

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 9 March, 1976

Pensioner Concessions on Motor Vehicle Registration Fees (Petition)—Land Development at West Pittwater (Petition)—Questions without Notice—Legislative Council: Election of Member—Botany Bay Development—Bills Returned—Statute Law Revision Bill (Int.)—Pastures Protection (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground Amalgamation (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Port Macquarie Entrance Improvement Works Bill (second reading)—Mines Inspection (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Adjournment (Trotting Track at Kana-hooka)—Question upon Notice.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

GROWTH CENTRES

Mr WRAN: My question to the Premier and Treasurer concerns the deferment last Friday by federal Cabinet of further funding of regional growth centres in New South Wales. Did this action by the Premier's federal colleagues put in jeopardy the future of designated growth centres such as Albury-Wodonga and Bathurst-Orange? What steps does the New South Wales Government propose to take in an endeavour to stop its federal colleagues from renegeing on this important commitment to the States in respect of growth centres?

Sir ERIC WILLIS: As I have had no official advice that last Friday federal Cabinet did what the Leader of the Opposition alleges, I am not really in a position to comment further on the remainder of his question. I shall have inquiries made because this is a matter that is of considerable importance to not only the Government and honourable members but also the people at the growth centres and other parts of the State. As the Leader of the Opposition gave no indication of the source of this information relating to the actions of the federal Government, I shall have to leave it at this point, and simply say that I shall make inquiries and advise him and the House in due course.

LOANS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr PARK: My question is directed to the Minister for Decentralisation and Development. Will the Minister inform me and the House what the Government proposes in regard to loans, 'guaranteed by the State Government, for small business development, and when these loans might be made available?

Mr SPEAKER (THE HON. JAMES CAMERON) took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

Mr SPEAKER offered the Prayer.

PENSIONER CONCESSIONS ON MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEES

PETITION

Mr HATTON presented a petition praying that the Legislative Assembly will grant pensioners in country areas concessions on motor vehicle registration fees.

Petition received on motion by Mr Hatton.

LAND DEVELOPMENT AT WEST PITTWATER

PETITION

Mr MALLAM presented a petition praying that the Legislative Assembly will arrange for the Warringah Shire Council or the Department of Lands and Forests to resume the land known as Rocky Point Reserve, moods Peninsula Reserve, and Sturdee Lane on Floods Peninsula situated between Lovett Bay and Elvina Bay, West Pittwater, and that the land be held in perpetuity for the benefit of the community.

Petition received on motion by Mr Mallam.

Mr MORRIS: As the honourable member for Tamworth is aware, the Government announced some little time ago that it would be establishing, within the Department of Decentralisation and Development, a small-business bureau which will have as its aim, as the name implies, the care and nurturing of small businesses. I said in the House last week that small businesses account for the employment of 41 per cent of the Australian work force. Therefore, it is an important part of **employment-giving industry** throughout Australia.

On 31st March the bureau will have its full complement of eight officers, and they will be available to talk to small businessmen who may want to contact them. The officer in charge of the bureau took up his duties yesterday and seven more officers are to be recruited as the month progresses. When that is done the bureau will be in full swing. I imagine that small businesses in the manufacturing field employing **fifty** persons or less would be the type of enterprise in which the honourable member for Tamworth is most interested, for Tamworth, a desirable provincial city in this State, has attracted many such concerns. These are the people showing initiative and creating employment opportunities; they are the ones who have weathered the storm of the past year or two of tragic federal economic policies. Some of them need help, advice, assistance to expand, or support in an effort to modernize their equipment, and it is in this regard that the Government hopes to come to their aid.

Later in the month I shall indicate to the honourable member for Tamworth and to the House precisely how small businesses should go about availing themselves of the services that will be on offer. We shall be asking small businessmen to talk to their bank managers, in the first instance, and if the bank is unable to assist them, the bank will prepare a submission, with the businessman's approval, and send it to my department. Obviously this will save the employment of an army of people. We shall then be able in appropriate cases to give a bank guarantee of up to \$50,000 to enable any industry that is economically sound but for some reason or other is short

of cash, to obtain the finance that it needs to expand, to provide more employment opportunities, to modernize its equipment, and bring itself up to scratch. I am sure that such a proposal would have the approbation of honourable members such as the honourable member for Tamworth.

SALE OF WATERFRONT LAND

Mr FERGUSON: My question is directed to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports and as the representative in **this** House of the Minister for Planning and Environment. Is it a fact that the Maritime Services Board of New South Wales is selling waterfront land in Sydney Harbour to private homeowners, thereby preventing public access to many parts of the harbour foreshores? Has the Maritime **Services** Board defended its action on the 'ground that the land cannot be used for port facilities? Will the Minister, in the interests of the people of New South Wales, instruct the Maritime Services Board to stop these sales?

Mr PUNCH: The answer to the last part of the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is, no, for the reason that the land in question is adjacent to the properties owned by people to whom it has been sold, who have held a lease over it for many years, in many cases dating back to the turn of the century. The article on this matter that appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* dealt principally with land at Hunters Hill. It has been the policy of the Maritime Services Board for a considerable time, where a landholder has reclaimed an area, perhaps of a few square metres to square up his property, to put in a lawn or to put in a pool, to lease that land to him. That has happened all over the city. None of the leases has precluded the use of the land for port development. Where the land adjoins a reserve, a roadway, or anything of that sort, it is sold to the local council or to the Planning and Environment **Commission** and becomes open, public land.

It is not true to say that by these land sales the Maritime Services Board is precluding the use of waterfront land by the

public. The fact is that the land is already leased and the board is merely tidying up small parcels of land spread along the harbour front by affording leaseholders the opportunity to make a purchase. The board's action will not preclude people from having access to the harbour. On the contrary, in the past the Maritime Services Board, together with the Planning and Environment Commission and the various local government authorities concerned, has been involved in negotiations to achieve proper planning and proper land use so that in every municipality beautiful sections of the harbour will be set aside for the enjoyment of the people.

RURAL BANK COMMISSIONERS

Mr BROOKS: I address my question without notice to the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer. Has an appointment been made to the board of the Rural Bank to fill the vacancy created by the retirement of Sir Norman Rydge? If so, will the Minister inform the House the name of the person appointed to this position?

Mr RUDDOCK: The board of the Rural Bank consists of three full-time commissioners and two part-time commissioners. One of the full-time commissioners, Mr John Oliver, is president. Recently Sir James Auswild, who had been a part-time commissioner for fifteen years, was re-appointed for a further term. At the same time Sir Norman Rydge, who had given the board good service for fifteen years, retired and he has been replaced by Mr H. P. Anderson, a well-known expert in financial matters. Mr Anderson, who is 56 years of age, has had an eminent career in finance and rural matters. Last year he retired as managing director of the Australian Mercantile Land and Finance Company, after forty-one years service. In the late 1940's Mr Anderson was involved in the pastoral side of the banking industry when his company managed the large cattle stations of the Bovril company. In the 1950's he became his company's branch inspector in New South Wales and in the early 1960's he was appointed manager and secretary of the London office of the Australian Mercantile

Land and Finance Company. In 1969 he returned to Australia as chief executive officer of the company and was appointed to the National Council of Wool Selling Brokers of Australia. In 1971 he became president of that council, which he represented on the Australian-Japanese Business Co-operation Committee and the Pacific Basin Economic Council. Mr Anderson is the country chairman of the door-knock appeal of the Royal Blind Society. I should say that Mr Anderson's appointment is an excellent one and compares favourably with some of the appointments made in recent times to the Reserve Bank and the Commonwealth Bank.

METROPOLITAN BOYS SHELTER

Mr KEARNS: I ask the Minister for Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs a question without notice. Has the metropolitan boys shelter been subjected to strong criticism over a long period? Is such criticism directed at the deplorable accommodation, over-crowding, lack of segregation, low staff morale and lack of training, inconsistent discipline, assaults on boys by other inmates and lack of rehabilitative and recreation programmes? As the Minister's predecessor said that the metropolitan boys shelter would be closed, what action is the Minister taking to expedite the closure and the establishment of modern, decentralized remand and assessment centres? Will the Minister encourage members of this Parliament to visit this centre and other departmental establishments of this nature in order that they might inform themselves of prevailing conditions?

Mr CLOUGH: I have visited the Albion Street shelter and I was not entirely pleased with what I saw there. Though accommodation at the shelter is reasonable, the exercise yard is quite inadequate. The worst aspect of the shelter is that some children on remand are kept there far longer than I should like them to be held. Only yesterday when I reviewed the weekly statement that is presented to me as the Minister responsible for the shelter, I sent a note to the director to see what could be done to shorten the periods of remand. The Albion

Street shelter houses about thirty boys. Over the years the shelter has been inspected by the various Ministers responsible for this aspect of government administration, including some members of the party to which the honourable member for Bankstown belongs. So far it has not been possible to find the funds necessary to meet the cost of removing this shelter from its present position. However, I assure the honourable member for Bankstown that I shall do everything possible to ensure that the Albion Street shelter is improved in the immediate future and that ultimately it is removed. Work is proceeding at the shelter to provide better recreational facilities and this will improve the position to some extent. I repeat, the worst feature about the shelter is the comparatively small exercise yard there. I hope that before too long I shall be able to find a solution to that problem.

Mr KEARNS: Can we have a look at the position there?

Mr CLOUGH: I have had a look at the shelter and if the honourable member is willing to accompany me I shall take him there.

MARKET RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr WEBSTER: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer representing in this House the Minister for Labour and Industry, Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Federal Affairs. Is the Minister aware of a market research group known as *Shopper's Voice*? Is he aware that this organization is distributing through letter boxes in areas of Sydney, including my electorate, a questionnaire which as well as asking questions about certain propriety products asks questions of a personal nature such as: What is your gross income? Do you own a television set? It also wants to know whether the lady of the house goes out to work and if so at what hours. It asks also: Does anyone in the family carry credit cards, if so which ones? Yet another question is in these terms: Is there a female in the house aged between 11 and 17 years? I ask the Minister whether it is true that if a respondent completes the form there may

be a reward. Can he inform me and this House whether the public may be protected in any way from the risk of innocently or unwittingly making private information available to unknown persons?

Mr RUDDOCK: I have seen the pamphlet called *Shoppers Voice*, to which the honourable member for Pittwater has referred and, quite frankly, when I read it I was astounded—as every member would be. I was astonished that any document purporting to come from a market research bureau should ask such personal questions that are an invasion of the privacy of the individual. As the honourable member for Pittwater intimated in his question, this pamphlet asks the householder whether a girl between the ages of 11 and 17 years resides in the home. The pamphlet also asks for details of the income of the householder, whether there is a colour television set in the home, whether the lady of the house goes out to work and what hours she is home at night.

Questions of this nature constitute an invasion of a person's privacy and they should not be asked. The pamphlet could lead to the availability of a manual for a potential housebreaker because the answers would tell him all he needed to know about a particular residence. Housebreakers are always interested in whether there is a colour television set in a home and whether during the day the householder is at home or away at work. Even if the document were prepared in good faith, it has most distasteful connotations. If I received a copy of it I would promptly tear it up and throw it in the wastepaper basket. However, many people could be taken in by the inducement of a \$2 hamper of groceries as a reward for filling in the form and returning it to the market research bureau.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjection.

Mr RUDDOCK: I shall advise the Minister for Labour and Industry, Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Federal Affairs of what has occurred. The Consumer Protection Council which has a noteworthy and outstanding story to tell with

regard to consumer affairs in this State will, no doubt, be able to advise both the honourable member for Pittwater and the House what can be done from its point of view. This Government has done more in the field of consumer affairs than has been done in any other State. There is no question of that. The Attorney-General and the police could be interested in the information sought in the document though it is somewhat dubious whether it breaks any precise point of law.

It is a good thing that the honourable member for Pittwater has brought the matter before the House. It gives people in his electorate and in the metropolitan area of Sydney the opportunity to ignore this gross invasion of their rights, not to answer it and to throw it away. The document will be referred to the Minister in another place. He will be able to advise what can be done and it may be that this innovation in the so-called field of advertising--on that is not needed as far as consumer affairs is concerned--can be stamped out.

TELEVISION PROGRAMME ON KATINGAL

Mr KEANE: My question without notice is directed to the Chief Secretary. Was a Sydney television station granted permission to film and interview convicted murderers at Long Bay gaol? Are two of those interviewed and glamourized in the programme Alan Baker and Kevin Crump who staked Mrs Virginia Morse to the ground, raped her and then shot her through the eyes? Is it Government policy to allow these types of vicious killers to be given star treatment? Has any consideration been given to the feelings of the Morse family and the families of other victims of killers who appeared on the programme?

Mr COLEMAN: The facts about this series are that the channel expressed interest in this maximum security prison at Malabar—Katingal—about which over the months there has been ridiculous and extreme propaganda and criticism. It has been described as a horror block and a torture chamber. Frequently it has been described in terms

like that. In fact it is not that kind of maximum security prison at all except to the extent to which, as far as it is humanly possible, it is escape proof. Within its walls there is a range of programmes which make this particular prison unique among maximum security prisons throughout the world, housing, in many cases, dangerous criminals. When the matter was referred to me it was thought desirable that some of the facts about this prison be made available—

Mr FERGUSON: Did you want a pair of stars for it?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr COLEMAN: —and that a television journalist and cameraman be admitted to this so-called torture chamber, this so-called horror block, which had evoked so much ignorant criticism. In the course of making the inquiry from the point of view of informing the public—the large viewing public of that television channel—the people concerned asked if they might interview some of the nineteen inmates of the prison. The purpose was to make clearer the nature of the programmes being conducted within the prison. I emphasize that, and I cannot emphasize too strongly that there is not the slightest intention on behalf of the television journalist and nothing could have been further from my thoughts and those of the director—

Mr WRAN: Why did you glamourize them?

Mr COLEMAN: —that anything should be done that could even faintly be described as glamourizing the perpetrators of these monstrous crimes.

[*Interruption*]

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

Mr COLEMAN: These undertakings were given. It was also one of the undertakings that no names whatever be mentioned. The interviews were to be with anonymous prisoners who; in many cases, are dangerous criminals and killers. Those requirements were insisted upon by me and

by the department. The undertaking was accepted by the journalist carrying out the particular inquiry. If in fact things have gone differently from what was planned and was undertaken——

Mr L. B. KELLY: You know they have.

Mr COLEMAN: I have seen only one of the programmes and it certainly achieved the object that I had in mind and I believe the journalist in question had in mind, which is to show the ridiculous, disgraceful and in many cases damaging and ignorant attacks made on this particular prison and on the administrators——

[Interruption]

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

Mr COLEMAN: ~~by~~ members of the Opposition and by their ignorant and malicious allies outside the Parliament. That programme had the effect of showing that the criticisms were of the nature I have described. I am concerned that the story, if I may call it that, or the journalistic inquiry has taken a turn that neither I nor the commissioner wished—and I do not know that that is the case and I should be surprised if Opposition members who are screaming out would know. I shall certainly make inquiries about it. The journalist has his ordinary freedoms to make such comment as he sees fit. I cannot interfere with that nor do I have any wish to do so. What we were concerned to do was to impose the sort of conditions——

Mr WRAN: Irrespective of how it was done?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

Mr COLEMAN: ——that we were sure would be met and to expose the criticisms that were so malicious, stupid and ignorant. That particular purpose will be achieved. If there are other aspects of the matter, I assure the House that I will be taking steps to check on those to see whether that sort of concern is also unjustified.

UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES

Mr WOTTON: Is the Minister for Minerals and Minister for Energy aware of the problems and damage to underground farm water supplies caused by some coalmining operations? Is the Minister aware particularly of the concern being expressed by landholders in the Gunnedah district that already their properties have been affected by such operations? If so, will the Minister undertake to send a senior officer from his department to the district to make a thorough investigation into this problem?

Mr FREUDENSTEIN: About a fortnight ago the honourable member for Burdondong mentioned this matter to me. Landholders in the Gunnedah area particularly have fears that as mining operations proceed in that area the water table may fall below bores and spearpoints put down to provide stock water, thus inconveniencing the landholders and causing a possible loss of stock. Following a reminder by the honourable member I made further inquiries to find out whether the fears were justified. The mining company has given an undertaking that where the water table level falls below bores and spearpoints it will provide the stockowner with water. There is a danger, as has been expressed by the honourable member, that this action may not take place quickly enough and that great inconvenience and stock losses will occur. I have arranged that within the next week a senior geologist of the department and an engineer will go to the area to see what action can be taken.

CHILD CARE AGENCIES

Mr BANNON: I address my question to the Minister for Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs. Did he recently receive a deputation from representatives of child care agencies at which he was informed that establishments conducted by these agencies were in a critical situation owing to rising costs and reduced income? Did the deputation seek an increased subsidy from the State Government? Is the subsidy paid by the New South Wales Government the lowest in Australia? Will the Minister inform the House whether the Government is willing to increase its contribution to the

agencies and, if not, will he say how he expects these agencies to maintain their vital role of caring for children?

Mr CLOUGH: On Friday next I shall be receiving representatives of the child care agencies to discuss this matter and other matters relevant thereto.

Mr KEARNS: Has the Minister not talked to them?

Mr CLOUGH: I have been a Minister for six weeks and I have seen quite a number of agencies. I am quite willing to talk to the honourable member for Bankstown. It is true that the amounts being received by the voluntary agencies are lower than we should like them to be.

Mr SHEAHAN: The lowest in Australia.

Mr CLOUGH: That is true. We are endeavouring to discuss these matters with them and find a basis upon which we can try to improve the allowances. I am sure that in the near future this will be done.

NON-PAROLE PERIODS

Mr HARROLD: My question is directed to the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice. What are the guidelines used by judges in fixing non-parole periods in this State? Has the Minister received any complaints that some non-parole periods are too short in view of the seriousness of some crimes? If so, will the Minister undertake an investigation and inform me and the House of the details and the result?

Mr MADDISON: I must point out that, strictly speaking, the Parole of Prisoners Act is the responsibility of the Chief Secretary. He has the responsibility for recommending changes in law and the administration of the parole board and the probation and parole service. However, the question that the honourable member for Gordon has directed to me is concerned more with sentencing policy than with the provisions of the Parole of Prisoners Act and associated Acts.

In more recent times this matter has been the subject of some criticism by the Australian Bankers Association and the trade

union movement representing bank employees, which have indicated concern that the non-parole periods set by the courts seem to be too short in duration compared with the enormity of the crimes for which the sentences are imposed. This matter was raised as recently as last Friday in Hobart at the meeting in that city of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, when the attention of the Attorneys-General was invited to these criticisms coming from the banks and bank officers. A current study being undertaken by the Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research in this State into armed robbery generally is now more particularly directed to whether some change of policy by statute should be introduced in view of the criticisms that have been made.

The point of a non-parole period is to enable the sentencer—be he a judge or magistrate—to fix a period of time before which it would be inappropriate for the parole board even to consider parole. As honourable members know, in the normal course the court fixes both an overall sentence, which is the maximum period the offender has to serve in prison, and another period before which the offender cannot be released unless some extraordinary circumstances require the exercise of the prerogative of mercy. There has been a lot of misunderstanding of the philosophy behind a non-parole period. It is designed to enable the parole board at the expiry of that period to consider whether an offender should be released on parole on certain terms and conditions as to employment, residence and matters of that kind, provided he reports to a parole officer, or whether he should complete the sentence subject to the normal remissions that would apply.

Parole is a difficult and technical matter. The community has been fortunate in having a parole board which, since its inception, has had as chairman a Supreme Court judge with considerable experience in the criminal law, a woman member, and two or three other members who by bringing to the board their general experience within the community have been able to put the community view before the board. By and large the community of New South Wales has been well served by implementation of

the concept of a non-parole period and it owes a debt of gratitude both to the parole board and probation service for their excellent work.

FAIRHAVEN SCHOOL

Mr O'CONNELL: I ask the Minister for Youth, Ethnic and Community Affairs whether he knows that the Fairhaven School conducted by the Sub-normal Children's Welfare Association at Point Clare has grossly inadequate facilities to cater for retarded children living in the Central Coast area. Is the Minister aware that the federal Minister for Social Security, Senator Guilfoyle, has refused this school a subsidy for which it had applied under the Handicapped Persons Assistance Act, even though the school had raised its share of the \$220,000 that is the estimated cost of additions to the school? Will the Minister inform the House how the school can overcome this rejection by the federal Government and provide proper school facilities for its children? What assistance will the State Government give the school, and what action will the Minister take to persuade Senator Guilfoyle to reverse her decision?

Mr CLOUGH: I am not familiar with the school to which the honourable member has referred. If he places the matter before me in detail I will give it consideration and advise him and the House of my attitude on the matter.

FOOT ROT VACCINE

Mr MACKIE: I ask the Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Water Resources whether the Department of Agriculture has discontinued the issue of prescriptions for foot rot vaccine. Will the Minister say why this departmental decision has been taken, especially as sheepfarmers in my electorate have had considerable success in the use of this vaccine and any action taken to restrict its availability will seriously jeopardize the planned programme of eradication of a costly sheep disease?

Mr COWAN: I am aware that there are quite a lot of problems in the control of foot rot in sheep. With the present wet

conditions, an outbreak of foot rot may be expected generally throughout the State. Property-owners spend a lot of time and money in attempting to prevent foot rot. Prior to 1969 the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization carried out experiments in the vaccination of sheep to counteract foot rot. The vaccine that was produced appeared to be successful, but when produced commercially it was unsuccessful in practice. I am sorry to say that at the moment no available vaccine will combat foot rot in sheep. However, the honourable member may rest assured that the Department of Agriculture and the CSIRO are keen to carry out further experiments with a view to finding a vaccine that will be effective.

PETROL TAX

Mr WADE: I ask the Minister for Revenue and Assistant Treasurer a question without notice. Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the fact that service station proprietors in the Newcastle electorate are suffering deprivations and economic hardships as a result of the iniquitous petrol tax? Is the Minister aware that garage owners are faced with extreme difficulties in meeting their payments on assessed quarterly sales which have not been achieved because of inroads made by cut-price petrol sales by XL and others? What action is proposed by the Government to relieve owners in this category, who face Government threat of cancellation of licences and a daily fine for non-payment of the tax when sufficient petrol sales have not been made to comply with the quarterly assessment furnished in anticipation of sales? Will the Government legislate to abolish the petrol tax?

Mr RUDDOCK: First, I make it quite clear that this is not a petrol tax but a petrol licence fee. It is for this reason, of course, that problems have arisen regarding this petrol licence fee. I am well aware of what has happened. As we all know, the federal Government gets 29c a gallon, which passes unnoticed because it is in three different forms of excise, and the

payments are made by the oil companies. In this State, in order to charge the 9.6c a gallon by which the price of petrol was raged in order to permit resellers to pay their licence fees, the payments are made by the service station proprietors. As a result quite a number of service station proprietors become a little irked when they have to write out their cheques.

The licence fees were due on 1st March. I knew some days ago that supplies from the oil companies to various service station proprietors had fallen and that, as a result, numbers of service station proprietors would be able to apply for remissions. Promptly on 1st March I gave a three weeks' amnesty to the bona fide resellers who would be applying for remissions because their turnover had fallen below the figure on which they pay their licence fees. This was given to the bona fide resellers; it is not intended to apply to some people who might intend at the end of the period—be it 1st March or any other time—to take whatever moneys they had collected and leave their service stations. We shall still be hot on the trail of those people; this is something that the service station proprietors would want us to do.

It might be of interest to some members of the Opposition that 60 per cent of service station proprietors are still increasing their turnover, and that therefore they would be ineligible to apply for a remission such as the one I approved during my first term in this office. Another 20 per cent are trading at about the same level. The remaining 20 per cent are trading at reduced levels. The reductions have been caused by various factors, one of which was mentioned by the honourable member for Newcastle: the existence of a discounter in the area. They are the resellers who are able to apply for a remission.

The remission to which they were entitled related to 5 per cent by which they fell below the licence fee but I have now determined a new figure, on the 9.6c a gallon, of 2½ per cent. In effect, most resellers

get back, less 2½ per cent, the whole of the amount by which their sales fell below the calculation of their licence fee.

I know it is a popular pastime to condemn the petrol licence fee, but I assure honourable members that, as the Premier and Treasurer has already stated, if this State had a fair return of taxation, compared with the Commonwealth and the other States, and was not subsidizing the other States, we could look at some of these taxes.

I am well aware of the discounters in Newcastle. Indeed, I have received a deputation from Newcastle, which told me what was going on in that city (before the honourable member for Newcastle told me about it. They have three weeks' amnesty, and will be able to apply for their remission. It is not as bad as the honourable member for Newcastle makes out. Only two or three days ago, when I had a full discussion with Mr Blundell, Mr Jeans and Mr Johnson of the Service Station Proprietors Association, we reached certain understanding on the matter. As a result of that, we have reached the 2½ per cent remission figure and also the three weeks' amnesty. They know where we are going, and we have told them clearly also what we are doing. We know that the Opposition, although it has very little knowledge, wants to make a lot of noise about this subject. The Government has a lot more knowledge of this matter, and will be taking appropriate steps when it can.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL: ELECTION OF MEMBER

ELECTION OF DOUGLAS FREDERICK MOPPETT,
ESQUIRE

Sir ERIC WILLIS laid upon the table a copy of the certificate of the Returning Officer under the Constitution (Legislative Council Elections) Act, 1932, respecting the election of Douglas Frederick Moppett as a member of the Legislative Council, together with *Gazette* notice.

BOTANY BAY DEVELOPMENT

Debate resumed (from 4th November, *vide* page 2222) on motion by Mr Crabtree:

That this House views with alarm and expresses its concern with the Government's proposal to permit major development to proceed on the foreshores of Botany Bay without—

- (i) a total development plan of the proposed port development incorporating all presently known developments and future Government plans for reclaimed land at Botany Bay;
- (ii) discussion with the community, local government, environmentalists and persons who make their living from the waters of Botany Bay and associated waterways on the effects of proposed and future developments;
- (iii) a total environmental impact study of the effect of major development upon Botany Bay and its nearby residents; and
- (iv) establishing a Botany Bay Port Development Authority to implement the recommendations of a total environmental impact study and to control future development and the operations of the port of Botany Bay.

Mr BRERETON (Heffron) [3.24]: The time that has passed since this debate was adjourned has led the local people to be even more concerned than they were earlier about the ramifications of the Government's proposals for the development of Botany Bay, and has left them more strongly in favour of the Government's proceeding along the lines suggested in the motion.

This matter was the subject of a petition presented to the Legislation Assembly signed by about 3 500 persons who live around the foreshores of Botany Bay and are opposed to the manner in which the Government is proceeding to develop that port. They feel that there has been a great deal of deception by the Government in simply not coming clean and disclosing completely what is involved in its plans. Time and again the Government has covered up by holding piecemeal environment impact studies, which give no opportunity for an assessment of the effect of one part of the development plan in relation to the others. In fact, the environment impact studies that have been conducted had limited terms of reference. That is why I say the general feeling among the local people is that the

Government has been involved in a process of deception, in pulling the wool over the eyes of the local people to ensure that the development goes through without their knowing what is really involved.

A typical example of that was the decision by the Government to display a model of the proposed coal loader at Botany town hall and Randwick town hall. That model gave the local people a visual concept of the proposal, but it was not until long afterwards that they discovered that the coal loader intended to be built at Botany Bay will be nothing like the model shown to them. The plan was changed. Whereas originally it was indicated that the coal loader would incorporate four large silos, it now appears that it will have thirty-five single silos. That is typical of the sort of situation in which the Government has become involved that has led the local people to distrust it greatly. When this was brought to the Government's attention by the Botany municipal council, the Minister for Planning and Environment simply replied:

As to Council's comments on the difference between the model exhibited at the round table discussions and that previously displayed at Botany Town Hall, I would point out that each model was a conceptual one designed to give an impression of the form the development could take. As the project developed, consideration of detailed design criteria caused variations to be made to the original model. In fact, it is likely that still further variations will be necessary in which case Council will be kept informed.

As the honourable member for Georges River has commented, some variations. That letter clearly outlines that the people of Botany are faced with the fact that the Government more than likely will vary the plans again now that the environment impact study has come down on the side of building the coal loader.

For a long time the people of Botany have been feeling the effects of the development of a port in Botany Bay. Recent developments emphasize the need for local participation, for a real knowledge by the people of what is involved, with an opportunity to assess the project fully before it proceeds. The Government has not faced up to the realities of the port development at any

stage. In Botany Road, for example, it has not been possible to have a set of traffic lights installed. The Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports admitted in this House last December that Botany Road is carrying about 24 000 vehicles a day, yet representation after representation has failed to obtain from the Government an indication of when it is likely that a set of traffic lights will be installed at the major intersection of Botany Road and Banksia Street.

That is typical of this Government's attitude. It will not go out of its way to provide even some small measure of protection to people **who** are forced to cross a busy road in order to get to food shops, paper shops, hotels and so on. Despite the fact that the development which has already occurred in the Botany Bay area has led to a vast amount of extra road traffic, and that the Government plans export roads to carry more traffic, it will not approve the installation of traffic lights as a matter of urgency.

Many of my constituents are concerned about a pipeline under construction. Recently I looked at this work to assess some of its impact on the citizens of Botany. This pipeline is being laid in Hastings Street to the corner of Edward Street and in Ramsgate Street and Dover Road. This project is wreaking havoc upon local people who live in an already over-developed area. The method of constructing this pipeline presents potential dangers, especially to children and it is indicative of the Government's approach. It does nothing about providing positive and proper protection for these people. If the Minister were to **visit** this pipeline project he would see **many** long lengths of pipe stacked on the roadside. These stacks are unlit and are not properly supported: the pipes could be easily dislodged. Children play in and around these stacks, and bear in mind that each pipe is about 50 feet long. About **fifteen** of them were stacked one on top of the other.

A trench 6 feet deep has been dug along the middle of some streets. The manner in which the trench has been barricaded offers no real protection to passers-by. Once again,

children are apt to play in this most dangerous situation. I am aware that children should not be there but they certainly would not be there if proper protective measures were taken. In addition, **unlit** vehicles park at night in streets in the area. These vehicles, which are not parked in accordance with the provisions of the Motor Traffic Act, are a traffic hazard, particularly at night. They are parked all over the place and are a cause of **great** concern for local residents, many of **whom** have contacted me about the danger.

In some streets footpaths have been completely blocked by workmen's sheds and prevent access along the footpath to the homes of a number of my constituents. A **considerable** amount of welding is being done in this area. The long lengths of pipe are welded together before being lowered into the trenches. The welding procedure seems to be dangerous. Admittedly, the welders wear appropriate protective goggles. However, they do not work behind a welding screen. Consequently, passers-by, including children and motorists, run the risk of receiving a welding flash in their eyes. Is it any wonder that local residents are worried about the future development of **Botany** Bay? Is it any wonder that people in my electorate should feel so strongly about the matters brought before the House by my colleague the honourable **member** for **Kogarah**?

The people of Botany and other areas affected by the development of Botany Bay are **not** too confident of the Government's bona fides in respect of its intention to develop Botany Bay. I was interested to hear the answers given in this House to a number of questions on this subject asked by the honourable member for Georges River. I know the honourable member intends to speak in this debate so I shall not refer to those matters. No doubt he will explain in some detail the manner in which Botany Bay will be destroyed. If the Government intends to press ahead with this development, and obviously it does, it should at least give undertakings along the lines of the provisos set out in this motion. The real answer to the problem is probably to

set up a judicial inquiry, removed from the influence of the Government and the Public Service Board and conducted within strict limits under specific terms of reference. That would be the most positive and satisfying manner in which problems associated with the development of Botany Bay could be investigated. I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak again on this subject. I urge the Government to pay immediate attention to the matters I have raised. I know that they are causing considerable hardship and worry to people living in the Botany area.

Mr COATES (Blue Mountains) [3.37]: The motion before the House, put forward by the honourable member for Kogarah and supported by other members of the Australian Labor Party, is that this House views with alarm and expresses its concern over the Government's proposal to permit major development to proceed on the foreshores of Botany Bay without certain provisions. I rise to take part in this debate with knowledge that I have accumulated over many years on this subject, and to oppose the motion. I believe this motion is a subterfuge to try to cover up the real policy of the Labor Party. In case there be any misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word subterfuge, I remind members that the dictionary definition is that it is an attempt to escape censure or defeat in argument by avoiding the real issues. I am certain that the Labor Party is well aware of the planning that has gone on over many years with the intention to develop Botany Bay as an additional port to augment the existing port of Sydney.

The subject under discussion this afternoon did not arise last year or the year before. The matter was under consideration by the Government for many years. All honourable members should be aware of the work done by the Maritime Services Board as part of the planning of the development of Botany Bay and in order to protect the people who live in that area. For those members of the Labor Party who are critical of the Botany Bay development it may be interesting for me to put on the record that when Labor was in office in this State the first part of the Botany Bay development

took place at Kurnell when, without planning, without an environmental impact study and without all the other things that the Opposition demands today, the former Labor Government gave approval for the development of a tremendous industrial complex on the southern headland of Botany Bay. Now, for political reasons, the Labor Party is objecting to the development of Botany Bay even though it concedes that the further development has been planned and that environmental issues have been considered.

Mr BANNON: The people of the area do not care two hoots about politics. They are concerned because they live there.

Mr COATES: We now have an interjection from the honourable member for Rockdale.

Mr BANNON: A very timely one, too.

Mr COATES: Before I proceed with my argument I shall deal with that interjection by emphasizing the fact that when the Leader of the Opposition came to my electorate he said that the Opposition would **not** oppose the development at Botany Bay. However, some months earlier in another public statement he had put his party's opposition to the development of the coal loader at that port. Now he is trying to get the message across through his supporters in my electorate that Labor favours the development. An article published in the *Lithgow Mercury* on 23rd June, 1975, contained this statement:

At one o'clock this afternoon the Leader of the State Opposition, Mr Neville Wran, Q.C., issued a special statement by telephone to *The Mercury* in which he pointed out that the Botany Bay coal loader is only one of the several proposals the Government has for Botany Bay. He said that others included a petro-chemical storage and possibly oil refineries . . .

The Labor Party wants to win the seat of Blue Mountains, which is right in the centre of the western coalfields. The Leader of the Opposition, whom we may assume speaks for the Labor Party, recently went to my electorate and said:

We are going to support the building of the coal loader. We think it is good.

What a change of policy. The honourable member for Rockdale, also a member of the Labor Party, bitterly opposes any development at Botany Bay. At a public meeting at the Rockdale town hall on 30th June, 1975, he said:

There should be a total freeze on the proposed development at Botany Bay.

Mr **BANNON**: Why don't you read the whole statement instead of misrepresenting the position?

Mr **COATES**: At the same meeting the honourable member for Kogarah on behalf of the Labor Party, moved a resolution. There were hundreds of coalminers from my area present at this meeting where the honourable member for Kogarah said:

I was born and bred at Botany Bay. I will fight to preserve it for the people. Whilst I am member for Kogarah I will fight against this coal loader proposal.

I shall return now to what I was about to say when I was **interrupted**. Each of the ninety-nine members of this House has a responsibility to ask himself from time to time what should be done in the best interests of this State and the Commonwealth. We should not ask ourselves what should be done in the best interests of the Liberal Party, the Country Party, the Labor Party or any other political party; we have a responsibility to discharge the duties that have been given to us by our electors. With this thought in mind I should like to ask honourable **members**—indeed all Australian—three or four questions. The first of them is, what port facilities do we have available in New South Wales at present?

Mr **RAMSAY**: Very little.

Mr **COATES**: That is a good answer from the shadow minister for ports.

Mr **HAIGH**: I did not interject.

Mr **COATES**: To continue, the second question is, are these port facilities adequate and suitable for our present and future needs? The third question raises the point, is there a need to provide additional facilities to meet this State's expanding import and export trade? The fourth question

is, if the answer to the last question is in the affirmative, where should the facilities be provided? I have always endeavoured to be constructive both in my investigations and my criticism about what has been done in the past and what should be done in the future. I have been a member of the **development** corporation since its establishment by this Government about ten years ago. One of the responsibilities given to four members of a subcommittee of that development corporation was to inquire into coal loading with particular reference to what should be done at Port Waratah. Recently I was appointed chairman of a **committee** set up to investigate problems associated with the establishment of coal loaders, including offshore coal loaders, and all aspects of port development with particular emphasis on coal loaders. I have looked at the question and applied to it the experience I have gained from my investigations in this State and in Queensland. We should look at what facilities are available from the northern border of this State to Eden in the south. I mention coal in particular because we are dealing with a proposed coal loader as a specific item of conflict as part of the total development of Botany Bay.

No coal loading plant for the **export** of coal has been established anywhere north of Newcastle. It would be wasting time to think about developing the Clarence River port as a centre for loading coal. The reasons are obvious. Much the **same** could be said about a number of other places south of the Clarence. The first adequate coal loading plant south of the Clarence is at Port Waratah. As a result of a recent Government decision, the handling capacity of that equipment is being increased. The Port Waratah loader is the only installation **cap**able of handling all the coal from the **New**-castle coalfields. For a **long** time I have advocated that the Government should exercise its right to hold certain land vested **in** it at Kooragang Island and that it should acquire other property which has not yet been developed, **from** there across to **Stock**-ton Bay. Irrespective of any opposition that

is raised in the future, I envisage that an offshore coal loader will be built in Stockton Bay or in a man-made port in Port Stephens.

Mr RAMSAY: That would take fifty years.

Mr COATES: And it will involve a lot of money. The construction of an offshore coal loader is not as big a job as building a man-made port. The port of Newcastle has a limited capacity. The depth of the water there is such that only ships taking out a maximum cargo of 60 000 tonnes can be handled. In addition to difficulties concerning the depth of water, the turning space there is limited. Today there is an ever-increasing need—indeed a demand—for coal-carrying ships to have a maximum capacity of between 80 000 and 150 000 tonnes. It will never be possible to accommodate that type of ship in the port of Newcastle.

A ship of the capacity I have mentioned could be loaded in Stockton Bay with an offshore loader. In Sydney, only one coal loader has been built. I am referring to the one built at Balmain many years ago at a cost of £800,000, to load annually 750,000 tonnes of coal into ships capable of carrying 40,000 tonnes. The water at that point is only 34 feet deep. That is quite silly these days. That is the only coal loading plant in the port of Sydney and there are no others until one gets to Port Kembla. Alterations made to the Balmain installation have stretched its capacity to enable it to handle 3.5 million tonnes of coal annually. What an abortion of a set-up it is. People who talk about environmental problems should go to Balmain and see how the people who live there have been subjected for years to the problems associated with an open dump of coal. Honourable members have an opportunity to get rid of that sort of problem and to lend their support for an installation that will be economically sound and will not have the other problems I have enumerated.

The port of Balmain is the only port where one can load coal economically from the western coalfields. It is easy for Opposition members to say that coal from those fields should be sent to Newcastle or Port

Kembla. Port Kembla has its problems including lack of plant capacity. As the honourable member for Wollongong knows, the Government is spending millions of dollars on building an offshore loader at Port Kembla, in order to meet demands for export coal from the southern coalfields alone. It is not being done to handle coal coming from the western fields. That coal cannot be sent there economically and in the long term Port Kembla cannot handle that coal.

Mr RAMSAY: That is rubbish.

Mr COATES: It is not rubbish.

Mr HAIGH: They are sending it there now.

Mr COATES: Some coal is going there, in little bits and pieces when it cannot be handled at the Balmain loader, which has an absolute maximum capacity of 3.5 million tonnes. Permission has been given, after about two years of fighting by me, for another pit to operate in the western fields. Within a few years Coalex Pty Limited will be producing at least 3 to 4 million tonnes of coal a year. Already Coalex Pty Limited, the Austen and Butta colliery, the Clutha organization and perhaps other collieries are having their coal loaded at Balmain. How can one expect Balmain to handle the expected tremendous increase in coal production in the west? Is the Labor Party trying to say that the western fields should be denied access to a loader? I have been living in the western coalfields area as long as I have been on this earth, and one subject about which I really know something is coal-mining.

I have given a lot of consideration to this issue. The opposition to it is quite unreasonable. There has been talk about environmental issues. This proposal was not brought forward yesterday, last year or the year before that. A lot of people have been making a progressive study of it. The proposed coal loader will involve an expenditure of about \$30 million, which will have to be found by three companies. However, the whole project will be controlled by the State Government. One of the later studies, by Dames and Moore, is an environmental impact investigation of the proposed coal loader. I have seen the report.

Mr HAIGH: On whose behalf was the study carried out? Was it done on behalf of the coal barons?

Mr COATES: There is no argument about that.

Mr HAIGH: If you pay well for a job, it will be well done.

Mr COATES: They were paid for it. If one wants a good job one should do what the Government did, that is, appoint an expert, independent commissioner. That commissioner went into the subject and brought down his recommendations.

Mr BANNON: Who was that?

Mr COATES: Mr Coffey. He is a man of great capacity and, in my view, he did an excellent job. Not one of the members who have been vocal today, except the honourable member for Heffron who virtually just put in an appearance at the public inquiry, was game enough to give evidence as I did. My name is recorded as a person who gave evidence. I gave evidence because I could justify my claims.

Mr HAIGH: What did a government committee say about Mr Coffey? That committee condemned him.

Mr COATES: I will tell the honourable member for Maroubra who gave evidence. The Communist Party of Australia put in an official appearance and evidence was given on its behalf. Although the Miranda branch of the Australian Labor Party came out into the open, not one of the vocal members on the other side of the House, including the honourable member for Maroubra who is the shadow Minister for Ports, the honourable member for Rockdale or the honourable member for Georges River came forward. In my opinion they would not have been able to answer the queries submitted to them. Is not the report of Dames and Moore, compiled in July, 1974, an indication that the matter has been subjected to lengthy investigation? As it is only a report I am not willing to accept what Dames and Moore said. Many pages of that report deal with safeguards that should be incorporated in the development of a coal loader at Botany Bay. The report,

which covers about thirty subjects, makes for interesting reading. This was not the determining factor when I made up my mind that the coal loader could be a goer and would be in the best interests of the people of the Botany Bay area. On 18th February, 1975, the former Premier and Treasurer made a statement in the press that Cabinet had approved in principle the establishment of a privately-financed coal loader and wharf for Botany Bay. In this lengthy press statement it was pointed out that the coal loader would be one of the most modern in Australia and that the idea had not been conceived without notice—rather the proposal represented years of study. It is planned that export coal will arrive by unit trains. The haulage of coal by road will be replaced. This is of importance whether the coal comes from the Blue Mountains or the Wollongong area. There is to be dust control mechanism in the unloading system.

Mr F. J. WALKER: That has all been changed.

Mr COATES: The honourable member for Heffron said that there had been a change of design. That is not true. I assure honourable members that the coal trucks will travel on long welded rails. The existing railway level-crossings are to have bridges built over them and they will be of concrete, not of rattling steel. An expert gave evidence at the public inquiry to which I referred that a coal train travelling at 15 to 20 miles an hour would not make as much noise as an accelerating motor car. When the unit trains arrive at Botany Bay they will go into an enclosed shed that is to be 258 yards long. The coal will be unloaded inside this totally enclosed shed and any dust will be picked up and taken away. Then the coal will be conveyed by a totally enclosed belt to four rows of five banks of hoppers. The first five to be built will each have a capacity of 100 000 tonnes. They will stand about 150 feet high. As and when demand increases more banks of these hoppers can be installed and inter-connected.

Following upon a long investigation and public hearing, Mr Coffey came down with a recommendation which, because of Jack

of time, I shall not read in detail. He said that he considered the proposed coal export facility at Botany Bay should not be rejected on environmental grounds. He then made certain recommendations about what should be done, I have been given an assurance and the Government has stated that when work on the facility proceeds the requirements of the Planning and Environment Commission will be adhered to so that the people of the area are safeguarded.

I wish to emphasize the importance of this matter to the western coalfields. On 20th June, 1975, Mr Jack Savage, the president of the western coalminers federation, said that there were about 800 workers in the mining industry in the western field, including some 400 members of the Miners Federation—in other words, men working underground. Mr Savage stressed that it was of vital importance to the mining industry in the western field that the proposed Botany Bay coal loader estimated to cost between \$25 million and \$30 million be built as soon as possible. He asserted that coal loading facilities at Newcastle, Balmain and Port Kembla were too congested and too expensive to operate and their capacity was well below that required to increase coal production, develop the mines and increase mine staff at the western coalfields.

I have in my possession dozens of newspaper cuttings that express the concern of people in my electorate about the environmental aspect. But they have said that as the subject has been resolved, the construction of the coal loader at Botany Bay should go ahead. I have no doubt that the environment, in which I am most interested, will be properly protected. The coal loader should be built as soon as possible.

Mr F. J. WALKER: You would be done like a dinner in the upper Blue Mountains.

Mr COATES: I should like the honourable member for Georges River to express his opposition to the coal loader at Botany Bay among the mining fraternity in the same way that my Labor opponent did until the Labor Party told him to pull his head in as the miners were against him. In the past the western coalfields have had a difficult

time. At one meeting organized by the Labor Party my Labor opponent went to the pit and addressed the miners. They told him exactly what they thought of his attitude and that of the Labor Party to the coal loader. Do not let us kid ourselves; Opposition members are opposed to the Botany Bay coal loader. With due respect to the shadow minister for ports, he has stated that a wal loader should be built at Darling Harbour. I have the whole of his statement with me. He knows that this cannot be done; it is impracticable. One would not build a coal loader virtually in the middle of Sydney. The coal loader is designed for Botany Bay and that is where it should be built. With a modern loader one would not see even one piece of coal. I am not one who rises to speak on all matters that come before the House but I am glad to have had the opportunity to speak on this important subject, about which I have knowledge. I have genuinely and honestly tried to go into the matter. I do not support the motion as I consider it improper, unnecessary and a subterfuge. When a vote is taken I shall demonstrate my attitude which is to support the building of the coal loader in Botany Bay, subject to the environmental protections to which I have referred.

[Personal Explanation]

Mr BANNON: I wish to make a personal explanation, as I have been misrepresented. Early in his contribution to the debate the honourable member for Blue Mountains made reference to what I was alleged to have said at a public meeting in Rockdale town hall. When he was talking about my attitude and what I was alleged to have said I asked by way of interjection, as you will recall, Mr Speaker, whether he had had the proceedings taped as I wanted to be sure that he had the right evidence.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rockdale should know that there must be reflection cast upon his standing as a person before a personal explanation is appropriate.

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River) [4.7]: It is now evident that the Botany Bay port development is the largest and most

costly project ever embarked upon by a New South Wales government. It has been cloaked in more secrecy than the Allied invasion of Normandy—and well might it be because the environmental degradation and human misery it will bring in **its** wake can be validly paralleled with the senseless destruction of war. I would be recreant to my constituents' trust if in speaking on this issue I did not condemn the mastermind of this developmental outrage—the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports.

The people of New South Wales are beginning to appreciate that the Willis-Punch coalition is a government representing narrow sectional interests and contemptuous of the majority of citizens. Above all, it is a North Shore government dedicated to substantially improving the lifestyles of the privileged minority living in Sydney's northern suburbs.

[Interruption]

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Georges River has the call and he alone will have it while I am in the chair.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Further, it is committed to lining the pockets of an exclusive coterie of wealthy rural interests such as dairyfarmers with milk quotas. Eventually these men born to rule condescendingly bestir themselves to hand out a few crumbs to us lesser mortals—but only on the understanding that the price we pay for such bounty is to live in polluted suburbs, with antiquated transport, inadequate schools, inferior health services and the right to pay more regressive taxes than in **any** other Australian State.

Proof of these charges abounds in the Botany Bay development scheme. For some years the Deputy Premier has been clandestinely putting together the many projects that go to make up the four stages of the development. His policy is one of concealment, surreptitiously finalizing the various parts of this gigantic jigsaw and then springing them as *faits accomplis* upon an unsuspecting defenceless public. At this point in

time he has been willing only to lay on the table incomplete details of a handful of projects in stages 1 and 2. Stages 3 and 4 remain in his top-secret drawer. **If** out glimpses of the first two stages are any indication, then the balance will be an environmental nightmare.

Necessity demands that we debate only those projects that have been pulled out of the Minister's hat. Let me commence by dealing with the extensions to Kingsford-Smith Airport. The Premier has just announced that he intends to co-operate **with** Mr Fraser in the construction of a second north-south runway into Botany Bay. That means more reclamation. The existing reclamation works have already caused millions of dollars damage to the foreshores, particularly at Sans Souci and Towra Point.

Mr GRIFFITH: Drivel.

Mr F. J. WALKER: I suggest that the Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative Societies should go to Towra Point, which is in his electorate, and see the horrific damage that has been caused there. I suggest further that he ask the local fishermen to show him the damage. Plate corals, growing since ancient times, have been wiped out; 30 per cent of the bay's weed beds have gone and with them important fish and marine habitats. The only Olympic sailing course within fifty miles of Sydney has been written off and the bay looks like losing its value for recreations such as swimming, sailing and fishing.

The Government puts two arguments in favour of duplicate runways. First, it maintains that Sydney must remain the biggest city in Australia and to do that we need the biggest airport. Second, it asserts that the second runway would reduce noise by 80 to 90 per cent, because most planes would land over the bay. We all know that the Liberals are obsessed with **maximum** growth rate economics. They will have a city of Sydney with a population of at least 6 million by the turn of the century. The Minister for Planning and Environment has stopped looking at his interests in Minnamurra and commented that this is not right. The rest of the Liberals are convinced that it is necessary.

The city will be jam-packed into an area that should not support more than 3 million. Sydney will have the highest land service costs and commodity prices in the world. Our roads will become so congested as to make road vehicles undrivable and our transport system will proceed at a snail's pace. Our once-beautiful city will become a grey, ugly place choked by poisonous photo-chemical smog. Our rivers and beaches will be fouled with sewage and industrial waste; our citizens will be plagued by skin and respiratory ailments and rendered deaf by the incessant whine of jet engines. Surely the time has come for responsible parliamentarians to put an end to this childish rivalry between Sydney and Melbourne. The biggest city is not the best—the chances are that the quality of life in the biggest city will be considerably inferior.

If Mr Fraser is too miserable to build a second airport then let Melbourne have the additional air traffic, the additional trade and industry, the additional population, traffic jams, pollution, cost inflation, crime and social instability. The argument of the Premier and Treasurer that the new runway will decrease aircraft noise by 90 per cent is yet another example of his doing violence to the truth. If one looks at the air traffic figures one notes that 20 per cent of the arrivals had their flight path over the State electorates of Georges River, Hurstville, Kogarah and Rockdale. That amounts to some 30 000 movements a year when departures are taken into account—that is, an average of eighty planes screaming over my electorate each day. Naturally the noise becomes far worse in certain weather conditions when most flights take that path. The noise is already unbearable for many people and grossly irritating to all people.

Doubtless, the Premier's misleading statement about a 90 per cent reduction would be welcomed if it were not a fairy tale. The fact is that the projected growth for air travel at Mascot is from 7 million passenger journeys a year at present to 32 million in twenty-five years. The Government says that it wants that growth to occur. If it does, then by the time the runway is built the increase

Mr F. J. Walker]

in passenger journeys will be such as to ensure that it will be fully used and there will be no decrease in the number of aircraft movements over my electorate. In the meantime my constituents will have to suffer an increase in average daily flights of 100 per cent to say 200 movements a day—a truly intolerable situation but nothing to what they will have to suffer in the next twenty years when the movements would increase to 600 each day. All that the extra runway will do is increase air traffic and exacerbate the noise nuisance.

The next project I wish to consider is the infamous coal loader which is to be forced upon a protesting public after the chairman of the State Pollution Control Commission held one of the Government's typical phoney inquiries into its environmental impact. The State Pollution Control Commission is not an environmentally concerned organization; it is development, not conservation, oriented and has been carefully constituted to protect the interests of the developers—not to conserve our natural environment. It is understandable therefore that it lined up with the coal combines in rejecting the unprecedented public protest expressed in dozens of well-attended meetings and in petitions. The Botany Bay Planning and Protection Council which leads the fight against the Minister has over 100 affiliated local organizations, all of which have unanimously called for a halt to the project, but Clutha, Coalex and Austen and Butta are to build a gigantic coal loading facility at Botany Bay, which will have an annual throughput of 25 million tonnes. It will include up to thirty-five storage silos. Each will be 42 metres in diameter and as tall as a 17-storey building. The total capacity will be 1 400 000 tonnes.

The coal will be railed to the loader from the western and Burragorang fields. There will be twenty-three coal trains each day entering the port—that is forty-six movements. Trains will have forty waggons with a capacity of seventy-seven tonnes each and be half a mile in length. Despite Mr Coffey's whitewash assessment the project poses a serious threat to our environment. First, we ought to be challenging the whole concept of exporting our substantial but

finite coal reserves. World petroleum resources are being depleted rapidly. Within twenty-five years coal will be the world's major energy source. It is also needed to produce steel, plastics, fertilizers and chemicals. Conservative estimates suggest that our best coal reserves will be exhausted within sixty years. If this is the case, we may well be advised to look after our own interests. There is also the moral argument that we are exporting to developed nations and making it impossible for the developing third world nations to improve their standards of living—with all the problems of wars and revolutions around the world.

Coal dust pollution of the air and water is inevitable if the project proceeds. The Government and the companies have been contradictory in their statements as to whether the loader will be fully enclosed or not. The trains will be uncovered and the high speed transfer conveyor into the ships' holds looks like being uncovered. The honourable member for Blue Mountains claims that they will be covered, but there are other statements from the Government that this will not be the case. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be clouds of coal dust. I remind honourable members that excessive exposure to coal dust leads to silicosis, pneumoconiosis and emphysema, not to mention aggravation of bronchitis, asthma, hay fever, eye troubles and skin conditions such as dermatitis.

A considerable amount of water pollution must be expected also, particularly from the effluent treatment plant. Noise will be a major problem. With coal trains running day and night, ships and loaders will hardly be silent. There is a potential fire risk by spontaneous combustion in the 40 000-tonne storage silos. The coal trains will create chaos in our metropolitan rail system. Even greater delays can be expected in a system already notorious for its inefficiency. We are going to have to pay through the nose for this private enterprise facility. On the Blue Mountains it is expected that the extra trains every two hours will cause a lot of problems.

Mr COATES: It will be carried at night.

Mr F. J. WALKER: If the coal is to be carried over the twenty-four hours it will be carried during the day as well. If it is carried at night it will interfere with the people's sleep and peace of mind. In addition to the huge sums spent on reclamation and buildings and maintaining the port facilities, we shall be subsidizing the rail transport of the coal. The coal barons are subsidized to the extent that they pay the same freight on a tonne of coal as an ordinary citizen would pay to post a seven kilogramme parcel within New South Wales. No wonder the railways incurred a \$270 million deficit; no wonder the deficit will continue to increase. Let us not forget the \$90 million we are committed to spend on the 1000 brand-new coal waggons. It is a pity the money was not spent on passenger carriages. Only recently we celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the introduction of the metropolitan electric train service in my electorate. The Minister said, "Here is the first railway carriage that ran from Central to Oatley." That carriage is still in service, yet the Government is spending \$90 million on 1 000 brand new coal waggons so the coal barons can be subsidized. They pay a ridiculously low freight rate on coal.

I now come to the visual pollution of this massive project. It is hard to imagine that sixteen of these silos would fit into the Sydney Harbour Bridge. They are seventeen stories high. They would be the most massive sight on the Sydney skyline. They would be aesthetically disastrous to the whole of the Botany Bay area. There could be nothing as ugly as thirty-five of them. There are alternatives to placing coal transport and export facilities in the centre of the most densely populated city in Australia. We can utilize the facilities at Port Kembla, which already can take ships of 100,000 tonnes, and at Newcastle, where the impact on human beings would not be nearly as severe as at Botany Bay. I appreciate that there are real and human employment problems in the coal industry, but there are a million people in the vicinity of Botany Bay, and their interests should be considered.

Another project deserving of super-critical examination is the plan to make Botany Bay Australia's largest liquid chemicals handling port. The full extent of the Government's intentions is still not clear. In such matters the Government does not act on its own initiative; it meekly accepts its riding instructions from the oil moguls. There are to be two terminal depots for the storage of liquid chemicals, one on the south side of the main port road and the other on the south-west side of the main port road. These terminals will have an initial capacity of 48 000 cubic metres and 18 000 cubic metres respectively. More extensive terminals are planned for later stages of the work. Supertankers of 210 000 tonnes dead weight will berth alongside a T-head wharf and berthing dolphins. A bulk berth is under construction to handle initially liquid chemical carrying vessels of a dead weight of up to 30 000 tonnes, and supertankers at a later stage. Massive dredging will be necessary to permit the entry of supertankers, which will add to the environmental and erosion problems already being experienced. Honourable members who calmly absorb these intentions without turning a hair would be well advised to read Noel Monstert's book entitled *Super Ship*. I shall read a few brief extracts to indicate the immensity of the problem that will have to be faced at Botany Bay when the supertankers enter it. This is the first extract:

In May, 1970, the 50,380-ton Norwegian tanker *Polycommander*, carrying a full cargo of crude oil, ran aground and burst into flames at Muxieirio Point, on the Spanish Atlantic coast near Vigo. The oil spillage amounted to about sixteen thousand tons, or one-third her cargo; it caught alight on the sea, and the flames created by this burning oil were so fierce that they caused a "fire storm"; a heat disturbance of such intensity that it raised hurricane-force winds in the immediate vicinity of the stricken ship. The winds whirled aloft a huge amount of oil, spraying it into a line mist, and bore it up to high altitudes. The mist condensed into drops and some days later a black rain began to fall upon the coast—upon its farmlands and upon the villages of Panjón and Bayona. Damage to homes, gardens, and crops was extensive and cattle died of eating oil-covered grass; it all would have been much worse had it not been for the fact that most of the black rain fell on uninhabited bush and hill country.

Mr F. J. Walker]

Imagine if that were to happen in Botany Bay. This is the next extract:

In the four years 1969 to 1973, according to the Tanker Advisory Centre, New York, whose data are obtained from Lloyd's List, there were 82 total tanker losses, together amounting to 3,299,000 tons deadweight, and in which 451 men died. The calculated spillage caused by these accidents was 719,000 tons. Thirty of these losses were through weather or stranding, twelve through collisions, twenty-seven from fire and explosions, and five from flooded engine rooms.

This is another excerpt on supertankers:

Guiding and steering a ship from a bridge set nearly a quarter of a mile from the bows is frightening enough to a man unaccustomed to it, but he also is one hundred feet above the water and has to walk one hundred and fifty feet from port to starboard to see what is happening on the other side: even on the *Queens* the bridge was reasonably close to the bows, and anyway moving one of those ships in or out of dock was normally a huge joint effort of ship and shore and fleets of tugs.

Even on the open water supertankers need plenty of sea room. They cannot respond to split-second timing. It takes at least three miles and twenty-one to twenty-two minutes to stop a 250,000 tonner doing sixteen knots: overlong hulls create different forces of momentum, giving the effect of a lower resistance to the water, despite the awkward blunted shape, and sheer weight seems to augment this and to keep them rolling on and on and on. The Ship Division of the National Physical Laboratory found that a 100,000 tonner may lose only one knot per minute while attempting to stop. At very low speeds such as those advisable in fog mammoth ships may be unable to manoeuvre at all. Between four and five knots a 30,000 tonner easily loses its steerage way and starts sheering off its course, unless helm and engines are skilfully used. Under these circumstances, trying to stop or manoeuvre a VLCC on the open sea is tricky enough when attempting to avoid collision or to retrieve a man who has gone overboard, these being the most common of emergency manoeuvring situations, but in confined and crowded and shallow waters it is infinitely more so, and sometimes impossible.

Anchors don't stop these ships. Where an ordinary merchantman would drop its anchors in an attempt to hold its motion, putting down anchors to stop a 200,000 tonner even slightly underway would simply mean having their cables wrenched from the deck.

Yet another excerpt reads:

Supertankers enter shallow waters at great risk simply because of their draught. Fully laden, many cannot enter the Baltic at all.

It is dangerous to bring supertankers into Botany Bay. If one caught alight in an accident—these accidents happen—the effect would be similar to exploding a one megaton bomb in Botany Bay. Hundreds of thousands of people in the area would be killed and the whole of Sydney would have burning oil showered on it. This would be a disaster. After all, Botany Bay, is to be mainly a container port. The plan involves 40 hectares of unsightly container **terminals** and six berths. Roads in the area will be subject to increased use by heavy trucks carrying **goods** for export. Southern **metropolitan** roads are already overcrowded and a driver's nightmare. New export **highways**—including the **southern** and south-western freeway—will be carved through peaceful residential areas. If they are flooded with thousands of articulated vehicles they will become clogged to the point of making driving impossible. The container industry requires transit terminals, and already the container interests are scouring the area for suitable sites. It is inevitable that **quiet** back streets will be invaded by container trucks, and that air and noise pollution will be substantially increased.

I could go on to talk about **the** pipelines that will cut a swathe through the Cooks River Valley to the **Parramatta** area, and about the proposed oil refinery at **Kurnell** that will cost the Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative Societies his seat very soon, but the time available to me does not permit of this. I hope I have given the House and the people of Botany Bay region a glimpse of the enormity of the situation and the senselessness of holding the additional environmental **impact** study into individual projects when the Government should be probing the integrated effects of scores of major developments, all of which are potentially harmful to the environment and the way of life of a **million** people.

Dr Larkum, senior lecturer in biology at the University of Sydney, asserts that Botany Bay will be polluted and **will** become ecologically dead within a decade if the proposed development proceeds. The Minister for Housing and the honourable member for Hurstville think he is a liar, but

I think he is an honourable man who should be listened to. Dr Bell, senior lecturer in geography at the University of New South Wales, points out that the quality of life in Sydney's southern suburbs will be substantially reduced by the development projects. I point **out** to my constituents and to those in Hurstville and other neighbouring electorates that property values will be considerably reduced as the St George district ceases to be a residential area and becomes an industrial slum. They must appreciate that if the project proceeds as planned, the air in this area will become grossly polluted by coal dust, sulphur dioxide, oil **particulants** and carbon monoxide. Their roads will become so overcrowded as to make driving a waste of time and council rates prohibitive. The already poor rail services will become completely impossible. Their peace of mind will be destroyed by high noise levels from roaring trucks and screaming jets. Land values will plummet **as** the area becomes a far less attractive place in which to live.

[Interruption]

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Kogarah and the honourable member for Hurstville wish to have a debate, they have my permission to leave the Chamber.

MR F. J. WALKER: Botany Bay and Georges River will cease to be pleasant recreational areas and will become cesspools and sewers like **Cook's** River and **Alexandra** canal. Oil spillages will put the seal on the destruction of the marine ecology of the bay and the fishing and oyster industries. The danger of a holocaust from a supertanker accident will be ever-present. Unfortunately, we are already stuck with many of the proposals. However, if we are responsible legislators who genuinely care about the quality of life of the residents of the suburbs surrounding the bay, we must take urgent action to take stock of where we are going.

The Victorian Government took some action in this field. I am hardly a supporter of Mr Hamer, the Victorian Premier, but he is a far more enlightened leader than

our present Premier. He and Sir Henry Bolte had the same problem at Westernport, which presented almost exactly the same situation, with many projects being developed in the one area, giving rise to the same problems for local residents. Objections were raised and meetings took place. The Victorian Premier did not forge ahead senselessly and ignorantly, as the New South Wales Government did. He was sensible about it; that is why he does so well in the electorate. The Victorian Premier placed a two-year moratorium on the whole development, and had a total environmental study done of the whole project.

I am not suggesting that Botany Bay should not be a port. In fact, it is pretty much a *fait accompli*. All I want is a full investigation by the Government of all the facts of stages 1 to 4—not inquiries into one small aspect of one stage. I want the Government to embrace the scheme in its entirety, so that the full facts may be placed before the people concerned. With such an approach we could have intelligent and informed debate about the many controversial aspects of the projects, and positive steps could be proposed to maintain environmental values in the area, thus keeping the southern suburbs as pleasant places in which to live.

[Personal Explanations]

Mr GRIFFITH: I wish to make a personal explanation. I cannot speak in this debate, Mr Deputy-Speaker, as I have already spoken. However, the honourable member for Georges River, in his speech, referred to a Dr Larkum, and alleged that I had called Dr Larkum a liar. I want to make it clear to the House that I have never heard of Dr Larkum; I do not know anything about him; and I certainly never made any reference to him at **all** in this House or in any other **place**.

Mr MEAD: I wish to make a personal explanation. The honourable member for Georges River alleged that I also had referred to Dr Larkum as a liar. I do not know Dr Larkum, and I have never said anything about the gentleman in this House. Therefore, what the honourable member for Georges River said is a lie.

Mr ROZZOLI (Hawkesbury) [4.33]: The ramifications of this motion extend much further than the purely local issues that would initially spring to mind. Indeed, the ramifications of any major development project anywhere in New South Wales, and the manner in which it is carried out, are of deep significance to all honourable members, irrespective of the electorate in which the development is proposed. I appreciate the concern of the honourable member for Georges River, especially his concern for the future of the oyster industry in the Georges River. I understand that only recently the Opposition has been checking on this particularly important section of the oceanic industries. I welcome back to the debate the honourable member for **Kogarah**.

The honourable member for Georges River delivered a form of contribution that has become typical of him; it was based on an emotive type of sensationalism, and his manner of delivery would do credit to the leading character—be he hero or villain—in a second-rate melodrama. Emotionalism and sensationalism, for their own sake, do nothing to advance the cause espoused by the honourable member for Georges River. I wonder whether the people represented by him have grave misgivings regarding his capacity to look after their interests. The type of contribution made by him was simply a string of words that have been so commonplace in environmental debates, that most environmentalists have long since dropped them because this type of approach has become extremely tired and outdated. It is probably of no small significance that soon after the honourable member commenced his speech most Opposition members left the Chamber, and it is only now that they have started to return.

If one were to accept the submissions put by the honourable member for Georges River in the latter part of his speech, it is questionable whether anything should be built in our community. He painted a horrific picture. Indeed, if things were as his information indicated—and I do not doubt the authenticity of the statements he **made**—and if we are to accept the connotation he placed on it, the establishment of any

facility involving the storage of petroleum products would be of such potential danger anywhere in the world, that it should be totally removed.

It has been suggested that in the development for Botany Bay the oil installations should be removed to some other place. The honourable member for Wollongong said that he would be happy to receive them at Port Kembla, and suggestions have been made that they should be sent to Newcastle or anywhere else except Botany Bay. It must be noted that installations of this kind are already operating in Sydney Harbour. If we are to accept the statements by the honourable member for Georges River, then we must consider it to be irresponsible to place such installations in Botany Bay or anywhere else, I am sure that members of the Opposition would not agree with the honourable member for Georges River that these installations should fade into oblivion. We have not yet reached the stage where we can dispense with the facilities these installations provide in a modern community.

The text of the motion is interesting. I accept it in its total import, with a minor addition. I suggest that the words "with the Government's proposal" should be replaced by the words "if the Government proposes".

During this debate the only concrete information has come from the Government side, and indicates that, in general, the demands foreshadowed by the honourable member for Kogarah in his motion have been largely carried out. I have closely studied the report of the previous day's debate. It is always an advantage to speak on the second day of a private member's motion because a member can consider at leisure the pearls of wisdom that fell on the first day. I have found the *Hansard* record of the debate most interesting, especially the Minister's detailed history of the development of Botany Bay. I have no intention of placing in *Hansard* a repetition of the details already given by the Minister.

Mr CRABTREE: He denied the full impact—

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr DUNCAN): Order!

Mr ROZZOLI: The honourable member for Kogarah, in his opening remarks impressed me by his sincerity and intent and I awaited with interest the Minister's reply. I was pleased that the Minister responsibly and satisfactorily answered the essence of what had been put forward by the honourable member for Kogarah.

Mr CRABTREE: Tell us how?

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROZZOLI: The honourable member for Kogarah has requested that certain procedures be implemented in relation to the development of Botany Bay. Of course, the honourable member is quite entitled to ask for those procedures to be adopted. In fact, the Government has not denied the right of the people to have an environmental impact study, of the community to be involved in the development of a design plan for this area and of local councils to be consulted. If major development work were envisaged in my electorate, I should certainly demand that these things be done. However, having those sentiments in mind and knowing that what I felt should be done was being done, I hardly think I should move in this House a motion such as the one moved by the honourable member for Kogarah.

When considering the development of Botany Bay or any other area we must look closely at the degree of environmental responsibility which the community, as individuals represented by citizen action groups, progress associations, members of Parliament and the Government, should have. It is for this reason that I should like to look at the matter on a plane higher than merely the environmental responsibility. These days some words are bandied about so much that they suffer from over-exposure. Two such words are environment and conservation. The word environment is often used in the wrong context. It is often construed as meaning a situation of pleasantness, with clear blue skies, green trees and parklands. Environment is not that at all.

Mr CRABTREE: Then tell us what it is.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Kogarah to order for the first time.

Mr ROZZOLI: There is an environment within this parliamentary Chamber. Environment is merely a set of circumstances in which life exists. When we speak about environmental control we are not necessarily considering whether the sky is blue or the water is clear; we are speaking about a situation which exists in a certain set of circumstances at a particular time. Botany Bay has a distinct environment, just as any other area has its own distinct environment. Before we consider what we might do with an area we must make an assessment not necessarily of the good things in the environment but of the good and bad things. In other words, we must assess what **exists**—and that is the environment.

The word conservation, also, is often used wrongly. Many people believe it relates to green grass, trees and the pleasant side of life. However, **conservation** in its true sense is the maximum utilization of resources to ensure continuance of life on the planet. That is what conservation is all about. On earth we must ensure that life support systems have adequate resources.

Mr CRABTREE: They will not last long.

Mr ROZZOLI: I agree; this is a matter of great concern. We have the responsibility of ensuring that our life support systems are sufficiently regenerated to maintain a continuing supply or, if we are using resources that will be exhausted, that those resources will be replaced by an alternative before exhaustion of the original supply so that life may continue. When we look pertinently at an operation such as the development of Botany Bay we must look beyond whether we should put something here or whether it would be better to take something away from there. We must consider what the proposed development **can** contribute to the community, to the metropolis of Sydney, to the State, and to the Commonwealth as a whole.

From a true **conservationist's** point of view these things must **be** balanced against disadvantages which might flow from noise, smell, dust pollution, visual pollution, or any one of the other factors that are disadvantageous to people living in the area.

We must study the system that the Government has evolved to assess these particular requirements, involving the various inquiries carried out by the State Pollution Control Commission. I was rather surprised and disappointed at what the honourable member for **Georges River** said in his contribution to this debate. I thought he was a true conservationist and at heart a rational man. I was disappointed to hear his condemnation of the State Pollution Control Commission and the one-sidedness, as he put it, of its inquiries which result always in triumph for the vested interests over community interests. I recall the results of Mr Coffey's inquiry and the redirection of the pipeline away from the Blue Mountains National Park.

Mr CRABTREE: On a point of order. The House has before it a positive motion in relation to the development of Botany Bay. The honourable member for Hawkesbury is referring to a Mr Coffey, whom I do not know. The honourable member has not designated who this gentleman is. I have checked the rolls and found that they contain about 800 Mr Coffeys. The honourable member has referred also to a pipeline in another part of the State. These matters have nothing to do with the motion relating to the development of Botany Bay. The honourable member for Hawkesbury has been warbling on for a long time but he has not dealt with the motion before the House. I ask you, Mr Acting-Speaker, to direct the honourable member to deal specifically with that motion.

Mr GRIFFITH: On the point of order. I have been in the Chamber throughout this debate. In reply to the point of order taken by the honourable member for Kogarah I point out that the honourable member for Georges River vigorously attacked Mr Coffey who, as every member of this House knows, is the Pollution Control Commissioner. I submit that the honourable member for Hawkesbury is merely replying to that attack.

Mr ACTING-SPEAKER (Mr DUNCAN): Order! There is no point of order involved. My assessment of the contribution being

made by the honourable member for Hawkesbury is that he had explained the meaning of the term environment and was in the course of explaining the meaning of the term conservation. There is no doubt that the Mr Coffey to whom honourable members have referred is the gentleman who holds the position of Pollution Control Commissioner.

Mr ROZZOLI: I recall the results that Mr Coffey produced from the pipeline inquiry as well as from the Boyd Plateau issue. Recently another pipeline issue affected my area. I pay tribute to the work Mr Coffey did in resolving the various conflicts affecting the feeder line to Newcastle. What I have said relates directly to Botany Bay. An inquiry into Botany Bay was held. The honourable member for Georges River took honourable members overseas to all sorts of interesting places. It was a pity that the honourable member for Kogarah was not here at the time. It was fascinating. The honourable member for Georges River spoke about the results of inquiries which are part of the Government's system of environment assessment. In his motion the honourable member for Kogarah asks for a stay of proceedings while environment studies are carried out. The value of such assessment and whether the Government's system is a valid one is the very substance of the motion. The honourable member for Georges River sought to denigrate the work of the State Pollution Control Commission which, during the relatively short time it has been in existence, has brought out as many decisions that have been welcomed and applauded by environmental protection groups as unwelcome decisions.

Mr F. J. WALKER: I cannot agree with that.

Mr ROZZOLI: If a body of inquiry does not always agree with one, that alone is not a ground for condemnation, though it would appear that that is the criterion used by the honourable member for Georges River. When we look to the specific matters raised by honourable members as to the development of Botany Bay we find that Opposition members are not interested in any inquiries when they do not agree with

the results. As well, they are not interested in points of view that do not accord with the points of view they hold. The point I am trying to get across to the Opposition is that the essence of what is asked for in the motion is in fact being carried out.

Mr CRABTREE: That is not true and the honourable member for Hawkesbury knows it.

Mr ROZZOLI: The honourable member for Kogarah says that this and that is not true. I was amused to read in *Hansard* that during the earlier debate the honourable member for Rockdale accused the Minister of tedious repetition. I am sure that he must have meant the honourable member for Kogarah. The Minister gave a detailed summary of what had happened at Botany Bay. Whether or not one agrees with the Minister, one could not describe what he said as tedious repetition. If honourable members consider what has happened and is to happen in Botany Bay, the demands for environment studies, the various studies that have already been undertaken and the background —

Mr CRABTREE: What studies?

Mr ROZZOLI: If the honourable member for Kogarah reads the report of the debate on the first day he will find the answer to his question. I do not intend to stand here and read, chapter and verse, what the Minister said.

Mr F. J. WALKER: How about talking about Botany Bay?

Mr ROZZOLI: I am talking about Botany Bay as much as the honourable member for Georges River did. The honourable member for Georges River gave a far-reaching dissertation on problems that might affect Botany Bay. He gave comparisons of things that have happened in other areas. That is an excellent way to prove a point. If one takes all those factors into consideration, one discovers that the development of Sydney could never have got off the ground if people had been faced with the absolute lack of comprehension displayed by the Opposition on how to tackle a major project. The Opposition seems to feel that this is a small project and that one can, as

it were, stand over the top of it, and give a quick run-down on it as one perhaps could in relation to the construction of a boot factory or something like that. This is an extremely diverse development proposal, and almost every ingredient envisaged in the Botany Bay project can be discovered in Sydney Harbour. We are all doing a little bit of crystal ball gazing—until we have all lived another twenty or thirty years we cannot know with absolute certainty what will happen. However, we can look at Sydney Harbour and see whether anything detrimental has occurred. Many developments in Sydney Harbour were brought about when there was no environmental control and no consideration of environmental factors. The terminology had not been coined when half the installations in Sydney Harbour were built.

Mr CRABTREE: The Government proposes to put them all into Botany Bay.

Mr ROZZOLI: I do not think it will transfer them all to Botany Bay. Without doubt Sydney Harbour is one of the two most beautiful harbours in the world. I believe it is the most beautiful in the world, but I am biased. Installations have been built in Sydney Harbour over a long period without control, and the harbour has survived. It has a coal loader, wharves and other installations. Sewerage effluent and rubbish have gone into it—

Mr F. J. WALKER: The same will happen in Botany Bay.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Georges River to order. The honourable member had half an hour in which to speak. He should have been able to say what he wanted to say in that time.

Mr CRABTREE: He did.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Kogarah to order for the second time.

Mr ROZZOLI: Despite all those things, Sydney Harbour has survived, just as Botany Bay will survive if this project is carried out in conformity with the general

terms that the honourable member for Kogarah put in his motion. They are being carried out as they should be. The Opposition has suggested that there is no over-all plan. The Minister gave his reply on that aspect. I shall leave it at that. While dealing with Sydney Harbour I should like to mention a number of matters. I should pity poor Dr Bradfield if he were trying to build the Sydney Harbour bridge today. The Opposition, with its philosophy, would say that it could not be done, because it would visually pollute the marvellous vista of Sydney Harbour. Yet, the Sydney Harbour bridge is something of which people have become exceedingly proud. It might have been said that the harbour bridge should not be built because it would bisect the historic Rocks area. The people of Sydney have come to accept the fact that the harbour bridge is there and has merged with the historic area. Though nowadays people are more appreciative of historic matters, they have come to accept the fact that the restoration of this most historic area is being planned around the Sydney Harbour bridge.

If one tries to assess dispassionately the damaging effects of some of these things, one can find living proof of the fact that they have not been disastrous and that areas which were, or could have been by today's standards, considered disaster areas are being retrieved because of a type of thinking which has now become accepted and involves a consciousness of the need to improve our environment and the quality of our life style. That philosophy ensures that areas which would have been damaged before will be saved from that fate.

In any consideration of the role of Botany Bay in the Sydney metropolitan area one must take account of the historical and geographical factors that have led to some of our troubles. If we could clean the slate and the Botany Bay area were free of encroachment by buildings, Botany Bay **would** be seen as a beautiful, natural area.

Mr CRABTREE: It is.

Mr ROZZOLI: The foreshores are crowded with buildings and the area supports a magnificent series of electorates which **must** indicate a certain amount of

development of the area. They are the factors that have changed it from its natural state. Obviously the way we have to go about the development of the area is completely different from if we were dealing with a virgin area. In addition, we have various geographical factors that have led to the type of development that characterizes Sydney and in turn led to a number of our road and rail problems. This cannot be entirely set aside. We have to accept what fate has brought to us. We have to accept the early historical growth, which was without planning, because the colony had to be populated with people whose main aim was to survive. Had Captain Phillip in 1788 set up the Planning and Environment Commission, quite a number of problems might have been avoided. I have read the contributions to this debate by Opposition speakers and those from the Government side. I have listened keenly to the debate and I am certain that the Government's proposal will meet the challenge of Botany Bay.

Mr HAIGH (Maroubra) [5.2]: We have had quite a number of speakers who have given a summary of the proposal to develop Botany Bay and a summation of what has taken place, all designed to oppose a sound motion moved by the honourable member for Kogarah. I take the opportunity of giving a summation of what has really happened in relation to the development of Botany Bay so that the public will be informed. In 1961, the Maritime Services Board was commissioned to make a survey and viability study of the possibility of developing the port of Botany Bay. At that time, all thinking was that the development of the port should be on the southern side of Botany Bay. Planning was already advanced when in 1965, because two seats on the southern side were won from Labor, the State had a change of government. From then on the viability and research studies were directed by the Premier, Mr Askin, to the development of the port on the northern side of Botany Bay. He said, "Forget all the work done on the southern foreshore and let us get the port on the northern foreshore so that we will be able to hold those two seats."

In 1966, the publication *A Ten Year Port Redevelopment Plan* contained a contribution by Premier Askin. An examination of the book will show that Captain Brotherson was saying that Botany Bay would be developed as a port ancillary to the port of Sydney and would be a general cargo port. Since that date a number of development approvals have been given by the Government in strange fashion. In 1968, action was taken to vest certain areas of reclaimed land in the Maritime Services Board. In 1968 I warned the people around the foreshores of Botany Bay of what was likely to happen. In fact my warning was published on the front page of the local paper, the *Messenger*. I warned that the port would no longer be a general cargo port. It was easy to envisage what would happen.

In 1967, those who have now been given the approval for the development of certain installations on the foreshores of Botany Bay for the purpose of holding chemicals made an application—without ownership or any rights or interest in the site of the old Bunnerong power station—for development on that site. Only because of the vigilance of the Randwick council at the time and its fight against the planning authorities was it possible to have the application set aside. That application was made by Terminals Pty Limited for Swift and Company Limited. This organization had a plan for development before Randwick council on 13th February of this year and the plan was approved with a number of conditions. I want to talk about this matter because on 17th February, 1975, the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports issued a press release in these terms:

A \$1.5 million contract has been awarded for the first of a complex of wharves in the \$100 million Botany Bay development project.

The Minister for Public Works and Ports, Mr Leon Punch, today announced that John Holland (Constructions) Pty Ltd had been awarded the contract to build a bulk liquids berth in the port basin.

On 9th May, 1975, the Minister for Planning and Environment in reply to my inquiries about this petro-chemical complex, said: "I am not aware of the proposed installation." Let us have no doubt about it.

The chemicals will be by-products from the petroleum refinery. I point out that before that date—on 17th February, 1975—the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports was able to say that a berth was being built in the port for this very installation. The application came before the Randwick council on 13th February, 1976.

In the initial stage Botany Bay was to be a general cargo port. That has now changed completely. We find that Botany Bay will have bulk chemical installations, a coal loader and installations for the receipt and distribution of crude oil and petro-chemical by-products, whether from petrol or aviation fuel. In addition, the Government has agreed to duplication of the runways at Mascot. At no time has there been a comprehensive environmental impact study made of the whole of the Botany Bay area and at no time has the Government told the people what it intends to do in the development of the complex there. It is interesting that as these matters became known to the public, there was a most unfavourable reaction and the Minister had to justify the action that had been taken. On 24th June, 1975, the Minister for Planning and Environment, the Hon. Sir John Fuller, said that he had set up a co-ordinating committee to co-ordinate all the aspects of the Botany Bay region.

This committee will be known as the Botany Bay Management Co-ordination Advisory Committee. Representatives from local councils have been asked to the committee, in order to placate and to set aside the criticisms of the people. The Minister sent a letter to me on 24th June, telling me of the establishment of the committee, but although the committee has functioned for eight months, it has met only three times, and the meetings have extended for no longer than three hours. The chairman of the meetings has been Mr Coffey, who acted as chairman of the inquiries into whether or not certain installations should be approved. Mr Coffey has been roundly criticized for the manner in which he chaired the meetings. The Government has been criticized because of the restriction imposed by the terms of reference relating to

Mr Haigh]

the inquiries to be undertaken. In fact, the committee said that there should be an independent chairman, not just a puppet of the Government. It said, further, that the independent chairman should have a legal background.

One wonders why the Government has embarked on this sort of action. The Minister, Sir John Fuller, again said that he would have an inquiry into the construction and operation of the fuel pipeline from Botany Bay to Rosehill. When criticized over the way the inquiry had taken place, he said that he was fully satisfied with the projected fuel pipeline.

Following the coal loader inquiry, a report was presented to the Government. It was initiated to find out whether there should be a coal loader at Botany Bay. The report was prepared by Dames and Moore, who were employed by the coal barons. Obviously everything in their report would be slanted to the requirements of their employers. That was the basis of the material that went before the committee of inquiry. That inquiry also was chaired by the chairman of the State Pollution Control Commission, Mr Coffey. Everybody who was objecting to the proposal to build a coal loader said unanimously that the terms of reference were too narrow, and that there could be only one final determination from this inquiry—that is, that it would approve the coal loader being built at Botany Bay.

When one examines the people who were invited to give evidence, one sees the strength of arm and muscle that was directed from government departments. Small local organizations did not have the capacity to succeed in this regard. Why did these things happen? We now have the complaints coming in from the local councils in the area. The Hurstville municipal council has said that it wants the strongest protest to be lodged against the State Government's continuing insistence on discussing all Botany Bay port and airport development proposals in isolation from the overall concept. This is what I have said today, and this is what has been echoed by the million people who are living around the perimeter of Botany

Bay. All they want is a proper environmental study, which they have not had. The reason for this sort of action by the Government is to bring in approvals by subterfuge, in a manner that should be roundly and openly condemned by every responsible person in this State. The letter from the **Hurstville** municipal council, went on to say:

A Royal Commission is demanded into the conduct of development of the Botany Bay region and the possible extension of runway facilities at Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport.

Why should there be a Royal commission? It is interesting to look at the name of the chairman of the Clutha complex who pushed on and succeeded in getting a favour from the Government, through the chairman of the State Pollution Control Commission, who was chairman of the inquiry. It was a bodgy inquiry, which did not allow a proper analysis of even that limited project in the development of the Botany Bay proposals. The chairman of Clutha is **Sir John Austen**, and it is interesting to note that he is also the chairman of Blue Metal Industries. It is further interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition only last week stated:

However, the matter does not stop there, and the gravity and urgency of the matter is accentuated because **Sir John Fuller**, the man who made the decision, has been and is still closely and financially associated with Blue Metal Industries Limited.

Last week we were able to expose that **Sir John Fuller** was in close association with Blue Metal Industries Limited, the chairman of which is **Sir John Austen**. This same gentleman is the chairman of the Clutha complex, which was given approval for a coal loader by a kangaroo court, which was directed in its terms of reference by **Sir John Fuller**.

Mr PUNCH: On a point of order. The line being followed by the honourable member for Maroubra now is casting aspersions on the Minister for Planning and Environment in relation to a matter that was debated in the usual muck-raking tactics of the Labor Party in this House last week.

Mr CRABTREE: You go in for muck-raking too.

Mr PUNCH: If you want to get into the gutter, you can. I am trying to keep the debate out of the gutter, where you would revel any time. That is the normal place for you.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the point of order from the **Minister**.

Mr PUNCH: Mr Speaker, I ask your ruling on whether the honourable member for Maroubra is allowed to continue with this character assassination of a member in another place and of Blue Metal Industries Limited, a company not related to this debate. This company is in no way related to a motion relating to the proposed development of Botany Bay. Just because there is a coal loader and another company concerned, the honourable member for Maroubra is casting unnecessary aspersions on the Minister. I submit that he should not be allowed to pursue that line.

Mr HAIGH: On the point of order. I have established, by repeating what is recorded in *Hansard*, that **Sir John Fuller** is financially associated with Blue Metal Industries Limited. I have established, also, that the chairman of Blue Metal Industries, **Sir John Austen**, is also the chairman of the Clutha complex, which was given favoured treatment at an inquiry in relation to the coal loader. That is what I have established. If the **Minister** feels that there is a reflection, against anyone's character, it must be because he knows a lot more than the members on this side of the House. I submit that there is no point of order involved, and that I am addressing my remarks during this debate not only to the facts that caused these decisions to be made, but also to the fact that these decisions were not in the best interests of the people of this State.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The only matter involved is whether what the honourable member is saying is relevant to the motion before the House. I am inclined to think that it is rather remote from it, but I am prepared to hear the honourable member shortly.

Mr HAIGH: Randwick council was concerned about an approval of a development application by Terminals Pty Limited on behalf of Swift and Company Limited, and insisted upon a long list of conditions covering three foolscap pages. These conditions make it quite clear that at all times when making inquiries from this organization the council was unable to establish what type of chemicals or liquids would be contained at the site. Perhaps a most explosive form of liquid chemical might be kept there. The council was quite concerned at that possibility, but its hands were tied following a decision by the New South Wales Planning and Environment Commission. The resolution of the council was that:

Pursuant to Interim Development Order No. 14 of 22nd November, 1974, and the direction issued by the Minister for Planning and Environment under the provisions of section 342v (3) of the Local Government Act, 1919, in regard to development applications for the use of land reclaimed for the Botany Bay Port Development, the Council advise the N.S.W. Planning and Environment Commission that it has examined a development application submitted by Terminals Pty Limited of 77 Pacific Highway, North Sydney, for the use of Lot 3 D.P. 251079 fronting a road proposed to be named Friendship Road, for the purposes of the receipt, storage, blending, drumming, packaging, despatching and otherwise handling bulk liquids, liquified gases and other products as set out in clause 11 of the lease from the Maritime Services Board to Swift and Company Limited.

In February, 1975, the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports made a statement about the development proposal and the servicing of that development. In May, 1975, the Minister for Planning and Environment said he knew nothing about it. Now Terminals Pty Limited, a wholly-owned American company, using oversea capital, has made an application to the council. This shows that the people have been misled by the Minister for Planning and Environment. The conditions recommended by the council are subject to the approval of the State Planning and Environment Commission and the Minister. That is why I am concerned about the association between this Minister, Sir John Austen

as chairman of Blue Metal and Gravel Limited and Sir John Austen as chairman of Clutha Developments Proprietary Limited. One might ask, how far does it go?

Mr CRABTREE: And Sir John Fuller.

Mr HAIGH: That is a question the Opposition wants answered. No environmental impact study has been made on this proposal. I venture to say that this will be the worst possible development that could be approved for the foreshores of Botany Bay.

Mr PUNCH: Which one is this?

Mr HAIGH: The application by Terminals Pty Limited for Swift and Company Limited. There has been no public inquiry about this. There have been only two inquiries--one about the coal loader and one about the carriage of petroleum products. Those two inquiries had limited terms of reference. It is interesting to note that the Minister for Planning and Environment directed that the terms of reference be restricted.

Mr CRABTREE: And he has an interest in it.

Mr HAIGH: I do not know about that.

Mr PUNCH: The honourable member for Kogarah does not have the courage to say that outside the Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRABTREE: It is true.

Mr PUNCH: Like the deal with your Iraqi friends. That is an example of the honest Labor Party.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. I will not tolerate this type of interruption of proceedings. Debate must proceed in an orderly fashion. The honourable member for Maroubra alone has the call.

Mr HAIGH: Because of my summation of what has happened in the development of Botany Bay it is obvious why it is urgent that the Government should re-think its attitude towards this motion. It is urgent that the Government should consider the call by Hurstville council and others for a Royal

commission to inquire into how these developments are being pushed through. The inquiries held have been nothing more than kangaroo court type of inquiries. The people must be satisfied. The Government should do this to justify itself and to try to clean its hands of the soil that is upon them.

Mr FISCHER: What about the Kurnell refinery approval?

Mr HAIGH: My colleagues have spoken about what will happen because of this indiscriminate approval of development around the foreshores of Botany Bay. It may be appropriate for me to say what has happened already. Because the Government decided to develop the northern foreshores of Botany Bay instead of following the planned industrial development with wharf and berth facilities in a complex on the southern side of the bay, the cost factor increased enormously. To date the known increase in cost is more than \$30 million because of the armoured breakwall that had to be built and the extra dredging and protection that would not have been necessary had the southern shore been developed. That is the price that this Government is willing to pay to stay in office and to hold two seats. If it is willing to do that in relation to staying in government, what is happening in relation to the other matters of which I have spoken?

When the Government began to develop the northern foreshore of Botany Bay the first thing that occurred was that the whole **Kurnell** peninsula was scoured and washed away. The Maritime Services Board built groynes in an endeavour to consolidate the foreshore and keep the area intact. Then **Yarra** Bay and Frenchman's Bay were scooped out. Almost \$1 million will be spent on works and groyne development to protect those bays. That is what happened following a political decision to move the development of the port from the southern side of the bay to the northern side of the bay and to change the purpose for which the port was to be developed. It was altered from a general cargo port to a general cargo port, a container port, a bulk liquid chemicals port and a port required to handle ships with a deadweight of 200 000 tonnes

and an expectancy of even larger ships in the future. Though all this was happening, at no time did this Government carry out a total environmental impact study or state its total development plan in relation to Botany Bay.

The Government has not even required Terminals Pty Limited or Swift and Company Limited to disclose what type of chemicals, liquids or gaseous materials they might hold in the bulk liquid containers that are to be located in this port complex. An assessment of what could be stored there has been made but there could be a change. The companies concerned have not said anything. The Department of Planning and Environment has not asked for a listing of what is proposed to be kept in those containers. The companies say they will not give a listing because there may be a change in the type of chemicals or gaseous materials that they wish to bring into the port.

This is the most serious thing that could conceivably come before the Parliament in relation to this development. The fact that approvals have been given and that there is an odour in regard to the way in which these approvals have been given should be investigated. If the Government wishes to clear itself with the public, local councils and local organizations a Royal commission should be appointed to investigate fully activities that have occurred within the planning and development of this complex. A Royal commission could explain in detail the association of development applications and approvals. Though the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports made clear statements about the development of Botany Bay only four months ago, the Minister for Planning and Environment said he knew nothing whatever about it. When that sort of conflict occurs at Cabinet level there is a doubt and consequently a need for a Royal commission to investigate the matter. The people should be satisfied in this regard.

Mr MAHER: Mr Speaker——

Mr L. B. KELLY (Corrimal) [5.31]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

AYES, 44

Mr Bannon	Mr Jones
Mr Barnier	Mr Keane
Mr Bedford	Mr Kearns
Mr Booth	Mr L. B. Kelly
Mr Breton	Mr Maher
Mr Cahill	Mr Mahoney
Mr Cleary	Mr Mallam
Mr Cox	Mr Mulock
Mr Crabtree	Mr O'Connell
Mr Day	Mr Paciullo
Mr Degen	Mr Petersen
Mr Einfeld	Mr Quinn
Mr Face	Mr Ramsay
Mr Ferguson	Mr Renshaw
Mr Flaherty	Mr Rogan
Mr Gordon	Mr Stewart
Mr Haigh	Mr Wade
Mr Hills	Mr F. J. Walker
Mr M. L. Hunter	Mr Wran
Mr Jackson	
Mr Jensen	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Johnson	Mr Durick
Mr Johnstone	Mr Sheahan

NOES, 48

Mr Arblaster	Mr Mason
Mr Boyd	Mr Mead
Mr Brewer	Mrs Meillon
Mr Brown	Mr Morris
Mr Bruxner	Mr Mutton
Mr Clough	Mr Osborne
Mr Coleman	Mr Park
Mr Cowan	Mr Pickard
Mr Crawford	Mr Punch
Mr Darby	Mr Rofe
Mr Dowd	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Doyle	Mr Ruddock
Mr Duncan	Mr Schipp
Mr Fischer	Mr Singleton
Mr Fisher	Mr Taylor
Mr Freudenstein	Mr Waddy
Mr Griffith	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr Hatton	Mr Webster
Mr Healey	Mr West
Mr D. B. Hunter	Sir Eric Willis
Mr Leitch	Mr Wotton
Mr Lewis	
Mr McGinty	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Mackie	Mr Jackett
Mr Maddison	Mr Viney

Resolved in the negative.

Mr **MEAD (Hurstville)** [5.36]: It is obvious how sincere the Opposition is about discussing the Botany Bay scheme: an attempt was made to gag the debate before the time had expired. The honourable member for Maroubra tried to use the debate to assassinate the Hon. Sir John Fuller. When the honourable member for Maroubra was mayor of **Randwick** he was involved

in a public scandal about sending off thirteen hundred dozen bottles of beer that were supposed to be for the pensioners. Who was it pinched the pensioners' Christmas beer at **Randwick**?

Mr **HAIGH**: On a point of order. A reference designed to defame me was made by the honourable member for **Hurstville**. I use the term in deference to the House.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order!

Mr **HAIGH**: I do not know what the honourable member for **Hurstville** is talking about.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! I do not expect honourable members to persist in speaking when the Chair intervenes. What is the point of order?

Mr **HAIGH**: The honourable member for **Hurstville** referred to knocking-off beer. That is offensive. I ask for an apology and a withdrawal.

Mr **PUNCH**: You can dish it out but you cannot take it.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! If the honourable member for **Maroubra** says that the words are offensive to him, I shall ask the honourable member for **Hurstville** to withdraw them.

Mr **MEAD**: If the honourable member for **Maroubra** finds the words offensive, I shall withdraw them. I want to talk about the **Botany Bay** scheme.

Mr **PUNCH**: Ask him to give the beer back.

Mr **HAIGH**: I take another point of order. There was an inference by the Minister when he said, "Give the beer back". I again ask for a withdrawal and an apology. The only people who could give the beer back—

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order!

Mr **HAIGH**: —are those people on the other side of the House who took it.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! I draw specifically to the attention of the honourable member for **Maroubra** that he has twice repeated

the conduct that I have criticized: he has persisted in speaking when the Speaker is on his feet. That is grossly disorderly. If there is any repetition of that conduct, the honourable member will be dealt with under a standing order that provides a severe penalty. I have no intention whatever of making the order sought.

Mr MEAD: Let me return to the Botany Bay port development scheme which will not be the monster that it has been portrayed by some members of the Opposition and some of their so-called conservationist left wing friends. It is time that people were given the **true** picture of what is proposed instead of the distorted picture that honourable members opposite and others have been painting over the past year or so. The Botany Bay port development scheme will be one of the most important projects ever undertaken, not only in the development of Sydney as one of the large cities of the world, but also as a vital component in building up Australia's export markets. I should have thought that honourable members of the Opposition, who claim to be the friends of the workers, would have been interested in the increased employment opportunities that will be created, especially as their **comrades** in Canberra put so many people out of work.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Thirty-five jobs?

Mr MEAD: The honourable member for Georges River does not know what he is talking about. Contrary to the claims made by Opposition speakers, the reclamation and port development will improve a neglected and decrepit part of Botany Bay and provide parks, gardens, recreation areas, a scenic roadway and even fishing spots in what has been for 200 years of white settlement a neglected and shallow area of mud and sand flats. Since the honourable member for Kogarah moved his motion in November the State Pollution Control Commission has published the reports and findings of an environmental inquiry into the proposal to establish the coal loader as part of the port development scheme. The people **will** be able to see in these documents **some** interesting findings and certain assurances which demolish the false propaganda claims

that members of the Opposition have been repeating. The honourable member for Maroubra said that a petro-chemical complex is to be established there. Had he read *Questions and Answers* he would see that the Minister, in reply to a question by the honourable member for Georges River, has stated:

There is no petro-chemical plant to be sited on the port development at Botany Bay.

There are to be no large chemical processing factories like the ones the Labor Party established at Kurnell—without any environmental inquiry at all. The honourable member for Georges River in another question asked the Minister whether he would list all the industries planned to be sited on reclaimed land in Botany Bay. The Minister replied:

There are no industries whatever to be sited on reclaimed land in Botany Bay.

Mr F. J. WALKER: The Maritime Services Board will be building installations there.

Mr MEAD: Will you shut up? You had your say. The Minister went on to say he had many times emphasized that the reclaimed land would be used for short-term transit storage of ships' cargoes. The Opposition tries to mislead the House about petro-chemical complexes and all that sort of rubbish. I note one absentee—the **vociferous** and loquacious member for **Campelltown**. He should be concerned about his coalminers but he is not here today. He is probably out looking at his milk quota. The people have been told that the nearby suburbs from Rockdale to Cronulla will be smothered in coal dust from the loading plant and from swarms of uncovered coal carrying motor trucks. The people have been told that the Government rushed in without **completing** any environment study.

Mr CRABTREE: Without full environmental studies.

Mr MEAD: Wait a minute. In November, 1973, the report of the Botany Bay and Georges River basin environment study was published.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Is that the basis for the development?

Mr MEAD: Apparently the honourable member has not seen it. He claims in this House that no environmental study **has** been made. He claims to be the great conservation expert but **if** he had read some of this material instead of reading the speech he made this afternoon, he might be a little better informed.

Mr CRABTREE: I have read it.

Mr MEAD: The honourable member for Kogarah claims to have read this study and yet he says that there has been no environment study. What utter hypocrisy.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I **am** completely dissatisfied with this debate. One member in particular has been called to order **on** two occasions yet persists in interjecting **further**. There are interjections from both sides of the House. That is not acceptable to me and I must ask that the debate proceed in a more orderly fashion.

Mr MEAD: Statements by the Opposition that no **environmental** study has been made and that the suburbs will be covered in coal dust are irresponsible and dishonest. What is more, they are designed deliberately to mislead and disturb people in the interests of **dishonest** political purposes. There have been environment impact studies of Botany Bay and even as far afield as the catchment area. One of **those** studies was completed nearly three years ago—that is the one I have referred to—and another is proceeding even now **in** more detail. I emphasize that nothing will be done in the port development scheme which **conflicts** with environmental interests. The Government has given an assurance to this effect.

Two other points should be cleared up quickly. We have had reference to road haulage and coal dust nuisance. There **will** be no road haulage of coal and there will be no dust. It is sheer dishonesty for honourable members opposite to make those statements. **All** the coal will be **carried** in covered cod waggons and the coal loader will be covered. The loader will be on land **leased** by the Maritime Services Board and a condition will be that no coal will be

received at the port by road. There **will** be no dust and little noise. The Botany goods line is to be electrified, the track duplicated and **reballasted**, the rails welded to cut down noise and the number of crossing **points** reduced. Level crossings are to be eliminated; sidings and shunting will be reduced and the warning bells on level crossings will be needed there no longer.

The report of the inquiry into the wal loader, which has been ridiculed by the members of the Opposition who have made scandalous allegations about the conduct of that inquiry, found that there were no reasons for rejecting the coal loader on environmental grounds provided the proponent companies obtained **from** the State Pollution Control Commission all necessary approvals under **the** Clean Air Act, the Clean Waters Act and the Noise Control Act. They must also meet the requirements of all public authorities having statutory responsibilities and they must submit for the approval of the State Pollution Control **Commission** a plan describing the measures proposed for improving and maintaining the appearance of the loader and minimising **its** visual impact. This is quite **different** from what the public has been fed by the **propagandists** of the left wing.

To listen to the prophets of doom who are trying to whoop this up as an election issue one **would** think that a first-class **residential** area is to be destroyed. That is completely untrue. I think that only 173 houses are involved and it is a drab industrial area. The small number of houses would certainly not be classed as A1 residential. We have to listen to this sort of nonsense the Opposition feeds to the public. The Minister for Planning and Environment has made it clear that no major development in the Botany Bay complex will be approved until the Government has received an independent report from the Stake Pollution Control Commission on the environmental consequences. There are clear provisions in the law which require the approval of the State Pollution Control Commission before any projects can be constructed or operated which would lead to the **pollution** of air or water or even the creation of unacceptable noise.

Members of the Opposition have repeatedly talked about the stopping of work on the port until an environment impact study is made; that is part of the motion before the House. It is also part of the election ploy of the Leader of the Opposition and some of his left-wing colleagues like the member for Georges River. In May last year the Leader of the Opposition said that the whole sorry saga of the Botany Bay scheme has been a patchwork of piecemeal development, with no overall long-term plan and no total environment impact study. He was also quoted in a local newspaper out there, and the heading of the article gives the game away. The heading was, "River sets Labor's strategy: Pollution is vote clincher." The article went on to say:

"An anti-pollution drive in St George is expected to set the style and strategy for the State Parliamentary Labor Party's campaign against the Askin Government during the next three years.

Mr DAY: Was that in the *St George and Sutherland Shire Leader*?

Mr MEAD: I am sorry to disappoint the honourable member for Casino; that quotation was from a Cumberland press newspaper, the *St George Pictorial*, which does not exist any more. It did not get any Arab money. The article continued:

Seven Labor M.L.A's have banded together to launch a thorough investigation of pollution in the Georges River. The campaign has political implications that go far beyond the Georges River.

It could make the St George area the generator of the revitalized A.L.P. leadership's "new wave" attack on the State Government to recover ground that was lost in the setbacks of last November's election.

The seven-man bloc is led by Opposition leader and member for Bass Hill, Mr Neville Wran, whose takeover of the party leadership after the November poll nudged the centre of power to the Left and into the ranks of the party's "white collar professionals".

That is further proof that this is an election stunt by the Labor Party. I would be happy to outline to members of the Opposition some of the matters discussed in this environment impact study, but they are so anxious to gag this debate and cut down the time that I shall be unable to do so. This report was prepared by an impressive

consulting team, which included some most distinguished and foremost consultants in the various fields of industry. The study dealt with a wide range of subjects including oceanography, water resources, climateology and air quality, flora and fauna, fisheries, manufacturing industries, transport, public utilities and recreation. But I remind the House that the decision to make Botany Bay a major shipping port was taken in 1961 by the State Labor Government, which certainly did not precede its decision with any environmental studies such as those that have been undertaken since the present Government came to office.

Mr PUNCH: One of its main purposes, according to the Minister for Local Government at the time, the honourable member for Phillip, was to handle chemicals.

Mr MEAD: That is right. Last year the Hon. Sir John Fuller announced another environmental study of Botany Bay and its tributaries, which is still continuing, with the following six principal objectives: to identify any existing environmental problems in the waters of the bay and its tributaries; to determine the measures needed to rectify these problems; to identify possible environmental problems that could arise in the waters of the bay and its tributaries from future developments within the catchment; to determine the environmental controls that must be imposed on future developments to ensure that such problems do not arise; to identify the attributes of the bay and its tributaries, and to consider the possible uses of these waters by and in the service of the community; and to recommend to the Government a comprehensive water resource management plan for the bay and its tributaries.

The honourable member for Georges River should be reminded that when the Labor Party was in office, as the honourable member for Maroubra said, it wanted to put the port development on the southern side, at Quibray Bay. If the people in the St George district are as concerned as the honourable member for Georges River says they should be concerning the increase in road traffic that may be generated by shipping at Banksmeadow, one can imagine the

chaos that would have resulted if the port had been placed on the southern side of the bay, with the traffic having to go through the St George area via Tom Ugly's bridge and Captain Cook bridge.

It is also pertinent to remind the people of St George and Sutherland shire that Senator Arthur Gietzelt, now a leading very left-wing member of the Australian Labor Party federal executive, in more humble days as president of the Labor controlled Sutherland shire council, welcomed the State Labor Government's intentions in 1960. He said development of Botany Bay as a port was good town planning. He also welcomed the Labor Party's proposal to make Towra Point a second airport, saying it would be a great boon for the Sutherland shire. How times change! In those days they were espousing an airport on Towra Point and also shipping facilities for Botany Bay, but now the left-wing of the Australian Labor Party has found a new mistress in the environmental political front, in which the honourable member for Georges River is so vocal. It is strange that these people who have been vocal about environmental impact studies and other things seem to be ignorant of what is going on.

The total planning of the land surrounding the bay is being considered by two study groups. One is the environment impact study which the Hon. Sir John Fuller announced last year, and the other is the management committee for the port, which was announced by the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports. Although honourable members opposite are claiming that the local councils are not consulted in these matters, I must point out that the membership of this committee includes an alderman or an officer of the Botany, Randwick, Rockdale and Sutherland councils. Opposition members say that no one is told anything and local councils do not have an opportunity to be represented on a management committee that will consider the proper use and development of the port. The environment impact study that is going on under the direction of the Minister is making

Mr Mead]

available its information progressively as it goes along. It is not going to sit until it is finished, but as soon as the information becomes available it is put at the disposal of all who should have it.

It is incredible that we should be subjected to so much dishonesty, confusion and untruths from members of the Opposition. This report reveals that 60 per cent of the total industry of the Sydney metropolitan area is concentrated in the Botany Bay-Georges River basin.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It being 6 o'clock p.m., the debate is interrupted. This question having been debated at two sittings of the House, the motion lapses.

[Mr Speaker left the chair at 6 p.m. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

BILLS RETURNED

The following bills were returned from the Legislative Council without amendment:

National Fitness (Repeal) Bill

Radioactive Substances (Amendment) Bill

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

INTRODUCTION

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), *Attorney-General and Minister of Justice* [7.31]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to promote the revision of the statute law by repealing enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary.

The bill that I seek leave to introduce will give effect to the first report of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission on statute law revision. It represents one stage in the continuing work of reviewing the statutes of New South Wales. During this review, it has been found possible to remove from the statute books many Acts which, for one reason or another, have ceased to have any practical operation. Obviously, this will be an involved and time consuming continuous process; however,

just as obviously, it is a task which must be undertaken. The Law Reform Commission will continue to record instances where legislation may safely be **repealed** with a view to the Government introducing similar bills from time to time.

The bill will **affect** two classes of Acts. The first class comprises Acts which are recommended for total repeal. The second class comprises Acts which contain matters which should be repealed as well as matters which are to be retained but cannot be incorporated as amendments elsewhere. There are various reasons for the proposed repeals. For example, some of the Acts have performed all their functions and thus are spent. Falling into this category are statutes authorizing public works and loans. Other Acts have been superseded by Commonwealth legislation—for example, the Quarantine Act, 1897. Though this is not a measure one could expect to have popular appeal, it nonetheless is an important piece of legislation in the process of bringing up to date New South Wales statute law. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MULLOCK (Penrith) [7.32]: This piece of legislation will provide the means of removing from the statute book certain enactments which, if we accept what the Attorney-General has said at this introductory stage, and we do accept it, have ceased to have any practical operation. Also, certain enactments which contain matters that have ceased to have force or have become unnecessary and should be repealed as well as matters that should be retained will be dealt with in the bill. Law reform needs to be continually looked at. The Opposition will examine the pieces of legislation that will **come** within the **ambit** of this measure. There is no objection to the introduction of this bill and the Opposition looks forward to the opportunity of perusing it. The Opposition will determine its attitude after the bill has been examined.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

PASTURES PROTECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

SECOND READING

Debate resumed (from 4th March, *vide* page 3950) on motion by Mr Cowan:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr COWAN (Oxley), Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Water Resources [7.34], in reply: During the second-reading debate certain matters were raised by members from the Opposition and Government sides of the House and I should like to reply to them. The honourable member for Murrumbidgee, who led for the Opposition, queried the necessity to have pastures protection boards. I should like to say that since taking over the Ministry of Agriculture and for many years prior to that I have been aware of the importance of pastures protection boards. Those boards are responsible for ridding rural areas of noxious animals and disease. Over many years the boards have served a useful purpose. No doubt rabbits and dingoes are the principal noxious animals and pastures protection boards have played a big part in ridding the State of **these** nuisances.

The Government places great importance upon the structure of pastures protection boards. It has been suggested that a representative of the Department of Agriculture should be appointed to each board. There has always been a close liaison between the department and pastures protection boards. The council of advice is responsible for the executive running of pastures protection boards and all boards keep in close communication with the department through this council. The Government believes it to be important that the work of pastures protection boards should be continued and wherever possible strengthened. Pastures protection boards express the view of local landholders and local people control the destiny of those boards.

With regard to payments to directors of pastures protection boards, the existing Act provides that payments must be set by regulation. Under the proposed Act payments to directors **will** be set by the Minister. I **should** point out, however, **that** neither the

old nor the new Act compels a board to pay anything to a director. A discretion is given to the board to make payments within certain limits. It is mainly a matter of an approach to the Minister concerned who will set fees for a particular board. Of course, these payments will relate only to travelling and **accommodation** expenses incurred when a director is engaged on the business of the board.

The existing Act provides that seven days' notice must be given to a landowner before an inspector may inspect a property for noxious animals. The proposed Act provides for immediate entrance. However, there is no provision for inspection of the dwelling on the property **unless** a magistrate's warrant is first issued. This proviso is necessary because many people keep animals such as rabbits and foxes as pets.

Another matter raised related to merchandising of boards. I know that merchandising has been a complex question and subject to a lot of debate among pastures protection boards. A veterinary inspector may take with him only sufficient antibiotics or substances to enable him to treat a beast or animals on the spot. The bill provides that pastures protection boards may not sell at a profit **implements** or medicines to be used to destroy noxious animals on a property. The honourable member for Dubbo raised the question of a permit for travelling stock at night. There is still a need for a permit but within certain areas of the central division and eastern division it will not be necessary to have a permit endorsed for stock travelling by motor transport at night.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE

Schedule 1

(4) Section 9—

Omit the section, insert instead:—

10 9. (1) The board may allow to any director such **Fees and expenses** as the Minister may determine **from** time to time in respect of that director.

(2) Except as provided in subsection (1), no fee or other payment shall be **allowed or made** by the board to any director.

Mr Cowan]

Mr GORDON (Murrumbidgee) [7.43]:
I move:

That at page 5, **all** words on **lines** 7 to 14 be left out.

The reason for the amendment is that the words that the Opposition proposes should be left out provide for payment of fees and expenses to members of pastures protection boards. The community as a whole is not ready for this action. The Opposition has no objection to payment of out-of-pocket expenses and travelling expenses such as meals, and in some areas, perhaps in the Western Division, overnight expenses would properly be incurred. Bearing in mind that most rural shire councils and rural county councils do not pay their members, who have a far greater responsibility, the Opposition feels that this proposal in respect of pastures protection boards would be an added expense on the rural community and is not in favour of it.

Mr COWAN (Oxley), Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Water Resources [7.44]: The Government does not agree to the amendment moved by the spokesman for the Opposition. I have outlined already the reasons why that is so.

Amendment negatived.

Page 14

10 (5A) The notice referred to in subsection (5) is not required to be given where the board, in the exercise of its powers under that subsection, by its officers, servants, agents or contractors enters land to destroy any noxious animals kept in captivity thereon without the permission of the Minister granted under section 85.

Mr GORDON (Murrumbidgee) [7.45]:
I move:

That at page 14, all words on lines 6 to 12 be left out.

The Minister spoke at great length about the need to destroy noxious animals. The Opposition resists the provision in this part of the schedule quite vigorously. The noxious animals referred to in the bill are rabbits, hares, foxes and dingoes. It is not right for the power in this provision to be given to a pastures protection board inspector. The inspector could then enter an area and destroy a pet rabbit, a pet dingo, pet fox or pet hare belonging to a child. The present

wording places an added responsibility on the inspector and gives too much authority to directors of pastures protection boards. Honourable members on this side of the Chamber oppose the schedule in this respect. If a person is keeping too many rabbits or other noxious animals such as hares, foxes or dingoes we have no objection to implementation of the provisions in proposed new subsection (5B) of section 82. That gives the pastures protection board the right to ask a stipendiary magistrate to issue a warrant authorizing a person to enter a dwelling-house for the purpose of searching for and destroying noxious animals. That should apply also to the grounds and the near vicinity of residences of people who live in closely settled areas and even on farms.

Children on a farm may find a young dingo and keep it as a pet. If the animal is kept at home it does not affect anyone, so why destroy it? As a child I kept pet rabbits, as no doubt did many other honourable members. I would be willing to wager that about half of the members of this House kept pet rabbits. If a person found a hare, took it home and looked after it, it would do no harm to anybody. For an officer of the pastures protection board to be able to enter a property and destroy a pet rabbit or dingo is asking too much. It asks too much of the inspector who may be directed by his principals to enter private land and destroy a pet belonging to a child. The Opposition objects to this provision.

Mr LEITCH (Armidale) [7.47]: It is pathetic that the spokesman for the Opposition should go on in this way. I do not know if the honourable member for Murrumbidgee ever kept a pet dingo—he has hinted that he kept other pets. Does he wish to eradicate rabbits? These things are important. I do not think that people and rabbits can live together. We have to eradicate rabbits in this country. It is all very well to quote doubtful cases in a sanctimonious way. I do not see that we can carry on our pastoral or farming activities with rabbits, dingoes or foxes. A rather specious argument given from an emotional viewpoint was that some people may wish to keep a pet dingo. If that is so I do not

think that the local inspector will be chasing them. The argument was specious and unsatisfactory. I certainly will not be voting for this amendment.

Mr COWAN (Oxley), Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Water Resources [7.49]: This provision was requested by pastures protection boards within the State. There is hardly a thing in the bill that was not asked for by the boards.

Mr GORDON: The Opposition does not agree with the request.

Mr COWAN: The Opposition is against pastures protection boards. The other night the honourable member for Murrumbidgee said that they ought to be eliminated. That must be the feeling of the Opposition. The honourable member for Murrumbidgee is its spokesman. The Government is strongly against abolition of the boards. They serve a useful purpose in the community. The Government supports them strongly and will give them more power. In that way local people control local problems as far as noxious animals and diseases are concerned.

Inspectors of pastures protection boards have had power to inspect property for a long time. They had to give seven days notice before they were able to do so. As has been said by the honourable member for Armidale, if rabbits, dingoes and foxes are running round a place, there is a tendency for them to escape, and the cost and effort of eradication by landowners goes down the drain. If a pet that is kept on a property escapes, the work that is done and the cost incurred is wasted. As I said earlier, before an inspector will be able to inspect a house he must have a magistrate's warrant but he will be able to enter a property and search for noxious animals on the property. The Government rejects the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Schedule agreed to.

ADOPTION OF REPORT

Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted on motion by Mr Cowan.

SYDNEY SPORTS GROUND AND
SYDNEY CRICKET GROUND AMAL-
GAMATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

SECOND READING

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman), Minister for Culture, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism [7.53]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill gives trustees of the Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground the power to make rules and regulations in relation to regulating or prohibiting any person from entering on to lands controlled by the trustees and allowing a penalty of up to \$100 to be imposed for breaches of such rules and regulations. It has particular relevance to the invasion of the playing areas of the Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground by spectators—both adults and children—before the end of a match or immediately thereafter, as honourable members will recall happened so frequently during the football season last year.

As was pointed out in the previous session of Parliament in answer to a question without notice by the honourable member for Liverpool, the practice of spectators running on to a field, while a match is still in progress, poses a real threat to the safety of those persons. At that time, the House was given an instance where a child was killed in similar circumstances at a football match in New Zealand. The press has given considerable coverage to this problem and many people have put forward ideas on how the problem might best be overcome. Until now, intruding upon the playing area of the Sydney Sports Ground or the Sydney Cricket Ground has not constituted an offence in itself and the Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground Trust has not had the power to make rules and regulations that could deter persons committing such an offence.

The law can go only so far when it concerns the range of powers it gives to a body such as the Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground Trust. It is left to the administrators of the law to implement such provisions as events require. I should like

honourable members to look upon this as an enabling bill—a measure that will enable trustees to make rules and regulations regulating or prohibiting acts such as running on to a playing area before the end of a game. In itself, it does not immediately make a person liable to the maximum penalty of \$100 should he run on to the cricket ground. The rules and regulations will set this out. Rules and regulations, whenever made or amended, will always be tabled in Parliament giving honourable members the opportunity to propose such changes as they see fit. I should like to emphasize that it is the rules and regulations that will determine how this provision will be implemented.

I am sure that the Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground Trust will consider closely any rules and regulations that affect intrusions on playing areas. I am sure, too, that the trust in the first instance will give careful and sympathetic consideration to all the circumstances of any intrusion before deciding whether to proceed any further. I am sure, also, that honourable members opposite will be able to rely equally on the deliberations of trustees having, as they do among their number, the honourable member for Phillip and the honourable member for Castlereagh.

The major **difficulty** confronting trustees in dealing with spectators, especially at football matches, when they jump the boundary fence and run on to the playing area before the end of the game, is that many of them are children. As honourable members are aware, children may not be prosecuted in the same way as adults. The trustees of the Sydney Sports Ground and Sydney Cricket Ground have made it quite clear to me that never at any time have they intended to seek legislation that would **conflict** with such basic principles of the common law as those dealing with the prosecution of children, but they do want rules and regulations, for the proper control and good management of the grounds under their jurisdiction, to be clear on the subject of unauthorized entry on such grounds, and to be able to have **as** a deterrent a penalty, in this case, of up to \$100.

This may be only one step forward but it is basic and one that will lead to more orderly conduct at sporting fixtures and greater safety for all concerned. Though I have spoken at some length on this matter, the bill is short but, I feel, one of great interest not only to players and spectators of sport but also to parents and all those concerned with the safety and proper control of all persons at sporting functions. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr PACIULLO (Liverpool) [7.58]: If I appear to be in some physical agony, I want to assure you, Mr Speaker, and the Minister that I am. That is because I and some of my parliamentary colleagues yesterday personally inspected the cricket ground and foolishly became involved in a game of cricket on the very area of which we are speaking tonight. At the outset I might say that the Opposition supports the principles involved in the bill, though we on this side regard the penalty of up to \$100 as too harsh. A little later I shall give reasons in support of that contention.

The entry of unauthorized persons on to lands under the control of the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust has been a matter of growing concern not only to the trust itself but also to players, spectators and, I believe, the whole community. This behaviour is an annoyance because of the disruption to play, in the main by exhibitionists. It is a matter of concern also because of the likelihood, as the Minister pointed out, of injury or even death, as occurred in New Zealand. The New South Wales Rugby League initiated action, as I understand it, for some control over the situation at the Sydney Cricket Ground and sought the very legislation that is now before us. **It** was with the support of the trust that we have reached this stage. I was informed by the members of the trust to whom the Minister referred, that the police had been reluctant to act as there is no law that clearly allows them to apprehend persons running on to the oval while the match is in progress or afterwards.

It has been suggested that if this legislation had not been brought before Parliament, there would have been virtually no

alternative to erecting some type of wire barricade to keep people from running on to the cricket ground. That would have been unthinkable, abhorrent to all of us. The Opposition, in supporting the bill, accepts that the powers to be given to the trust **will** be used by it with discretion—one might say, with extreme discretion. Honourable members have been informed that the powers will be used in the main as a deterrent. Warning people over amplifiers of the law is one of the ways in which that deterrent can be effected. However, prosecuting sometimes excitable children is fraught with all sorts of dangers and repercussions. I suggest strongly to the Government that there ought to be no occasion in future when there will be reason to regret the introduction of the legislation on this aspect.

Further, I believe that there should be some public disquiet and misgiving if, say, persons were prosecuted for going on to the cricket ground when a match had been completed. The Minister said in his second-reading speech that the purpose of the bill was to control events and to prevent unauthorized persons from running on to the cricket ground during and after matches. Surely some stage must be reached after the match when no harm would be caused by such an occurrence. It is a natural reaction for a crowd in a moment of intense excitement, in a moment of sporting history, to want to go on to the ground to applaud their heroes, and the like. Once again, in **this** respect it is important that the powers proposed to be given to the trust be used with care.

The Opposition believes strongly that the proposed maximum penalty of \$100 for this offence is excessive. **All** the objects of the bill could be achieved successfully with a maximum penalty of, for example, \$40. I foreshadow that at the Committee stage I shall be moving an amendment to that effect and at that time shall give some examples of anomalies in the impositions of fines in this State. I suggest that the Minister and the Government give favourable consideration to the points I make.

I have said before and I repeat, the Opposition has no argument with the principle of the bill. We support it. However, I seek

clarification from the Minister of the law on this matter as it applies at other places. The bill will deal with a situation at the Sydney Cricket Ground, but what is the position if the same **incident** occurred on a racecourse? I am sure the Minister will appreciate that some short time ago the practice of streaking was popular, not only at the Sydney Cricket Ground, but also at racecourses. Is it proposed to introduce a measure to deal with such matters, or can they be controlled in other ways? There are many suburban grounds where sporting events take place and I am not exactly clear, nor are other members of the Opposition, whether the Government has given thought to ensuring that what it seeks to prevent at the Sydney Cricket Ground will be prevented at other grounds as well. There is a case for uniformity in that regard. With the reservations I have expressed, I repeat on behalf of the Opposition that we shall support the motion for the second reading.

Mr DOYLE (Vaucluse) [8.5]: As a member of the Sydney Cricket Ground for some thirty years I share **somewhat** the views of the Opposition on this measure. I enjoy watching cricket and football and although I recognize the need for the bill, somehow the thought of disciplining cricket spectators sticks in my gizzard. Perhaps I **am** disappointed not so much with the Minister **as** with the crowds at the Sydney Cricket Ground who behave in a way that **calls** for the introduction of legislation like **this**. Cricket has always been a game of the people, a game in which there has always been close **affinity** between spectator and player. Reference to the archives shows that cricket was being played in **1700**. Cricket is **older** than White Australians. Shepherds would use a pine cone as a **ball** to bowl at a man in their sheep pen defending the stumps. It is that sort **of** a game; it is a game that has been carried on by the people. Even the decoration of this Chamber with the colour green has a connection with the village green, where cricket was played, where the people engaged in the game **of** cricket. It seems to me to be unnecessary to go to the point of controlling those sorts of crowds.

I looked into the history **of** cricket to find out when the first game was played in New South Wales and I discovered that this happened only fifteen years after Governor Phillip arrived. In 1834, it is recorded, there was so much interest in the game that the Supreme Court adjourned in order to allow counsel and solicitors to join in a game of cricket. I suggest that when the Legislature ventures into the field sought to be covered by the bill it is not advancing the sport of cricket in the spirit in which it has developed over the years.

Small boys are the worst offenders, I admit, but sport will founder or flourish on the support that it gets from spectators. My sons from the ages of, I suppose, 8 to **14** years—for six years of their life—were more inclined to spend Saturday at the Sydney Cricket Ground watching cricket than they were to go surfing, because there was a possibility of dashing out to the pitch and patting their heroes on the back. To be able to slap Greg Chappell or Doug Walters on the back is something that attracts the young to cricket matches, and sports flourish or die according to the degree of enthusiasm of that sort displayed by spectators. Nor would the players object. Today, with their professionalism, players realize more than ever before that a personal following is essential if they are to succeed in getting the highest possible fees for endorsing products. That is an unattractive thought, but it is a fact, and few players would object that they were being mobbed, for they know that such incidents put more noughts behind the figures in their bank **accounts**.

I inquired from the members **of** the **trust** **as** to what extent accidents had occurred at the Sydney Cricket Ground. They had to admit that there had been nothing more serious than a badly bruised **seagull**. So, although the boggy can be raised that small children could be injured in **running** on to the ground, the fact is that to date, after about **thirty** years, to my memory, of people running **on** to that green sward, there has been only the odd bruised **seagull**. I wonder whether that history of accidents is sufficient to warrant this sort of measure.

Another practice that has developed in recent years is throwing back balls when a boundary has been scored. This also gives delight to young people, and it saves a round fieldsman from having to run the full distance to the boundary. That is acceptable to him, and a delight to the boy concerned, especially if mum or dad should be watching him on television doing that bit of retrieving. I should not like to see that practice eliminated. If we in this city of three million people continue to legislate every time a killjoy raises the probability of injury, we shall wipe out all sorts of physical sports. We have already murdered cracker night. We cannot have bungers now, and my children will not have cracker night unless they can throw bungers at me. We have eradicated boxing from school sports on the ground that it is too vicious. If we go on raising the bogey of personal injury in this respect, we shall finish up a molly-coddled race.

One can imagine the killjoys starting to examine activities like scouting and outdoor activities that are arranged at schools. *All* these things will gradually come under their steely gaze, and in the end there will be no body-contact sports, and we shall become a completely mushy race. It would be unfair to suggest that the Minister, by presenting this legislation, is of that ilk, for it is definitely necessary to empower the trustees of the Sydney Cricket Ground to deal with streakers, who are outlawed anyway. I have seen a well-wisher take a glass of beer to the centre of the pitch and tip it over the head of Ian Chappell. We certainly do not want that, and this measure is necessary to prevent it. Indeed, even a gorilla wandered on to the pitch this season. Admittedly, it was a man dressed as a gorilla, but that sort of thing and those sort of people must be restrained.

I congratulate the Minister for bringing forward this measure, but I ask him and the trustees to administer the measure with equanimity, having regard to the things that give joy, especially to young children. Let me make a constructive suggestion. Crowding on to the oval after football matches has been mentioned by the Minister, and

certainly this practice has gone too far. One cannot have children running out while the game is still in progress, but when football is being played the whole of the ground is not being used. I suggest that police barriers could be erected inside the ground to form a small area in which children could gather in the last few minutes of a match so that they could see their heroes as they walked through to the dressing rooms.

I show honourable members a sketch, which illustrates how the children could proceed from the Noble stand, the members stand, the public stand and the hill in order to reach an area through which the players could walk after the match. This would obviate the danger of any of the children getting on to the field while the game is in progress. It would certainly give the children all the joy of patting their hero on the back, and at the same time doing no harm. This idea might be embraced by the trustees. Of course, it would not be a practical suggestion for cricket, because that game occupies the whole area of the ground. Even so, it might be possible to have the cricketers leave the field through a special area at the north-west corner of the Noble stand on their way to the dressing rooms. That would achieve the same object.

Spectators running on to a sporting field is no novelty. Ray Robinson, in his book entitled *On Top Down Under* records that, when the first Australian test team beat England in 1882 in England, in the concluding overs men noted for coolness were trembling like leaves and when Australia won by seven runs it is recorded that spectators rushed the ground. This great game moves spectators to extreme expressions of enthusiasm, and has done so for many years. One should not get too hysterical about the present enthusiasm for cricket.

In summary, my appeal to the Minister and to the trustees is this: by all means prosecute the streakers, drunks, political agitators and even gorillas; but take it easy on the kids, particularly in the period after games. When a cricket match is over the

umpires could remain at the crease, removing the stumps and preventing people running on the pitch. They could do this adequately if they were supported by a couple of greenkeepers in grey coats. I see no reason why the pitch should be harmed. The **kiddies** love running on to the oval. Let us hope that the London *Daily Telegraph* was wrong when, after reporting the atrocity of political agitators digging up the pitch during the third test at Headingly, it stated:

There was a time when the game of cricket was the quintessence of life on this island. A field of rich green—a cloudless sky—tea and sticky buns in a white marquee. Perhaps all that belongs to a era which is purely mythological—standing in relation to our own time as the Homeric age did to a later baser Greece.

Mr WOTTON (Burrendong) [8.16]: Let us not get too carried away with emotion. I commend the Minister for introducing a bill such as this one. I agree with the honourable member for Vacluse that we should look after the children, but the stage has been reached when this sort of thing is getting completely out of hand. No longer is it just children who run on to the field; we now see the exhibitionists, the male and female streakers, and the **larrikins** half full of idiot juice, as I heard it described in another place. It may be, as the honourable member for Vacluse said, that spectators first entered the playing field in 1882, but this general pattern of people running on to sporting fields has really developed only in the past few years. Someone might have run on to the field a hundred years ago when England was beaten at cricket for the first time, but basically this is a recent development.

Our law has been rather peculiar when it allows people to go on to virtually private property. This sort of thing happened at the Sydney Showground a few years ago; a person could not be charged with trespassing but was charged and found guilty of creating a disturbance. Yesterday when the annual cricket match between members of Parliament and the press gallery was held at the Sydney Cricket Ground, the honourable member for Liverpool and others who were taking part were apprehensive because

this law was not in force and we would be powerless to prevent streakers and other emotional spectators from running on to the ground. As it turned out, there was no need to worry, because when one of the spectators lost interest and left the ground, the crowd was reduced by one half.

This is an excellent measure, for it will stop the **larrikins** and the exhibitionists who are running on to grounds these days because they want to be involved in the scene. Other honourable members have mentioned our sporting heroes. Quite often when people run on to the field and come face to face with their heroes they are disappointed to find that their heroes are ordinary human beings. As a result, the hero image tends to disappear. If a person invaded the field and, when patting one of the Chappell brothers on the back, accidentally hit him on the nose, causing his nose to bleed, he would come away saying: "He is just an ordinary bloke. His nose bleeds like anyone else's." When that sort of thing happens, the hero image suddenly fades away.

During this debate the hope has been expressed that members of the Sydney Cricket Ground Trust will use their authority in the correct manner. Surely the people who are appointed to the trust are responsible and would administer any power vested in them in the correct manner. Honourable members need not get carried away with the thought that this measure will cause disquiet among the community. I think the public will applaud it and will be delighted to see that the game is not to be interrupted by a lot of silly people—young or old—running on to the ground. I do not think that the penalty of \$100 is excessive. These days that is not considered a large amount. We must make the penalty severe enough to prevent these happenings at our sporting fixtures, whether they be cricket, football or any other game in a sporting arena. People will have to obey the rules.

The honourable member for Vacluse went back into history and said that the first game of cricket in Australia was played in the early 1800's. Then he spoke about the green grass of England and that sort of

thing. However, he must realize that people now act differently, and different rules must be made to cover some of the actions that they go on with. I do not think small boys are the worst offenders in respect of the conduct we are discussing. There has been talk about erecting police barricades to keep people in a certain part through which the players could pass. Surely to goodness the area of an oval is **sufficient**: that is the place where **children** will have to look at their heroes without rushing in to pat them on the back.

Do not let us reach the situation in Victoria where football players enter and leave many sporting ovals through steel cages so that the spectators cannot touch them, stick hatpins into them or go on with that sort of conduct. That has gone on for a long time in Victoria. We must ensure that that sort of thing does not happen on the Sydney Cricket Ground, a place that the greatest cricketer of our time, Sir Donald Bradman, described as the finest cricket ground in the world. Do not let us disturb it by making cages for players to run in and out of.

The honourable member for Vacluse spoke about little boys throwing the ball back after a boundary is hit, to look after some rotund players. If players are rotund they have no right to be representing New South Wales or Australia. If rotund players are members of the Parliamentary Eleven, like the honourable member for Canterbury and myself—but not the honourable member for Liverpool, who is a fitness fanatic—they have no right to be playing for any other team. If players with that sort of figure are playing for Australia or New South Wales, it is high time that the selectors dropped them. The New South Wales Cricket Association is very much involved in what goes on at the Sydney Cricket Ground and it has been so involved for a long time by Act of Parliament. I am sure that the association welcomes the measure. I compliment the Minister on the bill. Finally, I wonder whether the proposed penalty is large enough to deter the sort of people who make an exhibition of themselves by interrupting a good game played on a halloed ground.

Mr MCGINTY (Willoughby) [8.26]: I do not want to delay honourable members but there are a few comments I should like to make about the bill. I was greatly interested in the matters raised by the two previous speakers from this side of the House about the game of cricket. My memory does not go back much further than the **first** time I went to the Sydney Cricket Ground. It cost me sixpence to get in to watch **McCabe** getting stuck into Larwood. When he scored **187** not out I was one of those kids who shook **him** by the hand. The practice of young boys and girls—but particularly boys—running on to cricket grounds in Sydney and elsewhere began at a time when cricket was at its lowest ebb. I thought then that it was a good idea that young people should be allowed to go on to a cricket oval and congratulate a player who had scored a **century**, that it was bringing some interest back to the game, and I did not consider the practice objectionable in any way. However, this practice has now become widespread. **The trouble is that now there are not so many young children involved; instead the bores are getting into the act. Streakers and others dressed up as gorillas are coming out on to the field and interrupting the game.**

The bill, which seeks to control this type of conduct at the Sydney Cricket Ground and the Sydney Sports Ground, is a good measure. People should be able to go to those grounds and be able to enjoy a match there. The game of cricket attracts a lot of **interest and people should be able to enjoy it in peace and comfort.** The sort of practices that have crept in at these grounds should be stopped; they are boorish and, as far as I am concerned, they add nothing to the game. I am happy to agree with this measure which will seek to stop these activities.

I agree with the honourable member for Burrendong that we should be careful how the measure is administered. It would be a great pity if young boys were deprived of the opportunity of being able to meet and congratulate their cricket hero who may have just scored a century. Some young boys have almost made idols of their cricket heroes. I do not think that anything is lost

by that sort of action; in fact, there is everything to be gained from it. When a batsman has scored a century, time is taken off to congratulate him and he raises his bat to acknowledge the plaudits of the crowd. In that short period some children run on to the ground to congratulate the player. I do not think the practice is all that bad.

I am concerned about what is happening at football matches. When young people run on to the ground before a game has ended it can create a dangerous situation. None of us would like to see a repetition here of the sort of accident that occurred in New Zealand. For years I have heard some sporting commentators such as Rex Mossop and Frank Hyde—like voices crying in the wilderness—asking the Government to do something about children running on to football grounds before the game is finished. Unless some action is taken to stop this practice someone is sure to be killed. I agree with the honourable member for Liverpool that perhaps this bill will cover the Sydney Cricket Ground and the Sydney Sports Ground, but what about other grounds? I have attended many football matches at the Sydney Sports Ground and the Sydney Cricket Ground and it is my experience that there is not a lot of running on to the field by young people before the game is finished there.

In some way or other this practice can be controlled at those two grounds. However, at places like Belmore Oval and Chatswood Oval, where rugby union is played—and it happens just as much at union games as it does at league matches—it is a dangerous practice. No sportsman, certainly no honourable member of *this* House, would want to see a child accidentally killed as a result of this activity. One night recently a league match was being played in the Wills Cup competition and the referee awarded a free kick to one team just as the hooter blew to signal full time. The team awarded the free kick could not take it because by the time the hooter had stopped the oval was full of young people who were endangering their lives by running all over the field. This incident was particularly unfortunate for the team that had been awarded the free kick: I understand that it might have won

Mr McGinty

the match. The action of those young people in running on to the field caused some delay in the game which was still in progress, but it created a potentially disastrous situation.

I agree with the honourable member for Liverpool that this sort of thing happens not only in big league games in this city but also in other parts of the State. Though young people are entitled to admire their idols and they should have the opportunity to express their admiration, it is good to give power to control them to the trust of the Sydney Cricket Ground and the Sydney Sports Ground. In response to criticism by the honourable member for Liverpool that a penalty of \$100 is too harsh, I remind the honourable member that it is a maximum penalty. The magistrate will impose a penalty having regard to the gravity of the circumstances. An upper limit must be set. People who become boorish about this sort of thing should face a severe penalty.

I would not normally worry about children running on to a playing field but in games of football some effort must be made to protect them from their own foolishness. I do not believe that a maximum penalty of \$100 is too harsh. If a person feels he has been unduly dealt with by a magistrate who has imposed a fine of \$100—and it is not often that the maximum penalty is imposed—he has the right of appeal. It is necessary that a severe penalty be available to deter boors from conducting themselves in this way. Warnings issued over amplifiers have no effect whatever. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine when a game finishes in relation to the sounding of the siren and the blowing of the whistle. When the siren sounds many people run on to a playing field and often it is difficult to determine whether they have done so before or after the game has finished.

More effort should be made by municipal councils, who in the main control suburban ovals, to enforce powers that they already have. If councils do not have sufficient power, I ask the Minister to take steps to ensure that they get that power so that young people who are enthused with a game—and I think that is a good and healthy

activity—should not be allowed to endanger themselves by running on to a football field before the game has concluded. We do not want a repetition in Sydney of the recent fatal accident on a playing field in New Zealand.

Mr COATES (Blue Mountains) [8.33]: I support the bill. As one who has always been an enthusiast in sport, and particularly in recent years when I have not had the opportunity to witness many league games at the Sydney Cricket Ground, as an enthusiast for television replays in the evening. I have been greatly concerned with the habit of young people, some no doubt imbued with enthusiasm, others through **larrikinism** and still others for various unknown reasons, running on to the ground. Not only is this disruptive, but also it is rude and dangerous. Something must be done to prevent it. Action is overdue. I commend the bill for providing powers for organizations to make their own rules and regulations. That is good. It is the responsibility of the Parliament to bring down legislation along the lines followed by this bill. It is good that the organization subjected to problems such as this, and therefore better informed about them than the Parliament, should have power to bring down regulations and apply them as they see fit in the circumstances.

The honourable member for Liverpool, who led for the **Opposition**, expressed his concern that the penalty of \$100 is too high. I do not agree with the honourable member on that point. People who are apprehended for this sort of offence will ultimately come before a magistrate. In the light of the evidence submitted by the prosecution, the magistrate will decide on the penalty. That is not inconsistent with the practice of the law for many generations past. Consequently, one would assume that in a bad case where circumstances demanded it, and when in the eyes of the magistrate it is warranted, an offender may be fined the maximum of \$100. On the other hand, I have no doubt that most people apprehended and convicted of this type of offence will be fined a much lesser **sum**. I see no objection to a maximum penalty of \$100.

The bill is a good one. It is a start. If it is found that it does not operate in accordance with the present intention, this is the place in which to amend it. I commend the Minister for bringing forward the measure and hope that it will restrict the objectionable happenings that have occurred in recent times with people, whether they are clothed or naked, running on to sports grounds.

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman), Minister for Culture, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism [8.37], in reply: I thank the honourable member for Liverpool who led for the Opposition, the honourable member for Burrendong who has had a vast experience in administration of cricket, the honourable member for Vacluse, the honourable member for Willoughby and the honourable member for Blue Mountains for their worthwhile contributions to this debate. What the honourable member for Liverpool said about penalty was covered by each of the last two speakers from this side of the House. It has been pointed out that \$100 is to be the maximum penalty. The magistrate will decide the actual penalty. I reiterate that the trustees of the Sydney Cricket Ground will decide on the rules and regulations. During my **second-reading** speech I used on at least three occasions the term, while a match is in progress. I believe that the trustees can define when a match is actually finished.

What the Government is aiming at and, I am sure what the trustees want, is to stop people running on to the field of play. The obvious reason for this aim is to prevent interference with a match in progress and to avoid injury to persons running on to the field. We have been told tonight that already there has been one death in New Zealand in circumstances similar to those we are discussing. Last year on several occasions in Sydney serious injury could have resulted from people running on to playing fields. Another factor is that on occasions teams are unfairly penalized. Last weekend in a rugby league match between Eastern Suburbs and St George, the St George team was well in the lead when the final siren sounded. A penalty was awarded

to St George simultaneously with the sounding of the siren but the St George team could not take advantage of the penalty kick because many people, children and adults, had run on to the field of play and were interfering with the game. The referee called an immediate halt to the game. However, this had serious ramifications to the St George team. I should like to read an article from yesterday's *Daily Mirror*:

Yesterday at Kogarah the hooter sounded just as referee Kevin Roberts awarded St George a penalty and hundreds of children swarmed over the fence.

Saints had the game well won, but needed a further two points to beat Balmain into Sunday's Wills Cup final on a points for and against basis.

The effect of that incident could have been that spectators going on to the ground determined who would play in the final of the competition. Further, they could have determined who finally won the competition. Rugby league is a highly professional game and this incident may have affected not only the fees paid to a team that may have won but also the chance of the team to play in a final.

The most important element is safety. As I mentioned at the introductory stage, players like Arthur Beetson, or a member of the All Blacks rugby union team, the Springboks or the British Lions team may be running flat out close to the final whistle being blown and if someone were to get under his feet he would be trampled as if by a charging elephant. One must remember that completely fit footballers are hurt notwithstanding that they know what they are doing. Last year Russel Fairfax broke a leg. I do not wish to see children hurt in the fashion I have described. The Government considers that a \$100 fine is a deterrent only. It is the maximum fine, and whether it is imposed is a matter for a magistrate to decide.

The responsibility for intruders upon other sports grounds is that of the local governing body. For the information of the honourable member for Willoughby I shall make inquiries to ascertain whether individual local councils have power to impose
Mr Arblaster

similar restrictions. If they have not, I shall ascertain whether something can be done about it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE

Clause 2

Page 2

(b) by inserting after section 8 (1) the following subsection:—

(1) A N I and regulation made under subsection (1) (e1) may impose a penalty not exceeding \$100 for any breach thereof.

20

Mr PACIULLO (Liverpool) [8.43]: I move:

That at page 2, line 20, the figures "\$100" be left out and there be inserted in lieu thereof the figures "\$40".

The Opposition considers the maximum penalty of \$100 to be excessive and unnecessary as the same results can be obtained by imposing a lesser penalty. One may ask whether this figure was plucked out of the air. The Opposition considers also that the penalty should have some relationship to penalties for other misdemeanours. To substantiate the Opposition contention that the penalty is excessive, I refer the Committee to the following misdemeanours and maximum penalties: vandalizing shrines and monuments, which is a far more serious offence than running on to the Sydney Cricket Ground or some other field, \$100—the same maximum penalty as proposed by the bill. The public would be more concerned about the nature of that misdemeanour than in the offence of running on to the Sydney Cricket Ground. I am sure that all honourable members would regard the defacing of walls as most offensive.—However, it attracts a maximum penalty of \$50. Betting in a public place, which invariably involves huge sums of money and has many undesirable aspects, attracts a maximum penalty of \$100. Although that offence cannot be related to the offence created by the bill, the penalties can be equated. A person convicted of the offence of running on to the Sydney Sports Ground may be fined the same amount of \$100. Another interesting example is that

bribing a **constable** of the police force by a licensee attracts a maximum penalty of a mere \$20 for a **first** offence.

Mr **MUTTON**: How **old** are the penalties?

Mr **PACIULLO**: They are up-to-date. The information was provided last week by the Parliamentary Library staff. The maximum fine proposed by the measure is not appropriate when one considers the other fines and penalties to which I have referred. Yet another example is the fines imposed by regulations under the Clean Air Act which refers to pollution of the environment. Again the penalty is \$100, with \$10 for every **additional** day involved. Although **environment** is an issue that concerns every citizen of the State, it attracts the same maximum penalty.

The Opposition does not wish the Government to add another anomaly to the State's penalties. It considers the amendment to be sensible and more in keeping with a minor offence. I reiterate that the **Opposition** supports the principle of the bill and the need for a penalty that is a deterrent. However, the legislation, apart from the penalty provision, will afford the cricket ground trust and the police all the power they need to control the **problem** and achieve the same results. I **commend** the amendment to the Committee.

Mr **ARBLASTER** (Mosman), Minister for Culture, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism [8.48]: The Government does not accept the amendment. The examples given by the honourable member for Liverpool, such as vandalizing shrines and monuments, do not involve any danger to life. The offence created by the bill may involve risk of injury. Also the pleasure of many thousands of spectators may be interrupted by people going on to the field and interfering, for instance, with a cricket match. I **am** pleased that last year during the cricket test matches there were not as many instances of people entering upon the playing field as there had been in previous years. I remind the Committee that we are discussing the **maximum** penalty that may be imposed if the magistrate so chooses.

The Sydney Cricket Ground trust recommended that any person committing a breach of the rules pertaining to the entry of unauthorized persons to the playing field or to the damage of any property by a person within the grounds should be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$100. The **unanimous** decision by the trust was reached at a meeting that was attended by two Opposition members: the honourable member for Castlereagh, a former Premier and Treasurer, who is chairman of the trust; and the honourable member for Phillip, a former Leader of the Opposition.

Both those gentlemen are on the trust of the Sydney Cricket Ground. They were part of the trust that made the recommendation to the Government. The Opposition put forward arguments about the penalty of \$100 being too high and then gave examples of defacing property, which does not involve the risk of injury. I do not believe that the argument holds **water**. I do not think the Opposition was sincere in putting **it** forward. The Government cannot and will not **accept** the amendment.

Question—That the figures stand—put.

The **Committee** divided.

AYES, 50

Mr Arblaster	Mr Maddison
Mr Boyd	Mr Mason
Mr Brewer	Mr Mead
Mr Brooks	Mrs Meillon
Mr Brown	Mr Morris
Mr Bruxner	Mr Mutton
Mr Clough	Mr Osborne
Mr Coates	Mr Park
Mr Coleman	Mr Pickard
Mr Cowan	Mr Punch
Mr Crawford	Mr Rofe
Mr Darby	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Dowd	Mr Ruddock
Mr Doyle	Mr Schipp
Mr Fisher	Mr Singleton
Mr Freudenstein	Mr Taylor
Mr Griffith	Mr Viney
Mr Harrold	Mr Waddy
Mr Hatton	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr Healey	Mr Webster
Mr D. B. Hunter	Sir Eric Willis
Mr Jackett	Mr Wotton
Mr Leitch	
Mr Lewis	
Mr McGinty	
Mr Mackie	

Tellers,
Mr Fischer
Mr West

NOES, 44

Mr Bannon	Mr Johnstone
Mr Barnier	Mr Keane
Mr Bedford	Mr Kearns
Mr Booth	Mr L. B. Kelly
Mr Brereton	Mr Maher
Mr Cahill	Mr Mallam
Mr Cleary	Mr Mulock
Mr Cox	Mr Neilly
Mr Crabtree	Mr O'Connell
Mr Day	Mr Paciullo
Mr Degen	Mr Petersen
Mr Durick	Mr Ramsay
Mr Einfeld	Mr Renshaw
Mr Face	Mr Rogan
Mr Ferguson	Mr Sheahan
Mr Flaherty	Mr Stewart
Mr Gordon	Mr Wade
Mr Haigh	Mr F. J. Walker
Mr Hills	Mr Wran
Mr M. L. Hunter	
Mr Jackson	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Jensen	Mr Mahoney
Mr Johnson	Mr Quinn

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman), Minister for Culture, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism [8.59]: I am absolutely astounded. The Government was forwarded a recommendation from the Sydney Cricket Ground and Sports Ground trust as to what the penalty should be. The penalty in the bill was based on that recommendation. The chairman of the trust, the honourable member for Castlereagh, is in the House. The honourable member for Phillip is also on the trust. Both honourable members have voted against their own recommendation. The suggestion has been made that the amount of the penalty should be reduced from \$100 to \$40. Two different sets of values have been adopted.

Clause agreed to.

ADOPTION OF REPORT

Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted on motion by Mr Arblaster.

PORT MACQUARIE ENTRANCE
IMPROVEMENT WORKS BILL

SECOND READING

Mr PUNCH (Gloucester), Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports [9.0]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this legislation is to enable the construction of significant improvements to the entrance of the Hastings River at Port Macquarie. The river entrance at Port Macquarie is typical of such entrances on the New South Wales coast in which the river discharge occurs over a submerged beach or bar. The entrance to the Hastings River has characteristics common to many of the New South Wales coastal river entrances, including a limited water depth of less than 10 feet over the bar, a shifting channel over the bar, and waves breaking at the bar under certain weather conditions, making navigation hazardous.

Since its discovery in 1819 by John Oxley the Hastings River entrance has proved a hazard to navigation, with repeated stories of vessels being damaged by running aground on the bar, or being swamped and even wrecked. Until 1940, when the construction of the northern training wall was finished, the entrance varied in position over a range of about half a mile up and down the beach, and the depth of water over the bar ranged from 4 feet to 8 feet. The pattern was for floods to cut through the northern sand spit somewhere south of the reef, and for this new entrance to migrate slowly southwards under the action of the local drift pattern in the lee of the Port Macquarie headland. The southern limit of the entrance was fixed at the turn of the century by the construction of the southern breakwater, resulting in the reclamation of a considerable area of foreshore, and the formation of the well-known and popular Town Beach.

Port Macquarie has a long-established fishing industry, with catches annually from both river and ocean totalling about 400 000 lb. It is reported that over recent years ocean catches have declined because of the difficulty of navigating the river entrance, and only three boats now work outside the river compared with fifteen boats ten years ago. Improvements carried out at Camden Haven, about 30 kilometres to the south of Port Macquarie, have offset the loss in production to some extent, and Camden Haven does offer alternative emergency shelter for the Port Macquarie fishermen. Even so,

there is no doubt that fish production from offshore fishing grounds will increase significantly and prove more efficient when the entrance to Port Macquarie is improved.

My colleague the Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources has been persistent in his representations to the Government for this project to proceed. The record shows that over the whole of his period in this House he has strongly and consistently advocated the construction of this breakwater. It is certainly a tribute to his tenacity that the project has reached the stage where authorizing legislation is in the process of being passed. A major problem from the point of view of the honourable member representing the electorate and, indeed, for the people of Port Macquarie, was the fact that, because of the relatively small number of fishing craft operating out of Port Macquarie, it was difficult to justify expenditure of the magnitude involved on economic grounds relating solely to the fishing industry. However, it is quite clear that improvements to the river entrance will also give a tremendous lift to tourism in Port Macquarie.

Port Macquarie, an official government tourist growth region, already has the infrastructure and broad base of tourism, and it is estimated that more than \$10 million is spent annually by visitors to the town. The Department of Public Works commissioned a firm of consultants to assess the benefits that would accrue to the tourist industry in the event of entrance improvements being constructed. A most extensive study was undertaken, and a firm conclusion was reached that the ratio of benefits to cost would be favourable. The benefits were assessed by Pannell, Kerr, Forster and Company, a firm with considerable experience in the analysis of tourist development proposals throughout the world. In briefing these consultants, care was taken to ensure that they understood the nature of the improvements, and that benefits should be assessed realistically on a state basis, as no great advantage would be conferred on the State by attracting benefits to Port Macquarie at the expense of some other centre.

The proposed works will, however, result in additional tourist revenue from power boat and deep sea fishing, game fishing by charter boat, and the increase in general tourism. On the other side of the coin, the entrance works will boost the growth of the local fishing industry. Here again, I pay a tribute to my colleague the Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources who chaired the parliamentary committee which has just completed its exhaustive inquiry into the fishing industry. There is no doubt that the fishing industry in Australia has progressed to the point where it has become a major commercial enterprise, earning millions of dollars in export income. It is, in fact, the fastest growing primary industry in Australia. More than 9 000 fishing boats of all sizes are operating around the Australian coastline, catching fish to the value of well over \$100 million each year.

New South Wales fishermen are participating in this lucrative field, with the total catch in this State valued at about \$21 million. These figures relate only to the actual value of the fish to the fishermen at the co-operative, and the total value of the catch is subsequently enhanced considerably through processing. Though these figures are encouraging, it is still true that the catches by Australian fishermen are insufficient to supply local needs, and we rely heavily on imports of fish to the extent of more than \$74 million a year. We are, on the other hand, exporting fish to the value of about \$70 million, principally lobster and prawns. It is clear, however, that increased attention needs to be given to the supply of fish to local markets. It is equally clear that the sea must be harvested like the land, and that our resources of fish need to be exploited in a responsible manner.

There is a proper place in government policy for encouraging New South Wales fishermen to exploit new fields, and we are anxious to secure for New South Wales fishermen the greatest possible share of the resources adjacent to our coastline. The New South Wales Government believes that it has a major role to play in helping to expand the fishing industry, both for local consumption and for increased export earnings, by creating the necessary climate to

foster growth within the industry. It is to meet this need that the Government is carrying out an extensive programme of fishing port construction. It is our aim to link the whole of the New South Wales coastline with a chain of safe fishing ports in all centres where the industry is actively operating. Substantial work has recently been completed at the South Coast ports of Eden and Ulladulla, and at Nelson Bay within my own electorate. Work is nearing completion at Coffs Harbour, and other major breakwater construction is about to commence at Narooma on the South Coast.

The proposed entrance improvements at Port Macquarie will cost in the vicinity of \$1.3 million and will be financed from loan funds. The project involves the construction of a breakwater on the northern side of the Hastings River entrance, extending in an easterly direction a distance of approximately 530 metres from the existing foreshore. The construction of the proposed works will have only a minor environmental impact. The quarry is located adjacent to the proposed works on the northern side of the Hastings River, remote from the town of Port Macquarie, and hence there will be no traffic or dust nuisance in the town, and negligible noise from blasting operations. The visual impact of the breakwater will be quite pleasing. It is an extension of existing works, while the beach to the north of the rivermouth will accrete, adding to the reserve which already exists, and there will be greater stability of the sandbanks and weed beds within the river estuary.

The situation at Wooli, which was raised at the introductory stage, prior to the construction of the entrance works was that fishing boats were frequently bar-bound—sometimes for weeks on end. These were small boats used mainly for trap fishing on the excellent reef grounds nearby. The local fishermen were consulted both to define what their problems were and to obtain information on local features. It was recognized that the small size of the Wooli estuary with its relatively small tidal flows in and out severely limited the potential for

Mr Punch

improvements. Despite this, it was considered worth while to build entrance improvement works to sustain and encourage the small-scale fishing industry at Wooli which, at that time, was about to founder because of the entrance depth problems.

Works were authorized under the 1967 Wooli River Harbour Works Act at an estimated cost of \$681,000. These works were completed by December, 1971, at a cost of approximately \$510,000. A crescent shaped bar quickly formed off the entrance and had stabilized by November, 1972, when a survey was carried out. This survey showed a maximum depth at lowest tide levels of 4 ft on a direct approach and 6 ft on an indirect approach from the north. Later checks in 1973 revealed little change. The primary objective had been attained. This was to improve depths at the Wooli entrance so that the small fishing boats operating from there could proceed to sea and service fish traps, weather permitting of course, whereas formerly they had been often bottled up within the harbour because of the shallow entrance depth.

A persistent shoal has formed just inside the breakwaters confining navigation to a narrow channel adjacent to the rocks of the northern breakwater. In addition, the channel curves sharply to the left at this point and it is also subject to wave action, albeit this is greatly reduced by the action of the bar and the configuration of the entrance. The result is that navigation demands a high order of seamanship especially in rough weather. Engineers of the department have been investigating this problem for some time without making any break-through on the cause and possible remedies of the problem. A hydraulic model has been built of the entrance; extensive testing has been carried out and ideas-tested. This model is now being extended to permit further ideas to be checked. Current expert opinion is that the problem is probably due to the small size of the Wooli estuary and therefore will not be amenable to improvement. No such problem is seen at Port Macquarie as this is a large estuary with much larger tidal flows.

The **bill** is the usual **type** associated with works of this nature. It sanctions works in the **sum** of \$1.3 **million** and the work involved is deemed to be an authorized work under the Public Works Act, 1912. The schedule describes the works and I invite the attention of honourable members to the fact that provision is made for works to be carried out specifically for the protection of the environment. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr HAIGH (Maroubra) [9.14]: The Opposition joins with the Government in supporting the passage of this bill. It is interesting to note that for some years now there has been a **demand** for port improvements at Port Macquarie. I looked back through the history of this Parliament and was able to establish that a parliamentary standing committee on public works went into some detail and prepared a report that was made available to this Parliament in 1898, asking for works, known as harbour works, at the Hastings River. A number of requirements were listed in that report of the standing committee and from time to time some of those works were implemented.

It is interesting that the parliamentary standing committee on public works which **dealt** with this matter was most concerned that there was only a 10-foot seaway over the bar at the entrance at Port Macquarie. From silting and other **movements** that have since occurred the bar is awash at low tide and is in fact a surfing area. Over the years the situation has become more critical even though, spasmodically, certain works have been undertaken. The works proposed in the bill are only supplementary to work already undertaken which did not meet **all** the works seen as necessary in the report of 1898 to provide a safe harbour entrance to the Hastings River. It illustrates how the parliamentary system moves slowly but in a never-ending pursuit of the ultimate. After a period of fifty, eighty or one hundred years we finally get the things that may have been planned by our forebears.

It is interesting to read of some of the problems encountered in those days and up to about 1920. I was not able to get such a detailed account of problems that had

been encountered from that date—certainly not in the same detail as in relation to the earlier period. I noted that there was some reference to the 1922 era when a barque was lost with all hands at this point. There was a reference also to the Japanese submarine sighted there in April, 1943. These were enough to indicate that there has been a demand for this work and for even more work than is proposed in the bill. These demands have continued since 1898.

I appreciate that problems exist, sometimes caused by the non-availability of money. I know the difficulties the Minister is experiencing. He has a government in Canberra—a composite party government—which has not provided the money necessary to undertake works of this nature although they have been demanded for so many years. Except for an interval of about three years that coalition Government has been in office for a quarter of a century and I know the difficulties that governments of this State have suffered as a result of that situation.

I was interested to hear the Minister say that the bill was not so much designed to benefit the fishing industry. He said that although the fishing industry was considered, fewer boats are operating out of Port Macquarie than was the case some years ago and the Government had regard to the need to provide some security and safety for pleasure craft entering and leaving the port. I commend the Minister on his attitude. If the bill were primarily designed to benefit the fishing industry, certainly the Opposition would commend the Minister for it but we congratulate him on his enterprise in doing something for the tourist industry.

Few governments in Australia have shown much enthusiasm for the tourist industry. An exception was the last Australian Government, which had a rough **passage**—probably as rough as the passage of anybody trying to take a boat across the bar at Port Macquarie in its present condition. At least the Government of New South Wales has been shown some leadership in this matter by the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports, despite the

fact that he is not responsible for tourism. In that respect, his efforts stand out like a beacon to guide his colleagues.

Mr CRABTREE: More like a red light.

Mr HAIGH: He has given us the red light on Botany Bay, where he is leading us to disaster, but he has shown the green light at Port Macquarie, where all systems are go. I do not have later figures than those for 1974, but in that year income from tourism in the United States of America was \$4,800 million. In the United Kingdom it was E680 million, or about \$1,300 million, and in the same period the total income from tourism in Australia was \$184 million. Why do we fall so far behind when we have more to offer than any other country in the world? I believe the reason is that we have not encouraged tourism. I congratulate those who have taken the initiative and have developed Port Macquarie as a tourist centre. Already that town has many visitors from New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia in particular, and with the development of safe boating facilities there should be an increase in big game fishing, which will be an attraction to oversea visitors. I have in mind Americans, who like new fields to discover. Australia is a continent that offers them much in that regard.

The bill is a progressive one in that it will ensure the safety of professional fishermen who have to navigate the Port Macquarie bar; it will ensure the safety of local residents, of intrastate visitors, and of people who come here from other countries and seek to enjoy the benefits offering in that lovely area. The Minister responsible for tourism in this State ought to regard the bill as a beacon. His record in encouraging the tourist industry is lamentable. We have a beautiful country. There is an exhilaration to be had from visiting the New England ranges that can be experienced only in that part of the State. The beautiful beaches on the lower North Coast would inspire enthusiasm in anyone who visits them. The tourist activity on the far North Coast is well known, and there is much to be seen on the South Coast. More could be done in

the northwest, the midwest and the southwest of the State. Nowhere had the Government moved to develop this industry until it fell to the lot of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports to deal with a problem that has existed since 1898 and has been treated in a piecemeal fashion over the years. The Minister decided to spend money not only to assist the professional fishing industry but also to develop the tourist industry.

Mr CRABTREE: He is beginning to implement the 1898 report.

Mr HAIGH: It takes a long while for a Minister for Public Works in the present Government to absorb the details of a report submitted by a parliamentary select committee in 1898. However, I know that the present Minister will get round to it; I have great confidence in him.

Mr PUNCH: Will the honourable member for Maroubra accept a job as my campaign director?

Mr HAIGH: I would not want to campaign for a candidate in a defeated government. I know that after the next elections, as a result of what is happening in Botany Bay, the Minister will be sitting on this side of the House. I hope that he will make similar comments about my capacity when I am sitting in his place as Minister. When that stage is reached, we shall implement the whole of that report, and we shall certainly move much more quickly than the Minister is allowed to move by his Cabinet colleagues. I know that he wanted to do more, but they restricted him.

It is important to increase the flow of money through the tourist industry, and we have not attempted to do that in this State. For that reason those who occupy the Treasury benches stand condemned, for here is a ready-made source of income, and an opportunity to diversify employment opportunities throughout our country districts. Young people are leaving country towns because they cannot get work. Here is a chance to correct that situation. Having travelled whenever I get the opportunity, both in this country and overseas, I believe

that Australia, and New South Wales in particular, have more to offer in the way of tourism than any other place in the world. On behalf of the Opposition, however, I compliment the Minister on showing the initiative that has led to the introduction of this bill and plead with him to enthrone his Minister for Tourism in the hope of getting him to emulate the stand he has taken on this occasion.

Mr SINGLETON (Clarence) [9.30]: I support the bill, which will improve the entrance to the Hastings River, thus giving marked assistance to the promotion of the tourist industry in the Port Macquarie area. I am delighted to hear the honourable member for Maroubra, who led for the Opposition, showing such great confidence in the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports who, although a relatively new leader, is a great leader for the Country Party in this Parliament; indeed, I am sure that the confidence in him expressed by the honourable member for Maroubra is fully acknowledged by all supporters of the Government, particularly members of the Country Party.

I am pleased that the Government recognizes tourism as a significant industry, which promotes a tremendous amount of employment and brings monetary returns to business in the country areas of New South Wales. The Clarence electorate has a big tourist industry, and I am sure that the works proposed in this measure will give it a tremendous impetus at Port Macquarie. The Government has built many works of this kind along the coast. Most of them have effected wonderful improvements, but others have not fulfilled expectations. I am pleased that the Minister mentioned in his second-reading speech the Woolli entrance works, and how they have not been as successful as expected. I realize that probably the small flow of water in the Woolli river system is part and parcel of the sand siltation at the man-made entrance, but there must be some solution to this problem. The hydraulic model that has been constructed might disclose the cause of the siltation; if so, I hope that money will be made available to complete remedial works.

The harbour works carried out by the Government at Coffs Harbour have been most successful. The project there was to benefit mainly the commercial fishing fleet, although yacht club boats are moored within the harbour, which was not built for any particular tourist purpose. Further money is needed there for the completion of the works and for the construction of a boat ramp to cater for the tourists who are so vital to local employment and business.

I was particularly interested in the State's 9 000 fishing boats mentioned by the Minister. This State produces \$21 million worth of fish annually, but still imports \$74 million worth. This is proof of the need for tremendous expansion of the fishing industry for, if this State can be self-sufficient, it will have to produce more than three times as much as is produced at present. The fact that we export \$70 million worth of shell fish proves that this is a most important part of the fishing industry on the New South Wales coast. Further, it proves the soundness of the Government's policy to complete works of the kind authorized by the bill, which will assist in the expansion of the fishing industry and the State's export earnings. I have great pleasure in supporting the measure.

Mr MAHONEY (Parramatta) [9.35]: I, too, have great pleasure in supporting the bill, and add my congratulations to the Minister for his progressive outlook in this matter. I congratulate the honourable member for Oxley, also, who has played a big part in having this measure brought before the House. I acknowledge, also, the part played in the promotion of the bill by the honourable member for Raleigh.

Many people at Port Macquarie have been concerned about the dangerous bar to the Hastings River; conditions on the bar change quickly as the weather changes, and many people have been drowned when boats have overturned there. I pay a tribute to the local organizations, particularly those set up in recent years, to provide safe boating for tourists and the local people. I refer particularly to the police, who have a most efficient organization, which answers distress calls speedily and goes to the assistance of vessels that are in trouble on the bar. This

organization has saved many lives, and should be **complimented** for its excellent work.

Having seen most of the famous tourist centres in the world, I am convinced that Port Macquarie is the most beautiful. I have no hesitation in saying that, for Port Macquarie has everything that the tourist wants; it has beautiful beaches, plenty of fishing and a beautiful hinterland. I admire the mountains in the background and also Lake **Cathie** to the south. I am pleased to see that this work is to be done at this important tourist centre and, as a result of this legislation, the entrance to the river will be used much more because it will be safer.

Port Macquarie is a most historic place; this is realized when one examines the historical documents of Australia and also some of the novels such as *Ralph Rashleigh or The Life of an Exile*. After reading some of these things, one realizes the important part that Port Macquarie has played in the history of Australia. I am pleased that works are to be undertaken to make the entrance to the Hastings River safer. These works will certainly improve the prospects of the fishing industry, which needs so much assistance at the present time, as explained by the report of the select committee that inquired into the fishing industry in New South Wales. For those reasons the bill should receive the **full** support of the House.

However, I invite the Minister's attention to another extremely urgent service required at Port Macquarie. I refer to the importance of a sewerage system for the town and **surrounding** district. The present arrangements are a danger to health, especially on the southern side of the town. A sewerage extension is urgently needed, and I hope that the Minister will be introducing another measure in the near future to make provision for it. I welcome this progressive legislation and once again **congratulate** the Minister and the local member for their enterprise.

Mr BROWN (Raleigh) [9.40]: I wish to add a few more words to the second-reading debate on this bill. I think it is important

that as much of this harbour improvement work as possible should be done. It is interesting to note that as a result of the policy of adding emphasis to tourism, Port Macquarie is being included in the port works to be put in progress. Until a short time ago the main guideline in respect of getting work done at a port or a harbour was the benefit that would flow to the fishing industry. This had always been the case. Though Port Macquarie may be a great holiday place providing good opportunities for people to fish for sport, the fact is that commercial fishing there is on a small scale. It is hoped that if the port is made safe, to enable boats to leave and enter under most conditions, the commercial fishermen will return and operate from that area, which will be beneficial to the throughput at the local co-operative. We have had **the** Radley family at Port Macquarie for many years and they are skilled seamen, but other commercial fishermen have gone to other fields. Perhaps the bill will result in some of those men returning to the port.

I mentioned at the introductory stage a gentleman who came out from England in the last century and made a survey of our ports. At that time I could not think of his name. However, I have checked and found that the gentleman was—and this has been mentioned tonight by the honourable member for Maroubra—Sir John Coode, who did a report on every river entrance on the New South Wales coast. I have been to the parliamentary library and studied all his reports—particularly those in respect of areas in my electorate. Sir John Coode was undoubtedly a skilled engineer. At the conclusion of his investigations he reported his findings to the Parliament. Then the Public Works **Committee** of the Parliament considered the reports. It is interesting to see what has been done on harbour improvement works since then and the costs involved in them.

When leave was being sought to **introduce** the bill I spoke about the possibility of the work at Port Macquarie being done by contract. One firm that has approached me is keen to do the job. This **firm** is efficient and it has all the information that

it could possibly get from the Department of Public Works. Moreover, it has taken out a detailed costing of the work involved and it is firmly of the opinion that it could do this work in a shorter time and at a much lower cost than is contemplated by the department. I appreciate that the Minister has gone into all these matters with the chief construction engineer and other people in the department. There may be good and proper reasons why this work is not going to contract at the present time. I understand that work at Narooma will be put to contract. It may be the wish of the department that one job be done by contract and the other by its own day labour staff.

The firm of which I speak is competent to do the work and although it has not done this type of breakwater work before—and few firms have—it has demonstrated its efficiency by the way it has managed its affairs and by its able performance a number of other jobs, some of which have been for local councils and supervised by the department. This firm has shown that it has skilled management and good plant. The Minister has pointed out—and I welcome it—that a great deal of the work at Port Macquarie will be let out on contract. The permanent work force will be comparatively small and it is possible that the plant of some interested firms will be wanted for use by the department.

It is interesting to note that over a considerable period the Government has been keenly interested in the fishing ports on the New South Wales coast. Today I looked up the 1973 policy speech of the Country Party, which was virtually the Government's rural policy speech. That policy stated:

The Government . . . has been undertaking a comprehensive programme of fishing port construction to provide safer harbours for the fishing fleets operating in N.S.W. coastal waters, and thereby stimulating growth of the State's fishing industry. The rate of expenditure on this programme has been doubled within the last three years, and works to the value of \$2.6 million are now in progress on the ports of Coffs Harbour, Nelson Bay, Ulladulla and Eden. Similar projects have recently been completed at the ports of Camden Haven, Ballina, Wollii and Iluka.

At that time investigations were going on into work at Narooma, and that work it is now going to tender. At South West Rocks the fishermen go out from the river or use the South West Rocks Creek. I understand that the department is carrying out investigations into whether it is possible to construct a boat harbour in South West Rocks Creek, and it is a matter that I again want to bring to the attention of the Minister. This matter is important because about thirty fishing boats are going out over the main bar of the Macleay River or operating from South West Rocks Creek. Naturally, at times both these places suffer as a result of shifting sand.

It is interesting to note also that one of the areas to be investigated—and no doubt the local member will be pressing for this—is Forster-Tuncurry. I presume that if the local member takes it up, we will see some action in that direction. The work that has been done at the State's fishing ports has represented a great advancement towards the Government's overall goal of constructing a chain of safe fishing ports along the entire length of the New South Wales coastline. In our policy speech before the last State elections we said that funds would be provided to meet the growing demands of tourism and pleasure craft. Even at the end of 1973, we said that investigations were being conducted at Port Macquarie for the purpose of determining the feasibility and economics of meeting these needs. Port Macquarie is the first area at which the point of view of tourism has been taken prominently into account, and no doubt this will give the district a great boost. I welcome the introduction of the bill. It is one more work under way. Even at this stage it is not too late for the Minister to bear in mind some of the matters I have raised in regard to contracts.

Mr RAMSAY (Wollongong) [9.48]: I welcome the introduction of the work that is contemplated at Port Macquarie. However, I wish to raise the general question of boat ramps and the wharfage situation generally on the New South Wales coast. I had the opportunity and the privilege to be a member of the select committee of the

Parliament that inquired into the fishing industry. That committee was under the chairmanship of the honourable member for Oxley, who is now Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Water Resources. I do not intend to push the parish pump tonight. However, the position is that generally within my electorate, particularly in the Greenwell Point area near Nowra, a tremendous number of fishing vessels do not have an adequate anchorage that is safe in a heavy surge.

Mr LEWIS: What has that to do with Port Macquarie?

Mr RAMSAY: Sit down. We are speaking about professional fishermen and I am sure that we shall be having more to say about them shortly. It is a matter of concern to professional fishermen along the entire coast of New South Wales that this situation should obtain. In northern areas there are plenty of ports where vessels cannot always get out and there are many places where there are inadequate ramps for pleasure craft. I have pushed the parish pump about Wollongong, a city of 200 000 people——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is a little remote from the bill.

Mr RAMSAY: In the Wollongong area there are not proper facilities for the fishing industry. In some northern areas there are ramps and slipways but there are none in my area. Fishing vessels must have proper slipping facilities. This is a matter of tremendous concern to people in my area. I should like the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports to look at their position as a matter of urgency and to provide for my area the facilities that are at Port Macquarie and a number of other places along the coast.

These matters are of vital concern not only to professional fishermen but also to the people who use pleasure craft up and down the coast. The Opposition recognizes that this is a real problem but asks the Government to take urgent action to remedy the position. Members of Parliament have inspected boat ramps and harbour entrances

at Port Macquarie and other fishing centres along the coast. If New South Wales is to advance its tourist industry and its fishing industry the Government must provide adequate facilities by way of boat ramps, slipways and safe waterways. There is a need to do these things not only at Port Macquarie but also at other locations. Some centres with a population far greater than that of Port Macquarie have far fewer boat-launching and harbour facilities than already exist at Port Macquarie.

The Minister has said that the Government is looking generally at the need for the construction of these facilities up and down the New South Wales coast. This is a most important issue for Wollongong. I ask the Minister to look urgently at providing sufficient boat ramps for pleasure craft, adequate slipping facilities for professional fishermen and proper dredging at Wollongong and other ports along the coast.

Mr PUNCH (Gloucester), Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports [9.52], in reply: It is a pleasure to bring forward a bill that receives the unanimous support of all honourable members. I appreciate the points made by members of the Opposition about the progressive policy adopted by the Government in introducing this measure to assist the tourist industry. It is the first time that a bill of this nature has been brought into the Parliament. Although the honourable member for Maroubra was rather sarcastic about the time it has taken—I think he said since 1898—I might remind him and the honourable member for Illawarra that since that time the Labor Party has been in power in this State for substantial periods but, of course, it did virtually nothing in this or other areas.

The fact is that hitherto governments of all political persuasion have not introduced legislation of this type. It has fallen to the present Government to accept the need to promote the vital tourist industry of this State. I am sure my colleague the Minister for Culture, Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism could speak more eloquently than I on the importance of the

industry. With regard to fishing ports, tourist resorts and other coastal centres used by holiday-makers the Government accepts that there is the necessity to provide further assistance. Port Macquarie is the first harbour to be the subject of work of this nature. The Government will be promoting similar works in other areas in the future.

The honourable member for Wollongong referred to the need for more boat ramps and other facilities up and down the coast. I remind him that already much has been done, though I do not deny that more could be done in some areas. It is a matter of finance. I hope soon to be able to introduce further measures that will enable tourists to enjoy the New South Wales coast even more than is possible now. Without a doubt this State boasts the most beautiful coastline in the world. It is the responsibility of the Government to promote this outstanding asset by providing more boat ramps and safe boat harbours, and ensuring safe entrances to our waterways. What is being done in this bill and what is proposed in other measures now under consideration by the Government indicates a genuine desire to make the greatest possible progress with the funds available.

The honourable member for Raleigh referred to the work to be undertaken at Port Macquarie and a particular contracting firm. Some problems are associated with the matters raised by the honourable member but I shall look at what he has said and see what can be done. The policy outlined to the honourable member will be followed by the Government. That is regarded as the cheapest and most satisfactory method of construction for this work at Port Macquarie, and therefore in the best interests of the people. Generally speaking, I believe there should be a measure of private contracting and day labour work in such projects. The work at Port Macquarie can best be done by the method outlined to the honourable member for Raleigh. However, I will look at the points he has raised and will let him know about them later.

Mr MAHONEY: Will the Minister look at the sewerage problem, too?

Mr PUNCH: Yes, I shall look at the sewerage problem too. I commend the bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

COMMITTEE AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted on motion by Mr Punch.

**MINES INSPECTION (AMENDMENT)
BILL**

SECOND READING

Mr FREUDENSTEIN (Young), Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy [9.58]: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The main object of the bill is to fulfil the obligations laid upon this State under International Labour Convention No. 111 to repeal or modify statutory provisions that tend to discriminate against persons on the grounds of race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin in ways that nullify or impair equality of opportunity or treatment in employment. Restrictions on employment in metalliferous mines based on age, health and knowledge of English are not considered to be discriminatory since they exist for the preservation of the life, health and safety of miners. There will, therefore, be no attempt to repeal or modify the provisions of the Mines Inspection Act containing these restrictions.

The restrictions on the employment of women in or about a mine except in office work or other approved surface work are repealed. They are replaced by provisions which will allow women to be employed without restriction in any surface mining work, but will restrict employment underground to work in the exempted categories laid down in International Labour Convention No. 45 of 1935. I referred to this convention at the introductory state. Article 2 of it states quite plainly that no female, whatever her age, shall be employed on

underground work in any mine. This convention was ratified on 7th October, 1953. A total lifting of the ban on women working in underground mines would be a breach of this convention.

Under article 5 of International Labour Convention No. 111 special measures of protection provided for in other conventions are not deemed to be discrimination. The provisions of convention No. 45 constitute such a special measure. Removal of the restrictions on the employment of women underground in metalliferous mines is therefore limited to making provision for their employment in the exempted categories referred to in article 3 of convention No. 45. These categories comprise managerial positions in which no manual work is involved; health and welfare services; periods spent underground as part of a course of studies; and occasional entry to the underground parts of a mine for the purposes of a non-manual occupation. Employment in these categories is provided for in section 26 as amended by the bill. There will be no restriction on the employment of women in surface mining work.

The minimum age below which persons may not be employed in or about a mine has been lowered to 15 years. Male persons under 16 may not be employed underground unless they are apprentices. Persons under 18 may not be employed on caging operations. The bill repeals section 28, which section was evidently designed to prevent the employment of child labour in the early days of the century and to keep a check on school attendances. It serves no useful purpose now, other than to place a discriminatory barrier between youths of 16 to 18 years of age and grown men who are qualified to work underground. For this reason and because the word boy will be replaced by the words person under 18 years the definition of boy as meaning a male person under 18 years will be omitted from the Act.

Attention has been given also to working conditions for male and female employees. At present general rule (47) of section 55 limits facilities for female employees to

Mr Freudenstein]

washing and toilet facilities. Women employed on surface mining operations or on special underground occupations will need drying and changing facilities also. The general rule has been amended to make it obligatory for the owner, agent or manager of a mine employing more than four employees to provide rooms containing showers, toilet facilities, wash basins and facilities for changing clothes for all employees regardless of sex. Other references in the rule to male and female employees have been eliminated.

Provision is made in general rule (2) and general rule (67A) in the same section to allow miners or persons undertaking technical courses in the handling of explosives to receive practical instruction and experience in boring and charging holes and firing explosives under the supervision of an experienced miner or shotfirer. At present any quarry manager who allows a trainee to do his field work on handling explosives would technically be in breach of general rule (67A) and the trainee himself would be guilty of an offence under the Act. If general rule (2) were applied literally in its present form, no trainee miner would be able to receive any practical training in handling explosives. This amendment will authorize such training.

The remaining amendments proposed in the bill are soon explained. Sections 6, 9 and 13 provide for fees to be prescribed for examinations and registrations of holders of certificates granted outside New South Wales. They impose an upper limit of four dollars. This limit was set in 1901 and has never been increased. Section 46 and general rule (67A) which prescribe fees for boiler testing examinations and shotfirers' examinations do not impose any upper limits. Sections 6, 9 and 13 will be brought into conformity with section 46 and general rule (67A) by removing the limitation of four dollars. This will allow fees to be adjusted realistically when required, though no increase is envisaged at present.

Section 32 provides that the Governor may appoint a chief inspector of mines, a deputy chief inspector of mines and other

inspectors. These officers are first appointed under the Public Service Act, 1902. They are then appointed under the Mines Inspection Act. In effect, officers are being appointed twice to the same position. Section 32 will be amended to make the initial appointment under the Public Service Act sufficient for the purposes of the Mines Inspection Act. The section will also be amended to provide for the appointment of more than one senior inspector of mines. Section 40 requires every inspector of mines to submit an annual report to the chief inspector who then reports to the Minister. In future those reports will be summarized by the chief inspector and embodied in the annual report. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr JOHNSTONE (Broken Hill) [10.7]: After the introductory speech of the Minister I said that I opposed the measure. On closer examination I find that there is not a great deal in the bill to which the Opposition can take exception. I find it somewhat hard to accept that the definition of boy as a person under the age of 18 should be excluded from the Act, but there is not really a great deal of alteration to the definition. The bill requires that anyone doing manual labouring underground in the mining industry must be at least 18 years of age. These days persons of that age are allowed to vote so they should be allowed to earn a man's wage. In the old days a person had to be 21 years of age before he went to the mine face. Though the Act has not been amended, honourable members are aware that persons below the age of 21 have been employed at the face. The upper fee limit of \$4 prescribed for examinations and registrations of holders of certificates granted outside New South Wales will be removed. The figure has been \$4 or £2 for a long time; it is time that the fee was increased—even for enginedrivers and mine managers.

My main bone of contention at the introductory stage related to the employment of females underground. The bill now makes it clear that no female may be employed underground on manual work, and I have

no objection to that. I see no problem if management desires to employ a female on managerial duties and she is required in the performance of her duties to go underground to contact men working there. My remarks apply also to a nurse or a welfare worker. Similarly, a woman studying geology or mining engineering might be required to go underground in the course of her studies. Years ago no women went down a mine but in these days of women's lib women are entering more and more fields. I have no objection to women geologists or women mining engineers going underground to further their studies.

I am pleased that the provision that miners must work for two years at the face before becoming qualified is not being altered. To become a qualified miner a person must spend two years at the face. Persons 18 years of age are now entitled to vote, therefore for other purposes they should now be equivalent to people aged 21 in former times. The amendment in schedule 3 to section 31 (1) of the Act will mean that no longer will a record of boys be kept. I am a little perturbed at one aspect of the provision for appointment of senior inspectors. We all know that when the word Governor is used in legislation it really means the Minister.

Mr FREUDENSTEIN: No, it does not.

Mr JOHNSTONE: The Minister has the final say. It is useless to cross swords over words. The Minister has the final say when appointments are being made. The Public Service Board always considers the qualifications of men who apply for positions. I know that throughout the years the mine inspectors have been fighting for this provision. If they want it, we of the Opposition have no objection to it. They are the men doing the job. I cannot see anything wrong with the provision for appointment of senior inspectors. If the Minister or the Public Service Board wants to appoint a number of senior inspectors, the men appointed should get the higher rate of pay. We have no objection to the provisions covering shot-firers and the handling of explosives. The

Opposition welcomes insistence upon qualifications by persons who handle explosives or fire shots in a quarry or anywhere else. Explosives are dangerous, and people who handle them should be properly trained and qualified.

Schedule 5 among other things amends general rule (47) (b) by omitting the paragraph and inserting instead:

- (b) Where at a mine more **than** four persons are employed, whether above or below ground, the owner or manager shall provide for the use of the employees rooms containing showers, toilets, wash basins and facilities for changing clothes.

As a follow-on there will be hot cabinets for the drying of clothes. The Government has been fighting nude bathing at Lady **Jane** beach but at one time announced that it would provide a beach for mixed nude bathing. Not content with that, it is bringing **mixed bathing** into the Mining Act. This worries me.

Mr L. B. KELLY: Not underground, surely?

Mr JOHNSTONE: The Act is being altered to provide that females may work underground, but there will be no separate toilets for them. As I said in my introductory speech, old miners in this House and elsewhere will be throwing their crutches away and going back to the mines. They will think there might be something in it other than hard work.

As the Government is amending the Act to provide that **women** may be employed in mines, restricted though that employment is, provision should have been made to set aside a couple of showers for females. After all, we are not **all** that far advanced with women's lib and the modern way of life that we should want to shower together. The Minister might look at that matter; something will have to be done about it. **As** I said, the Opposition sees nothing in the **bill** to condemn. It is perhaps a little advanced to allow women underground. Though the Act is being amended, the metalliferous miners have to be convinced that women should work underground. I

have been **talking** to the miners over the weekend and they have said that they will not have any women working underground. As the **miners** put it, "They will not be allowed to join our union; they will have to be on the **staff**." The bill provides that women cannot do manual labour. That **disarms** everyone. However, the Government should not widen the scope of the legislation to allow women miners to work underground with male miners. I see nothing wrong with the bill and I commend it to the House.

Mr FREUDENSTEIN (Young), Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy [10.17], in reply: The honourable member for Broken Hill appears to agree with the bill in its entirety except that he has a puritan streak in his western make-up in that he does not wish to bathe with ladies. The view of the Government is that in accordance with the International Labour Organization convention women are to be permitted to work in mines. I am sure that the **mineowners** will make sure that women will be entitled to their privacy, as most people would like, and women **will** be allowed to bathe privately. The Department of Labour and Industry lays down standards for the provision of the appropriate number of toilets and showers in most industries. I do not think we need any further segregation of the sexes and I do not believe this to be a matter that Mr Hawke, who came back rather suddenly from the **most** recent meeting of the International Labour Organization, would want to **talk** about. The Government has adopted in principle, and in effect, the articles of the International Labour Organization convention. The provision is in the bill and I have to convince **coalminers** as well as metalliferous miners but I point out that there **will** be no manual labour for women at the coalface or the mineface. Special categories have been laid down. As this **was** the only worry referred to by the honourable member for Broken Hill, I commend the bill to the **House**.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

COMMITTEE AND ADOPTION OF REPORT

Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted on motion by Mr Freudenstein.

ADJOURNMENT

TROTTING TRACK AT KANAHOOKA

Mr FREUDENSTEIN (Young), Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy [10.22]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr PETERSEN (Illawarra) [10.22]: I wish to raise a matter that has caused me a great deal of concern. I refer to the expenditure of funds by the Department of Main Roads to build a trotting track in an area called Kanahooka, which is on the southern bank of Mullet Creek in my electorate. What is known as the F6 expressway is being built through my electorate and in the near future the Department of Public Works will be calling tenders for the construction of a bridge across Mullet Creek to extend the expressway beyond Northcliffe Drive to go to Yallah through Dapto. In the process it will go through an area owned by a Mr Wilson who runs a farm on which he breeds and trains trotting horses. This area of land is on the floodbank of Mullet Creek. It is subject to flooding, and it is here that Mr Wilson has constructed a trotting track, obviously without a great deal of expenditure. It is simply a flat area that seems to have had a bulldozer around it. At a rough guess I should say that a bulldozer would not have been used for more than a week. A few inches of metal dust were then put on the area.

In the construction of the F6 expressway extension a corner of this land will be taken. Apparently the Department of Main Roads has come to an agreement with Mr Wilson that in return for taking away a corner of the land that embraces this trotting track, they will construct another trotting track. Probably that would be fair enough if they were building a trotting track equivalent to the one they were taking away, but that is far from being the case. The

trotting track that the department is constructing is approximately seven-eighths or a mile long and very much built up. It has on it about three feet of slag, a foot of gravel, a foot of clay and four inches of metal dust.

In addition, apparently the Department of Main Roads considers that Mr Wilson has to be additionally compensated as it is constructing for him a swimming pool for his horses; it is 200 yards long by about 20 yards wide. The incredible thing about the decision by the department is that it has cost between \$250,000 and \$500,000 to construct the trotting track and swimming pool for Mr Wilson's horses. The track that has been constructed on the southern bank of Mullet Creek at Kanahooka is roughly equivalent to the public trotting tracks at Fairfield and Bankstown.

I ask the Minister this question: has the Department of Main Roads so much money that it can spend this large sum on constructing a trotting track and a swimming pool for horses? Surely it could have compensated Mr Wilson with a much smaller sum for the property that has been taken over from him. I have spoken to employees of the Department of Main Roads. Honourable members are probably aware that employees of the department have been on a strike that was recently settled; it concerned the expenditure of public funds on main roads in the area. I ask why so much money has been spent on such a luxurious facility for a private owner who has been amply compensated. I understand that he received between \$140,000 and \$160,000 as compensation for the land taken from him for the construction of the expressway. I ask why this other money has been outlaid on the construction of a new track and swimming pool for horses, especially as the track is to the standard of the public tracks at Fairfield and Bankstown.

It is apparent to me that the Government is far more interested in giving compensation to the owners of property than it is in constructing roads for the people in the area in which I live. In the case I have brought under notice the department has

spent a considerable sum of money on constructing horse-training facilities for a property owner who had his land taken from him. The Minister for Public Works has been a party to this construction, and I suggest that the compensation has been far beyond what one would consider adequate for the disadvantage suffered by the owner. Why should an owner be provided with a luxurious trotting track that he now says he will use for **gymkhanas** and private racing?

Workers employed by the Department of Main Roads have told me that priority was given to this project and that men were taken off important construction work being carried out on the Mt Ousley road in order that this trotting track could be built. How can public funds be wasted in this way? How can this compensation be awarded and excessive expenditure made on what amounts to a luxury that is totally unnecessary? The South Coast has to put up with inferior roads, which have not had the money spent on them that should be expended on them. Recently the Department of Public Works announced that it was not going to spend more money on our roads. Moreover, it sacked forty-eight of its workers. This action was taken as a result of money being expended in the way I have detailed. Why should money be wasted on this unnecessary luxury? There has been no concern for the people in my area though these special privileges have been granted.

Mr PUNCH (Gloucester), Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports [10.32]: I have always felt that people who follow the Peking or the Moscow doctrine are confused, and I have never heard a more confused speech on the adjournment than the one I heard tonight. Perhaps the honourable member for Illawarra will indicate to me where the Minister for Public Works comes into this situation. Tonight I was informed that the honourable member for Illawarra had told the Government Whip that he wished to raise a matter dealing with the Department of Public Works. However, all he has talked about is a trotting track—and that may be the

concern of the Minister for Culture, Sport, and Recreation and Minister for Tourism. Then he talked about an expressway and main roads, which may be the concern of the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways. Then he spoke about a gentleman who he **claims** has had a lot of money spent on a private trotting track at the expense of the road system in the area, which I doubt very much, without knowing the facts.

The honourable member for Illawarra spoke about the Department of Public Works calling tenders for a bridge. However, that department does not now build bridges—that is the sole responsibility of the Department of Main Roads. The honourable member spoke about inferior roads. One of the main reasons why many of our roads are inferior at the present time is that the previous federal **Labor** Government cut dramatically our funds for public roads in this State. That government cut our funds in respect of rural roads from \$26 million to \$16 million—and that is not allowing for the inflation that went on at the same time—in one year. Then those funds were cut down further, to \$15 million and then to \$13 million.

I do **not** know what the heck the honourable member for Illawarra was talking about. He seems to have some obsession about a Mr Wilson who has a trotting track worth the honourable member says **from** \$250,000 to \$500,000, and is, again he says, having money spent on it at the expense of roads in that area. Then he asked why the Minister for Public Works was a party to constructing this trotting track. The fact is that I would not have a clue, to be quite honest, and frankly I do not think that the honourable member for Illawarra has a clue about it either.

I should be happy to refer **this** matter to whatever authority handles it but I am not sure who does handle it after the confused explanation we have had here tonight. I think it is quite a ridiculous insinuation that the honourable member for Illawarra has levelled at the gentleman to whom he refers.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Department of Main Roads has not been a party to the ridiculous allegation that has been levelled at it here tonight, about spending money on some trotting track at the expense of the local roads, about building a swimming pool in some drain and about \$140,000 being given as compensation. I do not know and I do not have a

clue about what the honourable member is referring to, and I do not think he knows himself. However, I shall have this matter looked at and refer it to the Minister for Transport, who may be the correct Minister.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 10.36 p.m.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

The following question upon notice and answer was circulated in *Questions and Answers* this day.

COMMUTER TRAFFIC ON FERRIES

Mr HARROLD asked the MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT AND MINISTER FOR HIGHWAYS—

(1) What is the current average number of passengers carried each day, from Monday to Friday, by ferries operating from:

- (a) Neutral Bay wharf;
- (b) Cremorne wharf;
- (c) Mosman wharf;
- (d) Athol wharf; and
- (e) Manly wharf?

(2) How does this average compare with the usage from each of these wharves over the last three years?

(3) Does he propose to encourage the use of ferries for commuter transport?

(4) Will he introduce a ferry service between the city and Middle Harbour and its estuaries?

Answer—

On 24th December last I forwarded a letter to the honourable member answering the above questions. The following is an extract of my reply.

(1) The average number of passengers carried each day Monday to Friday in 1975 from certain Sydney Harbour wharves is as under:

(a) Neutral Bay Wharves	3 777
(b) Cremorne Wharf	} *	6 992
(c) Mosman Wharves						
(d) Athol Wharf	2 263
(e) Manly Wharf—						
Ferries	8 020
Hydrofoils	5021

* Combined service

(2) The average number of passengers carried each day Monday to Friday in 1973 was:

(a) Neutral Bay Wharves	4 899
(b) Cremorne Wharf	}	*	6505
(c) Mosman Wharves						
(d) Athol Wharf	3 537
(e) Manly Wharf —						
Ferries	10450
Hydrofoils	4 050

* Combined service

(Statistics for the years 1972 and 1974 are not now available.)

(3) It is proposed to encourage the use of ferries for **commuter** transport.

(4) It is **not** proposed to introduce a ferry service between the City and Middle Harbour and its estuaries at the present time or in the Immediate future. However, the matter is being kept under continual review.

