

## Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 8 September, 1976

---

Petitions—Questions without Notice—Precedence of Business—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Eighth Day's Debate)—Ombudsman (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Public Works and Other Acts (Interest Rates) Amendment Bill (Int.)—Centenary Celebration (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Young Men's Christian Association of Sydney Incorporation (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Church of England Trust Property (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Statute Law Revision Bill (Int.)—Interpretation (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Administrative Changes Bill (Int.)—Youth and Community Services (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Technical and Further Education (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Department of Agriculture (Repeal) Bill (Int.)—Miscellaneous Acts (Transport Legislation) Amendment Bill (Int.)—Constitution (Ministers of the Crown) Amendment Bill (Int.)—Ministers of the Crown (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Acts Reprinting (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Restraints of Trade Bill (Int.)—Industrial Arbitration (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Miscellaneous Acts (Inspectors) Amendment Bill (Int.)—Wheat Industry Stabilisation (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Teaching Service (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations of N.S.W. Incorporation Bill (Int.)—Friendly Societies (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Prices Regulations (Amendment) Bill (Int.)—Allocation of Time for Discussion—Adjournment (Lyne Park, Rose Bay)—Questions upon Notice.

---

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

Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

### PETITIONS

The Clerk announced that the following petitions had been lodged for presentation and that copies would be referred to the appropriate Ministers:

#### Sunday Hotel Trading

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

- (1) A referendum on Sunday Trading in hotels was held in New South Wales in the year 1969 which showed an overwhelming majority voting against Sunday Trading in hotels.
- (2) It is considered by the undersigned that any changes in the law allowing extension of Sunday Trading in liquor in hotels or in any shop selling liquor will increase the acknowledged evils associated with the consumption of liquor including particularly danger in road travel and in crime, and in damage done to domestic life of wife, husband and children in **many** cases.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House:

- (1) Will not pass any legislation which will allow any extension of Sunday Trading in liquor in hotels or in any other place where the sale of liquor is permitted.
- (2) If nevertheless it is intended to submit legislation to the House this should not be done until a further Referendum is held to ascertain the wishes of the people as was previously held and which as stated showed an overwhelming majority against such legislation.

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

Petitions, lodged by Mr Crabtree, Mr Lewis, Mr Mackie and Mr Park, received.

#### Gambling Casinos

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 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.

Petitions, lodged by Mr Crabtree, Mr Leitch, Mr Lewis and Mr Mackie, received.

#### Abortion Laws

The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of New South Wales respectfully sheweth:

- (1) That as taxpayers we object to the use of funds for abortions under the guise of health payments and/or benefits.
- (2) That no pressure should be brought to bear to hinder the prosecution of those participating in criminal abortion.

Your Petitioners humbly pray that the Honourable House takes such steps through the appropriate channels to stop the misuse of taxpayers money and to ensure that the law prohibiting abortion in New South Wales be properly enforced.

Petition, lodged by Mr Paciuolo, received.

High School for East Concord

The petition of certain citizens of New South **Wales** respectfully **sheweth**:

That a need exists for the construction, without delay, of a comprehensive High School in Stanley Street, Concord, on land acquired a number of years ago for such a purpose.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will construct a comprehensive High School in Stanley Street, East Concord, as a matter of urgency.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Maher, received.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

**OUTDOOR RESTAURANTS**

Mr ROZZOLI: My question without notice is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier representing in this House the Minister for Planning and Environment. Is it a fact that restaurants in Sydney have improved greatly in recent years? Does Sydney have too few outdoor restaurants despite the fact that it is well suited for this type of activity? Will the Minister request his colleague to examine city and suburbs planning ordinances with a view to removing any impediment to the establishment of these colourful and attractive additions to our way of life?

Mr HAIGH: The lack of outdoor restaurants has been brought to my attention. Both the Minister and the Government are concerned to see that sufficient outdoor restaurants are established for the public. I shall certainly refer this question to the Minister and give the honourable member and the House a more detailed reply as soon as possible.

**RANDWICK PLANNING SCHEME**

Mr CLEARY: My question without notice is directed to the Minister Assisting the Premier representing in this House the Minister for Planning and Environment. Is the Minister aware of the long time it has taken for the preparation and prescription of a planning scheme for the Randwick municipality? Is there deep public concern at the fact that the planning scheme has taken so many years to develop? Are residents in the vicinity of an area known as the Gully deeply concerned at the suggestion that high-rise development applications are pending in respect of this area? Will the Minister advise what progress has been made, when it is expected that this scheme will be prescribed and whether that planning scheme will restrict completely high-rise development of any kind in the area known as the Gully?

Mr HAIGH: I am aware of the deep concern of the honourable member and residents of the Randwick municipality about the long delay in the preparation and prescription of a town planning scheme for Randwick. It is expected that this scheme will be prepared and ready to be prescribed towards the end of this year or early next year. If it is not prescribed until January next year, it will have been fourteen years since its preparation was first begun by the Randwick council. As a matter of fact, it is about eleven years since the council submitted the scheme to the State Planning

Authority, which has been replaced by the Planning and Environment Commission. It appears that some marked delay has occurred both in the State Planning Authority and the commission in getting the scheme to a stage to enable it to be prescribed. Further, this delay has resulted in the ratepayers of the Randwick municipality having to pay no less than \$500,000 by way of planning proposals and propositions that have been put inadequately before the State Planning Authority.

I am aware of the deep concern that has been shown by the honourable member for Coogee about certain proposals for high-rise developments in the Glebe Gully area. I compliment the honourable member on his zeal and concern for the welfare of the people of his electorate and his continued expression 'on their behalf that high-rise development is not appropriate in that area. Not a month has gone by without the honourable member for Coogee inquiring about the plan and asking for it to be submitted. For these reasons the Minister has looked upon this as an urgent matter and has called on the Planning and Environment Commission to devote time to the task so that the plan may be prescribed at an earlier date than originally suggested.

#### COUNTRY PARKS AND RESERVES

Mr BRUXNER: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Lands. I ask the Minister whether he advised honourable members representing country electorates, by letter dated 4th August, of a Cabinet decision to discontinue payment of a special allocation of funds from his department to trustees of parks and reserves in country areas on the recommendation of the local member. Will the Minister advise whether that action was recommended by Government members representing country electorates? Is the Minister aware that in many instances it was the only means whereby trustees of parks and reserves in small centres were able to obtain recognition of their needs for improvements to grounds? Will the Minister advise whether funds will still be available from his department for this purpose? If so, what will be the method of application for, and distribution of, these funds?

Mr CRABTREE: I thank the honourable member for Tenterfield for being of such great assistance in asking this question. I thought the Leader of the Country Party would have raised the matter. It is not true that members received a letter from me saying that special allowances were to be discontinued. The letter referred to special electorate allowances. The Leader of the Country Party has been vocal about this matter in country areas and that is why I thought he would have asked this question a fortnight ago. I decided, and my colleagues agreed with me, to discontinue the annual allowance of \$500 to country members for distribution by them to park trustees. I refute the claims of the honourable member for Tenterfield and the Leader of the Country Party that there will be any drop in financial assistance for the development and maintenance of parks and reserves in country areas. In fact the Government's programme that I have approved will be a more effective way of helping to solve the problems of local groups responsible for the management of parks. I am not interested in the parish-pump politics in which members of the Country Party indulge. Every country electorate will benefit in turn under the revised system. The allowance to country members accounted for only about \$16,000 out of the total expenditure by the State of almost \$3 million on parks and reserves in New South Wales during 1975-1976. In future that \$16,000 will not be dribbled out in sums of \$50 and \$100. I shall make sure that the money is spent efficiently and on substantive projects.

**[Interruption]**

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

Mr CRABTREE: The old system was introduced at a time when park management in New South Wales was conducted on an *ad hoc* basis. Today the Government has a highly sophisticated system of park management, both at local and State level. No wonder the honourable member for Wollondilly hangs his head in shame. Naturally we do not expect the Leader of the Country Party and some of his colleagues to understand what I have said. It was obvious from a file I had before me the other day that the Leader of the Country Party did not even understand the old system that he has been so vocal in defending in country areas. Only recently the Deputy Leader of the Country Party applied for assistance for a community group in his electorate that was not eligible to receive that form of assistance. Yet, honourable members opposite run around the State criticizing an efficient government. Honourable members will be pleased to know that while I am Minister for Lands any money spent on parks and reserves will be used effectively. It is obvious that those who are directly involved in the management of parks and reserves have welcomed the approach of the **Wran** Government. Only yesterday I received a letter from the secretary of the Croppa Creek Hall Committee.

Mr Doyle: Do you know where it is?

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

Mr CRABTREE: Of course the Liberal Party would not know where it is, and I do not think the Country Party would either. Instead of adopting a critical approach the committee has thanked me for the contribution of \$4,700 for improvements to the hall and surrounding recreation areas. This is only one of many letters of congratulation that I can produce to this House in which the Government has been thanked for its progressive approach to the development of parks.

#### APPRENTICES

Mr RYAN: My question is directed to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy. Is it a fact that, due to the upsurge in national unemployment, many trade apprentices have had their apprenticeships interrupted? Is it feasible for technical colleges to convert the trade courses of the people affected from part-time courses into full-time academic courses combined with a short practical skills course? Could such a scheme include school-leavers who are unable to obtain employment in trades? Could an approach be made to the federal Government for students enrolled in full-time trade courses that involve the acquiring of practical skills, to become eligible automatically for unemployment benefits while they are properly pursuing their studies?

Mr HILLS: The Government is concerned about the large number of apprentices who are unemployed. Unfortunately, because of the laxity of the previous Government in exercising the control which exists under the apprenticeship legislation to ensure that employers notify the department, and particularly the director of apprentices, of the fact that they have been forced to lay off apprentices, we have no accurate up-to-date figure of the number of apprentices who are unemployed. Last week I was obliged to place an advertisement in the press seeking information from apprentices who are unemployed so that we can properly assess the problem. I am sure that all honourable members are aware that there has been a serious downturn in the building industry and this would mean that a large number of apprentices would be unemployed in that field. In fact, the Building Workers Industrial Union claims that some 1 200 apprentices in the building industry are unemployed. The department's view is that the figure is

probably somewhere in the vicinity of 800. However, because of the laxity of the previous Government in enforcing the legislation which it brought into this Parliament —

Sir Eric Willis: You are reflecting on public servants.

Mr HILLS: I am not reflecting on public servants.

Sir Eric Willis: You are.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HILLS: I am reflecting upon the honourable gentleman who previously held this portfolio, namely, the Hon. F. M. Hewitt, who was formerly a member in another place. The present Government has to overcome that situation. The honourable member for Hurstville points up a serious problem. It will be necessary for us to ensure that these people, if possible, complete their apprenticeships. It might interest honourable members on the other side of the House to know that there was a turndown in the number of apprentices who began training during the past two years. The peak was reached in 1973–1974, when about 15 300 apprentices began their training. In 1974–1975 the figure dropped to 13 800 and in 1975–1976 it declined even further, to 11 400. From these figures it will be seen that the number of apprentices is continuing to decrease and this means that in future there will be a shortage of skilled personnel.

This year there is the added problem that it is possible that many of the young men now out of work will be lost for all time to industry. What the Government aims to do is to identify the problem by getting the people concerned to indicate that they are unemployed. Then we will attempt to place them with an employer who may be short of labour, or to ensure that they continue their technical training. It may be possible to take that time into account as part of their training.

The honourable member asks whether the matter has been raised at a federal level. Yes, last Friday in Adelaide I raised it at the Labor Ministers' meeting which was chaired by the Hon. A. A. Street, representing the Commonwealth Government. I said to him that no longer was the Commonwealth Government or the supporters of the Liberal and Country parties calling these young people dole bludgers. That tag was given to them by supporters of those who are now on the Opposition benches and I am sure that they must hold their heads in shame over their criticism of these young people who are anxious to gain employment and to make a worthwhile contribution to industry.

At that meeting we put forward also a proposal that the Commonwealth should provide a subsistence allowance to young people so that we may be able to take them into our technical colleges to receive full-time training in, say, the first year of their apprenticeship. In their second year they would be much better equipped to go into industry. The new employer would not be losing their time as he would if they were attending technical college one day a week. The matter has been discussed already at government level. I have been in touch with my colleague the Minister for Education through correspondence, and I am conferring with his officials who are members of the apprenticeship council. I should hope that when Ministers for Labor are brought together again on 12th November in Melbourne—the result of a request of mine agreed to by all the Ministers—under the chairmanship of the Hon. A. A. Street the Commonwealth will react favourably to the proposition and that funds will be forthcoming to ensure that these people are paid a subsistence allowance during their period of training.

## SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr McDONALD: I wish to direct a question without notice to the Premier. Is it a fact that when the Premier was Leader of the Opposition, in a debate in this House on 2nd September, 1975, on small business enterprises he said: "Not even . . . . the unhappy condition of small businesses in New South Wales is due to inflation and the high wage structure. On the contrary, State taxes are the major burden upon those who conduct small businesses."? Did the then Leader of the Opposition say also, "Relief in a real sense is in the State Government's hands."? Is it a fact that at that time he urged the Government to review the incidence of payroll tax, land tax, petrol tax, workers' compensation premiums and related discounts and other State and local government taxes and charges applicable to small business enterprises? Now that the former Leader of the Opposition is Premier, will he state clearly to the House that his attitude towards and concern for small businesses has not altered in a year and that he has not resiled from the position he was then urging? Further, will the Premier immediately implement the review of State taxes that he sought on 2nd September, 1975?

Mr WRAN: It is most rewarding to see a member of such relatively new standing in the House applying himself to some of the better speeches that were made in the past twelve months.

Mr Doyle: This twelve months.

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

Mr WRAN: I could not vouch for the accuracy of the observation in respect of 2nd September, 1975, but all the sentiments that were expressed last year were true then and they are true now. It will please the honourable member for Kirribilli to know that although the outgoing Government, if I may quote the words of the Leader of the Opposition, left the cupboard bare, in recent times **the Government—**

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr WRAN: He might be addicted to something. The honourable member for Kirribilli will be pleased to know that in the past few weeks the Government has been conferring with representatives of small businesses with a view to giving some teeth to the concept of a small business advisory council, which will assist small business by means of Government guarantees and Government-sponsored loans, and generally to review the serious difficulties of small businesses in Australia. Their importance as part of the industrial and commercial field cannot be overestimated, for 40 per cent of the work force in Australia is employed in small businesses with an annual turnover of \$1 million or less. Proprietors of small businesses can take comfort from the Government's plans to solve their present problems, which are probably greater than those being experienced by any other section of the business community.

## LABELLING OF FOOD INGREDIENTS

Mr O'CONNELL: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Health. Are artificial colourings, flavourings, preservatives and thickening agents being commonly used in foodstuffs these days? Will the Minister take action to make it

mandatory that the known contents of such foodstuffs are displayed prominently on the label?

Mr STEWART: The answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is yes, artificial colourings, flavourings, preservatives and thickening agents are commonly used in foodstuffs on sale at the present time. As to the second part of his question, I should like to make a few comments. Generally speaking, where artificial colouring or flavouring is added, such additives must be shown on the label in accordance with regulation 3 of the Pure Food Act dealing with flavouring and colouring. Where preservatives are added the label of the package of such food must acknowledge that preservatives have been added. This is required under regulation 2 of the Pure Food Act. Where a food contains anti-oxidants which are added to prevent food becoming rancid, or to slow the rate of deterioration in this way, the addition of such anti-oxidants must be shown on the label in accordance with regulation 2A of the Pure Food Act. I add that only specific colouring agents and other agents which I have dealt with, as determined by the National Health and Medical Research Council, can be added to foods. These are under constant review.

The honourable member referred also to gelling agents. These are thickeners and, in general, their use is required to be declared on the labels of standardized foods such as thickened creams, yoghurts, jams and sauces, because the standard for the food prescribes what gelling agent may be used or whether any may be used. Gravy and soup mixes are nonstandardized foods and for them the list of ingredients is included on the label. The gelling agents are among these ingredients. Ingredient labelling of all foods is currently under consideration by the food standards committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

#### ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

Sir ERIC WILLIS: Has the Premier announced the Government's intention to establish an ethnic affairs commission presided over by a full-time commissioner? Has the chairman of the interim committee of the consultative council on ethnic affairs expressed the view that this commissioner should be a person of migrant background? Will the Premier give an assurance that before making any appointment he will give every consideration to this viewpoint, and will he give an assurance also that this position will not be what is often described as a job for the boys? In particular, will he put an end to current rumours that either Mr Geoff Cahill or Mr Jim Speigelman will be appointed to this position?

Mr WRAN: I think it is a great pity really that the Leader of the Opposition has decided to use such an important community activity as the proposed ethnic affairs communities council to denigrate two talented and capable men. Apart from Mr Speigelman's great contribution to the Department of the Media, it has been mooted recently that he will become a member of the Australian Law Reform Commission. Before that, of course, he gained the odd university medal in arts and law and cleaned up all the academic challenges with which he was confronted. The Leader of the Opposition would do well not to besmirch the reputation of an honourable and reputable Australian.

I can understand the Leader of the Opposition flinching every time the name of Geoffrey Cahill is mentioned, because Mr Cahill played a very important and leading role in deposing the Leader of the Opposition from the Premiership of New South Wales, and in bringing sanity back into the political life of this community by assisting the present Government to get into office. When one starts to speak of jobs for the boys—and this is really the little bit of mud that the Leader of the Opposition

is trailing his coat through in his question—it is a great shame that the Leader of the Opposition should endeavour either to judge or prejudge people of capacity, talent and reputation as he has chosen to do.

If one thinks of jobs for the boys, one does not have to look far beyond the nominations and the appointments made by the previous Government. For instance, who is the president of the Publications Classification Board of New South Wales? Of course, the Leader of the Opposition knows it is Mr John Atwill, the federal president of the Liberal Party of Australia. One does not have to look far back to the time when these benches were graced by a Minister for Public Works who was then the honourable member for Armidale. He is now the Agent-General in London. In case there is any anticipation rising in the breasts of honourable members opposite, we shall not be doing them the favour that they did for our former colleague, Mr Abram Landa, who was the honourable member for Bondi.

Mr Bruxner: What about Pat Buckley?

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

Mr WRAN: Time will not permit me to go through the list of jobs for the boys that I have here; I shall refer to only the contemporary and more famous people. I ask honourable members, who was the Leader of the Opposition who sat in the very place occupied by the honourable gentleman who has asked this question and was given a job for the boys? Of course, I refer to Mr Vernon Treatt, who was appointed chief commissioner of the Sydney city council, and later chairman of the Local Government Boundaries Commission.

Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I should like to say that each of those gentlemen, including Sir Davis Hughes the present Agent-General in London, performed his task and duties competently and properly. If the test for appointment is talent and capacity, this Government will not be deterred because of any present or former political allegiance that a person might hold or have held. We do not intend to be as parochial as the Leader of the Opposition, and we do not intend to be as inaccurate. If he had looked into the question he asked, he would have discovered that Jim Speigelman was born in Europe and came to Australia as a child of a migrant family at a very early age.

It is true that the Government intends to constitute an Ethnic Affairs Commission in the next few months. If either of the gentlemen mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, in that somewhat pejorative way for which he is renowned, offers his capacities and talents, they will be considered together with those of any other persons offering their services. But one thing that will not disqualify them is that they are or have been members of Australia's greatest political party.

#### FLOOD MITIGATION

Mr JONES: My question without notice is directed to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing. Is the Minister in a position to announce the State Government's allocations for flood mitigation programmes this financial year, particularly in the Hunter Valley?

Mr FERGUSON: I take this opportunity of congratulating the honourable member for Waratah on the interest he has displayed in flood mitigation, not only in the Hunter Valley but indeed on the north and south coasts of this State. I am in a position to announce the State Government's allocations for flood mitigation for the financial year 1976–77. The allocation is \$2.5 million, and it is based on a contribution of

two-thirds by the State Government and one-third by the flood mitigation councils. To show the Labor Party's impartiality—which is obvious anyway—I shall read out a list of the rivers for which provision is being made, and the amounts allotted to them. It sounds like a list of Country Party seats. The first is the Tweed River, for which we propose to allot \$100,000. The others are the Richmond River, \$225,000; the Clarence River, \$730,000; the Maclean River, \$380,000; the Hastings River, \$180,000; and, to be fair, we propose to allot \$668,000 for the Hunter River.

We propose to make other contributions, but I just want to point out that members of the Country Party, who see fit to attack the Labor Party for what they say is a failure to attend to the needs of country areas, should be reminded that the North Coast of New South Wales is represented in the federal Parliament by the Deputy Prime Minister, the Rt Hon. J. D. Anthony, and every other federal seat coming down the coast is held by the Country Party. Despite that fact, the State Government has had no indication from the federal Government of what amount it proposes to contribute towards flood mitigation programmes in the next five years. It ill behoves members of the Country Party to criticize the Labor Government of New South Wales, for it has recognized the necessity for flood mitigation. Members of the Country Party should speak out in the councils of that party. They should stand up their own federal leader, the Deputy Prime Minister, and all other federal Country Party representatives, telling them that they have a responsibility to contribute to flood mitigation on the North Coast of New South Wales.

#### NUCLEAR-POWERED WARSHIPS

Mr PARK: Is the Premier aware that the United States navy has more than 100 nuclear-powered vessels and has been sailing nuclear-powered ships for more than fifteen years? Is the Premier aware that in this time no accident has occurred involving a spillage of radio-active liquid or material? Is the Premier aware that if the hypothetical one-chance-in-a-million emergency did occur, the area of contamination would not be more than thirty metres around the ship? If the Premier is aware of these facts, will he agree that his present attitude to visits to New South Wales ports by such ships could seriously jeopardize Australia's relations with the United States of America? Is the Premier willing to accept the consequence of a possible breakdown of the ANZUS Treaty and other defence security arrangements?

Mr WRAN: As someone has just remarked, the question asked by the honourable member for Tamworth is a good one as it reflects the grave ignorance in respect of the entry of nuclear ships into port of Sydney. The honourable member related to the House a lot of detail most of which is sadly inaccurate.

*[Interruption]*

Mr Coleman: All of which is accurate.

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

Mr WRAN: I thought the only persons in possession of the secret documents of the federal Government were members of the defence forces and ASIO.

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr WRAN: The whole basis of the meeting on Friday last between the Minister for Defence and the New South Wales Minister for Planning and Environment was that the federal Government is not willing to make available the full report it has on

the environmental consequences of the presence of nuclear ships in Australian ports. I think the air should be cleared once and for all on this subject. A lot of claptrap is being talked, especially by people such as the honourable member for Fuller and the honourable member for Tamworth in relation to the New South Wales Government's attitude in respect of nuclear ships. The fact—the incontrovertible fact, and the fact agreed between the federal Government and the New South Wales Government—is that at present there are no provisions for the safety of nuclear ships or the manoeuvring of nuclear ships in the port of Sydney. That is the situation despite the fact that the Opposition when in Government was graced with such naval and military geniuses as the honourable member for Tamworth and such great defence planners as the honourable member for Fuller.

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr WRAN: The fact is that although these men were in government for eleven years and although we live in a nuclear age, during that long period no measures were adopted by the members who are now in Opposition to provide a safety code for the port of Sydney. This is so despite the fact that the honourable member for Fuller is saying bullshit—which he is not prepared to say aloud.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is addressing the House. He has been asked a question and is answering it. In response to an interjection he has given the same reply. I trust that the honourable gentleman who made the interjection will refrain from doing so again. I call upon the Premier to continue with his answer.

Mr Coleman: On a point of order. I made no interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: I did not refer to the honourable member for Fuller at the time. In my remarks I referred to the honourable gentleman who had made the interjection and I said that I trusted that he would refrain from doing so again.

Mr Cameron: On a point of order. When the Premier continues his reply will you, Mr Speaker, direct him to reply in the Queen's English and not in toilet language?

Sir Eric Willis: On a point of order. This Legislative Assembly has long been known for its high standards of dignity and order. There have been many occasions when honourable members have used undignified or what might be called toilet language, and the Speaker of the day has said that the language used was unparliamentary. I ask you to direct the Premier not to use the language he has just used or, might I ask, are we to assume that there are no words now that are out of order?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to direct the Premier to withdraw.

Mr WRAN: I shall try as far as practicable to refrain from repeating some of the profanities and obscenities that flow from across the Chamber. The agreed fact and it is incontrovertible—the Rt Hon. J. M. Fraser and all those responsible in the federal Government agree—is that there is no safety system for the protection of either the environment or the people of Sydney in respect of the presence of nuclear ships in Sydney Harbour. A debate about the entry of nuclear vessels into Sydney Harbour would be completely barren and empty unless and until a safety system is devised. Finally, in order that those who seem to have got a little emotionally excited on the Opposition benches might know all the details—

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr WRAN: I might say that in relation to the USS *Truxtun* and the submarine USS Snook which visited Cockburn Sound in Western Australia recently, there has been no request by the federal Government or any other authority for the entry of any nuclear vessel into Sydney Harbour.

#### MEDIBANK FOR STATE WARDS

Mr WHELAN: I address a question without notice to the Minister for Youth and Community Services. Did the federal Labor Government's Medibank scheme, which will cease to operate on 1st October, 1976, provide complete health insurance for State wards under his care? Will the same benefits in relation to medical cover extend to State wards after 1st October next?

Mr JACKSON: It is a fact that the Medibank health scheme introduced by the Whitlam Labor Government provided full health insurance for all State wards under my care. The operation of Medibank introduced by the Whitlam Government was simple. On Friday last I was amazed—indeed disgusted—to learn from sources that had been advised by the Prime Minister that the new health scheme to operate from 1st October, 1976, will not cover wards in community placements, training schools or special establishments. That is the cruel part about it.

The new Medibank scheme which commences on 1st October will not cover children in deaf, dumb and blind schools, spastic centres and crippled children's society homes or others who are in similar unfortunate circumstances. Often the parents of children placed in my care are not completely responsible, and this makes the situation more serious. The Prime Minister has said that the federal Government will not accept responsibility for the treatment of underprivileged and unfortunate children: in other words, he just does not care about them. Moreover, the federal Government has said the care of these people will be the whole responsibility of the States. Not a great deal of money is involved in the care of these people; it runs into a few thousand dollars, which is quite a large proportion of the budget allocation of the department when we have regard to the position in which the former Government left it.

There is a principle involved in this matter. The Prime Minister has been named father of the year. If the sort of statements he has made in the past six months about the underprivileged are indicative of the qualifications needed to be named father of the year, then the people responsible for giving him that honour have made a complete mockery of the title. I could name six other instances where the federal Government has received no mandate from the people to withdraw medical assistance for the underprivileged children of this State. The federal Government did not get a mandate to withdraw from the Australian Assistance Plan. In December last year the Prime Minister and his party made no reference to the fact that if they were elected to office they would abolish the Aboriginal child care scheme, the children's commission and several other similar projects that were provided by the previous Labor Government. They made no mention of the fact that if they were elected to office they would withdraw all the essential services that Labor provided for underprivileged children. They received no mandate from the people to do this.

If the Prime Minister had an ounce of decency, he would resign from the position of father of the year and allow some more suitable person—for instance, the father of an underprivileged family—to take the title. There are hundreds of fathers

in poor circumstances who are not only responsible for their own children but also accept the care of State wards. Apparently none of these people was considered by the committee that nominated the father of the year. It would seem that they made their choice and appointed a reactionary Prime Minister because he represents big business in this community.

Sir **Eric Willis**: Joe Cahill was father of the year.

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

Mr **JACKSON**: Joe Cahill established the department. Prior to 1941 a government of the same political persuasion as the Leader of the Opposition did not provide one social welfare benefit in this State. In the years from 1932 to 1941, under a government of his ilk the underprivileged in the community were not provided with free spectacles, dental treatment, surgical benefits or similar help. Governments before that time did not even give **people** a decent dole. Moreover, they reduced a large percentage of people in this State to the lowest ebb of degradation and despair. It was not until 1941 when New South Wales had a Labor government that provision was made to help the underprivileged of this State.

It ill behoves the Leader of the Opposition to refer in this way to a great Premier of this State who formed the department in 1956. When Labor went out of office in 1965 New South Wales was the leading State in Australia in respect of the provision of welfare benefits. However, today New South Wales provides the underprivileged with the lowest benefits given by any State in Australia; it does not even provide decent benefits for parents who are willing to care for State wards. New South Wales is 500 per cent below the other States in relation to the sum given as pocket money to State wards, and it pays only \$86 a fortnight to deserted wives and unmarried mothers compared with \$119.50 provided by the Commonwealth. Every other State provides better welfare benefits than New South Wales. The Leader of the Opposition, who left New South Wales in this miserable position, should be ashamed of himself. Now the Prime Minister whom he supports intends to dump state wards, and withdraw assistance from them. The State **will** have to pick up the tab.

#### WATERFRONT STRIKE

Mr **DOWD**: In view of the serious industrial dispute crippling the port of Sydney, I ask the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines **and** Minister for Energy what action the Government proposes to take to resolve this dispute. If that action is not effective, what does the Government propose to do to get the port of Sydney working in the future?

Mr **HILLS**: All honourable members will be deeply concerned about the industrial dispute that is at present in existence on the New South Wales waterfront which has serious implications. The Transport Workers Union operates under a State award and the Waterside Workers Federation under a federal award. Mr Justice Sheehy and Commissioner **Heffernan** have already had a number of discussions with the two unions involved in this dispute. Moreover, the dispute has been before Mr Justice Sheehy on a number of occasions, and last week he brought down a decision that was not agreed to by members of the Transport Workers Union. Only yesterday Mr Justice Sheehy had discussions with the parties following which he adjourned the matter until tomorrow.

A conference in regard to this dispute is being held today at the Trades Hall between the president of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the parties. It is hoped that following this conference commonsense will prevail. No member of the trade-union movement—certainly no member of this Government—is ever happy about what are described as demarcation disputes; they are the sort of things that in our view should never occur. We believe that commonsense should prevail when a dispute arises between members of different trade unions. The unions should be able to settle these differences between themselves without allowing them to develop into industrial disputes. In addition to the matters I have already mentioned, I have, through the Industrial Registrar, been in touch with members of the Industrial Commission of New South Wales about this dispute. Also, I have had conversations with Mr Ted McBeatty, of the Transport Workers Union to see whether the matter can be resolved. I hope that after today's discussion we shall soon see a settlement of this dispute.

---

#### PRECEDENCE OF BUSINESS

Motion (by Mr F. J. Walker) agreed to:

That on Thursday next, Government Business shall take precedence of General Business.

#### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY

##### Eighth Day's Debate

Debate resumed (from 7th September, *vide* page 641) 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.

Mrs MEILLON (Murray) [3.12]: I support the motion moved by the honourable member for Parramatta, for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I congratulate all honourable members who have made their maiden speeches

over the past two weeks. I offer you, Mr Speaker, my congratulations on attaining the high office **you** hold in the Parliament. On Friday, 27th August, only three weeks after His Excellency the Governor told the House that the Government has already reduced water charges to irrigators by 40 per cent, the chief commissioner of the Water Resources Commission announced that Cabinet had decided last week that charges for water supplied within irrigation areas and districts for the year 1976-77 will be at the same basic level as those fixed at the commencement of the 1975 season. Within only a matter of days of that statement the chief commissioner made an announcement that for the 1976 season irrigators on the Murray could expect only 90 per cent of their water allocation.

In the 1975 season a new system of water charges was implemented—a three-tier system whereby the irrigator is charged \$4.50 a megalitre for the first half of his permanent allocation, \$2 for the second half and \$1 a megalitre for over-allocation water, if and when over-allocation water is available. This meant that in 1975 an average irrigation farmer in the Berriquin, an irrigation district between Berrigan and Deniliquin, using 797 megalitres found that his water charges averaged out at about \$1.53 a megalitre but for 1976, when there will be no cheap over-allocation water and his allocation will be reduced, his usage will be less than 500 megalitres and his water charge will average out at close to \$3.38 a megalitre. That represents an increase of up to 62 per cent on last year's base charge, but the unit cost has more than doubled. The irrigator now has to face up to the fact that he had been used as a pawn in a game of politics which does no credit to the present Government.

Hardship in the farming community is just as worrying and just as serious to Australia as hardship in the shipbuilding industry. It is past the time that the community realized that the financial survival of farmers affects the whole nation. Eight per cent of Australians produce 50 per cent of our exports. Export earnings can come only from export industries that are profitable and progressive. Agriculture is fast becoming unprofitable. Put simply, export markets mean jobs, the generation of more money and the continuance of our high standard of living. A typical farm in the Berriquin irrigation district is about 600 acres. It grows about 70 acres of rice, and about 140 acres of wheat, though because there has been only three inches of rain in eight months that will not be the case this year. Such a farm grows approximately 60 acres of barley, 20 acres of summer pastures and 270 acres of winter pastures. About 60 acres is dry area not yet cleared or laid out to irrigation. The figures I have mentioned come from the New South Wales Department of Agriculture Economic Information Series, *Berriquin Farming*, July, 1976.

It has been estimated that the 40 per cent cut mentioned by His Excellency was worth \$700,000 to the Berriquin irrigation district, as a group, for the 1975-76 season. The Auditor-General's report showed that at 30th June, 1975, the Berriquin irrigation district had an accumulated surplus of \$2,856,578. The value of the typical Berriquin 600-acre farm on a walk-in, walk-out freehold basis is \$97,620. Last year the net income for such a farm was \$8,295 which had to provide for payment of a wage for the labour of the owner-operator, payment of income tax, servicing of debts to lenders, reduction in bank overdraft and, if any is left, that is the profit for the year. In making some allowance for the value of the owner-operator's labour as a cost, the Department of Agriculture assumed that he works only forty-five hours a week for forty-eight weeks of the year. I do not know too many farmers in that district who have had one week's holiday, let alone a month. The department allows him \$2.40 an hour, using a permanent tractor driver's wage as a guide, and this would value his labour at \$5,185. The monetary return on capital invested in the farm would be \$3,110. Honourable members will not be too astonished to learn that many Berriquin farms are listed for sale. Several auctions have been forced by mortgagees

*Mrs Meillon]*

and more are pending. At quite a number of recent auctions no bids have been forthcoming. Agriculture is becoming unprofitable and the Berriquin farm, worth more than \$97,000, last year gave an approximate return, before tax, on the value of the capital investment of 3.2 per cent. That will not service the farmer's debts.

In 1974, the Berriquin rice grower received \$115.05 a tonne for his rice. Fertilizer cost him \$47 a tonne. In 1976 the same man on the same property, for the same amount of effort, received \$63 a tonne for his rice and paid \$95.50 a tonne for fertilizer. On top of this, in 1975–76 water charges were increased by 72 per cent. What many taxpayers do not realize is that the huge storage sheds and rice mills have come out of the rice growers' pockets. They have been built by the rice industry from funds raised from equity deductions from growers' returns. It is also not realized by many taxpayers that it costs the rice industry \$23 a tonne to receive, store, transport, mill, quality control, aerate and in fact do everything to a tonne of rice to get it to the ship's **side**. To shift the rice from the wharf to the ship's hold costs **\$24** a tonne.

The rice industry has proved that it is not inefficient. The farmers constantly strive for efficiency. They have cut costs wherever possible, increased production, kept abreast of new methods and are operating at maximum efficiency. The industry has contained costs reasonably well—certainly better than most industries. When the 8 per cent who produce the 50 per cent of our exports have been destroyed what will happen then? If union leaders have any basic training in economics at all it is time now for them to put that training to use. It is time for union leaders to use their talents to encourage more productivity and conscientiously endeavour to encourage new investment and faith in our ability to produce and compete, resulting in the creation of new jobs. Every unionist, indeed every Australian worker, expects as a result of his labours to make a reasonable living. Why must it be considered sufficient for farmers merely to survive?

Mr RYAN (Hurstville) [3.20]: In speaking on the resumption of the adjourned debate on the Address in Reply, I wish first to congratulate the Wran Government on the speedy implementation of certain sections of its election policy and on the indication in His Excellency's Speech that the remainder of the platform will be speedily implemented. Second, I wish to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to your high office and on the competent manner in which you have fulfilled the functions of it. I should like also to congratulate the honourable member for Parramatta who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and the honourable member for Blue Mountains, who seconded it. They did so in a most erudite and enlightened manner, which augurs well for their future contributions in this Chamber.

I am honoured to have been elected to this Parliament to represent the electors of **Hurstville**. The history of Hurstville and its gradual settlement and steady progress to its present high standard of community living is an interesting one. The name Hurstville was originally bestowed on the village in the 1860's, "hurst" being an old English word meaning a clump of trees. Hence, it was appropriate that it should be called Hurstville, and the main route to Hurstville in those days, as it is today, was Forest Road. The township began really to progress when the Illawarra line was constructed in the late 1800's. The railway had originally been routed over what is now the Rocky Point area, but fortunately it was diverted and we have seen that this change has been more than justified by the subsequent progress of Hurstville and, indeed, the St George district generally. It proves, I suppose, that political decisions are not always shortsighted.

I wish now to pay tribute to the members of my local Labor branches and the many hard-working supporters from outside the branches who worked so strenuously and gave so generously and cheerfully of their time, energy and money to assist me to gain election. I am tremendously indebted to my campaign director, Mr Paul Muir, and to all those wonderful people for their dedication, enthusiasm and sacrifices. Without their assistance I should not be here.

Prior to gaining election to this Chamber I had the honour of being the mayor of Hurstville. I take this opportunity of placing on record my admiration for the aldermen, officers and staff of the Hurstville Municipal Council. They have my respect and confidence and I am certain that they have the respect and confidence of the ratepayers generally. It is an efficient and approachable council which exemplifies the true meaning and depth of the word "local" in local government.

My experience in Hurstville has allowed me to be much better qualified not only in local government matters but also in respect to competing arguments in relation to the amalgamation proposals. If all councils were as competently conducted as is Hurstville council, the weighty arguments in favour of amalgamation would be in serious danger of rebuttal. In any consideration that I may be required to give in this Chamber to the proposals for amalgamation of local government areas, the favourable impression I have of the excellent performance of Hurstville council must weigh heavily in my deliberations.

The Hurstville planning scheme, which has been in course of preparation for many years, is finally on public exhibition, after having been recently prescribed. This plan is associated with a further redevelopment of Hurstville. This subsidiary scheme envisages the metamorphosis of Hurstville into a modern, attractive shopping plaza with associated amenities for shoppers, citizens and their children. We in Hurstville are justifiably excited about these proposals. We visualize a shopping and community centre that will be a mecca for the southern suburbs.

As I intimated earlier, Hurstville was originally a railway town. Unfortunately, its progress developed along those lines and the shopping centre is cut in halves by the Illawarra railway and Forest Road, which runs parallel to it. Obviously, this meant that a noisy, dangerous thoroughfare was prejudicing shoppers and businessmen alike and placing in danger children and shoppers as they went about their arduous duties—duties that ought to be enjoyable. We hope that the implementation of this scheme will make the onerous duties of mothers, particularly those accompanied by young children, more pleasant while they are in Hurstville.

I must again compliment the Hurstville council on its aim to improve social amenities and the quality of life of Hurstville residents. It was the first council—certainly one of the extremely few initially in New South Wales—to employ a full-time university-qualified social worker. She—and I emphasize she—has been magnificent in detecting, delineating and seeking the solution of social ills and inadequacies in the area.

In working towards these goals the council and its staff have been greatly assisted by the South West Sydney Regional Development Council and the Australian Assistance Plan. The AAP was a Whitlam initiative in social welfare and has done much to alleviate social problems. I deplore the present unseemly attack by the Fraser Government on this wonderful grass roots involvement of, and assistance for, the ordinary person in the street. I deplore the cynical and heartless privation of needy people being inflicted in this area by the Fraser Government under the auspices of the Iron Butterfly.

*Mr Ryan]*

We in Hurstville are proud also that we are one of the few local government authorities to provide in our town plan for the building of self contained or "granny flats" in or on to existing homes. The granny flat concept means that elderly people will not necessarily be forced by high costs and perhaps indifferent health from the homes in which they have lived for many years into so-called convalescent homes or institutions for the aged. They will now be able to be assisted in their own homes by friends or members of their family, but at the same time they and members of their **family** will have the privacy and independence of a self-contained unit.

Further, this enlightened action can be of much assistance to newlyweds or independent family members who require privacy and independence but do not want to leave their families or cannot face the high cost of purchasing their own homes. I believe that this is a great progressive social move that should be copied by all local government organizations in New South Wales. I hope that the traditional local government thinking that saw progress and development in terms of the kerbing and guttering, and the potholes-in-streets mentality will quickly be replaced by an outlook towards progress and the development of people and personality, which will encourage such things as libraries, enlightened town planning and assistance to people generally so that they may more satisfactorily enjoy their way of life and so fulfil their lives and expectations and those of their children.

Hurstville and the St George district generally are pleasant residential areas surrounding the lovely and historic Botany Bay. For almost two centuries Botany Bay has assisted in providing seafoods, recreation and a pleasant vista for the residents. It is as much a part of the St George area as Sydney Harbour is of our city. Unfortunately this historic bay, the birthplace of our nation, came under insidious attack from the previous Government. A secretive plan for the conversion of Botany Bay into a heavy industrial port prevented the general public from becoming aware of its massive proportions. Millions of dollars were spent by the coalition Government before the public realized the extent of the plans. They became aware of their massive proportions only when certain civic-minded people raised the matter from time to time. Finally, the Liberal-Country party Government was forced by the sustained pressure of public opinion to reveal the full extent of its machinations. Even then the honourable member for Gloucester, who was Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports, did not on behalf of the previous Government have the good grace merely to reveal the plans and **leave** it at that; he attempted to belittle, denigrate and deter the civic-minded and sincere people who had revealed the plot. The honourable member attempted to ridicule and denigrate them as radical agitators.

Millions of dollars were spent on dredging port facilities and in creating environmental monstrosities without any provision or planning for the obvious increase of heavy vehicles on to the already inadequate surrounding streets and roads. Suddenly confronted with this gigantic planning blunder, the previous Government on the eve of an election hastily dusted the various surveys and road studies that had been placed aside for years, sifted through the pot-pourri of statistical evidence and came up with the momentous discovery that an expressway was needed to feed the western suburbs from the proposed port development. The so-called discovery was really an old proposal—it had been gathering dust for more than twenty years—for a county road from Kyeemagh to Chullora. The proposal had always been environmentally suspect as it involved destroying one of the remaining virgin bushland areas in the Cook's River district. Also, it had been suspect from a pragmatic point of view because it was suggested at a time when the immensity of the Botany Bay proposal was not realized. However, the previous Government on election eve gave it a gloss and put it out as a panacea for all the problems. Fortunately the citizens in the area recognized it for the election bait that it was,

The new Government is now confronted with the problems of this colossal blunder and complete lack of planning for Botany Bay. Following upon its election promise, the Wran Government immediately placed a moratorium on all future works and instituted a public inquiry into all aspects of the proposed development. Irrespective of the inquiry's findings the Government is faced with the dilemma of choosing between continuing a project with its attendant cost and interference with the residential and environmental amenities of the area, and sacrificing the hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money that has been spent already without due and proper consideration of the full ramifications of the proposal.

The Liberal-Country parties have attempted in this House and at other forums to make cheap, political capital out of an alleged ambivalence of the present Government in contemporaneously holding a public inquiry to decide the fate of the project and allegedly calling for tenders for proposed works. The Liberal-Country parties have failed to put the facts associated with the tenders, which are that tenders were opened by the previous Government in January-February and were extended by that Government in April, on the eve of the election. The present Government has merely granted a further extension of three months to permit the inquiry to be held. There has been no misleading of potential tenderers and certainly no new tenders have been called.

I now wish to turn to the alarming position of the public hospitals in my electorate. St George Hospital provides services for residents in the Hurstville electorate and for people throughout the St George area. Its medical and administrative staff have provided a wonderful service with the limited facilities at their disposal. However unpalatable as it may be, the truth must now be faced: insufficient beds are available at this hospital. Literally dying people are in danger of being refused admission to that hospital and of finding a bed there. I appeal to the Health Commission of New South Wales to give top priority to the provision of an extra wing for the St George Hospital.

I am most disappointed by our society's priorities. At a time when the St George area and the western suburbs are crying out for hospital-bed accommodation, hospitals in more affluent, social and geographic areas are able to equip their wards in an opulent fashion and provide them with unnecessary luxuries. I refer specifically to a most recent example, St Vincent's Private Hospital which caters for the wealthy with unnecessary frivolous and extravagant appointments, at a time when dying persons in my electorate cannot find a hospital bed.

This brings me to comment upon certain aspects of our society which were nurtured and encouraged by the indifference and in some cases outright connivance of the previous Government. I refer to society's standards which acknowledge and acclaim those who can make the most money in the quickest time regardless of business or professional ethics. It was a climate nurtured by the previous Government that rewarded company manipulators and corporate criminals with social acclaim and prestige. Indeed, in some cases the previous Government gave the final imprimatur by dubbing these devious, so-called gentlemen knights of Her Majesty's realm. By contrast, as a result of these double standards, vengeance was wreaked on the common or petty thief. Meanwhile corporate moguls who stole not petty-cash and goods but the very livelihood of their victims were allowed to parade around and grace the highest echelons of society and government, cloaked with the adulation and approval of a sycophantic government.

I am confident that the present Government will right these wrongs to which I have referred and reward honesty not roguery. It will work strenuously to allow **the** little man, be he businessman or worker, to lead a satisfying life **of** fulfilment,

*Mr Ryan]*

free from oppression both overt and covert, with a reasonable supply of material possessions to allow him dignity, free from subservience and the need to ingratiate himself with overlords or to face financial and social deprivation and discrimination.

Finally, I should hope that the Government will do what no previous government has done: grasp the nettle presented by our appalling carnage on the roads by legislating and educating drunken drivers off them. At the same time I should hope that it will consider not only such immediate causes of death as the obvious crash caused by the drunken driver but also the underlying social problems such as the encouragement of drunken driving by the present policy in respect of the licensing of hotels and other drinking places. The present policy results in the construction of huge subregional hotels that can be reached only by driving to them. The obvious result is that a driver who is perhaps not inebriated but to some extent intoxicated is obliged to drive a vehicle on a public street in New South Wales.

Mr BOYD (Byron) [3.40]: First, I congratulate the new members who have made their maiden speeches in this Address-in-Reply debate. It is a fairly traumatic experience to make a maiden speech in this House. I am sure that these members will make a useful contribution to this establishment and will look back to their experience with happy memories of the friendly reception on both sides of the House. I hope that spirit will continue for many years.

His Excellency's Speech has been criticized by many members but I have found some statements in it that have pleased me very much. I was happy to note that the New South Wales parliamentary fishing committee's recommendations will be acted upon. The 700-page report of the committee was prepared in about ten months by a very hard-working committee that was chaired by the Hon. Bruce Cowan, the former Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Water Resources. Members who read the document will learn quite a bit from it. It indicates that the fishing industry has many problems and that some of its needs are urgent. It is clear that the fishing industry in New South Wales, with local annual production to the value of \$70 million, is suffering severely from overseas competition, particularly in processed fish. This is tearing the heart and soul out of the industry and obviously something must be done urgently to assist it.

The oyster industry has its problems too and action must be taken to help oyster growers. I hope the Minister for Lands and others associated with the administration of legislation that governs the industry will study the report and then determine to push on with dedication in an attempt to solve the problems revealed. Members will find from the report that the abalone industry, a small but important one, has grave safety problems requiring correction. I hope this will be done shortly.

I was delighted to read in the Governor's Speech that certain action is to be taken about the disposal of Crown land. I congratulate the Minister for Lands. Having served for 25 years on a local land board, I have always believed in the system of conditional purchase for the disposal of Crown land as a just and sound one. I note from the department's publication that the cost of a Crown land building block ranges from \$11,000 to \$17,500. I appreciate that this land is in the outer Sydney suburbs, but somewhere along the line the Government must try to reduce the cost of land to homebuilders. This problem affects the Crown as much as anybody else. I believe Crown blocks are too dear. I was interested to learn that the parliamentary committee on drugs is to be reconstituted. This is an important committee. From reports I have heard, it has been doing a splendid job in dealing with a problem that is tearing the heart and soul out of our society.

Mr Petersen: They are not as bad as alcohol.

Mr BOYD: You would not know. It is a tragedy that the committee has lost five months sitting time because of the slowness of the Wran Government in re-constituting the committee, which last met in May. Valuable time has been lost, but if the committee is quickly reconstituted I am sure its members will work assiduously and make up for the lost time.

The federal Government is deserving of commendation for its statement of several days ago that heavy penalties will be imposed on drug pushers. People involved in the drug traffic for profit must be hit hard. To get to the root of the problem the source of the supply must be dried up. It has been suggested that penalties of fines up to \$100,000 with twenty years gaol will be imposed. This is a step in the right direction and I strenuously commend it. I hope this implication will not be lost on the Premier.

I am pleased that death duties are to be abolished when the estate passes to a surviving spouse. This too is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. State death duties must be abolished in their entirety. Death duties are an iniquitous form of taxation representing an imposition on the thrifty and the most productive sections of the community. These iniquitous duties cannot be got rid of quickly enough. I hope this Government will continue with the programmes initiated by other State governments, especially the Queensland Government.

In the field of public works, fifteen water supply and fourteen sewerage programmes are to be proceeded with, but only because of the previous Government's initiatives. I hope this Government will not continue to bask in the reflected glory of the previous Government's initiatives, and that it will institute new works, particularly in the country area I represent. I am concerned about the heavy load imposed on the Minister in charge of public works. Although with his training as a bricklayer he has been used to carrying heavy loads, the load he is now being asked to carry is too much for any man. Not only is he Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing; he is also Deputy Premier. Although he is obviously applying himself to the utmost of his ability and working extremely hard in all these portfolios, the load is far too heavy for him and he cannot cope with all the work thrust upon him by a Premier who obviously does not understand the portfolios.

I give as an example the development of Botany Bay. The Premier cannot appreciate the problems involved in that development. I think this subject was covered quite well by the honourable member for Mosman. The Premier is ducking for cover and wants to shelve the whole idea until he appreciates what it is all about. The honourable member for Hurstville made some comments on Botany Bay. I do not want to be too harsh on the new member, but I remind him that the initiatives for the development of Botany Bay were started by the Liberal-Country party Government, not by the present Labor Government.

Honourable members opposite should avail themselves of the opportunity to inspect the model of Botany Bay that was constructed some years ago. After their inspection they will be convinced that there is no secret about it. I fly over Botany Bay week after week, and I can see what is going on. There is no secret about it and the policy is clear-cut. The development was initiated by the Labor Party and carried on by the Liberal-County party Government. This policy must be of enormous benefit to the people of New South Wales, particularly those in the coalmining areas. For that reason I believe it is a pity that an election decision brought much of this development to a halt.

On the electoral level, I am more concerned about the shortcomings of the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing, particularly in relation to beach erosion at Byron Bay. This is a major

problem, and numerous investigations have been carried out by local committees. Many letters have been written to the Minister, in his capacity as Minister for Public Works. As recently as 5th August this year the Minister received an urgent telegram, which arose from a meeting at Byron Bay, inviting him to come to Byron Bay and to examine the position so that he could make a better and more temperate assessment of the problem.

To this date I have received no acknowledgment or reply to that telegram. I know why this is so: it is because the Minister is far too busy. Obviously he is unable to handle the business load imposed by all his portfolios. I feel sorry for him, for it is too big a load for any one man to carry. An urgent telegram was sent to the Minister because this matter is urgent.

The meatworks at Byron Bay has an annual turnover of \$10 million and employs 360 people. I do not doubt that all the employees contribute to the funds of the Labor Party, through their union fees. Therefore, one would surely expect that the Labor Party would be aware that their jobs are in jeopardy and would be keen to get their Minister on the spot to discourse with these people and to find out what can be done to help them. In addition to the meatworks at least forty houses are affected. Indeed, I believe that most of these houses are occupied by employees of the meatworks. These good, honest people are worried sick by the inactivity and by the fact that the Minister cannot find time to answer an urgent telegram.

In contrast, a similar problem at North Beach, New Brighton, was dealt with by the previous State Government, which found \$250,000 for the purchase of threatened homes so that the people could retreat from the danger area with dignity. I hope that the new Government will be sympathetic to the people of Byron Bay, and that it will give the forty homeowners there some consideration. If this is not done, obviously the people in these homes have big problems ahead of **them**.

I am concerned about the finances of this State. This matter was not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech; indeed, it was completely ignored. The Premier of this State is a smooth-talking legal eagle who has the same approach to finance as had the Hon. E. G. Whitlam. He has had the same training. He is one of those very wealthy barristers to whom money was never an object, and was able to live well beyond his means because the money kept flowing in. He charged extraordinarily high fees to appear in court on behalf of clients, so money was never an object to him. Therefore, he has never been a money manager. This worries me, especially as the Premier has come from the same political stable and the same university, and has had the same training and background in finance as Mr Whitlam. Obviously, if he has nothing good to say, he says nothing, and is therefore hiding something. I have never known of a barrister who did not have plenty to say if there was **something** to talk about. But when he says nothing about the finances of the State, it suggests to me that we are heading for problems. The trouble with Mr Whitlam and the Premier is their great neglect of the productive elements and their fostering of the trendy elements. Their attitude would **seem** to suggest that if one looks after the trendies the national economy will look after itself. Of course, that is no so.

It is pertinent to examine the record of Mr Whitlam when he was in office in Canberra. In 1970–1971 the federal budget deficit was \$10 million, but in 1975–1976 it was a staggering \$4,000 million. This happened because the Prime Minister was engrossed in looking after the trendies, the way-outs, and the people with kinky ideas. But the people who made this country and developed it are the productive group. I am afraid that this State may be going down the same road as Australia did under the federal Labor Government. Total federal Government expenditure in 1972–1973 was

\$10,000 million. Thus in 1972–1973 the country was managed on \$10,000 million, but in 1975–1976 it had become necessary to spend \$22,000 million to do it. This is typical of a wealthy man's attitude to finance. I am referring to a man who has always come by his money easily by appearing in courts and getting extraordinarily high fees for it.

Despite the setback from the great inflationary spiral, which has obviously burnt the heart and soul out of this nation, New South Wales under a Liberal-Country party Government managed to finish 1975–1976 with a surplus of \$22 million. I ask honourable members to compare that with a deficit of \$4,000 million. One hears people complain bitterly about money management, and some experts on the other side try to pretend that something is wrong with the economy of New South Wales. The economy of New South Wales was never stronger or better managed by the last State Government. This happened despite the fact that in that period a system of tied grants was generated by the federal Government. In 1971–1972 these tied grants for New South Wales amounted to \$87 million; in 1972–1973 they totalled \$136 million; in 1973–1974 they came to \$203 million; and in 1974–1975 a staggering \$422 million was involved.

In his mad search for power and centralized control Mr Whitlam gave rise to this finance problem and this abortion of democratic principles. I shall examine how he went about it, how this great centralist attempted to get complete and utter control. In contrast, the States are now getting a system of decentralized control. The general purposes assistance fund for local government amounted in 1975–1976 to \$29.2 million, but under the new system of democracy, which allows local areas and local communities to make their own decisions, this has been blown out to \$51.22 million, an increase of more than \$22 million. As well, autonomy has been returned to people who can control their own future at the local level and confer on others the benefit of their local knowledge.

One asks whether the Wran Government will follow the Whitlam Government down the same financial chute. What can we expect in the next three years from this Government? We have not yet seen the Budget, but obviously it will be the test. Many promises have been made but only a certain amount of money is available for distribution. Obviously there has to be some giving and taking here and there, but anyone who has given any thought to the matter would suggest that this State is headed towards playing the deficit budget game, on the basis of pay on the never never. I might be old-fashioned. Indeed, the Premier frequently calls me a troglodite. That is an insulting term, but I do not mind telling you. Mr Speaker, that I accept the trogloditic law, which is a very good one for it says that no monkey will monkey about with another monkey's monkey. I believe that honourable members on this side of the House subscribe to that fundamental and basic law.

I have been called a rat also—a Tobruk rat—by a man named Lord Haw Haw. That was a long time ago. I say this about Lord Haw Haw and the Premier: they share a similarity of style. Both are plausible and vicious. I remind honourable members of the way in which the Premier today in this House denigrated one of the finest soldiers produced by the State. I regret very much what the Premier said, for it did him no credit. The honourable member for Tamworth, Colonel Park, is probably one of our greatest soldiers of all time. He began his period in the army as a private soldier. He was evacuated from Greece. Subsequently he was taken prisoner as a member of the rearguard at Crete, and escaped. He saw an enormous amount of service during the war. He won the D.S.O.—the Distinguished Service Order, I add for the benefit of some Government supporters who might not know what the letters mean—at the age of 24, as a subaltern, and he represented Australia as a member of the coronation

*Mr Boyd]*

contingent in 1953. He rode as one of Australia's eight mounted escorts at the coronation of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth. He was chosen for that distinction because of his service to the army and his country. It ill-behoves the Premier or anybody else to decry a man like the honourable member for Tamworth, who has contributed so much to his country both in this House and in other places. I point to the remarks by the Premier today as an example of the viciousness we have come to expect from him, just as we came to expect it from Lord Haw Haw. However, Lord Haw Haw was ineffective, and the Premier is ineffective. Trendy is the word to describe both men. I believe, one was and the other is detrimental to the progress and development of this country in different ways and in similar ways.

One thing my experience at Tobruk taught me was to judge character. Any person who has served any field of operation—the army, the navy, the air force or any other service—learns how to judge character. I learnt something also about basic economics. I learnt the elementary fact that if you put two tins of bully beef into a dixie, you cannot get three out of it. That concept seems to be foreign to many Government supporters. They seem frequently to think that it is possible to put two tins of bully beef into a dixie and get four out of it. The fact is that there is no pie in the sky, and nothing is free. The three operative words today should be work, responsibility and productivity. Work is a four-letter word, but it is not a dirty word. We must get that message through to people at all levels of our society. I notice honourable members on the Government benches who strongly support the unions laughing about this matter: apparently work is a dirty word to them. If the three ideas represented by those words are spread and fostered, it will not take long to get the country going again.

I noted that the Premier was concerned about the meat industry to the extent of dealing with it in one paragraph of the Speech prepared by him for His Excellency the Governor. That paragraph appears on the second page of the Speech. One can only ask, how insincere can he be? Here we have a great country, the last great meat-producing country in the world, with a primary industry in trouble, and the Premier devotes a mere paragraph to it. One of the problems of the meat industry can be seen in our meatworks. The slaughtermen and others work on a system of dargs. It is not a question of taking pride in what they do, but of taking pride in what they do not do. So many people have been taught and convinced that work is a dirty four-letter word by union representatives and shop stewards.

A 20-hour week has been introduced into the meatworks, on the basis of working only four hours a day. Once the darg has been met, the worker must go on to overtime. He is not permitted to take some pride in achievement: he must flog the industry for all it is worth. New hide-pulling machinery has been installed in our meat-works to speed up the assembly line output. The unionists, instead of thanking the management for making their job easier, say that they want whatever extra benefit is available from the installation of the machinery, from the financial commitment by the management and from the technological development. They want all of it: nobody else is to share in the benefit. So the workers argue that they should retain the dargs set before the machinery was improved or, in some places, have the dargs reduced. The result has been that the cost of killing a beast frequently exceeds the cost of the beast. The whole operation has reached the stage where it has become a great bottleneck, and this has been brought about by excessive unionism, too many strikes and attempts to hinder industrial progress. The younger supporters of the Government must become aware of their responsibility to get this message across.

The sort of attitude to which I refer is seen in the shipbuilding industry. Each unit of labour is being subsidized to the tune of \$13,000 a year. The Premier sheds crocodile tears and asks the federal Government to allocate \$30 million to keep the

State Dockyard going. What he does not say is that he has given away \$22 million by reducing fares on metropolitan public transport. Yet he has the gall to ask the federal Government for a \$30 million handout to do something he should have done himself. That is lamentable, but true. Farm income dropped from \$2,000 million in 1973–74 to a relatively meagre \$700 million in 1975–76. What does the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries do about that? Obviously he gets very upset about some matters, and regards his big contribution so far as being the freezing of the price of milk. This is the same old socialist **dirge**—cheap food for the masses. Where the food comes from or how those who have to produce it suffer is not taken into consideration.

In the period from 1972 to 1975 the cost of living went up by 55 per cent. One can only pose a question to the Minister: did he promise to help the non-BMQ dairyman from a genuine concern for their welfare or for political expediency? If it was for political expediency, will the Minister transfer cane quotas to the Richmond and Clarence districts to help him hold the electorate of Casino? Will it be expedient to transfer wheat quotas to the electorate of Castlereagh to hold that seat when the present incumbent retires? Many questions are raised in the minds of hard-working members of our community. One wonders where we are all going.

The problem is serious indeed. The Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries is trying to coin a new slogan. He wants to make history with the slogan of "Get small or get out." That is the slogan of the Communist Party—get rid of the middle class, for they constitute a threat. It is impossible to manipulate people with remote ideas where there is a strong middle class. In 1975 there were 3 200 people out of work in Australia. The Premier is showing excitement about unemployment now, but he said nothing about the matter in December, 1975. The Country Party has put forward a positive programme to the Premier on this matter. I commend it to the Premier.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! The time of the honourable member for Byron has expired.

Mr ROGAN (East Hills) [4.10]: I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, my colleagues the honourable member for Parramatta and the honourable member for Blue Mountains. I compliment them on their maiden speeches in this House. Labor will retain the Government benches while ever it has members of their calibre. I congratulate Mr Speaker on his elevation to that high office and I congratulate you, Mr Deputy-Speaker, upon your election. Within a day or so of your assuming the chair in the absence of Mr Speaker you were called upon to give rulings. Those rulings were subsequently challenged and upheld by this House. Your rulings have shown that while you are in the chair, in the absence of the Speaker, or while you are performing your duties as Chairman of Committees honourable members can be assured of fair and informed decisions from the Chair.

I congratulate the Government on His Excellency's Speech, which brought a breath of fresh air to the people of New South Wales and will no doubt ensure that this State will once again become the leading State in Australia. The Governor's Speech showed that this Government has innovative and progressive policies, in stark contrast to what we have seen over the past eleven years. New South Wales was the leading State in the nation prior to the change of government in 1965. I am confident that over the ensuing years New South Wales will once again achieve that status. In his Speech His Excellency referred in detail to the high level of unemployment. He said:

My Government is deeply concerned about the high level of unemployment in New South Wales.

The Australian economy has failed to show the economic recovery experienced over the past year by most of her trading partners overseas.

In New South Wales the building and construction industry is at its lowest ebb since the Great Depression. Manufacturing industries generally are producing well below capacity.

The employment situation in New South Wales has deteriorated. At the end of last month there were 115,997 unemployed in this State, representing 43 per cent of the total unemployed in Australia, despite the fact that New South Wales' population is only 36 per cent of Australia's total population. Moreover, registered job vacancies have fallen sharply during this year, so that now there are 20 persons unemployed for every one registered job vacancy.

The situation facing New South Wales has been forced upon it by policies pursued by the Fraser Government. One need not look too hard at the performance of that Government in Canberra to see just how far it has taken the Australian nation backwards in the short period it has been in office. Even now there is talk about the introduction of a third federal budget. Government sources in Canberra are hinting that another budget might have to be introduced before the next one that is due in August. That will mean that Australia has seen three federal budgets brought down in less than twelve months.

When the Whitlam Government was in power it was accused of failing to follow traditional policies to reduce unemployment and inflation. In the nine months that the coalition Government has been in office in Canberra it has become obvious that it is flying by the seat of its pants. Inflation has not been reduced to anything below the level that would have come about as a direct result of the Hayden budget. Unemployment is at a record level and I fear that it will get worse. Living standards are being depressed. For the first time, Australia has assumed the role of an international mischiefmaker. During the Prime Minister's 4-day overseas trip he caused trouble between the major powers. Business in this State has lost faith in the federal Government's policies, as is evidenced by the high level of unemployment here. The people have become disillusioned, and the country is slipping back, along the path it was travelling prior to 1972. [*Quorum* formed.]

I am indebted to the honourable member for Orange for calling a quorum and giving me a bigger audience. His action suggests a degree of sensitivity about the actions of his colleagues in Canberra. The Opposition is touchy about the prevailing situation in this nation under the Fraser Government. Its policies are having a devastating effect upon all areas of State administration. That Government is a government of broken promises, exceeding the bad reputation of the Askin Government that came to office in this State in 1965. It is incredible that the federal Government has built up such a bad record in such a short space of time. People living in cities, suburbs and country areas will all suffer as a result of severe cutbacks in public works, which will increase unemployment. Recently I have heard members of the Country Party wailing about affected projects in their electorates. I suggest that they use their influence on their Canberra colleagues.

The Governor referred to the fact that urgent public works have had to be delayed as a result of drastic cuts imposed by the federal Government and he said that New South Wales had been particularly affected by the cutback in capital works programmes, which added further to the burdens of the building and construction industry. He said that the State Government had continued to press for emergency funds for housing and an increase in loan allocations for urgent public works. That

would include, of course, the home construction field. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to tell the nation that everyone must tighten his belt and that we must all make some sacrifice. I should like him to sit in my office and listen to the people who come to see me, as indeed they must go to see other honourable members of this and other parliaments, seeking housing.

It is all very well to say they must tighten their belts, but is the Prime Minister aware of situations such as that outlined to me recently by a lady whose husband brings home \$120 a week to support his family of four children? This couple thought they would do the right thing by purchasing a home and they are committed to repayments of \$60 a week. That leaves them with only \$60 a week for other necessities. From my own household budgeting, I find that it takes something like \$50 a week to feed my wife, myself and our two children. On that basis this couple would have precious little left over. This lady told me they had been married for thirteen years and that she and her husband had been to the movies on only two occasions. Certainly there is not much chance of that family tightening their belts. It would do the Prime Minister and the nation some good if he were to sit in his electoral office and listen to the problems of ordinary people. Let him learn some of the distressing problems that exist in our community as a direct result of his Government's policies.

I was pleased to see in the Governor's Speech that the new Government has indicated that, as far as the budgetary situation will allow, it will legislate in areas to assist those people who are not receiving this assistance from the national Government, which has as its responsibility a policy of helping these people through the States. I am pleased that one of the first actions of the new State Government was to set up a working party as the first step in the appointment of an education commission. The previous Government was in office for eleven years. It promised teachers, the community and educators generally that it would establish an education commission, but it broke that promise and failed to implement that part of its policy. One of the reasons why the former Government now occupies the Opposition benches is that it failed to keep its promises.

I fail to see why there is objection to the establishment of an education commission. Already in this State we have the Health Commission, the Electricity Commission, the Planning and Environment Commission and many others. Though education is one of the greatest spending areas in any State budget, the former Government failed to implement its policy in this regard and to establish a school commission. By contrast, the new Government has shown clearly that it will not fail the people or break its promises. It has set up a working party as the first step in the establishment of an education commission.

I am pleased to see also that legislation has been prepared for the establishment of a lands commission for the purpose of developing land for resale at cost to home-seekers. 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 home. There is a recognition by the Government—it was not present in the previous Government—of the need to bring about a reduction in or a stabilization of land prices so that land can be put within the reach of young homeseekers. In this way people can achieve probably their most important goal in life: the possession of their own home.

I turn now to that part of the Governor's Speech relating to the Industrial Arbitration (Further Amendment) Bill, which will grant full access to industrial tribunals for public servants, teachers, officers of Parliament and certain other employees who do not at present have this right. The previous Government's record in this field should make honourable members opposite hang their heads in shame. I have had

**Mr Rogan]**

the Parliamentary Library undertake some research back to 1965 when the present **Opposition** occupied the Government benches of this State. An examination of the **records** shows that the only legislation enacted by the former Government was of a provocative or machinery nature: not one innovative programme was drafted or introduced to come to grips with the deep-seated, serious problems facing the work force, unions and management. Some measures introduced by the former Government were the Annual Holidays (Amendment) Bill, the Apprentices (Amendment) Bill, the Building and Construction Industry Long Service Leave Payments Bill and the Factories, Shops and Industries (Amendment) Bill. When the former Government got into any legislative area it was only of a machinery or provocative nature.

I want to mention specially the Teaching Service (Amendment) Bill. I was pleased to hear the Minister announce the Government's intention to repeal that measure, which was a direct repudiation of agreements that the Government of the day had made with teachers. The repudiation showed that Government's double standards. The former Government had always told the union movement that it should go to the appropriate tribunal and that the Government would abide by its decision. In this case a decision was arrived at: agreement was reached that a preference clause would be inserted in the award covering members of the Teachers' Federation. However, the former Government repudiated that agreement; it overrode the decision of the tribunal and brought down the Teaching Service (Amendment) Bill.

In 1971 the former Government introduced the Industrial Arbitration (Amendment) Bill, which dealt with secret ballots, lockouts and the cancellation of registration of trade unions. Also, it increased penalties for lockouts and illegal strikes. Measures of that kind are provocative. Instead of getting down to the job of doing something positive in the industrial area, the former Government chose to ignore that course. It did what I have heard honourable members opposite do in this debate, including some who were making their maiden speeches—indulge in the union bashing that one has come to expect from them. Opposition members have not come forward with one positive idea or policy designed to alleviate problems in industry and to bring about industrial peace. I need only cite the example of the Dunstan Labor Government in South Australia, which in 1972 set up what is now called the unit for industrial democracy. That unit has as its aim the sort of things that I am hopeful this Government will implement in the future.

I have made submissions to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy outlining certain proposals that I should like to see put into effect. I am hopeful that he and the Government will see fit to legislate in this area. I should like to see the Government reorganize the Department of Labour and Industry so that it includes also a department of technology. The new ministry and department could be called the Department of Labour, Industry and Technology. That department would become the liaising and advisory body to the Government, unions and industry. Its role would be to encourage industry to become more efficient by offering advice on more efficient methods of production. It would be the liaison body between unions and management.

Before any major change is introduced by industry which would have the effect of making redundant large sections of the work force, due notice would be required to be given to the department. I envisage that the proposed department would advise the Government on the need for specific legislation in this field. The proposed Department of Labour, Industry and Technology would be required to report to the Government on the means by which the party policy of worker participation might be implemented, with a major emphasis on bridging the large communication gap which exists throughout industry at the present time.

Worker participation, to be effective, must be introduced with a sincere desire on the part of both management and the work force to see it work. As I said before, the South Australian Department of Labour and Industry unit, which is now called the unit for industrial democracy, is an outstanding example of the way in which such a programme can work. One does not have to go far to see the great need for such a department to be set up in New South Wales. Up to 41 per cent of older Australian workers are deeply apathetic about their jobs, and their apathy is growing. These figures are provided from findings of an unpublished study prepared for the federal Government, and edited by Mr L. Prowse, then head of the South Australian Government unit set up to improve the quality of work life. The figures were published in the *National Times* on 11th August, 1975. The position is that there is no happiness at work or at home for nearly 400 000 Australians. Many workers in Australian cities feel that they have no hope in their work or their lives. Previously, no recognition was given to the incidence of industrial diseases and accidents. Indeed the last budget introduced by the former Government reduced the assistance provided for safety in industry, which indicates its sorry neglect and abrogation of its responsibility in this field.

We hear much about productivity and that we should get out and work harder. I put it that increased productivity means an improvement in the means by which production is achieved. In the northern coalfields area of Queensland where the black gold, as it is called, is being mined the operators use a stripper—it is \$10 million worth of dragline—that shifts the over-burden in giant bucketsful after the hard rock has been loosened by explosives. The dragline bites into the overburden, working around the clock seven days a week. It would take 20 000 men with shovels and wheelbarrows working 24 hours a day to match its output. That is the sort of production aid that is needed in New South Wales and throughout Australia. It does not mean that to increase production people have to work that much harder. If we are to improve living standards and the happiness of the work force, we should be looking for means by which work becomes easier and more enjoyable, so that people will enjoy going to work. This can be done only by the introduction of the sort of technological improvements I have mentioned, which allows one dragline in a coalfield to do the work of 20 000 men.

Some notice should be given when this new technology is to be introduced into industry. It must be done with the knowledge and participation of the work force and the workers should share in the benefits that will flow from the improved technology. One has only to contemplate the backward thinking that over the years has prevailed in management in New South Wales and Australia on the introduction of new technology. One reads that miners were informed about new tools only when they were installed. The Amalgamated Postal Workers Union learned that the Redfern Mangler, which was a machine installed to sort mail automatically, was ready when members were taken to see it in the new mail exchange building in Sydney. The *Australian* of 9th August, 1972, in an article entitled "Who cares for the Automation Victim?" had this interesting report:

A survey by the Department of Labor and National Service on changes in manufacturing industry produced some revealing figures. Of the 1 629 manufacturers in the first three stages of the survey that introduced technological change in the preceding three years to 1969, only 17 per cent had consulted with the unions about it.

#### Secrecy

Many of the firms surveyed accommodated the changes without displacing or retrenching people. Of those with displacements, though, only 31 per cent talked about them with the unions, and only 41 per cent of those: with retrenchments.

Mr Rogan]

Of the 134 manufacturers who retrenched workers, only 30 per cent asked the Commonwealth Employment Service to help find alternative jobs. If this survey is any guide to normal practice—and the unions say it is—most companies don't bother to prepare their employees for change, even though it is the primary of a set of guidelines called "Adjusting to Technological Change" issued by the National Labor Advisory Council.

I hope that if the New South Wales Government can see its way clear to introduce the sort of measures that I have outlined we shall see the sort of changes that will benefit workers in New South Wales. Indeed, it might be a pace-setter for the remainder of Australia.

I should like also to deal with a reference in the Governor's Speech to the Extractive Industries Bill, which will provide a new code for the extraction of all materials from the ground. During the last session of the previous Parliament the honourable member for Woronora and I repeatedly called upon the coalition Government to do something about the effects of sand mining in the Georges River, particularly in the area of Chipping Norton. The previous Government set up a committee known as the Georges River Extractive Industries Inter-departmental Committee. It was established by the Minister for Public Works, the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Transport in the first Askin Government. The committee first met on 11th December, 1967. Its final meeting was on 21st June, 1972. The Maritime Services Board, the Department of Lands, the Department of Local Government, the State Planning Authority and the Liverpool, Fairfield and Bankstown councils were represented on the committee which was under the chairmanship of the assistant principal planner of the State Planning Authority of New South Wales. The committee's first term of reference was:

Are the activities of extractive industries resulting in undesirable conditions in the Chipping Norton area and elsewhere along the Georges River?

There were nine terms of reference but I shall refer to only three. Another term was:

What authority or body has the power to control activities and to take action to remedy undesirable aspects? Is the proposal made by the Liverpool Council for the creation of a lake a satisfactory and desirable solution to the problem in the Chipping Norton area?

That report was in the Government's possession in 1972 but it came to the knowledge of the honourable member for Woronora and me during our term which we commenced in this Parliament in 1973. The report had been completely ignored by the Government. It was only owing to the actions of the honourable member for Woronora and me in persisting with this matter in Parliament that the Government reluctantly agreed that there would have to be certain controls put on the mining that was being done at Chipping Norton, which was having an effect on the Georges River. The committee found with regard to the loss of river banks that, theoretically, the Department of Public Works could take action under the River and Foreshores Improvement Act to prevent and restore damage. In practice, the committee had been advised by the Department of Public Works that the requirements under the Act were such as to make it almost impossible to obtain a successful prosecution. Hence the need for firm legislation in that field. We discover that, although sand mining has been carried out there for the past ten years, it is only now that the Labor Government has come to office that we are to see the enactment of legislation that will safeguard the Georges River. The need to safeguard the river is ably pointed out by a

report prepared by Messrs R. F. Warner and G. Pickup of the University of Sydney. It relates to channel changes in the Georges River between Picnic Point and Lugarno from 1959 to 1974. It states:

Bank erosion is pronounced in many parts of the alluvial section of channel between Liverpool and East Hills. This is also a problem area in other respects; with low tidal flushing, a high flood potential, pond development and off-channel dredging at Moorebank and Chipping Norton. It also has the lowest scenic potential.

I am delighted that the Governor's Speech has intimated that this Government will take positive action on that matter.

The final matter that I wish to mention is one I have already taken up with the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways. The East Hills railway duplication and extension project was abandoned by the previous Government, but the promise was made in Labor's policy speech that the work would proceed. I am hopeful that when the budgetary situation of this State is better we shall see a start on that work. I am hopeful also of seeing work begin on the Lidcombe-Alfords Point county road which involves extensive road works leading to the Alfords Point bridge and major widening of both Fairford and Davies roads, Padstow. Hopefully we may see in the loan works programme or the budget some provision for work associated with the widening of Canterbury Road, between Fairford and Chapel roads and the southwestern freeway.

I hope to see also provision made for a new crossing of the Georges River south of Liverpool and the construction of a new carriageway from the Hume Highway to Fairford Road. I trust that this might also go ahead, but with due regard to the environmental consequences of it. I should like to see also the reconstruction of the railway bridge on the East Hills line at River Road, Revesby, which is a bottleneck to traffic using that roadway. I was glad to learn from the recent statement of the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways which announced that \$500,000 would be spent on commuter parking, that the East Hills electorate will fare rather well, with parking areas provided at Padstow and at East Hills. It augurs well for the future of New South Wales under this Government when one sees the innovative programme outlined by His Excellency.

Mr ROZZOLI (Hawkesbury) [4.40]: Along with other members who have spoken in this debate I congratulate members who have made their maiden speeches in this House. A maiden speech is a significant occasion. I well remember my maiden speech some years ago when I moved the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. I deplore the breaking down of the tradition that maiden speeches should be of a relatively non-controversial nature.

Mr Petersen: Mine was not. You heard it.

Mr ROZZOLI: The honourable member did not make his maiden speech this time. In return for observance of the tradition that maiden speeches should be heard in silence, they should be relatively non-controversial in content. I appreciate that any speech made in this House is of importance to the member who makes it, but maiden speakers should realize that in their first speech they do not have to include everything they wish to tell the House. I think the tradition is a good one and should be observed.

Mr Petersen: It is a tradition only as far as you are concerned.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROZZOLI: As has been indicated to me, it has not been accepted by all members.

Mr Sheahan: I was subjected to interjections in my maiden speech.

Mr **ROZZOLI**: That sort of thing is deplorable. There is plenty of time later in an honourable member's career for him to speak of controversial matters. Now turning to the Governor's Speech, I was more concerned with what was left out of the Speech than what was put in it. My colleagues have drawn attention to the large volume of material in the Speech which is a confirmation of the progressive policies of the previous Government. I do not object to this kind of material being included in the Speech. His Excellency gave not only a dissertation on what could be expected in the future but also a summary on what has happened in the past. These matters may validly be included in the Governor's Speech as a record of happenings in the State. If one subtracts from the Speech the matters initiated by the previous Government, only a relatively minor portion of the Speech is left to set out the initiatives that the new Government proposes to take.

I am concerned at the great disparity between the amount of material included in the Speech and the amount of material included in the State platform of the Labor Party which was prepared prior to the recent State elections. I am quite in agreement with some of the policies outlined in the platform, but I cannot help wondering what has prompted the Government to exclude them from the Governor's Speech. I am concerned that since the election some of the good ideas included in the State Labor platform which was published last February have already been put in the waste paper basket as being too idealistic to be practical. During the next twelve months I shall be interested to discover whether the legislation that comes forward contains some of the progressive reforms that were then set out. I am wondering whether they will see the light of day or become submerged and remain out of sight, as they are in the Governor's Speech. Because of my interest in planning and environment I was especially alarmed when the new Government when setting up its Cabinet separated the portfolios of planning and environment. It is incongruous that planning and environment should be under the administration of separate Ministers. We criticize the Government for this, but it is to the Premier's credit that he eventually admitted that he had made a mistake. This was much preferable to continuing with planning and environment in different portfolios. I give the Premier credit for recognizing his mistake.

In reading the Labor Party platform one sees why the Premier constructed his Cabinet as he did. Under the heading local government, section 12 of the platform covers a wide field of local government functions and planning. Obviously this thinking influenced the Premier in the construction of his Cabinet. That is not particularly disturbing. What is disturbing is the implication that Labor Party members, despite their protestations of being people interested in planning and environment, fell into the trap of including in the platform on local government the field of planning, divorcing these matters of planning from considerations of the environment. For some years all people concerned in this field have accepted that there is a strong connection between planning and environment. Indeed, the terms are almost synonymous. I can only surmise that in preparing the State platform the Labor Party leaders failed to realize this significant fact. One wonders just how much else they have failed to understand about planning and environment. This is a matter of grave concern to members on this side of the House.

I was interested to compare the Labor Party's policy on the environment with some of the basic objectives of the Labor Party. One of them that sounds quite good is that they place man in the highest possible category. They place him above the machines he uses in his life style—I have no objection to that—but they also place him above his environment. Much as we might like to think of ourselves as highly important in the scheme of things, I do not believe that we can consider man as being higher than the environment that supports him. It is now generally accepted philosophy

that if man destroys the environment around him and subjugates it, he is likely to destroy himself. The **Labor** Party's objective on that aspect is highly dangerous. Government supporters have failed to attack environment problems as the former Government did. Although we do not pretend that we overcame all the problems, we did much to combat them. Many of the conflicts are continuing and emerging in their nature, and they will continue to emerge as time goes on. They must be kept constantly under surveillance. A close watch must be kept on all the products of our civilization that are detrimental to the environment. If we add this basic objective within the **Labor** Party's philosophy to the apparent lack of understanding of the basic requirements of planning and environment, we have cause for considerable concern.

In examining the platforms of the two major parties, one sees, as a matter of logical conclusion, some similarities. As I said before, there are many things in the platform of the State ALP with which I agree. They are based on common sense, and any responsible group of citizens examining this area would have to come to the same conclusion. I foresee that in our basic objectives there will be areas of strategic agreement over the next few years. What we on this side of the House will be paying particular attention to will be the way in which the Government implements the proposals set forth in its platform.

That brings me to the next stage of my remarks. Considerable criticism was levelled at the previous Government by sectional interests that would have been affected by the Environmental Planning Bill. The criticism was that the public did not have enough opportunity to study the bill and to comment on it. Any fairminded person would have to disagree with that suggestion, and would attribute some of the criticism to those who neglected their obligation to examine the legislation when they had an opportunity to do so. The former Minister for Planning and Environment, the Hon. Sir John Fuller, made every attempt to put his line of thinking before the public. He had prepared a number of documents to assist in the achievement of that objective. He produced what was known as the green book, then the blue book, and finally the white book. Anyone who was interested in the subject could have followed the progress of preparation for the legislation.

Obviously one cannot examine a bill until it has been presented to Parliament. Anyone who is involved with legislation or interested in what happens to it understands that fundamental point. However, the previous Government anticipated such a contingency and prior to the dissolution of Parliament before the election of 1st May last, had taken the bill to the stage of the Minister's second-reading speech. When the debate was adjourned the bill lay on the table of the House pending the outcome of the elections. If the Liberal-Country parties had been re-elected, the legislation would have been proceeded with in this session, leaving ample time for anyone who was interested to examine the measure and to comment on it well in advance of the resumption of the debate. Even in the circumstance of the defeat of the former Government, the action taken by it has served the purpose of making available to the public a piece of legislation that was actually under consideration by the House.

I understand from statements made by the Vice-President of the Executive Council and Minister for Planning and Environment that he is not averse to many of the provisions in the bill. That does not surprise me, for it is a measure that is based largely on expressions of opinion by the public, and by responsible bodies such as the Planning and Environment Commission. Because many individual aspects of the platforms of the two major political parties have similarities, anyone going through the same exercise as the Hon. Sir John Fuller, irrespective of his political affiliation, would be likely to arrive at a point of view similar to the one at which the Minister arrived. It is not surprising, therefore, that the new Minister is somewhat kindly

*Mr Rozzoli*]

disposed to the provisions of the legislation. I can understand that he might want to make some refinements and some changes, and while he is doing that the public will have a further opportunity to examine the legislation and its implications. As we all appreciate, there is a considerable difference between **talking** about legislation in broad terms and then drafting it. It is often much harder to put an idea on paper in legislative terms than to produce the concept in the form of a working document.

One of the matters that is paramount in the platforms of the Liberal Party and the Labor Party is the necessity for involving the public in the determination of their own future. It is in this respect that one finds an intriguing contradiction in the stated objectives of the Labor Party. One objective is the socialization of the means of distribution, production and exchange. Another objective is total opposition to restriction of the development of the personality of the individual by the intrusion of the State. Yet one finds the Labor Party emphasizing that the welfare of the public should be achieved by the process of socialization. As I say, that seems to be a direct conflict with the other objective to which I have referred.

The fact remains that both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party are seeking to involve the public in the determination of their individual futures. That is easy to say. It is a simple principle to enunciate, but is hard to put into practice, and the former Government found in drafting the legislation that that concept presented grave difficulties. I know that it will prove of equally great difficulty to the present Government. It is interesting to note when looking at the philosophy of public participation in the decision-making process that one of the first actions of the present Government—one of its highest priorities—will be the reintroduction of compulsory voting in local-government elections. I hope that those who support the Labor Party and are members of citizen action groups will bear in mind the effect that compulsory voting in local-government elections will have on their capacity to influence the welfare of the community in which they live. Only since the introduction of voluntary voting in local-government elections have citizen action groups been able to organize themselves to exert pressure on existing members of local government bodies, or get into local councils people of their persuasion, so giving them an opportunity to make their voices heard.

Where does one find the correlation between the much vaunted philosophy of letting people have a say in their ultimate destiny and the stifling of one of the most effective ways by which members of the public in the past few years have been able to put across their viewpoint? I am glad to see the Minister for Local Government at the table of the House, for I know of his great and genuine concern for local government. I know that he was involved in planning for a short period, and I hope that he will give careful consideration to the view I am expressing, for it goes to the essence of democracy as we understand it. We have to be careful that irresponsible minority groups, in being given a voice, do not place an unfair burden on the community. I do not for a moment say that any group, no matter how small and no matter what point of view it represents, should not be heard. However, if we are to look at planning responsibly, there is a point at which we have to draw a line in relation to the capacity of the public to criticize and to hold up the normal process.

The vexed question of where a new airport should be sited always causes a political furor. One wonders how far from such a subject a citizen should be allowed to direct comments, and on what basis the comments should be accepted. The further a citizen gets from the specific issue, the more academic must be his point of view. Less emphasis should be placed on such an opinion if it means a **holdup** in the process of decision-making. An individual point of view must not be readily accepted unless the person making it can support his criticism by expert comment which by its own

authority commands respect. This introduces a further complication. It raises the question: who among the public can comment and how can they be heard? In the drafting of any proposed legislation I should like to see the Government give serious consideration to this point.

Governments will come under considerable pressure from minority groups who will seek to have their voices heard irrespective of whether they have any real rights in the issue under consideration. I note with some dismay the manner in which community participation in the decision-making process is to extend to planning. Paragraph (b) of item 12 of the Labor Party's platform on planning provides that local planning should be the responsibility of councils or regional planning districts administered by elected local government representatives in such regions. Paragraph (c) provides for membership of a regional planning district. That paragraph contains one of the two options set out in paragraph (b). It provides that membership of the regional council shall comprise one elected alderman—and that provision is consistent. It provides, also, for the appointment of town planning officers from each council or shire. Although that sounds sensible, it is not the same thing as the elected representatives referred to in paragraph (b). The crunch comes at the end of paragraph (c), "and such other people as the Minister for Local Government may appoint".

There is no indication whether these people are to come from the regional area or whether they are to be elected representatives or have a particular expertise in the field of town planning. They might come from Timbuktu, Woop Woop or the back of Bourke. That sort of generalization is dangerous in the light of a professed policy of allowing people in an area to have some say in their own destiny. In other words, from four council areas there can be four aldermen, four town planning officers and fifty other persons appointed to such a committee, completely overriding the wishes of the local population.

These are some of the inconsistencies disclosed in the Labor Party platform and they must cause great concern to anyone who really analyses the position and tries to determine where the new Government stands in regard to planning and the environment, or a combination of the two fields. It is obvious that the Premier did not understand the position when he arranged his Cabinet. He understandably bowed to public criticism. Though that may seem commendable, it does not necessarily indicate any understanding of the situation. The Premier said that he would combine the two portfolios of planning and environment and give them to the Minister in another place. I am a little interested to know where the Premier intends to go from here. I assure him that though his action might quieten the people for a while, the present position will not continue for long. As the Government gets more involved in legislation affecting planning and the environment—which affects every facet of our life—he will strike more trouble. Far more rational thinking will have to be introduced into this area and brought to its logical conclusion.

We have the incredible situation of housing being tacked on to the end of the public works and ports portfolios. Government supporters have stressed—and I agree with them—the importance of housing in the community. Most of us think there is nothing more important than having a roof over our heads. We all like to think we have something there to keep the rain away. Yet the Government has placed so little importance on housing that it has tacked its administration on to the end of one of the biggest portfolios—public works and ports. The position would not be so bad if housing had been added to a more appropriate portfolio. It should have been put in with planning and environment. There is nothing more important to the average person than the house in which he lives. If we want to help people on low incomes, it behoves us to provide them with suitable houses. They must be given housing that is

*Mr Rozzoli*

environmentally pleasing and upgrades their way of life. Major planning factors such as the proper distribution of water and sewerage facilities and the deployment of other services are most important and should form part of a comprehensive plan. If the Government wants to put housing administration somewhere, it should be put with planning and environment. It certainly should not have been tacked on to the end of the public work and ports portfolios. I do not wish to be critical of the Deputy Premier, but I am sure that he will have his work cut out in handling public works and ports without becoming greatly involved in housing problems.

It is obvious from one of the Government's early press releases that one of its earliest pieces of legislation will concern the preservation of historic buildings. I could not agree more with the necessity to bring in legislation of that type. This is something that concerns me greatly. I had hoped that if the planning and environment legislation previously proposed was to be delayed indefinitely, at least that part of it dealing with historic buildings could be extracted and introduced as a separate measure. There would have been merit in doing this, if only to achieve something quickly. Day by day we are losing part of our national heritage in the form of historic buildings. A further example of the incredible lack of real understanding the Premier has about these matters occurred in regard to Elizabeth Bay House. One would not criticize the Premier if he allowed his Ministers to deal with their own portfolios while he worried about the overall running of the State, but as he has interfered in other areas he has to accept criticism.

I draw honourable members' attention to a speech by the Leader of the Opposition in another place last Thursday. On that occasion the Minister clearly stated the Government's attitude on Elizabeth Bay House. There is no easy way to introduce legislation to preserve historic buildings. It involves compensation and assistance that have to be given to people who retain historic homes. There are problems in ensuring that all this is done with a minimum of government invasion into people's private lives. It is difficult to abolish discrimination by bringing in anti-discrimination legislation. In the same way, it is difficult to preserve historic buildings by simply telling people that they cannot be pulled down. In some circumstances such a statement leaves the owner of the building or the people responsible for it in an intolerable situation.

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

Mr BRERETON (Heffron) [5.10]: I am delighted to have the opportunity of taking part in the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I congratulate those new members who have made their maiden speeches in this debate. I congratulate particularly the honourable member for Parramatta and the honourable member for Blue Mountains, who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In particular, I congratulate my new colleagues, the honourable member for Ashfield, the honourable member for Monaro, the honourable member for Gosford and the honourable member for Hurstville, all of whom have made worthwhile contributions to this debate. All those honourable members stand as an example of the reason why Labor occupies the Government benches after being in Opposition for eleven years. They show clearly the talent, the capacity and the all-round ability of Labor candidates in the State elections. These honourable members won marginal seats which resulted in victory for the Labor Party.

In the past few weeks I have been amused by the sad faces of Opposition members. I have never seen a more unhappy bunch in all my life. They are quite transformed from what they were when they were sitting on the Government benches. Their performance has been a little sadder than their faces. We all know that honourable members opposite are victims of the born-to-rule syndrome. They did not believe that they could ever be anything else but the rulers of the State of New

South Wales. When they were cast out by the people on 1st May, they were faced with a situation that they simply found unbelievable—they had to wake up to their responsibilities and act as a constructive Opposition. Up to this very hour they have not managed to look at all constructive in any respect. It struck me as curious that each time a division is called in the House—and there have been many divisions—the members of the present Opposition have come through the doors of the Chamber and attempted to sit on the Government benches. It is obviously a practice that they got into over the past eleven years and find hard to break. I am sure that we on this side of the House will manage to break them of that habit in the long years ahead.

It is worth while reflecting on the reasons why the former Government was turfed out of office. There has been much recent talk about people being turfed out of Parliament, but surely that is quite a secondary matter to the real question that the people of New South Wales had on their minds. They felt impelled to throw out the Government of the day and to put **Labor** into office. The people did so because they were greatly dissatisfied with the former administration. It is worth mentioning that there have been no post-mortems by members opposite. They still believe that what happened on 1st May was some sort of incredible accident. It was no accident. The fact is that my leader has already been Premier of this State longer than his predecessor, the present Leader of the Opposition, was Premier. He has been Premier for 117 days whereas the Leader of the Opposition, after he deposed his colleague, the honourable member for Wollondilly, was Premier for only 113 days. He was there just long enough to get his photograph on the wall of the foyer. It is up there on the stairs, with a gloomy grey background, quite different from other adjoining photographs.

The former Government will be best remembered for the manner in which it set about disregarding the views of the people of this State. It disregarded them totally. I have said since the day **Labor** achieved office that the major problem facing us is unemployment and that the Fraser-Lynch Government has set out upon a deliberate campaign of using unemployment as an economic weapon. It has ignored the consequences to the working man and his wife and children, or the working woman, and all people who are family breadwinners. There was no consideration of that by the former Government. A question was asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition—with tongue in cheek—when he blatantly attempted to misrepresent figures about how things were so rosy during his term of office. Yesterday was the first time we have seen him making much noise about unemployment.

Before the elections he was not concerned with it. He and his colleagues were totally committed to a marvellous cosmetic job to fool the people of New South Wales into forgetting the depressing issues of education, treatment of nurses, petrol tax and other matters of great concern. Certainly the former Government was not interested in the problem of unemployment and what the Fraser-Lynch Government was attempting to do. From the time of the elections until yesterday honourable members opposite have been preoccupied, not with unemployment, but with disrupting this House. They have set about a deliberate campaign to denigrate your office, Mr Speaker, and to attempt to rule New South Wales by way of a de facto government. They still believe they are in government and they have set about doing nothing but disrupt the proceedings of this House. They have not acted as a constructive Opposition. **The** recent dissent motions were notable because they were aimed at protecting their **own** reputations and, on one occasion, attacking mine.

I should like to spend a couple of minutes examining the Leader of the Opposition and his performance both as Minister for Education and later as Premier of this State. I have been amused by the face of the honourable member for Wollondilly,

*Mr Brereton]*

because throughout the past two weeks every time the Leader of the Opposition got a caning—with great repetition during the past week, particularly—the honourable member for Wollondilly was the only person smiling on the Opposition benches. He looked as if he had swallowed a canary—he had a grin from ear to ear. He should not have been smiling. We are the ones who are smiling. The honourable member for Wollondilly was the greatest bonus that Labor ever received. He was of immeasurable help to my party. I had hoped to propose him for a knighthood for services to the Labor Party. I was disappointed when he missed out on the nomination by his associate, the present Leader of the Opposition.

A couple of other interesting members were victims of the rise to power of Sir Eric Willis. They were the honourable member for Bligh, who had been running around for about five months like a chook with its head cut off, and the honourable member for Dubbo, who has not been far behind him. They are now quite satisfied to be sitting in Opposition. They had already lost their perks and plum jobs; they had been deposed. That is one of the real reasons for the ineffectiveness of the Opposition. Their ranks are divided and they would not know what day it is.

I should like to spend a few moments looking at the progress of education during the term of office of the present Leader of the Opposition. I was interested the other day to hear him describe the Minister for Education as a poodle who gets his orders from a so-called militant teachers federation. He also accused the Government of dudding the figures relevant to the number of unemployed teachers. I put it to the House that by suggesting some kind of plot was organized by the Government, the Leader of the Opposition is casting a grave reflection on the excellent officers of the Department of Education who are responsible for compiling these figures. Under the Willis Government—not the Labor administration—some 2 200 teachers were registered with the department as unemployed. On this occasion the Minister for Education has referred to certain unemployment cards that were compiled by departmental officers. They were compiled with the same thoroughness that those officers always apply to their tasks, not only for the present Minister for Education, but also for the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Hornsby when they held that portfolio. To say that the Government would mislead the public on the question of 2 200 unemployed teachers in February is a gross reflection on the department's manpower officers.

The Labor Minister for Education is rightly distressed by the reflection involved in the speech by the Leader of the Opposition, who was never very successful in the education portfolio. The people of New South Wales know this. He had a reputation for union bashing. I think he was quite proud of it. He continually provoked the Teachers Federation by making outrageous statements. In doing so, he forced the education of children to become a pursuit secondary to his ruthless determination to score political points at their expense. Since the Labor Government came to office there has been only one strike involving teachers of more than two hours. That is worth putting on the record. That was the strike of Newcastle teachers against Medibank on 16th June. The only strikes concerning local issues in the Department of Education occurred at Junee high school on 8th July and 13th July over the ridiculous question of transfer of a teacher. It was an easy matter for the Minister and the Premier, who personally intervened, to sort out that matter in double quick time. By contrast, when the previous Government was in office more than 22 000 teachers were out on strike on some days. That was the former Government's sorry record of administration. Look at what happened on 13th April, 1975, when the present Leader of the Opposition, then the Minister for Education, said:

The public needs to be aware that my department is dealing with an extremely militant union executive whose main interest is to assume as much influence and authority as it can over public education in this State.

That was his assessment; that is the manner in which he set about doing his job. His Government was not only anti-union—it was also anti-teacher. How can the Leader of the Opposition believe that 43 000 teachers in New South Wales, including those involved in isolated country schools, special schools for the handicapped and infants' schools, are militant ratbags? If he thinks so, let him tell the House now. I believe that is his opinion, but I doubt whether we shall hear it from him again. We know how the former Government applied itself to education issues. Ask the people at Nowra primary school about the library block promised by the present Leader of the Opposition. Ask the people of Tumut about the assembly hall that was promised at the Tumut high school. The Leader of the Opposition promised that hall in a fashion in which departmental advice was coloured and touched up in political window-dressing by him as Minister for Education.

Ask the Queanbeyan primary school parents and citizens association about its attacks on the Leader of the Opposition for the lies told by the honourable member for Hornsby, who arrived at Queanbeyan during the by-election campaign and promised a school library, although the association was more interested in classrooms. The honourable member for Hornsby did not even have a ministerial file on his promise. This caused his departmental officers considerable embarrassment. When the Leader of the Opposition was attacked by the association he mumbled that the Labor Government had pushed the programme down the priority list. The truth is that the honourable member for Hornsby was aware that there was no file or project. The Leader of the Opposition tried to blame the Government for his Minister's blunder. I am certain we shall hear more on this matter from the honourable member for Monaro, the honourable member for South Coast and the honourable member for Burrinjuck in this session of Parliament.

The honourable member for Hornsby was adept at making promises while Minister for Education, but he refused to visit a building that was badly in need of repairs at Kogarah high school until he was tricked into having morning tea there. What about Katoomba? This Government's first priority on a new high school is on the site of the Katoomba primary school where children now have to wear parkas in below-freezing conditions in a school that can be described as no better than a stable. The honourable member for Hornsby was ready to duck out of that one, too, when he was Minister for Education. His avoidance of the problem must have caused considerable embarrassment to the former member for Blue Mountains, and no doubt it was one of the reasons why he lost that seat. The honourable member for Hornsby did a good job in that regard; we ought to congratulate him.

The Opposition's record on education matters has always been one of politics. The sum total of the achievements in education of the honourable member for Yaralla, who was asleep in the Chamber yesterday, and his crowing colleague, the honourable member for Burwood, was to pontificate in the term of the previous Government about the proposed school at Concord. The honourable member for Drummoynes is flat out trying to make progress rather than propaganda out of that school. **Such a thing would** not have happened under a Labor administration. This Government has endorsed the calling of tenders for work to the value of \$47,000 at Manly girls' high school, where the previous Government built thirty-six rooms without lights. The Willis Government cancelled the work in 1975 under the pretext that federal funds had been reduced. That is not a Labor electorate. The honourable member for Manly ought to be thankful to the new administration for the job it is doing for people and children of Manly.

Recently in this Chamber the honourable member for Gordon, who for obvious reasons has been nicknamed Hagar the Horrible, was crowing about some maintenance

*Mr Brereton]*

work that he found was needed at Cromehurst special school. He even released information to the press, along with photographs of the damage such as rotten floor boards and dangerous wiring in wet weather, both of which arose while his team, his party and his Ministers were in government. The work has already been put in hand by the new Minister for Education. Orders have gone out. We on this side will do everything possible to patch up the situation that grew up over the years of neglect by the former Government, irrespective of whether the seats are now held by Labor or Opposition members. Children come first, not politics.

The Government is concerned about education, not politics. Look at what it has done already in the field of education. It has restored the right of teachers to have their union fees deducted from their salaries by the Department of Education. It is abolishing the out-dated bonding scheme and is re-assessing the method of selecting teachers so that good, concerned teachers are chosen because of their suitability, rather than on the result of their school marks. The Government will restore the union preference clause for employment purposes.

Mr Petersen: Hear! hear!

Mr BRERETON: Hear, hear, indeed. We have helped to reduce certain class sizes and have relieved the principals of second-class primary schools of teaching duty. Already the Government has put on an extra eighty remedial and English second language teachers. Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, who attempted to force school councils down the throat of the community, this Government is committed to the establishment of an education commission, which will have on it teachers and parents alike, side by side, exploring ways of introducing effective community involvement in schools. The Government is examining migrant teaching requirements and has announced a teacher-exchange programme with Italy, which will be followed by one with Greece and one with Yugoslavia. Of course, the press has been quick to praise the Government's endeavours in education in New South Wales. For the first time in a decade parents are free of the fear that a political strike will break out, disrupting the school and the education of their children. Parents are talking openly about education and about the ways in which they will share in the functions of the Education Commission. What a far cry from the situation that existed only a few short months ago.

The Leader of the Opposition again misled the House last week when he said that the Minister for Education was receiving deputations from the Teachers Federation on his own. The truth is that the federation has regained the position it had prior to 1965, so that its members can now approach the Minister freely on matters of concern to them, knowing that they will get a sympathetic hearing. There is nothing new about what is being done. The federation was able to approach the Minister for Education under Labor administrations right up to 1965. We all acknowledge, surely, that not every request made by the Teachers Federation will be granted. However, Government supporters know that the Minister for Education understands the situation and welcomes the opportunity to be able to meet representatives of teachers. The senseless irritations have been taken out of these deputations, and on all major deputations the Minister has invited departmental officers to be present. The Minister not only asks them; indeed, he welcomes them for the advice they are able to give. Members of the Opposition have given no indication of what they would do to solve the education problems in New South Wales.

The fact is that education is facing a crisis, particularly with school leavers. The policies of the Fraser Government are causing that crisis and its policies are those to which the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition spokesman on education, the honourable member for Hornsby, subscribe. It is the same Liberal Party federally and in the State. Yet these honourable members are strangely silent about the fate of

250 000 boys and girls, including 85 000 in New South Wales, who will finish secondary and tertiary education in December next. We have heard nothing from the Opposition about them. More than **10 000** young people throughout Australia who left school last year still do **not** have **jobs**.

Mr Petersen: And they cannot get the dole because Senator Margaret Guilfoyle will not let them have it.

Mr BRERETON: That is correct. Nearly 40 per cent of the total unemployed are under 20 years of age, although that group accounts for only 12 per cent of the work force. About 35 young persons are registered for every city vacancy, and up to 600 are registered for every job vacancy in New South Wales country centres. What a scandalous situation. What are members of the Opposition doing about it? Where are their expressions of concern? Where is their constructiveness? We have not yet seen it. In addition, the Fraser Government has decreed that school leavers must wait three months—not a month, or two weeks—before becoming eligible for unemployment benefits.

Mr Peterson: Shame.

Mr BRERETON: It is a great shame indeed. Let me look next at the Schools Commission. The report of that commission points out that the Fraser Government's cuts in education have been so severe that it will not be able to meet its objectives or to undertake any new initiatives. That is in print. The *Sydney Morning Herald* agrees with the commission's assessment, stating in an editorial of 12th August that the 2 per cent real growth in funds for 1977 must be related to the fact that school enrolments are expected to be increased by 1.11 per cent. Have honourable members opposite put pressure on their federal colleagues to remedy that state of affairs? Of course not. Again, the federal Government has starved the Technical and Further Education Commission of funds, despite the fact that enrolments have increased at a much greater rate than capital expenditure. Instead of going ahead, technical education has slipped further behind, and that is scandalous.

The State Minister for Education informed me today that there has been considerable misrepresentation of the nature of the federal Government's allocation for technical and further education this year. Although the Commonwealth has indicated that its financial support for technical and further education provided for a 7.5 per cent growth in real terms in 1977 over the figure for 1976, and a 5 per cent growth per annum in real terms in 1978–79, the actual recurrent grants proposed represented a reduction in 1977 of approximately 40 per cent compared with the recurrent grants available in 1976.

I should like to spend the last few minutes available to me discussing the manner in which the Leader of the Opposition, a former Premier of this State, attempted to hoodwink the people of New South Wales on the subject of double taxation. The Labor Party saw this possibility as a major election issue in the election campaign, and it was clear that the people regarded it as a significant problem that would have to be faced if the Liberal-Country parties were re-elected. A great deal of gobbledegook was talked on the subject by the present Leader of the Opposition. A report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 23rd April, 1976, is in these terms, purporting to quote the Leader of the Opposition:

"The Fraser federalism plan allows a State government to remove unfair, indirect taxes, and replace them by a more equitable income tax—a tax based on capacity to pay," he told a news conference.

There would be only one assessment, one tax form and one collecting agency.

His colleague the Prime Minister came to his defence in the election campaign, when, on 19th April, he ruled out the possibility of double taxation, saying that the new arrangements would involve having only one tax form, one assessment, and one set of tax scales for everyone. In other words, there would be one taxation system. As the pressure was applied and public opinion built up on this matter in the dying days of the campaign the Leader of the Opposition changed his tune and on 26th April he was reported in the press as pledging the Liberal-Country parties not to increase State taxes, and not to abolish indirect taxes and replace them with an income tax during the next Parliament. He was reported as saying also:

Maybe they could be replaced by an income tax—a much fairer tax—  
but that would be many years in the future.

I have had the opportunity of going to Canada, where I obtained a Canadian taxation form. The system there is supposed to be the one upon which the Fraser plan is based. One can see quite clearly from the Canadian taxation form that if our system is to follow Canada's the people of New South Wales have been misled by the federal Government.

An examination of the document shows there is one assessment, one taxation form and one collection agency. Part of the document sets out the different rates of taxation that apply in each State. In Newfoundland the rate is 40 per cent; in Prince Edward Island it is 36 per cent and in Nova Scotia 38.5 per cent. The rate of tax in New Brunswick is 41.5 per cent and in Ontario 30.5 per cent. In Manitoba the rate of tax is 42.5 per cent; it is 40 per cent in Saskatchewan, 26 per cent in Alberta and 30.5 per cent in British Columbia. This is the type of system proposed by Opposition members and their federal colleagues. I shall enjoy having a lot more to say on this question when the opportunity is afforded to me during the budget debate.

Mr FREUDENSTEIN (Young) [5.40]: Mr Speaker, during the past couple of weeks you have reminded us of the fact that in the Address-in-Reply debate an honourable member can speak on several subjects; he can speak on the matters contained in the Governor's Speech and things that are not part of that Speech. The honourable member for Heffron certainly directed his remarks to the things that do not appear in the Governor's Speech. Moreover, most of his remarks represented an example of negative thinking. It is strange to see a young man of his age living so much in the past rather than projecting the future policies that one would expect from one in what he called a forward-going party. I believe that in the next three years in New South Wales we will see just how backward-looking the Labor Party is. An illustration of that backward-looking attitude has just been seen in the speech made by the honourable member for Heffron.

It is traditional at this time for honourable members of vintage '59 to welcome new members to this House. I shall follow that tradition by congratulating those honourable members who have made their maiden speeches in this debate. In particular, I congratulate the honourable member for Parramatta and the honourable member for Blue Mountains who had the honour of moving and seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech. I congratulate, also, other honourable members who have made their contributions to this debate. In particular, I congratulate the honourable member for Barwon who has a great example to follow in the service rendered by the former honourable member for Barwon. By his speech the honourable member for Barwon indicated that his record would be equally as famous and positive as the contribution made by the former honourable member for Barwon.

I regret to say that the same cannot be said about the speeches made by Government supporters—they were speeches of despair. In fact the Speech that was delivered by His Excellency the Governor—and we all know it was prepared by the Government—is one of despair. It is little more than saturated negation; it contains few positive statements and indications of improvements in quality of life. I propose later to comment on the few positive parts of the Governor's Speech. In the interests of the community of New South Wales, I propose to draw the attention of the House and the public generally to the changing standards that are reflected by the new Government and, in particular, by the Premier. It appears that criminals get greater sympathy from the Premier and the Labor Party than law abiding citizens who diligently respect the law and the rights of other citizens, and uncomplainingly pay their taxes towards the support of the community.

Only a few days ago the Premier criticized the law enforcement agencies of this State for raiding a group of drug pushers on the far North Coast. In addition to criticizing the police, the Premier made certain other statements and called for a report on the matter. As I know that area—and as the local member knows it—it is certain that a serious drug problem exists there.

Mr Petersen: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I submit that this matter is *sub judice*; the case is before the court and I submit that you should direct the honourable member not to refer to it.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is referring to a particular matter; he is referring to the question generally.

Mr FREUDENSTEIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I shall not refer to any specific case that is before the courts. The fact that the honourable member for Illawarra took that point of order indicates that he and his colleagues sympathize with druggies and pushers, and he has now provided confirmation of that sympathy. However, the Premier goes even further. He is willing to encourage not only demonstrations against the Governor-General but also illegal demonstration in any form. The Premier went to Newcastle where there is a serious problem concerning the shipbuilding industry. It is a problem that should exercise our minds.

Mr Petersen: It did not exercise the minds of your colleagues.

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

Mr FREUDENSTEIN: Instead of encouraging the unions to get on with the job of building ships and so keep their jobs, the Premier went to Newcastle and told the men there that the Prime Minister's terms were not acceptable. The Prime Minister's offer would cost \$13,000 to keep each employee in his job. However, the unions would not accept the Prime Minister's offer—even to retain the men's jobs. Though the farming community of this State has suffered a big drop in income it is still willing to keep producing. The Premier encouraged shipbuilding workers to reject the Prime Minister's offer. That is why I described the speech prepared for the Governor as one of despair and saturated negation.

Let me comment on the one positive thing in the document—which was obviously written by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy. It concerns the increase and proposed increase in the power plants following the announcement that an energy authority would be established. The document states:

The installation of additional generating plants is already well advanced at Wallerawang and Vales Point power stations and new projects are being planned to meet the anticipated demand for electricity. Eraring Power Station, which will be the largest in Australia, will be commenced this year.

It was commenced before we left power. Let me indicate to the House just what the needs of electricity will be over the next ten years. By 1979 the winter peak power demand will require 6 650 megawatts and the production of 12 million tonnes of coal to produce it. By 1986 the expected winter peak power demand will be 10 000 megawatts and we shall require the production of 18 million tonnes of coal to produce that.

Having looked at those estimates, the Electricity Commission under my ministry commenced work on a 500 megawatt generating unit at Wallerawang. It was commissioned this year. I remind the honourable member for Blue Mountains that it was at the insistence of the former member for Blue Mountains that we put a power station at Lithgow. The Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy when he was Minister for Local Government in the previous Labor administration said that Lithgow coal was unsuitable and that he would not be putting a power station at Wallerawang. There was a positive achievement by the former member for Blue Mountains in the establishment of that power station. This year a new 500 megawatt generating unit will be constructed at Wallerawang. At Vales Point a new 660 megawatt generating unit will be constructed. The first of these units will be in service in 1978 and the second in 1979.

The **Shoalhaven** scheme is going ahead. I noticed earlier in the Governor's Speech a reference to the Eraring power station which, when I was Minister, was the subject of a long and difficult environmental impact study. That power station is now being hidden in the hills and work on it is proceeding. We are told that it will be commenced this year, whereas tenders were called prior to our leaving office.

These are the positive things in this document and the positive things, I remind this House, were started in the time of the Liberal-Country party Government. I shall remind honourable members also when we begin to consider the bills referred to in the Speech that most of them were in the pipeline when we were in office, particularly the one concerning extractive industries. Someone was complimenting the new Minister about that but the bill had already been drafted while we were in office. I did not have the pleasure of putting it through but if it is the same bill as I had prepared, I shall be doing something to support it.

I ~~was~~ not able to attend in the Chamber a few days ago when the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy addressed himself to the question of natural gas and the laterals to country towns. However, he said in that speech that the former Government had no agreement with the Australian Gas Light Company to carry gas out on the country laterals, that is, from Young through Cootamundra to Wagga Wagga, and from Young through Cowra to Bathurst, Orange and Lithgow. This technically was not a lie; the story was that in 1970 when the pipeline was to be built by AGL it was to be financed with money guaranteed by the Government of New South Wales and AGL. It was to be built under the New South Wales Pipelines Act, 1960, and a permit had been applied for by AGL to build that pipeline from South Australia to Sydney.

State Cabinet met on this question and, having stipulated certain conditions including conditions as to the environment and the areas through which the pipelines could travel, it indicated to AGL that it would be willing to issue a permit for that company to construct the pipeline to bring natural gas from South Australia to Sydney, granting a sole franchise in Sydney for the sale of natural gas, provided those conditions were fulfilled. One of the conditions was that lateral pipelines would be built to Cootamundra and Wagga from Young and to Cowra, Bathurst, Orange and Lithgow simultaneously with the main pipeline being constructed.

A dreadful thing happened to Australia in December, 1972. A fellow by the name of Connor took over the minerals and energy portfolio in Canberra and he had a great dream to nationalize everything that he could put his hands on. In January, 1973—he waited only a month—he said to AGL, "You are not going to build the pipeline from South Australia to Sydney. We shall take it over and build and operate it." At that stage he set up the Pipeline Authority. My predecessor in the mines and energy portfolio, the Hon. Wal Fife, at that stage contacted Mr Connor who had the mines and energy portfolio in the federal Labor Government, intimating to him that New South Wales had an agreement with AGL to build lateral pipelines to various country towns. Mr Connor agreed to take the details, and he did so. This is where my friend, the present Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy, misled honourable members when he spoke in this House last week. He said that we had no agreement.

Here is the agreement, or a section of it, between the Pipeline Authority, a body corporate established by the Pipelines Act of 1973, and the Australian Gas Light Company. Clause 26 (1) on page 16 states:

For the purpose of enabling A.G.L. to fulfill the obligations which prior to the negotiation of this Agreement the Government of the State of New South Wales had imposed upon it to supply natural gas to the cities and towns of Orange, Bathurst, Lithgow, Cootamundra, Cowra and Wagga Wagga in the State of New South Wales, the Authority shall construct and complete as soon as practicable laterals for the carriage of natural gas.

I ask the House whether we did or did not lay down conditions. I suggest to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy that he check the files and if he cannot find this agreement I shall give him copies that I have kept personally. Might I now draw attention to the wording of the agreement. One of the conditions had been that the pipeline laterals would be constructed concurrently with the main line. Mr Connor amended the agreement to read "as soon as practicable". When I said to him in Canberra shortly after taking up the portfolio, "You wrote something into an agreement that New South Wales had with the AGL and you refused to show the New South Wales Government what it was", Mr Connor said, "I was asked to keep this document secret from the Government of New South Wales".

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

Mr FREUDENSTEIN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was speaking on the question of the carriage of natural gas to the country towns and cities and I had revealed to the House that the former federal Minister for Mines and Energy had told me that the terms of the agreement between the Australian Gas Light Company and the federal Government's Pipeline Authority had been kept secret from the New South Wales State Parliament at the request of the Australian Gas Light Company. If that were so, I have no alternative but to accuse the federal Labor Party and the company of contriving and conniving to keep natural gas out of our country towns. In view of the statement made the other night by the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy, when he denied that New South Wales had imposed any conditions prior to the natural gas project being taken away from the State when the federal Government confiscated all its powers in the matter, I have to accuse the Government of New South Wales also of contriving and conniving to keep natural gas out of our country towns.

It was clearly written into the agreement between the Pipeline Authority and the AGL, following negotiations between the AGL and the Government of New

South Wales that it would supply natural gas to the cities and towns of **Bathurst**, Orange, Lithgow, Cootamundra, Cowra and Wagga Wagga. However, one word was altered, with the knowledge of the federal Government. Was it altered at the instigation of the **Labor** Government in Canberra, or was that Government so anxious to take over and socialize the gas industry in this State that it was willing to accept anything that the AGL put up? It altered the timing. If the Minister for **Industrial Relations**, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy cares to look at the files, **he** will find a letter of about November, 1972, from the Premier of New South Wales, and another of July, 1970, implicitly pointing out the conditions that were to **be** imposed if the AGL were to be granted a permit. The company did not reply. **At** that stage it was obviously negotiating with the Labor Government, or the Labor Party, in an endeavour to keep gas out of our country towns and cities.

I must point out that this is an indication of how seriously the **Labor** Party, both State and federal, views the question of decentralization. **Labor** was willing to play along with a company that refused to charge that small extra fee to city **con-**sumers in order to give a cheaper fuel to country areas and to attract industries **out** there. I question the integrity of any party in the federal sphere, be it **Labor**, Liberal or Country Party, that would contrive and connive with a large company that had a sole franchise to deliver gas to the metropolitan area but refused to give the same benefits of that great fuel to the inland towns of this State. I say now to the Minister that he **should** check the files. The information is there. If he cannot **find** it on the files, I have copies in my own personal files and I shall supply details to him. **I can** give him a copy of the agreement signed by **Mr Connor**, a **Labor** Minister in the federal Parliament, and the AGL, which obviously has sought not to take gas into our rural towns.

I have tonight described the Governor's Speech as a document of saturated negation. I have picked out the few positive points in it. They are the initiatives taken by the former Government, principally in the field of energy where it provided for increased demands in energy over the next ten years. This Government claims as its own achievement the power station at **Eraring**, and the increase of two extra units of 660 megawatts at the Vales Point power station and the Wallerawang power station, all of which were begun in the term of the former Government. Over the years the former Government did much to foresee the needs of the future and to protect New South Wales in its further energy crisis, if there is one. We know that since problems with fuel from the Middle East, virtually every country has had an energy crisis. New South Wales has no need to have one. Not only did the former Government initiate new power stations; it also took the initiative in the conversion of coal to liquid fuel in the great open spaces. We did more: we set up exploration areas throughout the State to research coal reserves and to find out how much is under the ground.

A claim is made in the Governor's Speech that this Government let a contract for Warkworth. I could have done that. I called for tenders long before I left office, but because I did not want to be accused of looking after big business I did not let a contract. I am pleased that this Government has let a contract to a firm that I believe **will** provide the greatest return to the people of New South Wales. **The** contract was correctly let. I hope that no change will be made in the policies that were laid down in the Mining Act, which gave free enterprise a great role to play in the coal industry. I hope that this role is continued and that our great coal industry will not be socialized. I am concerned principally with this Government's turning away from the traditional code of ethics within our society. Its support of druggies and criminals cannot be tolerated. The people will recognize this quickly and throw the Government out of office.

Mr FERGUSON (Merrylands), Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing [7.40]: I welcome the opportunity to take part in this important debate. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the honourable member for Parramatta and the honourable member for Blue Mountains. Both honourable gentlemen have distinguished themselves and shown that they will be here for many years to come. I congratulate all honourable members who have made their maiden speeches, though I must admit that the quality of the speeches made by the Government supporters was better than the quality of the speeches made by members of the Opposition who, unfortunately, had to try to defend the decisions of the former Liberal-Country party Government and its performance over almost eleven years in this State. That is like trying to defend the indefensible.

I wish to comment on the contributions made to the debate by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party. It is rare indeed for both the tail and the dog to take part in the one debate. It may be that the Leader of the Country Party was forced into the debate by the abysmal standard of the contribution made by the Leader of the Opposition. If that was the case, I can assure him that he dead-heated for last with the Leader of the Liberal Party. Conservative politics in this State have never been at such a low ebb.

Mr Punch: We seem to have worried the Deputy Premier.

Mr FERGUSON: The Leader of the Country Party and the Leader of the Opposition do not worry me. The major concern of the Leader of the Country Party at the moment seems to be the speeches he made when he was Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports. He has requested my department to provide him with all of the speeches that he made when he was the Minister responsible for that department. My first reaction was to throw them all in a wheelbarrow and send them over to him. I made inquiries and ascertained that they were researched and written by departmental officers and are part of the department's files.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Byron to order for the third time.

Mr FERGUSON: I have found since becoming a member of the Government that public servants worship pieces of paper. They harbour them, protect them, and want to keep them in their own departments. Respecting that viewpoint I decided that I would not have fourteen public servants spending the next few weeks photocopying the speeches made by the former Minister. If the honourable gentleman indicates specifically which of his gems of profound wisdom he wants, I shall assign an officer to get that particular speech for him. Let me say finally in replying to the interjection by the Leader of the Country Party that I am surprised he did not take all his speeches with him when he left office. He took everything else, including the paper clips.

We had the spectacle the other day of Opposition members bleating about the disclosure that former Cabinet Ministers and former Government backbenchers held milk quotas worth more than \$600,000 a year at a time when the Government of the day refused to give dairyfarmers outside the milk zone a fair share of the milk market. No other government but the one thrown out of office last May would have countenanced such a disgraceful situation. I even doubt that it could have happened in Queensland under Mr Bjelke-Petersen. It is little wonder that the former Government covered

up for the corporate criminals. They could hardly do otherwise when there were so many men in the Government making a fortune because they refused to grant the just claims of dairymen outside the milk zone.

The Leader of the Opposition spent most of his time accusing the Government of having stolen his policies. Let us have a look at that claim. He talked of grants to the surf life saving movement, of prison reform, of tighter fire regulations, and of a review of the legal profession. He omitted to tell the House that his Government had more than ten years in which to attend to those matters, and it was only after the election campaign began that the Liberal and Country parties decided that something should be done about them. We did not steal our policies from the Opposition—the Opposition stole them from us. The Leader of the Country Party laughs. Why during nearly eleven years in office did the coalition not implement the policies it now claims that the Government stole? The fact is that the coalition parties stole these policies from the Labor Party, and because we are willing to implement them the members of the Opposition are bleating and wailing.

The Leader of the Opposition can, perhaps, be excused for misleading the House. In government the Liberal Party found it impossible to distinguish between truth and outright lies: a leopard cannot change its spots. I can appreciate the desperation of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Country Party when they look from their side of the House, see a united determined government, and compare it with the faction-ridden, dispirited coalition led by them. The Opposition parties have had three leaders in two years and are now looking for another to take them out of the political wilderness. In my usual friendly way I offer members opposite some advice on this subject. I have looked through their ranks and I suggest the best thing they can do is settle back and enjoy their twenty years in Opposition. I do not want to be too critical of the previous Government, but I believe the people are entitled to know how their money was managed or mismanaged.

Mr Fischer: And how it is going to be mismanaged.

Mr FERGUSON: If the honourable gentleman keeps up that sort of comment, I shall take back the \$2,000 I gave him. Let us consider the Opera House, for example. **The Labor Party**, on coming to government, discovered **examples** of gross **mismanagement** and a disgraceful waste of money on the project since the day the previous government sacked the original architect, Mr Joern Utzon. No doubt we shall discover more examples of gross mismanagement. In regard to the Opera House, the former Government used as an excuse for sacking the original architect the argument that it would be able better to manage the construction of this multi-million dollar project. What was the result? First there is the saga of the dirty tiles in the restaurant kitchens. The tiles were selected by experts appointed by the previous Government. Those tiles now have to be replaced at a cost of \$250,000 under an order issued by the health department of the Council of the City of Sydney. Good management? The city council found that the tiles did not comply with the health regulations.

Next we discovered that the orchestra pit designed by the same experts is too small. It must be enlarged at a cost of \$341,000 so that it can accommodate 78 players instead of 58 players as at present. One must then add the growing cost of providing an organ for the concert hall. So far about \$900,000 has been spent on the organ project, but there is no organ. Take another example of the efforts of these so-called, or should I say self-styled, **government** managers. Last financial year the federal Government allocated in the Hayden budget \$11,700,000 to the New South Wales Government for land acquisition as part of a scheme to reduce the price of residential land. In the previous year New South Wales got \$820,000 for this purpose, and in the first year of the scheme it did not seek any funds. Compare those figures with the allocations to

South Australia, which received more than \$47 million. I can almost hear members of the Opposition thinking that the federal Labor Government favoured the South Australian Labor Government. Nothing of the sort. South Australia received more money because it acted quickly and set up a land commission to acquire land. The previous New South Wales Government was fearful of incurring the wrath of its land-developer friends, and so it lost about \$35 million that it could have had, compared with the much smaller State of South Australia.

In case Opposition members think that South Australia is the exception I shall give them the figures for other States in the first three years of the scheme. Queensland did not take part in the scheme, because of the Premier's hatred of the federal Labor Government. Victoria received \$28 million, compared with \$12.5 million for New South Wales, and the other non-Labor State, Western Australia, received almost \$19 million. Good managers—good business enterprise? So much for the men of experience.

Where the former Government failed to act, we have acted with speed and determination. We will shortly bring forward legislation to set up a land commission to compete with private land developers. We see this as a positive step in the fight against the land price spiral and one which will benefit every future land buyer in the State. I do not believe anyone other than the land developer from Kirribilli would deny the need for urgent action to bring down the price of land. However, this Government proposes to give the honourable member for Kirribilli some competition. It will put land on the market at a price that will benefit the people of this State. It will not tie up land as the honourable member has done in the past.

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr FERGUSON: I should like to inform the Kirribilli developer that Sydney land is 30 per cent dearer than land in Melbourne and 50 per cent dearer than Adelaide. Why? Because the previous Government did nothing to stop exploitation of land buyers. In fact, it joined the exploiters by auctioning Crown land to the highest bidder. This meant that genuine homeseekers had to compete with speculators for Crown land. I am proud that one of our Government's first acts was to abolish the iniquitous auction system for the disposal of Crown land. That is an undeniable statement. Mr Speaker, one could go on for hours listing the sins of previous governments, whether we are talking about the Askin Government, the Lewis Government or the Willis Government.

I should like now to contrast the inaction of those governments on vital issues with the urgent action displayed by our Government. Year after year the former Government drove countless thousands of passengers away from public transport with repeated fare increases. That is undeniable. When we promised to reduce fares by 20 per cent we were told by the men of experience on the other side that it could not be done. We have done it and it **has** been universally accepted by the travelling public. Let us take Botany Bay, a matter of great concern to the Opposition.

Mr Webster: There is no doubt about that.

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

Mr FERGUSON: Again, we were criticized when we halted new work on this project. We were doing something absolutely disgraceful in the eyes of the Opposition—giving the people in the area the right to put their views before an independent

inquiry. What a shameful act. We were actually going to allow local residents to have a say in the future of their area. This never happened under the Liberal-Country party Government. It knew what was best for the people and if anyone did not agree he was labelled a red. McCarthy will never die while the Liberal Party is in existence. Its members, together with members of the Country Party, see everyone else as ratbags, fools or reds. They argue that you have to let private enterprise in and it is necessary for business to make **money**.

That philosophy applies only if the development of private enterprise takes place in the eastern, western or southern suburbs of Sydney. If there is any suggestion that brick pits or any other industry might be established on the North Shore, straight away it is an assault on the environment: no longer is it a question of ratbags, fools or reds. Honourable members opposite preserve the north side of the harbour. They work on the south side but then travel back to the north side and its salubrious surroundings. They agree to development out of hand in Botany Bay without regard to the welfare of the working-class people who live in that area.

Mr McDonald: What about Duffy's Forest?

Mr FERGUSON: I have no doubt that the honourable member's colleague, the honourable member for Pittwater, would agree to a proposition to construct an airport at Duffy's Forest.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the floor.

Mr FERGUSON: Another area in which this Government's attitude is completely different from that of our predecessors is employment. Like their federal colleagues, they see unemployment as a way of making the capitalist system work more efficiently for capitalists. Had they been in government there is no doubt they would have accepted the federal Government's decision to destroy the shipbuilding and ship repair industry at Newcastle, with the frightful increase in unemployment that would have accompanied that decision. After all, they are the same men who sentenced 500 young Australians to death in Vietnam: why would they worry about 3 000 or 4 000 more unemployed in Newcastle? Our Government will never accept unemployment as a fact of this State's economic life. I want to refer specifically to unemployment in the building industry to show to the satisfaction of all concerned that the federal Government is not doing nearly enough to overcome unemployment.

Mr Punch: We did not sack any, but you will.

Mr FERGUSON: The former Minister for Public Works sacked 500 workers in one fell swoop.

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr FERGUSON: For the record I repeat that the Leader of the Country Party said his Government did not sack any but my Government will. Also for the record I remind honourable members that it was the Leader of the Country Party who, as Minister for Public Works, sacked 500 carpenters, bricklayers and labourers, and that was last year at a time of economic buoyancy. On Monday last I chaired a conference attended by representatives of all sections of the building industry and it was unanimous in the view that the federal Government must provide urgent help. In the past financial year the number of people employed in the industry fell by 45 100. These are the federal Government's own figures.

Dismissals of apprentices have reached crisis proportions. There are now 1 200 unemployed building apprentices in New South Wales and more are being laid off every week. In addition to the soul-destroying impact of unemployment on young people, there is the added loss of **skilled** tradesmen in future years. Every section of the industry is concerned at this problem, yet the federal Government refuses to acknowledge that it even exists. On the other hand, the State Government is doing everything possible to keep the industry going. It has continued the deferred payment scheme on major projects, but frankly we have just about reached the end of our financial resources. We are investing through the building and construction industry long service payments fund in the home building industry. It is expected that regular investments of \$500,000 can be made from this source. Other measures will be announced in the budget. While the federal Government is cutting back on funds for welfare housing, at the same time it is boosting the amount handed out to rich farmers by way of the superphosphate bounty. This year Malcolm Fraser and other big graziers will share the major part of \$50 million allocated for that bounty.

Though the State Government announced today that it would spend \$2.5 **million** on flood mitigation, the federal Government has given no indication that it will spend one cent on that problem. This illustrates the strange priorities of the federal colleagues of Opposition members: they give great benefits by way of superphosphate bounties to wealthy people but they will spend nothing on flood mitigation, which would help the Country Party areas of this State.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I regret to draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that many disorderly interjections are taking place, and I have had to call a number of honourable members to order. I am now giving a firm warning that I will deal with honourable members in a much harsher manner if they continue to behave as they are behaving at present.

Mr FERGUSON: What distresses me is that the federal Government gives to wealthy farmers a superphosphate bounty that is almost as much as it allocated to this State for welfare housing. This State is getting almost the same amount for welfare housing as the federal Government is handing out to its big friends. The federal Government is a good manager all right—but for whom? I propose now to talk about the backlog in sewerage programmes. The wealthy friends of the federal Government will get much more than the \$19 million allocated to New South Wales to help eliminate the backlog of sewerage works in Newcastle, Sydney and Wollongong. The allocation for backlog sewerage represents a cut of more than \$22 million on last year's allocation, and gives a true indication of the Fraser Government's priorities.

In the last year that the Whitlam Government was in office in Canberra, New South Wales received \$42 million for backlog sewerage works. Not even the members of the Liberal-Country party coalition—some of whom are continually sending me requests to have sewerage extension works carried out in their areas—can complain about the priorities of the former federal Labor Government. The Fraser-led Government cut last year's allocation of \$42 million for sewerage backlog works to the \$19 million it has allocated this year.

Recently the Government was criticized by the press and the federal Government for its decision not to allow nuclear-powered ships to use Sydney Harbour. It is about time that the federal Government and its supporters among the newspaper barons realized the dangers associated with the use of nuclear ships in port. It was quite significant today that the question about visits by nuclear ships was asked by the honourable member for Tamworth, which is a long way from Sydney Harbour. I thought

that perhaps the honourable member for Vaucluse or the honourable member for Kirribilli would have been showing concern for their constituents. I live out in the sticks at Merrylands, and perhaps my constituents would not be as concerned as other people about the visit of nuclear ships. The Government's decision to ensure that no nuclear ship comes into Sydney Harbour indicates its concern to ensure that the safety of the people of Sydney is protected.

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr FERGUSON: I propose now to refer briefly to the previous Government's policy of selling off harbourfront land. When my Government came to office I found **that** land owned by the Maritime Services Board **in** all parts of the foreshores **of** Sydney Harbour had been sold to private landholders. Now the Government has banned the future sale of harbourside land. This Government is the first in this State to show a positive concern for the protection of the harbour from over-development. We hope in time to restore many parts of the harbourfront for the use of the general public, instead of the privileged and wealthy few. For far too long this State was the haven of every con man in the business.

To illustrate that claim I propose to give as an example the home building industry. Most builders are reputable, honest businessmen who endeavour to give value for money. However, there are those who batten on the unsuspecting and the gullible. I propose to give the House some examples of the extent of the activities of **these** swindlers. A firm called Jack-up-your-home, which claimed to be in the business of carrying out lower-storey extensions, has fleeced at least twenty homeowners.

Mr Webster: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, when I attempted to raise this matter last Wednesday night I was ruled out of order on the grounds that the matter was *sub judice*.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Just before the point of order was taken I had my attention distracted by another honourable member, and I was not able to hear what the Minister was saying. I shall ask the Minister to continue and then I shall rule on the point of order.

Mr FERGUSON: My understanding is that the activities of some of these operators have resulted in claims on the Builders Licensing Board insurance fund. Surely the honourable member for Pittwater would like to be assured that the people who have been fleeced by these swindlers —

Mr Webster: On a point of order. The Deputy Premier is referring to people who have been charged in connection with this matter. He has used the word fleeced, though the matter is *sub judice*.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have listened to the Deputy Premier and so far his remarks have related to the Builders Licensing Board insurance fund. He is dealing with a subject that is competent to be raised in the debate on the Address in Reply. It concerns government policy.

Mr Coleman: Further to the point of order. I submit that the point the Deputy Premier is raising is the very one that the honourable member for Pittwater attempted to raise last week.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister of Justice and Minister for Services to order for the first time. I had already ruled on the point of order taken by the honourable member for Pittwater. The honourable member for Fuller has said that he wishes to raise a matter that is further to the point of order, upon which I have already ruled. The question now is whether the Deputy Premier is in order in addressing himself to the matter he has raised. The ruling I gave the other evening was made in the debate on the adjournment. On that occasion I said that it was not in order to have two debates current at the same time, and it was important that the honourable member raising the matter on the adjournment should confine himself to matters within his own electorate. As the honourable member for Pittwater could not give me that assurance, I ruled him out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: The people about whom I am concerned have been fleeced; they have been left with their homes suspended on piers after paying for extensions that were never completed. The Builders Licensing Board will compensate these people to the extent of about \$10,000 each under the insurance provisions of the Act. However, they cannot compensate them for the inconvenience and mental anguish they have undergone. Another firm, W. T. & M. E. Peterie Pty Limited, has duped eighty-six homeowners. These people will receive a total of about \$130,000 in insurance payments from the board. Yet another group of swindlers, Brentwood, Honeywell, Page and Associates Pty Limited, took down forty-three homeowners and this will cost the board \$115,000 in compensation.

I take this opportunity of urging anyone intending to engage the services of a builder to deal only with persons or firms licensed by the Builders Licensing Board. In this way they can at least receive compensation if the builder fails to perform his contract. The Government is seriously concerned at the ease with which some crooks in the industry can stay in business simply by a change of name and address. I am at present conferring with my colleague the Attorney-General with a view to dealing with this problem.

In conclusion, I should like to say something about the Governor's Speech. It contains an outline of the Government's policies and details of the proposed legislative programme. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have ascertained it to be the pleasure of His Excellency the Governor to receive the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech at 3 o'clock, p.m., tomorrow, at Government House.

## OMBUDSMAN (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr WRAN (Bass Hill), Premier [8.10]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to enable the Ombudsman to investigate certain conduct of local government authorities.

The legislation being introduced honours an important election promise made by the Labor Party prior to the 1st May election. The former Government resisted all attempts for any extension to the powers of the Ombudsman. To ensure that the rights of the people are fully protected, and to bring the powers of the Ombudsman into line with the original recommendations of the Law Reform Commission, the Government is of the view that the Ombudsman must be able to investigate complaints against administrative decisions of local government authorities.

At present there is no avenue for people to lodge complaints. This bill will reverse that lamentable state of affairs. The previous Government refrained from affording full protection to the people. The present Government will do everything in its power to ensure that the people of this State are protected. I commend the motion to honourable members.

Sir ERIC WILLIS (Earlwood), Leader of the Opposition [8.12]: It seems that the honour of presenting the first bill of the new Government has fallen to the Premier. Accordingly, notwithstanding the rude remarks from the Minister two removed on the Premier's left, I have done him the courtesy, on behalf of the Opposition, of speaking in reply to the Premier in his seeking leave to introduce the measure. I say "courtesy" because it was something that, I regret to say, the Premier did not show by his ungracious words when he sought leave to introduce the measure. First, what he said was full of error and, second, it was full of unwarranted criticism of those whom I lead. However, the Premier has no worries because it is a safe bill for him to introduce.

I assure the Premier that the measure will receive support from this side of the House as it does from his side of the House, for the simple reason that what the Premier claims honourable members on this side had never done, never intended to do and had no desire to do, was in fact stated clearly by me in the Liberal Party's policy speech last April when I said, "We will extend the power of the Ombudsman to investigate complaints against local government authorities". In just the same way, the Premier in his policy speech said, "We will extend the powers of the Ombudsman to investigate local government matters". We both used almost identical terms. The gentleman who is so bigoted and prejudiced, who writes the Premier's speeches, was apparently unwilling to accept the fact that that was the intention of the former Government. Let me quote from a Cabinet document of that time. As I was Premier then, I have a copy of the document. It reads:

It is proposed that legislation be introduced to amend the Ombudsman Act to extend the power of the Ombudsman to investigate complaints against local government authorities subject to that power not being extended to decisions of councils against which an appeal already lies to a court or administrative tribunal or decisions of a policy nature properly lying within the discretion of the council.

I assure the House that that particular matter was properly considered by the Cabinet over which I had the honour to preside. It was indeed the intention of the former Government to legislate—the legislation was already authorized before there was a change of government. I should have thought that the Premier, noted for his courtesy, suavity, urbanity, graciousness, charm and manners, would have at least had the gentlemanliness or the common courtesy, to put it in the toilet language the Premier sometimes prefers, to acknowledge the situation rather than try to make the situation out as being somewhat different from what it is.

I would not have said what I have said had it not been for the ungraciousness of the Premier. Let me be a little more constructive. When the Ombudsman legislation was first introduced by a decision of the former Government, consideration was given to whether local government administrative decisions should be brought within the scope of the Ombudsman. It was felt that this was an enormous area of investigation and it was considered by the Government that it was perhaps a better idea then to act in a relatively smaller way and to expand the legislation later if it were found desirable and possible to do so. Therefore, the Ombudsman was precluded from investigating local government matters at that stage. It became obvious, as the first few months of the Ombudsman's administration went along, that it would be desirable.

That became a recognized fact not only by the Government but also by the Ombudsman himself, who personally told me he thought it would be desirable that the extension of his powers should be enacted.

That was the background to the decision of the Government that I had the honour to lead. Presumably it was the same reason why the Government now in office has made the same decision. I want to put the record straight, that this is a bill that would have been introduced no matter what party occupied the Treasury benches this evening. It will receive the support of this side of the House because it has been acknowledged as a desirable bill.

Though I do not want to delay the House any further—the Opposition supports the bill in principle though I should like to see some of the details, particularly the proviso that I mentioned a few minutes ago—I take this opportunity on behalf of my colleagues of expressing our appreciation of the work already done by Mr Ken Smithers, C.B.E., the Ombudsman. He has already set a magnificent pattern for the future work by whoever may succeed him or work with him in the years he holds office. Mr Smithers is a **man** of outstanding capacity and of superb qualities in every respect. He has done the job even better than could have been hoped for when he was first appointed by the previous Government. I take the opportunity to pay this respect to the work he has done and to wish him and his associates well in the extension of the work that will come about as a result of the measure for which the Premier now seeks leave to introduce.

Mr WRAN (Bass Hill), Premier [8.18], in reply: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his courtesy which is welcome and quite a change from the atmosphere of the House in the past **couple** of weeks. I thank the Leader of the Opposition also for his support, though it is **doubtful** that we need it. I applaud the new-found objectivity of the Leader of the Opposition and his identification with the real forces of reform. If this combination of courtesy and support from the Leader of the Opposition continues, it is obvious that this will be a fruitful legislative session on which in years to come all honourable members will be able to look back with a great deal of satisfaction.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## PUBLIC WORKS AND OTHER ACTS (INTEREST RATES) AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

Mr FERGUSON (Merrylands), Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing [8.20]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the **Public Works** (Amendment) Act, 1975, and to amend various other Acts in consequence of the enactment of that Act.

Honourable members will recall that this bill was introduced previously into this House on 10th March, 1976, and passed through all stages. However, it was not reached in the Legislative Council before the election and thus it is necessary to re-present it. The Public Works (Amendment) Act of 1975, which was assented to on 18th December, 1975, **clarified** the position concerning payment of interest on compensation moneys payable upon the acquisition or resumption of land. A number of other Acts

incorporate provisions of the Public Works Act, dealing with payment of compensation on acquisition or resumption. These Acts have been examined and consequential amendments are necessary.

This bill makes those consequential amendments and specifies a rate of interest payable on compulsory acquisition or resumption of land after 18th December, 1975. The purposes of the bill are merely procedural and it is relatively short. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman) [8.23]: The Opposition will examine this bill carefully in two respects. From March, interest rates have changed in an inflationary period. The Opposition is concerned with the interest rates that are paid to owners of land that has been resumed or sold to the Government, and for which they have not received payment. The Opposition proposes to ensure that the owners of these lands are not disadvantaged. Though the rate of inflation is slowing down, interest rates change frequently.

All Opposition members agree that the owners of resumed property should be compensated as interest rates change, in line with interest rates on the open market. I hope the bill contains provisions to ensure that owners will not be disadvantaged by subsidizing government resumptions.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## CENTENARY CELEBRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr COX (Auburn), Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways [8.25]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to vest in the Public Transport Commission of New South Wales certain land vested in the Chief Minister by the Centenary Celebration Act (51 Vic. No. 9) and being part of the land comprised in a Crown Grant issued to the Chief Minister pursuant to the Centenary Park Sale (Conveyancing) Act, 1905.

The bill concerns land located at the corner of York Road and Oxford Street, Waverley, adjacent to Centennial Park, which is part of Waverley bus depot and for seventy years has been used by the Public Transport Commission and its predecessor authorities in connection with the Sydney transport services. The purpose of this bill is to transfer the title to the commission. It is a straightforward measure that I shall explain in detail at the second-reading stage. I am sure it will have the support of the House.

Mr VINEY (Wakehurst) [8.27]: By and large the Opposition sees no reasonable objection to this measure. However, this land is part of property that was handed over to the people to commemorate the centenary of the establishment of the colony. Most of it was intended to be used for recreation and other community purposes. Though the Opposition appreciates that the land has been used by the Public Transport Commission and its predecessors for about seventy years, my colleagues and I are concerned that the land is to be alienated for ever from the original purpose for which it was granted to the Crown.

Perhaps it would be better if occupancy were continued for a reasonable period subject to review by the Government, perhaps in fifteen years' time, because the bill proposes to alienate recreation land **irrevocably**. I do not deny that the Public Transport Commission might need the continuing occupancy of land for fifteen or twenty years, but that might not be so. If the land were not required, it could revert to the original dedication.

Mr COX (Auburn), Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways [8.28], in reply: I assure the honourable member that **the future** use of this land will be under the strict control of the Planning and Environment Commission of New South Wales.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

#### YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF SYDNEY INCORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

##### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.29]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Young Men's Christian Association of Sydney Incorporation Act, **1906**, for the purpose of altering the objects and certain of the powers of the Young Men's Christian Association of Sydney.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Act of **1906** by virtue of which the Sydney **Young Men's** Christian Association was constituted a body corporate. From the vicissitudes of its beginnings in 1853, the Sydney Y has become in **1976** a substantial **and** highly significant organization in our community, offering a great variety of services and programmes to more than 53 **000** people of all ages. Inevitably, the extensive changes that have occurred in the association's work in the years since its incorporation have produced quite fundamental organizational changes, with the result **that** the existing legislation is no longer adequate **to** meet the needs of the Sydney YMCA.

Perhaps the most vital part of the association's work in the past fifteen years or so has been the development of local community centres, both through the **Y's** own initiative or working with government or other civic bodies. Indeed, in modern **times**, the YMCA has become a specialist in organizing and conducting community programmes of social, educational, physical and recreational activities. It is a body to which others turn for guidance and to benefit from its **skills** in the management and administration of such programmes. In furtherance of these programmes, the Sydney association has established major community centres at Epping, Greenacre, **Bankstown**, Liverpool, Lindfield, St Ives, Sutherland, Ultimo and, of course, **the** inner city in Pitt Street. Less substantial operations are also carried out in a number of other suburbs. Though the YMCA sees these developments as only a **beginning** in the work of meeting community needs, its existing legislation fails to provide for such a decentralized *modus operandi*.

The need for effective delegation by the central board of management to suburban committees was, of course, never envisaged in **1906**. Similarly, the bill seeks **to** widen eligibility for membership of the association, with is at present couched in **somewhat** abstruse doctrinal **terminology**. The doctrinal basis known as the "**Paris basis**", which has been adopted by the other world and Australian bodies, is proposed

to be substituted. It is a statement of belief and purpose which can be readily understood by all, and would reflect more accurately the all-embracing spirit of Christian fellowship with which the association pursues its goals.

I do not now propose to examine the bill's provisions, but remind honourable members that though bills of this character would, in strictness, be required by standing orders to proceed by way of private measure, it has been customary to give well-known charitable bodies the benefit of having their legislation enacted as public bills. The purpose of this approach is to avoid the diversion of funds which might more productively be employed in carrying out the organizations' activities. I can think of no more worthy case than the present for the continuance of this policy. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr CAMERON (Northcott) [8.31]: This bill, which has been evolving for some time, is welcomed by the Opposition this evening. I was glad to hear the Attorney-General confirm that it will deal with a number of important matters that the YMCA has long been seeking, including the delegation of powers to local committees. It will deal also with an unfortunate aspect of the existing situation concerning the entrenchment of certain articles of the constitution of the association, and it will enable wider membership scope to be achieved. All in all, it is a desirable piece of legislation which I am quite certain the Opposition will support at each stage.

The Attorney-General has mentioned the Paris basis that will go into the new bill in lieu of the most limiting and one might say doctrinaire basis that is the present position. The doctrinal basis is enunciated in article 3, in nine detailed theological expressions. Although they might have been widely accepted in 1906, today even minister of religion would disagree substantially concerning them. The Paris basis is a simple proposition put forward in these simple terms:

The Young Men's Christian Association seek to unite those young men who, regarding Jesus Christ as their God and Saviour according to the Scriptures, desire to be His Disciples in their faith and in their efforts for the extension of His Kingdom amongst young men.

Most men are thoroughly familiar with the great work being done by the Young Men's Christian Association. The changes in its statutory basis which will be given effect in the bill will be tremendously welcome. Most honourable members would appreciate that the first YMCA in Australia was founded in Adelaide as long ago as 1850. In 1853 other associations were established in Sydney and Melbourne and in 1854 in Hobart. Since then steady expansion has taken place. Games which today are part of the sporting life of our nation, such as basketball and volleyball, were invented by the YMCA and later fostered by it. We all know of the tremendous wartime work of the YMCA during the first world war and the second world war. Although the Opposition looks forward to the detailed provisions of the bill the House may be assured that they will have the support of the Opposition.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## CHURCH OF ENGLAND TRUST PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.33]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Church of England Trust Property Act, 1917.

The purpose of the proposed bill is to effect a number of amendments to the Church of England Trust Property Act, 1917. The amendments are designed to give greater flexibility to the church in the administration of its affairs and generally to bring the trust property legislation into line with modern needs. In this regard, it is pertinent to recall that the final session of the previous Parliament saw the passage of two other measures sought by the church, namely, the Church of England Constitutions (Amendment) Bill, 1976, and the Anglican Church of Australia Bill, 1976.

I do not intend at this stage to enter into any elaboration of the provisions of the bill. However, I mention that in introducing this legislation by way of public bill, the Government is adhering to the policy that governments in this State have adopted for many years—to endeavour to assist churches in the conduct of their affairs by avoiding the heavy expenditure that would be involved for them if a private bill were to be required. Although, as honourable members will be aware, the strict procedure would be to have introduced a private bill, I am sure there would be no dissent in this House from the view that the funds of the church can and should be more fruitfully directed to the carrying out of its good works.

I assure honourable members that there is unanimous support for the bill within the church in New South Wales. I am satisfied that the church has complied with all the procedural requirements of the legislation affecting it in respect of these amendments. I assure honourable members that copies of the requisite diocesan legislation are held by the secretary of the standing committee of the general synod, together with the necessary consents of the dioceses, and that I can make available copies of the diocesan legislation to any honourable member who wishes to peruse it. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is, That leave be given to bring in a bill. All those in favour say, aye; those ~~against~~ say, no. I think the ayes have it. The ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented.

Mr Cameron: I am not aware that you, Mr Speaker, have given me the opportunity to speak to this bill.

Mr SPEAKER: I proposed the question but I did not notice you rise in your place. It is necessary for ~~an~~ honourable member to draw to the attention of the Chair ~~the~~ fact that ~~he~~ wishes to speak. I ask the Clerk ~~to~~ read the bill.

Mr Cameron: I do object strongly. I believe you put those propositions with abnormal rapidity with no indication being given that opportunity was to be given for a member to speak.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I do not have to intimate to the honourable member or to any other member of the House whether he should rise. I proposed the question and if you wish to seek the call you should rise in your place. You did not rise and therefore, unfortunately, I put the question.

Mr Cameron: I agree that it was unfortunate, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I cannot take any blame for your **laxity** in rising.

Bill read a first time.

**Mr F. J. Walker]**

## STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

## Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.37]: I move:

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

The bill for which I seek leave to introduce is virtually identical with a bill introduced by the previous Government into this Assembly shortly before Parliament was dissolved. The bill gives effect to the first report of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission on statute law revision. The substantive clauses of the bill are short and self-explanatory. Their purpose is to accomplish the repeal of all those enactments included in the schedule to the bill.

There are many such provisions and their repeal has been recommended for various reasons. Essentially the basic reason for their repeal is that they no longer serve any useful purpose and their presence on the statute books of the State has long since been unnecessary. The preparation of the schedule has been, as can clearly be seen, a task of no little magnitude. The painstaking efforts of the members and researchers of the Law Reform Commission, government departments, the Parliamentary Counsel, and many other persons have gone into the compilation of the schedule and they are all to be commended for their work. From time to time, as the number of proposed repeals warrants it, the Government will introduce similar statute revision bills. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr CAMERON (Northcott) [8.39]: As the Attorney-General has intimated, the legislation was drafted by the preceding administration. If its content is as it was when the previous administration was in power, it will certainly be embraced with great enthusiasm by the Opposition within this Parliament. I am committed to the view that this type of bill is a highly desirable piece of legislation. It is imperative that there should be a continuing purification of the body of Statute law and that there should be continuing efforts to cull out the dead wood from the statute book. However, the Opposition will be looking in great detail at the bills or portions of bills enumerated in the schedules to ensure that in all respects they are repeals or part repeals in conformity with the best interests of the community at large.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

## Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.40]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1897, so as to make provision with respect to the making of certain instruments under an Act or a statutory instrument before the Act or statutory instrument has commenced; and to validate certain matters.

The provisions of this bill have their origin in the unanimous decision in June of last year of the Victorian Supreme Court, which decided that the Victorian counterpart to section 37 of this State's Interpretation Act, 1897, was defective. Section 37 of the

New South Wales Interpretation Act is in substantially the same terms as its Victorian counterpart. If the Victorian decision were to be followed in New South Wales, certain instruments made in reliance on section 37 would be invalid.

It seems prudent to avoid this uncertainty. Accordingly, the bill proposes to repeal section 37 of the Interpretation Act and to enact in its place a new section to place the matter beyond doubt. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr CAMERON (Northcott) [8.41]: The Opposition will look at the detailed provisions of the bill with interest. Section 37 deals with the exercise of statutory powers between the passing and the commencement of an Act. There is no further comment I need make at this stage in regard to the provisions of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General 18.421: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill relating to administrative changes in connection with the Ministry, departments and officers of departments; and for this purpose to enable orders to be made affecting the construction of certain references in Acts, instruments, contracts and agreements and containing other provisions incidental to or consequential on any such administrative changes.

This is the first of seven bills I shall seek leave to introduce into this Chamber dealing with administrative changes. It is, however, the principal bill of the series. It will to a large extent, though not completely, render unnecessary future bills dealing with administrative changes.

After the proposals embodied in the bill were placed before the Government by the Parliamentary Counsel, they were adopted because of their obvious relevance to problems encountered by all governments when making administrative changes. The bill enables orders made under the bill by the Governor to effect administrative changes, but it provides also the machinery to deal with administrative changes effected elsewhere, for example at Executive Council level. The term administrative change is given thorough definition in the bill.

The procedures set out in the bill will mean that less parliamentary time need be spent on matters that are of an essentially administrative nature. It will be possible to make orders more expeditiously, especially if Parliament is not in session. The definition of department in the bill embraces not only government departments as such, but also other parts of the public service. However the police force is expressly excluded from the operation of the measure. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [8.43]: It appears from what the Attorney-General has said that this is a formal measure to make easier the administrative changes following upon changes the Government has introduced in its Ministry and departmental structure. I noted, however, that the Attorney-General said that it will make changes easier when the Parliament is not in session. One would want to look closely at precisely the extent of the changes that are to be authorized by the legislation. However, seeing that it is, as I understand it at this stage, a rather formal measure, I should think that the Opposition would be willing to agree

to what is proposed; but naturally we on this side reserve our right to examine the bill in detail, and more particularly to look at the regulatory powers that are contained in it, for it would appear that these would take away from Parliament the immediate right to express a view if it were a change that would normally be done through legislation, and not by regulation or proclamation. We look forward to the bill, and we shall determine our attitude to it when we have examined it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## YOUTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.44]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to repeal section 4 of the Youth and Community Services Act, 1973.

The bill will amend the Youth and Community Services Act to remove the present statutory basis for the Department of Youth and Community Services, and to place it in the same position as other departments so far as concerns its future existence and title. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [8.45]: The remarks I made at the introductory stage of the previous bill apply also to this measure, which appears to be an innocuous amendment to the legislation. However, time will tell whether this is so. We again reserve our right to examine the bill in greater detail when it is available.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.46]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to repeal section 6 of the Technical and Further Education Act, 1974.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the principal Act to remove the present statutory basis for the Department of Technical and Further Education, and to place it in the same position as other departments so far as concerns its future existence and title. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [8.47]: The remarks I have made twice in relation to the introduction of previous bills apply also to this measure. We shall await the bill before we determine our final attitude.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (REPEAL) BILL

## Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [8.48]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to repeal the Department of Agriculture Act, 1907.

The Department of Agriculture Act provides for the creation of the office of Minister of Agriculture and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. The portfolio has been abolished and the department continues to exist. The effect of repeal of the Agriculture Act is qualified by a provision in the bill for the continuance of the Department of Agriculture. The office of Minister of Agriculture is abolished. The bill will be deemed to have commenced on 14th May, 1976. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr BRUXNER (Tenterfield), Deputy Leader of the Country Party [8.49]: The apparent innocence of the production of this bill should not blind the House to the importance of the measure. The Attorney-General is seeking the repeal of an historic piece of legislation, which was enacted in this Parliament in 1907. The words he is seeking to abolish—Department of Agriculture—fell glibly from his lips, but they reveal a wide gap in the credibility of the Minister for Decentralisation and Development **and** Minister for Primary Industries, who a little time ago said that he knew absolutely nothing about any moves to change the name of the department or to abolish, it.

We shall await with interest the details that the Attorney-General has promised at the second-reading stage, but I assure him and the House that the Opposition will not merely sit by and watch an important and historic establishment, which is basic to the interests of primary industry and rural production, wiped out with the mere stroke of a pen. We shall await the second-reading stage with great interest.

Mr DAY (Casino), Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries [8.50]: I am amazed at the emotion that has been aroused in the breasts of the members of the Country Party in regard to the abolition of the office of Minister of Agriculture and its replacement by Minister for Primary Industries. The only Country Party Government in Australia, the Queensland Government, has the title Minister for Primary Industries, which we are **seeking** by this measure to introduce in New South Wales.

The hypocrisy and the big flap that the honourable member is endeavouring to work up over this quite minor change are highlighted by the fact that the Country Party's federal counterparts, as late as November last, changed the name of the federal Department of Agriculture and the Minister for Agriculture to the Department of Primary Industry and the Minister for Primary Industry. But here, because the change is being made by a **Labor** Premier and a **Labor** Government, the Country Party is attempting to establish that a **sinister** attack is being made upon primary industry. **All** I can say is that if this is **all** that honourable members opposite can find against this Government's progressive attitude to primary industry, we shall be pleased indeed—and the primary industries themselves will be highly delighted—that New South Wales has had **a** change of government.

I read the remarks of the honourable member for Tenterfield in the **Address-in-Reply** debate when he spoke of rumours about the change of name of the Department of Agriculture. I did not ever suggest that the name of the department be changed, but there were worries and thoughts--conservative worries and **thoughts**--

that any change should be contemplated. This is the attitude of conservatives. They are opposed to any change. I attempted to indicate that I had no thoughts of change, but I said that if there were any worries in the department about it, perhaps they had better make out a case so that a formal submission could be made on it. Out of this there came great headlines in rural newspapers, supported by the honourable member for Tenterfield, the Leader of the Opposition——

Mr **Bruxner**: You issued a statement in your name.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order!

Mr **DAY**: ——~~the~~ Leader of the Country Party and his deputy, saying that this change was imminent and giving an amazing amount of money as the cost involved. It was never more than a quite minor exercise on the part of the department, which did not want the name of the department changed as the Ministry had been changed. It was humbug—real humbug—by the Country Party. It was announced in the rural press that this would be an unnecessary and expensive change. The Country Party overlooked all the things that were so much more important than the change contemplated in this proposal. All the words we have heard from the honourable member for **Tenterfield** and the Country Party about it indicate that they are completely barren in the matter of making any real criticism of this Government's attitude to primary industry. They can find nothing to criticize but such a paltry change of title.

It is accepted generally these days that primary industry more properly reflects the multiplicity of endeavours in the rural economy than the more constrictive and restrictive title of agriculture. I have no doubt that for this reason the Premier determined that the Ministry which I am proud and privileged to occupy be styled the Ministry for Primary Industries. At this stage no serious consideration has been given to any change in the name of the Department of Agriculture, which is only one of the many departments and organizations that I administer as Minister for Primary Industries.

Mr **TAYLOR** (Temora) [8.55]: The Minister is defending himself and not the Government for this proposed change of name of the Ministry. The fact is that the Department of Agriculture and the Ministry of Agriculture are important and proud names in the history of New South Wales. The portfolio has been held by many men before this Minister, who has yet to prove that he is the equal of many of them. Yet he says that it is a small thing to change this name. Agriculture is a proud name. The Ministry of Agriculture has made a major contribution to the welfare of the people of this State. The Minister said that he has so many other things to do that the Ministry of Agriculture is only a minor part of his responsibilities. All I want to say on behalf of the Country Party and others on this side of the House is that agriculture is a proud name and the Department of Agriculture is a proud department; up till now the Ministry of Agriculture has been a proud Ministry. It remains to be seen whether the Minister will be a worthy successor to previous Ministers. Reference was made to a change in the name of the federal Ministry. We all know that the previous federal Labor Government changed its name to the Ministry of Agriculture. What happened in Canberra in this respect has no great historical significance to people in agricultural industry. Agricultural industries in this State are the pathfinders, and Ministers for Agriculture have been the pathfinders in agriculture in Australia. It ill behoves the Minister or the Government so lightly to change the name of a great department and a great Ministry.

Mr **COWAN** (Oxley) [8.57]: I am sorry that I was not in the Chamber when the **Deputy** Leader of the Country Party addressed the House. Might I add to what he said by voicing my grave concern at the change of name. It is indicative of what

we expected the Government to do. It is idle to compare a State Department of Agriculture with the Commonwealth Department of Agriculture. Ours is a broad department and covers many aspects not covered by the Commonwealth department. In my opinion this is an indication of the incompetence of the Minister, who may be the only spokesman on the Government's side who knows a little about agriculture. I might exclude the Treasurer who, I feel, has such a background, and perhaps the Minister for Conservation and Minister for Water Resources. The Government is playing with a Ministry that has had a proud position in this State since 1907 when it was associated with the Mines Department. Many people, including those associated with agriculture in the State, will be deeply concerned. If the Government wants to make the change it has the numbers to go ahead and do what it wants to do, but it cannot gauge the opinion of people who produce primary products.

I say to the Minister that I do not think the Government cares, but let him not forget that he and his colleagues in this House represent a multitude of people upon whom this State depends to a great extent for a thriving economy. When considering State agriculture one must never overlook the fact that no matter what the Commonwealth Ministry calls itself, State agriculture is the basis of agriculture. The Government is putting up this change of name as a gimmick, just as it will put a date stamp on a bottle of milk at some time in the future. If it thinks that this gimmick of changing this traditional name will work, it has another think coming. I do not know the attitude of the 4 000 officers of the department to this change—I have not asked them—but I feel that they are proud of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Minister is not too proud of it; otherwise he would have stayed at the Black Stump and not moved to the Department of Decentralisation and Development. It is clear that in his short term of office as Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries he has downgraded the Department of Agriculture. If this is the tradition that he is going to follow I shall oppose it and take him on at any time. I shall fight to see that the name agriculture is solidly held. This is what agriculturalists and others who know agriculture will be strongly supporting in this State.

Mr LEITCH (Armidale) [9.0]: I was fascinated that the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries indicated some guilt for not introducing this bill and should have felt compelled to speak on the motion. I think that Dr Freud was roaming this House tonight. He does so occasionally, but this was a flagrant example. The Minister protested vigorously. Why has the Government decided to change the name of the Department of Agriculture? I suppose we shall find out at the second-reading stage what advice the Minister took on the matter. He seemed to indicate by his behaviour and by the apologies he offered that he felt guilty about the proposal. Well he might, for, as other honourable members have said, the Department of Agriculture has a proud name. Perhaps the Minister is too busy wearing his other hat of Minister for Decentralisation and Development. The measure will be a backward step, and indeed a blow at a proud department. I repeat, it has been fascinating to see the way the Government has gone about this proposal.

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.2], in reply: For the sake of honourable members who think that the bill for which leave to introduce is sought is intended to abolish the Department of Agriculture, as the Deputy Leader of the Country Party indicated, I assure the House that the Department of Agriculture will survive. It is to be retained. There is no question of its being abolished. The Deputy Leader of the Country Party ought to know better. He should not be doing violence to the truth in this way. The only issue concerns the office of Minister for Agriculture, which will be abolished by the passage of the proposed bill. There is plenty of precedent for this proposal as my colleague the Minister for Decentralisation

**and** Development and Minister for Primary Industries has already indicated. For example, the Premier of New South Wales in making this decision is merely following the example of that great Country Party leader, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, who did the same thing in Queensland, thinking it was a wonderful idea, and obviously being contemptuous of his Country Party colleagues in New South Wales. The Premier was following the example also of the federal Country Party Leader, the Rt Hon. J. D. Anthony, who did the same thing in the federal sphere, and we all know how contemptuous he is of his Country Party colleagues in this State—and rightly so. It ill behoves the Deputy Leader of the Country Party to suggest something quite false, namely that the Government is about to abolish the Department of Agriculture. It is not.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## MISCELLANEOUS ACTS (TRANSPORT LEGISLATION) AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.3]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to repeal section 5 of the Ministry of Transport Act, 1932, to repeal section 3 of the Transport (Division of Functions) Act, 1932, and to amend section 4 of the Transport (Division of Functions) Further Amendment Act, 1952.

The bill for which leave is sought will remove the present statutory basis for the office of Minister for Transport and for the Ministry of Transport, the Department of Motor Transport and the Department of Main Roads, and will place them in the same position as other ministerial offices and departments so far as concerns their future existence and titles. The bill, if passed, will commence on 14th May, 1976. I commend the motion.

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [9.4]: The Opposition will agree to the granting of leave, but reserves its right to indicate a view on the bill when it becomes available.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## CONSTITUTION (MINISTERS OF THE CROWN) AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.5]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Second Schedule to the Constitution Act, 1902.

The proposed bill is consequential on the measure designed to repeal the Agriculture Act and to amend the transport legislation of the State. The Constitution Act at present provides that the holder of an office under the Crown is disqualified from being a member of Parliament. The proposed repeal of the offices of Minister for Agriculture and Minister for Transport means that the number of other Ministers provided for by the Constitution Act must be increased from fifteen, at present, to seventeen. The bill, if passed, will take effect from 14th May last. I commend the motion.

Sir ERIC WILLIS (Earlwood), Leader of the Opposition [9.6]: I shall study the bill with considerable interest when it is available, for my understanding of the Constitution Act does not tally with that of the Attorney-General. I would not for one moment suggest that my knowledge of the law equates with his or with that of his departmental officers. However, my understanding of the Second Schedule to the Constitution Act is that it provides for the Premier, the Attorney-General and fifteen other Ministers of the Crown to be members of the Executive Council. That is a total of seventeen. If one then adds the office of Vice-President of the Executive Council, which is referred to in section 17B, quite separate from the Second Schedule, one has eighteen Ministers, which is the number we have at present.

Therefore, I am not satisfied with the explanation given by the Attorney-General in his much too brief remarks. I believe that the true purpose of the bill is to get the Government out of the mess into which it has got itself by failing to provide sufficient Ministers in another place, thereby overburdening the Vice-President of the Executive Council. I remember the Leader of the Opposition in 1968, now the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy, saying he felt sorry for the Vice-President of the Executive Council in the Government of which I was a member at that time because of the burden he was asked to carry. I do not know how the Minister, in his compassion, feels about the present Vice-President of the Executive Council, who has twice the load borne by the holder of that office in 1968.

Mr F. J. Walker: He is twice the man.

Sir ERIC WILLIS: The Attorney-General might think so. Tonight I heard the Attorney-General say that Mr Bjelke-Petersen was the greatest. I do not know how that will go over when the Attorney-General goes moratorium marching again, for the last time he was in such a march he was talking about another great leader, but on the other political wing. He is now saying, "I want to be like Mr Bjelke-Petersen". That is hypocritical. To follow the Government's footwork one needs to be an expert not only in political matters but, indeed, in the law and in another field that I should not mention in this House. It is difficult to follow the Government's manoeuvrings, for what is going on in fact is not always what it appears to be.

I repeat, I shall look with great interest at the details of the bill when it is presented, and at another measure for which leave to introduce is to be sought in a few minutes. I suspect that the purpose of this legislation is not precisely what the Attorney-General indicates in his speech in support of the motion for leave to introduce.

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.9], in reply: The Leader of the Opposition was quite right when he informed the House that he knew nothing about the law. He has not been following the sequence of bills for which leave has been sought. If he had, he might have understood the nature and purpose of the measure proposed now. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he have a quiet chat with the honourable member for Northcott, who is joint Opposition spokesman on matters affecting the Department of the Attorney-General, or he might consult the other joint spokesman—though I am not sure he has been so identified yet. I suspect he has. I refer to the honourable member for Lane Cove. They will be able to straighten the Leader of the Opposition out, explaining to him that his worst suspicions are completely unfounded and the suggested deviousness of the Attorney-General does not exist. It is a simple matter and there is no need for concern on the part of the Opposition.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## MINISTERS OF THE CROWN (AMENDMENT) BILL

## Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.10]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend section 4 of the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1959.

The bill will repeal so much of section 4 of the Ministers of the Crown Act, 1959, as deals with matters consequential on a change of name of any ministerial portfolio. **The** provisions to be repealed are unnecessary in the light of the contents of the Administrative Changes Bill. I commend the motion to the House.

Sir ERIC WILLIS (Earlwood), Leader of the Opposition [9.11]: From what the Attorney-General has said this appears to be quite a harmless measure, though again I suspect that it has something to do with the mess that the **Labor** Party has got itself into. I hope that the Attorney-General will take the opportunity to reply to my comments on the introduction of this bill, an invitation which he chose to ignore with regard to the previous bill. I hope that on this occasion he will tell us how he and his colleagues, particularly the Premier, intend to extricate themselves from the mess into which they have got themselves in having only one Minister in another place. We have heard mealy-mouth words from the Attorney-General and his leader about the **Labor** Party's admiration for women and its policy of advancement of women in our modern society. Yet, when an opportunity presented itself to make a woman a Cabinet Minister, the **first** ever in this State, they dodged it and ran away from it. Perhaps it is because the language used in the **Cabinet** room is comparable with that used by the Premier in the House today and they did not want that sort of language used in front of a lady.

I assure the Government that the lady who is the deputy leader in another place is more qualified to be a Minister than some of the Ministers who now grace the Cabinet table. Accordingly, I should think that these **great** champions of women's liberation and the advancement of the cause of women would have taken an early opportunity to provide: a means whereby the Hon. Edna S. **Roper** could be brought into the Cabinet. There are a number of ways in which that could be done. They could drop the tail off the present Cabinet—the last one on, who was dead even in the voting and whose name was drawn out of a hat. In fact, I **should** have thought that he was drawn out of something else, though that is another story.

Alternatively, the Government could have done what the Hon. W. J. **McKell** did when he was Premier of this State. The Hon. W. J. **McKell**, who is highly admired by the present Premier—he has said so recently on several occasions—appointed a couple of honorary Ministers who worked as Ministers but did not receive the salary that Ministers get by statute. However, all the other Ministers pooled their funds and they took out equal shares so that the two honorary **Ministers** would get salaries comparable with those of the other Ministers. I have not noticed this type of graciousness or communal spirit emanating from the young **leftwing** Attorney-General and I do not think that the Cabinet would extend its warmheartedness to the point that it would give this sort of consideration to a most competent and charming lady. The Opposition will wait with bated breath to find out how the **Labor** Government will extract itself from this mess into which it got itself because of the Premier's impetuosity and hatred of the Legislative Council, making obvious his desire to have as few **Ministers** in that place as possible.

I might add that it is common knowledge that the Premier intended that there should be no Ministers in the Legislative Council until somebody patted him on the shoulder **and** told him that under the Constitution Act it was essential for at least one

member of the Legislative Council to be a Minister and to act as Vice-President of the Executive Council. The Premier reluctantly decided to appoint one Minister in that other place. It will be interesting to see just how this young Attorney-General will advise the Premier on how to get out of the awkward situation into which the Premier has got himself and his legal colleague the Hon. D. P. Landa. Of course, the Premier and the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council worked together in the legal profession. The Premier, as a barrister, was briefed by his colleague, a solicitor. I should have thought that the Premier, who now has a new solicitor to brief him, would therefore have been able to find a way to ease the burden upon the Hon. D. P. Landa in the Legislative Council. Apparently we are to be disappointed again, unless the Attorney-General takes this opportunity to tell us whether the two bills discussed tonight are designed to extricate the Premier from the **difficulty** in which he finds himself.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## ACTS REPRINTING (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

**Mr F. J. WALKER** (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.15]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Acts Reprinting Act, **1972**, so as to enable parts of Acts to be reprinted, and to authorize amendments to be made to Acts in relation to certain out of date references.

The bill for which I seek leave to introduce has been prompted in part by difficulties presently associated with the printing of certain Acts which, by reason of their large size, cannot be printed without the need for long and arduous preparation of proofs, printing and binding. The Local Government Act, **1919**, is an outstanding example of the problems facing the Government Printer when printing large Acts.

Members will understand that when an Act the size of the Local Government Act is amended the incorporation of amendments in the Act will usually result in a substantial recast of the proofs prepared by the Government Printer. A reprint of the Local Government Act becomes very quickly out of date. Some twenty-one amending Acts have been passed since the last reprint in **1974**. Usually, of course, only a comparatively small portion of the Act is affected by any one amendment, though a great deal of printing work must be undertaken nevertheless.

The Parliamentary Counsel, with a view to resolving the difficulty posed by the printing of large Acts, has conferred with the Government Printer and devised a scheme to enable each part of any Act to be reprinted as and when required. This will permit the amended parts to be quickly reprinted and save the Government Printer having to print and bind the Act as one volume. The public need also buy only those parts of Acts with which they are concerned, rather than being obliged to purchase unnecessarily the whole Act. It is presently the intention of the Government that this scheme should extend only to the Local Government Act but the bill makes provision for the Attorney-General of the State, or the Parliamentary Counsel as the Attorney's delegate, to extend the scheme to other legislation.

The bill inserts also into **the** Acts Reprinting Act a new clause which, if accepted, will enable out of date references to an act, matter, person or thing to be

omitted by order from reprints of Acts, and the up-to-date references inserted instead. Appropriate safeguards are incorporated in the bill and I shall have more to say about them at the second-reading stage. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr CAMERON (Northcott) [9.18]: The bill as outlined by the Attorney-General appears to be a commonsense provision of a straightforward **kind**. The Opposition will examine its detail and in particular whether or not the discretion to which the Minister referred in terms of extension of the measure to Acts other than the Local Government Act, should be vested in him personally. The Opposition does not oppose the introduction of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## RESTRAINTS OF TRADE BILL

### Introduction

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [9.19]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill relating to restraints of trade.

On 6th August, 1970, the report of the Law Reform Commission on **Covenants in Restraint of Trade** was tabled in this House and ordered to be printed. The report flowed from a reference by the Attorney-General then in office to the Law Reform Commission to review the law relating to the validity and enforcement of covenants **in** restraint of trade. It is the source of some embarrassment to me, as Attorney-General, to have to bring up legislation so long after recommendations were made by the Law Reform Commission.

But, of course, it must be of even greater embarrassment to the former Government not to have acted on the report, either by rejecting it or by implementing its recommendations. Be that as it may, this long overdue Restraints of Trade Bill, 1976, is an important law reform measure in the field of contracts. The purpose of the legislation is aptly summarized by the Law Reform Commission in these words used at paragraph 47 of its report:

We are concerned . . . to see that, so far as consistent with the public policy against undue restraint of trade, the law should give effect to the reasonable expectations of the parties to a contract rather than let legitimate interests be imperilled by inartificialities of expression.

The bill declares that a restraint of trade is valid to the extent to which it is not against public policy whether or not the restraint is expressed in severable terms. Further, it confers specific statutory powers upon the Supreme Court to declare a restraint to be wholly or partly invalid from a date specified by the court, if the court is satisfied that there was a manifest failure by the person creating the restraint to make that restraint reasonable.

I shall detail the provisions of the bill at the second-reading stage. In the interim I commend to all honourable members the report of the Law Reform Commission as a detailed explanation of the present law in respect of restraints of trade. For those who take the trouble to read the report I would point out that the draft bill annexed to the report has been substantially revised. Nevertheless, it accords with the commission's views and has its support. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [9.21]: The Opposition welcomes the introduction of this measure. I have listened with interest to the Attorney-General. Though he intimated that the bill is in a slightly different **form** from that recommended by the Law Reform Commission, I have no doubt that if the principles set out in the bill are in accordance with those recommended by the commission the Opposition will have no objection to it. Without wishing to be defensive about this and the causes for the delay in the presentation of the bill to Parliament, I remind members that one of the recommendations made by the Law **Reform** Commission was that this amendment should find its way into the Conveyancing Act.

During the time that I was Attorney-General I took the view that the provision would be inappropriately placed in that Act. Now I **am** delighted to **find** that the Attorney-General has apparently taken the same view and has introduced a measure which stands on its own and is **not** related to the Conveyancing Act. The Opposition, **welcomes** the introduction of the bill. We shall await the details of this measure with interest so that we can peruse it and ensure that it is in accordance with the principles to **be found in** the report of the Law Reform Commission. When we have done that, we **will** be in a position at the second-reading stage to indicate our attitude to it.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr HILLS (**Phillip**), Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy [9.23]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1940, with respect to the rights of certain employees of the Crown and members of the police force.

In December, 1973, the Government then in office referred to the Industrial Commission for consideration and report pursuant to section 35 (1) (o) of the Industrial Arbitration Act the question whether or not access should be granted to the industrial tribunals in those areas from which public servants, teachers and members of the police force are at present excluded.

The inquiry was conducted by the President of the Industrial Commission, Sir Alexander **Beattie**, who in December, 1974, presented his report to the Minister for Labour and Industry then holding that portfolio. In brief, the president recommended that, with certain exceptions, the powers of the industrial tribunals be extended to permit increased access to those tribunals by public servants, teachers and members of the police force, other than the Commissioner of Police, the Deputy Commissioner of Police, the Senior Assistant Commissioner of Police and the Assistant Commissioners of Police.

The policy presented to the electorate by the Australian **Labor** Party for the May election this year included an undertaking to implement fully the recommendations made by the President of the Industrial Commission in his report. The amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act and ancillary amendments to the Teaching Service Act proposed by this bill will give effect to this policy undertaking. That concludes my brief outline of the purpose of the bill. I will outline its provisions in detail at the second-reading stage.

Sir ERIC WILLIS (Earlwood), Leader of the Opposition [9.25]: I assure the Government that if this bill follows the lines outlined by the Minister it will receive the support of the Opposition. Again I rise to rebuke the Minister, politely and respectfully, for not being a little more gracious in the course of the proceedings this evening. I should have thought that a more experienced person like the Minister at the table would have at least acknowledged the part played by the previous Government in dealing with this measure. The Minister said that in December, 1973, this question was referred to the Industrial Commission of New South Wales by the Minister for Labour and Industry, exercising his powers under the Industrial Arbitration Act. That is so. Perhaps I should remind the House that that reference was consequent upon an undertaking given by the Premier and Leader of the Liberal Party in the 1973 State election campaign.

The report submitted by Sir Alexander Beattie, President of the New South Wales Industrial Commission, was both comprehensive and detailed and it necessitated a great deal of consideration by the former Government and its advisers. It was my privilege, last April, in my capacity as Premier, to announce that the Government had decided to accept the recommendations of the President of the Industrial Commission as outlined in his report. This is an example of the fact that if the previous Government were still in office, precisely the same legislation would have been introduced, and I suppose that the same person would have prepared the notes for the introductory speech that the Minister has delivered tonight. Instead of the situation being as it is, it would have been precisely reversed.

I assure the House that the Opposition will support this amending bill. For many years a campaign has been carried out by various public service unions, teaching service unions, the police—and for that matter, the officers of Parliament—to attain direct access to the Industrial Commission, from which they are currently precluded by virtue of a proviso in section 20 of the Industrial Arbitration Act. I imagine that this is the section that will be amended by the measure now before the House. I look forward to seeing the detailed provisions of the bill. Perhaps the Opposition will have more to say about it at the second-reading stage. However, if the bill follows the course of the recommendations of Sir Alexander Beattie, it will have our commendation and support.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## MISCELLANEOUS ACTS (INSPECTORS) AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

Mr HILLS (Phillip), Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy [9.29]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend various Acts so as to prevent the disclosure by certain inspectors of certain information obtained by them in connection with the administration or execution of those Acts.

In June, 1975, the Commonwealth Government, after obtaining agreement to such action from all the States, ratified the International Labour Organisation convention No. 81 dealing with labour inspection in industry. Ratification of an ILO convention involves the ratifying country in ensuring that its law and practice conform with the requirements of the convention. In New South Wales law and practice relating to labour inspection in industry conforms with the requirements of convention No. 81,

except in one particular. The exception is that there is at present no legal requirement that inspectors operating in the industrial area shall not reveal, after leaving the public service, any manufacturing or commercial secrets or working processes that may have come to their knowledge in the course of their duties. Such a prohibition is required by the convention. In order to meet this situation it is proposed by this bill to amend this State's laws relating to labour inspection in industry to require this post-employment secrecy. This concludes my brief outline of the purpose of the bill. I shall give more details at the second-reading stage.

Mr DOWD (Lane Cove) [9.31]: The Opposition will not oppose the granting of leave to introduce this measure. On the face of it, the provision appears to be an important and proper addition to the law relating to inspection. The policy of the international convention which is to come into effect by this amending measure is to make more effective the law relating to inspectors. One would like to think that the Government would be as careful about some of the other inspections that take place, such as those under the Companies Act, by not lightly publishing the contents of the reports made by inspectors. This measure appears to be a proper addition to the law and a proper protection for inspectors.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr DAY (Casino), Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries [9.34]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend section 4 of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1974, in relation to the definition of "wheat products".

The purpose of the bill is to make the definition of wheat products in the State Act consistent with the definition in the corresponding Commonwealth Act. The bill will be explained in detail at the second-reading stage. I commend the motion to honourable members.

Mr MACKIE (Albury) [9.35]: The Minister has given only brief details of what he proposes in amending the Wheat Stabilisation Act. Honourable members on this side of the House will look forward to studying the bill in detail when it is before them. They will listen with great interest to what the Minister says during his second-reading speech. Honourable members on the Opposition benches will always support any measures introduced by the Government that are beneficial to the wheatgrowers of New South Wales. The Opposition realizes only too well the importance of the wheat industry, not only to New South Wales, but also to the general economy of the nation. Wheat is one of the few viable primary industries in Australia today. For that reason members of the Opposition will support any measure that benefits the industry.

As the Minister is a new Minister, I suggest that when he is contemplating any amendments that affect primary producers he would do well to consult with the industry before he makes a decision to bring any legislation before the House. By that I mean consultation with the grower organizations, which are controlled by men with wide experience in the primary industry of this State. If the Minister does that he will

receive from the organizations valuable advice which will help him in preparing any legislation he has in contemplation. The Opposition looks forward to the Minister's second-reading speech.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## TEACHING SERVICE (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr BEDFORD (**Fairfield**), Minister for Education [9.37]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to repeal section 24A of the Teaching Service Act, 1970, and to repeal the Teaching Service (Amendment) Act, 1975.

On 13th March, 1975, the former Government introduced a bill to amend the Teaching Service Act. Its purpose was to empower the Director-General of Education to select for appointment to the teaching service any qualified officer who in his opinion was the most suitable person for appointment to that service. That amendment gave the director-general that power, notwithstanding any other law, or any award or order made under any Act. Honourable members will recall that this amendment was the cause of grave industrial trouble in 1975. In fact it was the subject of a number of compulsory conferences before the Industrial Commission of New South Wales. This industrial unrest **occurred** not because of any power to appoint the most suitable applicants to the teaching service, but because it became clear that the real purpose of the amendment was to override the normal award provision for giving preference in employment to members of the New South Wales Teachers' Federation.

The Government announced in its policy prior to the elections in May that if elected it would repeal this amendment. Not only would we do this to remove a provision that makes it possible for the director-general to override the provisions of any law in making appointments to the teaching service, including those provisions of the preference-to-unionists clause included in the award for teachers by the Industrial Commission of New South Wales: we would do this also in the interests of better industrial relations in the teaching service. In short, the bill removes and repeals section 24A of the Teaching Service (Amendment) Act. I feel that most honourable members will accept the desirability of this measure and support its introduction.

Sir ERIC WILLIS (Earlwood), Leader of the Opposition [9.39]: Most of the measures of which notice has been given this evening have been non-controversial. Many of them are bills that were drafted by the former Government or were mooted by it, but this bill is a direct reversal of action taken by the previous Government. Therefore, I want to make it quite clear at the outset that the Opposition will be doing what Oppositions quite frequently do with Government legislation—opposing it. The Minister has revealed the stark contrast that exists between the basic philosophies of the party that now occupies the Treasury benches and the parties that are on the Opposition benches. ~~The~~ Minister has clearly indicated that the **Labor** Party is a party that believes in regimentation, controls, compulsion and the opposite of the things that honourable members on this side of the House espouse in the way of all possible freedom and allowance for people to choose their own way of life, and to decide with whom they shall associate and for what purpose.

Members of the Opposition do not believe, for the same reasons that the United Nations charter indicates, that people should be compelled to join an organization, unless they freely choose to do so. On the other hand, the **Labor** Party apparently

believes that people should be given freedom in certain respects but that when it comes to trade unionism they should be compelled to join their appropriate trade union. The Minister knows that that was the basic cause of the trouble that produced the legislation that he is now seeking to repeal. He said that the Act he wished to repeal gave the Director-General of Education, the man who employs all the school-teachers of the State, the authority to employ the most suitable applicants for positions as schoolteachers. What else should it have given him? What other power? What the Minister is now seeking is to take that power away from the Director-General of Education and in its place to require the director-general to give preferential treatment to members of the Teachers Federation of New South Wales, even if they are not the most suitable applicants.

Even if they are not the most suitable applicants, they are to be given preferential treatment over people who are qualified and suited for appointment. This will inevitably bring about compulsory unionism in this noble profession of teaching. It is the only profession in which the appropriate union has sought the protection afforded it by section 129B of the Industrial Arbitration Act, which gives to the union the power to force people in the profession to join the union or run the risk of not being able to obtain employment from, in this case, the only employer they may go to for employment. For those reasons, I believe this is a most retrograde step, a step back to the days of compulsion, which is a hallmark of the socialist philosophy to which Government supporters subscribe. We have in this State at present a very militant trade union in the Teachers Federation. If I may use the vernacular, it has the present Minister for Education by the scruff of the neck to the extent that he has meetings every week with executive officers of the federation in private in his room, without departmental officers being present. Presumably, he receives his instructions on what he shall and shall not do in his administration of those great departments under his control.

The Teachers Federation believes that it should determine who should get jobs as schoolteachers in this State, that it alone should have the right to say whether people should be employed by the director-general who is supposed to answer only to the Minister. This retrograde action this evening will reverse the freedom in employment that has been enjoyed by the Director-General of Education who—and I say this of all director-generals over the years—has always properly chosen people because of their qualifications. Now they are to be chosen because they are members of this militant, left-wing union. Whether they want to be members or not, they will be dragooned into it. The Minister has shown that he subscribes to this by allowing the Teachers Federation to have its union subscriptions deducted at source, notwithstanding its shocking industrial record.

For all these reasons I believe the teachers of this State and parents will have reason to resent this proposed legislation, and the children of the State will in future years have cause to resent it. I do not intend to oppose the first reading: that does not serve any useful purpose. However, honourable members on this side will have much more to say on the second reading if the bill is intended to do what I believe it will, that is, restore the position that existed prior to the introduction of the amending measure last year.

Mr BEDFORD (Fairfield), Minister for Education [9.45], in reply: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the bill will do exactly that, so he had better get his battle lines drawn for the second-reading stage. The intelligence of the Leader of the Opposition is sadly awry. It is a surprise to me that members of the Teachers Federation meet me in secret in the ministry. The Leader of the Opposition should get his private CIA, or whatever it is that looks into these matters, to check what is

going on. Then he would not make the stupid statement that we have heard him make tonight. It is patently not true. The Leader of the Opposition wants us to retreat to those days of insanity when the Government of which he was a member purposely fought, day by day, with the Teachers Federation about education in New South Wales. The purpose of the bill is to bring about a return to the days of sanity, to remove this irritant that was deliberately thrown into industrial matters concerning the education system, together with the penalty put on the federation, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, by way of not allowing deduction of fees at source and a number of other matters.

During my twenty-one years as a teacher I was never faced with the possibility of having to go on strike because of the actions of the Government. The leader of the Teachers Federation for most of that time was a card-carrying communist, which no doubt would scare honourable members opposite. Never once was I as a teacher faced with that possibility. Anything that this Government can do to bring about a return to the days when the department and the Minister could come to reasonable terms with the Teachers Federation, we will continue to pursue. As a first step tonight, I have sought leave to bring in this bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## FEDERATION OF PARENTS AND CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF NEW SOUTH WALES INCORPORATION BILL

### Introduction

Mr BEDFORD (Fairfield), Minister for Education [9.47]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to provide for the incorporation of the Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations of New South Wales.

The Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations of New South Wales is an unincorporated body representing associations of parents and citizens who are attached to State schools. Honourable members will know of the federation's work in furthering the cause of education in New South Wales. As an unincorporated body, it is not able to hold title to real or personal property in its own name, but must arrange for registration of property to be effected in the name of trustees. The bill will allow the federation to become a corporation with provision to register title in its own name. At the second-reading stage I shall outline the provisions of the bill in detail but may I say that it will enable this body more effectively to discharge its important responsibilities. I trust that leave will be granted and that the bill will be passed through both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible.

Mr PICKARD (Hornsby) [9.48]: Members of the Opposition will not take any objection to the bill, which was prepared by the previous Government. May I say a word of commendation for the work that the parents and citizens federation groups have done in supporting education and providing educational equipment in schools throughout New South Wales over many years. The fact that they occupied office space granted to them by the department was appreciated by them and it has assisted them in their work. We are glad that under this measure they will be able to go into their own buildings and own them as a corporation without let or hindrance.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

## Introduction

Mr EINFELD (Waverley), Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Co-operative Societies [9.49]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Friendly Societies Act, 1912.

The last amendment to the Friendly Societies Act was introduced in 1967. Since then there have been a number of developments in the Friendly Society movement and an increased interest in the formation and registration of societies under the Act by persons with no connection whatever with the movement. Major features in the proposed amendments are more stringent requirements for the registration of societies and their names and rules. A friendly societies advisory committee will be established to advise the Minister and the registrar regarding proposed societies and other matters affecting them.

The bill revises present requirements for accounts, audit, inspection and investigation of societies. It prohibits undischarged bankrupts and certain convicted persons from taking part in the management of societies and certain persons from being appointed as trustees of societies or branches. The bill provides for powers to facilitate dealings with investments by trustees appointing delegates and to permit investment in permanent building societies. In addition, it provides for friendly societies to join an association of co-operative societies. Amendments are proposed to facilitate borrowing by societies, subject to certain restrictions and clarification so that they and their branches may invest only in land and buildings required for the purpose of transacting their business and holding their meetings.

Penalties, and proceedings for their recovery have been revised. Provisions have been enlarged for registration of branches, for cancellation of registration and dissolution of societies and branches. The bill amends the power for subscribing to charities by societies and branches so that this may be up to an amount specified in rules. It includes new conditions to allow assignment and charges over life assurance and endowment benefits, subject to certain limitations, and to facilitate payments on the death of members.

The bill changes arrangements for the payment of subvention grants, partly because of the introduction of Medibank. These include termination of payments of grants for medical benefits and medicine, and arrangements for payment of lump sum termination payments to societies, equivalent to the value of future subvention grants for sickness benefit and funeral donations. Finally, the bill provides for a number of miscellaneous technical and consequential amendments, and for some amendments associated with statutory reforms. These and the proposed amendments that I have already mentioned should cater more adequately for the needs of societies and their members. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr BROWN (Raleigh) [9.52]: The bill refers to some wonderful societies which over the years have played an important part in the social life of communities, the basis of which has been man helping his fellow man. I welcome the fact that the Act will be brought up to date to meet present-day conditions. The intentions of the bill as outlined by the Minister are quite in order so far as the Opposition is concerned. Stringent registration conditions are important. The Friendly Society Advisory Committee will be drawn mainly from people experienced in those societies. They will be of advantage to the committee. It is important also that accounts and audits be strictly supervised and that undischarged bankrupts should not be trustees.

I welcome particularly the fact that there can now be investment in permanent building societies. In that way those who need homes will be assisted by the availability of additional funds. I observe with pleasure that friendly societies can now join an association of co-operative societies. The matter of subvention grants mentioned by the Minister is important. Friendly societies have had a lot of their members for many years. Now that they are getting old the provisions of the bill will enable them to obtain lump sums, when they are of some help to them, rather than existing on small amounts from the societies. The Minister has not mentioned anything that will in any way cause the **Opposition** to oppose the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

## PRICES REGULATION (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Introduction

Mr EINFELD (Waverley), Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Co-operative Societies [9.55]: I move:

That leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the Prices Regulation Act, 1948, for the purpose of constituting a prices commission; and to amend the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Act, 1975, for the purpose of determining the remuneration and allowances payable to the Chairman of the Commission.

At present price fixing in New South Wales is provided for by the Prices Regulation Act of 1948. The actual price to be fixed for goods and services declared by the responsible Minister is left to the absolute discretion of the Prices Commissioner or an assistant prices commissioner. The view of the Government is that this feature of the Prices Regulation Act is unreasonable.

Discretion as to price-fixing should not be left in the hands of one person. However, I want to make it quite clear that this does not mean that the Government has any doubts whatsoever about the impartiality and integrity of the Prices Commissioner. The Government feels it necessary for the Prices Regulation Act to be amended to replace the position of the Prices Commissioner and the powers that he exercises with a prices commission which will have similar powers and will hear applications to deal with price variations. The bill will provide that these powers of the Prices Commission will be increased to the extent that it will hold open hearings on applications for price increases at which members of the public can be present and take part.

The bill will provide also that the Prices Commission will comprise three members for a renewable term of three years. It will have a suitably qualified and full-time chairman and two part-time members, one a representative of consumers and the other a person experienced in commerce or business. My second-reading speech will explain that much of the commission's work will be in the field of investigating complaints of exploitation and unjustified increases in the price of goods and services. As I have said, the bill will provide that the Prices Commission will hold public hearings at which interested parties may contest or intervene in hearings of applications to deal with price variations. These interested parties may have access, except in special circumstances, to information which is submitted to the commission in support of these applications. It will provide for the conduct of meetings of the Prices Commission as well as other amendments designed to update various provisions of the Prices Regulation Act.

The bill is concrete evidence of the Government's concern at the lack over the past eleven years of real consumer representation in a matter that concerns the citizens of this State every time they enter a shop. We have been concerned that consumers have had no representation not only in past price-fixing decisions by the Prices Commissioner but also in the pricing of goods and services generally. This measure is an earnest of the Government's intent—in consumer affairs, as in other matters that affect the lives of the citizens whom it represents—to broaden public participation in decision-making as much as it can. I have given only a brief outline of the provisions of the bill. A more detailed explanation will be given at the second-reading stage. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr BROWN (Raleigh) [9.58]: Although what the Minister has said appears to be fairly harmless, the Opposition will study the bill carefully. Controls, restrictions and constrictions generally are abhorrent to the philosophy of Opposition members. In present economic circumstances industry generally wants price control of any sort like it wants a hole in the head. In 1948 the Prices Regulation Act came into effect in New South Wales after powers were handed over by the national Parliament which in 1939 took them as a wartime emergency measure.

Though it is generally accepted that petrol and bread are the only two items the prices of which are fixed, there are other commodities that have a price fixed under various Acts. I instance milk as one product subject to such price control. I note with interest that the bill provides for the appointment of a full-time commissioner and part-time members. If they are as qualified as the Opposition and, I expect, as the Minister hopes, there should be little ground for complaint. I find no fault with the proposal that they investigate complaints. The Minister mentioned also that price-fixing was to be the responsibility of not one person but of the proposed commission. That indicates to me that the idea of fixing prices may not have disappeared completely.

As the Minister also said, he has given to honourable members only a brief outline. We have no objection whatever to the introduction of the measure, but we shall study it closely to see that no further controls are placed on industry, which is suffering badly at the present time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a first time.

#### ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISCUSSION

Mr F. J. WALKER: On behalf of the Premier I give notice under Standing Order 175B that it is the intention of the Government to deal with the following business: Supply Bill: introduction; second reading; Committee and report stages; adoption of report. 12.30 p.m., Thursday, 9 September, 1976.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Lyne Park, Rose Bay

Mr EINFELD (Waverley), Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Co-operative Societies [10.1]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr DOYLE (Vaucluse) [10.1]: I delay the Mouse tonight on a matter immediately arising and pertinent to my electorate. I thank you, Mr Speaker, for permitting me to introduce into this Chamber a plan that will allow me to demonstrate my points. This matter is not only pertinent to my electorate but is also significant to all Sydney-siders who love their harbour and bridge, are proud of their opera house, and abhor any visual pollution of their harbour's foreshores. I speak of the visual pollution that is currently known as the Rose Bay flying boat base.

At present there is a hangar of corrugated fibro, that has been holed as a result of louts throwing stones at it. The building is in a state of disrepair. Weeds are growing throughout the area and garbage is gathering. Last week someone set alight the office buildings which are half burned and are now in a dilapidated condition. In fact, the whole area is a complete eyesore. In addition, a half-submerged pontoon is a menace, because even a mild storm could well cause it to break loose and constitute a danger to shipping. Access to the area is easily gained by a person rolling through a sizeable gap under the existing gates; anyone can gain admittance and commit whatever nuisance he wishes.

The Minister has interrupted all the plans for this area, and has virtually sacked all those who have spent many hours endeavouring to arrive at a blueprint that would make Sydneysiders proud of this area. I have a letter here which states that following a review of the proposal, a review of the plan by departmental officers is required. A review of the plan is probably the Minister's term for stagnation. Further, it has been decided by the Minister to disband the implementation committee, a committee principally composed of public servants. In view of the termination of the activities of that committee, he is saying that he feels there is no further need for the local committee, chaired by myself, which also should be disbanded. This is the great hand of the socialist in this decision.

I shall give a little history of this area. When the Commonwealth abandoned it in 1974, the honourable member for Wollondilly, who was the Minister for Lands, appointed Mr John Fisher, an architect of accepted standing in the city. He is a man who has a great knowledge of outdoor architecture—something that is required for this site. He was appointed to produce a plan, which he did, at considerable expense to the taxpayers.

Mr Fisher spent many months in preparing a plan, which is reproduced here for the benefit of honourable members. I demonstrate with the pointer the existing Lyne Park and the area now occupied by the Rose Bay flying base. Members will see from the plan that previously there was a launching ramp in the position that I indicate. That ramp has been closed and a launching ramp of wider proportions is to be built in the position that I again indicate. A car park for trailers is located in the centre. These installations will exclude the area of the park that I now point out to the House. It will be not only unsightly but also dangerous, because the ends of the trailers will jut out. The black marks indicate new trees.

Mr Brereton: On a point of order. I am not sure about the trees, but I am positive that in indicating a launching ramp the honourable member for Vaucluse has pointed his cue at Flanagan's floating restaurant.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is well taken. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that if he would like to have his remarks recorded in *Hansard*, it is impossible for the Hansard reporters to take down the directions he is giving with his cue and to record where he is pointing it. I think he should elaborate on the points he is making.

Mr DOYLE: I think the plan prepared by this eminent architect might be incorporated in *Hansard* if a photograph can be taken of it. Let me condense the recommendations of Mr Fisher. The development of this area would be something of which the people of Sydney could be proud. Not only is the plan attractive; it is also feasible in terms of cost. Woollahra council has an obligation to submit a proposal for the area. The sum of about \$30,000 is coming from that source. The federal Government, which occupied the area for some time under permissive occupancy, is required to return the area in its condition prior to occupancy. That means it must remove the concrete, hangar and buildings, and re-establish the grassed area as it was before. The Commonwealth has made a trifling offer of \$25,000. It would cost \$100,000 to \$200,000 to do the work properly. I submit that this is a sound plan produced by a capable architect for the beautification of an area on the foreshores of Sydney Harbour. I am afraid the Minister is following the Cahill-like procedure of approving expenditure only in areas represented by Labor members.

Mr CRABTREE (Kogarah), Minister for Lands [10.8]: I am happy to have the opportunity to talk about Rose Bay. I want to inform the honourable member that there has been a change of government of which he may not be aware. This Government will not tolerate the appointment of private committees for the purpose of designing the usage of Crown land. I have visited this park twice, and I am fortified in my opinion by the representations made to me by the Vacluse Progress Association, the Rose Bay Scouts Association, the Woollahra Sailing Club and representatives of the proposed youth clubs. After interviewing Mr Fisher, the architect, and representatives of the resident action groups. I have no apologies to make. I have been in contact with the Woollahra council, which is in agreement with the department. It welcomes the decision. The council has written to me expressing concern about my opinion that the centre of the park should not be used as a parking area for eighty-seven trailers, motor cars and motor boats. I make no apologies for it. I am supported by the residents of Rose Bay in my opinion that it would not be desirable to have a motor boat club in the centre of this park.

The fact is that Lyne Park will be restored as a result of collaboration between the State Department of Lands and the federal Government. I have complimented Mr Fisher. I have complimented the *ad hoc* committee set up by the honourable member for Wollondilly. The honourable member for Vacluse can be assured that, in the interests of his constituents and the people who have made representations to me, a beautiful park will be established on this location. However, negotiations will be conducted through the ordinary channels, which are the State Department of Lands and the Commonwealth Government. Private citizens or individual members of this House will not be called upon to do the designing.

I repeat, Lyne Park will be developed by my department in collaboration with the Woollahra municipal council, and all the nonsense about having *ad hoc* committees made up of persons drawn from the streets to design something for this area is not on. My department is the responsible authority. If the honourable member for Vacluse wants to co-operate with the Department of Lands in ensuring that the best design is achieved, he may do so. If he wants to stick with the honourable member for Wollondilly and seek to design this park with the assistance of a few people who own motor-boats so that they can put them in the centre of what should be a beautiful area at Rose Bay, I will not have it. Although I come from Kogarah, I assure the people of Rose Bay that they will have a beautiful park at this location, and one of which they can be proud.

Mr Mutton: When?

Mr CRABTREE: The negotiations are far advanced. We have been in touch with the council and I hope that in the near future the Maritime Services Board will be talking to people about slips for motor boats. I have been in touch with the Boy Scouts. I have guaranteed them a lease. We have been in touch with the Woollahra sailing club. We have guaranteed them a lease. We have discussed the matter with the Youth Club. We are determined to see that Rose Bay has a decent park, despite the efforts of the members of the Liberal-Country party Opposition.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.

---

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

The following questions upon notice and answers were circulated in *Questions and Answers* this day.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Mr LEWIS asked the Minister for Local Government—

- (1) Did the Local Government Boundaries Commission inquiry into the amalgamation of local government councils in the Berrima district conclude some weeks ago?
- (2)
  - (a) Has he received a report from the commission and if so when will he make a decision on amalgamation?
  - (b) If the report has not yet been received, when is it expected and when will he announce his decision on amalgamation?

*Answer—*

- (1) The inquiry by the Local Government Boundaries Commission into boundary proposals involving the Berrima district concluded on 30-6-76.
- (2) (a) and (b) The commission expects to be in a position to forward me **its** report in the next two to three weeks. My decision on the proposals **will** be made as soon as practicable after I have received and studied the contents **of** the report.

PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION PLAN

Mr **LEWIS** asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for **Housing**—

(1) Does the Government intend to go ahead with the Lewis Government proposal to construct public works on a construct-now pay-later plan?

(2) If so, will he ask the Commonwealth Government to use this plan for Commonwealth public works in New South Wales to assist the building and other industries?

(3) Will he extend the Lewis Government bus-leasing scheme to apply not only to vehicles but also to rolling stock, buildings and other requirements of the Government?

*Answer—*

(1) In late 1975 twenty-three primary and secondary schools contracts were let, by the then Government, on a deferred payment basis. These contracts have progressed satisfactorily and the first progress payments for work carried out to that time were made on or after 1st July, 1976. The letting of further contracts is presently being considered by Cabinet as a possible means of assisting the building industry during the present period of great difficulty. However, there are many factors to be taken into account, not the least being the amount of funds available to the Government for its total building construction programme. At this time the whole matter is receiving the closest attention and I expect a decision on the Government's intentions in this regard to be announced shortly.

(2) Yes, but the Commonwealth has ample finance raised by way of taxation from the people of New South Wales and should not need to adopt this practice. The New South Wales Government believes that the Fraser Government could and should be substantially increasing its spending on Commonwealth public works in this State.

(3) The leasing of privately-owned premises for Government use is under review. However, as a matter of general policy the **Labor** Government does not subscribe to the Lewis Government's policy of assisting developers by leasing from them large areas of office space that would have otherwise remained empty.

The question of leasing rolling stock is one for my colleague, the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways.