spent in this way since this Government has been in office.

Mr RENSHAW: Tropical research was started before.

Mr DUNCAN: I do not deny that, but new facilities have been provided. The Commonwealth is doing something in the field of decentralization, and this is the type of worthwhile activity the people whom I represent want to see.

Mr RENSHAW: What secondary industries are established in the area?

Mr DUNCAN: Secondary industries have been assisted in many ways. Readings is one of the biggest engineering firms on the North Coast today.

Mr RENSHAW: How many people are employed there?

Mr DUNCAN: About 100 people at present. The honourable member for Castlereagh will get his chance to speak during this debate. I acknowledge in all sincerity that the Commonwealth could do more in the field of decentralization. It could attempt to attract city-based industries to the country by offering taxation and trunk telephone charge concessions. The city-based industrialist should be shown that it will mean cash in his pocket to go to the country. We are not going to achieve a great deal with the present persuasive policy. All these things indicate the interest of the Government in these problems. When I entered Parliament one of the greatest problem in-

dustries on the North Coast was the dairy industry. Government supporters are told not to keep harping about the 24 years of Labour administration, but as a member of the dairy industry, I look back with disdain upon these same 24 years.

When Labor was in office we in the North Coast could not even get T.B. herd testing, let alone have the industry put on a unified basis with the opportunity of sending milk to the Sydney market. What did the Leader of the Opposition do when the Dairy Industry Authority Bill was introduced? He sent 1,100 letters into the electorate of Upper Hunter with the message to the people: "You need not be losing any of your market. Look at those North Coasters; they have their pigs and calves." But now we have an authority which can work in a practical manner. Members should look at what happened when the feed-year scheme was introduced. The honourable member for Castlereagh was the Leader of the Labor Party at that time. In the 1968 elections his candidate in my electorate was saying that the feed-year scheme was leading the farmers to a precipice and letting them topple over. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke on the legislation he said that nobody wanted it, that it was the thinking of a bumble-footed government. Yet we have seen general acceptance of the sound thinking of the Askin-Cutler Government.

What about the question of margarine? It took the former Minister for Agriculture, the honourable member for Tamworth, to break down the door so that we could see what was happening. In the time of Labor an offending company could be fined \$20. That was making a caricature of justice. These are matters that members opposite should think about when they speak about twenty-four years of Labor government. Who is the friend of the primary producer in this State? Members on this side of the House have acknowledged the crisis in the wool industry and the wheat industry. The people I represent are fortunate to be involved in the dairy industry at this time. Admittedly, dairy farmers are not receiving a large income but they have learnt to

live with it. Valuations have been maintained and there are prospects of greater returns in the industry in the future.

What was Labor's approach when the House met after the elections several months ago? Honourable members opposite asked for a select committee into marketing, prices, decentralization—the whole rural crisis. They asked for this at a time when rural producers and country people were passing through a period of unparalleled bewilderment due to the problems that have arisen in marketing generally. The Government could not afford to be hamstrung by setting up a select committee that would have taken two or three years to complete its investigations—as members opposite well know. The Government has introduced a policy to help rural people and it should be allowed to get on with the job. This move by the Opposition brands it as a complete phoney. In February last Labor claimed to have the answer to marketing, decentralization, prices and many other matters. But the first move the Opposition made was to ask the Government to set up a select committee. They asked the Government to open the door so that Labor could, for the first time, learn what the problems are. After that type of action Labor is capable of prostituting the fearful plight of the rural producer in New South Wales at present. The Government has a policy in respect of local government, roads, probate duties and other matters which will be implemented. If select committees are appointed to deal with matters the Government will be hamstrung at a time when people are crying out for assistance.

What is the attitude of the Opposition? It is hard to find. Yesterday the honourable member for Goulburn raised a question about a conference held in Launceston—if members opposite know where that is. The rural spokesman for the Labor Party at that conference was Mr Hayden, the federal member for Oxley, who is not of the same calibre as the member for Oxley in this House. Mr Hayden said that what they had been speaking about in regard to the primary industry was a loose patchwork of totally unrelated propositions, and he confirmed this remark in Brisbane at the

weekend. In the *Courier Mail* he is reported to have said, when speaking about the wool industry, that "wealthy wool-growers would have their bank accounts generously larded." Would the honourable member for Castlereagh be prepared to say that in his electorate or in any other country electorate in this State?

The honourable member for Kogarah was in this House when the honourable member for Goulburn spoke in this debate and he asked what Dr Patterson had had to say about Mr Hayden's remarks. No doubt Dr Patterson would have liked to prescribe a sedative to put Mr Hayden to sleep. The following day, when interviewed on the television programme *This Day Tonight*, Dr Patterson replied to Mr Hayden's criticism of Labor's piecemeal rural policy and another suggestion by Mr Hayden that no government can just keep pouring subsidies willy-nilly, like a madman in charge of a counterfeit press, into an industry, whether primary or secondary. I wonder if he was referring to the Government's decentralization programme? Dr Patterson, in the television interview, said:

How many people at this conference were rural people who understand the technicalities of the rural industry?

Was not the New South Wales Leader of the Opposition at that conference? Is not Dr Patterson's statement an indictment of the Leader of the Opposition who has been claiming in this House that he knows all about rural problems? It is about time that we heard less from Labor. Members opposite knock the State Government and the federal Government on everything done in an attempt to help primary industry. It is about time members of the Opposition told the Government what they think are the answers. The Liberal-Country party coalition Government is not blind to good ideas. If the Opposition were to put forward a good suggestion it would be readily considered. The Government welcomes ideas. It is sickening that members opposite should continually knock everything that the Government has done. I have yet to hear in this debate a new or worthwhile idea expounded by the Opposition in an attempt to assist primary industry.

Crisis is a popular word these days. We have heard much about a crisis in education. Like many other members of this House, I have recently faced teachers and parents in my electorate and discussed the subject of education with them. Next week I shall be facing more people and endeavouring to tell them what the Government has done and intends to do in this important field of human endeavour. I suppose finance is the only thing that restricts our ambition continually to broaden the State's education programme. I do not believe that any person can deny that the State Government is giving high priority to education. At a recent meeting in Lismore I was asked whether I was prepared to say in this House that there was a crisis in education. I told that meeting quite emphatically that I was not willing to say that. I acknowledge that there is a shortfall in teachers but I believe this can be overcome by co-operation between teachers, the department, parents and all other persons and organizations concerned.

I deplore the action that the Teachers Federation is proposing for next week. To my mind strike action is a poor commentary on the education system in New South Wales. It can only have a retarding effect on it. In all sincerity I say that I would have as much at stake in education as any other member of this Chamber. I have one boy at high school and I hope that another son will start at high school in a couple of years. If I had the audacity to say in this House that I believed there was a crisis in education and then left those boys at that school I should be nothing less than a hypocrite. I attended the same school as my son is now attending. I believe that he is receiving an infinitely better education than I received. I have ample confidence in the education that he will receive at that school and in two years I shall send my second son to the same school so that he may be educated under the same system.

On a previous occasion I said publicly, and I should like to repeat now, that I believe our education system in the past has been piecemeal. I say this without criticism of any government. Education is the biggest industry in this State. I believe that

*Mr Duncan]*

the Minister might well give consideration to conducting an inquiry into the whole structure of the education system. The inquiry could look at things such as relationship between secondary schools and technical colleges. To my mind these two important sections of education seem to be worlds apart. When a student reaches fourth year and has in mind taking up a trade he should be attracted to a technical college. Does this happen within our present system?

Perhaps the Wyndham scheme, having been in operation for about eight years, could be reviewed to determine whether it is achieving what is most desirable in educating our children. If necessary the scheme could be amended. Those of us who come from country areas, as we look at the multiplicity of boards and our decentralized education system, admire the work of inspectors and area directors. Consideration should be given to greater financial status and opportunity for promotion within the sphere of their areas. I do not make this suggestion by way of criticism of a fine government department or the officers who work within it. Perhaps at the end of an inquiry such as that I have suggested the present system would be accepted. Even so, the inquiry would have been worthwhile. If not, any improvements agreed upon could be phased into the system over a period of ten, twelve or even twenty years.

Another area described as a crisis is the nation's inflationary trend. The lead in curbing inflationary trends must come from the Commonwealth Government and must be supported by this Government. I believe that the Prime Minister must look hard and close at introducing next week a budget that includes measures which, though perhaps not popular, will curb the inflationary trends evident in Australia.

Law and order is another subject that is described as being in a condition of crisis. Time and time again in this debate mention has been made of the growing concern in the minds of sound-thinking citizens of this State and of this nation at the continual undercurrent caused by people who want to break down traditions built into our society

over a long period and accepted by the majority. In recent times we have seen the spectacle of strikes and demonstrations, even against sporting bodies. I suppose many eyebrows were raised among people of the same political colour as the Premier of Queensland when he declared a state of emergency in that State. However, always there are people looking for a meaningful and purposeful lead. Soon after the Queensland Premier's declaration his party had resounding victories in by-elections in Maryborough and Brisbane. Last night in this Chamber we heard about loss of voting strength in the electorate of Clarence. Political fortunes are always changing. Maryborough, the Queensland seat recently lost by Labor, was the very heart of the Labor Party in that State.

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate. I hope above all things that this Government and the Liberal-Country party coalition Government in Canberra will give meaningful purpose to considerations of these crises, especially the undercurrent against authority and the continuing inflationary trend.

Mr COX (Auburn) [12.20]: I should like to remind the honourable member for Lismore, who just resumed his seat, of a statement he made on 21st February, 1967, when he criticized his own Government in these terms:

Twenty four years of Labor governments in this State were not conducive to country development. I say this in all sincerity, but the current decision concerning teacher training colleges heavily loaded in favour of country teenagers' city cousins, to my mind displays very little improvement by the Liberal-Country party government. It demonstrates a complete lack of realism and sincerity to a major aspect of country affairs

During this debate a magnificent speech was delivered by the honourable member for Casino, who at the last election breached the Country Party area in the north. The forecast has been made that the breakthrough will take place in the north, and that the Country Party's strength in that area will gradually diminish. This is the reason why two Country Party speakers have already been on their feet during this debate. For a long period we were unable to get them into the Chamber to talk about

Country Party affairs and to make submissions on rural freight rates. Indeed, not one Country Party member has demonstrated a real interest in railway matters.

I intend to discuss transport on the basis of fares, railway employees and freights in New South Wales. Dealing first with fares, I was interested to read comments that were made by previous leaders of the Opposition. For instance, on 7th June, 1956, during the time of the Cahill Government, the honourable member for Mosman, who at that time was the Leader of the Opposition, said, "Workers and families with young children will be the hardest hit." That is what he said when a small fare increase took place. On 23rd February, 1960, the present Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, had this to say about fare increases: "The Government never seems to wake up to the fact that increased fares must lose patronage." On 20th September, 1962, the present Premier said: "Not a single word was said about the increases before the elections." Of course, before the last State elections not one word was said about the savage increases that the Liberal-Country party Government was going to inflict upon the community.

I shall give two outstanding examples of how fares have increased for people who travel on workmen's weekly tickets. In 1965, prior to the State elections, a 15-mile journey cost \$1.70. At that stage the present Premier was saying: "Let us have a little bit of Bolte in this State. He is a wonderful man. He could lead the State; his ideas are grand." However, at the same time in Victoria a 15-mile journey was costing \$2.50, which was 80 cents more than in New South Wales. A 20-mile journey was costing \$1.82 in New South Wales and \$2.74 in Victoria. Since the present Government has taken over in New South Wales the 15-mile journey has risen from \$1.70 to \$3.75, an increase of 120 per cent; also, the 20-mile journey has increased from \$1.82 to \$4.25, an increase of 133 per cent. Despite this, the Government has the hide to say that the fare increases here are lower than previous fare increases. Under Labor's last six years of office fares were increased



by 45 per cent, but under the present Government, speaking in terms of flat increases, they have gone up by 70 per cent. However, in respect of workmen's weekly tickets, the Government has slugged the family man by imposing increases of up to 175 per cent.

In recent times the honourable member for Blue Mountains intimated that he would vote against the fare increases and the Premier, with a shrewd political trick, said that he would reduce the fares from those outer areas at a cost to the State of \$150,000. Four weeks before that he gave to the country racing clubs a handout of \$250,000. What are the facts of this situation, and where does the realism come in?

Mr COWAN: The honourable member knows where the \$250,000 will come from—from the racing industry.

Mr COX: Yes, from the people who bet on the TAB—the little people. Earlier this week the Premier did not reply to a question on payroll tax. The State now has payroll tax, which has been increased from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent and will bring in \$4,000,000 for the Government. Concessions will bring in another \$4,000,000. Although it is receiving \$8,000,000 from those two items, the Government is forcing the small income man in this State to meet the total losses of the railways. I shall give the figures relating to the percentage increases of fares and freights.

It is a pity that the honourable member for Blue Mountains is not here. Though the Premier has made some small concessions in his electorate, the honourable member is still faced with the fact that a return journey from Katoomba to the city has been increased from \$2.81 to \$4.92, an increase of 75 per cent. This 75 per cent increase goes right down the line to Leura, Lawson, Linden, Valley Heights, Blaxland and Emu Plains. Admittedly, there is a fractional reduction for a fortnightly ticket, but if the honourable member for Blue Mountains intends to vote for these proposals he is deserting the people of his electorate and is not facing up to his responsibility as a member representing New South Wales as a whole. It is essential that when the by-

laws covering these increases are introduced, the Government gets the greatest kick in the pants, because the people of this State will not tolerate being priced out of government transport and being expected to pay for all the losses of this great undertaking.

Labor's policy on fares was clearly indicated during its twenty-four years of office in New South Wales. During that time we successfully kept fares to the lowest level in the Commonwealth, and bus fares were not increased from 1956 to 1965. By contrast, bus fares have been increased by the present Government on four occasions. It even seized the opportunity to increase fares when the conversion to decimal currency took place. The Government, on fares alone, stands condemned. If it wants to do something for the small family man it should have weekly tickets, and permit the wife of the weekly ticket holder to use her husband's ticket when she wants to travel to the city. The Government should make at least this concession in order to grant some relief to these people.

If this were permitted a woman would at least be able to travel to the city at the weekend on her husband's weekly ticket. It is most unfair to draw a line in relation to the sale of weekly tickets. For example, it is unreasonable to declare that from Penrith to the city weekly tickets must be purchased, but from beyond Penrith fortnightly or yearly tickets are available. Consider the anomaly of the 75 per cent increase in the cost of the return journey from Emu Plains to the city, a distance of 38 miles, compared with the 50 per cent increase in the return fare to Penrith, which is 36 miles from Sydney. The people who use the Emu Plains service must be staggered by this anomaly and they have every reason to complain about the fare structure.

Train travellers are concerned also about the frequent delays on the railway network. Let me refer briefly to some information that has been supplied to me by a man in relation to rail services from Hurstville. He informs me that a train was nine minutes late leaving the station on 23rd April, another one left fifteen minutes late on 27th April and although a train left that



station on time on 10th May, it was ten minutes late at its destination. On 13th May a train was fourteen minutes late leaving the station, another was twelve minutes late on 21st May and yet another was six minutes late on 27th May. He states that another one left thirteen minutes late on 8th June, and he points out that a metal carriage No. 3178 on the 7.40 a.m. train from Hurstville station on 15th June last was flooded as a result of a leaking roof. This gentleman informs me also that on 22nd July of this year a complete seat was missing from a carriage on the 7.40 a.m. train out of Hurstville. Such is the type of service available on the railway system in Sydney.

Mr RENSHAW: The Minister is looking into it.

Mr COX: Perhaps. Is it any wonder that delays occur when 420 of the 537 power cars in use on the railways are more than forty years old and 245 of the department's 532 trailer cars were built more than forty years ago? Yet this Government has announced that it is renewing the rail fleet. What has it achieved so far? In 1969 it built four double-deck Tulloch power cars, but it has not yet brought into service any trailer cars, except on the inter-urban service, for which it has had eight power cars and eight trailer cars constructed, bringing to twenty the number of new cars brought into service by this Government. Admittedly the Minister has 159 new cars on order. Since the Liberal-Country party Government came to office it has spent \$82,700,000 on new rolling stock compared with \$105,300,000 spent by Labor in the last six years that it was in office, a difference of \$22,600,000.

An examination of the Auditor-General's figures reveals that this Government is attempting to finance the eastern suburbs railway by cutting back on other essential railway activities. Labor is not opposed to this railway, but we say that the Government should provide extra funds for it. When the rail loop to Circular Quay was completed the government of the day had spent over a period of three years \$26,000,000, \$25,000,000 and \$27,000,000. This Government has not reached that sort of spending once in the past six years. As

a result there is a crisis in the transport services. To honour its undertakings to complete the eastern suburbs railway the Government is trying to meet the cost of construction at the expense of the whole railway network. Since its election to office this Government has not spent one cent on duplicating rail lines. So much for country Party representation in the Government.

Mr FISHER: What about the Muswellbrook to Liddell line?

Mr COX: I invite the honourable member to refer to the documents I have in which he will find that not one cent has been spent on the duplication of lines. If he doubts my word he should check the records of railway finances. Since the Government's election to office there has been a staggering deficit of \$46,700,000 in the railway system. Now people are being told that the eastern suburbs railway will cost not \$85,000,000 but \$135,000,000. Recently the Minister stated that the cause of this problem is the cost of acquiring properties but on another occasion he said:

... but I can say that acquisition costs are expected to be \$6,400,000, bringing the total cost of the project to \$85,300,000.

The Minister should give a full and proper explanation of the reasons for the staggering increase. In another couple of years we might well be told that the project will cost \$150,000,000. I leave the fare rises to deal briefly with the position of railway employees. I resent the attacks upon railway men by members of this House who, because there happens to be an industrial stoppage, vilify these men and declare that they should go to arbitration with their dispute. However, when they attempted to go to arbitration the door was slammed in their face. The Australian Railways Union tried for five years to get some clarification of its members' problems, but it could never obtain a full settlement. Some members of this House are virtually crucifying railway employees for the recent stoppage. No one likes industrial stoppages. Representing a railway electorate, I know that railway employees do not like them. However, these men have to feed and educate their children.

According to the Commonwealth Statistician's figures for the June quarter of 1970 the average national wage was \$80.40. Do members know that the average wage of railway employees is \$70? According to the statistician's figures the average national weekly wage rose from \$56.50 in 1964-65 to the present figure of \$80.40, representing a rise of 42 per cent. A comparison of railway wages for the same period reveals that the increase in the earnings of a railway worker has fallen short of the national average by about 5 per cent. In 1965-66 total wages in the railway service were \$123,800,000 compared with \$160,000,000 now, so there has been a rise over that period of \$36,200,000. Recently the Minister issued a press statement to the effect that an extra \$45,000,000 would be required to meet the last increase in the wages of railway employees. That this figure is not correct is established by the department's own records. Statements of this sort inflame these men. They and the union know that such allegations are not correct, yet the Government makes them at a time of industrial turmoil. Why does not the Government tell the truth about wages for railway employees and associated costs?

Mr MORRIS: I did not make that statement. Even though I do not want to interrupt the member's speech, I feel I should make the denial now.

Mr COX: I shall show the Minister the relevant press cutting later. Wages for government transport workers have risen from \$22,900,000 in 1960-61 to \$30,300,000 in 1969-70, representing an increase of \$7,400,000. This figure is well below the Australian average for wage fluctuations over that period. Though I admit that wage increases play a most important part in the running of an undertaking like the railway system, they should not be advanced as the only reason for increasing fares. That would not be disclosing the facts.

I want to refer now to freights to establish that a sharp decline has occurred in this aspect of rail operations. They tell a most remarkable story about the management of the railways. In 1960-61 total

freight income was \$124,100,000, compared with \$172,900,000 in 1969-70. In 1964-65 101,425 waggons of sheep and cattle were loaded by the New South Wales Department of Railways but by 1969-70 the figure had declined to 50,692.

Mr FISHER: What about refrigerated vans?

Mr COX: I shall come to those in a moment. Let me now give the Commonwealth Statistician's figures for livestock slaughtered for human consumption. In 1964-65 the total was 13,800,000, and in 1968-69 it had risen to 14,300,000. Railway statistics show that in 1964-65 33,333 waggon loads of fertilizer were carried, and in 1969-70, 21,496. The relevant figures for flour are 19,824 and 14,410; fodder, 28,024 and 12,165. The rural crisis is responsible for this greatly reduced figure. In 1964-65, under the heading of general freights, 293,278 waggons were used, and in 1968-69 272,728. The loads increased in that period under the headings of interstate traffic and metals. Other decreases were from 107,485 to 103,970 in the carriage of ores and from 104,592 to 82,614 in the carriage of perishables. Steel loads increased, but in that period the number of timber waggons decreased from 37,185 to 31,885, and for bagged and bulk wheat from 163,277 to 154,422. There were reductions of 27.3 per cent in the carriage of flour, 7 per cent in general freight, 3.3 per cent in ores, 21 per cent in perishables, 14.3 per cent in timber, 5.4 per cent in wheat, 5.1 per cent in wool and 35.5 per cent in fertilizer.

Figures from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics show that in 1964-65, 837,956 tons of fertilizer were used, and 902,000 tons in 1968-69. These are the latest figures available. Tonnage in 1968-69 increased by 19.8 per cent compared with tonnage in 1965, and by 29.7 per cent compared with tonnage in 1964. However, railway freight revenue increased by only 13.9 per cent since 1964 and passenger revenue by 17.1 per cent. In 1964-65 passenger revenue was 24.26 per cent of total revenue, and in 1969-70 25.32 per cent. On the increases just announced, passenger fares will constitute 32.7 per cent of

total revenue. Passengers are being compelled to defray the heavy losses on the railways. The fare increases are staggering. Housing Commission figures show that 47.8 per cent of the commission's tenants earn less than \$60 a week. It is grossly unfair to saddle them with fare increases of 68 per cent.

Mr FISHER: The honourable member did not give the bulk wheat figure.

Mr COX: Bagged wheat and bulk wheat were down by 5.4 per cent. The honourable member for Casino has not been a member of this Chamber for long, but it is to his credit that he made representations to the Commissioner for Railways for a siding in his electorate so that more stock could be sent from that area. At present the railways are handling only half this traffic. As a rural man, the honourable member is interested in boosting railway freights and improving rail services for country people. The Commissioner for Railways has now agreed to provide this facility so that more stock may be moved from that area. Revenue from coal amounts to \$24,000,000 a year on a total load of approximately 12,000,000 tons and the average haul is thirty-eight miles. The cost of transporting coal from pit to railhead is \$2 a ton and the railway freight is 4.75 cents per ton per mile. It costs the railways from 3.2 to 3.7 cents a ton to move the coal.

What is happening with Clutha Development? It has been said that Clutha's coal production could be as high as 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 tons a year. The Government, by letting Clutha Development Proprietary Limited build a private railway, is virtually bleeding the railways of this State. At the rate of 10,000,000 tons of coal for the first year, the loss to the State railways from losing this business would be \$6,000,000. This figure will increase. Such a situation can lead only to further price rises for rail services. The Government should ask railway experts to make an inquiry immediately, perhaps assisted by people from Professor Blunden's staff at the University of New South Wales.

If the Government allows this situation to deteriorate, instead of a deficit of \$26,700,000 there will be a deficit of

\$50,000,000 before long. Railway finances are slowly running down the drain. The railways face an economic crisis, which will not be solved by the Minister's sitting over there and not arranging for an inquiry. Loss of railway freight revenue is a serious matter. The railways are largely dependent on coal and steel for their revenue. By letting the Clutha deal go on, the Government will make it extremely difficult for the railways to survive. I call for an expert inquiry into the whole question of railway freights, on which the Government has been lax. The Country Party has been a dismal failure on this question. The Opposition will not tolerate this situation. The Government's only solution was to impose savage fare increases on railway passengers. This is grossly unfair. The Government is not facing the situation at all. Freights are the lifeblood of the railways. Railway revenue must be increased if the railways are to become a viable trading organization, but the Government is not going out after business. The figures show that the railways are losing out in competition to the road hauliers. I challenge the Government, which is satisfied to surrender railway freight business. The Government has allowed road hauliers to get a big share of business that should go to the railways.

The railways provide a worthwhile service for the rural community, and for Government supporters to suggest that it is all right for road hauliers to handle freight traffic is an indictment of them. The Government should be encouraging freight traffic for the railways, but it is not doing so. The Government's policy is denying freight traffic to the railways. The Department of Railways is not getting its proper share of revenue from freights with the result that passengers are being slugged and are paying more than they should be asked to pay. I challenge the Minister in the interests of the State and the railways to institute this inquiry in an attempt to help the railways win back the alarming loss of freight revenue.

Mr DARBY (Manly) [12.50]: First I should like to say how much I appreciated the contributions made to the debate by

my neighbour and colleague the honourable member for Wakehurst and by the honourable member for Sturt, who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I pay my tribute to those members who have made their maiden speeches. A large number of those who have delivered their maiden speeches in this debate have invited attention to the inadequacies of this antiquated building. At the very inception of responsible government in 1856, the existing parliamentary building, built in 1816 and subsequently extended, was regarded as inadequate. [*Quorum formed.*] Since then the population of our State has increased from 266,000 to 4,650,000. Throughout that period complaints about our Parliament House have persisted.

In 1861 William Lynn received a prize of £600 for a design for a new building. In 1888, the centennial year, the Governor, Lord Carrington, solemnly laid a foundation stone on a site now occupied by the Public Library. In 1897 Sir George Reid said, "... it is simply a rotten building; dangerous to maintain." Recently large sums have been spent on repairing the ravages of white ants and dry rot. It is a serious fire hazard, and it provides substandard working conditions for all concerned. In 1967, Sir John Overall decided not to recommend that a new parliament house be placed in The Rocks area, but that it should be built on the site of Sydney Hospital. Tentative plans have been prepared.

Within a short period, perhaps eighteen months, a decision will be made. It will be important for the new buildings that they should be designed for the year 2100 rather than 1970 and for a population of 50,000,000—the population of England today—rather than 5,000,000. When the decision is made, it should be specific, otherwise it may just be wishful thinking. The target, I believe, should be for an official opening on Tuesday, 26th January, 1988, the 200th anniversary of the foundation of our State.

Have we courage enough to resolve that the new Parliament House will be remote from Sydney? Concentration of our population in a tiny coastal area has always hung

*Mr Darby*]

over us like an ugly cloud. Geographical considerations have certainly favoured such concentration, but the marriage of political and commercial power has been largely responsible. Should New South Wales stand for Newcastle, Sydney and Wollongong? Over 75 per cent of our population now lives in that complex. Despite all the speeches and all the expenditure and effort to date, concentration continues. The population of the complex is expected to double in the next thirty years while the population elsewhere will remain almost static. Those who are able to detach themselves from conservative complacency regard the situation as a disaster. We now live in a society which by sheer effort, brilliant adaptation of scientific discovery and imaginative social legislation has buried the spectre of poverty. Yet indefensible stupidity has condemned us to the hopeless frustration of our present metropolitan existence. Despite astronomical expenditure, our traffic congestion is an abomination. Having succeeded in reducing hours of work, greatly reducing the physical and mental fatigue of a working day, we find that the worker himself has to add at least one-quarter of his working time in an exhausting effort to get to and from his home and his place of employment.

The State Planning Authority talks in terms of \$2,600 million being required in the next thirty years for our metropolitan roadway needs. The water board wants to spend \$2,000 million in the same period. Only in the past few years have we suddenly realized that we are polluting ourselves out of existence. Over all this is the shadow of social deterioration. The crime waves, the recourse to drugs, the disintegration of family life, the increasing incidence of mental disorders and the anarchic resentment of authority, are distinctive symptoms of the disease of metropolititis. We need a better, wider term than decentralization, or deconcentration. We should talk positively of the dispersal of our population so that, taking full advantage of our skills, we can live and work in comfort, and develop the good that is inherent in us. Our own society, as we know it, is governmentally dominated. The example

of population dispersal must be proclaimed by our Government. Is the Government prepared to break away from a conservatism which has crept over us in recent years, and re-establish an adventurous pioneering spirit? Are we courageous enough to announce that we shall build our new Parliament House at least a hundred miles from Sydney?

Fortunately, we have a Premier who is deeply conscious of this problem. One of the main planks of his policy speech in 1965 was the establishment of a separate Ministry of Decentralisation and Development. During the past six years, under the energetic guidance of the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller, \$32,000,000 has been allocated and 550 firms have set themselves up in 150 rural centres; 125 of them having moved the whole of their enterprise to a rural location. The direct employment of 12,500 persons means that 65,000 people have been withdrawn from the drift to the cities. At first, the Hon. J. B. M. Fuller was unable to spend the money available to him, but his plans have gained such wide acceptance that entrepreneurs are seeking his advice rather than listening rather coldly to his contention that industrial enterprises do better in country towns where labour turnover is less and workers live close to their place of work. The present seminar organized by the Real Estate Institute illustrates the popular acceptance of the Government's campaign.

In 1950, in discussions with Sir Vernon Treatt, I first put forward the idea of an impetus. I argued that the Government should give an impetus to the growth of selected country towns so that a population of at least 50,000 people could be reached in a few years. Until such a population is exceeded, employment and education opportunities are so limited that ambitious youth migrates to the city. The theory lay in the pigeonholes until 1968 when it was vindicated by the Development Corporation in its special report. The Government, at the moment, has difficulty in implementing the report because of the conflicting aims of country towns. No bigger impetus could be given than a decision to transfer the seat of government.

Praiseworthy as the efforts of the Department of Decentralisation are, and necessary as it is to start the wheels turning, we should not plan to achieve the dispersal of our population by constant subsidy. Dispersal is so necessary, and so beneficial, that once the story is told, once the Government has set the example itself, the business world will gladly accept the principle and act accordingly. It is not necessary for a seat of government to be located in a metropolis. Of the fifty states in the United States of America, only eighteen have their largest town as their capital city.

Many more examples could be quoted, but recent developments in communication have made it much more acceptable to have a capital remote from a metropolis, apart from the fact that in a modern metropolis it is often more difficult to reach its centre from an outlying suburb than from a distant city.

*[Mr Speaker left the chair at 1 p.m. The House resumed at 2.30 p.m.]*

Mr DARBY: Within twenty years we shall be living, as it were, in a global village. Our new Parliament House will reflect the new age by including a heliport, a rapid transit station and an extensive car park. Commuters generally will use public transport rather than their own private conveyances. Most members of Parliament would be able to travel from a heliport near their homes within an hour. Some of those perhaps would travel also by aeroplane, but the journey would still be completed within an hour. An increasing proportion of metropolitan members live in outlying suburbs, and many of these would be able to travel to a Parliament House in a rural area quicker than by the tortuous journey to the centre of Sydney.

We have now begun our entry into the computer age. The effect upon government activities will be revolutionary. In the not far distant future a special journey by a citizen to the head office of a government department will be extremely rare. In every constituency there will be at least one government information office to deal with a full range of government activities. Citizens then will be able to study on a

video screen, or on rapidly typed documents, information that they requested only a few minutes previously. They will be able to make any necessary application on the spot, and receive the benefit of immediate expert advice.

In addition to the fascination of the new service that the computer age can provide, there is the recognition that a computer control centre, or a central reference centre, or any other device in the computer network, can be located at any place or places desired, without any interference with efficiency. The selection of that focus, or these focal points, can actually be made now or at any time during the next ten, or twenty, or thirty years, or however long it takes before all our government services are on computers. Apart from the use of such inventions as telex, we can look forward to easily arranged visual telephonic meetings with the participants long distances from each other. I refer to the telecommunications brochure that all honourable members have received in the past two or three days.

In short, by the time a new Parliament House is erected the factors which make it unnecessary to have a seat of government within walking distance of a commercial centre of a metropolis will be so mature that there will be no inconvenience at all. One further point may be added. Modern developments, of which television is only one, permit communities relatively isolated to enjoy the benefits of those cultural associations which hitherto were confined to large centres of population.

A new capital situated in rural New South Wales should be located as near as possible to the future centre of population gravity of the State. Its local resources must be adequate for a population that may reach, ultimately, a half-million, but could perhaps reach 200,000 by the end of this century. Some 200 square miles of well watered fertile terrain unimpeded by mountains or gorges is requisite. Water resources and potential sewerage facilities should be adequate without extensive pumping. It should be close to supplies of foodstuffs, building materials, and raw materials for industry. Easy communica-

*Mr Darby]*

tion by air, rail and road should be possible to all parts of the State. A decision would have to be made on whether the new city should be created out of farming or forest land, or use an established town or city as a nucleus.

The site of Canberra was selected as the future capital for Australia so that there could be an entirely new city, unhampered by any previous development. I do not think the Canberra experiment should be repeated. Those who laid out the city, constructed its original roads, erected its early buildings, and planted its original trees, lived in temporary huts and returned to their homes in other towns when each particular project was completed. They treated Canberra as if it were just another damn job. For over thirty years Canberra was an awkward and unsatisfactory agglomeration. It was even threatened with abandonment. Now that its population is over 100,000 its growing pains have ceased, and it can provide a wide range of occupational opportunities for its young people.

Canberra started off on the wrong foot with its unnecessarily jealous leasehold system. True it was that no private person should make windfall profits from land given an added value by government activity, but those who were given original leaseholds find themselves now with an asset which they acquired at a bargain price. Canberra has cost the Australian taxpayer far more money than is generally confessed. These enormous costs would not have occurred if the new capital had incorporated an established town or its development had been organized by a statutory authority which could acquire land, subdivide it, and sell at a profit.

It has long been recognized that housing estates, new suburbs and even new cities can be created with a considerable profit for the developer. In outer Sydney today a residential block costs \$7,500. The cost of providing access roads and other services should be less than \$2,500. This means that with a minimum of four blocks an acre, a gross return of \$20,000 an acre is available. With the value of the land for intensive agricultural use at \$400 an acre and survey and other costs reaching \$600 an

acre, the profit on each acre is \$19,000. This profit may, of course, be now shared among a succession of speculators, but if a new capital city is to be erected, comparable profits can be made by a development authority. The windfall profits available to developers because of the expansion of cities is the justification for the recent tax of 30 per cent of the added value when non-urban land is rezoned for residential or commercial purposes.

In the Canberra experiment, parliament buildings and office blocks were built first and gradually a city formed itself, and the needed amenities emerged. If the device of expanding an existing city is adopted, those who expand it will live in the city and be part of it. Not only will the progress be natural and satisfactory during the first sixteen years, and subsequently, but also there will be a useful profit for the developing authority.

The Seat of Government Act to authorize the erection of a new Parliament House and the change of the seat of government in 1988 should provide for the establishment of a development authority. It should be constituted similarly to our present State Planning Authority with representatives from the municipal and shire councils concerned, and, for the developmental period, it should assume all planning responsibilities. Its major role would be to define the ultimate area for the new capital, and then to plan and execute its development. It would be given the power to resume all land within the new city area with compensation satisfactory to the owners. As new suburbs are laid out, it would auction land for private use and negotiate the sale or lease of other lands to government departments or organizations concerned with community welfare.

With the progressive transfer of possibly 15,000 public servants, the consequential service industries, and new commercial and industrial undertakings which would be attracted, an additional population of 150,000 can reasonably be anticipated. After provision of local services, the profit on the sale of the home sites, industrial sites, and other areas of land could well be of the order of \$60,000,000. This money

would be progressively available for the construction of administrative buildings, inter-suburban roads, parks, beautification schemes and general amenities for local communities. Funds would be progressively available as loans for water and sewerage capital works, electricity reticulation, construction of rapid transit systems, and similar undertakings. Interest on such loans would provide continuous funds for future development. There would certainly be sufficient financial resources to donate to the State Government all land for its parliamentary and administrative buildings as well as making a substantial contribution to the building of a new Parliament House.

It should, of course, be borne in mind that the expense of building new schools, hospitals, police stations and other government buildings should not be regarded as the cost of building the new capital, as they would have to be built in an ever-expanding Sydney anyhow. It should be recognized also that any government office building in Sydney that becomes redundant can be readily sold, possibly for a price in excess of the original construction cost. Further, the government would save considerable sums for rented office space no longer required.

Unfortunately the idealism of Canberra has not been followed in the extension of our established cities. Only occasionally do we find a new suburb that shows any imagination in design or a determination to provide ideal surroundings for residence or for occupational pursuits. In the 20th century we have perfected the kind of dwelling we want for a family and how it can give adequate provision for all kinds of amenities. What has been sadly neglected is the ideal location of a dwelling in relation to the situation of places of work, study, obligation or relaxation. Yes, our standards of living have undoubtedly improved, if standards of living are measured by real wages, working conditions and housing, but a requisite standard of life cannot be enjoyed unless we ensure that a home is located to provide convenient, safe and rapid access to the other elements of our civilization.

A required standard of life means that no dwelling should have its entrance on to a busy thoroughfare, that a pre-school kindergarten is within a few minutes walking distance, that primary schools are within an easy walk, high schools within short bus or train rides and tertiary education facilities well within a half hour's travel. The worker should be able to join a rapid transit system close to his home and have only a short walk from a terminal station to his place of employment and his time of journey should be less than half an hour. I firmly believe that just as we have been able to achieve the present convenience of a modern home, so the ideal location of homes and all other buildings can be attained. The creation of a new capital city in our State will give a magnificent opportunity to demonstrate how a newly conceived city can improve our standard of life.

In my search for a suitable location I believe that Bathurst is the answer. It has, as Macquarie discovered, an adequate terrain with nearby areas of excellent soils. Large areas are irrigable. A recent report on the water resources confirms that in an adequate catchment and drainage area, water and sewerage can be readily provided with full reticulation for a population of 120,000 with an estimated capital expenditure of \$13,000,000 and \$14,500,000 respectively. This is certainly less than that required for comparable Sydney expansion. Bathurst has excellent deposits of building clay and river sand. Cement works are close; important sources of cypress pine are nearer than for Sydney. Bathurst will shortly be the centre of an ever-expanding softwood milling industry. Considerable stands of good hardwood timber are in the locality. It will be sited on or near the main natural gas line. Steel is the only major construction requirement not available in the vicinity.

Bathurst is on the main western railway line and has adequate facilities for expansion of its railway yards and the economical construction of radiating suburban railway lines. It is the focal point of an established road system with the exception of northern access. At least one

*Mr Darby]*

new road would be needed to link it to the Hunter Valley. Its convenient and expandable airport is only a few miles from the city centre. Access to the amenities of the coast and to Sydney is now reasonable and in the future will be much easier. Its climate is more moderate than Canberra's and less enervating than Sydney's.

Macquarie and those who followed him in laying out one of the best planned cities of Australia would have been very disappointed if after 150 years the population would have been less than 20,000. As it is, Bathurst with its splendid existing town planning is well situated for expansion. All its public and semi-public institutions can readily absorb, or be readily expanded to absorb, an increasing population until larger institutions can be progressively established. The fact that Bathurst is now certain to expand of its own impetus whether a new parliament building is to be opened in sixteen years or not, ensures that the progression towards its becoming the capital of New South Wales will be orderly. The historical, educational and cultural associations are a final and conclusive determinant.

My conviction that the theory of the impetus should be implemented led me to the bold decision in 1952 that we should plan to transfer the capital of New South Wales to a country centre. A letter published by the *Sydney Morning Herald* and other discussions made me feel that citizens generally would have to experience the problems of concentrated metropolitan living for a longer period before they would be prepared to consider such a drastic contribution to population dispersal. Early in 1967 I communicated my thoughts to the Premier. By that time I was convinced of the suitability of Bathurst and that a target date for 1988 should be set. The honourable member for Bathurst to whom I confided shortly after his election, asked a general question in December, 1967, but it was not until October, 1968, that Bathurst was first mentioned in parliamentary debate. Mr John Yeomans in the *Sun-Herald* wrote an appreciative article and the leading article did not disparage the idea. I was invited to address a meeting in Bathurst in



January, 1969. A strong committee was appointed, under the capable chairmanship of the mayor, Alderman John Matthews and a seminar arranged for 10th November, 1970, attracted considerable publicity. Dr Colin Clarke said he favoured a country centre for the new Parliament House.

When the *Sydney Morning Herald* published a feature article on 10th December, 1970, a significant break-through was achieved. Mr Elias Duek-Cohen of the University of New South Wales and Professor Winston of the University of Sydney were among the town planners who publicly declared support. When interviewed next day the Premier, though cautious, did not discourage the movement. Since then the committee has continued its work. Its report when completed will be of considerable assistance to the Government. The committee fortunately has the support of the staff of the Mitchell College of Advanced Education. I am delighted that arrangements are proceeding for the college to establish the first known faculty of decentralization. The recent articles by Mr Ron Saw in the *Daily Telegraph* and Mr Tony Stephens in the *Sunday Australian* are indicative of public interest in the proposal. I pay a personal tribute to the late William Dow who as editor of the *Bathurst Advocate* championed the cause from its inception until his sudden death early this year.

The Bathurst committee has approved in principle the suggestion of a development authority. In fact I found that a pilot scheme of local development is already in operation. The new suburb of Eleura, which adjoins Kelso and is less than three miles from the centre of Bathurst, is being developed, and the surplus from the sale of the residential blocks at prices from \$2,000 to \$3,000 permits all public utilities to be supplied and reticulated. My suggestion that resumption by the Bathurst planning authority be made on the basis of twice the U.C.V. as at January 1st, 1971, with a 5 per cent annual increment has been favourably received. I feel confident that the local governments concerned would gladly co-operate. The Rocks area is going to be splendidly developed by the Sydney Cove

Redevelopment Authority. It will present assets as a gift to the ratepayers of Sydney, and considerable profits to the State Treasury.

Members of this House and the public generally are now challenged to take a new look at the disease of "metropolitis" which is attacking New South Wales more extensively than perhaps any other place in the world. "Populate or perish" used to be the cry of the politicians at the beginning of the century. Now it should be, "Dispersal or disaster". Disaster will come not only from the intensification of those economic and social problems of which we have ample evidence, but from the simple fact that if we are not capable of dispersing our population adequately to use the spacious lands beyond our coast, there are many crowded nations to the north of us who would lay a justifiable claim to succeed where we have failed.

Leadership in dispersal must be taken by the government. The plan I have outlined is not a panic measure, but orderly and progressive. Modern technical capacities will make it relatively simple, and satisfactorily refute objections which belong now, I trust, to a bygone age. It is definitely feasible that the project can be financially self-contained. In fact, the enormous cost of trying to keep Sydney in working order will be reduced. Sydney will not languish when the announcement of the removal of the capital is made, but its choking growth will be reduced. The amount of retardation will depend upon how the example given by the Government is followed by private industry.

We have now an opportunity to extend a new vision of living, to establish new standards and to translate the dreams of Cadbury, Ebenezer Howard, Edward Bok and Burley Griffin into modern reality. I do not ask for a decision by the Government now. I do request the Premier to ask the Minister for Decentralisation and Development to confer with the Bathurst for Capital Committee, to check the validity of the statements I have made and the practicability of the project. If his report is favourable, as I am sure it will be, I am confident that the Premier himself will confer with the

committee and then, knowing that the deliberations of that committee are valid and well founded, will make a favourable recommendation to Cabinet.

Mr BEDFORD (Fairfield) [2.50]: I congratulate honourable members who made their maiden speeches in this debate. I hope that they will continue to contribute to our deliberations on a policy and not a personal level, and that the amicable feelings between members on both sides of the House will be experienced by them also.

Reference was made in His Excellency's Speech to proposed legislation. One matter to be dealt with is pensions for widows of railwaymen. Another is pollution control over motor vehicles. Some research has been done into that matter recently, though there seems to be a difference of opinion between State and federal authorities on devices that could be used to control such pollution. I trust that the Minister for Environment Control will be giving that matter his attention. His Excellency mentioned in the Speech that measures will be introduced to amend the Teaching Service Act and the Higher Education Act. In the omnibus paragraph it is stated that other measures will be placed before us. Two matters that I should like to see something done about under that section are motor vehicle insurance and an education commission.

I would compliment the honourable member for Manly on the amount of research he put into his study of decentralization and a possible new parliamentary capital for this State. His proposal is something for honourable members to think about. In the present position, anything would be a step forward.

The other night the honourable member for Northcott gave a dissertation from his little red book. He might have done this in an attempt to stiffen up his party because at the moment Mr McMahon is telegraphing his punches to Mr Gorton. Perhaps the present events will be the last straw that breaks the camel's back. It seemed that the honourable member for Northcott was addressing members here in the same way as he would speak to a pre-selection committee in his electorate. If that

is what he was doing, I should point out a few differences that exist between what goes on at a preselection meeting in his area and one in my electorate.

I can see members of a preselection committee in my area asking me simple questions like: "Eric, if I go on to workers' compensation, will I be called a bludger? Eric, will there be enough teachers in our schools next year? Eric, do you think we will be able to afford increases in transport charges?" They would not ask me whether John Stuart Mill meant what he said when he spoke about freedom. The honourable member for Northcott gives us flowery speeches and sometimes he makes a fruity one, because I remember on one occasion he referred to an avocado economy. If there is ever any meat in his speeches, I suggest that it is tripe.

I turn to education. In New South Wales there is a great divergence between the teaching service and the Teachers Federation on the one hand and the Minister for Education on the other. I think the Minister is either ill-advised or is being pushed by a group of Government members. I shall give an example of this. The honourable member for Northcott spoke about the situation at Beecroft school and made statements that were highly inflammatory. My colleague the honourable member for Mount Druitt has received a letter from Beecroft and if I may, I shall read parts of it. The letter is addressed to my colleague.

Mr RUDDOCK: Could you state the name of the person who wrote the letter?

Mr BEDFORD: The lady who wrote the letter has asked that her name not be mentioned. I have checked on the electoral roll and her name appears there and I would make it available to the Speaker and to the Minister if necessary.

Mr RUDDOCK: On a point of order. If a letter is to be read in this House and an inquiry has to be made about the signatory, that name should be advised to the House.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr MAHONEY): Order! The position is that if a letter is read in full, the name of the sender and the letter should be disclosed to the House. However, if a member does not read the

full letter but just refers to it, it is not necessary to supply the name of the person who wrote it.

Mr BEDFORD: I shall quote portions of it. The letter reads, in part:

I am writing this letter to defend the Beecroft Infants' School Mothers' Club against untrue accusations made by Mr J. Cameron, M.L.A. We object to being made use of by Mr Cameron as a stick to beat his old enemy, the Teachers Federation. While many of us regret the lack of open day, and the Teachers Federation actions, we certainly have never intended an open confrontation with the staff.

The letter then goes on to explain the sequence of events that occurred at the school but I shall not go through them in detail. The letter continues:

Mr Cameron is not correct in saying that the community of Beecroft is united in condemnation of the staff. The people of Beecroft are looking for co-operation, which is not forthcoming at staff level. In fact, a great deal of support has been expressed for the staff since Thursday. The head mistress, Miss Hodges, has received many messages of support from parents and community leaders.

A little later the letter reads:

Mr Cameron's remarks on Beecroft School's modern buildings are largely true for the primary section, but in the infants school the staff room and the music room are in a wing that is over 70 years old. There are also large heaps of demolition materials, such as old roofing tiles which have been lying in the infants' playground since last December, waiting for the Department of Public Works to come and remove them. The infants' playground area is thus in a pretty poor state.

Wrong information was put before the House and people in the area have felt it necessary to state the position correctly. The attacks that have been made on teachers have embarrassed the Minister and caused friction between him and the Teachers Federation. I believe the attacks have done a great disservice to the Minister. The honourable member for Fuller continued the same sort of attack yesterday. He spoke of a so-called crisis. How bad does he want the situation to get before he is prepared to admit that there is a crisis in education? Senior officers of the Department of Education recognize that there is a crisis, because they have got to the stage where they are prepared to put in black and white the position in regard to staff shortages.

It is clear to everyone who is associated with education—not those who want to deal with it in a witch-hunt sort of fashion, but those who take a real interest in it—that there is a crisis and that the Government must do something about it. The honourable member for Fuller spent some time in giving us a run-down on the executive of the Teachers Federation, but this is not the important thing as far as education is concerned. He said that files from his secret service seemed to reveal many factions in the executive of the Teachers Federation. He spoke last night about various members of different groups, but I cannot remember them all. I think Albania was mentioned as one, and Peking and Moscow. I think he was right about Yugoslavia. He would not declare himself about Mr Whalan.

Mr COLEMAN: There are only two—the Aarons group and the Clancy group.

Mr BEDFORD: I am not worried about either one. The point is that when I add up all the groups referred to and divide that number into the number of members on the executive of the New South Wales Teachers Federation, which is seventeen, they must be very small groups, and there must be some very fancy coalescing for them to get together and arrive at any decision at all. I think the honourable member for Fuller has gone up the wrong lane. He is not really concerned about the education system. He only wants to put forward his own ideas about what should be done. However, I believe that members on both sides of the House share my view that education is in a critical state. The position can be summed up by acknowledging that there are increasing enrolments and higher retention rates in forms. There is an increasing rate of resignation among teachers coupled with a disappointing overseas inflow of teachers.

I remember by way of interjection last year I asked the Minister, when he was referring to the overseas recruitment campaign, how many teachers he expected to recruit from overseas. He told me that 21,000 applications had been received. Some of them must have been unsatisfactory, because we seem to have been able

to recruit only 500 people from that source. I do not know how successful this overseas recruiting campaign has been. The other thing is that there are reduced teaching periods this year. We have gone back from forty to thirty-nine teaching periods.

The Teachers Federation and members of parents and citizens associations have been asking that a 40-period week be reintroduced in schools. It was hoped that this would happen in 1972 but we are going backwards. There will be more reductions. Sport is to be eliminated from high schools. I shall not refer to this subject as it has been fully canvassed by the honourable member for Wallsend. I agree with everything he said. I am concerned about what will happen to elective subjects, particularly in the senior section of schools. I intend to refer only to secondary schooling. At a later stage another Opposition member will address himself to the primary area of education.

The errors that have been made in estimating intakes into schools are quite apparent. I think they have been honest mistakes, but I am concerned lest they be repeated in the next decade. Not one demographer has been appointed to any committee set up to advise on education. Any demographer at one of our universities would confirm that Australia is entering a second wave of the baby boom that followed World War II. This sort of information must be obtained now by the people who make decisions in the education field otherwise by about 1975 primary schools will face the same problem that secondary schools now have.

I should like to refer to a letter written by Mr J. Buggie, deputy-director general of education, administration, and addressed to Mr I. G. Lancaster, general secretary of the Teachers Federation. I shall quote figures in respect of estimated teacher staffing for 1972. The figures are frightening but the one that concerns me most is that next year it is expected that 2,270 teachers will resign. This is the whole crux of teacher shortage. The resignation rate is 13.1 per cent. Why do teachers resign? About six weeks ago the Minister appointed a committee of three—I do not know what the

*Mr Bedford]*

education advisory commission is doing—to inquire into why teachers leave the Department of Education. The report of that committee is due and I look forward to seeing it soon. Why are teachers resigning? I do not profess to know all the answers.

Mr MEAD: It is not only in the teaching profession that there are many resignations.

Mr BEDFORD: It is happening in other industries, too, but I know of no other industry in which the resignation rate has increased in such an alarming way.

Mr CAMERON: The New South Wales teacher resignation rate is about half the Canadian rate.

Mr BEDFORD: The point is that young teachers go straight from college into a situation where they find it almost impossible to engage in the kind of enlightened teaching methods taught to them in college. This is because of the difficult circumstances in so many schools. New teachers take one look at their surroundings and decide teaching there is not for them. They try somewhere else. Possibly this is a reason for some resignations, though obviously there are others. The teacher loss rate has increased from 8.2 per cent in 1965 to 13.1 per cent in 1970. New South Wales cannot afford that wastage. If somewhere along the way we could have held it at even 10 per cent it would have meant that in 1970 New South Wales would have had 2,027 more teachers than it has now. This would cover our extra needs for next year. A survey to ascertain why teachers are leaving their jobs should have been made some years ago. Something should have been done to retain these teachers in the service and so avoid what is now described as a crisis. Education in the outer metropolitan area of Sydney and in some country areas will be a pure shambles at the beginning of the next school year.

Mr CAMERON: The honourable member has said that for the past three years.

Mr BEDFORD: That is so and I have been correct. It will be an even greater shambles next year. Lack of teachers is our greatest social problem and causes

much upheaval in the community. People who previously had never bothered to demonstrate now do so. People who never before went to a school meeting turn up to have their say. Parents are worried because their children are worried. There must inevitably be a reduction in the quality of teaching in this State. It is difficult to ask a teacher who has been trained to teach French to take a mathematics class. Teachers do not like doing this, but they put forward their best effort and try to get the message across. Teachers are trained to teach perhaps two or three subjects, yet they are told to teach another subject. A teacher may have dropped mathematics when in fourth form and subsequently completed university studies in a completely different field. For instance, a trained historian may be told by the department to take mathematics classes. That is not good administration.

Pupils have lost confidence in the system, particularly since the department's announcement that no allowance will be made for a reduced number of teaching periods or large turnover of staff. Many high schools in Sydney have had a succession of eight or ten mathematics teachers in the one year. This causes lack of continuity in teaching and has led to students' lack of confidence in the system. Some students will soon sit for major examinations and compete against other students who have attended favoured or lucky schools where school work has not suffered major disruption.

Mr COLEMAN: What is the honourable member's solution to all these problems?

Mr BEDFORD: I am coming to my solutions. The Director-General of Education has been left to carry the baby. No doubt honourable members will have noticed that of late the director-general has been making all sorts of press statements. Apparently the Minister has washed his hands of these problems. I am not attacking public servants. I say, let us give the director-general a go. On 6th August the *Sydney Morning Herald* published an article about Mr David Verco, the Director-

General of Education. He was asked his views about his role as director-general and he replied:

I see my main role as to look ahead in terms of the quality of education.

That is good thinking. I say, let us give him a go. What chance have we to obtain high quality education if we cannot avoid the sort of problems education will face next year? Mr Verco continued:

Greater emphasis on individualized instruction of pupils.

Yet the staff will be reduced next year. He continued to describe his new role:

Equality of educational opportunity.

Some members of this House were on a platform with me recently when we were speaking about this topic. We agreed that equality should exist. Mr Verco said he saw his role as including:

Teaching pupils how to think, not what to think.

That is what we should build into the system. I remember a student by the name of Collie who wanted to go to teachers college. Because he had worn a Vietnam moratorium badge he did not get there. The director-general continued:

Assisting youngsters to develop their own system of values.

I should like to refer now to some cases that have occurred in my own area. Recently the honourable member for Northcott referred to the enviable conditions at a Beecroft school. I come from the outer western suburbs where things are pretty rough and tough. A few nights ago 450 people attended a meeting at Cabramatta high school called by the staff to discuss staffing problems. Some parents are not happy because their sons have had to take cooking as their craft subject because no manual art teacher is available for this school. Perhaps that is all right; some might make good chefs. Some of the boys might like cooking instruction, but the plain fact of the matter is that the lack of a manual arts teacher has led to these students' being put in a cooking class.

As a result of the turnover of staff that school is short of five or six teachers a year. Next year I hate to think what is going to

happen. At the meeting they asked me what I was going to do about it. I only wish that I could do something for the 450 people who attended were unhappy. I have received 100 or more letters from the Fairfield girls high school, complaining that they do not have a mathematics teacher this year and some of the girls are soon to sit for important examinations. The Minister's reply was that the staffing situation was bad all round, and that the department could do nothing about it. That is cold comfort for the children and the parents, who naturally are worried.

I have a letter from the staff of the Fairvale high school. This letter of 8th June, 1971, was sent to the Minister and states:

We bring to your notice the fact that we are 2.4 members of staff below the number set by the Department of Education for this school for 1971.

That was after the discussion with the conciliation commissioner. They were 2.4 teachers down on what they were told they would get. The letter went on—

This is the equivalent of 72 periods per week. When the resignation of another member of staff takes effect at the end of June, this figure could jump to 102 periods.

Our attempts to provide teaching and supervision for the classes involved have, of necessity, been in the nature of a compromise. This is a standard of education below the level which the pupils and parents of this area have a right to expect.

We go further than this, and claim that these "makeshift" arrangements in this year, as in previous years, have been positively harmful in that—

1. They have caused not satisfaction, but dissatisfaction amongst the pupils and teachers involved.

2. They have led to a lowering of the standard of work and behaviour on the part of the pupils which tends to be carried over into other periods.

3. They are causing pupils to develop a poor attitude towards education—an attitude which, once established, is difficult to change.

4. They are causing loss of "job satisfaction" amongst the staff concerned—i.e. the feeling that you are doing a worthwhile job and are being given the chance to do it well.

Having in mind the remarks of the honourable member for Fuller, I do not know to which group these teachers belong. I shall give him their names, and he can

*Mr Bedford]*

do a run-down on them. I believe that they are really interested in the education of the children, irrespective of the group or party to which they belong. They have outlined their feelings in this letter, and it is obvious that they are worried. The honourable member for Fuller asked why the federation does not solve this problem.

Mr COLEMAN: No, I asked what constructive solutions it offered.

Mr BEDFORD: I am coming to that. Losses and shortages of staff are not its responsibility. The federation has tried to draw attention to the crisis, and I shall refer later to this aspect. The federation's suggestions have been mentioned in press statements and in articles that have appeared in *Education*, the journal of the Teachers Federation. In a press statement the federation said:

The responsibility rests with the governments of the past ten years—

Labor, too, gets a bit of criticism; that makes it nice and ecumenical. The press release went on:

—and in particular with the current government and Minister for Education who have been in office long enough now to have taken those measures which would have produced the teachers to cope with the situation. The Federation gave the warnings and presented the only possible solution. The warnings were classed as alarmist propaganda, the advice was ignored. The Minister and the Government must accept the responsibility.

In a recent issue of *Education* the following statement appeared:

A deputation from Federation to the Director-General on Thursday, July 15, was met by some departmental officers—Messrs McClaren, Mason and Gavin.

I know the first two gentlemen very well, and I can vouch completely for their integrity. I do not know the other gentleman, but I should say that for certain he would be in the same class as Messrs McClaren and Mason. The article goes on to describe how they answered questions put to them concerning the federation's proposals and they gave these answers:

The "crash-course" for graduates starting on August 20 would take 134 candidates.

The overseas recruitment campaign had gained 269 primary and 550 secondary teachers to date and the United Kingdom campaign was being stepped up.

They didn't know when the next American advertising campaign would begin.

Ancillary staff for secondary schools and Class I Primary schools would be supplied this year but other schools would have to wait until 1972 (secondary schools to be supplied immediately, primaries at beginning of 3rd term).

Employment of superannuated teachers and improvement in conditions were up to the Public Service Board and the Minister.

We cannot get the Public Service Board or the Minister to do anything about the superannuated teachers. Even the much vaunted education advisory committee has made a suggestion and nothing has been done. Another resolution adopted by the council of the Teachers Federation was a demand that Parliament immediately allocate sufficient money. We can always use money. Then it mentioned the Commonwealth Government again, and suggested that not enough pressure has been put on the federal Government to loosen its purse strings. Another resolution at this time was:

That the General Secretary advertise for applications to teach next year, submitted to Federation, from:

- (1) Untrained graduates willing to undertake the six months Diploma of Education course;
- (2) Superannuated teachers;
- (3) Other suitable applicants. . .

This shows that the federation is advocating that its own money should be spent to find teachers for the service. In a letter to Mr Cameron, secretary of the Public Service Board, the federation listed the following suggestions:

- (a) The admittance of a greater number of graduates to the six months' "crash" course commencing at the end of July, including:
  - (i) married women unable to accept appointment anywhere in the State provided they accept appointment as temporary teachers and as supernumeraries,
  - (ii) people who are not Australian citizens.
- (b) The stepping up of the overseas recruitment campaign by the continuation of advertising, more rapid pro-

cessing of applications, and the appointment of officers to the London office.

- (c) The continuation of the recruitment campaign in New South Wales.
- (d) The reform of the Inspection System in accordance with Federation policy in order to retain teachers in the service. Cessation of all Inspections except those requested by teachers, and the consequent return of some Inspectors to the teaching service.
- (e) Establishment of conditions, as previously proposed by the Federation, which would make country service more attractive.
- (f) The issuing of a proclamation permitting superannuated teachers under 65 years of age to be employed full-time during 1972.
- (g) The offer to pay return fares to Australia of Australian teachers overseas.
- (h) The appointment of additional ancillary staff from the beginning of July and the setting up immediately of the enquiry in relation to the extension of ancillary staff in the schools—as promised by the Premier in his policy speech.
- (i) The granting of teachers' college scholarships to all suitable and qualified applicants."

MR JACK BEALE: That only mentions what was already being done.

MR BEDFORD: Some things have not been done. The role of the Opposition is to put forward suggestions. I do not say that these are the answers, but I put forward some constructive suggestions, not in any political sense. The first thing is to overcome the immediate problem in 1972. We can all think of long-range suggestions, but the re-employment of superannuated teachers is one that could be implemented now. Also, smoother re-entry and re-admission to the service could be adopted. A teacher in my area has been waiting for eighteen months to have her status on re-entry established by the department. The department should cut away the administrative red tape and get these people back into the service more easily. If this is not done, when this lady's friends ask her about going back into the service, she would probably say to them, "If you want to go through the rat race, have a go at it."

Crash courses have been mentioned, but I suggest also crash methodology courses for use in schools, improved oversea recruitment, child minding in difficult areas, and the dropping of level one—having in mind that it is to be dropped anyway in 1973—and instead giving the top 10 per cent distinction passes. In most schools this would save one and a half teachers. There is also the suggestion of a seven-period day for first form in third term, so long as prior provision is made for the extra period.

Mr RUDDOCK (The Hills) [3.20]: May I at the outset congratulate the new honourable members, particularly the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on what I believe to be a much higher standard of maiden speeches than I have heard for some time. I am indeed pleased to follow the honourable member for Fairfield, for like him I intend to devote quite a deal of my time to the subject of education. I have always found the honourable member a most pleasant fellow, and I value his friendship. I believe he endeavoured to look honestly at the problems of education in an effort to solve them. Unfortunately, once or twice he resorted to the chorus of the Teachers Federation, "There is a crisis in education", and then changed his mind and called it a disaster. In a further change of mind he made it a catastrophe.

Of course, this is all part of a plan to discredit education, and it is the sort of thing that in the long run harms the very people for whom this Government is concerned and who should be of concern to the Opposition, the schoolchildren of this State. I am most conscious of the shortage of teachers. In this House there are now six former school teachers, the honourable member for Bass Hill, the honourable member for Wallsend, the honourable member for Fairfield, the honourable member for Lakemba, the honourable member for Manly and myself.

Mr BEDFORD: We could open a school.

Mr RUDDOCK: Indeed we could, but I am fearful of the ideologies that would be taught in the various classrooms adjoining one another.

Mr BEDFORD: Who would be principal of the school?

Mr RUDDOCK: I am also fearful of what would occur when it came to making that appointment. It would be an amazing school, and I acknowledge that the former teachers on this side of the House would lose by four votes to two when any matter was put to the vote. I do not deny that there are problems in education. No one would wish to do so. Much of it is epitomized in His Excellency's Speech when he said:

Enrolments in departmental schools now total approximately 803,000, an increase of over 34,000 in two years.

The problem must be faced, and the Government is doing quite a lot even though a few deficiencies must still be overcome. In the latest issue of *Education*, the journal of the Teachers Federation, Mr B. J. Keighran makes a lot of sense in this letter to the editor, in which he says:

The present head-on collision between the Teachers Federation and the Department of Education regarding 1972 staffing is another example of two "immovable bodies" progressing in a straight line.

This unbending attitude does neither organisation credit and, as is usual in a situation such as this, the innocent third party, the school children, is bound to suffer.

He also said something that I, too, believe, that federation members—at least the top half dozen members of the executive—are lowering the prestige of teachers, and that soon they will not be able to lay claim to being members of a profession. Teachers will have to watch this danger, and generally they realize it. Shortages occur in any rapidly progressing community. There are shortages not only of teachers; there are shortages also of dentists, doctors, plumbers, bricklayers and members of many other trades and professions. It is only natural that shortages should occur when an effort is being made to do things in a hurry. New South Wales certainly wants to go places in a hurry, and thank goodness it has a government that will do things quickly.

Fourteen school teachers of Narrandera primary school have requested the federation to discontinue what appears to be its habit of criticizing and rejecting everything



put forward by the Department of Education. They say in a letter that is set out in *Education* that it is time to co-operate with the department instead of fighting it, and they add:

Some of the recent actions of the Federation lead us to believe that the Federation is not anxious for the problems facing education to be solved.

Mr BEDFORD: Who signed that letter?

Mr RUDDOCK: It was sent by fourteen teachers from Narrandera primary school who, for obvious reasons, have not had their names revealed. I firmly believe that the root problem—and I do not stand on my own in this respect—is the Wyndham scheme itself, which when it was brought in about ten years ago was heralded as a great new system of education.

Mr BEDFORD: What has that to do with the teacher resignation rate?

Mr RUDDOCK: We are short of teachers because of the rapid increase in the number of children enrolling at schools. In addition, there is a shortage of classrooms because of the Wyndham scheme. I liken the introduction of the Wyndham scheme to Childe Harold's pilgrimage to disaster—in a crisis, if you like. I believe that we should all be better off if the scheme were dumped right now; then we should be able to begin to solve immediately our education problems.

Even the Minister in a recent statement has announced that the change in curriculum has expanded enormously the demand for teachers, and that the need to provide small groups of teachers for elective subjects has placed a tremendous strain on the department's resources. The only benefit that anyone could claim for the Wyndham scheme is that students are able to obtain a diversification of knowledge. My reply is, so what? Are children ending up better educated than the children of earlier days? I believe that the answer is in the negative. Naturally, not everyone agrees with me on this aspect, but at least I have been consistent over the years. I made a similar statement when the scheme

was being introduced and I have repeated it in this House at times since then, including today.

At least one high school headmaster—I know the gentleman extremely well—Mr H. A. Glasby, the principal of Parramatta high school, has expressed his views on this problem, and members of this House and members of the Teachers Federation would do well to read his statements on the matter. He has said:

Teaching has acquired an unfavourable image and I am sure this is one of the most serious causes of the present teacher shortage.

In many ways the teaching job in N.S.W. is superior to teaching overseas and it also compares favourably with most other jobs available in our own country.

Our teachers have a security which does not exist in many other countries.

In N.S.W., as a result of the federation's efforts, salaries have become attractive to teachers.

A reasonably able girl can become a mistress in charge of a subject department by about the age of 30, on a salary of more than \$8,000 a year (\$153 a week).

Not many jobs will pay a girl, or a man for that matter, such a salary at this stage of a career. An assistant teacher is able to retire at 60 years of age on a pension of \$104 a week, or he can receive \$41 a week plus \$32,000 in hard cash. Few careers offer such salaries and conditions. Much of the denigration of the teaching profession has come from the teachers' own union. It is high time that the Teachers Federation listened to the views of teachers like those at Narrandera or to Mr Keighran and Mr Glasby and the many others like them. Opposition members might be interested to learn that members of this profession are going along in ever increasing numbers to meetings of branches of the Liberal Party. They are doing so because they want to do something constructive about education in the only proper way possible, through the Government and its methods of tackling the problem; by contrast with what has been suggested by the federation and particularly by members opposite, who no doubt incite the federation.

I am indebted to the honourable member for Fairfield for raising the question of manual arts teachers. By coincidence a manual arts teacher was promoted and transferred from Northmead high school to Narrandera high school where he is now the manual arts master. I approached the Minister for a replacement at Northmead. He looked into my request and informed me later that one of the department's scarcest commodities is the manual arts teacher. He promised to do his best, and indeed he succeeded in obtaining a very fine teacher, a 32-year-old man named Jones from Castle Hill. This expert in woodwork and metalwork gave up a job paying him \$6,000 a year and the use of a motor car to teach at Northmead high school.

When Mr Jones arrived at the school the staff held a meeting and decided that as he had not been trained to the federation's requirements he could not begin teaching. They declared him black. He is still at the school doing minor chores, but he has not been allowed to teach a class. If the federation had allowed this man to take one class for one hour he would have been able to do a crash course in teaching. The department will not let him do a crash course until he has taught for an hour, so the school is a teacher short. The sufferers are the children of Northmead and Baulkham Hills who are not being taught manual arts such as woodwork and metalwork. This situation has been caused by the obstinacy of the teachers who have some hifalutin idea that Mr Jones is not acceptable to them. However, he is such a charming fellow that some of the staff now say that he has not had a fair go. It will not be long before members of that branch of the federation think he is such a good fellow that they ought to change their minds. I took the opportunity of mentioning this matter to my friend, Mr Verco, at the opening of Parliament and I asked him to do something about it. He said that he would.

Education is a very big problem. Many people, mainly teachers, who ought to be helping are not doing so. The honourable member for Northcott and others seem to be right in saying that parents visit schools to see what is happening and to find out

*Mr Ruddock]*

whether their children are being taught effectively. They will be taught effectively, and not indoctrinated in matters in which they should not be indoctrinated, only if the federation changes its mind. I know that 85 per cent of teachers or even more are good citizens and teachers; it is only the top few in the hierarchy of the Teachers Federation who seem to be doing things they should not be doing.

I have always been vitally concerned about pollution and sewerage. Problems surrounding pollution of the environment and installation of sewerage are featured in the Governor's Speech. The Minister for Environment Control will realize there are ways of turning waste products round in cycles and re-using them. We shall have to do this if we are to survive in this world. I read the other day that if one puts two flies of a certain kind in a bottle with a certain quantity of food and returns in a few days, one will find hundreds of flies in the bottle and the food rapidly disappearing. A few days later the food will have disappeared and all the flies will be dying. That will happen in this world if we do not get rid of pollution and improve methods of food production.

The Dandy bacon factory at Murarrie in Queensland has found a way to turn its potentially polluting waste products to profit. The wastes are contained in 150,000 gallons of water used at the factory each day. The company built four settling ponds to handle the effluent water. Instead of discharging the effluent into the nearby creek and polluting it, the company contrived to pass the water through the ponds, two with a capacity of 800,000 gallons and the other two twice as large, to remove detergents and other pollutants. When the water is still heavily laden with animal matter, it is sprayed through a system of automatic sprinklers on to paddocks sown with pasture grasses. The company keeps 125 breedings cows on 200 acres under grass. In these operations the company uses waste products to advantage and is able to raise cattle for profit. It has made good use of water that would otherwise

pollute surrounding creeks and the environment generally. Far more companies should do this sort of thing in New South Wales.

I read in the Governor's Speech that \$10,000,000 has been allocated for treatment works at Malabar and North Head. The Minister for Public Works knows that I believe this is a waste of money. I am firmly convinced that the Imhoff and Pearsall scheme should be adopted, despite the cost of \$1,000 million. In this scheme the effluent is re-used after adequate purification and treatment. I suggest that the sewage should go to some place over the Blue Mountains—

Mr HILLS: What will the honourable member for Dubbo say about that?

Mr RUDDOCK: I know that the honourable member for Dubbo is keen on such a plan. The Minister for Public Works has said that the main objection to this scheme is its cost of \$1,000 million. I wonder whether we could not afford that sum to bring sewerage to everyone in the Newcastle-Sydney-Wollongong complex. Instead of wasting effluent, it should be used again to the advantage of the dry interior of Australia. I have mentioned this plan before, and I shall keep on mentioning it. It is good sense. I have a letter from a constituent of the honourable member for Dubbo, Mr Henry M. Robinson, an architect of Parkes, who has written to me in these terms:

Hence I feel that your suggestion should be considered from a national point of view and the Board's statement that 100,000 acres would be required to disperse the water reinforces your suggestion.

One hundred thousand acres should be capable of yielding about \$30,000,000 and as you know \$1 introduced to a country town usually serves a sixfold purpose. Thus even at the large cost of \$1,000 million the yield would be somewhere in the vicinity of \$180 million or 18 per cent on the capital.

Mr Robinson writes a good letter, not merely because he agrees with an idea that I have put forward. He knows that this scheme would be a wonderful thing for our

dry interior, and of great assistance to primary producers who are passing through a bad time at present. His letter continues:

I often wonder what the economy of this State might be like, if the West Bogan Triangle—that stretch of land between the Darling and the Lachlan which has no surface or underground water supplies could be put into intensive production. There the risk of pollution of surface streams would be negligible as the only major creek, the Cowl, peters out before reaching a drainage channel. What would be the result of reduction of dust storms, the raising of the water table, the cooling of the ground temperature and heaven knows what to people living in those parts?

I shall not go into greater detail on this important matter, which must be studied in future. It is heartening that pollution of our beaches will be reduced when money is spent on the treatment works. Quite a deal of money will be spent on sewerage schemes for people in Sydney, but where will the sewage go finally? The time will come when this must be considered. There are sewerage problems not only in the homes but also on interstate and country trains, particularly on trains approaching Sydney at 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning. This is the time when country folk travelling on trains to the city make areas around Pennant Hills and other parts of the northern line more like a cow paddock than an ordinary railway. Professor B. W. Gould of the University of New South Wales has brought to my attention a suggestion that ought to be adopted. I shall send it on to the Minister for Transport. An Electrolux vacuum sewage treatment system, as used on Swedish trains, would eliminate this problem entirely. I assure the House that people who live beside the railway, 20 or 30 miles from Sydney, in areas through which the trains go early in the morning would be grateful if the Electrolux vacuum sewage treatment system were adopted on passenger trains.

I shall deal now with a most important subject—hospitals. I have here some information from the secretary of the Hornsby hospital which shows that the large increase in the number of maternity patients at that hospital consequent upon the rapid population growth of the area will make conditions unbearable unless something is done. The Hornsby hospital

should be helped. We need a district hospital in The Hills regardless of what is done at Westmead. I see from His Excellency's Speech that it is proposed to build a western district regional hospital. Such a hospital is needed to cope with the rapidly growing population of the whole area, but in addition to the Westmead complex, a district hospital is needed. The Premier when he was in the area said that it was obvious to him that with the tremendous growth of population the area should have a district hospital irrespective of what happens at Westmead. The land has been available for some time.

I am sure that the honourable member for Campbelltown, though he has ideas of his own on this, would agree with me that another way to help Sydney generally would be to build a university for the Parramatta district. Sydney needs another university now; Parramatta needs it. I am sure that the honourable member for Blacktown and the honourable member for Mount Druitt would agree. An area of about 400 acres bordered by the Old Windsor Road and Seven Hills Road has been marked by the State Planning Authority for a university. This site should be considered now. It contains no houses; no development has been undertaken. Consequently, the land would be relatively cheap to acquire now. This land, only a mile from Seven Hills, at West Baulkham Hills is the only land left near Parramatta. If Parramatta is ever to have a university, this is where it must be built—three or four miles west of Parramatta and serving the electorates of Parramatta, The Hills, Mount Druitt, Blacktown, Penrith, Nepean, Hawesbury and Campbelltown. I agree that Campbelltown should have a university but definitely not before Parramatta.

Another matter that I should like to mention quickly is the traffic and road problem facing Sydney. I sometimes wonder whether it might not be a good idea to allow road traffic and road problems to grow until the system breaks down. Then decentralization would be forced on the people. However, we cannot do this; the people would not permit it and it will not occur. The Government is building ex-

*Mr Ruddock*]

pressways and roads to solve the problems of traffic when we should possibly be looking to complete decentralization in the future. If we are thinking of an extra crossing of the harbour I suggest that the road tunnel in Hong Kong might be worthy of examination. The 6,060 feet cross-harbour traffic tunnel there is in fact a pipe-laying operation on a vast scale. It involves the fabrication and placing of twin-tube, 2 x 34 feet diameter, 340 feet long tunnel units, with bed excavation and filling and installation of ventilation, lighting, traffic control and fire-fighting equipment. The tunnel is to cost \$60,000,000 in Australian money and is being financed by a private consortium with shareholding by the colonial government. By 1999 the tunnel will revert to the Government. This is a tribute to the tiny island of Hong Kong. We have grave problems in Sydney, perhaps more than in other places. Our harbour, the rivers, Botany Bay and Broken Bay present tremendous problems to moving people in and out of Sydney, but means can be found to help solve this problem.

I have tried in this speech to compliment the Government on the way that it is tackling problems and the manner in which after many years it has brought stable government to New South Wales. While the Premier remains in control I could not imagine anything happening in this Parliament as has happened in other places. He as Premier directs and exercises control of this Government as no other man could. I give him credit for that. This does not mean that I have no suggestions to make. Part of my function as a private member—and it is the function of other private members, too—is to bring forward ideas, to show what is needed and to help the Government achieve what it should be doing in every sphere. One thing about it, the Government is receptive to ideas. Then, as foreshadowed in the Speech, it is happy to put those ideas into practice. That is a tribute to the Government and I am indeed glad that six or seven years ago New South Wales had change of government.

I summarize briefly the matters that I have referred to. I hope that my ideas on education will be listened to. I hope that

the people in control of the education system will listen to what is being said in this House and do something about it. Sewerage is important to the whole population. Again I stress the importance of looking ahead. The university at Baulkham Hills is a necessity for the Parramatta area. The land has been set down by the State Planning Authority as the site for a university and something should be done. I have emphasized the accommodation problems of hospitals and I think of the wonderful job that the Hornsby hospital is doing. In 1965-66 there were 1,313 births at the Hornsby hospital; last year the number had increased to 2,051, in exactly the same space and the same wards. Therefore I say that Hornsby hospital needs help. I say again that a district hospital is needed in The Hills area. This is the one big gap in the outer metropolitan area. It could work in conjunction with the huge regional hospital at Westmead to serve the Parramatta, Penrith, Campbelltown and Nepean areas. Then we shall be really making the sort of progress that I know the Government intends to make.

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River) [3.42]: I express my sincere congratulations to those new members who have spoken in this debate on the excellence of their maiden speeches. I was especially interested in the comments of the honourable member for Gosford about the inferior conditions under which members are expected to serve their constituents. In the little time that I have been in this Assembly I have become frustrated and disgusted by the contempt with which the executive of this State regards back benchers in this House, and indeed the principle of parliamentary democracy itself. I have become resigned to working in an office with nine other members, receiving a salary lower than that paid to many public servants with far fewer responsibilities and sharing an amanuensis with three other members. However I am not willing to lie down quietly while the Government runs roughshod over the few remaining elements of parliamentary democracy in New South Wales. Members should be given the opportunity to consider legislation well in advance of the Minister's second-reading speech: instead we

have the current situation in which the Government legislates from ambush. Guerilla government is the only description for it. Even back bench supporters of the Government have little opportunity to prepare speeches or to undertake research for debate on vital matters affecting their constituents. I object to the fiddling bureaucratic procedures that have recently been forced on this House under the new standing orders.

Consistently with this Government's attitude these standing orders were brought down in a debate that was viciously gagged from start to finish. There can be no rational justification for reducing the time for the most important speech a member makes—in the Address-in-Reply debate—to a miserable thirty minutes. These speeches should be of at least an hour's duration. Why should members have to go through the legalistic poppycock of obtaining the Clerk's signature and certificate to petitions? This rule is an insult to the dignity and integrity of members.

If I could have had the time I should have liked to dwell at length on such crucial matters as the crisis in education in New South Wales that has become, despite the views of the honourable member for Fuller, a catastrophe under the maladministration of a man who must be the most incompetent Minister for Education, or indeed Minister, that this State has ever known. I should have liked to voice my protest at the shambles our transport system has become, the incredibly cruel fare increases, the buses and trains that never run on time and the rolling stock that is filthy and full of rust. I should like to have had the opportunity to show that the galloping inflation which currently besets this State is a direct result of the policies of this Government and its federal comrades in Canberra.

Regretably time allows me to deal with only one problem, which for me has the greatest priority of all—the increasing violence to our environment which has been accelerating by geometrical progression to the point where today there is not one reputable biologist or ecologist in the world who is prepared to give the human race

any chance of survival to the end of the century. Within the next two decades they predict we shall be in the throes of an ecological disaster. These are not the views of longhaired radicals—most of them have no hair at all; they are the deeply considered prognoses of the best scientific brains on earth today.

To whom do we sheet the blame for this terrifying state of affairs? I say that it is to be laid squarely at the feet of men who, because either ignorance or greed has blinded them to reason, have prostrated themselves at the feet of the god they call progress. Our children and their children from their antiseptic biological deserts will undoubtedly describe it as criminal negligence. True it is that my party is not without blame in the matter. Regrettably we did site the oil refineries at Kurnell to pollute Botany Bay and the Georges River. I concede that Labor administrations gave up many small areas of public recreation reserves to sporting and other organizations but these mistakes were on a relatively small scale and were made at a time when the science of ecology was in its infancy and public awareness of it almost nil.

Let us examine the record of the Liberal-Country party coalition. It came into office in 1965 on a promise to "dedicate parks and reserves irrevocably". It has had six years to do that and what is the position? Its record is so horrific that this period will go down in history as the dark ages of conservation in New South Wales and the name Askin will be used by teachers of history in the same breath as Genghis Khan and Atilla the Hun whose hordes raped and sacked the landscape of Asia in like fashion to this Government.

MR LEWIS: On a point of order. I point out, for the benefit of the honourable member and the House, that it will be impossible for the Askin regime to go down as the dark ages in conservation, the dark ages having passed under the Labor administration.

MR SPEAKER: Order! No point of order is involved.

*Mr F. J. Walker]*

MR FERGUSON: On a point of order. I submit, Mr Speaker, that you should take action to make sure that the Minister for Lands desists from this practice of repeatedly taking frivolous points of order.

MR SPEAKER: Order! I cannot sit in judgment on the motives of the Minister for Lands. If it were competent for me to do so, or if it were my duty to do so, I should have to apply the same principles to all other honourable members, and that would lead to very great difficulties.

MR F. J. WALKER: This Government's first great step to conserve our natural heritage was to pass the National Parks and Wildlife Act—a cruel misnomer, for under that Act 95,000 acres of existing public parks were desecrated by giving them over to logging and mining. I refer to 1,500 acres of the Blue Mountains National Park given for a coalmine and many acres of the Ku-ring-gai Chase for an airport, not to mention 85,000 acres of our best alpine ash forests in the Kosciusko National Park. The truth is that in the name of conservation this Government allowed the biggest park grab in the history of Australia. Next a large portion of the Colong Caves reserve was given over to the cement monopolists to mine limestone. This was one of the most highly dedicated public reserves, with a beautiful cave system and a flora and fauna sanctuary.

Then this conservation-minded Government gave away 5,000 acres of a reserve for the preservation of native flora and fauna on the Boyd Plateau so that timber millers could plant pine forests. These are nothing more than ecological deserts, for biologists tell us that they are the very antithesis of a wildlife habitat. To add insult to injury the Government then gave the beach miners—the most savage and destructive form of mining there is—the right to mine all but seven miles of the 400 miles of our northern coastline. This was done after the Sim committee made a report on the conflict between mining and conservation—a committee that more than adequately reflected the views of the Government. In true Indian-giver style the Government promised the people ten small coastal parks but by the time they get them at least

nine will have already been mined. Already 1,500 acres of the proposed Angourie Park have gone and the rest is at the mercy of the Minister for Decentralisation and Development who wants it for a tourist resort.

The Minister for Mines has with reckless abandon granted mineral exploration licences over our national parks. I refer here to the New England National Park. Does the Minister deny that?

MR HUGHES: I do.

MR F. J. WALKER: Does the Minister deny that a licence was granted over the Dorrigo State Park?

MR HUGHES: Yes, I absolutely deny it. It is a complete lie. I have been on the trust that is dealing with it.

MR F. J. WALKER: The Minister will have his opportunity to speak later.

MR HUGHES: The honourable member asked me the question and I answered it.

MR SPEAKER: Order!

MR F. J. WALKER: The Minister for Mines also tried to grant a coal prospecting licence over 38,000 acres of the Blue Mountains National Park, but he did not go on with that. Perhaps an independent member had something to do with that. All credit to him for putting pressure on the Minister. At the moment we know that the Government is wheeling and dealing with the system of public reserves which protect the scenic edges of the Bungonia Gorge system. Not the least of this Government's attacks on our environment can be seen in the provisions of the recent Crown Lands (Amendment) Act which in one stroke carves up for sale 38,000,000 acres of land under leasehold tenure—an act of a Minister who is pledged to be the guardian of our parklands.

What I have said is enough in itself to condemn the Government. However, it is by no means the whole story. To give the House some indication of the extent of the problem, I take this opportunity to make a short case study of the situation on the South

Coast, which includes the electorate of the Minister for Environment Control. Might I comment in passing that the appointment of the honourable member for South Coast to that portfolio was final proof to me of the hypocritical and cynical attitude of the Premier to this Parliament. He might as well have appointed the Rev. Ian Paisley to administer the Vatican Council.

MR COLEMAN: On a point of order. I take grave offence at the Premier's being described as having a hypocritical and a cynical attitude to this Parliament, and ask that the honourable member for Georges River withdraw the remark.

MR SPEAKER: Order! I cannot ask the honourable member for Georges River to withdraw the remark on the request of the honourable member for Fuller. If the Premier were here and objected, I might perhaps have given consideration to it.

MR F. J. WALKER: Let us look at the situation on the South Coast, where there are no national parks. A 200-mile long plantation has been established on the escarpment of the southern tableland. This inevitably will lead to pollution of the coastal rivers from soil run-off, insecticides and fertilizers. We have three chip milling areas, each of 50 miles radius and each with inevitable erosion and silting problems. Of course, they have been granted permission to replant with pine, and what I have already had to say about pine I stand by: pine plantations are ecological deserts. Then we had the mini-dam programme on coastal schemes of the Minister for Conservation. These schemes were nothing but political ruses and were established in the face of the economics of any cost-benefit analysis. They are completely uneconomic, and I submit that they will destroy the rivers as natural streams. Inevitably the dams will silt up and there is a possibility that by this interference with the flow of sand down the rivers, the beautiful South Coast beaches will eventually become emaciated. These are all problems that the Government does not want to consider. Then we have the Forestry Commission, which persists in what I call its policy of incendiarism, burning off



our forests without any reference to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Only recently they burnt off portion of Jamieson Valley, and that would have been the end of the lyre birds in the area.

Mr HEALEY: You have never seen a bush-fire.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Ask the honourable member for Clarence whether I have seen a bushfire. On the South Coast we have a great suburban smear, and we have all seen it. Despite the lip service that this Government pays to the concept of decentralization—its claims were exploded by the honourable member for Casino in his maiden speech—on the South Coast a huge suburban smear has been allowed to build up. We have on only 260 miles of coastline, ten ports and associated installations. There is no doubt that they are polluting the surrounding areas. Other ports are to be developed in and around Jervis Bay, with the possibility of a steelworks and a nuclear power station. The South Coast has already been described by respectable scientists as a eco-disaster area. The credit for this goes to the Minister for Environment Control. The jewel in his crown, however, must be his passive acceptance of the Clutha project, which will destroy O'Hare's Creek water catchment area and pollute the air and the waterways on the South Coast with coal dust.

I want to deal at this stage with only two minor aspects of the Clutha Development Pty Limited Agreement Act. In future I shall have a lot more to say about that legislation. I want to establish at this stage only our allegation that the Act was passed without intelligent debate or proper investigation. Second, I shall ask the House to consider whether the statement of the Minister for Mines is true, that the Clutha legislation is overridden by our pollution laws. Dealing with the question of the indecent haste with which the Clutha Development Pty. Limited Agreement Act was passed, I quote not my opinion, but that of Professor J. H. Wootten, Q.C.

Mr HEALEY: Was he here at the time?

Mr F. J. WALKER: Professor Wootten, as all honourable members know, is the dean of the faculty of law at the University of New South Wales. He is one of the Government's appointees. Surely he is a man whose opinion has some relevance. I heard a speech made by him on the subject in which he said:

Thus the bill was before the lower House for a total of five hours, with six days from introduction to final passing . . .

That included a weekend.

. . . and transparently no expert assessment to help members evaluate it intelligently. But that was slow and lengthy compared with what happened in the Upper House. The Bill had its first reading just prior to 11.50 p.m. on Tuesday, 24th November, and the total debate was from 4.45 p.m. to 6.35 p.m. on Wednesday, 25th November, less than 1 hour 50 minutes. Just before the debate concluded the Leader of the Opposition said that he had not had time to read the schedule—which is the main part of the Act.

To claim that parliamentary control is an adequate safeguard for public interest in matters like this is sheer hypocrisy.

Mr COLEMAN: But you were here.

Mr F. J. WALKER: I was gagged, too. Professor Wootten continued:

The account of the debate shows the Parliament is totally unequipped to deal with the kind of issues involved in the Clutha Act. If it had a system of House Committees, like the Congressional Committees of the United States, it could hope to call witnesses, hear interested parties, and get reports that would enable it to make informed judgments on the detailed issues raised by the Act.

The Act excludes the provisions of the Public Works Act. It would have required that these proposals be gone into and they could have been discussed intelligently.

I deal next with the Minister's allegation relating to pollution. The Minister was reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 19th July as saying:

This State was the first to introduce far-reaching pollution control legislation. If the Clutha bill competes with any part of this legislation, the pollution control legislation prevails.

Of course, the public relations man for the Clutha company made a similar statement, that our pollution legislation overrides the



Clutha Development Pty. Limited Agreement Act. However, section 3 of the Clutha legislation provides:

Upon the making of the agreement the provisions thereof may be carried into effect—

and the next are the important words:

—notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act.

Section 13 provides that any orders or the like made pursuant to any Act shall be deemed to be invalid if they conflict with the Clutha legislation. These are amazingly wide provisions. I could not find the like of them in any other legislation except the Clean Waters Act, the Act setting up the co-ordinating commission to deal with the pollution legislation, and the Waste Disposal Act. In giving the words their ordinary meaning it would appear that insofar as the carrying into effect of any term of the agreement is concerned, the fact that such action would be illegal under any other Act is of no concern to the Clutha company.

The rule of statutory interpretation that applies here is that in the event of an inconsistency between Acts, the later Act prevails. In this instance subsequent Acts would have to be specific because sections 3 and 13 of the Clutha legislation give exemption from future Acts and regulations as well as existing legislation. The question is whether or not the pollution legislation applies, and this is an interesting question. The three Acts, the State Pollution Control Commission Act, the Clean Waters Act and the Waste Disposal Act were all passed on the same day as the Clutha Act, namely 9th December, 1970. Therefore four Acts were passed on the same day. If there is an inconsistency between them, the later prevails, but which is the later? The only rule is that the Act numbered last would prevail. That is the only possibility. These Acts were numbered alphabetically on that day. What then do we find the situation to be?

The Clean Waters Act is number 78. The Clutha Act is number 79. The State Pollution Control Commission Act is number 95 and the Waste Disposal Act is number 97. This would mean that, contrary to the Minister's statement, the Clean Waters Act does not override the Clutha Act. The State Pollution Control Commission Act is cold

comfort for anyone who desires some sort of pollution control, because it is merely a co-ordinating measure. Its only penalty provision relates to a failure to supply information. We are left with the Waste Disposal Act, and that is limited to the metropolitan area. It does not affect the South Coast of New South Wales or the Burragorang Valley. The effect of the provisions of section 3 and section 13 of the Act is that there are no anti-pollution measures—whether the Clean Air Act, the Clean Waters Act or any other Act, applicable to Clutha. The Clutha Act overrides the lot. So much for the Minister's statement.

In conclusion, I wish to deal with a problem at Oatley Bay, which is in my electorate. It relates also to pollution. For some years the local council has been endeavouring to dredge Oatley Bay. There is no doubt that it needs dredging. It is badly silted up. Oatley Bay has two arms, the north-east arm and the north-west arm. The north-east arm has been dredged. When that arm was dredged the council encountered considerable difficulty in deciding where it should deposit the silt. They merely shifted it from one arm of the bay into another, forming a small island in the middle of Oatley Bay. This is not satisfactory to many citizens in my electorate and in the area represented by the honourable member for Hurstville. It is obvious that when it came to dredging the north-west arm, some alternative site had to be found on which to place the silt. In this respect, I must give a deal of credit to the Chief Secretary. I have a great deal of respect for the fisheries branch of the Chief Secretary's Department and for the way he administers that department. However, that is about the limit of my regard for the Minister. I feel that he does an excellent job having regard to his many and varied portfolios.

The council determined to dredge the north-west arm of Oatley Bay and deposit the silt in Poulton Park which runs along the boundaries of Hurstville and Georges River electorates. This park is used by children, who play soccer there. More important, that area and Oatley Park are about the only remaining natural reserves

in my electorate. What the council intended to do was to pump 12 feet of silt, consisting of 20 per cent mud—the rest being water—over the park. This would have resulted also in the destruction of a large area of mangroves. I have been criticized in the past for being a mangrove lover, but I was pleased to discover that many experts, including Professor Birch, state that mangroves are among the most important areas for the breeding and nutriment of marine life, including small fish and prawns. By destroying these mangroves we are destroying a vital part of our environment. There is a great deal of other flora and fauna to be found in the area.

In its wisdom the Kogarah council decided to destroy this natural area. However, it failed to appreciate that more than 2,500 people in my electorate and other areas were prepared to raise a protest. The protests of these citizens brought the matter to the attention of the Chief Secretary and Minister for Tourism and Sport, or his officers, and the council was stopped from going ahead with the scheme. Now the council is investigating a proposal to dredge the north-west arm of Oatley Bay and deposit the silt where it will do no harm to the environment. I congratulate the officers of the Chief Secretary's Department on their actions in this matter and I endorse fully what they have done.

Georges River is one of the most polluted rivers in this country. At Lugarno sewage is pumped into a part of the river that has many oyster leases. If one read the report of the Oyster Farmers Association, one would discover that oysters ingest sewage. Is it any wonder that oysters are opening up and dying in many parts of Georges River? Is it any wonder that the health of people in the Peakhurst subdivision of my electorate is being placed in danger? Unless some steps are taken to prevent the further pollution of Georges River and the destruction of our natural environment we shall pay for it in the next two decades, and our children will not thank us for it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Fisher.

*Mr F. J. Walker]*

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### STATEMENT BY HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR CORRIMAL

Mr WILLIS: I desire to make a personal explanation. It has come to my notice that in the course of the debate on the Address-in-Reply motion which is before the House, the honourable member for Corrimal yesterday indicated that when I was a university student I was noted for my extreme left views and radical views, and that I was expelled from what he called the Evans-Hughes party of the Labor Party. In the first place, there was no such thing, as far as I am aware, as the Evans-Hughes party. This would seem to indicate that the honourable member for Corrimal was in his swaddling clothes at that time.

Mr CRABTREE: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have ruled on a number of occasions that under the guise of a personal explanation a member can only explain how he has been misrepresented. Any reference to what clothes the honourable member for Corrimal was wearing when he made a statement would have no bearing on the personal explanation.

Mr WILLIS: I did not say that.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister can explain matters of a personal nature, but he must not indulge in debate.

Mr WILLIS: I was merely attempting to explain that I could not be expelled from something that did not exist. I would point out that the honourable member was probably being confused about the Hughes-Evans faction of the Labor Party that took control of that party in 1941 which, when it took control of the Labor Party—

Mr CRABTREE: On a point of order. I must again submit that the honourable member has exceeded his right.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister may explain a matter of a personal nature, but it must not be a debate on all the facts to clarify something that another honourable member said in his speech. He can only put matters of a personal nature, and I hope the honourable member will do that.

Mr WILLIS: I am trying to do that. The honourable member for Corrimal said that I was expelled from what he called the Evans-Hughes party of the Labor Party. I am explaining first that there was no such body.

Mr JACKSON: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I submit that the Minister is trifling with your ruling. He is again embarking on the same matters he was putting earlier when you directed him to say whether he was expelled from the Labor Party or not. He is not doing that; he is attempting to say something about what existed in the Labor Party. I believe he has been most disrespectful to you as Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Does the Minister understand the position? He is not permitted to debate the matter. He may explain it only so far as it is a matter of a personal nature that affects him. I ask him to be brief and to limit himself strictly to what the standing order allows him to do.

Mr WILLIS: If I were permitted to utter a complete sentence without interruption by points of order being taken, Mr Speaker, I should be able to do precisely what you are requesting me to do. An incident which the honourable member for Corrimal alleges occurred when I was a member of the Sydney University Labor Club has been completely misconstrued. I should like to have the opportunity without interruption to explain what is the correct position so that my name might be cleared. I was a member of the Sydney University Labor Club when that organization was maintaining a policy in accordance with the traditions of the old Labor movement. When it followed the line adopted by the Hughes-Evans faction in the Labor movement and went to the left—in other words when the Labor Party changed its principles—I, of my own accord, voluntarily left the Sydney University Labor Club. I have never been expelled from it and I have never been expelled from any organization of any kind, anywhere. I place on record that I regard the misinterpretation of the events of those days as a complete—

Mr CRABTREE: On a point of order. On four occasions, Mr Speaker, the Minister has been instructed to do certain things. He is showing great discourtesy to you, and is being disorderly in this House. It is most inappropriate for a senior member of the House to defy rulings from the Chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the Minister was doing that. I think he was winding up his point. In fact, he would have finished by now had he not been interrupted.

Mr WILLIS: I was endeavouring to explain the true position. Apparently the honourable member for Kogarah does not want me to do so. It was not I who changed my principles: it was the Labor Party. The other point on which the honourable member for Corrimal misrepresented the position was in relation to a statement he said I made in answer to a question about workers' compensation. I shall not attempt to clarify that matter, for it is obvious that the Opposition does not want to know the real position.

#### ADJOURNMENT

##### CLUTHA DEVELOPMENT PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr WILLIS (Earlwood), Chief Secretary and Minister for Tourism and Sport [4.22]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr JACKSON (Heathcote) [4.22]: I wish to raise a matter of most recent occurrence and of an urgent nature concerning a company called Clutha Development Proprietary Limited. This company has been given unprecedented privileges to enable it to carry out certain developments in my electorate. Some time ago this Parliament passed legislation to enable the Government to enter into an agreement with the Clutha company. It has come to my notice that in the past few days this company and its principal, Mr Daniel Ludwig, have been served with writs each claiming \$1,000,000 and alleging fraud and dishonesty.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member indicate why this matter could not be dealt with and canvassed in the Address-in-Reply debate?

Mr JACKSON: This information has come into my possession since I spoke in the Address-in-Reply debate. I think that the Parliament should be made aware of it and the Government given the opportunity of deferring any further investigation or feasibility study by this company until the Court has decided whether Mr Ludwig and his company are guilty of fraud and dishonesty. There is little need for me to say that these are serious charges.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! This is a matter that any honourable member could raise on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which is now before the House.

Mr JACKSON: It is a matter vitally concerning my electorate. Most of the development referred to in the legislation is to take place within my electorate. My constituents, practically to a person, are gravely concerned at the prospect of this development. No doubt they will be even more concerned to know that the Government of this State has negotiated with, entered into an agreement with, and sent representatives to New York to confer with, the head of an organization who will be required to face charges levelled at him and his organization by a member of his own company now living in Australia.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It seems to me that thus far the honourable member has not raised anything that might not be raised during the Address-in-Reply debate. I was not in the Chamber when the honourable member spoke in that debate but I understand he dealt with this matter at length. The only new thing that has been raised is that certain writs have been issued against Mr Ludwig and the Clutha company. If that is so I shall have to make inquiries as to whether the matter is *sub judice*.

Mr JACKSON: I submit it is not *sub judice*.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not know.

Mr JACKSON: I did speak in the Address-in-Reply debate at length about the Clutha Development Pty. Limited Agreement Act. However, this fresh information came into my possession only this morning. I think that this Parliament and the Minister concerned should know about it.

Mr WILLIS: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have already intimated to the honourable member for Heathcote that he has spoken on this very subject in general terms during the course of the Address-in-Reply debate. You have reminded him that the only new matter he is raising this afternoon is something that is before the Court and is therefore *sub judice*. Particularly if the honourable gentleman follows his usual line of prejudiced argument, it might well be that he will commit a serious breach of the *sub judice* rule in that what he says in this Chamber under privilege could be construed as likely to influence the decision of the Court with regard to a matter before it. I submit also that on many occasions it has been ruled that controversial subjects of a general nature should not be the subject of discussion during the adjournment debate. That is precisely what is occurring now. If the honourable gentleman wishes to discuss the matter in general then it is controversial, and in any event it is capable of being discussed during the Address-in-Reply debate. If the honourable member intends to discuss a specific matter, namely the writs he says have been issued, the matter would be *sub judice*.

Mr JACKSON: The writs have been issued and so are public property. I am not discussing the merits or demerits of any matter contained in the writs. I am saying that the charges made in the writs specifically mention fraud and dishonesty and therefore are most serious.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Surely if the honourable member is talking about writs now before the Court he is breaching the *sub judice* rule.

Mr JACKSON: The writs are not before the Court.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Have the writs been issued?

Mr JACKSON: Yes.

Mr SPEAKER: Then they are before the Court.

Mr JACKSON: I am not arguing whether or not there has been fraud or dishonesty. I say there should be a stay of proceedings in order to protect the Minister and particularly the Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not think I can allow the honourable member to pursue this matter any further. So far as the Clutha Development Pty. Limited Agreement Act is concerned, this matter may be raised, and indeed was raised by the honourable member himself, during the Address-in-Reply debate. If the honourable member wishes to direct attention to writs that have been issued since he spoke in that debate then it would seem the matter would come under the *sub judice* rule and ought not to be canvassed in any way in this House.

Mr JACKSON: Mr Speaker, you said you did not think you could allow me to continue—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I shall be more precise. I will not allow the honourable member to proceed.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 4.29 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, 17 August, 1971

Legislative Council (Vacant Seat)—Death of Major-General J. R. Stevenson, C.B.E., D.S.O., E.D.—Clerk of the Parliaments Sworn—Questions without Notice—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fifth Day's Debate).

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.28 p.m.

The Prayer was read.

### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

#### VACANT SEAT

The PRESIDENT announced the receipt from the Acting District Registrar of a certified copy of an entry made on 12th Aug-

ust, 1971, in the Register of Deaths at the District Registry Office, Lismore, recording the death of the Hon. John Charles McIntosh on 10th August, 1971, and that an entry recording his death had been made in the Register of Members of the Legislative Council.

The PRESIDENT announced also that, in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of the Constitution (Legislative Council Elections) Act, 1932–1961, His Excellency the Governor had been notified that the seat of the Hon. John Charles McIntosh had become vacant before the expiration of his term of service, through his death on 10th August, 1971, and that the notification had been duly acknowledged by His Excellency.

DEATH OF MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN ROWLSTONE STEVENSON, C.B.E., D.S.O., E.D., CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS AND CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

The PRESIDENT reported the receipt of a communication from Mrs R. A. Stevenson thanking the House for its resolution of sympathy.

### CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENTS SWORN

The PRESIDENT reported the receipt of a communication from the Acting Official Secretary to His Excellency the Governor enclosing the official oath taken by Mr A. W. B. Saxon as Clerk of the Parliaments.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### MEAT PROCESSING AT BLAYNEY

The Hon. L. D. SERISIER: I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture a question without notice. Does the Minister know that Blayney meat processors, McPherson Brothers, have laid off 29 male and female employees? Is the Minister aware that Mr M. McPherson of that firm said that his company had laid off these employees because it had been unable to achieve sufficient export production to meet its orders during the past twelve months?