

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 1 September, 1976

Petition (Gambling Casinos)—Milk Quotas (Urgency)—Questions without Notice—Dissent (**Ruling of Mr Deputy-Speaker**)—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fifth Day's Debate).

Mr Speaker (The Hon. Lawrence Borthwick Kelly) took the chair at 2.15 p.m.

Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

PETITION

Gambling Casinos

The Clerk announced **the** following petition had been lodged for presentation by **the** honourable member for **Albury** and that a **copy** would be referred to the appropriate Minister:

The Petition of the undersigned electors in the State of New South **Wales** respectfully sheweth:

- (1) There are at present sufficient legal gambling outlets in the State of New South Wales.
- (2) During the last recently recorded period of a year the amount spent or invested in gambling exceeded the sum of \$4,000 million.
- (3) The opening of casinos will enlarge this expenditure and will create further inroads upon the amount available to families for the conduct of their domestic life and will thus cause hardship to parents and children in the home and will also, as experience has shown, be an incentive to crimes of stealing, embezzlement and fraud in order to make up for moneys that have been lost through gambling or which are intended for gambling.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will not legislate to legalize casinos in New South Wales.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Petition received.

MILK QUOTAS

Urgency

Sir ERIC WILLIS (Earlwood), Leader of the Opposition [2.17]: I move:

That it is a matter of urgent necessity that this House should forthwith consider the following motion, *viz.*, That this House—

- (1) Deplores the conduct of the Minister for Primary Industries in publicly disclosing in respect of members of this House personal and confidential information obtainable only from government files;
- (2) Censures the said Minister for so gravely misusing his ministerial authority; and
- (3) Calls on the Premier to remove him from office forthwith.

In the opinion of the Premier, the Attorney-General, and some of their colleagues, including the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries, this may be a matter of levity, but in the opinion of the people of the State it is one of grave importance and of considerable urgency. The matter is urgent because yesterday the first indication was given by the Government that the threat reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 17th May—which was hotly denied by the Premier—to use personal files on Ministers is now being implemented.

The matter is urgent because this day this Parliament, without any delay whatever, must formally and overwhelmingly indicate its revulsion at the practice of invading the privacy of individuals. It is urgent because yesterday it was members of Parliament, and tomorrow it could be anyone. It is urgent because the Premier himself, when Leader of the Opposition, putting the case for a politician's right to a private life, said, "None of us can bear total scrutiny." From yesterday that principle espoused by the Premier has been buried, for the action of his Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries had his full blessing. The Government must be given this opportunity, this day, to state through the Premier whether that principle is to have only a one-day interment or whether it is to remain buried for ever.

This matter is urgent because yesterday we had the first evidence that this Government will do, with vengeance, in government, what it sought to do in opposition, that is, to sully the character of persons by innuendo or by attacking them when they are unable to defend themselves. This matter is urgent because this House, this mother of Australian parliaments, must stamp itself this day as a place of true democracy, of democratic and ministerial responsibility and respectability—not as a parliamentary whore-house where those principles can be prostituted by the likes of the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries.

This matter is urgent because, if the rights of parliamentarians who have some opportunity to defend themselves can be treated as they were yesterday, the rights of private citizens in our community, with no opportunity for redress, can be trampled in no time. The matter is urgent because the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries carried on yesterday the pattern of cowardly attacks set by other members who sit on the Government benches. The member for **Charlestown** attacked the new member for **Kirribilli** when that member was not in a position to defend himself.

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. It has been ruled on countless occasions that a member when speaking to an urgency motion must address himself specifically to urgency and not debate the substantive motion. It is not enough for the Leader of

the Opposition to say continually that the matter is urgent when the text of what he is saying relates to the substantive motion and not to the motion of urgency. I put it to you that the Leader of the Opposition is directing himself to the substantive motion.

Sir **Eric Willis**: On the point of order. Obviously, the Attorney-General has leapt to his feet because as I have referred to the member for Charlestown, the Attorney-General is afraid that I shall expose him as the vile, cowardly person he is for attacking **people** and assassinating their character under the cover of parliamentary privilege.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is starting to stray from the motion of urgency, as intimated by his reference to the honourable member for Charlestown. The urgency motion is **specific**. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to speak to the reasons why he believes the matter is urgent and should be dealt with this afternoon by the Parliament.

Mr F. J. Walker: On a further point of order. My further point relates to the point of order taken by the Leader of the Opposition. I suggest that that point of order was both frivolous and vexatious, taken only to score a political point and not in an attempt to assist you or the House in any way. I put it to you that the Leader of the Opposition was out of order in **taking** that point.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! I call upon the Leader of the Opposition to speak to his motion of urgency.

Sir **ERIC WILLIS**: I shall ignore the list of examples I could quote relating to members on the other side of the House who have misused parliamentary privilege. The matter is urgent because this reprehensible code of conduct by **Labor** politicians in this Parliament must be brought to a halt immediately and this House must be given an assurance by the leader of the Government that it will be halted. It is urgent because the Premier himself must immediately give a guarantee to the people of **this** democratic State of New South Wales that the precedent established yesterday by the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries will not be followed by other Ministers.

For example, by the Minister for Youth and Community Services talking about what he finds in the files of his department about people who were juvenile delinquents; by the Minister for Education revealing information relating to individuals' IQ levels taken at school; by the Treasurer disclosing how much people have in accounts **with** the Rural Bank; by the Minister of Justice and Minister for Services in relation to confidential court records and confidential records held by the registrar of births, deaths and marriages; by the Attorney-General, encouraged by the member for **Illawarra**, raking up details of divorce cases; or by the Minister for Health giving details of the health records of certain people. These are the things that must be stopped before they start.

Mr Speaker, the matter is urgent because all members of this **Parliament** must be given clear guidelines from either yourself or the Premier on the code of conduct to be observed by all members when speaking in this House. If the gloves are to be off for one, they must be off for all—not just for Ministers but for everybody. Of course, we all know that that would bring Parliament into disrepute and could even destroy the parliamentary institution.

The matter is urgent because public servants who handle confidential information in the normal course of their duties must be left with no misunderstanding about the confidentiality of that information—despite the behaviour yesterday of the Minister for Primary Industries. It is urgent that the Premier give an assurance to

this House and to the community that his other Ministers are not sitting on hate lists, though such an assurance would be meaningless in respect of the Attorney-General who has his own corporate hate list reminiscent of the enemies lists uncovered in the Watergate scandal. Finally it is urgent because, as the Premier said, "None of us can bear total scrutiny", and there are many on the other side of the House whose private and business practices could not stand total scrutiny. For those reasons I submit that it is urgent that this House should immediately discuss this motion and the misuse or abuse of parliamentary privilege such as we witnessed in this House yesterday.

Mr WRAN: (Bass Hill), Premier [2.26]: I am sure all honourable members will appreciate the dilemma in which the Leader of the Opposition finds himself. Yesterday he, somewhat ineptly, was the instrument, by that awkward and thoroughly unresearched question which he asked, of releasing a floodgate of truths against some of the former Ministers of the Crown in New South Wales.

Sir Eric Willis: This is more like Watergate, not floodgates.

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

Mr WRAN: Now, having embarrassed his former ministerial colleagues, the Leader of the Opposition is seeking to lay down a smokescreen around the revelations of the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries. How incredible it was that although the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries, who is the honourable member for Casino and a champion of dairyfarmers in New South Wales, sought for months to have the Ministers who were receiving payment under the Dairy Industry Act reveal to this Parliament and the people the sums of money that they had received, steadfastly they refused and they retired behind their ministerial privilege.

Mr Punch: You are lying and you know it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Punch: That is an **untruth**.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am unhappy with the remarks of the Leader of the Country Party. Yesterday he indulged in similar phraseology. I ask him now to withdraw that remark and to apologize.

Mr Punch: If the Premier takes offence, I withdraw and apologize.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I directed you to withdraw.

Mr Punch: All right, I withdraw and apologize.

Sir Eric Willis: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, are we to infer that whenever an honourable member on this side of the House is required to withdraw, he is also required to apologize but in similar circumstances honourable members on the Government side are required only to withdraw?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I apologize to the Leader of the Country Party for asking him to apologize. It was my intention to ask for a withdrawal of a remark and not for an apology.

Mr WRAN: With respect to you, Mr Speaker, I find it difficult to take offence at anything that comes from the inane lips of the Leader of the Country Party. Be **that** as it may, the relevant information was **sought** by the Minister for Decentralisation

and Development and Minister for Primary Industries. However, for months members now on the Opposition benches, formerly Ministers of the Crown including the Leader of the Country Party, retired behind their ministerial privilege because they were embarrassed. Why were they embarrassed?

Mr Punch: On a point of order. It is most inappropriate that the Premier should be allowed in the course of the debate to state something that is clearly untrue. He knows, as well as other honourable members know, that the milk quotas of the former Ministers of the Government were revealed when they were asked for; and they were revealed to the press. I repeat that the Premier is telling an untruth in this regard.

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

Mr WRAN: They were embarrassed, as they were embarrassed yesterday, because the campaign that they were conducting, and are conducting, was that they, together with other quota holders, should receive compensation in respect of their quotas. How could they, in conscience, as Ministers of the Crown, argue for compensation when they themselves would be the greatest receivers of money from the Dairy Industry Authority? There has never been in the history of this Parliament an exhibition of hypocrisy such as we have seen over the past few months.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRAN: I ask the honourable member for Mosman, who is coming to the aid of his Country Party colleagues and quota holders, how many of their affairs he looked after as an accountant. He should not put his head into it otherwise he will find himself in the same position——

[Interruption]

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

Mr WRAN: Let me put the mind of the Leader of the Opposition at rest about the standards by which the new Government will conduct itself. The standard by which we will conduct ourselves is the standard which will require in due course—and it is being considered at the moment—a revelation of the financial holdings of members of Parliament. It is the view of this Government, as in respect of local government where aldermen and shire councillors have to reveal their pecuniary interests, that members of Parliament, especially Ministers of the Crown, should have to reveal their pecuniary interests.

[Interruption]

Mr WRAN: That man of honour and virtue asked for a standard. That will be the standard. It is now under critical examination. It is part of the Labor Party's policy that there be such revelation. Each honourable member opposite will be required to reveal his interests in the same way as every Government member will reveal his.

Mr Arblaster: On oath?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRAN: It is a great pity——

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mosman to oraer for the second time.

Mr WRAN: It is a great pity that the former Minister for Health, the honourable member for Davidson, should stick his hand halfway down his throat and mumble when making interjections that he is too fearful of having heard, and does not have the courage to say publicly what he just said, in order that his standards could be judged. No amount of mumbling can disguise the fact that the way in which the previous Government of this State lined its own **pockets** at the expense of ordinary dairyfarmers is nothing short of a disgrace.

Sir Eric Willis: On a point of order. As the Leader of the former Government to which the Premier has just referred I take offence at his suggestion that I lined my pockets at the expense of anybody. Also, I take offence at the suggestion that any of my colleagues lined their pockets at the expense of anyone. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to direct the Premier to withdraw the remark immediately. Indeed, it is so offensive that he should be made to apologize.

Mr WRAN: I withdraw the remark to the extent that it could possibly apply to the Leader of the Opposition, who is not known as a milker of cows.

Mr Viney: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, as a member of the party that supported the Government I resent the implication that I lined my pockets at the expense of anybody. I ask that you direct the Premier to apologize.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRAN: All these gentlemen-----

Mr Punch: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, are we to have one set of rules for one side of the House and another set of rules for the other side of the House?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Are you rising on a point of order?

Mr Punch: Yes.

Mr SPEAKER: Or are you defying the Chair?

Mr Punch: No, sir, I am rising on a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: If you are taking the point that the Premier did not withdraw the remark, that is in order.

Mr Punch: On the point of order. I ask that the Premier be directed to withdraw and apologize, as I was forced to apologize yesterday, for an offensive remark.

Mr SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition took a point of order and the Premier withdrew the remark. Then the honourable member for Wakehurst took the same point, and the Premier nodded his head.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Order! Serjeant, remove the honourable member for Yaralla.

Mr Healey: On a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

[Interruption]

Mr Healey: I want to take a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Serjeant, remove the honourable member for Davidson.

[The honourable member for Yaralla and the honourable member for Davidson left the Chamber, accompanied by the Serjeant-at-Arms.]

Mr Viney: I take the point of order that the nodding of a head cannot be recorded in the proceedings of this Parliament. *Hansard* does not draw pictures.

Mr SPEAKER: If you gentlemen had been polite enough to wait until I had finished addressing the House whilst I was on my feet, and not indulged in disorderly behaviour, the honourable member for Yaralla and the honourable member for Davidson would not be where they are now. I was informing the House, on the point taken by you, that the remark should have been withdrawn, and I was asking the Premier to do that. Then the interruption by the Leader of the Country Party occurred and I considered it was disorderly as I was on my feet. I ask the Premier, in response to your point of order, to withdraw the remark he made.

Mr WRAN: I withdraw any remark that was apparently offensive—

Sir Eric Willis: On a point of order. I rise with reluctance because I do not like interrupting the Premier while he is speaking. I should be willing to move that he be granted additional time if I take up any of his time, but I must raise a point of order. The honourable member for Yaralla and the honourable member for Davidson have just been removed from the Chamber upon your instructions. There are standing orders relating to this matter, one of which says that an honourable member must be warned three times.

[Interruption]

Sir Eric Willis: The other one is that if a member is guilty of gross disorder he may be removed by motion of the House. As neither of these took place, I ask that as perhaps in a moment of haste you have removed those two honourable members contrary to the standing orders, you might invite them back.

Mr Wran: On the point of order. We have had a number of points of order in this debate, the last of which—as the Government will not agree to urgency—has been taken by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, and I quote his earlier remark, spoke about this Chamber being turned into a parliamentary whore-house. The conduct of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues on the opposite side of the House, in constantly taking vexatious and frivolous points or order and points of order in respect of matters that you have specifically ruled upon—indeed, you ruled yesterday in similar circumstances upon the very point that the Leader of the Opposition took—rather than making this a parliamentary whore-house is converting it into a parliamentary madhouse. If in the result the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleague, the Leader of the Country Party, is such as to provoke their colleagues to the sort of misconduct that we witnessed here today—and, regretfully, yesterday from the member for Maitland—then they are in the process of shattering all respect for themselves and for the Parliament of which they are members.

Returning to the point of order taken by the Leader of the Opposition, I should merely like to submit, with respect, that in the light of your ruling yesterday, the arguments in support of the points of order are quite frivolous and vexatious and I ask you in ruling on this point of order to impress upon honourable members that, though this is a place of free speech and democratic process, it is not a place in which honourable

members can behave vexatiously, frivolously and irresponsibly, as so many members of the Opposition, including the leaders of both parties represented there, did yesterday and have done today.

Mr Cameron: On the point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is it the same point of order?

Mr Cameron: Yes. I refer to the incident canvassed by the Premier in his point of order. It is clear that one or other of Standing Orders 387 or 392 is involved, but you, Mr Speaker, have not conformed to either of those standing orders. It is not clear to the House under which standing order the honourable member for Davidson and the honourable member for Yaralla were removed from the Chamber. It is imperative that the House should at least know for how many sitting days they have been suspended as it is quite clear that the penalty is quite different depending upon which standing order you have purported to use, although you have conformed to neither. In conclusion on the point of order, I put that it is a grave reflection upon your administration of this House for it to be said, as the Premier said, that it is a parliamentary mad-how.

Mr Booth: On the point of order. I refer you, Mr Speaker, to a previous ruling given by your predecessor, now the honourable member for Northcott, in relation to an action of mine in the House for which I certainly was not warned on three occasions, when I was removed from the Chamber for a much less frivolous attack under his administration. I refer you, Mr Speaker, to that previous ruling of the former Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I stated yesterday that I was concerned at the level of interjection from both sides of the House, particularly from the Opposition side, during question time. I emphasized then that I intended to be most strict. Any honourable member who wishes to peruse the *Hansard* record of yesterday's proceedings will see that clearly spelt out early in question time. The matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition is not valid. It does not mean necessarily that a Speaker is bound to apply Standing Order 387 or Standing Order 392. Those remarks are applicable also to the point raised by the honourable member for Northcott. Yesterday in reply to the same point of order taken by the honourable member for Northcott I said that when he was Speaker he used the same ruling on several occasions. I drew his attention to the decision of a former Speaker, the late Sir Kevin Ellis, which was in these terms:

In calling a Member "to order" it is not necessary to do so specifically by name (i.e. the Member's electorate). Hence a Member who persists in engaging in disorderly conduct despite repeated calls of "Order" may be removed.

Today my calls for order which I made a number of times were directed at Opposition members, two of whom I asked the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove. I asked for their removal under the practice of the House to which I have referred. If the conduct of honourable members continues in this regrettable manner, unfortunately I shall have to use the same rule again. I am not happy with the conduct of members. I want free speech to prevail; I want every member to have the right to speak but only when he has the call. Unfortunately members are engaging in debate across the Chamber contrary to my direction for order.

Sir Eric Willis: On a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled on the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Is this a fresh point?

Sir Eric Willis: It is a fresh point. It is an extremely important matter that goes to **the** very basis, the very core, of this institution. You, Mr Speaker, said a moment ago that when you call "Order!" it applies to **all** members of the Opposition. Are we to assume from that that when you call "Order!" in a general sense it applies to every individual **member** of the **Opposition**——

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Both sides of the House.

Sir Eric Willis: ——and if you say "Order!" for the second time **then** we are all called to order for the second time, and the same on the third occasion, and that after that we may be removed?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is canvassing my ruling. My direction to you and to other members of the Chamber was that when I am concerned that there is disorder I shall use the extreme method, and that is what I have done today. Yesterday I warned honourable members and I did not today. While I was on my feet addressing the House the honourable member for Davidson and the honourable member for Yaralla were completely disorderly. They had been disorderly earlier but I did not individually call them to order. However, they were instructed by my direction to come to order and that is the reason I have had them removed today. I do not intend to persist on this question. The time for urgency has expired.

Mr Cameron: I just want to ask a simple question——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! In reply to the point of order by the honourable member for Northcott, who asked how long the two honourable members would remain out of the Chamber, I inform the House that they will be out until tomorrow. The time for urgency has expired.

Sir Eric Willis: I should like to move that the Premier's time be extended.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Question of urgency put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 44

Mr Boyd	Mr Jackett	Mr Punch
Mr Brewer	Mr Leitch	Mr Rofe
Mr Brown	Mr Lewis	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Bruxner	Mr McDonald	Mr Schipp
Mr Cameron	Mr McGinty	Mr Singleton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Mackie	Mr Taylor
Mr Coleman	Mr Maddison	Mr Viney
Mr Cowan	Mr Mason	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr Darby	Mrs Meillon	Mr Webster
Mr Dowd	Mr Moore	Mr West
Mr Duncan	Mr Morris	Sir Eric Willis
Mr Fischer	Mr Murray	Mr Wotton
Mr Fisher	Mr Osborne	Tellers,
Mr Freudenstein	Mr Park	Mr Arblaster
Mr Griffith	Mr Pickard	Mr Barraclough

Noes, 49

Mr Akister	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Bannon	Mr Hatton	Mr Petersen
Mr Barnier	Mr Hills	Mr Quinn
Mr Bedford	Mr Hunter	Mr Ramsay
Mr Booth	Mr Jackson	Mr Renshaw
Mr Brereton	Mr Jensen	Mr Rogan
Mr Cahill	Mr Johnson	Mr Ryan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Johnstone	Mr Sheahan
Mr Cox	Mr Jones	Mr Stewart
Mr Crabtree	Mr Keane	Mr F. J. Walker
Mr Day	Mr Kearns	Mr Whelan
Mr Degen	Mr McGowan	Mr Wilde
Mr Durick	Mr Maher	Mr Wran
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mallam	
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Flaherty	Mr Neilly	Mr Cleary
Mr Gordon	Mr O'Connell	Mr Face

Pair

Mr Wade

Mr Doyle

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion of urgency negatived.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

RACEHORSE AND GREYHOUND VIRUSES

Mr DEGEN: I ask the Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism a question without notice. Is it a fact that rumours have persisted in recent months in Sydney racing circles about unknown viruses which have adversely affected the performance of horses? Is it also a fact that no major sustained research programme into viruses affecting both horses and greyhounds is carried out in this State, although leading veterinary authorities have insisted that such a programme is needed? As millions of dollars are invested in the racing industry, what action is the Government taking on viruses to ensure that punters are being protected?

Mr BOOTH: Since taking office the Government has been concerned about a number of statements that have been made in relation to not only viruses affecting horses and greyhounds but also, in recent days, to the nobbling of horses. When on 17th July some horses performed badly at the Rosehill race meeting, I called for a report from the Australian Jockey Club. On 20th July I received the report, which blamed the **virus**, or used it as an excuse for the performances of the horses.

As a result of this report from the Australian Jockey Club I made a public statement to the effect that I thought research should be carried out into viruses generally. On the very next day, within probably two hours of my returning to my office, the New South Wales Greyhound Racing Control Board, through its secretary Mr John Fell, provided me with a report that had been submitted to the previous Government last year. Honourable members will recall that last year a canine virus was rampant throughout the greyhound industry in New South Wales. At that time the Greyhound Racing Control Board, being generally concerned so far as its industry

was concerned, submitted this report to the Government, which did nothing about it other than to refer it to the federal Government, to see whether there was some research that that Government could conduct into the matter.

I commend the New South Wales Greyhound Racing Control Board for its interest in this matter. The report submitted to me by the board awakened a wider interest: in view of the Government's heavy commitment in the racing industry, it appeared to me that we should attempt to do something about the matter. I then **had some** discussions with the Australian Equine Research Foundation, the Australian Equine Veterinary Association, and others interested in racing, to see whether the Government could resolve the conflict, which has been highlighted in the past couple of weeks, about whether the real reason for the poor performance of horses was that they had contracted a virus or that they had been nobbled. The Government is providing \$60,000 for the first year of a research programme into viruses that affect horses and dogs. The research will be undertaken by the Australian Equine Research Foundation and the University of Sydney.

I am amazed at the lack of concern about the subject shown by the members of the Country Party, for viruses affect not only thoroughbreds but, indeed, horses generally. Thousands of young persons are members of pony clubs in this State. They meet regularly. Their animals could be affected by a virus. Dog lovers show their dogs every weekend throughout the State, and dogs too can be affected by viruses. The research, therefore, has wide ramifications and is not concerned solely with the racing industry. I can tell the honourable member for Balmain that the Government is taking positive action to isolate viruses that affect these animals. We have been able to get the assistance of experts through the University of Sydney. In each of the second and third years of the programme \$40,000 will be provided but the Government hopes that the racing industry itself will make some contribution in those years. If it does not, the Government will still be in a position to continue funding the research, but we are looking to the racing industry for assistance because of the wide ramifications of the problem. As I say, we hope to be able to isolate viruses and so distinguish between the effects of them and nobbling.

MILK QUOTAS

Mr PUNCH: I ask the Premier a question without notice. Did the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries state yesterday that it was the intention of the Government to introduce legislation that would result in the confiscation without compensation of up to 30 per cent of individual milk quotas held by dairymen in the BMQ area under licence from a statutory government authority, the Dairy Industry Authority? Can the Premier give an assurance that this is not the forerunner of other forms of compulsory acquisition of private assets on unfair and unjust terms? In particular, will the Premier give an assurance that other primary producers who have quotas that were allocated to them to maintain orderly marketing—for example, producers of rice, sugar, and eggs—will not be similarly treated at the expense of those seeking free entry to such industries? Will the Premier give an assurance also that government-issued licences for taxis and private buses, milk vendors' franchises and the like, will not be made available freely to any and all persons who are able to provide such services?

Mr WRAN: The question exhibits a degree of irresponsibility that does not become the leader of a once notable and viable political party. What the Leader of the Country Party is seeking to do is to create uncertainty in other primary industries and undertakings where none now exists. He is seeking to equate the

position with milk quotas with other **primary** industries particularly—which, incidentally, I thought it was his prime responsibility to protect and represent. The whole implication of his question as regards other undertakings, such as taxi services, is **so** fanciful as almost to be deserving of no **answer** at all. I must give the Leader **of** the Country Party credit for one capacity, that is, not to know when he has had enough on any question. As he has raised the question again, I shall favour him with a reply.

The word confiscation was not used yesterday by government supporters; it was used by the Leader of the Country Party's close colleague and confidant, the Leader of the Opposition, who was put up by the Leader of the Country Party yesterday to be shot down in flames for asking that asinine question which, as I said earlier, opened the floodgates for a quite proper attack upon a number of former Ministers of the Crown, and led to a revelation of facts and circumstances that the public was entitled to have. The Leader of the Country Party knows as well as any other honourable member that there has been a deep-seated measure of discontent in the dairy industry over a period of many years. Also, there has been deep-seated dissatisfaction among consumers in this State, particularly in the metropolitan area, where they have been paying through the nose for milk simply because certain larger quota holders have been increasing the cost of production in order to maintain fancifully high quotas that were awarded to them under the previous Government's administration.

Now all that is to end. The purpose of the policy which, before the election on 1st May, was clearly articulated by the present Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries, is twofold. First, it is designed to give all dairyfarmers a fair go. Second, it is designed to give New South Wales milk consumers a fair go. It should not be forgotten that if the Liberal-Country parties had been returned to government on 1st May, the price of milk in Sydney this day would have been several cents higher than it is now. The only reason that the price of milk has not increased is that the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries in the new Government commendably took action to protect consumers against the rapacious appetites of some large quota holders, prominent among whom were members of the previous Government.

Let us have enough of this humbug. The simple situation is, if I may borrow a phrase from one of the Opposition's idols, the Rt Hon. Malcolm Fraser, that the honourable gentlemen were caught with their pants down. So, let us have enough of it. The Opposition has taken a hiding. Let them play to the rules and accept the umpire's decision. I am sure the people of New South Wales are indebted to my colleague the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for **Primary** Industries for his forthright answer to the most inept question that came yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition.

DISSENT

Ruling of Mr Deputy-Speaker

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [3.4]: I move:

That this House dissents from the ruling of Mr Deputy-Speaker given on 26 August, 1976, when he ruled that the amendment moved to the Address in Reply by the Honourable Member for Northcott was out of order because it was in conflict with a ruling he had already given regarding the

extent of the Address in Reply debate and also that the matter contained in the amendment should be the subject of a substantive motion at an appropriate time.

It is appropriate that the House should recall the terms of the amendment sought to be moved by the honourable member for Northcott. It sought the addition of *the* following words:

We regret that there has not been included in Your Excellency's Speech any reference to the reasons justifying the conduct of the Attorney-General in facilitating the lapse of an *ex officio* indictment against an ALP parliamentary colleague regarding whom a strong and probable *prima facie* case has been established that he sought to bribe aldermen, or to the policy implications arising from that conduct.

I draw particular attention to the last phrase in that amendment, "to the policy implications arising from that conduct". Mr Deputy-Speaker, in ruling the amendment out of order, said:

I have listened with interest to the various points raised by honourable members, but I feel that the amendment is in conflict with the ruling I have already given regarding the extent of this debate. Because of that conflict I must ask the honourable member for Northcott to move a substantive motion at the appropriate time if he wishes to pursue this line. I rule the amendment out of order.

The amendment sought to be moved by the honourable member for Northcott was indeed in mild terms. If one refers to the Votes and Proceedings of this House on 10th November, 1927, one sees that on that occasion during an Address-in-Reply debate Mr J. T. Lang, a well-known member of the Labor Party, moved an amendment, as an addition to the Address in Reply, in the following terms:

That the address be amended by the addition of the following words, to stand as paragraph 4:—"We also desire to inform your Excellency that by his conduct in withdrawing a criminal information for defamatory libel filed at the Supreme Court on the *ex officio* information of the Attorney-General against Fairfax and Sons, Limited, and Messrs Cutlack, Allen, and another, the Attorney-General acted in derogation of his duty and prostituted his office for an ulterior purpose and polluted the administration of justice at its fountain head, and the said Attorney-General is unfit to continue in his high and responsible office, and by reason of his action the Government does not possess the confidence of this House."

That is a much more resolute and critical motion sought to be added to the Address in Reply in 1927. There was a similar example to that in 1928. At that time no argument was advanced to show that the amendment sought to be made to the Address in Reply was out of order or beyond the scope of the debate. The ruling of Mr Deputy-Speaker last Thursday seems to raise three points and accordingly the motion of dissent now before the House also raises three points. The first is, how wide is the debate on the Address in Reply? The second is, does the amendment moved and subsequently ruled out of order contain words that might impute improper motives to a member of this House, namely the Attorney-General, and thereby require a substantive motion to be moved if it is to be given effect? If in fact it can be said that there were imputations of improper motives in the amendment, the question is, is the amendment itself a substantive motion? On that last point I submit to the House that an amendment made to a motion before this House, the motion being on the Address in Reply, is a substantive motion.

I refer honourable members to the 19th edition of *May* where, at page 277, a substantive motion is described as a self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and capable of expressing a decision of the House. In my view the amendment moved fulfils those clear guidelines set out in *May*. It is within the power of the House to accept or reject an amendment. Of course, a separate vote is required on the amendment. I suggest that the House should seriously consider the extent to which the honourable member for Northcott has complied with the requirement that that is a substantive motion. Looking at the width of the debate on the Address in Reply, I submit that it is well-established that the subject-matter that may be canvassed is very wide indeed.

I submit that honourable members can deal in a general way with legislation and with matters going to administration and the affairs of government generally. There is ample precedent for ruling that in the Address-in-Reply debate honourable members may refer to matters that have not been referred to in the Governor's Speech to Parliament.

One of the matters of paramount importance within the powers of the Attorney-General is the right to issue *ex officio* indictments—the way in which the Crown is able to test whether a magistrate who fails to commit a person for trial on a question of law was in fact right in law. I understand that the Attorney-General has been quoted as indicating that he would favour an appeal by the Crown rather than the use of the time-honoured practice of issuing an *ex officio* indictment.

Mr Durick: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I submit that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is out of order in dealing with the matter that he is now touching upon; it has nothing to do with the question being debated, that is the motion of dissent from the ruling of Mr Deputy-Speaker. He ruled that the amendment sought to be moved by the honourable member for Northcott was not a substantive motion in the form in which it came before the House. Now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is attempting to stray from that point and is dealing with the matter which the honourable member for Northcott would have put forward if the amendment had been accepted.

Mr Einfeld: On the point of order. I support the honourable member for Lakemba. It is clear that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is dealing with *ex officio* indictments, which were the subject-matter which the honourable member for Northcott sought vainly to bring before the Parliament and was properly refused by Mr Deputy-Speaker. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is trying to do the same thing as the honourable member for Northcott attempted to do. At this stage the House is discussing whether Mr Deputy-Speaker ruled correctly or otherwise on that occasion.

Mr Speaker, I ask you to confine the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to that situation, otherwise he will attempt to open up the whole subject-matter which Mr Deputy-Speaker refused the honourable member for Northcott the right to discuss. I submit that if you allow the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to continue in this vein and to speak on *ex officio* indictments, he will attempt to discuss the whole matter which, we all agree, Mr Deputy-Speaker was right in ruling out of order. This matter needs a substantive motion. The argument being put forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is obviously self-contained; it is an addition to a motion before the Chair. I submit that with your wisdom and knowledge of standing orders, you will rule that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is wrong in pursuing this course of action.

Mr Maddison]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is trying to show that the amendment was relevant.

Mr MADDISON: All I am seeking to put on this aspect of the argument is that it is completely within the competence of an honourable member, in the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, to point out, for example, that a legal process is antiquated or is in need of some different approach. Also, he may attack the administration of the Attorney-General who, as appeared from the debate—and there is no hiding this; it was ruled in order at the time—had used double standards.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [3.14]: The issues here are clear. In ruling out of order the amendment moved by the honourable member for Northcott, Mr Deputy-Speaker relied upon a decision given by the Hon. Sir Kevin Ellis, a former Speaker of this House. I refer to decision number 170 of the decisions of the Hon. Sir Kevin Ellis. That decision, which appears on page 30, reads:

Imputations, allegations of improper conduct, charges, or innuendoes against another Member may only be made upon a substantive motion framed for the purpose; the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply should not be used for such purposes.

The only questions before the House at the moment are, first, was the decision of Sir Kevin Ellis correct? Second, if so, did the subject-matter of the amendment now being discussed infringe his ruling? Third, is the amendment a substantive motion? Sir Kevin Ellis was one of the great Speakers of this Parliament and his point of view must have powerful persuasive authority. In any event, I direct the attention of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to May's *Parliamentary Practice—the* greatest and foremost authority on parliamentary practice of all. Pages 367 and 368 of the 19th edition deal with the rules governing the subject-matter of motions and states:

Certain matters cannot be debated, save upon a substantive motion which admits of a distinct vote of the House. Among these are the conduct of (amongst others) Members of either House of Parliament. These matters cannot, therefore, be questioned by way of amendment . . .

Lord Campion confirms this point of view in subparagraph 4 of his *Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons* on page 171. He is at pains to point out that an amendment is not a substantive motion. He states further:

A substantive motion is the only admissible method of raising a question on the conduct of the holders of certain high offices.

He includes in his list of holders of high offices members of both Houses of Parliament. On page 175 he points out the obvious—that an amendment is not a substantive motion but a subsidiary motion.

Turning to the standing orders, I draw to the attention of honourable members Standing Order 151 which forbids imputations of improper motives or personal reflections on members. That in itself would be enough to rule the amendment out of order. However, it was not necessary for that point to be taken. What the amendment expressly referred to is the conduct of two honourable members of this House—the honourable member for Heffron and myself, the Attorney-General.

The honourable member for Heffron was falsely and vilely accused of having a strong and probable *prima facie* case established against him for bribery. If that

does not question his conduct, nothing does. The amendment also falsely accused me of "facilitating the lapse of an *ex officio* indictment"—a terrible thing for an Attorney-General to do.

To recapitulate, we have the rulings of a great Speaker—Sir Kevin Ellis—by comparison with whom the honourable member for Northcott was but the palest shadow. Unfortunately, Sir Kevin's shoes were too big and his wig far too small for the honourable member for Northcott. Sir Kevin Ellis, supported by May and **Campion**, stated categorically and unequivocally that if honourable members wish to question the conduct of other honourable members they must do so by substantive motion—and that amendment could not be a substantive motion.

If honourable members care to, they may refer to several other standing orders on this subject. Standing Order 395 provides that any substantive motion sought to be discussed must conform to the rules and practice of the House in respect of motions and notices of motions. Standing Order 110 requires notice to be given of substantive motions. If any honourable member can reach the conclusion that what the honourable member for Northcott was really trying to do was give notice of motion, I should be surprised.

What the honourable member for Northcott was trying to do in his amendment was to crudely smear the honourable member for Heffron and myself. It was an attempt to continue a political prosecution in one of the most disgraceful episodes in the history of this Mother Parliament. It was an attempt to continue the Pontius **Pilate** behaviour of the former Attorney-General, the honourable member for **Ku-ring-gai**.

Sir Eric Willis: On a point of order. I have been listening to the eloquence of the Attorney-General indicating in a most persuasive and persistent manner that it is utterly improper for any honourable member to cast the slightest imputation upon the ministerial conduct or the parliamentary conduct of any other honourable member except by way of substantive motion. Now the Attorney-General is unquestionably taking unto himself the prerogative of being able to cast imputations upon his predecessor without in any way moving a substantive motion. I submit, once again, as I have had to do every day lately, that what applies to the Opposition should also be made to apply to the Government.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! All honourable members seem to be getting a little touchy about political remarks and feelings on both sides of the Chamber are starting to run a little hot. Surely in this Chamber some remarks can be accepted by both sides. It is when a definite challenge is made to the integrity and character of a member that he should be concerned about it. What I have heard so far has in no way reflected upon the integrity and character of any member of the Opposition. **If** any member of the Opposition has been offended by any remark, he may ask that the remark be withdrawn. However, as no honourable member to whom the **Attorney-General** has referred has done that, the Attorney-General is in order.

Mr F. J. WALKER: I was trying to clear the character of the honourable member for **Ku-ring-gai** who had no part whatever in that *ex officio* indictment; he made sure that he was out of the State and did not have to dirty his hands with it. It was **Stainless Steel** who arranged for the *ex officio* indictment to get on the desk of a public servant. By his direction that happened; it was not the honourable member for **Ku-ring-gai**.

Sir Eric Willis: That is a most improper and offensive remark.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the Leader of the Opposition taking a point of order?

Sir **Eric Willis**: Yes. In case the Attorney-General does not realize it, in this House honourable members are referred to not by nicknames but by their electorates. That is a traditional practice of the House. I object strenuously to the suggestion of the Attorney-General that I in any way directed somebody to take action against the honourable member for Heffron. I regard it as completely contrary to the very things that you, Mr Speaker, and Mr Deputy-Speaker, have stated can be done only by substantive motion. If the Attorney-General wants to besmirch my character, let him move a substantive motion. He has not got the guts.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! If what the Leader of the Opposition has said is true, he can use the forms of the House to make a personal explanation. If the reference to the Leader of the Opposition by way of nickname is offensive to him, I shall ask the Attorney-General to withdraw it.

Mr **F. J. WALKER**: I always thought that Stainless Steel referred to his unblemished character. Perhaps his facility with a certain item of cutlery might have been the reason for it. I want to make it clear that the allegation that I facilitated the lapse of an *ex officio* indictment is completely wrong. I did no such thing. The truth of the matter is that there was no charge existing against the honourable member for Heffron when I became Attorney-General. As far as I am concerned it is a sad story that the Opposition should have the **hide**—

Sir **Eric Willis**: On a point of order. Is this a personal explanation with which the Attorney-General is regaling honourable members or is he engaging in an explanation, or purported explanation, of his conduct, or misconduct, as Attorney-General? You, Mr Speaker, have ruled that this debate must be confined to whether Mr Deputy-Speaker was right or wrong when he ruled in a particular way the other day. The debate does not go to the actions of the Attorney-General. He should not be permitted to use the debate as a forum in which to attempt to clear the very dirty name that he now has.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! I ask the Attorney-General to direct himself to the question before the Chair.

Mr **F. J. WALKER**: It is perfectly clear, if one looks at the decisions of that wise Speaker, Sir **Kevin Ellis**, and if one has regard to the standing orders, that there is no case against the Deputy-Speaker. He has acted with the greatest propriety, as he always does, and his ruling will no doubt go down in the records of the House as one of the wisest rulings ever made.

Mr **COLEMAN (Fuller)** [3.24]: On 26th August Mr Deputy-Speaker **ruled** the amendment of the honourable member for Northcott out of order because it was contrary to the ruling he had already given or, in brief, because the amendment was defamatory of the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General himself has quoted Mr Speaker **Ellis** in relation to imputations, allegations of improper conduct, innuendoes and so on. The Attorney-General said that such imputations were directed at two honourable members, himself as well as the honourable member for Heffron, although the Deputy-Speaker ruled that that was not so. His ruling was based on imputations and so on against the Attorney-General. There were no imputations, allegations of improper conduct, innuendoes and so on against the office of the Attorney-General—none whatsoever.

The point made by the honourable member for Northcott was an imputation, if you like, of incompetence by the Attorney-General. But there was no suggestion that the Attorney-General is a liar. There was no suggestion that the Attorney-General is a thief. There was no suggestion that the Attorney-General is a drunk. There was no

suggestion of any of those imputations of bad character or defects in his integrity. There was no suggestion about his integrity or character in any shape or form. There was, however, a suggestion that the Attorney-General is incompetent, that he is a maladministrator of justice in New South Wales. As far as this side of the House is concerned it could well be that the Attorney-General could establish that he is not incompetent and that he is not a maladministrator.

Mr Sheahan: On a point of order. The honourable member for Gordon has come into the Chamber with a tape recorder. You, Mr Speaker, should ask him to remove it from the Chamber. The only way that the proceedings of the House are to be recorded is by *Hansard*.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member for Gordon operating a recorder of any description?

Mr Moore: No. I have a device which is capable of being used as a tape recorder when it is switched on. It is not switched on.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the honourable member for Gordon remove it from the Chamber. He is not entitled to bring a recorder into the Chamber.

Mr Viney: On a point of order. The standing orders refer to tape recorders and the use of them by representatives of the press but do not, unfortunately, refer to recordings by honourable members. There were occasions, I know, when tape recorders were brought into the House by members who sat on this side of the House and are now on the other side of the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not propose to rule on that point of order. I have directed the honourable member for Gordon to remove the tape recorder from the Chamber. He has done so and has complied with my request.

Mr COLEMAN: It may well be that the Attorney-General could convince honourable members that he was right in what he did, but that does not relate to the motion. The motion being considered by the House concerns the matter contained in the amendment. It was a question of the competence of the Attorney-General. Perhaps he can establish that he is competent. In taking that step we on this side of the House were relying on the latitude given, for example, to the honourable member for Illawarra when he, in his speech, canvassed a large number of matters concerning divorce. Many honourable members would be tempted to describe the speech made by the member for Illawarra in very derogatory terms but nevertheless that was permitted by the Chair. The honourable member for Illawarra was given that latitude.

In this case honourable members on the Opposition benches are not asking for that sort of latitude. They are not concerned to go into that sort of private detail which most honourable members would consider unbecoming of members of this House. The Opposition asks that a grave matter of public administration, the administration of justice in this State and its maladministration by the Attorney-General, be discussed. The result of the ruling leads us to the extraordinarily anomalous position, which cannot possibly be the intention of the standing orders or of the Chair, that we cannot discuss this matter in an Address-in-Reply debate.

This has nothing to do with character. It has to do with the administration of the Attorney-General. But, the Attorney-General can discuss it in the public press. For example, in today's issue of the Bulletin the Attorney-General is interviewed on this very matter. It can be discussed by the Attorney-General in defending himself. I refer to the question, "Who is Martyn Greive?" The Attorney-General gives an

answer and gives some sort of justification for his action. He can do that in the *Bulletin*, a weekly newspaper, but honourable members, in an Address-in-Reply debate, cannot discuss the administration of justice.

It is anomalous that these matters may be discussed at large by the legal profession, the Law Society of New South Wales, the Bar Association and the news media. The *Financial Review* of 16th August has a long article on the ugly mix of law and politics, with a photograph of the Attorney-General. It is suggested that "the new Labor Government in New South Wales has allowed to lapse an ex *officio* indictment brought against a Labor member by the former Liberal Government but has surprisingly used this centuries old and questionable device to pursue alleged company offences." This can be discussed in the newspapers. The Attorney-General was criticized by this writer. He says: "That is a grave charge —"

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. Surely the honourable member, in attempting to recount criticism of an honourable member in a newspaper, is getting far away from the motion before the House, which is whether the Deputy-Speaker's ruling was right or wrong. I submit that he cannot be allowed to continue in this way.

Mr Coleman: On the point of order, Mr Speaker, my argument is that it cannot be the intention of the Chair or the standing orders that a matter such as this can be discussed in the newspapers, and by the legal profession and the community at large, and not be raised in the Address-in-Reply debate, which ranges over the whole of the administration of the Government of New South Wales. This would be so anomalous that the mind boggles when one tries to reconcile it with any logical interpretation of the standing orders. The writer of this article says things with which I disagree, so I am not using it to support my own view; I am using it as an illustration of the absurd position in which we would be placed if we were not permitted to discuss these things.

Mr Mallam: Can the honourable member vouch for the accuracy of that report?

Mr Coleman: Yes, I vouch for the accuracy of it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fuller has referred to reports made outside this Chamber in respect of a matter that was the substance of the Address-in-Reply debate. As he has canvassed that matter fairly well, I am sure he will now come back to the question of dissent.

Mr COLEMAN: I have given some examples of the public discussion on these matters and there are many others with which I do not agree. I am quoting them not to support my own view but to use them as illustrations. I will finish on this note. The writer continues:

In the case of Greive, an ex *officio* indictment has been used——

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have just directed the honourable member to return to the dissent motion. He is now attempting to quote from a newspaper. He says he does not agree with it, but he vouches for the accuracy of it. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that he is defying your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may make references to press reports. He must not read long extracts from them and he must vouch for the accuracy of them. I did direct him to start to link up his remarks with the motion before the Chair, and I hope he will do so.

Mr COLEMAN: May I complete this quotation in order to bring the matter to that point? It is **as** follows:

In the case of Greive, an *ex officio* indictment has ben used by the present Attorney-General, Mr Walker, **as** a blunt instrument to undo the due process of law.

These are serious matters which could affect us all and which call for a re-examination of our legal processes and redefinition of the powers of politicians in sensitive office.

This is the sort of thing being said in the public discussion on this matter. I use it only to illustrate my point. Indeed, the Attorney-General may well have arguments to refute what I have quoted. I doubt that he can but I am willing to accept that he might try to do so. My basic point is that these matters are being discussed widely, yet the ruling of the Deputy-Speaker has had the absurd consequence that members of this House—who enjoy the privilege of having the widest freedom of speech available to anybody in the world; and this is the basis of parliamentary government—may not debate a matter that any journalist is able to raise in the press or any lawyer can discuss at the Bar Association. I submit that this cannot be accepted as a correct interpretation of the rights of members.

Mr MULOCK (Penrith), Minister of Justice and Minister for Services [3.34]: I do not in any way agree with the motion of dissent against the ruling of Mr Deputy-Speaker Cahill on 26th August, 1976. The honourable member for Fuller was being quite pedantic in what he put on what was meant by the amendment that the honourable member for Northcott sought to move on 26th August, 1976. Let us consider the position. Clearly, the amendment proposed by the honourable member for Northcott was specifically designed to question the conduct of the Attorney-General in relation to a specific matter referred to by the honourable member as a serious dereliction of duty, which can be taken only as an allegation of improper conduct. The literary member for Fuller alleged serious dereliction of duty on the part of the Attorney-General—this State's first law officer.

Mr Coleman: Read Jack Lang.

Mr MULOCK: I have read Jack Lang. I am surprised to learn that the honourable member has, because I thought his tastes were much more conservative. Clearly, anybody who looks at the wording of the amendment, and particularly considers the approach of the honourable member for Northcott, including the fact that during the debate he ignored the rulings of the Deputy-Speaker, must conclude that the motion was aimed at the Attorney-General, not by innuendo but by specific allegation of improper conduct on his part. That allegation could not be sustained but the honourable member for Northcott, supported by the honourable member for Fuller, persisted in it. It is significant that the honourable member for Northcott has not initiated this motion, has not yet spoken upon it and is unlikely to speak on it. To remind members of what the honourable member for Northcott was aiming at I refer them to page 244 of *Hansard* of 26th August, 1976, where he said:

He is approaching his administration like a bull in a china shop.
It is extraordinary——

Mr Dowd: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, the point is whether the amendment ought to have been allowed, not whether the argument advanced in support of the amendment should be allowed. The only matter before the Chamber on this motion

of dissent is a ruling in regard to the amendment. I submit that it is not proper to consider the argument that may have been used in relation to that matter. The **only** thing that matters is the amendment itself.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think the Minister of Justice and Minister for Services has finished his argument and is coming **to** the point.

Mr MULOCK: I am answering the argument addressed to the House by the honourable member for Fuller. He said that the allegation would not require a substantive motion because it was not aimed at the conduct of the Attorney-General; it **was** aimed at his administration. He used the word maladministration and called **attention** to the way in which justice was being administered. He was trying to cloud the issue. I suggest that no allegation is contained in the motion moved by the honourable member for Northcott. The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai referred to amendments to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply that were moved in 1927 or 1928, and he said that no argument was advanced against them. He sidestepped the later decisions of Sir Kevin Ellis. Then he sought to suggest that this amendment was in fact a substantive motion and quoted from the 19th Edition of May at page 277 to support his argument that it was a self-contained proposal. That is a logical way for somebody trained in the law to put forward a proposition that it is a self-contained proposal when its very existence depends upon a condition precedent. The condition precedent was that there is already a substantive motion before the Chair. How can it be self-contained? In fact it relies upon a pre-existing motion that was in fact before the Chair. The proposal was of such a serious nature that it should be considered only as a substantive motion, which is a motion standing on its own. This one did not stand on its own; it was dependent on the pre-existing motion, in fact, the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The fundamental rule that debate must be relevant to a question necessarily involves a rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. There was no reference at all in the motion then before the House to the administration, or the maladministration, of the Attorney-General or to any other aspect of it. I submitted to the House and to you, Mr Speaker, that this proposition was put forward as a means of getting round the very essence of the late Sir Kevin Ellis's ruling: a motion of this nature against a member of the House should be a substantive one. The House heard on that occasion the bleatings of the honourable member for Northcott and today of the honourable member for Fuller **that** their views cannot be heard. They can be heard if they follow the forms of the House. The position is quite clear; the rules are available to them in the same way as they are available to every other member of the House if they choose to move a substantive motion. Further, if they wish a matter to be dealt with urgently they may move urgency, as it is moved week in, week out in this House. Today urgency was refused not on the ground that debate on the Address in Reply was proceeding but because the Government did not want Opposition members to get two beatings in the one day.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MULOCK: On 26th August the honourable member for Fuller **when** speaking on a point of order said:

The subject of the point of order taken by the Attorney-General is the very thing that has been discussed at some length in the newspapers of this city. In fact, it has reached the stage of general discussion in the **com-** munity at large. If this matter can be discussed in the newspapers of this

city and by citizens generally, surely it is proper for a member of this Parliament to discuss it. Otherwise the newspapers of this city have more freedom than do honourable members here.

Following that point the honourable member for Northcott said:

I seek to address the Chair on the same point of order. I submit strongly—adopting the language of Government supporters when they were in Opposition—that if it is open to the news media of this country to make criticisms which cannot be made by honourable members elected by their own constituencies in this Parliament, everything that responsible parliamentary government has long been associated with has lapsed within this Chamber.

That refers to the decision of the former Speaker on the sub *judice* rule. He **ruled** that a matter could not be **raised** as it was before the courts and subject to an inquiry although members then in Opposition had said that it was being discussed in the newspapers. There is no basis for asserting that the Opposition has been denied the opportunity to raise the matter in Parliament. It is able to raise it, but it sought to do so in a way that was not permissible. Although they were properly ruled against they are not willing to abide by the decision.

Mr CAMERON: Mr Speaker —

Mr FLAHERTY (*Granville*), Government Whip [3.43]: I move:

That the question be now put.

Mr Cameron: Can the victim of this ruling not speak?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Cameron: Can the victim of this ruling not be heard?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is, That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 49

Mr Akister	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Bannon	Mr Hatton	Mr Petersen
Mr Barnier	Mr Hills	Mr Quinn
Mr Bedford	Mr Hunter	Mr Ramsay
Mr Booth	Mr Jackson	Mr Renshaw
Mr Brereton	Mr Jensen	Mr Rogan
Mr Cahill	Mr Johnson	Mr Ryan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Johnstone	Mr Sheahan
Mr Cox	Mr Jones	Mr Stewart
Mr Crabtree	Mr Keane	Mr F. J. Walker
Mr Day	Mr Kearns	Mr Whelan
Mr Degen	Mr McGowan	Mr Wilde
Mr Durick	Mr Maher	Mr Wran
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mallam	
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Flaherty	Mr Neilly	Mr Cleary
Mr Gordon	Mr O'Connell	Mr Face

Noes, 44

Mr Arblaster	Mr Griffith	Mr Pickard
Mr Barraclough	Mr Jackett	Mr Punch
Mr Brewer	Mr Leitch	Mr Rofe
Mr Brown	Mr Lewis	Mr Schipp
Mr Bruxner	Mr McDonald	Mr Singleton
Mr Cameron	Mr McGinty	Mr Taylor
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Mackie	Mr Viney
Mr Coleman	Mr Maddison	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr Cowan	Mr Mason	Mr Webster
Mr Darby	Mrs Meillon	Mr West
Mr Dowd	Mr Moore	Sir Eric Willis
Mr Duncan	Mr Morris	Mr Wotton
Mr Fischer	Mr Murray	Tellers,
Mr Fisher	Mr Osborne	Mr Boyd
Mr Freudenstein	Mr Park	Mr Rozzoli

Pair

Mr Wade

Mr Doyle

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—proposed.

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [3.49], in reply: The debate this afternoon, as did the debate last week when Mr Deputy-Speaker gave his ruling, shows up the extraordinary sensitivity of the Attorney-General. The contribution by the Minister of Justice shows lack of any sensitivity. Apparently no objection is to be taken to comment made during the Address-in-Reply debate which goes to the administration of a department or the administration of an Act of Parliament, but when it comes to a question of maladministration a very different view is taken as soon as the word maladministration is mentioned.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation in the Chamber.

Mr MADDISON: It is then suggested that this is a reflection on the integrity, character or standards in a personal way of the Minister concerned. I thought the Attorney-General had a great sensitivity for the administration of justice. Consequently it surprised me that he should object to criticism levelled at him by virtue of the amendment moved by the honourable member for Northcott which relates to the way in which the process of the administration of justice is used. Indeed, I draw attention again to the words at the end of the amendment which was purported to be moved here—"or to the policy of implications arising from that conduct", meaning the conduct of the Attorney-General. There is no freedom of speech in this Parliament if we in this Chamber, from whichever side of politics we belong, cannot make an attack on the way in which a Minister—in this particular case the Attorney-General—conducts the administration of his department. As the honourable member for Fuller said, it is quite crazy to think that the media, the press and the legal profession outside here can discuss, argue and criticize, but within this Chamber we are hamstrung by a ruling made by Mr Deputy-Speaker.

Mr **Mulock:** Rubbish.

Mr MADDISON: It is all very well for the Minister of Justice and Minister for Services to say rubbish.

Mr Mulock: Move a motion. Use the forms of the House.

Mr MADDISON: The Minister knows full well that he is mouthing platitudes when he says, "Use the forms of the House," in the same way as the Attorney-General was when he said that in the course of his remarks. The Minister knows very well that other than in this generalized debate on the Address-in-Reply motion, a private member who seeks to use the forms of the House by which such a matter can be raised is completely hamstrung as it is in the hands of the Government of the day to say whether or not that substantive motion can be proceeded with.

Mr F. J. Walker: You were on the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr MADDISON: The Attorney-General is being completely mealy-mouthed in offering that as a solution. The Attorney-General has shown that he has double standards, different criteria for looking at one case in which an *ex officio* indictment was concerned and looking at another case where there was an *ex officio* indictment in a different way. Because the Attorney-General has shown that he has double standards, that he has followed different criteria in looking at two cases involving *ex officio* indictments, it cannot be said that this is a reflection on his personal integrity. It might be a reflection on his balance of judgment or his standards of understanding, but it is not, and it cannot ever be suggested, that it is a reflection on his personal integrity. Clearly the Deputy-Speaker's ruling was incorrect. The amendment should have been allowed as a proper amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion. I believe that if the House does not uphold this dissent motion it will turn back the clock immeasurably in the interests of freedom of speech in this establishment.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 44

Mr Arblaster	Mr Griffith	Mr Pickard
Mr Barraclough	Mr Jackett	Mr Punch
Mr Brewer	Mr Leitch	Mr Rofe
Mr Brown	Mr Lewis	Mr Schipp
Mr Bruxner	Mr McDonald	Mr Singleton
Mr Cameron	Mr McGinty	Mr Taylor
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Mackie	Mr Viney
Mr Coleman	Mr Maddison	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr Cowan	Mr Mason	Mr Webster
Mr Darby	Mrs Meillon	Mr West
Mr Dowd	Mr Moore	Sir Eric Willis
Mr Duncan	Mr Morris	Mr Wotton
Mr Fischer	Mr Murray	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Fisher	Mr Osborne	Mr Boyd
Mr Freudenstein	Mr Park	Mr Razzoli

Noes, 49

Mr Akister	Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Ferguson
Mr Bannon	Mr Cox	Mr Flaherty
Mr Barnier	Mr Crabtree	Mr Gordon
Mr Bedford	Mr Day	Mr Haigh
Mr Booth	Mr Degen	Mr Hatton
Mr Brereton	Mr Durick	Mr Hills
Mr Cahill	Mr Einfeld	Mr Hunter

Mr Jackson	Mr Mulock	Mr Sheahan
Mr Jensen	Mr Neilly	Mr Stewart
Mr Johnson	Mr O'Connell	Mr F. J. Walker
Mr Johnstone	Mr Paciullo	Mr Whelan
Mr Jones	Mr Petersen	Mr Wilde
Mr Keane	Mr Quinn	Mr Wran
Mr Kearns	Mr Ramsay	
Mr McGowan	Mr Renshaw	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Maher	Mr Rogan	Mr Face
Mr Mallam	Mr Ryan	Mr Cleary

Pair

Mr Wade

Mr Doyle

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion negatived.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY

Fifth Day's Debate

Debate resumed (from 31st August, *vide* page 342) on motion by Mr Wilde:

That the following Address in Reply to the Speech which His Excellency the Governor has addressed to both Houses of Parliament on opening this Session of the Parliament of New South Wales be now adopted by this House:

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

May It Please Your Excellency—

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

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

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

Mr MURRAY (**Barwon**) [4.0]: I extend my thanks to the people who on 1st May elected me to represent them in this Parliament. Also, I thank my parliamentary leader and my parliamentary colleagues for their guidance and advice not only during and prior to the election campaign but also since I have entered this House. Further, I thank the members of the branches of the party in my electorate for a job well done.

On this occasion I should like also to extend my thanks to Mr Marshal **Duncan**, my opponent at the last election, and compliment him on a clean election campaign, fought on political lines.

Mr Geoffrey Robertson Crawford was elected to this House in 1950, and retired on 1st May, 1976. When he entered this House record floods had just occurred in the electorate; coincidentally, he left the House following even greater floods. In between these times he experienced droughts and good times, but regardless of the situation and the problems that confronted him in his electorate, he served his constituents well and earned the respect and admiration of all the local people. Indeed, Ministers and members of this House hold Geoff Crawford in high esteem. His strength of purpose and **his** unquestionable integrity have set such a high standard that I **am** presented with an extremely difficult task following him as the representative for my area.

Geoff Crawford and I hold one great principle in common—the principle of democratic government, under which the government of this nation is based on the constitutional monarchy, with the monarch represented in the federal sphere by the Governor-General and in the States by the State Governors. The rejection by the Premier of New South Wales of the Governor-General in this State is a rejection of the principles of democratic government operating under a constitutional monarch. The Governor-General is an integral part of the system, and so is the Premier of a State. Because of the Premier's position and the fact that he has accepted the law as his profession, involving the swearing of an oath to maintain the law, one would expect **him** to accept the system. By rejecting the Governor-General he is rejecting law and order. If a man is elected under a system, I suggest that he is bound to accept and uphold that system. If he is unwilling to do this, he should have told the people before they made their choice at the election.

Geoff Crawford entered this Assembly in 1950 and made his maiden speech on 26th September that year. On that occasion he extended to the people of **Barwon** and the northwest of the State his sympathy for the hardships they had experienced during the great floods of the 1950s. Now in my maiden speech I too am extending my sympathy to the people for the hardships that they suffered during the record floods of 1976. Past governments have initiated relief plans for the victims of floods, and assistance and relief has been given to people who were in dire circumstances. This came in the form of food and fodder drops. These days helicopters are available; it may be that they ameliorate the problems caused by floods. Also, governments make concessions for the cartage of fodder and stock, but unfortunately times and circumstances change. Since the most recent great floods portions of the rail system have been closed, and on this occasion the people in the Northwest were unable to take advantage of some of the benefits. For this reason, I urge the Government to appreciate the developments that have taken place over the years, and to seek an amendment to the State-Commonwealth agreement, to replace rail concessions with road concessions, and also to bring into the system allowances for unusual circumstances.

During the recent floods helicopters were hired by private persons; otherwise the losses would have been absolutely astronomical. Levee banks are essential, and so are cost-benefit studies by the Government which, after all, contributes 50 per cent or possibly 66 per cent of the cost. However, any cost-benefit study must be considered on a broad plan, for it is impossible to put a price on human hardship, loss of confidence, or the will of people to crawl up out of the mud and rebuild what has been continuously damaged over the years.

Floods cannot be prevented but, with the expansion of the Soil Conservation Service, it is now possible to build contour banks on the upper reaches of rivers, to plan rivers, and to pull out dead logs and trees, cleaning up and maintaining the

Mr Murray]

streams. I believe, by adopting these measures, it is possible to do much to alleviate the effects of floods. This is done by regulating the input of the water in the **first** instance, and then by speeding-up the general flow of the water as it proceeds downstream.

Before the recent floods many towns were unable to construct levee banks; indeed, they never will be able to do this. However, over the years a home-lifting system has been initiated, and loans are made available through the Rural Bank, which provides a maximum loan of **\$3,500** at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, over twelve years, to a total of 90 per cent of the cost to people described as of moderate means. Many people have taken advantage of this, but unfortunately the system has to be updated, having in mind the inflation of the past few years. Some people can adequately reduce their liability to themselves, to the town in which they live and to the State and nation, but because they must compound their existing debt, they cannot take advantage of this scheme. The first **\$3,500** at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is all right, but when the cost of lifting the house is **\$8,000** or **\$9,000**, the additional money attracts **113** per cent interest. In these circumstances, many people cannot take advantage of the scheme. I might add that the cost of power and sewerage connections must be added to that figure I have just given.

For these reasons I suggest to the Government that it consider the base of **\$3,500** to put a house on blocks and bearers, and then to consider an additional **\$1,000** for each foot of lift. That would mean that a person whose house had to be lifted four feet would be able to obtain a maximum loan of **\$7,000**. Further encouragement should be given to people who are willing to help themselves. The saving on grants, let alone misery, would be substantial.

The Copeton Dam has been completed and will be of great benefit to the Gwydir Valley, in the same way as the Keepit Dam has been to the Namoi Valley and the Glenlyon Dam will be to the McIntyre Valley. However, in addition to the existing systems, further water conservation works are needed throughout the North. I urge the Premier and members of the Government to continue the works that have been planned, by completing distribution from the Copeton Dam and to completing the Split Rock and Chaffey dams on the Namoi River. This will generally assure the future on the North and Northwest, which is an area that can grow anything if it has the water.

Water is the future of the Barwon electorate, which has a fantastic capacity to grow premium wheat, top-quality wool, world-class cotton and all oil seed. It has the capacity to grow premium wines, to the extent that the **1972** vintage is now selling at **\$38** a bottle. This is a fine area for coarse grains and juicy meat. With due respect to the southern gentleman, it is the best meat grown in this country. Indeed, this area is the shopping basket for the nation.

For a number of years now—in fact for the past twenty years—water hyacinth has been a problem in the area west of Moree. The stage has been reached where it is beyond the capacity of local government or of the landholders to combat water hyacinth, which is spreading to river systems throughout New South Wales, to Victoria and South Australia. Unfortunately, it is spreading because the beautiful flower that can grow on the plant is easily picked and carried away to other parts of the State. The problem is intensified by the movement of people. Recently the Commonwealth and the State representatives responsible for these matters met in Moree. I believe that New South Wales should give a lead in this matter and if it is humanly possible to do so ensure that the State scheme decided upon at Moree is quickly implemented.

One of the side effects in this situation is the intransigence of the **Valuer-General**. As a result of the spread of water hyacinth, some land has become totally unproductive and yet the owners are required to continue paying high rates on it. **It is difficult** enough to live these days, but when a landholder has to pay rates **on** inflated values determined for non-productive land, the situation becomes **impossible**.

Sectional taxes are having a similar effect. They are becoming a problem and are lowering productivity throughout the State, not only in Banvon. Rating has now gone beyond reasonable limits. It is restrictive of production, and the householder and landholder can no longer afford to subsidize the rest of the community. Originally payroll tax was introduced with the idea that large manufacturers could absorb it, with little effect on the rest of the community, but that tax is now being felt by the smallest of businesses. The road maintenance tax is killing off trade. Competition from interstate transport is unfair, for trucks can be registered in South Australia or elsewhere and bypass the New South Wales system. These taxes produce inequities. They have proved to be totally unacceptable and I urge the Government to do all in its power to abolish them and probate, and replace them with an income tax, which is the fairest, most equitable form of taxation.

Schools and hospitals in Banvon still require attention although, generally they are in pretty good order. Geoff Crawford saw to that. However, in an area as vast and expanding as fast as the electorate of Banvon it does not take long for facilities to become quickly outdated. Two new high schools, one at Narrabri and the other at **Courallie**, have not been completed. The Narrabri high school is not yet **fully** operative and it is a shame to see such good facilities not being used to the best effect. At Narrabri West, as a result of **local** development, the movement of **traffic** has become so great that there is a danger on the main roads and highways, which must be located away from that school.

Of course, heat in the northwest is one of our major problems. Quite often we have temperatures of 38°C for many days on end. The honourable member for Broken Hill has the same difficulty in his electorate. The ability to learn if one is a student, or to get well if ill, is grossly impaired in such conditions. That is why I say that air cooling in our schools and hospitals is essential. Moree district hospital has had an air cooling plant since it was constructed, but unfortunately it is not working properly, and benefits that should be enjoyed by patients are not available. The ill in hospital have to put up with the heat. Therefore I suggest that when the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing is building new works or reviewing existing ones in the Northwest, he give consideration to including air cooling systems.

Community health centres are needed. Small villages and towns such as Lightning Ridge, which is 40 miles from any medical service, need community health centres. Until such time as they are established, the people engaged in mining at Lightning Ridge are in a dangerous situation. However, the greatest problem in education in a widespread area is that which relates to schools for the handicapped, pre-schools, and mobile pre-schools. It is only as a result of the dedicated and untiring work of committees in these areas that such schools can be kept going. Isolation makes the problem greater. There is a remarkable lack of trained staff to handle this sort of work, **especially** the handicapped. One day a month is not enough to educate a handicapped child. I urge the Government to upgrade rapidly the teaching service for the handicapped. It is essential.

I have heard much in this House over the past few days about the housing shortage throughout the State. The situation in Banvon is no exception. Economic uncertainty and the inability to complete contracts has led many people to invest

Mr Murray]

elsewhere. Something can be done about this. Teachers, the police and many other public servants are competing for available housing in country areas. Many of them are living in substandard accommodation. In the western part of the State this is most evident. I instance Boggabilla, Burren Junction, Goodooga and Collarenebri. Because those places are too small the Housing Commission is not interested in them. There are twenty-two public servants at Goodooga, fourteen at Collarenebri and eight at Boggabilla, all competing for the available houses, and many are living in substandard conditions. However, there is an opening for improvement through the police and teacher housing scheme initiated by the former Government. It could be extended to other public servants, and if that were done, the problem would be greatly alleviated.

Roads are the heart of Barwon. The railway has gone, and now is the time to upgrade our roads. The reduction in Commonwealth funds between 1974 and 1976 was a disaster. Yet we are still paying remarkably high taxes on petrol and motor vehicle registrations. Those taxes when collected, must be spent on roads, and until they are, the situation will not improve. Rural local roads and minor DMR roads have been treated shabbily. Some of them are on black soil formations and at certain times are totally untrafficable. The cut in road funds has been savage. Highways are rutted, rock strewn, trial tracks. The people of Barwon have difficulty in travelling any time, particularly in emergency, and it is a problem for them to get their produce to market. Indeed, only last year a semi-trailer load of wine grapes was bogged for days, and the produce was totally wasted. One of the main problems with our road network system is the maintenance of small towns. Small towns are finding it difficult to keep going, yet they are a basic source of labour and services for all local industries.

Further, if we do not have good roads, we shall not get tourists, and tourism is big business in Australia today. One sees vast armadas of caravans travelling the high-ways, looking for somewhere new to go. They cannot get away from the principal arteries. While on the subject of tourist activities, I might add that the Moree bore baths require extensive development. I ask the Minister for Sport and Minister for Tourism to consider this matter. If additional and better roads were constructed people would venture wide into the west of our State. That would give small villages and towns a chance of survival. The country areas must have roads. Decentralization is a most maligned word. It might be described as a bandwaggon word. If people cannot think of anything else to say they hop on to the decentralization bandwaggon. There is an urgent need to develop our natural assets. We should not destroy one area in order to build up another area. We must use and build up what we have. It is proposed to transfer the Department of Lands office at Moree to Tamworth or perhaps Armidale. One asks what is the point in breaking down one area to build up another. Natural assets and the future are correlated. We have good stock, excellent soil and natural productive areas.

The Government is considering an application for the establishment of an abattoir at Narrabri. If approved this abattoir will employ sixty persons. The establishment of this industry will not cost the Government a cent. It is an excellent example of decentralization, and will increase the productivity of the district. However, the project is in jeopardy. I am glad the Minister for Primary Industries is at the table, and I ask him to give earnest consideration to supporting this application. When travelling round the countryside one often sees on motor ears a sticker which proclaims, "If you like to eat you are in agriculture," yet so often that message is ignored. Primary produce is mutilated between the producer and the end user.

Rail services are inadequate to handle the movement of grain produced in the northwest of our State. All the silos are full and wheat is transported by road through to Queensland terminal ports, resulting in a loss of profit to the New South Wales

Public Transport Commission. In the West and Northwest vast wheat production areas are faced with having to find temporary storage for grain. It is expected that the coming wheat harvest will be a good one. These problems are compounded by stupid strikes. Only today we read of **transport** workers and waterfront unions **being** involved in a demarcation dispute which may eventually disrupt the whole of our export markets. Demarcation disputes are silly disputes.

Unfortunately, our community faces a situation of many people preferring to dictate rather than assist. There is a desire at large to force a way of life upon the **community** rather than to attempt to influence the community to improve itself. There is a desire to kill initiative rather than reward it. As a result of activities such as a tie-up on the docks, the future of rural Australia is in jeopardy. Wool, meat and wheat are involved. This continual disruption is strangling work forces within areas and it is even strangling the areas themselves. Unions attempt to assist workers to better themselves but often the opposite result is achieved. If the primary producer is not paid the shopkeeper is not paid; if the shopkeeper is not paid his employee is not paid, and so on. Also, if the primary producer is not paid there is no movement in productivity and there is no potential to create employment. If the primary **producer** is not paid villages and towns cannot be maintained or improved. Australia is almost totally dependent upon its rural exports.

In recent days we have read of shipyard workers virtually pricing themselves out of a job. There is a complete lack of co-operation between urban and rural Australia and unless checked it will destroy our lucrative export trade. Australian produce **will** be priced out of world markets and unfortunately that stage is being reached rapidly. No one would dispute that we **all** have the right to strike. May I suggest, however, that if the rural industry in this country were to go on strike it would be a strike everyone would regret. Primary producers are sick of fighting to protect themselves. They are tired of having their produce mutilated and destroyed; they are sick of being persecuted. I thank you, Mr Speaker, and honourable members on both sides, for your acceptance of this, my maiden speech.

Mr JOHNSTONE (Broken Hill) [4.28]: I wish to join in this Address-in-Reply debate and congratulate the mover of the motion, the honourable member for **Parra-**matta and the seconder, the honourable member for Blue Mountains. Both are new members to this House who, I am sure, will **make** a name for themselves with the effluxion of time. I congratulate all new members on their election to Parliament and hope that in each case their stay here will be as fruitful and enjoyable as mine has been. At times it is a rough and tumble House, and members must learn to give and take the good with the bad. We are all here to do a job and we must attempt to do that job in the best way possible.

Usually in this debate I have spoken from the other side of the **Chamber**. On each occasion I have relished the opportunity to make a contribution but in the past I have regarded the Governor's Speech as being lacklustre and presented without a great deal of enthusiasm. However, on this occasion, **speaking** from the other side of the Chamber, I find a great **difference**. The Governor seemed to present his Speech with what I might describe as more forcefulness and with an air of keenness, exhibiting confidence in the newly-elected Government in the **knowledge** that it will right wrongs that have occurred during the past ten years. [*Quorum formed.*]

This year the Governor seems to have put more fire into his Speech. If honourable members look through it they will understand why. In His Excellency's Address one finds something concrete, a vision and hope for the future. It is not a mere repetition of the same old story of why the Government cannot do this or that. The

Governor, no doubt, feels that the elected Government will be able to restore New South Wales to the position it held in 1964-65—the leading State of the Commonwealth. The Government will pull New South Wales out of the doldrums. The Governor said, "My Government proposes to give greater emphasis to regional development". During the eleven or twelve years that I have been a member of this House I have heard much talk of regional development and decentralization. Broken Hill is a long way from Sydney and the coast—farther than most electorates.

When I look about my electorate I cannot see much decentralization development that was carried out by the former Government. One or two small industries have been assisted but no regard has been paid to the future by way of establishing industries to take the place of the mining industry, which is the lifeblood of Broken Hill. The tourist industry has been exploited to a degree, but not by the former Government. That was done by the local tourist committee. The Government gave some help, but not to the extent **necessary**.

Broken Hill has been a mining town for nearly **100** years. Kalgoorlie in Western Australia faces the same prospect as will confront Broken Hill in the next ten to fifteen years. When considering the future of the city of Broken Hill **one** should learn a lesson from Kalgoorlie, which is situated in the wilderness with the main transcontinental railway passing through the town. Over many years **Kalgoorlie** has produced most of the gold that has gone into the coffers of the Australian Treasury, but now the golden mile is shrinking to golden inches: the end of Kalgoorlie is in sight. Broken Hill may not yet be in that position but perhaps it **will** be in the foreseeable future. When I raised the matter of the future of Broken Hill three years ago no one took much notice of me. Indeed, some of my colleagues said that I should not speak about my city in that way as the Government would not give anything to a place that was dying.

Plans must be made for the future of Broken Hill, a city of **30 000** people located in the heart of Australia. It has every utility and service needed for a city. **The** only way to keep Broken Hill going is to decentralize some of the industries at present located in the coastal areas of the State and develop the region so that it can continue to support at least the present population of **30 000**. It may be that the mines **will** be able to continue if new ore bodies are found. Broken Hill is not just a strip **like** the golden mile at Kalgoorlie: it is **a** highly mineralized area of something like **500** or **600** square miles. The former Government met a deputation of citizens led by myself and a deputation from the local mining companies, some of the biggest in Australia. The company representatives were listened to, but they did not get a good hearing. They asked why the local member could not be present at their deputation and were told by the former Premier and the former Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy that as I did not make the appointment for the deputation, I could not be asked to come along to it. The company representatives thought that I would be there as a matter of course. It was in that petty way that the former Government regarded the areas not held by Liberal Party or Country Party members. The former Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy and the Premier and Treasurer at that time never sent any reply to the representations made to them by that deputation.

With the change of government this year I took the opportunity to bring forward the matter again. **So** far three minor concessions have been made. In the near future talks will be held between the Treasury, the Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy and the Premier, on further suggestions for the expansion of industry in Broken Hill and for further prospecting in the area before the existing mines peter out. In most parts of the world, when a mine is showing signs of petering out the company grabs the riches and the ore that is easily obtainable, leaving the mediocre ore in the ground.

As I have said in this House many times, every ounce of ore whether it is coal, metal-liferous or any other type of mineral, must be extracted for there is no hope of recovering ore that is left 2 000 or 3 000 feet underground. It belongs not to any individual mining company but to the people of Australia.

Though the Government has been in office for little more than 100 days, action has been taken already. Important decisions have been made in relation to establishing mining concessions. Also, the Government is willing to talk about royalties. Royalties from Broken Hill have put about \$260 million into the coffers of this State over the past forty or fifty years. Mining in Broken Hill will not be finished tomorrow: it will still be going on in the lifetime of most honourable members sitting in the House today. However, unless further lodes are discovered the present line of lode will last for only about another twenty-five or thirty years. That is still a long span in the life of a mine. The Broken Hill area is known as having the richest ore body in the world, but geologists have hinted that the lode is not what it **used** to be.

For many years the mines have been milked by federal and State governments by their not putting anything back for their future development, planning or upkeep. I have been accused of looking after the big mining companies, but that is not true. I look after the welfare of the 30 000 citizens of Broken Hill, as well as my own job and that of the person who may follow me. The mining companies have interests throughout Australia and the rest of the world and they are quite capable of looking after themselves. I shall not discuss that matter further except to add that the present Government has matters of mining well in hand and that the industry will benefit from the discussions in which it is joining.

I wish to refer the House to the events that have occurred with the Old Folks' Home in Broken Hill, which caters for eighteen residents. It is in a bad state of repair. Over many years the building has been added to and repaired. It is now not big enough to meet the needs of the district. In 1969 the cost of upkeep and repairing the building had become too great and the local people decided that a new home should be built. At that time we approached the then Minister for Health, the Hon. A. H. Jago, who listened to our representations. He said that as Broken Hill had been known down the years for always contributing to the cost of these community projects, if the local citizens raised \$90,000 he would make available the rest of the money for a new building on a \$2 to \$1 or \$3 to \$1 basis. I remind the House that the citizens of Broken Hill contributed one-fifth of the cost of building its hospital and providing the necessary machinery and equipment. This contribution was obtained from a fund to which each worker contributed 3d. a week from his pay. When a new wing or maternity block of the hospital was required the money was available from the fund. That fund had reached the equivalent of \$300,000, which was used for the hospital.

The required \$90,000 was collected but unfortunately the Hon. A. H. Jago forgot to nominate for re-election to this House and he did not remain in office. We then asked the next Minister for Health, the Hon. J. L. Waddy, to honour the promise made by his predecessor, but he said that no promise had been made. I have the communication with me and though it might be regarded as not making a specific promise, to me it is as good as one. The letter advised that we should collect the \$90,000 and that the matter of a subsidy would then be discussed. When that communication was shown to the Hon. J. L. Waddy he hummed and hawed and said finally that we should approach the federal Government. If we had approached the federal Government we would have missed out on our upkeep subsidy from the State Government. At that time the federal and State governments were unable to agree. After twelve months of argument a Labor government came to office in Canberra and the then Minister for Health dug his toes in properly.

Mr Johnstone]

Mr Arblaster: Shame.

Mr JOHNSTONE: It is, when an old folks' home is involved. This is a matter above party politics. Broken Hill has no new building for the Old Folks' Home, and the cost of building one has increased from \$350,000 to \$560,000, as at six months ago. The collected \$90,000 has grown with interest and other incidental amounts and the federal Government, which apparently appreciates that some justice is needed in this instance, has provided \$300,000 for the project. The present Minister for Health has seen the merits of the case and is coming to the party if the people of Broken Hill collect a little more money. The committee of the home and the people of Broken Hill are confident they will be able to raise a further \$35,000 or \$40,000 before tenders are called and work on the new home commences.

Another problem that occurred was that we could not obtain a subsidy from the federal Government in the name of the Old Folks' Building Appeal as it represented a State project. In October, 1975, we asked the previous Minister for Health for permission to change the name to the Broken Hill Senior Citizen's Complex. At the time the Minister was to open a conference and we saw him at half-past eight one morning. He agreed to our proposal and said that he would confirm his decision in writing. Although I mentioned the matter to him on a couple of occasions and he promised to attend to it, we have never received a letter confirming the change in name. It may have been an oversight on his part: forgetfulness seems to be a trait common to previous Ministers for Health. That difficulty has been remedied following the Labor Government's assumption of office.

The matters I have mentioned demonstrate the way that the previous Government rambled on, especially when a safe Labor seat was involved. It adopted a different attitude with regard to Port Macquarie and other areas along the coast, where I have been told a number of industries are being subsidized. Some have thrived but others have gone bad. Subsidies seem to have been granted in a haphazard manner. I listened attentively to many honourable members opposite, some of whom were making their maiden speeches, indulging in what is commonly termed union bashing. The honourable member for Barwon blamed unionists for the present state of the rural industry. I could give him a hundred and one reasons for its present predicament. I am classified as a rural member, and my electorate embraces thousands of rural acres. I know a little about what is going on in the country areas and why the rural industry is in its present plight. Because of the type of country in my electorate, its landowners are not as badly off as their neighbours across the border in South Australia and in the northern half of Victoria.

When strikes occur on the wharves all the blame cannot be attributed to trade unionists. Members opposite blame the workers for strikes, and say that the communists are invading the unions and leading the men out on strike. I have been associated with trade unions all my life, and was mixed up with them very closely for many years prior to coming to this House. I have been associated with the miners who belong to one of the hardest and toughest unions. It takes a lot to make a unionist strike for anything that is not worthwhile. Unionists do not go out on strike willy-nilly: they hear the case first. I have put hundreds of cases to mass meetings, attended by 2 000 or 3 000 members. On some occasions I have convinced them but on others I have not **done so**.

Honourable members have no chance of knowing about these things unless they have been intimately concerned in union affairs. They certainly should not base their attitudes on what appears in the press. One often sees in the press that a group of workers is going out on strike for some reason or other. I remember an occasion when a newspaper reported that the miners had gone out on strike because a horse

had broken wind when it was in the cage going down a shaft. The truth of the matter was that a fall had occurred at the bottom of the shaft, the cage came back to the surface, and by the time the fall had been attended to the men had knocked off and gone home. I was attending a central miners conference in Sydney and I read the report in the newspapers about the men going on strike because of the horse.

That is the sort of unreliable report on which honourable members opposite base their arguments, and this has been the basis of statements they have made in the House over the past fortnight. Young chaps who come in here with their own ideas have no knowledge of union affairs, strikes and industrial arbitration. All they know about the settlement of disputes is what they have read in the newspapers, or what they have gained from slanted views that they have heard on the other side of the fence. I realize that there are always two sides to any dispute; to put it bluntly, there is the boss's side and the workers' side.

Mr Petersen: The boss's side and the right side.

Mr JOHNSTONE: I could not agree with that. Both sides have their aims and each, in its opinion, has good arguments. On most occasions, the parties get together, discuss their problems and resolve their differences in an amicable arrangement to suit both sides. At other times they cannot see eye to eye and fail to resolve their differences. Then clashes occur and strikes develop.

My colleagues in the north know more than I do about the shipyard dispute at Newcastle, but I compliment the Premier for advancing the negotiations as far as they have gone. I am afraid that if the Rt. Hon. J. M. Fraser and the federal Government had had their way, the Newcastle dockyard would now be all sewn up and finished; the dry dock would have been sunk, and thousands of men and women in Newcastle would be on the dole. Fortunately, a little commonsense has prevailed. I compliment the Leader of the Opposition on what the press has reported him as saying. He suggested that Mr Fraser went a little too far when he asked the workers to forgo wage indexation rises. The Prime Minister said that indexation is holding the country back, and he asked one set of workers to refuse wage increases. The 2 200 people at Newcastle would have provided the thin end of the wedge for the Fraser Government. There is a saying in union circles that the boss creates the thin end of the wedge—in this instance with 2 200 workers---and then, by driving in the wedge, he widens the gap to the other groups. In this instance the Prime Minister wanted the dockworkers to refuse indexation increases for twelve months. If they did so he would then say, "What about you other fellows too?", in the hope that they also would agree. In that way he would ultimately achieve what he wanted. I am glad to see that the new strong, vigorous Labor Government in New South Wales has had a victory, and is fighting to keep the State dockyard going.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman) [4.58]: I join with other honourable members in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I congratulate particularly the honourable members for Orange, Gordon, Wagga Wagga, Kirribilli and Barwon on the contributions that they have made to this debate. The honourable member for Gordon and the honourable member for Orange, who made fine speeches, have many years of service before them. As the years go by they will gain much experience and will represent their electors well, serving diligently with great strength and dignity.

I read and reread His Excellency's Speech. Though the Botany Bay project is the largest construction works ever undertaken by a government of New South Wales, I noticed in the Speech only eighteen words on this project, which vitally affects the

State. I shall deal specifically and in some detail with the decisions that have been taken by the new Government on the Botany Bay development, dealing particularly with the totally incompetent, dishonest and deceitful actions of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing to halt the construction of the Botany Bay port facilities.

Let there be no doubt that the Opposition believes that all the facilities planned for handling containers, liquids, bulk cargoes, crude oil and coal should be proceeded with immediately. Work on them should never have been halted. The decision to halt the development of Botany Bay has already cost the taxpayers of this State millions of dollars and further delays will cost millions more. In arriving at his decision to halt further work on Botany Bay it is obvious that the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing considered neither the enormous economic consequences nor the social consequences of his action.

Had the Minister undertaken even the most cursory examination of all factors involved he would have learned that the new port and its facilities are urgently needed. He would have found, also, that delay would increase the cost of the works at a rate of at least \$1 million a month. He would have found, further, that he was jeopardizing the signing of new coal export contracts. As well, he would have found that he was jeopardizing the future of the new coalmine venture at Clarence near Lithgow. Indeed, he would have found that he was halting ventures that would provide immediate employment for hundreds of people. It has been obvious to everybody except the Deputy-Premier that the port of Sydney cannot cope with the large container vessels now in use. For economic reasons these vessels are used for transshipping coal that comes from the western coalfields at Lithgow and the south-western coalfields at Burragorang.

Last week we saw evidence of the limited capacity of Sydney Harbour to accommodate large vessels. When the *Tokyo Express* sailed into Sydney Harbour other vessels had to be shifted from their berths to enable the big vessel to discharge its containers. This ship is smaller than other container vessels now under construction. This State is in urgent need of port development. I should like to quote this report from an authoritative journal, the August, 1976 issue of *Freight and Container Transportation*:

The port of Brisbane risked being by-passed by overseas shipping if there were any more serious delays in developing a new port at the mouth of the Brisbane River, the Queensland Minister for Tourism and Marine Services, Mr T. Newbery, warned last month.

He said projected trends in world trade and the advent of large bulk carriers and containerships had made it imperative to move Brisbane's port facilities to deeper water.

The port of Sydney does not have the large flat areas which are necessary for facilitating the storage and transit of containers. Also, the port of Sydney does not boast facilities that would enable our coal exporters to compete effectively on the open market with the Queensland exporters. In fact, our coal exporters cannot compete with overseas competitors for the coal markets in Japan and Great Britain. The urgent need to develop port facilities in Botany Bay is beyond question. In 1962 detailed investigations were started into the necessity for a new port, the economics of its operation, engineering studies and environmental studies. All those studies have stressed the need for new port facilities capable of accommodating future-generation vessels of the type now being built—vessels of up to 200 000 tonnes deadweight.

The future prosperity and expansion of New South Wales is directly dependent on the construction of new port facilities along our coastline but particularly at Botany Bay. The history of the development of Botany Bay is rather interesting. In 1968 the Government approved in principle the concept that a new port should be built there. In March, 1971, a contract was let for the dredging of approach channels and a port basin and for some ancillary reclamation works. These tasks were completed in October, 1973. I remind members that it was not just the former Liberal-Country party Government of this State that believed it to be necessary for work to proceed as quickly as possible on the development of Botany Bay. The previous federal Labor Government held that view, too. When the Hon. C. K. Jones was federal Minister for Transport and Shipping, he said:

It is essential to look ahead and keep port facilities abreast of development in shipping and cargo handling technology.

He went on to say:

It is clear that a new terminal complex is needed in the Botany Bay area as soon as possible. A terminal at Botany Bay should have better access than other existing terminals, and I hope that the State Government will take steps to facilitate such development as well as clearing up the unsatisfactory position at Glebe Island.

On 16th January last a joint statement was issued by the Hon. C. K. Jones and the Hon. R. F. X. Connor relating to the need for new coal-loading facilities in New South Wales. They said:

The Government's offer was based on an urgent need to increase the capacity of the existing coal loading facilities at Australian ports to meet the increasing export demand.

They went on to say:

Problems arise both from the inadequacy of the loading facilities at ports to cope with increased exports of coal and the inability of certain ports to accept large bulk carriers, which are essential to the efficient transport of coal.

It is interesting to note that ports at Gladstone and Hay Point in Queensland are now operating and are coming up to full capacity. Because of this exporters of coal from Queensland mines have a tremendous advantage over New South Wales coal exporters. As well as the Hon. C. K. Jones and the Hon. R. F. X. Connor supporting this proposal, more recently the secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation, Mr Charlie Fitzgibbon, has written to the Premier on the subject. On 20th May, the day after the Deputy Premier announced that the New South Wales Government had halted further work at Botany Bay pending an environmental impact study, Mr Fitzgibbon wrote to the Premier in these terms:

I have noted that Mr Ferguson has said that he would be terrified to think that the 35 million dollars already spent had been wasted. I would think that the Government should be more terrified by the fact that unless the Botany Bay project, at least in respect of the container terminals is in fact completed, the overall economic loss to the Sydney area will be infinitely greater than the 35 million dollars, which would have been wasted on the project to date.

Mr *Arblaster*]

He went on to say:

The question of development of Botany Bay has associated with it economic as well as environmental problems, and that there are two sections of the community vitally effected from an environmental point of view, residents of the Botany Bay area and residents of the Balmain area. Oddly enough of the two, the most effected would be residents of the Balmain area and then not by a continuation of the Botany Bay project, but by a decision to delay it or halt it.

I agree with what Mr Fitzgibbon said about the general economic loss to Sydney. The only point on which I differ from him is that I believe a coal loader must be built also. I agree that the total loss to Sydney will far exceed the \$35 million which will have been wasted if the project does not go ahead. The cost will not double; it will be ten times, twenty times or perhaps 100 times greater. Unfortunately, in addition to the financial loss, thousands of jobs will go by the board. No doubt Queensland mines will obtain orders which New South Wales cannot fulfil. Notwithstanding that there have been twenty-five separate environmental studies on the Botany Bay project the Deputy Premier announced:

All new projects associated with the Botany Bay port development have been stopped by the State Government until a total environmental study is complete.

The Deputy Premier, in making that statement on 19th May, did not take into consideration the human, social and economic factors involved in such a decision. Certainly he did not take into consideration the hardships that the economic factors would cause. It was a typical "I could not care less" approach to the future welfare of the State, to the number of jobs that would be associated with the port works and to the number of new jobs that would be created in the Lithgow and Burragorang coalfields by recommencing the Botany Bay works. Now the Deputy Premier sheds crocodile tears when he speaks about unemployment. Yet, he is the man who during the Medibank strike said, "Go out on strike; I shall not be going to work". Then he had the damned hide to urge the workers at the dockyard in Newcastle not to go on strike. From this single action we see the Deputy Premier as a man who is incapable of making responsible decisions. He is the first major failure as a Minister in the new Labor Government. We see in him both an incompetent Minister and one who is willing to mislead the people of this State.

Let me go through the timetable associated with the decision to halt construction at Botany Bay. It will show how dishonest and deceitful that decision was. In January this year the former Government called for tenders for the construction of the container terminal, with tenders to close on 27th April. The tenderers requested that the closing date be extended for one month. That was agreed to and the closing date for tenders was extended to 24th May. I am sure that the tenderers made that request because they wanted to give much greater consideration to the submission of alternate designs for the construction of container terminals. When those tenders are eventually considered by the Government it will be found that the technology and expertise of the private sector will result in large savings for the State. Probably those tenders will be 10, 15 or 20 per cent below the estimate of the Maritime Services Board.

On 17th May the Deputy Premier said that he would confer with officers of the Maritime Services Board for urgent talks on the future of Botany Bay. A mere two days later, after the Government had supposedly given the matter deep consideration and considered all the consequences, the Deputy Premier announced that all new projects

associated with the development of Botany Bay would be halted until a total environmental impact study had been completed. He said, also, that the Government's decision meant that tenders for a \$50 million container wharf had been extended for three months, to 16th August. On 2nd June the Premier announced the terms of reference for this so-called environmental inquiry. The first term **was** as follows:

To enquire into the role of the port in terms of the needs of the State.

The needs of the State for the port had been proved time and time again over many years. This is wholly and solely a commercial question. Is the port needed so as to **allow** our exporters to compete with other great shipping nations? Is it needed to handle the volume of imports that will be coming into Australia in future years? Is it needed to handle the **much** larger vessels that will be coming into service? The answer to every one of those questions is in the affirmative. The second term of reference was to inquire into the environmental impact of planned projects, including the social and economic aspects. The third term of reference was:

To make recommendations on the future of the planned port development and if necessary make alternative proposals.

One would assume that they would be basically engineering proposals related to dredging to deepen some part of the harbour and also to establish whether loaders and terminals should be at one place or another. Who was asked to look into these matters? Although no legal questions are raised, a lawyer has been engaged to submit a report. It is a total sham. In the same statement the Premier said that he hoped the inquiry would be completed in months rather than years. We did not know then how long the inquiry would take. We still do not know that. Submissions were to be lodged by 26th July. That was only three weeks prior to the closing of tenders for the construction of the \$50 million container terminal at Botany Bay. The inquiry **was** expected to last three weeks and that includes the time it would take for the person conducting the inquiry to bring down his report and to make recommendations. Contractors would outlay huge sums of money in preparing and costing tenders and in submitting alternative designs long before the results of the so-called environmental inquiry could be known. Included in the terms of reference was a request to make recommendations on the future of the planned port development and, if necessary, to submit alternative proposals.

The Deputy Premier, and the Premier, who have made pious and hypocritical statements on this issue, cannot deny that they have deliberately misled the people of New South Wales. Either they deliberately misled tenderers into submitting tenders that would require major alterations and therefore add substantially to the cost of the project or—and I believe this to be the case—the Deputy Premier and the Premier have deliberately and fraudulently misled the people of this State. In particular they have misled the residents of Rockdale, Kogarah, Hurstville and Georges River into thinking that the Government has been genuine in ordering the environmental inquiry and that the Government will give serious consideration to the recommendations. The Premier, ~~the~~ Deputy Premier and, more important, the people of New South Wales, know that the inquiry is a sham and a smokescreen. Both the Premier and his Deputy are well known for their two-time statements concerning the future of Botany Bay. **All** honourable members know of this statement made by the Premier in Lithgow, "The coal loader at Botany Bay will go ahead." They know also of this statement he made to a group of miners in Lithgow:

Do not take any notice of what I say in Sydney with regard to the coal loader, do not take any notice when I say that there will be a total environmental impact study, the coal loader will be built.

Mr *Arblaster*]

The Premier said at a meeting at Rockdale:

Botany Bay **will** not proceed until a full inquiry is held and the results known.

Let the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General, the honourable member for Hurstville, the Minister for Lands and the honourable member for Blue Mountains deny that those statements were made. This confidence trick **has** already hurt people. The Attorney-General, that convenient conservationist, and **his** colleagues, have remained remarkably quiet regarding the double cross of their constituents, but they were probably party to the back room arrangements before these **announcements** were made. Those announcements have cost the taxpayers of New South Wales **millions** of dollars and many jobs for workers. I wish to elaborate on the effects that the decision has had on coal exporting. Doubts about the completion of the coal loading facilities have already jeopardized the future expansion of **coal exports** from the Lithgow and Burragorang coalfields. The plain fact is that the facilities at Balmain are incapable of handling the vast increase in tonnage required to meet export demands. Balmain is not capable of handling the larger vessels that are **necessary** **so** that coal from those fields can compete economically with coal exports from Queensland and the Hunter Valley coalfields.

The Deputy Premier should not say that the coal exports, which are **potentially worth** hundreds of millions of dollars and could provide additional employment opportunities for thousands of people, can be shipped from other ports. It cannot be done. He well knows that additional transport costs will price our coal out of the market. Botany Bay is the only viable export port for coal from the Lithgow and south-western coalfields. If coal is consigned from other ports massive subsidies would be **required** forever to reduce coal freight. **It** will mean massive subsidies and a contingent liability that will hang over New South Wales forever. I refer not only to container ports, which are needed, but also to facilities to consign coal from Botany Bay.

The capital cost of \$50 million for the coal loading facilities which are to **be** constructed and paid for by a consortium of coal producers—a common **carrier** and at no cost to the State—is already far greater than the cost of similar facilities used by exporters in Queensland, who are competitors. Already the Government has jeopardized the whole future of the new mine at Clarence which could employ over **600** people. Many more would be employed in other mines in surrounding areas. The mines will bring stability and prosperity to the Lithgow and south-western areas. However, the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports **and** Minister for Housing, who is the responsible Minister, believes that these vast sums of money to finance the Clarence project can be raised overnight. He thinks that millions of dollars are available to be turned on and off like water. The Deputy-Premier and his Government believe also that buyers for the coal will sit about waiting for **them** to stop dithering. I assure him that the buyers will not do that. They will go elsewhere for their coal—in all probability to Queensland or South America. Further, they will take their finance with them.

The new Clarence project involves a commitment by the company of over \$40 million. The expansion of other collieries involved in the area will increase the expenditure to over \$100 million. These funds, which will provide employment and assist **in** the further development of New South Wales, cost large amounts to secure until they are required. Financing arrangements for the Coalex project involving \$40 million of loan **funds** were to have been completed by **30th** June, and **construction and** works **on** the Clarence project were to have been started **on** 1st July. While **the** Deputy Premier has fumbled, one may ask what has happened to the Clarence venture,

to the additional jobs that would have been available to the people of Lithgow and to the additional long-term export orders that would have been signed by **oversea** buyers.

I remind the House that Lithgow has over 1 100 unemployed. But for the fumbling of the Deputy Premier those citizens could have been employed for the past two months. If the Deputy-Premier had not made a completely dishonest, incompetent and deceitful decision this whole new venture at Clarence could have been under way. I wish to draw the 'attention of the House to what has occurred with the Clarence venture that was conditional on the Botany Bay coal loading facility being available in December, 1978. On 19th May the Deputy Premier said:

All new projects associated with the Botany Bay port development have been stopped by the State Government until a total environmental study has been completed.

On the same day the financiers and prospective buyers of our coal in Japan cabled **Coalex**, the proprietors of the Clarence project, as they were preparing to leave to finalize negotiations. The cable to these proprietors said:

Re your next visit to Japan. According to **Australian** information, new NSW Government seems to announce moratorium on further development in Botany Bay. Under such a circumstance we do not expect to make serious discussions with you on the future programme of Clarence project. Therefore we suggest you visit here after the NSW Government issues clear views on Botany Bay.

The sham and hypocritical decision of the Deputy Premier to have a so-called environmental study of Botany Bay has cost hundreds of jobs in Lithgow and led people to believe that the Government was genuine. By now they must have learned the truth. His actions have jeopardized the future of this great project in the Clarence area. Instead of playing round the Government should come out with a firm statement on the future of the coal loader, the Botany Bay project, the people of Lithgow and others who live further down the Blue Mountains and suffer every day from the rumbling coal trucks that use the Great Western Highway. It is time for the Government to state where it stands and what it will do.

I should regard it as an interesting exercise to call another public meeting in **Rockdale** and observe the Premier and other Government supporters assert that work on the coal loader will not proceed at Botany Bay and that an environmental impact study will take place. Then they could go to the Blue Mountains and say to the citizens there that they should not take any notice of what they have said in Rockdale, that they are prepared to tell lies there but not in Lithgow. The citizens of **Hurstville**, Lithgow, Kogarah and **Rockdale** know that there has been a double-cross by the Government. I am sure that the Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Co-operative Societies who is sitting at the table knows that it **was** a double-cross. I wish to refer to some other decisions made by the Government and to its style of government. Most honourable members know that the no-confidence motion moved against the Premier was defeated by 13 votes to 27 with 10 people away. Could this have occurred through the left-wing supporters saying that the Premier did not control the Government?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr JONES (Waratah) [5.28]: I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Parramatta and seconded by the honourable member for Blue Mountains for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor.

I congratulate also the honourable members who made their maiden speeches during the debate. This is the first occasion on which I have spoken on the Address-in-Reply motion as a Government supporter. In the past I have spoken as an Opposition member to an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply or I have been critical of the Speech of His Excellency. I congratulate the Premier and his Ministers on the *fine* job they are doing for New South Wales and on gaining public support. The Premier's performance must be of great satisfaction to the State generally. His main target has been to reduce the high level of unemployment, which has reached 115 997 in New South Wales. [Quorum *formed.*]

I realize that the Opposition has a responsibility to call quorums, but I *am* sorry that honourable members opposite did not go to the trouble of calling a quorum to hear the comments made by the honourable member for Mosman, who preceded me in this debate. The unemployment figure of 115 977 in New South Wales represents 43 per cent of the total number of unemployed throughout Australia; of course, that number has been increased since those figures were compiled, and the figures set out in His Excellency's Speech would certainly need to be updated.

The Premier and the Deputy Premier have done all they can, not only to reduce unemployment in the Newcastle area, but also to prevent the possibility of additional unemployment there. The federal Government, with the building industry collapsing around its ears through its failure to inject money into the public sector, has been taking action that could lead to more people losing their employment. It appears that that Government wants the workers to get down on their knees and pray to those who are in control. Up to a week ago the shipbuilding industry and its associated service industries, especially the State Dockyard and its subcontractors, were being placed in jeopardy; the dockyard employs 2200 people, and the subcontractors employ from 4 000 to 5 000 people. They are the fabricators that have built up their businesses in the past five or ten years for the specific purpose of carrying out subcontract work for the State Dockyard, the Broken Hill Pty Company Limited and other major industries in the area.

As an example of the magnificent job that the Premier has done, I refer to his saving of the work for Carrington Slipways at Tomago. It was proposed that the Bulkships cement carrier would be built overseas, but the Premier was able to bring together Carrington Slipways and the Bulkships company, leading to the contract being won for an Australian shipbuilding firm. Carrington Slipways was originally located at Carrington, as the name implies, and started business by building small fishing boats. As time went on the firm expanded and began to build much bigger vessels. It is doing a good job and, without the overheads that have to be carried by the State Dockyard, it is able to submit keener tenders when smaller ships are to be built. The State Dockyard is not geared for the construction of small ships and is at a disadvantage when attempting to gain work in this field.

Mr Einfeld: The Premier saved that order.

Mr JONES: That is so. The federal Government had given permission for the company to have the ship built overseas, and it is to the credit of the Premier that he saved the order for Carrington Slipways. The Premier and the Deputy Premier had discussions with the Prime Minister and the federal Minister for Transport. They did a fantastic job when trying to overcome the difficulty at the State Dockyard, and they put a magnificent case to the federal Government. However, the Prime Minister is asking workers at the State Dockyard to break the law, by volunteering to opt out of wage indexation, which is a major feature of industrial law and industrial life in the Commonwealth. What could the workers do other than what they did? They did not

reject the proposal; they put it to one side and asked for further negotiations so that the whole subject could be further considered. The Prime Minister complains about **people** breaking the law when they throw rocks and assemble around the Governor-General or the Prime Minister. He criticizes these people, but then he asks workers of this country to break the law by refusing to accept wage indexation increases. On the one hand he complains about people breaking the law and on the other he encourages them to do **so**. I believe the Prime Minister is talking with forked tongue. He should **have** another think about these things and give the workers at Newcastle a fair go.

The workers at the State Dockyard have not taken part in a local strike for almost eighteen months. Indeed, a local union committee has been established to deal with demarcation disputes. This is a most responsible group. The only strikes that have occurred over the period I have mentioned have been the national strikes, and the dockyard workers cannot be blamed for taking part in them. They are willing to come to the party and to undertake not to strike unless the federal Government deliberately goes out of its way to make them do so. Of course, that is what the federal Government is trying to do. Another aspect of the federal Government's attitude towards the Australian shipbuilding industry is that at a time when it is talking about the need to defend this country it wants to eliminate the industry in Australia. They say that during wartime and at other times the shipbuilding industry is essential for the defence of the country. From the point of view of the economy and efficiency, the State Dockyard has proved itself to be a leader in this field in Australia.

The graving dock has been mentioned. Although the federal Government deliberately went out of its way to axe it, it is heartening that the federal Government told the Premier and the Deputy Premier that it would look **kindly** at the State Dockyard designing and building its own floating dock. I know that the dockyard has plans and specifications for a 35 000-tonne deadweight floating dock. I **do** not know whether it would meet requirements, or whether additional plans and specifications would be needed. This aspect would have to be considered, but the fact that the federal Government has acknowledged the need to review the building of a floating dock at Newcastle is a step in the right direction.

Some people have been critical of my brother who, as the former federal **Labor** Minister for Transport, delayed the building of the graving dock. However, a site had to be selected and then proved to be workable. The first site selected was unsuitable because of undermining and slippery clay in the vicinity. The federal Government's engineers intimated to the former Minister for Transport, the Hon. C. K. Jones, that there was a possibility that the graving dock, if built on that site, would collapse and the gates would become jammed. The federal Minister requested the engineers to make further tests **and** if possible locate another more suitable site. Just after the **Whitlam** Government went out of office the engineers proving a suitable site put forward a proposal which they considered satisfactory for the construction of a graving dock. As that recommendation came forward after 11th November, the **Labor** Government did not have the opportunity to authorize the commencement of work. The Deputy Premier in the former Liberal-Country party Government in this State, the honourable member for Gloucester, intimated that the first site chosen was a satisfactory one for a graving dock but that the New South Wales Government did not support the federal Government's proposal. That statement was not correct and I take this opportunity to correct it and to put the matter in proper perspective.

I should like now to raise another matter that I believe is most important to consumers. I refer to the Flemington Direct Auto Exchange, or as it is known by its other name, the direct car market. I doubt whether this motor car exchange operates

Mr Jones]

in the best interests of the industry or the community. I am pleased that the Minister for Consumer Affairs is in the House. On Sunday last he visited this car market and observed it in operation. I ask the Minister to have a further and close look at the **workings** of this organization. I understand that it has already approached the Newcastle City Council in an attempt to secure similar premises for a market in Newcastle. The auto exchange at Flemington is, I believe, a direct challenge to the consumer protection laws that this Government intends to enforce in respect of the marketing of second-hand motor vehicles. Second-hand motor car dealers are required to be licensed. When they apply for a licence their background is investigated by the police. Should they be involved in even a minor infringement while holding a licence, they are required to give reasons why their licence should not be taken from them.

It is necessary also for a second-hand motor car dealer to operate only from licensed premises, but the people at Flemington are not licensed, nor are they operating from licensed premises. Cars are brought on to the site and the organizers offer facilities for those cars to be sold from that site. Organizations such as this should be subject to control in the same way as licensed dealers in motor vehicles. I have no axe to grind for any second-hand car yard but I am interested to ensure that the consumer protection legislation of this Government is effective. Should this operation at Flemington continue it could lead to a breakdown in consumer protection. The auto exchange advertises its sales and I have no doubt that it provides an avenue for the possible sale of stolen motor cars. No one knows the people offering cars for sale. The car is put on the stand, a deal is made, money paid over and the vendor is away and out of the place as soon as he gets the money in his pocket. He does not have to report back to anyone.

The auto exchange advertises good title but one might ask how it could check the title of a vehicle on a Sunday? Sometimes more than 100 vehicles are sold in a day. Admittedly, the deals are by private sale. Cars are put on the stand and people inspect them and do a deal with the vendors. This sort of selling gives **backyard** dealers an opportunity to dispose of their merchandise. The consumer affairs legislation was aimed at getting rid of **backyard** dealers. I should like the Minister to consider licensing these people or at least the premises from which the vehicles are sold and putting some sort of sanction on vendors. Under the existing laws anyone may offer a car for sale at this exchange so long as he pays to the organization renting the premises from the market authorities a specified sum. Another aspect is that these sales do not offer consumer protection by warranty.

The Government has decreed that there should be protection for buyers of second-hand motor cars. I have no doubt that the Minister fully understands the situation. There is a need to ensure that vehicles for sale at auto exchanges are owned by the people who offer them for sale. As the situation exists, cars under hire purchase may be sold and the purchaser could be up for great expense in getting his money back. I ask the Minister to investigate further this auto exchange and perhaps have the Corporate Affairs Commission look at it. I ask him to consider also the licensing of the premises. These operators could be **fly-by-nighters**: the industry does not need those types of people. I am concerned that if they can continue to operate in Sydney a similar operation will extend to Newcastle. There is a parking station in Newcastle which would be admirably suitable for this type of operation. I believe that will be the next venue of this type of operation.

While **talking** about consumers I should like to refer to the *Reader's Digest* organization and the way it distributes literature through letterboxes. I admit that I have been party to this operation, though I did it deliberately to see what would happen. It appears to be a good organization and some of the works offered are good and

acceptable. However, I have found that a number of them are not of first quality. For instance, on opening some books one finds that they fall apart. Also, the organization runs a scheme known as the *Reader's Digest* \$25,000 deposit passbook. Elderly people are bombarded with this material in the post. There is a need for further investigation. I believe that the *Reader's Digest* organization is a legitimate business but it should change its marketing approach. Prizes are offered but I do not know when or how the competitions are conducted. I have received its literature for the specific purpose of checking on the operation of the *Reader's Digest* organization so that I could raise the issue in the House if necessary. I believe there should be further investigation into its activities.

I congratulate the Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism on the magnificent job he has done since taking over his portfolio. I do not know whether people from the big racing clubs are happy with the action that the Minister has taken, but I know that people in Newcastle are happy with it. The former Government was not willing to put pressure on the Sydney Turf Club to make sure that it did the right thing for the industry. When two racing dates were taken from the Newcastle Jockey Club that was not good for country racing. The Minister has adopted a new approach to the industry, as he showed when he answered a question without notice today concerning viruses affecting dogs and horses. People who invest on the TAB and at racecourses know that the Government is looking after their interests in the best possible way. The Minister has taken an interest in trotting. He has called on people who are interested in trotting to put submissions to him so that he could analyse them and get what he believes to be the best possible board to manage the trotting industry in New South Wales.

The Greyhound Racing Control Board does an effective job. There is a need for a similar board to look after trotting. No doubt the Minister, having done that, will do something about horse racing. From time to time I have taken up a front row position in pushing this cause. An inquiry is necessary. The Minister gave racing dates to the Newcastle Trotting Club and to the Cessnock Trotting Club so that the industry in the Newcastle area might have a new start. That was commendable. It was a pity that the New South Wales Trotting Club took it upon itself to close the Newcastle and Cessnock areas. That was not done with due thought for the future of the industry. No sooner did it close Newcastle and Cessnock than it opened Muswellbrook and Taree. It was suggested that an effort was being made to regionalize the industry. It does not add up when one considers that people would need to go from Newcastle to Taree and Muswellbrook for events.

As president of the Newcastle Trotting Club I was pleased that the Minister gave Newcastle and Cessnock trotting clubs the opportunity to prove that they could succeed. The club in Newcastle has been working for more than six months to get things moving. The first meeting should be held on 1st October. It is hoped that things will go off with a big bang and so indicate that the people of Newcastle want trotting. I am confident that that fixture will prove that trotting can be a success in Newcastle.

The *Sunday Telegraph* of 20th June, 1976, published a comment from Mike **Wenden** under the caption, "**Wenden** in lament for sport 'dip'." The article deals with the poor performances of our athletes at the Montreal Olympic Games. Perhaps the Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism will be able to look at this problem. He could set up a committee to investigate it and produce a report. A man in Newcastle named Tex Morton, who is not the singer of the same name, but a professional swimming coach, went with Don Talbot to Canada. He remained there for a few years until his wife decided that she wanted to return to Australia to

Mr Jones]

raise her family. He told me something similar to what Mike **Wenden** said in the newspaper article to which I have referred. Governments in Australia are not putting enough money into providing coaches for sport.

There is a need for more coaches to give the children opportunities to improve their sporting prowess and participate in sporting events. Australia has lost a number of coaches to Canada, where they have achieved good results. We must realize that Australian coaches can do a fine job. In Newcastle a professional coach is willing to make himself available to help young people of this State perform better. He has some good prospects at Maitland and those he is coaching possibly will turn in good times later. The Government is doing a good job in this area. In closing, may I say that I was happy to hear the Governor mention that the Government will proceed with the deepening of the harbour at Newcastle.

[Mr Speaker left the chair at 5.58 p.m. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

Mr **JACKETT** (Burwood) [7.30]: I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I wish to congratulate also the new members who have delivered their maiden speeches during the debate. The great honour bestowed on those who are elected to **the** Parliament is felt most strongly when they first enter the Chamber. I hope that their stay in the Parliament will be rewarding to their constituents and the State. I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, upon your elevation to the Chair. It is the most important honour that the House can bestow upon a member. I was most impressed by those words you used when you stood on the upper step leading to the Speaker's chair:

It is my earnest desire to serve this Parliament with dignity, as tradition would have me do, and to discharge my duties in a firm, resolute and forthright manner.

[Quorum formed]. I was particularly impressed by your closing words:

It is my intention to apply the rules and standing orders in keeping with long-established practice so as to permit all honourable members adequate opportunity to express their point of view and to participate in the deliberations of this House. I will jealously guard the rights and privileges of members to use the forms of this Parliament in the best interests of their constituents.

In many churches throughout the land one finds inscribed in big letters on the walls a statement of the ten commandments, which are the basic tenets of the **Judaic-Christian** ethic. Unfortunately, **human** nature being what it is, we all sometimes depart from these tenets. Recently I learned that when the new parliamentary buildings are completed it is intended to upgrade suitably both Chambers of the Parliament. Mr Speaker, I suggest that the words you used, to which I have referred, could be appropriately placed so that you, the Deputy-Speaker and Acting-Speakers may see them. Perhaps the closing words might be placed above the Opposition benches immediately below the Hansard gallery.

The subject-matter of His Excellency's Speech was most melancholy. It was a dull recital of the Government's intentions. Many of its real intentions were cleverly veiled in ambiguity. Had it not been for the splendid presence of His Excellency who recited in his resonant voice the document prepared for him by the Government of the day, many people may have been asleep by the time the recital concluded. The heads of Government supporters were bowed not from sleepiness or the drug-like effects of the words, but in shame. The slick scriptwriters in the Premier's Department highlighted throughout the Speech the things that the previous Government had done.

Proposals such as the opening of a new court house and the introduction of **motor-trader** legislation were put forward as the ideas of the present Government. Credit was taken also for proposed child-bashing and other legislation. In truth the Government was pursuing the ideas put forward by the previous Government. The **Labor Party** is adept at breaking promises and hiding its real intentions. These are the reasons why the Speech of His Excellency was so dull and uninteresting and one of the worst that it has been my misfortune to hear.

I wish to refer to several matters that I should have liked to see in His **Excellency's** Speech. One of them is of particular concern to my electorate. Three or four years ago the headquarters of the Royal Blind Society was transferred from the city to **Burwood**. It now has there fine, new premises from which the wonderful work of the Royal Blind Society is performed. Through good management and the splendid efforts of wonderful people over more than a century of service to the citizens of New **South Wales** excellent facilities have been provided for the blind. In the past few years the society has started to run into financial difficulties in providing these services. Last year its deficit was more than **\$300,000** and this year it is **\$624,000**. In **two** years the society's reserves have been depleted by more than \$1 million. At its recent annual meeting the Minister for Health promised to do what he could to assist the Royal Blind Society with its financial problems.

The Government should give careful consideration to providing assistance to the Royal Blind Society. I brought this matter to the attention of one of the previous Ministers responsible for cultural activities, and I led a deputation from the society that put to him the problems confronting them, especially in the provision of library services. Throughout **the** State local governing bodies are provided with library subsidies on a *per capita* basis, but the Royal Blind Society, which provides library services for the blind, does not enjoy the subsidy. The Royal Blind Society provides **braille** libraries, which have to be prepared here or purchased from overseas at a great cost. Also, it provides talking books for the blind; they are highly technical, expensive productions. Further, the society provides large-print books for the partially sighted. I submit that the Royal Blind Society, which is providing a most essential library service for the blind, is entitled to a subsidy similar to that received by local councils.

When this matter was raised with the former responsible Minister, he was advised by his department that it was impossible to extend this subsidy to the Royal Blind Society. However, I submit that something should be done and, if it is not possible to do this administratively, legislation should be introduced to permit the Royal Blind Society to be placed on the same footing as local councils.

During the past eleven years the Liberal-Country party Government did a magnificent job by rapidly expanding the number and kinds of classes for handicapped children. In fact, there was a virtual explosion of services in this sphere. This remarkable achievement has gone a long way towards providing for the needs of these people, but a great many more disabilities have since been discovered together with ways in which to deal with them. As more and more young people are diagnosed as needing training in a handicapped school, more and more problems arise in our complex society. I pay tribute to the provision that was made by the **Whitlam** Government for handicapped children. I cannot praise that Government in many ways, but I do praise it for initiating the handicapped assistance fund. I am pleased, of course, that the present Liberal-Country party Government in Canberra has increased that form of assistance by 50 per cent.

Anyone who has not been in a home where there is a handicapped child would not understand the great strains that are placed on the parents, especially the mother, and on the other members of the family. Some completely normal children do

Mr Jackett]

not understand the reason why another **child** in the family who might **only** be mildly handicapped, seems to be favoured. This attitude places great pressure and strain especially on the mother. Some women break down when they cannot cope with the great difficulties involved in caring for a handicapped child, in helping at the school, and so on. The parents and citizens' associations of these schools require enormous additional funds to finance their work. I believe that we have reached the stage where consideration should be given to extending the education services available for these children. For example, we should be talking in terms of developing hostels where handicapped children can receive short-term and long-term accommodation and education.

I pay tribute to the Health Commission for the establishment of Sanbrook on Peat Island where short-term hostel accommodation is available for handicapped people. I compliment Dr English on the work that is done there, and I compliment also Dr Connolly who is in charge of the whole scheme. Unfortunately, this institution does not provide education for the children who go there. The Department of Education should be working along the lines of providing assistance to a mother who has reached the point where she can no longer handle the problems that have arisen in her family due to the presence in it of a handicapped child. I should like the child who is given care and assistance at a hostel to be taught there as well, even if only there for a few weeks. Many handicapped children will be able to work with dignity in our society and take their normal place in the community but they will do this only as a result of great efforts on their behalf by a large number of people. Much thought and development have gone into this special field of education, and I pay high tribute to those who have been involved in it.

I wish to speak now about the decline of community standards, particularly moral standards. This has been brought about not only by people in the ratbag fringe but also by the deliberate policies of people who want to destroy the Judaeo-Christian basis of our society. An enormous number of influences are at work to bring down the standards of our society. Many people are disturbed by the proliferation of opportunities to gamble. The Council of Churches, which is concerned about these matters, seeks to discourage governments from embarking on any move to extend opportunities to gamble.

Before the last elections the Council of Churches wanted to discuss with the parliamentary leaders some of these important issues. The Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Premier and Treasurer, was happy to discuss with them at length the problem they saw facing the State, and some of the things, gambling casinos for instance, that had been mentioned in the press. The Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, showed that he is not known as Nifty Neville for nothing. The people from the Council of Churches had some difficulty in getting him to the barrier because he was so nimble on his feet. They were unable to interview him for a long time, but a week before the elections they finally got him there, and found that he was even more nimble in the kind of answers he gave. Anxious to make his marble good, right at the outset he declared:

I am the only Protestant Leader of the Labor Party for 50 years, and many of the political leaders of the Party follow the Roman Catholic faith.

As if to suggest there was something wrong, something bad about being a member of the Catholic Church. I am sure that none of the gentlemen there on that day, particularly in these ecumenical times, would have held it against him in any way if he had said that he was not a Protestant. That statement became even more difficult to follow on 25th May last when the successful candidates were being sworn in as members of this Parliament. To our surprise the Premier did not take the oath of allegiance on a

copy of the Bible—Protestant or Catholic—but made an affirmation. The taking of an oath is an indication of a person's adherence to the Christian faith. However, the Premier's religious beliefs are not my business. On radio station 2CH, when he was specifically asked what he would do about casinos, he dealt with that question in a very nimble way indeed. He said:

No, my general attitude at the moment is that there is an adequate proliferation of gambling outlets. I am not anxious to create more outlets. I think if people want to gamble there are sufficient facilities on the race course, the T.A.B. and the poker machines . . . You name it, we seem to have all the facilities available in N.S.W. and I am not disposed as presently advised and I don't think I will be changing my mind very quickly to create more outlets. Certainly, I don't have in mind to establish a casino, a huge legal casino in Sydney.

In my view that is a clear assurance that the Premier had no intention of introducing gambling casinos.

Mr Sheahan: There is no need to introduce them. They are already here.

Mr JACKETT: Nonsense. That was certainly a clear indication to any reasonable person that there would be no legalizing of gambling casinos. But, what happened? He had not been in office for more than three weeks when he announced that he was going to introduce legislation to make gambling casinos in New South Wales legal. One of the newspapers said that the Premier had given a nifty answer. Being rather interested in the use of that adjective, I looked up the copy of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* that is kept in this Chamber and learned that the word nifty was a slang term and it meant spruce, smart, stylish and—smelly. His answer certainly smelled to high heaven. It smelled of duplicity. The people of New South Wales will need to be careful about the answers they get to straight questions asked of the Premier. I go further. The Premier said also:

It is a great mistake to think that if we are elected on Saturday there will be a great wave of permissive legislation. Anyone who thinks that misunderstands the nature of the Labor Party.

Not long ago a lady who is an artist telephoned me and complained to me about an art show. She said that in her view as an artist there was nothing artistic about this show and she regarded some of the material displayed there as deliberately pornographic. The next day we saw reported in the newspapers under the heading "Hands off Art shows, police told" the following article:

The Premier, Mr Wran, has directed the Vice Squad to discontinue vetting art exhibitions.

Mr Wran's directive came after the Vice Squad had been called to inspect an exhibition of Erotica at the Holdsworth Galleries, Woollahra.

Later, the article continued:

The Premier said he told the Assistant Police Commissioner, Mr M. Woods, that the police involvement was "an unnecessary intrusion into an art exhibition."

That is disgraceful. The Premier as Minister responsible for the police force should not give instructions of that nature. There is no doubt that it is a nimble, nifty, smelly approach. It is the kind of attitude we can expect from this Premier. We know what the Premier and his Attorney-General have done about the police and the raid at Nimbin. I am worried about these things and I have no doubt that every right-thinking citizen of this State would be worried about them, too. One should read not

so much the printed words used by His Excellency in his Speech but should read between the lines and watch the activities of the new administrators. How delightful it was yesterday to read this headline in a newspaper, "Teachers back police action at Tuntable." This is the article that followed:

A telegram to the Premier, Mr Wran, signed by 37 teachers at Mullumbimby High School says they fully support a recent police raid on Tuntable Falls Commune, near Mullumbimby.

Mr Wran was reported on August 17 to have asked for a report from the Police Commissioner, Mr Hanson, explaining why he had not been consulted about the raid, carried out by 60 police, some armed.

Forty-two people were arrested.

Is this the way the Premier intends to control the New South Wales police? Is it **right** for him to do so? Is it proper? I am concerned about these things. In the last Parliament and in the Parliament before it the most irresponsible member in the Opposition and the member who asked the most irresponsible questions was the honourable member for Georges River. After the elections of 1st May the sphere of irresponsibility transferred from one side of the Chamber to the other. I cannot see how revelations by Argus the boy wonder on the **Barton** case will assist anyone.

I come now to discuss the diminishing economy. Most members will recall the time when two of the most popular characters in Australian literature, radio plays and newspaper cartoons were Dad and Dave. I recall a particular cartoon depicting Dad and Dave passing a parish hall where a fete **was** being conducted. They used to be called a sale of work. Dave looked at the articles on display and said, "Crikey, Dad, fancy buying that." We all know what is happening in Newcastle in the form of "buying **work**" there. The country is being sold down the drain. Another character in the Dad and Dave cartoons was Daisy who would always put a foot in the milking bucket. We have a daisy in this House and yesterday he kicked the milking bucket. I am sure that by now everyone in New South Wales wishes that the Government would kick the bucket. I conclude by **referring** to the penultimate paragraph in His Excellency's Speech, which reads:

Honourable members will know that Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh will visit New South Wales next March. They are assured of **the** warmest welcome by the people of New South Wales.

Mr Sheahan: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, the honourable member has misquoted the Governor. He left out the words "and Government".

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr JOHNSON (Mount **Druitt**) [8.0]: I am pleased to speak in the Address-in-Reply debate now before the House. First, I congratulate the honourable member for Parramatta and the honourable member for Blue Mountains who so ably moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I feel sure that those two honourable members, the honourable member for Monaro, and the honourable member for Gosford, who have made their maiden contributions to debates in this House, will be an asset to our Government in the years ahead. I congratulate, also, other honourable members who have delivered their maiden speeches. It is certainly a great feeling to stand here today on the Government side and participate in the first Address-in-Reply debate under the first Labor Government for eleven years. [*Quorum formed.*] I congratulate the Premier upon leading Labor to victory on 1st May.

The electorate of Mount Druitt, which I am proud to represent, still has many **problems** that confront my constituents. Many of the problems were completely ignored by the previous Liberal-Country party Government over the past eleven years. The first matter I propose to deal with is health. The need for a general hospital at Mount Druitt is appreciated and advocated by **all** concerned citizens. The constant representations and questions on the subject that I directed to previous Ministers who now sit on the Opposition benches were to no avail. They were not interested in providing health services for the people in my electorate. **All** their efforts were directed towards pouring money into the **affluent** areas, which were already more than adequately catered for by hospital facilities. The **only** health facility in Mount Druitt is **the** polyclinic that was funded by the previous Australian Labor Government to the tune of **approximately** \$1 million and two-thirds of its running costs. The contribution by the **Whitlam** Labor Government was seldom acknowledged by members of the Opposition, who sought to deceive the people into believing that they were responsible for building this project. I want to make it perfectly clear that their contribution was very small.

The polyclinic is administered by the western metropolitan health region of the Health Commission of New South Wales. Some of **the** general health services available at the polyclinic include a paediatric service for the care of children, a hearing clinic and a family planning clinic. Other facilities include a prenatal clinic, an occupational therapy service and an orthoptics or eye care clinic. There is also a physiotherapy **service** and an assessment clinic for children. Also, an alcohol and drug counsellor is available who can work with families of alcoholics as well as alcoholics themselves. A mental health department is connected to the polyclinic with facilities for the diagnosis and treatment of mental, emotional and behavioural problems in both individuals and families. The department operates as a referral centre for mental health patients not requiring hospitalization and as a follow-up service for patients discharged from the psychiatric hospital.

The polyclinic contains a child health department, which is the headquarters of assessment of child development in the area. It advises on the preventive and screening methods carried out by the community nurse. It acts as a facility for the diagnosis and treatment of developmental, emotional and behavioural problems in infancy, childhood and adolescence. Therapy is given to children diagnosed as having a psychological problem and, where appropriate, their families are involved in counselling. Children suffering from speech defects are given speech therapy. Parents who are concerned about a behavioural or emotional problem or learning **difficulty** with their child can have the child seen at the clinic. At this juncture I should like to pay tribute to the physician in charge of the polyclinic, Dr Mooy, whom I have always found to be a most approachable man completely dedicated to his profession. I pay a similar tribute to all the staff at the polyclinic for their dedication to their work. Despite the services offered by the polyclinic, it is no substitute for a general hospital.

I congratulate the Minister for Health upon his recent announcement of **approval** for the preparation of plans for a general hospital of 296 beds at Mount **Druitt**. I understand it is to be built in three stages: the first will provide 60 medical-surgical beds, 48 paediatric beds, 5 intensive care beds and 15 minimal care beds, **and** associated facilities. The second stage would consist of doubling the bed numbers **in all** categories, plus additions to service areas. The Minister has recognized the **special** needs of the electorate. Mount Druitt is populated with relatively young family units, the average age of the citizens being 11 years. This is why one third of **the** total accommodation in the new hospital will be for the care of children. The new hospital will have four operating theatres, four x-ray rooms, an outpatients'

Mr Johnson]

department, and accident and emergency units. The third stage of the development is to provide facilities for psychiatric care and will include additional residential accommodation.

The Minister is to be congratulated also for including an outpatients' department in this hospital. The previous Liberal-Country party Government stands condemned in the eyes of the people of New South Wales for bowing to the whims of a number of doctors of this State and closing down outpatients' departments in public hospitals, thus forcing aged people seeking medical attention to troop to various doctors' surgeries—some of them miles apart. **When** the hospital is built at Mount Druitt it will relieve the position to some extent and provide a service for the people in my area; it will also relieve pressure on the Nepean hospital and the Blacktown district hospital. The polyclinic provides a worthwhile service but it is only a back-up facility for the hospital at Blacktown. No bed patients are admitted to the polyclinic. Surely it is not good enough today for a population of 70 000 people to be denied a vital necessity such as a hospital. I know the sincerity of the Minister for Health and I have great respect for him. I shall certainly keep on his back until this hospital becomes a reality.

There are approximately 900 Housing Commission dwellings in Mount Druitt. They were planned, designed and built by the commission. The standard and design of houses in the electorate have improved dramatically over the past few years, **particularly in Bidwell** where a large number of town houses have been built. **The** quality of these dwellings is second to none. I congratulate the Housing Commission for the effort it has put into planning and building this project. The general downturn in building throughout New South Wales has brought home construction by the Housing Commission almost to a standstill. This has been brought about in the main by the economic policies of the Fraser-led Liberal-National Country party Government in Canberra. That Government should be made to realize that by cutting back money to New South Wales it is depriving about 35 000 families of urgently needed Housing Commission accommodation. Many of these people have been waiting up to four years for a home. This cutback has thrown thousands of building workers out of jobs. **An** injection of a substantial sum of money into the building industry in this State is urgently necessary if there is to be an upturn in the industry.

I turn to public transport. The majority of my constituents have to rely on public transport to travel to and from work each day. Many of them spend up to four hours a day travelling, and it costs about \$10 or \$12 a week for those who travel to the city. The great majority of my constituents are low income earners. I congratulate the Minister for Transport who, in one of his first moves after the Labor Party became the Government, reduced fares by 20 per cent. This has been a considerable saving to people in my electorate. What a change this has been. The former Liberal Party-Country Party Government appeared to derive pleasure from increasing fares. **All** members **on this** side of the House remember the regularity of fare increases—114 per cent increase in the last two years of the administration of the former Government.

I was pleased to read in the Speech of **His** Excellency the intention of the Government to proceed with work on the quadruplication of the Granville to Penrith railway. It is absolutely essential that this work be completed as soon possible. I ask the Minister to look into the possibility of providing a faster service from Mount Druitt, Rooty Hill and Doonside, not only in peak periods but also in off-peak periods. Hourly services which are operating at the present time are not good enough. The Government **plans** to develop free commuter car parking facilities at railway stations. That move is to be applauded. So completely was the previous Liberal-Country party Government in **the** grip of private developers that it allowed Lend Lease Corporation to move the

Mount Druitt railway station from its original site to a site 500 yards east opposite the Great Western shopping complex. No provision was made for commuter parking. Cars now park on both sides of Mount Druitt railway station, particularly on the southern side of the railway, where Beames Avenue is too narrow for commuters to park safely. I ask the Minister to have a look at this position with a view to providing free car parking facilities for commuters.

The Minister is to be congratulated for implementing work on sophisticated computer-controlled signalling systems. Work has already commenced on this project to control train movements at and around Central railway station. Clear, concise train information for the bulk of Sydney's commuters is the latest improvement in the city's public transport system. More than 2 000 prerecorded cassette tapes are now in use at various stations to keep commuters informed of train movements. I ask the Minister to consider installing such a system at Mount Druitt railway station.

I now turn to unemployment in my electorate. In 1964 the State Labor Government commenced a programme of resettling families from the inner suburbs of Sydney to the Housing Commission estate at Mount Druitt, and the programme was continued by the Liberal-Country party Government. In years gone by governments were satisfied to provide merely for the housing needs of the people. From experience gained from such schemes, it has been shown that a need exists to provide the community infrastructure, such as shopping and community centres, playing fields and so on, at the same time. More recently, the need to provide local employment opportunities has been recognized. That has not been done at Mount Druitt, which has a total population of approximately 70 000 with an average age of 11 years. In July, 1975, there were 2 610 people unemployed in Mount Druitt. The figure had risen alarmingly by July, 1976, to 3 008.

The need for the establishment of industry in Mount Druitt is urgent. Large areas of land for industrial development are available at Rooty Hill and Plumpton. I am sure honourable members will share my grave concern at the lack of job opportunities facing not only the people at present unemployed, but also school leavers. School leavers throughout New South Wales face limited job opportunities. An even bleaker situation confronts my constituents because Mount Druitt has no industry. Despite representations I made to a former Country Party Minister for Decentralisation and Development, nothing was done to remedy this situation. The present Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries informed me in a recent letter that he proposed to bring forward a subdivision for industrial development at Rooty Hill. I impress upon him the urgency of this matter. The sorry record of the present federal Liberal-Country party Government has been responsible for the escalation in unemployment in New South Wales.

I ask the Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister for Public Works, to expedite sewerage to Rooty Hill, without which there is little chance of inducing industry to establish itself in the area. In the part of the electorate where I live—and there are other areas to which I can refer, such as Plumpton, Eastern Creek and parts of old Mount Druitt—approximately 6 000 people lack sewerage. I am one of them. For the past twenty-five years that I have lived in the area, twice a week I have had to **hump** the pan to the front gate. It is an unpleasant task, and even more so if the handle comes off the pan. When the sewerage is finally connected to our home it will be such a novelty that there will be a race to see who can pull the chain first.

I turn now to education. My electorate has twenty-five schools catering for the educational needs of approximately 21 000 pupils. I pay tribute to the dedicated district inspectors, principals, teachers and staff **working** in schools throughout the Mount Druitt electorate. Their dedication is second to none. I am deeply concerned

Mr Johnson

about the problem of reading retardation, a special problem that the previous Liberal-Country party Government refused to acknowledge. A significant number of children have a reading retardation problem. They have normal intelligence but need special attention to overcome this disability, for which remedial teaching is the proven remedy. To place such a pupil in a class for the educationally handicapped because no one has detected that he has a reading retardation problem should not be allowed to happen. It has a permanent and disastrous effect on the child's life. I applaud the efforts of the Outer Western Regional Council for Social Development in recognizing this problem among young people in Mount Druitt who have recently left school. Their efforts brought about the setting up of the SPELD organization. I am certain these people will be able to assist the young people so affected.

Two months after taking office the Minister for Education was confronted with a problem at Doonside public school. Acting on a decision made by the previous Liberal Minister, the Department of Education proposed to site demountable classrooms in the grounds of the Doonside public school to cater for 360 children from the recently established Housing Commission estate at North Doonside. Although a site was available for a school to be built to cater for these children, the previous Liberal Minister no doubt thought it would be better to place these funds in the more affluent areas and to hell with the children from Doonside. Prompt action by the present Minister resolved the situation by relocating the seven classrooms on land already set aside for that purpose at north Doonside. By his swift intervention the Minister has gained the admiration of teachers, pupils and parents alike at Doonside public school.

I am hopeful that provision will be made for sufficient schools for the proposed Housing Commission development of 2 000 homes at south Doonside by 1980. I am confident that the Minister will ensure that the people of Doonside will not have to face the confusion that existed at Mount Druitt under the previous Government's administration, when a number of schools were not built until well after people had moved into their commission dwellings. The Minister advised me last week that a technical college is to be built at Mount Druitt. This announcement will be welcomed by the people in my electorate. Colyton public school, which is more than 100 years old, is sorely in need of additions and I hope the Minister will expedite their provision.

There are approximately 40 000 young people in my electorate under the age of 18 years. Many of them are out of work at present and have nothing to do at night except roam the streets. The district is sadly lacking in amenities for youth. A few clubs provide amenities for them. There is a judo club, a netball club, and the Australian Air League—a club in which I am particularly interested and that does a magnificent job for the local youth. The local scouts movement does a marvellous job also. All the people who assist these organizations are voluntary workers and they receive no help from the Government.

I have made representations to the Planning and Environment Commission for the grant of a block of land for the Australian Air League. It is willing to finance a building but it does not have enough money to buy land. It is vital that a block be granted to it. North St Marys scouts, which includes cubs and guides, caters for 100 young people in that area. To illustrate their dedication, I mention that over the past twelve years they have been operating without a hall, in the open at the north St Marys primary school. They are grateful to the school principal for allowing them to use the school grounds, but during wet weather they cannot continue their training of the youth of the area. I shall be making representations to the Minister for Youth and Community Services for a grant to assist them in the building of a scout hall.

I conclude by saying that, with the return of the Wran **Labor** Government on 1st May every man, woman and child in this State can look forward with confidence to a better way of life.

Mr BRUXNER (Tenterfield) [8.24]: I extend my congratulations to the honourable member for Parramatta, who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, and to the honourable member for Blue Mountains, who seconded it. I trust that their stay in this House will be a short but happy one. I extend my congratulations also to those honourable members who addressed the House for the first time. I am particularly pleased that this afternoon I had the opportunity of hearing the maiden speech of my colleague, the honourable member for **Barwon**, my political next-door neighbour. He has given clear indications that he will carry on the fine work done by the Hon. Geoff Crawford. I am delighted to see the honourable member in the House. His maiden speech was preceded yesterday by the speech of the honourable member for Orange, who has the unenviable task of assuming responsibility for an electorate that was represented by the leader of our party for many years. **All** honourable members, regardless of their political **affiliation**, will agree that in the past Orange has chosen men of exceedingly high calibre to represent it here. I am sure the honourable member for Orange can look forward to as long a stay in this House as his predecessor had.

I join my constituents in **the** electorate of **Tenterfield** with the expressions contained in the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, particularly that passage which assures His Excellency of our unfeigned attachment to Her Most Gracious Majesty's Throne and Person. Every constituent in my electorate will join with me in confirming that unfeigned attachment, not only to Her Majesty's throne and person, but also to her representatives in the State and in the Commonwealth of Australia. I am delighted that we can expect Her Majesty's Australian representative, the **Governor-General**, to be the guest of honour in the new year to open the centenary **Tenterfield** show. On that occasion Sir John **Kerr** can expect to receive another **demonstration**—one of unswerving loyalty and congratulations for the job that he is doing on 'behalf of Her Majesty.

His Excellency delivered a Speech of average length on the occasion of the opening of Parliament. We have heard much of the plight of rural industries during this debate and we heard much about it during the election campaign in April. But for all the pages and words of His Excellency's Speech, drafted and written for him by the Government, on page two in only two lines we see the one reference to the beef industry, which is mixed up with the dairy industry. I quote from His Excellency's Speech: "Export prices remained low for meat and dairy products and, in the short term, trading difficulties are likely to continue to be experienced with these commodities." To the damnable shame of this Government, which has come to power in New South Wales with trumpeting of glory, we have had to listen for the past week and a half to the outbursts of the new Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries but he has not said one word about the plight of one of the most important primary industries in this State.

Perhaps it is because we do not have quotas for beef, and the Minister cannot come into this Chamber and accuse me of lining my pockets with profits from the beef industry. We have seen him carry out a vendetta directed at members of the Opposition who earned quotas in the dairy industry, some of them over a great number of years and after a lot of hard work. Because he cannot refer to our having beef quotas and cannot refer to wanting to confiscate them and give them to somebody else, he has had nothing to say about the beef industry. Apparently he and his Government have overlooked the fact that the beef industry in Australia is in the most desperate plight that it has ever been **in**.

I expect the Government and its Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries to take some urgent action on this matter. I do not want to hear them keep saying that when we were in government we should have done this and that, **Labor** has had its electoral victory: woe to the vanquished is its present catchcry. I have seen the ups and downs of politics over a longer period than many members on the **Government** side and I can take a hiding. The Premier referred this afternoon to the fact that we on this side had had a hiding. In my time I have had my share of hidings, but now I expect the Government, which boasts of delivering a hiding at the polls, to do something for the beef industry. I want to hear some proposals from the Government, but to date we have not heard a word from Ministers through their own mouths or in His Excellency's Address. The Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries has been given two portfolios, but I do not think that he has the time to take proper care of either portfolio.

Mr Petersen: He is most efficient.

Mr BRUXNER: He may be most efficient. He received a lot more votes in caucus than the honourable member for Illawarra is ever likely to receive. It does not matter how efficient he is, there has been a downgrading of two of the most important rural portfolios in New South Wales by lumping them together. While the Minister is **working** in one department, the other department is being neglected. I should like to know what is to be the new name for the Department of Agriculture. The Minister has the official title of Minister for Primary Industries, but there is still a Department of Agriculture. When the Minister was asked to **comment** on reports that the name of the Department of Agriculture was to be changed, he issued a press statement on **11th** June in which he described reports of a name change for the Department of Agriculture as "**complete hogwash and humbug**". He stated that he had never at any stage even contemplated changing the name of the department.

Apparently the Minister did not know that on 4th June his own private secretary in an interview with the *Northern Daily Leader* in Tamworth was reported as stating that a switch in the name is under consideration and the Minister is fairly non-committal on why the name of the ministry should be changed. The private secretary advised also that senior staff members in the head office of the Department of Agriculture had been circulated with a **memorandum** from their Director-General informing them of the plan. In a subsequent news interview the Minister said that he had given consideration to the matter. He discussed the necessary action and costs involved in such a change. I ask the Minister and the Government to inform the House whether a change in name of the Department of Agriculture is still proposed. If it is, he should inform the House of the costs associated with the change and whether he would agree that, in view of the desperate plight of most primary producers, any costs attached to a change of name would be better directed towards the alleviation of their difficulties.

As is well known, I was Minister for Decentralisation and Development in the previous Government. I challenge anyone to say that I did not work full-time and for long hours. There has never been a more important time than now to have a full-time Minister in the Department of Decentralisation and Development. He must be in constant touch with all sections of industry in the country and in the city. My task as Minister was to keep in constant touch with industry in the city of Sydney and other cities round the world so that I knew what was happening. The Department of Decentralisation and Development has a full-time officer in the New South Wales offices in London and New York. They report back to headquarters in Sydney so that the department can circulate everyone who is interested in investment in New South Wales.

Just prior to the elections the previous Government had established a new small business agency, which was one of the most vital needs of industry and business in city and country. That agency needs a Minister on the job in the department and in constant touch with what is going on. Government supporters are determined that the department should revert to a branch office of the Treasury, where they had it prior to 1965. The Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries had the unmitigated gall to say that over eleven years Sir John Fuller and I had completely ignored the needs of decentralized industry. Over the twenty-four years that **the** decentralization portfolio under Labor governments was a branch office of the Treasury, \$3.6 million was allocated towards the decentralization of business and industry in New South Wales.

Although Government supporters assert that Sir John Fuller and I were lazy and negligent in our duty to business, in the next eleven years under a full-time Minister for Decentralisation and Development and a full-time department, \$88 million was invested towards 1 000 relocated industries, which kept 80 000 people in the country. As part of that programme we built 2 000 houses outside the normal Housing Commission programme. Some Government supporters might not regard that as working, but they should circulate among the people whom my colleagues and I represent, who think it was a worthwhile contribution to the future of New South Wales.

Mr Kearns: What about growth centres?

Mr BRUXNER: I am delighted by the interjection by my friend from Bankstown, who was elected with me in 1962, though it causes me to rearrange my notes. The Country Party has never deviated in its policy of support for growth centres. It was the party that promoted them. That party received the support of the Liberal Party. When I piloted the legislation through this House I received the support of the Labor Party, which was then in opposition. There is some doubt in the Government about what its policy is on growth centres.

Mr Kearns: There is no doubt about the Fraser policy.

Mr BRUXNER: I wish to talk about the Wran and Day policy. On 28th June the Minister for Decentralisation and Development, who is responsible for administering growth centres, was reported in the *Lithgow Mercury* as saying that support for growth centres was assured under his Government, that it was fully committed to do everything in its power to carry on the promotion of growth centres. The Minister referred to the upsurge in building activity in Bathurst as an indication that growth centres were proving a success. However, on 6th July, eight days later, the Premier was reported in big headlines in the *Central Western Daily* as saying that growth centres are lagging and that cities like Dubbo are proceeding more successfully under their own steam than artificial growth in growth centres. He said also that it was a matter that was worth reflecting on at government level. Does one believe the Premier who does not want artificial growth, or the Minister for Decentralisation and Development who says growth centres are proving highly successful and commits his Government to do everything in its power to promote growth centres?

The honourable member for Bankstown implied by way of interjection that the federal Government was not doing much. I could not agree more with him. I am sadly disappointed that the federal Government appears to be marking time with growth centres. When I was Minister for Decentralisation and Development I had the opportunity to travel round the world inspecting growth centres in other countries. The only way to make them successful is to keep the momentum going. If a return is required on taxpayers' money already invested in growth centres in New South Wales and other States, the momentum must be kept going. I strongly urge my colleagues in the federal Parliament to do this.

Notwithstanding the activities at federal level, maximum State funds must be directed to these centres. It was inherent in our promise to the people who live there. When people questioned me about the acquisition of their land for growth centres, I gave personal undertakings that it would be paid for and used. No member of the Government would wish to see a retraction of such a promise. Although I have been critical tonight of the Minister for Decentralisation and Development, I do not believe that he would want to go to Bathurst-Orange or to Albury-Wodonga and renege on a promise which the Parliament unanimously wrote into legislation. There was no division on that legislation in either House.

I want to put right for all time one aspect of the Bathurst-Orange growth centre. It is not on the file. The Attorney-General will not be able to dig it out and use it in evidence. It was not kept off the file for any ulterior purpose. I was greatly disturbed to hear the Premier and the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries say that they were not committed to our promise to transfer the Soil Conservation Service to Orange. They said that it was only an election gimmick, a decision made in time for the Orange by-election. Anyone who heard the maiden speech of the honourable member for Orange yesterday would know that he did not need any gimmicks to get him into Parliament, and none is needed to keep him here.

I was chairman of the Cabinet committee that reviewed the possibility of transferring government departments to country areas and I prevailed upon the former Government to agree to the transfer of a major department to Orange at the express request of the federal Minister for Urban and Regional Development, the Hon. Tom Uren. I have his permission to use his name tonight. Mr Uren and I worked very closely on growth centres. If I may be so immodest tonight, Mr Speaker, I say that there are no two men in political life in Australia who know as much about the establishment and administration of growth centres as Tom Uren and I. I must include also the Hon. Murray Byrne, the Victorian Minister who has now retired. We had to live through the early days of that legislation and its administration; no other government or parliament in Australia handled it.

Tom Uren told me that in the face of a good deal of opposition he had committed the federal Labor Government to the transfer of Commonwealth departments to the growth centres. He said: "I know you are putting money into Bathurst-Orange, but I want to see something more tangible. I want evidence of really good faith on the part of your Government that you will back that Commonwealth money with some people." I took that message to my Government, and that was the reason I obtained a decision to transfer the Soil Conservation Service to Orange.

That decision was made long before Sir Charles Cutler retired from this Parliament—long before the by-election. I hope that decision will be respected. Despite the vehement denial last week by the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries that from now on there will be no favouritism in his department, I wonder whether the decision to transfer the Soil Conservation Service would have been suspended if we had intended to send it to Casino.

On the question of growth centres I query seriously the Government's announcement that it intends to set up a development corporation in each region of the State. I ask the Government to be careful what it is doing. Its members can read about this on the file, which the Minister has in the department. I had preliminary legislation drawn up to strengthen the structure of the regional advisory councils, but in

doing so I encountered a good deal of opposition from local government. We were trying to give regional councils a role that would bring them under the provisions of the planning and environment legislation.

Now I read that the Government is proposing to ignore that legislation and to set up a development corporation with powers of land acquisition, development and control. I hope local government voices its objection loud and clear to the Government, as it did when it told me, "Hands off the locally represented people in the area." I do not **think** a development corporation should have the power to acquire and develop land. I hope the Government does not intend to break the link that we intended to forge between local government, the regional councils and the new planning legislation. If it does, it **will** get into an unholy mess.

If the Government wants to criticize the previous Government's selection of Bathurst—Orange as the site of the first growth centre in New South Wales, let me say that the previous Government took this policy from the **Labor** policy speech delivered in 1971 by the honourable member for **Phillip**, who promised that **Labor**, if elected, would encourage growth centres and the first area of choice would be Bathurst—Orange. The Government must press on with this job, with or without federal funds, otherwise the whole thing will be a gigantic waste of time and money. I worked hard, long and faithfully to see it come to fruition; so did Tom Uren. I want the Government to carry on with this job, regardless of any other feelings it has for the State. This is the one and only chance we have to make a significant impact on the imbalance of population. The need for decentralization is agreed upon wherever one goes round the world.

I mentioned that I had departed from the sequence of my speech because of an interjection. Earlier I referred to the paucity of recommendations on the meat industry in the Governor's Speech. I want the Government to attack the problems of the meat industry with the same zeal as that with which it has attacked the milk industry. I want the Minister to engage just as fervently in searching out the problems of the meat industry. There were two lines about the industry in the Governor's Speech and it was not **mentioned** in the list of proposed legislation. The Government must do something about this industry, which has been brought to its knees. It must get together with the other States and find where the problems lie. They are not insurmountable. There is an over-supply of beef and a restricted export market. The cost structure of the industry makes it difficult to compete on that market. I want New South Wales to be a leading domestic supplier of beef and a leading exporter in the forefront of the fight.

The Premier, in a challenge this afternoon, said that he will force honourable members to disclose all interests and assets. He can have details of mine. I shall get the National Bank to send him details of my overdraft. He can lay the document on the table. He need not challenge me and tell the public that I am making a fortune out of beef. I am speaking on behalf of people who are deserving of as much attention as that given to people in the milk industry. The Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries has developed an obsession about the milk industry. He wants to reduce the quotas of Opposition members of Parliament, and he will not be satisfied until he has done so. I shall debate the mechanics of this when the legislation is before the House; I do not have time tonight. But let me say that when he brands my colleagues as criminals for holding milk quotas, he is **branding** 2 600 other people in the State. Many of them have very small quotas and others employ families. He spoke about the preservation of the family unit. Every time he restricts the opportunity of the quota-holding farmer to employ members of the family unit he will add to the growing list of unemployed in this State.

Mr Bruxner]

Do not make it a crime to hold a **milk** quota. It was a **Labor** government that created the system. A **Labor** government set up the original milk zone in order to control the supply of milk to the metropolitan area. Though the Minister thinks he is putting a freeze on the price of milk, let him not be sure that next winter we shall **not** be back to the days when milk was rationed in this State and people had to get in a queue to buy a bottle of milk. I well remember those days. If that happens again the Premier will see what happens to the freeze on the price of milk. The Premier says that the consumer is the person that he worries about. He will be begging for mercy and searching the State to see where he can get milk, but if he can get it he will have to pay freight on it to bring it to Sydney.

There is no harder job in this world than maintaining a dairy seven days a week. Do not brand as a **criminal** the **poor** old quota holder, who worked hard to get it, and works hard to maintain it. The Minister proposes to confiscate it without compensation. Though some farmers in New South Wales think they will enjoy a new quota as a result of the benevolence of this new Government, there is **no** guarantee that they will hold it. The mooted legislation will give the Minister full power, and there is no reference in the Act to the amount of milk. This means that, if he can take it away from my colleagues tonight—as he wants to do—and give it to someone in the electorate of Casino, this time next year he will be able to go back to the electorate of Casino and, without a by your leave, confiscate their quotas.

Mr Durick: That is only fantasy.

Mr BRUXNER: It is not; it is fact, and your constituents, while he is doing this, will be joining the queue. I watch with interest the performance of this **Government**. As I said, I am one who has watched the political pendulum swing for a long while now, and I have taken an active part in politics for the greater part of my adult life. I have lived in a federal and State electorate that were represented by **Labor** but saw the light, **and** came back to Country Party representation. I have not said to one member of the new Government one word of recrimination over the result on 1st May. They have received my congratulations and my offer of co-operation.

I hope that every member of this House would admit that they had access to me in the various ministerial portfolios I held, and that they were treated with courtesy—even though they might not have always achieved what they wanted. That will be my attitude in opposition, but I give this challenge: this Government was elected on a long string of promises; it said that it could back them up; it has made those promises to decent men, women and children, and I shall be here for a long while yet to make sure that supporters of the Government do not break those promises and let down those men, women and children.

Mr STEWART (Canterbury), Minister for Health [8.53]: I join with other honourable members in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. Also, I offer my congratulations to all the other new members who have made their maiden speeches during this debate. I believe that the standard of the maiden speeches augurs well for this session of Parliament, and I certainly wish those members a long and happy time in the House. Perhaps I am not as mean as the honourable member for Tenterfield, who hoped that their stay in the House will be a short one; I hope that they will stay here as long as the honourable member for Tenterfield, who, together with myself and the honourable member for Bankstown, has been a member of this Chamber since 1962.

The honourable member for Tenterfield carried on exactly the same theme as was commenced last night by the honourable member for Burrendong, who said that the Government was doing nothing for the country dwellers. Indeed, I think the honourable member for Burrendong said that His Excellency's Speech contained not one thing that gave any sort of promise, anticipation, benefit or help to country people. I shall quote some excerpts from the Governor's Speech.

In his opening remarks the Governor spoke about unemployment in New South Wales, and about the fact that the Labor Government was pledged to do something to restore some of the full employment that this State enjoyed for many years. Surely there are unemployed people in the Burrendong electorate, and that pledge would apply to his constituents. The Governor then went on to say:

My Government recognizes the fundamental importance of rural industry in the economy and in the balanced development of the whole community. Its aim is to serve all sections of the community wherever they live.

That does not suit the honourable member for Burrendong at all, because he does not want to help the whole community. The party he represents in this Parliament is sectional and parochial, and that is why he says that there is nothing in the Governor's Speech for the country people. His Excellency said also:

My Government proposes to give greater emphasis to regional development and plans to introduce further concessions for decentralised industries.

Despite this, the honourable member for Burrendong says that the Speech contains nothing for the country dweller. The Government has reduced rail fares by 20 per cent. Surely some country people travel by rail, or perhaps only the people who live in the Burrendong electorate do not do so. The Government intends to quadruple the line between Granville and Penrith and between Strathfield and Hornsby; this will be of great benefit to people on the Central Coast and on the Blue Mountains. Surely they would not be considered to be city dwellers. Despite all these things the honourable member for Burrendong talks about there being nothing in the Speech for country people.

The Governor's Speech also says that priority will be given to the interests of consumers. Surely there are some consumers in the country. Or does the honourable member for Burrendong believe that there should be no laws to protect the consumers in both the country and the metropolitan areas. The fact is that this Government is pledged to help, support and assist consumers wherever they might be. The honourable member for Burrendong and the honourable member for **Tenterfield**, who believe that the Governor's Speech shows no concern whatever for country dwellers, should read the part of the Speech that says:

The Government is determined to assist people seeking to buy their own home.

Surely some country people buy their own homes. Surely that is something that will be of assistance to country dwellers. The Governor's Speech also contains these words:

Government guarantees are to be provided to lending institutions to enable first home purchasers to borrow up to 100 per cent of the value of a dwelling.

Surely that will be a benefit to people in Gunnedah, Wellington and **Mudgee**. The Governor's Speech also contains comments on the Government's intentions in the field of ethnic affairs, and says:

It is proposed to establish a Commission for Ethnic Affairs . . .

Mr Stewart]

Are there no ethnic groups in the Burrendong or Tenterfield electorates? Or is it that the honourable members who represent those electorates disregard the people who come to Australia from other countries and need some sort of assistance so that they can assimilate into the community? I think the latter proposition applies.

The Government intends to introduce legislation to make voting at local government elections compulsory. What a great benefit that will be for the people who reside in country electorates. In the field of hospitals and health, I can speak about the construction of community health centres. Does the honourable member for Burrendong believe that the provision of a health centre at Gunnedah is of no improvement, concern or benefit to the people who reside in that area. It is under construction at the moment. Also, the Government proposes to construct hospitals at Shellharbour, Wyong and Pambula. Surely they will be of some benefit to country dwellers. It was intended to build a hospital at Wellington, but because of the cutbacks enforced on this Government by the honourable member's colleagues in Canberra, in the name of economies, a number of hospital constructions are now gravely in doubt. Planning will commence soon on ward construction and refurbishing at Griffith and Casino hospitals.

There has been a report that water charges have already been reduced in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area. Surely that is another matter that is of concern to people in the country areas. Despite this, the honourable member for Burrendong says that there is nothing in the Speech for country dwellers. The Government intends to amend the Public Hospitals Act; this will affect all parts of the State. The Government has already stated that there will be important amendments to the Dairy Industry Authority Act. Surely that will do something for the country people who have been ignored over the years by the Government that was tossed out so unceremoniously on 1st May.

I admit that this did not appear in the Governor's Speech, but yesterday, before the honourable member for Burrendong spoke, the Premier of this State announced the abolition of death duties in certain areas on certain estates. Yet the honourable member for Burrendong had the temerity to say in this Chamber that the Government is offering nothing at all to the country dwellers. I place these facts before honourable members. Surely everyone knows that this is a dishonest approach, and shows a sectional, parochial attitude held by the Country Party in this Chamber. They think only about the superphosphate bounty, beef subsidies, new Mercedes-Benz cars, and shiny tractors. They do not care about the people who live in the country towns. They do not regard town dwellers as country people; they believe that country people have to be on the farm, getting around in elastic-sided boots and big hats. Unless they do this, they are not represented by the honourable member for Burrendong and the honourable member for Tenterfield.

Despite what members of the Country Party in Opposition—a lovely word, and I never tire of saying it—tell us in this House, the Labor Government in New South Wales will serve all sections of the community without fear or favour. We are a real party, a great party, and we do not need band-aids to keep a coalition together in order that we might be able to make some show of unity. We will serve country and city interests alike.

I should like to touch on some matters relating to the portfolio of Health. The first concerns a report in this morning's press of the death of a patient at Nepean District Hospital. The report was to the effect that the stipendiary magistrate who conducted the coroner's inquiry suggested that there should be an investigation of hospital admissions. Already the Health Commission has been asked to provide a comprehensive report on the details of this man's admission to the Nepean District Hospital, and of the events that led to his untimely death.

I am not in a position to give the House any more information than that, except to say that I noticed a reference in the report to the fact that a doctor who gave evidence at the coroner's inquiry said that the man's death was caused by Medibank. **Although** I have no information about what the doctor was implying when he made that statement to the coroner, I am not at **this** stage willing to concede that Medibank would have played any part in the death of this unfortunate person. The hospital has a system for admitting patients, and that system is the same under Medibank as it was under the voluntary health insurance scheme. It will be the same under Medibank Mark **II** which comes into force on 1st October. I do not concede that Medibank would have had any part **in** causing this man's death but, as I say, I have called for a report from the Health Commission and as soon as I have received it I shall make a further statement to the House.

The other matter I want to raise concerns the death of a Mr Robert Smith. The allegation is that he was refused treatment by a South Coast doctor. That is indeed a serious charge, and I have referred it to the Health Commission with a request that it be referred to the Medical Board of New South Wales for investigation by the disciplinary tribunal. I do not attempt to prejudge the issue in any way. I merely say that the Government will leave no stone unturned in inquiring whether this man was denied emergency treatment. Later I shall give the House further information on the matter.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that Medibank has taken up most of my time since I became Minister for Health on 14th May. Perhaps it might now be called muddlebank, repudibank or renegebank. Anyway, it is not the Medibank that was introduced by the **Whitlam Labor** Government on 1st July last year. We now have the ironical situation that the federal Government is imposing a levy of 2.5 per cent on taxable incomes when the parties constituting that Government refused to agree in 1974 to a proposal by the Labor Government that Medibank be financed by a lower levy on incomes. In that year the Liberal-Country party Opposition in the Senate refused to agree to the passage of a bill proposing a levy of 1.35 per cent on incomes. That, I believe, was dealt with separately from the National Health Act, as it was a taxation measure.

The honourable member for **Burwood** spoke this afternoon on the subject of public morality and particularly in political affairs. He began by reciting the ten commandments, yet one **has** the hypocritical spectacle of the party supported by the honourable member refusing a federal Labor Government permission to apply a 1.35 per cent levy, but finding itself able to impose a 2.5 per cent levy after being elected to office.

I do not stand to be corrected on this, for what I say is accurate. The actuarial figures show that if the present federal Government wanted to apply a levy that could be equated with the 1.35 per cent levy proposed in 1974, it would not have to go beyond 1.6 per cent. As the federal Government has exceeded that figure, its levy can be regarded as a super tax applied to the wages of the people. Right from the start of this muddle I said that middle-income families could expect to pay between \$12 and \$15 a week for their health insurance. I was criticized by the press for not knowing the facts and for saying that pensioners and needy people would be inconvenienced by the federal Government's proposals. Yet this week we find that at least the munificent federal Government has decided to exclude from the scheme pensioners who have pensioner medical service entitlement cards. It now appears that it never was the Government's intention to include them, but aged persons, senior citizens, who are receiving more than \$78 a week including their pensions, according to today's news, are to have the 2.5 per cent levy applied to their incomes.

Mr Stewart]

So, when the Liberal-Country **parties** talk about public morality, they are **talking** about taxing pensioners; they are not talking about superphosphate bounties or about a \$65 million subsidy for the beef industry. If honourable members think that when I spoke of persons having to pay between \$12 and \$15 a week for medical insurance my figures were inflated, let me refer them to a letter published in the press yesterday written by Professor Julius Stone, who is Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Law at the University of New South Wales. Formerly he was Challis Professor of International Law and Jurisprudence at the University of Sydney. In that letter he said that despite his education and legal training, he could not understand the pamphlets that have been printed by the federal Government to explain its Medibank scheme. Making calculations based on details given in the Medibank pamphlet, he got the annual contribution for **himself** and his family up to \$880 a year. Under the old **Medibank** scheme he and his family would have paid nothing for medical insurance unless they wanted private hospital cover or wished to make a contribution for Multicover. This means that **middle-income** families will go from paying nothing for their health insurance to paying between \$500 and \$880 a year.

I want to be honest in this matter: Professor **Julius Stone** used the highest of the scales in all categories in making his calculation. However, he would like the Prime Minister to tell him when a ceiling is a ceiling. We understood that there was to be a ceiling on Medibank and a person would not have to pay more than \$300 a year for cover. When members of the Opposition talk about public morality, and when they preach at the Government, they should be reminded of what Mr Don Chipp said on 31st August, 1975, as reported in the *Sunday Telegraph*. He said that the Liberals would kill Medibank. The report was in these terms:

The Liberal-Country Party will dismantle Medibank if elected to Government next year, Mr Don **Chipp** said yesterday.

Mr Chipp, the Shadow Minister for Social Security, said the Opposition would return to a scheme of private health insurance with subsidised contributions for pensioners and low-income earners.

That is just about what will happen on 1st October next. On 2nd September the *Daily Telegraph*, under the heading "Row on Chipp's Medibank Statement", reported:

A spokesman for the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Fraser, said yesterday Medibank had been passed three times by Parliament and had been endorsed by the people of Australia at the general election last year.

Mr Leitch: On a point of order. The Minister appears to be quoting extensively from newspapers. Does he vouch for the authenticity of those reports?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is quoting from press reports which is quite in order. I assume he accepts responsibility for his actions.

Mr STEWART: The *Daily Telegraph* article continued:

A Liberal-National Country Party government will examine the workings of Medibank to see if an improvement can be made to give Australians the best possible health service," the spokesman said.

What humbug and hypocrisy from a man who is now Prime Minister of Australia! What humbug and hypocrisy from members of the Liberal-Country party coalition in this Chamber who lecture the Government on public morality! The honourable member for Burwood even directed such an accusation towards your good self, Mr Speaker. Let us look at what happened to Mr Chipp. He got sacked for telling the truth. When the Right Hon. J. M. Fraser formed his Government in December last year Mr Chipp did not get a guernsey. He missed out because Mr Fraser did not want

in his Cabinet people who told the truth. We all know that the Fraser Government could not possibly govern on truth. Mr Chipp was sacked because he told the truth to the people of Australia when he said that Medibank would be dismantled by a Liberal-National Country party coalition Government in 1976.

What has happened in New South Wales since the Fraser Government came to office? There has been a complete cutback right across the board in all health and hospital programmes. The cuts in capital works programmes in this State for 1976–77 are serious and no new development will be commenced in this period. Over the next twelve months only those projects already commenced will be ongoing. The federal Minister glibly talks about giving the States \$108 million, which is exactly the same amount received last year. It provides nothing for escalation of ongoing costs. The Health Commission and the Government of New South Wales have estimated a 15 per cent loss in the value of that \$108 million allocation. The federal Government has made no allowance whatever for that 15 per cent rise in ongoing costs. The federal Labor Government promised \$650 million over a five-year period for the establishment of health and hospital services in health scarcity need areas throughout Australia. That scheme has been scrapped by the Fraser Government. We have talked about Mr Chipp telling the truth. Let us see what Mr Bruce Lloyd, the Liberal-National Country party spokesman on health had to say in a press statement on 27th November last, right in the middle of the iniquitous lead up to the elections that took place last December. The press statement reads:

"A Liberal and National Country party Government will continue the Community Health Programme, Hospital Development Programme and School Dental Scheme", Bruce Lloyd, Liberal and National Country party spokesman on Health said today.

He was commenting on the false claims by Dr Everingham, Labor's Spokesman on Health, that these programmes would be cut. Mr Lloyd said that the continuation of the programmes was specifically stated in the recently released Liberal and National Country Parties Health Policy.

Mr Lloyd then went on to challenge Dr Everingham to state what a Labor government would do to resolve the conflict with chemists. He repudiated Dr Everingham's statement that there would be cutbacks in community health programmes, the hospital development programme and the school dental scheme, yet in New South Wales we now have instances of a severe cutback in the hospital development programme. What happened to Mr Lloyd? He got the sack. He did not get a guernsey either. The difference is that he was sacked for telling lies. On the one hand Mr Chipp was sacked for telling the truth; on the other hand Mr Lloyd was sacked for telling lies. In the past twelve months the fifty-fifty cost-sharing agreement for public hospitals, originated by Labor, has resulted in New South Wales receiving more money for this purpose than has ever been allocated by a federal government since Federation.

The Fraser Government invalidated the Medibank agreement because the heads of claim in the hospital section were declared invalid. The federal Government is in the process of rewriting a new agreement. The whole of the hospital part of the agreement will be virtually the same with the exception that the offending words will have been removed. However, the medical side of Medibank has been completely altered. Medibank was invalidated on the hospital side but all the federal Government did to that part was to take out a few offending words. This could have been done by a simple amendment. However, having done that and virtually put it back the way it was, the federal Government got stuck into the medical side of the agreement and in the result the middle-income families will have to pay out between \$12 and \$15 a week extra. That is in reality a supertax imposed upon people who can ill afford it.

Mr Stewart]

Mothers, fathers and families who have budgeted for housekeeping and other costs will, from 1st October, have to find an additional \$12 or \$15 a week in order to join the appropriate health funds and protect their families. Under the federal Labor Government New South Wales health services enjoyed great capital development. The Whitlam Government was responsible for accelerating the development of Westmead hospital. Although the New South Wales Liberal-Country party Government was considering its eighth plan for this project, and nothing concrete had been done at Westmead, after the Whitlam Government made \$4 million available for the hospital, its members had to get off their fat bottoms and get stuck into a little bit of planning and decision making. In the result the Westmead complex is now well under way.

Let us consider what happened at Campbelltown. The Whitlam Government gave the former New South Wales Government a grant for Campbelltown. No planning had taken place for that hospital but when the money came along planning commenced immediately. I pay tribute to the former Minister for Health who obviously had to make some quick decisions, and did so. I pay tribute also to the staff of the Health Commission who got stuck into planning Campbelltown hospital and had steel and bricks out of the ground within six months. The Health Commission regards that as a world record in hospital planning and construction. It is expected that the Campbelltown hospital will open in July of next year. It will be one of the quickest hospital constructions that has ever occurred in New South Wales and has probably broken a world record.

The federal Labor Government provided money for planning hospital facilities at Liverpool, Gosford, Shellharbour, Mount Druitt and others. It provided \$44.6 million for the development of New South Wales community health programmes over the three financial years ending in June, 1974, June, 1975, and June, 1976. That sort of thing had never been seen before, and certainly nothing like that was ever granted by a Liberal-Country party Government in Canberra. I remind members opposite that I am speaking about grants made by the Whitlam Labor Government which is said to have done nothing for country people because it did not grant a beef subsidy and it took away the superphosphate bounty. The Whitlam Government provided money for innumerable improvements and extensions throughout the State's hospital system. All of these things were done through funds provided by federal Labor or in compliance with federal Labor's total plan.

When the new Fraser Government came to office, full of morality and with the intention of saving everybody, the New South Wales hospital development programme allocation for 1976–1977 was reduced from \$37.7 million to \$36 million. Honourable members might say that that does not seem to be much but one should remember that a 15 per cent loss had to be absorbed because of escalation of ongoing costs. New South Wales has been placed in an invidious position in that it has embarked upon a development programme which cannot be maintained following the reductions made by the Fraser Government.

Let us consider also community health. The federal Government has talked about open-ended agreements in regard to Medibank but it reduced the New South Wales community health programme related to costs in May of this year from an estimated ongoing commitment of \$41.7 million to \$29.4 million—a short fall of \$12.3 million, or more than 30 per cent of the ongoing programme. That is what we got from the Fraser Government. This short fall excludes wage indexation and expected cost escalations.

In addition to having to cut back in that area, we have had an embargo on the filling of vacant positions on the community health programme. The honourable member for Burrendong claims that the Government will not do anything for country

people. The fact is that a magnificent health facility has been planned for **his** electorate. However, we are now in the situation where we might not be able to employ anyone in Burrendong because of the cutbacks forced on us by the Fraser-led Government. Also, we shall not be able to commence any new services. We have had to curtail the domiciliary paramedical scheme under which services such as physiotherapy, occupational therapy, chiropody and social work were to be made available to citizens, particularly the elderly. It is difficult to tell the difference between the Country Party and the National Country Party—one of them has had a band-aid put on it. The Labor Party is concerned about people no matter where they reside. I want to throw back in the teeth of the Opposition the claim made by the Opposition that the Labor Government of New South Wales will ignore country people: the Labor Party is concerned about people and it has always been concerned about them.

The performance of the Whitlam Labor Government during its three years in office in Canberra indicated its great concern for the people, especially those in areas that had been ignored all those years by former Liberal-Country party governments. I commend the Government of New South Wales, and I commend the Premier for the splendid speech he prepared for the Parliament, outlining the programme he has promised for the benefit of the people of New South Wales. The honourable member for Tenterfield referred to the promises and policies that Labor enunciated prior to the election. I remind the Opposition that this Government has a mandate from the people of New South Wales to implement all those policies—including amendments to the Dairy Industry Act.

Mr MASON (Dubbo) [9.22]: I join with other honourable members who have paid tribute to the honourable members who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate also those other honourable members who have made their maiden speeches in this debate. I am sure that we listened with a great deal of interest to the contributions made by the new members of this House. I express to all those honourable members the hope that they will find that by their membership of the Legislative Assembly they will be able to serve not only the people of their electorates but also people throughout New South Wales and Australia. I propose to direct my remarks tonight to a somewhat different subject than most of those raised by other honourable members in this debate. One of the jokes that we hear repeated round the State by some honourable members is that when His Excellency, by tradition, opens the Parliament he salutes the members of the Legislative Council and says "Honourable members of the Legislative Council"; then he looks at those of us who represent this august House and says, "Members of the Legislative Assembly". It has been said many times that it is obvious that there is no honour among members of the Legislative Assembly.

In raising this matter tonight I hope to introduce a topic that will be seen not to be political in its content but one of concern to all those who take their election as a member of Parliament seriously. Many parliaments throughout the Commonwealth have addressed themselves to the question of the role of their members. The Canadian Government appointed a committee that prepared a Green Paper on this subject. That committee had some important things to say about a member of Parliament. For instance, it said:

A member of Parliament is a trustee of public confidence and must perform and appear to perform his duties in a manner reflecting the highest degree of concern for public interest. Moreover, a member of Parliament must at all times ensure that his actions do not detract from the dignity of Parliament and the respect and confidence which society places in it. Members of Parliament should make every reasonable effort to avoid even the

appearance of those conflicts of interest which are not inherent in a representative democracy.

The Green Paper goes on to raise some tremendously important and, I believe, critical questions for members of Parliament. Some of these questions concern a member's involvement in the affairs of Parliament, the use of their own time and effort and how they might be affected by their membership of Parliament. Surely every member of this Parliament, no matter his political persuasion, will avow that he believes that we should have open, responsible and honest government. Moreover, this must not only appear to be so, it must also be so. I believe that we are our own worst enemies. Nowhere is the politician and the member of Parliament more vilified than in this House. One only has to listen to the interjections that flow from side to side—and they do not come from one side only. We have in this House, where all personal protection is gone, the idea that it is clever to destroy a member by rumour, innuendo, the use of the half-truth, the word that is thrown across the Chamber, the things that roll so easily off the tongue and the things that can be said irresponsibly and in respect of which a member can seldom be brought to account.

If we are going to take our position seriously, if we wish to take the word politician out of the dirty-word class and give it some dignity and meaning in the community, we must give the lead and set the example. I decided to speak along these lines some weeks ago, and it is completely fortuitous that we have seen the events of the past few days. We ought to remember that when we challenge one another—as we have seen in the past few days—the result is that every member of this House is downgraded. It is not just the members who are attacked but everyone of us is put down another slot in the view of so many people outside the Chamber—those who look at us and say, "Yes, there they are. They are interested in their own personal gain; they are not really interested in the affairs of state." How many times in this Chamber have we seen honourable members from both sides wanting to debate policies and advance arguments that have been prepared after a lot of research and concern only to see their contribution attacked. This is done not at the level of policies or on the strength of arguments but on the basis of an attack on the member. That is the lowest form of argument that can possibly be used in any sort of debate, and it is the one that seems to be retreated to in this House all too often. There seems to be an attitude of: do not attack what is said; attack the person advancing the argument. I make a plea to the members of this Parliament to set an example and to think seriously before they let the words trip off their lips.

Honourable members should realize that quick, irresponsible statements in the House denigrate the office of member of Parliament. I take the opportunity to make some suggestions about matters other than the essential contribution that honourable members should make. If members of Parliament are to be held by the community in the esteem to which we all aspire, consideration should be given to the recompense, accommodation, secretarial assistance and conditions under which members of Parliament work. Honourable members should be recompensed in a way that enables them to be fulltime members and independent. Not everyone accepts that view. I was intrigued to read, in a debate that took place in the House of Commons on the role of the member—the subject I am seeking to debate tonight—that a former Minister of the British House of Commons, a Mr Van Straubenzee, said:

I end by saying that I personally attach the greatest importance to hon. members having outside interests. I think that it is an important part of the independence of members of this House . . . The problem of this House is that members are becoming increasingly dependent on their salaries . . . that is not good for parliamentary democracy.

That is what that Minister thought. I find myself in complete opposition to his point of view. I believe that if honourable members are to make a real contribution to improving the opinion most people hold about members of Parliament the recompense for members must be set at a level that will make the member secure in his position and remove him from temptations that may be placed in his way. If that were done persons from every walk of life would seek to enter Parliament. Parliament would not be the preserve of either the poor or the wealthy classes. Service in the Parliament would become a vocation to which people from all walks of life would aspire.

One of the problems is that members of Parliament are much too apologetic about themselves. Within days of becoming Premier, no doubt in the belief that the decision would have some political and electoral appeal, the Premier said that he did not intend to allow the construction of the new State Parliament House to continue. What a tragedy it would be if, in the belief that some cheap political advantage could be gained, improved facilities for members are once more set aside. That has happened time after time in the long history of the Parliament of New South Wales which is the mother of Parliaments in Australia.

An important document that honourable members should carefully study is the report of the Remuneration Tribunal of the federal Parliament which has recently been tabled. I am delighted to say that it contains an indication that members of the tribunal are beginning to see what I have been trying to suggest—that the benefits and privileges of members have to be lifted to a new level. The work undertaken by members ought to be seen as being worthy of a just reward. If the standing in the community of members of Parliament is to be lifted to a satisfactory level that sort of thing must be done. I deplore the action of the Premier in suggesting that the new Parliament House building and other facilities should be set aside in what appears to be, once more, a downgrading of the role of the member of Parliament.

Mr Brereton: It was the correct decision.

Mr MASON: The honourable member for Heffron had better be careful of what he says. I am talking about members of Parliament elevating their standards. I hope that the honourable member will not interrupt me or lead me astray. Honourable members should resist that sort of temptation. I hope that the honourable member for Heffron will listen carefully to what I have to say. The Parliament must look at the need for a code of ethics and conduct. Serious consideration should be given to having a register of interests and assets of members. We in this Parliament lag a long way behind most parliaments in this regard. Some weeks ago when I began to research this matter I found that in 1973 our colleagues in the Victorian Parliament set up a select committee to look at this issue. That committee brought forward a most telling code for members. The federal Parliament set up a joint committee of both Houses to look at the whole question. The report of that select committee is also a worthwhile document. Both documents are well worth reading. This matter of ethics is much before parliaments in New Zealand and in many other countries.

I was interested to read in the policy statement of Mr Carter, a candidate for the presidency of the United States of America, where they are still reeling from the problems of Watergate, that one of the things that must be done, if confidence in members of Parliament is to be restored, and if the member is to be held in the esteem he deserves, is to look again at the code of ethics and the disclosure of interests and assets. There will be differences of opinion about that. Some will think that it is full of dangers and an invasion of privacy. I found myself persuaded to this point of

view by a book *Honourable Members* by Peter G. Richards, in which this passage appeared:

If members manage their private affairs discreetly, and keep on good terms with their sources of income, embarrassing publicity will be avoided. The influence of money in politics will not be terminated by regulation, but that is no reason why regulations should not be used to make underhand dealings more difficult. It is not enough that the conduct of public men should be knowable; it is important also that it should be seen to be honourable. Thus the frank declaration of members' interests is in the public interest.

I believe that the author is absolutely correct on that point. No action of this Parliament or any other will wipe out those possibly finding their way into our midst who cannot resist temptation. No mesh in the nets of tax collectors has ever been small enough to catch all who seek to avoid tax. In the long run we must depend upon the judgment, honour and integrity of the individual but—and it is an important but—all the doubts and fears held by honourable members about this procedure must not induce them to refrain from proceeding with the introduction of a code of ethics for members and some form of register of interests. The advantages far outweigh the disadvantages.

Many of us heard what the Premier said in the course of an answer in Parliament today about his agreement on this approach. I appeal to the Premier—if he is in earnest about this matter—instead of going ahead quickly to meet an urgent situation, and bringing forth some rules or regulations, to approach this matter in a bipartisan way. We should have a select committee of this Parliament to examine the matter in a non-political light. Because of all the problems that are inherent in it and the differences of opinion that there will be—because not all members will agree with what I am saying—this is a matter that cries out for a select committee that can really get on to the job.

If honourable members wish this House to be free of much of the mud slinging that goes on, to lift electioneering above rumour and innuendo and to elevate debate in this House to the level where it is concerned with policy and not personality, I call upon them to ask for the action that I have suggested—that we set up a code of ethics and have some sort of register of interests of members of Parliament.

The next matter that I shall deal with follows on from what I have been saying. I was deeply disturbed when I heard that the Minister for Lands had announced that the Government had decided to alter the auction system of disposing of Crown land in this State. That decision was a hasty one that will be regretted not only by the Minister but also by all officers of the Department of Lands. By abandoning the public auction system and seeking a quick and ready answer to what appears to be a difficult problem—inflated land prices and the Crown's involvement in it—he has taken out of the public arena and placed behind closed doors the exchange of money between officers of the Crown and members of the public. There is nothing more dangerous than that. It will place officers of the Department of Lands in an intolerable position. They will be subject to criticism and reflection and this reflection will extend to the Minister and the Government, whoever they might happen to be. It will leave them wide open to charges of corruption.

I ask the Minister for Lands to think far more seriously about this matter than he has done. No member of this House is unconcerned about steeply rising land prices, but to suggest seriously that the tiny amount of Crown land involved—because it is tiny compared to all the land that changes hands even in the city of Sydney—can possibly affect land prices generally is ludicrous in the extreme. What the Minister has done in attempting to come to grips with inflated land prices has been

to tie himself up to a monster, and he will regret it. There will always be room for innuendos and the suggestion of preference to members of his party, members of **Labor** leagues or friends of officers of the Department of Lands. When a tender system for the sale of valuable blocks of land worth \$20,000 to \$30,000 is altered so that a decision on the disposal of Crown land is to be made behind closed doors and without public knowledge, all the nasty things that people can say will be said. I am distressed that the Minister has taken this action. I ask him to think again about it.

One other matter that I wanted to refer to is the marketing of primary products, which was dealt with in the Governor's Speech. The Premier and the Minister for Consumer Affairs also have said that they are deeply concerned about the consumers of this State. We have just heard from the Minister for Health reassurances that the Government is concerned about the welfare of residents in country districts. I ask that all the Ministers concerned examine closely the marketing of primary products. It cries out for all members of Parliament to rise above seeking to gain political advantage and to try to come to grips with the terrible problems confronting primary producers. The producers of so many primary products are suffering a terrible recession and not getting a fair return for their products. Many are not even getting a return of the outlay that they have to make to produce their product. At the other end of the chain of the marketing of primary products stands the consumer. Too often he is not getting the benefit of the low prices paid to the producer. That is the tragedy of the situation. If the ill fortune of the producer resulted in cheaper prices and products for the consumer, it would be a different matter; but that is not the situation. Let me give an example from my own electorate.

At Narromine in my electorate the best oranges in Australia are produced. No one can argue with that. It is unfortunate that there are not more of them produced. The quality is beyond compare. The oranges are so large and of such fine quality that on the average they go sixty or seventy to the carton. The producer receives \$2 for a carton of oranges sent to the Sydney market. The carton costs 30c and transporting the fruit to the market costs 20c. A person who goes to a retail shop in the suburbs to buy those oranges would be extremely fortunate if he could buy a carton for \$10 or \$12. What is taking place in the marketing of primary products that is causing such a ridiculous situation? The producer gets \$2 and the consumer pays \$12. One can only speculate that there must be middlemen and others who get the benefit of the difference of \$10. A new insight and approach is needed to the whole question of marketing of primary products. Why, for instance, has it been necessary to spend millions of dollars to build a huge market complex in this city?

Marketing procedures have added tremendously to the cost structure. Transporting fruit and its necessary handling have placed an intolerable burden on the cost of the product. Responsible agents, who exist to represent the interests of both producer and consumer, should adopt marketing procedures that do not require the display of every individual piece of fruit. I ask all honourable members—not just the Government and its Ministers—to consider this problem. If New South Wales is to see progress, have security and create goodwill, as all honourable members would wish, it will not be through their trying to make political capital but by acting as reasonable men, looking seriously at problems and dedicating themselves to the welfare of the people. If we do that it will enhance each one of us in the eyes of our fellow members and of our constituents. We shall go down in history as parliamentarians who took their task responsibly and seriously.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Maher.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr Gordon, at 9.52 p.m.
