

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 7 September, 1978

Bills Returned—Petitions—Public Accounts Committee (Fourth Report)---Questions without Notice—Special Adjournment—Rebates to Taxpayers (Personal Income Tax) Bill (**Int.**)—**Animals** for Research—Electoral District of Wollondilly (Resignation of Hon. Thomas **Lancelot Lewis**)—**Printing** Committee (Fourth Report)—Questions upon Notice.

Mr Speaker (The Hon. Lawrence Borthwick **Kelly**) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.
Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

BILLS RETURNED

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

- Defamation (Amendment) Bill
- Ombudsman (Amendment) Bill
- Police Regulation (Allegations of Misconduct) Bill
- Police Regulation (Appeals) Amendment Bill

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced that the following petitions had been lodged for presentation:

Sunday Hotel Trading

The Petition of the undersigned citizens 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) Alcohol is a contributing factor in a large proportion of road accidents causing many fatalities and **maimings** and more facilities for weekend drinking will inevitably add to the problem.
- (3) The high incidence of alcoholism among our young people is causing much concern.

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 any other place where sale of liquor is permitted.

- (2) If however it is intended to submit legislation to the House, this should not be done until the people of New South Wales be given the democratic right of vote by referendum on this important issue.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr **McGowan**, received.

Prison for **Parklea**

The Petition of concerned residents of the electorates of The Hills, Hawkesbury and adjacent electorates, respectfully sheweth:

That they are in opposition to the erection of a maximum security prison, or other penal institution, at **Parklea** or thereabouts, as this will adversely **affect** the interests of the community in the aforesaid areas.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will take steps to reverse the decision announced by the Premier to build such a prison in this locality.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr **Rozzoli**, received.

Quality of Education

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

That because there is much concern in the community over the failure of modern education at **primary** and secondary levels to meet the expectations of many parents, teachers, lecturers, professors, employers and students;

That because there is considerable doubt as to the content and standards, philosophy and moral values of new courses or projects, such as M.A.C.O.S. ("Man—a Course of Study"—ex **U.S.A.**); "People of the Western Desert" (Aust.); and S.E.M.P. ("Social Education Materials Project"—Aust.) and in view of the fact that M.A.C.O.S. and S.E.M.P. have been withdrawn from Queensland schools;

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Parliament of New South Wales will:

- (1) Immediately suspend Courses and Projects such as "M.A.C.O.S.", "People of the Western Desert" and "S.E.M.P." from all N.S.W. primary and secondary schools and Teachers' Colleges, and conduct an independent public inquiry into their suitability and **conformity** with the provisions of the N.S.W. Education Act.
- (2) Enforce the following **guidelines** in relation to all text books, courses, projects, etc., used in State schools and **Institutions:—**
 - (a) They should encourage loyalty and respect for **God**, Queen and Country, our Federal and State Constitutions and observance of the laws of the land.
 - (b) They should recognize the importance of marriage, family life, motherhood and fatherhood, **as well as** the privacy of the family and the individual student.

- (c) They should avoid profanity, indecency or any encouragement of racial hatred, **anti-semitism**, sedition or violent revolution against our Australian democratic parliamentary institutions.
 - (d) They should provide for studies in history and geography (rather than sociology) and show the importance of the **Judeo-Christian** ethic as our natural Australian heritage.
 - (e) They should teach the 3 R's, that is, the **skills** of reading, writing and arithmetic, so that all children receive an effective basic education for their future responsibilities.
- (3) Implement a system of public preview and approval of all text books, novels, courses and projects with reasonable access for all parents and citizens before they are approved for use in schools in accordance with an approved core curriculum.
- (4) To introduce a more meaningful system of the testing and assessing of educational results so as to provide a more equal opportunity for all students in N.S.W.

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

Petitions, lodged by Mr Barraclough, Mr **McGowan** and Mr **Rozzoli**, received.

Pensioners' Electricity Accounts

The Petition of the undersigned citizens respectfully sheweth:

That economic hardship is being suffered by those citizens of this State whose incomes consist solely or mainly of age or invalid pensions and who **are—**

- (a) subject to increasing charges for electricity;
- (b) required to pay maximum rates applicable to smaller consumers; and
- (c) are not able to obtain any rebates under the existing provisions of the Electricity Act.

Your Petitioners accordingly call upon the Government of New South Wales to take early steps to so amend the Electricity Act as to empower each electricity distributing authority in this State to allow rebates on the electricity accounts of the abovementioned pensioners.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr McGowan, received.

Dental Clinics for Wollongong

The Petition of the Wollongong Unemployed Peoples Movement respectfully sheweth:

That people in receipt of unemployment benefit and other pension in the City of Greater Wollongong and the **Illawarra** Region have no local access to means tested dental treatment and are subjected to many months' wait for treatment at the Dental Hospital in Sydney.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will provide hospital dental clinics in this city in recognition of its place as a major industrial centre and commensurate with the services provided in the City of Newcastle.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr **Petersen**, received.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Fourth Report

Mr Durick, as Chairman, brought up the Fourth Report, during the currency of the Forty-fifth Parliament, of the Public Accounts Committee.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

OVERAWARD PAYMENT TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT COMMISSION EMPLOYEES.

Mr **COLEMAN**: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways. Why did the Government abdicate its responsibility to the public in consenting to and supporting the overaward wage increase to Public Transport Commission employees approved yesterday by way of consent award? Will this latest increase add further to the \$1,200 million total Public Transport Commission deficit accumulated since this Government came to office, as did the notorious June 1976 sweetheart deal? How is the public interest to be represented in preventing further excessive wage demands before industrial tribunals, when the Government, as the political wing of the Labor Council, is not willing to represent the public interest?

Mr **COX**: It is apparent that the Leader of the Opposition has not bothered to get any information about what happened yesterday in respect of this matter. I propose to read the recommendation made by conciliation commissioner **Walker**—and I stress that it was Mr Walker's recommendation. It is in these terms:

This matter has been in negotiations around an **agreement** between the Trades and Labor Council on behalf of unions and the State Government.

At that time a number of matters were left aside as reserved rights.

On the question of wage rates I found that the work of New South Wales car and waggon examiners had varied—I adjusted the rates on a work value basis and brought in a fifth year rate. The new rate brought car and waggon **examiners** in New South Wales into line with train examiners, class 1, in Victoria.

In Victoria service incremental payments apply at two levels and certain specified classifications, including the train examiner, class 1, and the leading **shunter**, class 2, are in the higher scale. I feel it correct that the same principle should apply in the Public Transport Commission as applies in Victoria.

I stress to all parties, including the Trades and Labor Council, that the recommendations that I am **making** that these two designations receive the tradesmen's over-award payment is strictly a recommendation associated with such areas of negotiation and have no bearing whatsoever in respect of any other agreement.

I indicate that my **recommendation** is that the adjustments should commence from the beginning of the first pay period after a resumption of work. Because of the wage structure presently existing I find that the car and wagon fitter should also be included in my recommendation.

For the **information** of the Leader of the Opposition, the representative of the Public Transport Commission in these negotiations raised with conciliation commissioner **Walker** the question of a flow-on, particularly as a number of unions have claims before the Industrial Commission. For that reason commissioner Walker emphasized that his recommendations should apply **only** to the particular category that he was dealing with. It is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition is directing his criticism towards conciliation commissioner Walker. Incidentally, it has been estimated that the sum involved in this matter will be less than \$100,000 a year.

Mr Mason: Ah, ah.

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

Mr COX: The Leader of the Opposition has once again made an attack upon a senior Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commissioner. He is forever telling the unions to go to arbitration, yet when they do so and get a favourable decision he immediately attacks the decision in this Parliament. This is the second occasion on which the honourable member has criticized commissioner Walker for a decision on these matters. Recently he suggested that a sweetheart agreement had been made and attacked the same commissioner for having brought down that decision. The honourable member is using the Parliament as a means of destroying the credibility of the arbitration system.

[Interruption]

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

Mr COX: The Leader of the Opposition attacks unions every time they go to court, and when they **win** he criticizes the decision.

[Interruption]

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

Mr COX: The Leader of the Opposition's attitude towards conciliation is disgraceful. I assure the House that the decision **was** made by commissioner Walker basically on the evidence presented to him by the union concerned.

PRICE OF PETROL

Mr BANNON: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Consumer **Affairs** and Minister for Co-operative Societies. Is the Prices Commission meeting today to consider yesterday's decision by the Commonwealth Prices Justification Tribunal to increase the price of petrol? Is the Prices Commission likely **to** pass on this increase? If so, what will be the effects of the decision in New South Wales?

Mr EINFELD: This morning the chairman of the New South Wales Prices Commission requested that, in accordance with the Act, I give him and his colleagues permission to deal with petrol prices increase **applications** without the necessity to hold a public inquiry. It is quite proper for the commission to do that. I expect, as does the chairman of the commission, that it will decide to pass on the federal Prices Justification Tribunal increase **as** it has done previously with tax increases **imposed** by federal budgets. Honourable members will be aware that this particular increase stems from the decision **of** the federal Government to **impose** a tax on oil at the refinery.

The cost to the ordinary consumer will be enormous. Indeed, it will mean that the federal Government will rake off fully 53 per cent of the price of each litre of petrol. In other words, \$800 million a year will go to the federal Government from the pockets of Australian motorists. This represents about \$260 a year from each New South Wales motorist or about \$107 from every person in this State. Already the aviation industry is talking of a 5 per cent increase in fares as a result of the federal Government's decision. Representatives of the long distance transport industry have been to see me to point out their problems particularly for small operators in that industry. They believe that serious unemployment in the haulier industry will result from this savage increase.

The federal Government's new petrol pricing policy will add to costs of primary and secondary industries. These costs will inevitably flow through to the consumer. They will add to the cost of government services, particularly public transport. Oil companies have already pointed out what the policy means to costs of working capital. They will have to find so much more money each day to pay for deliveries of petrol. Heavy costs will be attached to that requirement.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The level of conversation in the Chamber is far too high.

Mr EINFELD: Even service station proprietors who have to pay cash on delivery for petrol, will have to face problems of cost of working capital. The ordinary garage proprietor will need \$1,000 more in cash to pay for his regular deliveries of petrol. These problems will work their way into increased cost for the consumer. Apart from the federal Government, the only beneficiaries from this misconceived policy will be such oil producers as BHP, which is happily using its increased oil revenues to invest in its steel interests and other programmes. Should the Prices Commission today decide to pass on the increase—and it really has no alternative but to do so as it is a direct Commonwealth tax—the New South Wales Government will agree to endorse the decision only with extreme reluctance. This Government is of the view that the federal Government's new pricing policy is contradictory, confused, costly and unnecessary. That policy will affect every citizen in Australia every time a commodity is purchased. Every item on every shelf in every store will increase in cost as a result of this new tax imposed by the federal Government.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr PUNCH: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Conservation and Minister for Water Resources. Did the Minister for Lands announce some time ago that all interim development orders covering extensions to national parks were to be reviewed? Is it a fact that this undertaking has not been honoured and that large forestry areas are still covered by these orders, thus jeopardizing the availability of timber supplies and the economic position of many mills? Will the Minister say whether he has made representations to his colleague, the Vice-President of the Executive Council and Minister for Planning and Environment, to have the interim development orders lifted from these forestry areas? Will he inform the House what action he has taken to institute new development of indigenous timbers in this State?

Mr Brown: The answer is, nothing. The Minister for Lands went to the North Coast and told lies.

Mr Crabtree: The Liberal—Country party Government had eleven years to do something about it, and did nothing.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Raleigh and the Minister for Lands to order.

Mr Brown: All you have done is tell lies.

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

Mr GORDON: The level of employment in the timber industry is a little lower than it has been, owing mainly to the improved technology and a greater degree of mechanization in timber mills. There are now better handling methods in the industry, and that has caused some falling off in employment. That is the only reason for the lower employment rate in the industry. Some land has been transferred by way of revocation of dedications in favour of national parks. There have also been some revocations of land in forestry districts for other purposes. One example is at Karuah, in the electorate of the Leader of the Country Party, where a dedication was revoked to enable some of the honourable gentleman's constituents to enjoy a game of golf. The former Government had eleven years in which to do something about these matters, but did nothing. At least something is being done now. From time to time land has been transferred for environmental and other purposes. That practice still obtains and will continue.

CRUDE OIL TANKERS

Mr DEGEN: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy. Did the Minister recently meet representatives of Australian maritime unions and oil companies to discuss proposals by the unions for Australian-owned and Australian-manned tankers to take part in carrying crude oil from the Middle East? Did the unions assert in their representations that crew costs are a minor portion of total operating costs? Will the Minister advise the House whether the discussions were successful and, if they were, will he say whether he expects that fact to go a long way towards relieving the unemployment that exists in our maritime industries?

Mr HILLS: I think all honourable members are aware that there was a serious industrial dispute about oversea oil tankers coming to Australia. I was so concerned about it that I wrote to the two federal Ministers involved, the Hon. P. J. Nixon, Minister for Transport, and the Hon. A. A. Street, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations. I did that because the maritime unions are covered by federal awards. The matter was discussed subsequently at a meeting called by the Prime Minister, who invited the Premiers of New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia to discuss with him in Canberra the subject of the maritime unions and shipping transport. The Premier of this State attended the meeting with Sir Charles Court, Premier of Western Australia, and the Hon. Joh Bjelke-Petersen, Premier of Queensland. This dispute over the importation of oil, and whether tankers carrying the Australian flag should be used, cost the Australian community some \$30 million. The dispute was dragging on and nothing was happening. Federal Ministers were refusing to take any action. I took the bit between my teeth, even though the matter was completely outside my jurisdiction as State Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy, and I called together representatives of the maritime unions and the oil companies to see whether we could find some way around the impasse.

The maritime unions agreed to lift all bans throughout Australia on imported fuel while these discussions proceeded. Federal ministers refused to take action on this important matter, which cost the Australian community \$30 million that has to be passed on to the motorists, industry and users of oil for heating and the like. I took action to call together the federal unions and representatives of the oil companies, and was able to get some sanity into the matter. Subsequently, at the Premiers' Conference the subject was raised by Sir Charles Court, and the New South Wales

Premier was able to persuade that meeting that the continuation of negotiations should be left in my hands. I am pleased to report that a document has been agreed to in general terms by the industry and maritime unions and, in accordance with the formula proposed by the Premier at the Premiers' Conference, it will be raised in Brisbane tomorrow at a meeting of Ministers for Industrial Relations.

In the past the crewing of Australian tankers has been misrepresented. In the near future an announcement will be made by an Australian oil company indicating the fallacies of some of the arguments which suggest that there would be a substantial increase in the price of crude oil if tankers carrying the Australian flag brought overseas crude into Australia. When that announcement is made those who have been attacking Australian seamen in the past will have to eat their words and admit that it is proper for Australia to have its own seamen engaged in exporting and importing. I am pleased to inform the honourable member for Balmain that the maritime unions have acted responsibly in this matter. The dispute which had affected New South Wales was settled and the bans that had been applying throughout Australia were lifted because of the initiative shown by the New South Wales Labor Government.

RAPE ATTACKS

Mr BARRACLOUGH: I direct my question to the Premier. Is he aware that recently there has been an increase in the number of rape attacks upon women? Has his attention been drawn to the fact that many of these attacks have taken place in the Darlinghurst police area and with such violence that some victims have been attacked with broken bottles, and that in some cases drug users have been involved? In the light of this information, will he advise the House why one of the major eastern suburbs hospitals is not used as a rape referral centre? Will he request the Commissioner of Police to provide additional officers to stop these vicious attacks upon women?

Mr WRAN: I do not know the period to which the honourable member refers by the use of the term recently, but the number of rape attacks can be assessed only by the number of reported rape attacks. Since the Government instituted referral centres in the major hospitals in the metropolitan area the number of attacks reported has increased by about 50 per cent. It is a matter of concern to the community generally that in the past many attacks have not been reported, and probably attacks are still occurring and are not being reported.

The honourable gentleman may be assured that the Government is most concerned about this aspect of criminal violence. Indeed, as a result of our concern and of the great deal of assistance that was given to the Government on the matter by the Women's Advisory Council and the Women's Co-ordination Unit, the Government has acted upon a report by establishing sexual offences referral units. For the information of the honourable gentleman, those units have been established at the Royal Prince Alfred, King George V Hospital, Royal North Shore Hospital, Wollongong Hospital, St George Hospital, Blacktown Hospital, Royal Newcastle Hospital, the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children—for some of the attacks, regrettably and inexplicably, are made upon people of tender years—and also—and this would be of relevance to the honourable gentleman's electorate and the eastern suburbs of Sydney—at the Prince of Wales Hospital.

I should not like the honourable gentleman or any other member to think that the Government has ceased its programme in relation to these referral centres. It was announced—I think in the last week or so—that it was intended to extend the concept of sexual offences referral units in hospitals to other regions of the State. If, as is implied in the honourable gentleman's question, there is some deficiency in the

availability of these services in the eastern and southern suburbs of Sydney, I am certain that the Minister for Health will not only look into the matter but also co-operate with me as the ministerial head of the police force to ensure that steps are taken as rapidly as practicable to make this worthwhile system of sexual offences referral units accessible to everyone in this State.

BEEF PRICES

Mr ROGAN: My question is directed to the Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Co-operative Societies. Has he received advice from the Cattlemen's Union that beef prices will rise as a result of recent heavy rains? If prices are to rise, what action can be taken to make sure that beef producers get a fair return without hardship to consumers?

Mr EINFELD: The honourable member for East Hills has shown a continuing interest in trying to keep prices down, and that redounds to his credit. Although he himself is a vegetarian he is anxiously trying to protect the interests of his constituents and other citizens of New South Wales. I have seen reports that Mr Barry Cassell of the Australian Cattlemen's Union has said that he has written to me and to other Ministers for Consumer Affairs throughout Australia to announce what he believes will be forthcoming increases in the price of beef. The expected price increase is reported to be as a result of the recent heavy rains. I have not yet received any communication from Mr Cassell. I can inform the House that prices last rose as a result of heavy rains in June and other seasonal problems. It appeared then that these increases were steeper at the retail level than was warranted by the well-deserved rise which producers properly shared. At that time the Cattlemen's Union joined with the New South Wales Government in expressing concern and I welcomed its support. We complained that consumers were suddenly being asked to pay more for beef than seemed reasonable.

As a result of this concern the Australian Government asked the Prices Justification Tribunal to conduct a special examination of margins and prices applying in the beef industry. On behalf of the New South Wales Government, I prepared submissions for the inquiry. I understand that all the submissions sent in to the Prices Justification Tribunal were put on public display in both the Sydney and Melbourne offices of that tribunal as from yesterday. Honourable members can be assured that, while we are awaiting the outcome of the tribunal's inquiry, my colleague the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries and I will keep a close eye on the situation to ensure fairness to producers and consumers.

If there has to be an increase in beef prices and producers are to receive more **because** of a scarcity of cattle caused by continued rain, I make a plea that middlemen and retailers not try to exploit and take advantage of the community, as a minority did last June. It is time that marketeers and entrepreneurs understand that consumers are not to be fleeced. I assure the community generally that the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries and I will use our every endeavour to see that increases in the price of beef are kept to a minimum and **that** producers share in the benefit. Middlemen and retailers should not take **the** opportunity to fleece and exploit the community.

BELLINGEN SHIRE ROADS

Mr BROWN: On 1st July did the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways meet a deputation from Bellingen shire council which sought funds for a number of roads and bridges in the shire? Did the Minister ask the deputation for further information about a financial proposal that it put to him? Was that information

sent to the Minister on 26th July? Further, was the Minister to let the shire council know within a couple of weeks whether he could assist it? As six weeks have elapsed will the Minister advise the present position?

Mr COX: What the honourable member for Raleigh said is substantially correct. I do not dispute that. The financial arrangements to which the honourable member referred are still under consideration. A number of legal aspects have to be closely examined. I assure the honourable member that I shall give the matter urgent attention and endeavour to give a reply to the council as quickly as possible. I am most pleased to see the honourable member for Raleigh taking such an interest in his electorate.

RADIAL TYRES

Mr MALLAM: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways. Is the Minister aware that a tyre company in the United States of America has had verdicts given against it running into many millions of dollars because the radial tyres that it manufactured were declared to be responsible for many serious accidents? Is it a fact that many of the States in America have banned the use of these types of radial tyres as a result of their bad safety record? Is it a fact that English scientists have stated that certain types of radial tyres used on British cars are potentially dangerous? In view of these reports from Britain and the United States of America, will the Minister ask the officers of his department to investigate the safety record of radial tyres used in New South Wales?

Mr COX: The honourable member for Campbelltown has raised an important question about the use of radial tyres. At this stage I do not have any information to give to the honourable member but I shall have my officers investigate the matters raised by him as quickly as possible.

RYDE HOSPITAL

Mr MUTTON: I direct my question to the Minister for Health. Has a new 80-bed ward at the North Ryde section of the Ryde hospital been unused since it was completed more than twelve months ago, thus denying urgently needed beds to families in the surrounding district of Ryde? Is union pressure responsible for the Government's failure to open the much-needed new ward on which the Health Commission of New South Wales has spent more than \$200,000?

Mr STEWART: I am not sure whether the honourable member for Yaralla is referring to a ward at North Ryde psychiatric hospital or at the Ryde hospital. I understand the honourable member is referring to the North Ryde hospital. That hospital is within the fifth schedule hospital system, and the Ryde hospital is **within** the second schedule hospital system. It is not a matter of union pressure but whether the Government should place the emphasis on acute care or on providing care for geriatrics and looking after old people. It is a matter that requires a decision that does not affect unions. The honourable member for Yaralla obviously has his facts confused, through inadvertence or otherwise. Two different unions operate in second schedule hospitals from those that operate in fifth schedule hospitals. Sometimes difficulties arise with the fusion of services in second schedule and fifth schedule hospitals. The honourable member might recollect that the Public Hospitals (Amendment) Bill that the former Minister introduced into this House prior to the last elections was reintroduced by me. I took out one clause from that amending bill.

Mr Mutton: Why is it unused?

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

Mr STEWART: That was the amalgamation of the second schedule hospitals and fifth schedule hospitals. There are great areas of difference between the working conditions—

Mr Mutton: Why is it still empty?

[Interruption]

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

Mr STEWART: —and the superannuation conditions of the people concerned. I want to say this, that the Government certainly is changing direction. It will not continue to place the same emphasis on the provision of acute care when such a dreadful hiatus exists in the area of care of the aged. The hospital at North Ryde to which the honourable member refers lends itself ideally to a facility for the care of the aged, which is what I and the Government are looking at at the moment. If the honourable member for Yaralla —

Mr Arblaster: When?

Mr STEWART: The honourable member for Mosman asks when. The answer is, when we can get approval from the federal Government. I have received a letter from the federal Minister for Health—

[Interruption]

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

Mr STEWART: —stating that the federal Government will not recognize any new unit that is opened up in New South Wales.

[Interruption]

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

Mr STEWART: If the Government opens up any new units or improves bed capacity in a public hospital, it has to close the same number of beds somewhere else in New South Wales. The federal Government has said that if the State Government opens up any new unit without its express approval it will regard that facility as being outside the 50-50 cost-sharing agreement and the whole of the burden will have to be borne by the New South Wales Government. The same threat has been used on every other State government. Already the Victorian Government has had some talks with the federal Government on the matter. Officer talks on behalf of this State will take place on 18th September. If the honourable member for Yaralla is concerned about hospital facilities in his electorate, he should use his threats, good offices or force on the federal Government to get it to permit the New South Wales Government to staff and open these wards.

In November of this year the opening of the new Westmead Hospital will bring on line 885 beds. At the moment the Government is under threat by the Commonwealth that if that number of beds are brought on line, 885 other beds throughout New South Wales will have to be taken out of use. I remind members of the Country Party that about a month ago the President of the Australian Hospitals Association made an announcement that it was possible to reduce the number of hospital beds in New South Wales. He selected country hospitals, saying that beds in country hospitals should be reduced.

Mr Punch: You made the same statement yourself.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr STEWART: It is the federal Liberal—Country party Government that is using that threat on the New South Wales Government. As for the honourable members of the Country Party, as Minister for Health holding a metropolitan seat, over the last two and a half years I have spent more time in the country than the Leader of the Country Party has.

[Interruption]

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

Mr STEWART: The country hospital system of New South Wales is under threat because of the policies of the Liberal—Country party Government in Canberra. If the honourable member for Yaralla really feels strongly about this matter he will join me and the New South Wales Government in endeavouring to counteract the effect of the policies of his colleagues in Canberra.

ROADWORKS FOR LIVERPOOL ELECTORATE

Mr PACIULLO: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways. Will the Minister advise honourable members of the amount that the Government has allocated for major roadworks and bridge-works to the Liverpool—Fairfield area in the 1978—79 capital works programme? When will work commence, in particular, on the continuation of the southwestern distributor over the Georges River? Will the Minister also advise the commencement date for construction of the Liverpool bridge underpass, which is needed urgently?

Mr COX: For a long time the honourable member for Liverpool has been making representations to me for improved roadworks in the Liverpool area. It is to his credit that he has done so on a number of occasions and has fought consistently for his electorate. I am pleased to advise that the Department of Main Roads will be allocating \$890,000 in 1978—79 for expenditure on roadworks and bridgeworks on main road No. 515, Elizabeth Drive, in the electorate of Liverpool. This road is an important link between the municipalities of Liverpool and Fairfield. The department will also be allocating \$30,000 for construction work on main road No. 534 known as Cabramatta Road, which serves the electorates of Liverpool and Fairfield. I am pleased to say also that funds will be allocated for the Bigge Street underpass, the total cost of which will be \$300,000. Work on that underpass will commence in November of this year. It is expected that during the current financial year over \$50,000 will be spent on that work.

An important point raised in the question concerns the southwestern freeway. In this financial year substantial expenditure will be incurred on design and necessary property acquisition for the southwestern freeway bridge. The aim is for a contract for the new bridge to be let in about eighteen months' time, and for work to start on a traffic relief route, including the new bridge over the Georges River at Casula, in 1979—80. The southwestern freeway, a \$30 million project, will involve a link with Fairford Road, Padstow. I am pleased that at long last, funds have been allocated to get these roadworks under way. I am sure that the honourable member for Liverpool and his constituents will greet this news with a great deal of satisfaction. There are considerable road problems in the Liverpool electorate and that is why the Government has made substantial allocations for these projects.

LIQUID GAS

Mr LEITCH: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy. Will the Minister assure me and the House that conditions under which the liquefied energy gases LPG, LNG, propane, and similar products, are transported in New South Wales are such that a disastrous explosion need not be feared?

Mr HILLS: As honourable members are aware, recently new regulations that were brought down in New South Wales under the Dangerous Goods Act affect the transportation of liquefied gas. A large number of people died in tragic explosions that occurred in Spain and Mexico following accidental rupturing of tanks on vehicles carrying liquefied gases. It was fortuitous that the New South Wales Government had prepared new regulations and they were gazetted just before those conflagrations occurred. The regulations are strict. In fact, most other States are using them as a guide for the introduction of controls in respect of the transportation of these dangerous goods. All vehicles are being inspected to ensure that they conform to the regulations. That applies also to the containing vessels that are carried on vehicles. All honourable members will appreciate that the general public has no need for concern if these commodities are transported safely.

I am in consultation with my colleague the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways over the speeds at which these vehicles travel. That is an important aspect in the transportation of these goods. As the honourable member is aware, recently an accident occurred at Willow Tree on the New England Highway in which a vehicle turned over but, because of the safe construction of the vehicle, no loss of gas occurred.

Mr Fisher: The accident caused a lot of worry.

Mr HILLS: A lot of worry is still caused by such accidents. I do not want to prejudice the driver by saying that even though the vehicles used for this purpose have been constructed in a safe way and the vessels are properly tested and capable of holding the gases held in them, nevertheless it is essential that drivers exercise extreme care in the transportation of these goods. That is why it is essential for there to be co-operation between my department and the Department of Labour and Industry, which administers the regulations, and also the departments administered by my colleague, the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways.

HOUSING FUNDS

Mr R. J. CLOUGH: I direct a question without notice to the Minister of Justice and Minister for Housing. Is it a fact that the New South Wales Housing Commission has had a substantial reduction in funds as a result of the Commonwealth Government's cutback of 25 per cent in real terms to New South Wales for public housing projects? If so, will the Minister tell me how the Housing Commission's programme for the current financial year will be affected, with particular reference to housing in the country areas of New South Wales?

Mr MULOCK: Unfortunately, the assertion in the first part of the question is correct. At the beginning of this financial year the Commonwealth Government announced what amounts to a 25 per cent cut in real terms in the allocation to the Housing Commission of New South Wales. In the four financial years from 1974–75 to 1977–78 in real terms funds for housing in New South Wales were increased by only 3.7 per cent. Meantime costs were escalating, increasing by 30 per cent to 40 per cent. When that steady decline in funds is compounded by a decision to cut

real funding by 25 per cent, the result will be disastrous for the 30 000 people on the waiting list of the Housing Commission of New South Wales. The list is getting longer, as is the waiting time for accommodation.

An ill wind has been blowing from Canberra over a four-year period. The wind is becoming ever stronger, to the detriment of many people. At the beginning of this financial year 3 608 homes were under construction. A forlorn hope was held that the Commonwealth would make a reasonable allocation for housing this year but, as a result of that Government's decision, houses now under construction will absorb most of the allocation. The Government of this State has supplemented the federal funding to the extent of \$10 million out of the limited loan funds available to the State. Last year this Government set aside a similar amount to help bridge the difference between the 3.7 per cent real increase in funding and the rate of inflation.

I **should** like to take this opportunity to nail, here and now, the stories that have been circulating from the Country Party rumour factory. One of the myths propagated by the Country Party claims that country areas are receiving less than their fair share of attention from the commission. The truth is that country areas are receiving most favourable treatment. Since 1973–74 the commission has completed 5 572 dwellings outside the Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong areas. This figure represents 33 per cent of all the commission's completions during that period. In other words, during that period—that is from 1973–74 up until the end of the last financial year—**one** in every three homes the commission built was in the country areas. During this financial year the commission will call tenders for another 1 500 dwellings of which 505 or 34 per cent will be in country areas. One has only to look at the performance of the previous Government in the field of public housing during its last three years in office and compare it with this Government's first two years plus its commitments for the current financial year. This Government has built or will build 32½ per cent of homes in country areas compared with the 313 per cent built by the former Government.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The level of conversation in the Chamber is far too high.

Mr MULOCK: I admit that the margin is small but it certainly gives the lie to any claims that we have been neglecting country areas. When the commission became aware of the cutback in Commonwealth funding this financial year and that it was necessary to prune its building programmes, that pruning took place evenly across the whole State. Notwithstanding that, the commission will still endeavour to continue its policy of building a minimum of two houses in as many country towns as possible where there is an established demand for accommodation.

The other rumour that the Country Party has been busily spreading relates to the **cost** of commission homes. In its anti-Housing Commission campaign the Country Party seems to be intent on smearing the efficiency of the commission by claiming outrageously high costs for the construction of commission homes. So intent is the Country Party upon damaging the good name of the **commission**—

Mr Healey: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, the question asked by the honourable member relates to the effects of Commonwealth policy upon housing in New South Wales. For the past three or four minutes the Minister has been counter-acting, so he says, a lot of so-called Country Party rumours. None of his remarks have had anything to do with the question asked of him. I submit that Ministers are

abusing the privilege of question time by taking long periods to deliver lengthy, prepared answers, thereby reducing the opportunity for members on this side of the House to ask questions.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr **MULOCK**: I was saying that the Country Party is determined to damage the good name of the commission.

Mr **PICKARD** (Hornsby) [11.251: I move:

That the honourable member for Penrith, Mr **Mulock**, be not further heard.

The House divided.

Ayes, 42

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Pickard
Mr Barraclough	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Punch
Mr Boyd	Mr Griffith	Mr Rofe
Mr Brewer	Mr Healey	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Brown	Mr Jackett	Mr Schipp
Mr Bruxner	Mr Leitch	Mr Singletsn
Mr Cameron	Mr Lewis	Mr Viney
Mr Caterson	Mr McDonald	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Mackie	Mr West
Mr Coleman	Mr Maddison	Mr Wotton
Mr Cowan	Mr Mason	
Mr Darby	Mr Murray	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Dowd	Mr Mutton	Mr Fischer
Mr Doyle	Mr Osborne	Mrs Meillon
Mr Duncan	Mr Park	

Noes, 47

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

Resolved in the negative.

Mr **MULOCK**: Before I was so rudely interrupted, I was saying that so intent is the Country Party upon damaging the good name of the commission that it has been sending circular press statements to its country members for them to issue to the local press in their electorates claiming, among other things, that the cost to the commission of building a home is \$42,425. The honourable member for Byron made

that ridiculous claim—or told that lie—in this House last week and it is time that that rumour was nailed. He claimed that the average cost of a commission home in 1976–77 was more than \$42,000. He arrived at this spurious figure by the downright dishonest process of dividing the number of homes built into the total of capital funds available to the commission.

Mr Jackett: On a point of order. Standing Order 78 specifically provides that when a Minister is answering a question he shall not debate the matter. I am aware, Mr Speaker, that you continually quote the late Sir Kevin Ellis as saying that the Speaker has no right to determine how a Minister answers a question. I submit with all due respect that that has nothing whatever to do with this case.

[Znerruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bunwood will come quickly to his point of order.

Mr Jackett: May I ask you to control the honourable member——

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Bunwood to order and warn him that he will find it very cold outside and that is where he will be if he continues to ignore the Chair.

[Interruption]

Mr Jackett: Mr Speaker, I will not be intimidated whiie I am taking a point of order. The Minister is debating the issue of the matter to which——

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Burwood is now debating the point of order. The honourable member has made his point and has invited my attention to the provisions of Standing Order 78. I rule that the Minister is not out of order.

Mr MULOCK: The honourable member for Byron claimed that in 1976–77 the average cost of a commission home was more than \$42,000. He arrived at this spurious figure by the downright dishonest process of dividing the number of homes built into the total of capital funds available to the commission. He conveniently overlooked other items of expenditure—many very substantial items—such as the cost of houses commenced during the previous financial year, expenditure on new homes commenced but not completed during the financial year, capital improvements to existing dwellings and the cost of land acquisitions and site works on land being prepared for use. Had the honourable member wanted to state accurately the cost of commission homes he had only to turn over a few pages of the annual report from which he obtained his figures to learn that in most cases the cost of cottages including land was more than \$12,000 less than the figure he had claimed. That is typical of the campaign of misrepresentation in which the Country Party has indulged throughout the State. It is a symptom of its desperation and the fear—a quite valid fear—that it will lose several seats when next they are dragged before the people.

With regard to the Blue Mountains electorate, dwelling completions during the period 1st July, 1974, to 30th June, 1976, at Lithgow were 20, Katoomba 6 aged units and Leura 3, making a total of 29. Completions for the period 1st July, 1976, to 30th June, 1978, were Lithgow 38 and Katoomba 2, a total of 40. Contracts current as at 30th June, 1978, were Lithgow 36 including 8 aged units, Katoomba 6 and Leura 6 aged units, making a total of 48 including 14 aged units. Planned commencement for 1978–79 are Lithgow 8 and Katoomba 2, a total of 10.

In the two years prior to this Government coming to office, 29 dwellings, including 6 aged units, were completed in the Blue Mountains electorate. In the two years of Labor administration 40 dwellings have been completed and 48, including 14 aged units, are in the course of construction. Further, 10 more contracts will be let this year.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [11.35]: I move:

That the House at its rising this day do adjourn until Tuesday, 26 September, 1978.

Mr COLEMAN (Fuller), Leader of the Opposition [11.36]: The Opposition opposes this motion. Many urgent matters should be brought before the Parliament. A vast list of bills, many of which are most important, has been referred to but they have not been introduced. Although far more important measures are awaited by the public, the House yesterday spent time debating the police tribunal legislation. The Governor in his Speech referred to the need to tighten bail procedures. Time and time again federal authorities have said that when drug pushers and drug importers are arrested invariably they are given bail and immediately jump bail. This occurs at the rate of approximately one a week. Despite this desperate need for legislation to overcome this problem the Government has not brought amending legislation forward. That legislation is so urgent that it should be introduced into the Parliament today. Yesterday a great deal of time was taken up debating a bill which provides for complaints against the police to be dealt with in a certain way, yet legislation to restrict and restrain drug offenders has not even been introduced.

That is an example of the priorities of this Government. It brings forward a police tribunal measure instead of a bill that will strengthen the hand of law enforcement authorities in dealing with drug pushers, many of whom might be described as mass murderers. Many matters have been referred to by the Governor in his Speech or announced by the Government as urgent and important. The Opposition does not want the House to adjourn. The Opposition parties are willing to continue to sit and deal with these matters. The Opposition would like some of them dealt with straight-away.

What has happened to the bill to regulate psychosurgery? What about the chiropractors legislation? This morning the Minister for Health somewhat laughingly announced an intention to bring in legislation to license psychologists. What does the Government intend to do about the restructuring of nurses' education? What about its announced intention to restrict the sale of compound analgesics? All of those matters are important and the Opposition is willing to debate them. The number of matters referred to in His Excellency's Speech and mentioned by the Government from time to time is virtually endless. What does the Government propose to do about extending the legislation relating to compensation to victims of crime? The Opposition is ready to debate that now.

The Opposition wants the Government to bring forward a measure relating to victimless crime, a matter with which the Attorney-General is so closely associated, so that it may be fully discussed. The Opposition expects the Government to introduce a measure relating to harsh and unconscionable contracts. What about the proposed fishing industry bill? The Government has said much about amending the builders licensing legislation. It refers continually to amending the Child Welfare Act. So far

this year the Legislative Assembly has sat for only twenty-eight days. That shows complete contempt for the public. The Attorney-General, as Leader of the House, now seeks an adjournment though the House has sat for only twenty-eight days of the 250 days so far this year. The Opposition wants the Parliament to continue to sit and to discuss matters in the public interest. The Parliament is now in only the fourth week of this new session yet the Attorney-General, apparently exhausted, seeks a lengthy adjournment.

That speaks for itself as showing the contempt this Government has for Parliament, but let me remind honourable members that also on the business paper is notice of a motion standing in my name, to which the members of the Opposition attach particular importance. I intend to move that leave be granted to bring in a bill for an Act to authorize provision to be made for there to be allowed a rebate of a portion of the Commonwealth income tax levied on the residents of New South Wales. That, I submit, is an important motion representing a new stage in federalism. It would represent the first time since 1942 that the State Government could have some say in the income tax levied on the residents of New South Wales.

More important, the motion I intend to move will involve legislation to allow the State Government to give an income tax rebate. Naturally, the Government does not want to have such a bill debated because the Government is locked into the big lie that this new stage of federalism represents double taxation. The Government has talked about double taxation, apparently with some success in deceiving the people—so much so that it foresees the loss of that opportunity if my motion is debated. So brazen are the Premier and his Ministers that they will continue to say that this new stage of federalism represents double taxation. My motion, when debated, will make it harder for them to avoid the fact that they are determined not to have legislation that will give people of New South Wales an income tax rebate.

We are yet to have the Budget debate. The Government has introduced the Budget, and we have not had an opportunity of debating it. It is an extremely bad budget. It is a budget that was presented to the public as one giving tax concessions, but the tax concessions amount to only 0.3 per cent of \$3,500 million. It is pathetic. It fails miserably to deal with the real problems facing New South Wales, and we want to discuss them. There are grave problems facing New South Wales. Formerly we had a situation—and under the Liberal–Country party Government it was strengthened—in which New South Wales was the number one State in the Commonwealth. We had more investment than any other State. In two years of Labor government New South Wales has fallen to be number four State in the Commonwealth in attracting investment. We are still behind Western Australia, Victoria and Queensland. Under the Labor Government we are becoming the backward State of Australia.

That is one of the big problems facing us. The other is that people, and particularly young people, are leaving the State. The Government's own economy report shows that people are leaving New South Wales at a greater rate than at any time since the Victorian goldrush days of the last century, when gold was found in Victoria and the rate at which people left New South Wales to look for it decimated our population. I am quoting the Government's own report. According to the advice given to the Government, people are leaving New South Wales at the rate of 18 000 a year. So investment is down, people are leaving the State, and jobs are down. There are 38 000 fewer jobs in New South Wales in the private sector since this Government came into office. So in that way we have a bad situation. The State has slipped to be number four in the Commonwealth instead of, proudly, being the leading State, which it was under the former Government.

People are leaving. Investors are not coming to New South Wales. The number of available jobs is falling, and falling certainly at a high rate in the private sector. Why should people want to stay here when jobs are not available? Why should people want to invest in a State in which the Labor Government has imposed the highest taxes and charges of any State in Australia? These are the problems facing the Government. The Government introduced its Budget the other night, but now it does not want the House to debate it. That Budget does absolutely nothing to solve the serious problems to which I have referred. It gives tax concessions that are laughable. As I said, they amount to only 0.3 per cent of a \$3,500 million budget. So you can say that there are no serious concessions in the Budget as a whole at the very time when concessions must be made, at the very time when the opportunity is available to this Government to make tax concessions in order to stimulate the economy. Instead, the Government is destroying the economy. Clearly, under the Wran Labor Government in New South Wales we are going through the sort of period that Australia as a whole went through under the Whitlam Government. The Wran Labor Government and the Whitlam Government differ in minor details only, and the Wran Government is destroying the State of New South Wales in the same way as the Whitlam Government was destroying the country.

That is the problem we are facing. This Parliament has sat for twenty-eight days this year—an exhausting twenty-eight days. The honourable member for Hurstville can hardly stand on his feet because he is so exhausted after a sitting of twenty-eight days in the 250 days of this year so far. That is why the members of the Opposition want to discuss the problems that the Wran Government is inflicting on the State and what can be done about them. Yet the Government wants another holiday. It wants to adjourn. After the Budget we are not debating New South Wales will remain the State with the highest taxes in Australia and with more public spending of Whitlam-like proportions, but with an increase in unemployment. There are already 131 000 unemployed persons in New South Wales—a rate of increase which, even with the best construction the Government can put on it, is colossal compared with the previous year.

All that the Government has been able to do when faced with 131 000 unemployed has been to create 1 600 new jobs in the public sector. What is needed is 131 000 new jobs. The Treasurer can create jobs for only 1.2 per cent of the total number of unemployed. If there continues to be a loss of jobs in the private sector at the present rate, there will be an additional 18 000 unemployed. This Government has no plan to solve unemployment in New South Wales. The Budget, which we shall not be debating, will allow the current intolerable level of jobs to remain as it is for the foreseeable future; and it will allow New South Wales to remain a State with falling investment, with a falling population, and with increasing unemployment. Even worse than that, we have a Government that fiddles with the books. It has fiddled with the long service leave provision in order to keep the public transport deficit to the budgeted figure of \$400 million. It has shortchanged long service leave and general reserve funds to the tune of \$8 million. It has chosen to cheat employees of their long service leave entitlements rather than face up to a Public Transport Commission deficit overrun of \$8 million. That is a shameful tactic and we want to discuss it now instead of adjourning after sitting for only twenty-eight days.

The Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways has been compelled to defend his one-thousand-dollar-a-minute loss. He has already lost several thousand dollars since the motion for the adjournment came before the House. He has been compelled to defend it so often that he has chosen to adopt a shoddy and deceitful economic practice by failing to find reserves *to* meet budgeted leave obligations.

Mr Coleman]

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. I submit that it is out of order for the Leader of the Opposition to deliver his Budget speech on this occasion. He should be confined to giving reasons why Parliament should not adjourn for two weeks. Instead he is delivering a general speech on the economy.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition must confine himself to the motion before the House. It is permissible for the honourable gentleman to make passing reference to matters he feels the House should consider in support of his contention that the House should not adjourn. However, the honourable member may not deliver a long address on any particular subject.

Mr COLEMAN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. One thing that is important is that in this pathetic Budget, which does nothing to stimulate the State—and this is relevant to the motion—the Government gives a raw deal to pensioners. That is particularly annoying. The increase in the allocation to assist councils in financing concessions given to pensioners on rates is so slight that, allowing for inflation, it represents a decrease of more than 2½ per cent. So, the Budget, as well as being economically shocking, does nothing even in terms of simple welfare matters like pensioner concessions on local-government rates.

The Government cannot handle the economy of the State, but at the same time it reduces the concession to pensioners. It is not only incompetent but heartless. Some items in the Budget that are of great public importance were given prominence in the newspapers yesterday. Therefore, when the Budget is prominent in the minds of the public it is appropriate for the Opposition to object to the Government's proposal to adjourn the House. However, having in mind the ruling of the Speaker, I shall limit my remarks to general policy. The Treasurer in his Budget Speech made reference to the abolition of death duties. I doubt that this is a genuine commitment because, when the federal Government moved to abolish death duties, the shadow federal Treasurer sought the withdrawal of the bill until an alternative form of tax on capital was introduced. That subject should be discussed as a matter of urgency. The Government has given a small indication that in due course it will move to abolish death duties but we want to know whether it will follow the pattern set by its federal counterparts, and will introduce another tax as a substitute. The Labor Party is officially committed to the abolition of death duties but does not want them abolished. Senator Wheeldon, when outlining the Labor Party policy, has been reported as saying:

It is the view of the Australian Labor Party—I would have thought that this is a view held not only by socialists but by a number of people who believe in the equality of opportunity and in a more egalitarian society—that there should not be an unrestricted flow of capital from one member of a family to another member of a family.

We have every reason to be sceptical of the Government's announcement. The Labor member of the House of Representatives for Bonython, Dr Blewett, said:

We do not have very effective measures in this society for redistributing wealth. Let us not give away one of the few that we have. They make at least some contribution to redistribution in this society. When the Labor Party returns to Government in 1980 we will ensure that wealth.

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition, who has not prepared for this traditional debate, is quoting from federal Hansard and attempting to discuss federal debates. The question is whether this House should adjourn for two weeks. I submit the Leader of the Opposition is not entitled to pad his speech with this sort of material.

Mr SPEAKER: The point is well taken. It is not in order for the Leader of the Opposition to advance an argument that would be relevant to a full debate on the various matters mentioned in the Budget, such as the abolition of death duties. He could make passing reference to a number of matters raised in the Treasurer's Budget Speech, but he is now attempting to pick out individual matters and is proceeding to debate them in detail. I do not intend to allow him to continue in this way. Even he said that he intended to speak on items dealt with in the Treasurer's Budget Speech. The question is whether this House should or should not adjourn, and the Leader of the Opposition should confine himself to that question.

Mr COLEMAN: We oppose this motion. We want the House to continue its sitting so that it can debate matters raised in the Budget, such as taxation, the heartlessness shown towards pensioners, lack of serious concessions to business, increases in taxation such as stamp duties, the deterrents to investment and all the objectionable features of this Budget. I shall observe your ruling, Mr Speaker, and say no more on that matter. However, I emphasize that I raised these matters to illustrate that the House should be debating matters of policy, the softness of the Government in the area of crime, and drugs. It is not surprising that the Attorney-General—Potplant Walker as he is well known throughout the State—should move the adjournment motion. There are many bills that we want to debate. It is ridiculous after twenty-five, twenty-eight or thirty days—at the very most a month—out of almost nine months the Government should seek to adjourn the House. The Government is obviously scared to debate a number of matters attracting public attention. It is most anxious to dissolve the Parliament and the select committee on crime control, which is causing it so much concern. It hopes that by closing down the Parliament at this stage the debates that are now raging will not continue. Of course, while they rage they embarrass the Government.

Having listened to the hysterical remarks of the Premier, one could appreciate how embarrassed he was by recent press reports. Nevertheless, the House will adjourn because the Government has the numbers to carry the adjournment motion. It is common knowledge that in the course of that adjournment Parliament will be dissolved and there will be an election. No doubt the Government is anxious to dissolve Parliament quickly because of the embarrassment it is now suffering in respect to matters the Opposition wants to debate and which, if debated, would harm the Government's chances in the election.

As the House will almost certainly be dissolved, there are a number of members from the Opposition side who will not be in the next Parliament. It would be a great pity not to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the honourable member for Wollondilly, a former Premier of this State, who will not be in the next Parliament. His services to the State, the Parliament and the public over many years is well known. He was one of the most innovative Premiers, and the Parliament will be so much the poorer without his presence. There are some others who will not be contesting their seats at the forthcoming election. Taking them in order of seniority, I pay particular tribute to the honourable member for Manly, one of the most famous and celebrated members of this Parliament—a man of great originality of mind, who fathered much legislation in this House. He has served the public and the community faithfully over a lifetime and this House will be so much the poorer without his presence. It will also be so much the poorer without the honourable member for Albury, who will not be contesting the next election. He contributed significantly to a range of matters. Naturally, he has represented rural interests in this Parliament, as well as his own electorate. He has made deep and momentous contributions to a great range of debates in this Chamber.

We shall certainly miss the honourable member for Vaucluse whose fiery contributions to debates and irrepressible enthusiasm for parliamentary life have impressed everyone in the Parliament as well as the public at large. He has served the people, the State and the public interest with real distinction. We shall miss him. The honourable member for Cronulla will not be contesting the next election. He is one of the most respected members of this Parliament, respected by all parties on both sides. He has served well not only Cronulla but also the State. We shall miss him in the next Parliament. I know that when I say that I speak for both sides of the Chamber. The honourable member for Willoughby is another person widely respected in the community and by every member of this Chamber. He has served Willoughby and the State with enthusiasm and distinction. He has made deep and lasting friendships in this Chamber that will continue and will deepen after the next elections.

I have mentioned those members who will not be contesting seats at the next elections. I pay a deep and sincere tribute to every one of them for their friendship and for their contribution to this Parliament and to the community. I do that on this occasion because we all assume that during the adjournment, which the Government will carry by its numbers, the Parliament will be dissolved. Having said that and paid those tributes to those members, I come back to the fundamental fact that this is an irresponsible motion. There is no need for the adjournment. So many bills were listed in the Governor's Speech, so many announcements of measures have been made, so many scandals for which the Government is responsible are affecting the Government and the community at large, that we should be here discussing these matters. There are matters on the notice paper already that we should be here discussing. For the House to adjourn simply to suit the Government's convenience, when it has sat for fewer than thirty days this year, is indefensible. Let the Government proceed with the steps necessary for the dissolution of Parliament whenever it wants to, but let it sit next week and let the Government make its decision, if it wants to, in the course of that week or the following week. But there is no justification for the dissolution of this House when the scandals that I have mentioned, for which the Government has some responsibility, are affecting the Government and the community and there will be no opportunity to debate them.

It is clear that the Government is not seeking an ordinary adjournment in the ordinary course of routine. How could it, when the House has sat for only twenty-eight or twenty-nine days, whatever it is, this year. The Government is seeking to close down the Parliament in order to close down debate, to close down the select committee, to close down discussion and, in due course, to proceed to an election. It wants to close down the Parliament as quickly as possible to avoid the embarrassment that it is now experiencing. However, it is an embarrassment that it will continue to experience, even in the recess, which the Government will carry by its numbers. I assure honourable members opposite that in the coming election campaign, which we take for granted as the real reason for this motion, the scandals that the Government is trying to hush up will dog them to defeat at that election.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [12.5]: I join the Leader of the Opposition in protesting as strongly as possible against the motion, for the dogs are barking that we are on the eve of an election, despite the hypocritical statement of the Premier that I read to the House the other day, when he was strengthened by a poll which said that 62 per cent—I think it was—of people in this State believed that governments should run their full term, should not have early elections and should fulfil the responsibilities that the people have given them. When the Prime Minister talked about an early election, the Premier quoted that information, offering all sorts of calumny against the Prime Minister and castigating him for not running his full term. The dogs are barking that the motion is simply a forerunner of the announcement of a State election.

We know that certain bookings of halls have been made. It is common knowledge. It is in the newspaper this morning. Everybody knows about it. No mention is made, however, of the fact that this Government was elected for three years and that term will not expire until 1st May next year. No mention is made of the vast sum that an election will cost the people of this State. No mention is made of the down-grading of the Government as a result of this action.

I wish to be associated with the Leader of the Opposition in paying tribute to those honourable members of the Liberal Party who have served the Opposition well and will not be contesting the next elections and so will not be members of this House when next we assemble. The honourable member for Wollondilly, a former Premier and undoubtedly the most outstanding Minister for Lands that this State ever had, introduced innovations and legislation on all sorts of matters that won great appreciation, particularly from rural people in this State. Among his great memorials will be the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned other members—the honourable member for Manly, the honourable member for Cronulla, the honourable member for Albury, the honourable member for Willoughby and the honourable member for Vacluse. All of them have won great affection from members of the Liberal Party and I am sure from members on both sides of the House. We wish them the best of health and all the very best in the years of their retirement. We shall miss them greatly in this House.

There is no doubt that the main reason why this motion has been moved today is to try to clear the Government from facing up to the responsibility for mounting crime in this State. As the Select Committee of the Legislative Council upon Crime Control has proved to be an acute embarrassment to the Government, undoubtedly this action has been taken to silence that select committee more than for any other reason. That is nothing new from this Government. At the end of the last session of this Parliament the same sort of action was taken. An excellent select committee, which was looking at caravan parks and the tremendous problems of low-cost housing in this State and the problems of families trying to get a cheap holiday, was wiped out arbitrarily because one or two other select committees that were on the list were causing tremendous embarrassment to the Government. It will do the same again for it sees the embarrassment that is ahead.

I well remember the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways standing in this House and saying that he would give us a fullscale debate on transport. But every time we have raised the matter and every time we have said that we will cooperate fully so that the business paper can be cleared and we can have this fullscale debate, the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways has failed to give it to us. Meanwhile the public transport deficit mounts, commuters are complaining all the time of the deterioration in services and strikes are the order of the day.

The honourable member for Gosford should not laugh. A great number of people in his electorate are loud in their complaints about trains not being on time. They have deteriorated in every way. Also the honourable member for Peats will hear from his electors, who are sick to the teeth of what is happening to the public transport system. Where is the great debate on transport which the House was promised? It has been wiped aside because the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways will not give the House the opportunity to talk about the subject. We rarely have an opportunity to direct a question to him. Every time the Opposition attempts to raise the matter of public transport the forms of the House and the Government's numbers are used to stop the Opposition debating it. It is something about which the Government does not wish to talk.

Mr Mason]

The notice paper lists many bills that of great importance to the people of New South Wales. I instance the Motor Dealers (Amendment) Bill. The Opposition is anxious to talk about this bill as it knows what the people in the motor trade and industry are thinking. The Opposition wishes to see that legislation introduced. The Minister for Health gave notice of a bill relating to chiropractors about which there has been much talk. No piece of legislation has been as long in the pipeline as that bill. Unfortunately the Minister for Lands has left the Chamber when I was about to remind him of the Lord Howe Island Bill, which was one of the first bills that the Government gave notice of in this House. It is most important as people's lives are affected by proposed changes. One hears repeatedly about the bill. The Opposition has had some looks at it. It knows that there is deep division in caucus about it. Opposition members know that the Premier when basking in the sunshine of Lord Howe Island has told the people there, "I will not let them bring on the bill. It **will** never see the light of day." It is a travesty for a Minister to introduce a bill and not be permitted to proceed with it. The Opposition is ready to debate these matters.

We lodge the strongest protest against the way the proceedings of this House have been carried out in the past few weeks. Opposition members say to you, Mr Speaker, that they are most dissatisfied with the lack of opportunity that they have had to speak. We believe that free speech itself has been at stake in this House. The Government has altered the programme. We object to the way it is bringing on business of the House and arranging question time. The whole matter is disgraceful. Today, Mr Speaker, you were placed in an impossible position—and I feel **sorry** for you—when you were given instructions to give the call at question time to a certain member who was not even in the Chamber.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for **Dubbo** is reflecting on the Chair. I ask him to withdraw that reflection and to apologize to the Chair.

Mr MASON: I do so, Mr Speaker, at your request. It is an incredible situation when a member is called and is not even in the Chamber. That sort of thing tells Opposition members a lot about question time. I voice a serious protest on behalf of Opposition members at what we believe to be an intrusion on our rights and privileges in representing in this House our electors. We are Her Majesty's Opposition; we have rights and privileges. Your great responsibility, **Mr** Speaker, is to protect and safeguard those privileges.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Dubbo is straying far from the question before the Chair when he discusses the Speaker and the **matter** of calling members to ask questions. I ask the honourable member to come back to the question before the Chair.

Mr MASON: I wish to voice the Opposition's protest against what it considers to be the cavalier fashion in which the Government has been handling the business in the House, and the lack of opportunity it **has** given my colleagues and me to consider legislation, to prepare ourselves and to consider the effect of legislation. The Opposition has been given no time and no proper information. The Parliament and the way **in** which it has been handled have become a farce. For these reasons the Opposition opposes the motion as strenuously as it can. Opposition members are willing **to** sit on and deal with matters that are important to the people of New South Wales.

Mr COWAN (Oxley) [12.15]: There is an important Budget before the **House**. There is speculation throughout the State about a State election. If the House is to adjourn for a fortnight the Leader of the House or the Premier must make a clear statement to the confused **people** of New South Wales about whether there will be a State election and whether the House is to deal with the Budget that is now before it. The Premier and the Government must have some responsibility in this matter. The

Opposition calls on the Premier to honour his responsibility and put an end to the rumours and speculation that have appeared for months in the press, particularly at a time when the State's Budget is before the House. Even if one is to forget about the important issues that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and about the legislation before the House, we are all entitled to know what is to happen with the Budget. **The** Premier should make clear what is to happen with the Budget, which has never been debated or passed by either House of the Parliament, if there is to be a State election. Will another budget be brought in? Does the Government intend to deceive the people of **New** South Wales? If it does not, the Government should deny it and inform the House of the procedure.

This morning the question of death duties was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The Government should not confuse the people. The Opposition and the majority of the people of New South Wales know where the Government stands so far as death duties are concerned. There is no doubt that they have their doubts about the integrity of the Premier and his Government. That is why I say the Government should show some responsibility and not confuse the people of New South Wales.

Before I conclude my remarks, I wish to pay a tribute to those honourable members on both sides of the House who will be retiring. Although I am not aware that any Government supporter is voluntarily retiring, some members of the Liberal Party are. To the honourable member for **Wollondilly** I say, thank you for your service. I congratulate the honourable member on his former Premiership and on his service to the State as a former Minister for Lands which, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated earlier, was an outstanding contribution indeed. I thank also the honourable member for **Manly** who, over the years, made proposals that were of importance to the State. He suggested that Parliament House should be **moved** to Bathurst. Upon reflection, I am convinced that was one of the most sensible suggestions ever made in New **South** Wales.

I should like to single out for special mention the honourable member for **Albury**, who was a member of the parliamentary select committee on the fishing industry. He made a wonderful contribution to the work of the committee. He was an outstanding representative of the people. That leads me to mention the outstanding work done by all members who served on that committee, particularly Government supporters. Although there has been no direct mention within the House, I have **read** in newspapers about certain innuendoes contained in a document circulating in New South Wales relating to a Government supporter for whom I have the greatest respect. If the member concerned is the honourable member for **Waratah**, I ask that **the** Government recall him, as he is out of New South Wales at the moment, so that **he** can have the opportunity to deny the charge made against him. I have worked with **the** honourable member and I respect him. He is worthy of having something said about the matter. I feel sorry for him.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for **Oxley** is drifting **far** away from the question before the Chair. If he does not come back to the question I shall have no alternative but to direct him to resume his seat.

Mr COWAN: My purpose in rising was to ask the Premier to clear up **the** confusion about the Budget and the future programme of the House.

Mr BARRACLOUGH (**Bligh**) [12.21]: I join the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for **Oxley** in opposing the motion. I oppose it on the ground that there is no need to hold **an** election at present and to put the taxpayers of New South Wales to the expense of millions of **dollars**—

Mr O'Connell: On a point of order. The motion before the Chair is that this House adjourn for approximately two weeks. It contains no mention of an election. The honourable member is speaking as though this House were debating a Christmas felicitations motion. He is not speaking to the motion before the Chair but is embarking upon a discussion of matters that are not before the House at all.

Mr SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order taken by the honourable member for Peats. The question is, that this House adjourn until 26th September. The only points that honourable members can argue are why the House should not adjourn. Honourable members who want to stay here can give reasons.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: The honourable member for Peats should have waited until I finished what I was about to say. We all know that this House is getting up to have an election. If that is so, why does the Premier not come out and say so? The honourable member for Hurstville is not in the House at present, but why was he loading up his car the other night with nine boxes of envelopes and writing paper? I am told that he never writes a letter. This House rose on 16th March and resumed on 4th April for a few hours. It had not sat since, until it resumed on 15th August. The Government has kept us out of this Chamber. It is a disgrace. In fact, it is a bloody disgrace. It is a damned disgrace that this House is not allowed to sit. I am very angry indeed. At present New South Wales is governed by one man—a constituent of mine who attacks honourable members on this side of the House because of where they live. I do not attack people for where they live but if Government supporters want to do so, on 2nd December, 1972—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Bligh does not come back to the question before the Chair I shall have to direct him to resume his seat.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: Thank you for your advice, Mr Speaker. I shall come back to the motion. During this year this Chamber has scarcely met, although important legislation is waiting to be dealt with. I happen to be a member of a football club and a few weeks ago it received a letter from the Department of Sport and Recreation about the sports injuries compensation fund and how to apply for benefits under the insurance scheme. The relevant bill has not even been passed by this Chamber. That is quite misleading; some people would say it is a dishonest tactic to send out applications to sporting clubs, which costs the taxpayer a lot of money, when legislation has not been before the House—

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. The honourable member is trying to debate something that is not before the House. The issue is whether this House should adjourn for two weeks. Although it would give me a great deal of pleasure to refute the honourable member's argument, this is not the debate during which to do so.

Mr Barraclough: On the point of order. I was about to say that that is the very reason why this House should sit tomorrow and all next week and following weeks—to allow this legislation to come before it and be passed.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bligh is aware of the ruling that I gave earlier. An honourable member may make passing references to matters that he feels should be debated and state reasons why the House should not adjourn. I ask him to come back to the motion before the Chair.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: I shall, but I want to say that the people of New South Wales are being subjected to government by one man and one man only. Many people are **worried**.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the House's attention to the tedious repetition of the honourable member for Bligh, and I ask him to resume his seat.

Mr Barraclough: Mr Speaker, may I have your indulgence? I want to make a remark about the retiring members.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The ruling is quite clear.

Mr HEALEY (Davidson) [12.25]: It is important that the people of this State should recognize at this **time**—

Mr KEANE (Woronora) [12.25]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 48

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

Noes, 44

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

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Question—that the motion be agreed to—proposed.

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General (12.32), in reply: It was typical of the total leadership of the Liberal Party and Country Party that the Leader of the Liberal Party was not prepared for the debate today and had to have his minions scurrying around to get him some material. It is sad, but that was the situation. It was almost as sad as today when the Opposition sought to gag question time. As far as I know, that has never happened before.

Mr N. D. Walker: Tell us how many votes you got in the popularity survey of Ministers.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Does the honourable member for Miranda really want to know? I was the second most popular Minister. The first argument put forward by the Leader of the Opposition was that the House should not adjourn for two weeks because the House had sat for only twenty-eight days this year. If one looks at the last year in office of the former Government one finds how long the House had been sitting by 9th September, 1975. It had sat for twenty-seven days, one day less than this year. Yet the Opposition has the hide to put that argument. Obviously, that aspect was unresearched because if members of the Opposition knew the facts they would not have put forward that argument. A furphy about pensioners was raised. It was suggested that in its Budget the State Government was heartless towards pensioners. That was a furphy because all honourable members know that the provision relates to local government and not to State government. That was typical of the sort of thing that, in his desperation, the Leader of the Opposition was willing to put forward.

He raised also the issue of death duties and stated categorically that the Labor Party was opposed to their abolition. The fact of the matter is that there is a plank in the platform of the Labor Party at State level which provides for the abolition of death duties. Already death duties on estates passing from spouse to spouse have been abolished. Substantially increased exemptions have been introduced for rural properties. It was outrageous of the Leader of the Opposition to dare to put such an argument. He talked about the State Government being soft on crime and drugs. Only last year the Opposition moved an amendment to reduce the penalty for the manufacture of heroin to a \$2,000 fine. Honourable members opposite voted for that though the Government was trying to increase the penalty to hard labour for twenty-five years.

The Opposition has the hide to talk about the Government being soft on drugs. The Government doubled the drug squad and gave a vehicle to the drug squad in Wollongong so that squad members did not have to travel by public transport as had been the case formerly. The Government set up the Drug and Alcohol Authority, which has been substantially concerned with the drug problem. The former coalition Government left things in a disgraceful condition. That is why, if one examines the survey published in the press, it is quite clear that the public is convinced that the Government is doing a far better job on this issue than the Liberal Party and Country Party coalition did when it held office.

On the question of crime I point out that only yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked a magnificent question. He wanted to know why a three-months delay was occurring in the courts of petty sessions. The answer is simple: it is because the Government has got tough on crooks, the people who were protected before. When they were in office the people who occupy the Opposition benches now turned a blind eye to crime and did nothing about it. Offenders are now being brought to book and are facing the courts. A substantial increase has occurred in the number of people who are being charged in the courts of petty sessions, particularly those charged with white collar crimes. That is causing delays but they are small.

The Leader of the Opposition has a hide to say that the Government is soft on crime. Honourable members know who is soft on crime. The not-so-honourable member for Oxley was willing to drop a bucket on a colleague on the basis of an unsubstantiated secret poison-pen document that was doubtless prepared by the same sort of people in the office of the Leader of the Opposition who prepared other documents. The honourable member for Oxley dropped the bucket on his colleague while that colleague was absent. I have never heard of a more despicable thing in the Parliament.

Finally, some premature valedictories were made. Irrespective of whether such an event as is being predicted, or asked for, by the Opposition should come about, I should like to say that all honourable members know that the honourable member for Wollondilly is leaving this place in any event. He has given notice of that and doubtless he will resign either today or soon afterwards. On behalf of the Government I wish him well in his future life. I have some happy memories of the contributions he made to backbench members of the Parliament. His name will long be remembered as the Premier who gave members electoral offices and many other improved conditions. Honourable members on this side of the House wish him well. I had hoped that the Leader of the Opposition might have been less perfunctory in his praise of a former Premier who made a contribution to the State.

The honourable member for Manly is the father of the House. He has provided me with a great deal of amusement since I have been in the Parliament and I am sure that his contributions have always been of immense interest to other honourable members. The honourable member for **Albury**, the honourable member for **Vaucluse**, the honourable member for **Cronulla** and the honourable member for **Willoughby** also have our best wishes. I am personally sorry to see the honourable member for **Willoughby** go. He has been a good friend to me. Another honourable member will leave the House if the event foreshadowed occurs. The honourable member for **Cessnock** is a long-serving member of the House and, despite his recent illness, he has always tried to make a valuable contribution. I extend valedictory remarks also to the honourable member for **Fuller**, the honourable member for **Yaralla**, the honourable member for **Nepean**, the honourable member for **Wakehurst**, the honourable member for **Burwood**, the honourable member for **Batburst**, the honourable member for **Goulburn**, the honourable member for **Armidale**, the honourable member for **Burrendong**, the honourable member for **Young**, the honourable member for **Byron**, the honourable member for **Orange**, the honourable member for **Murray**, the honourable member for **Upper Hunter** and the honourable member for **Wagga Wagga**. The House has sat for four weeks straight and I think honourable members deserve a well-earned rest for two weeks.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 48

Mr Akister	Mr Crabtree	Mr Hills
Mr Bannon	Mr Day	Mr Hunter
Mr Barnier	Mr Degen	Mr Jackson
Mr Bedford	Mr Durick	Mr Jensen
Mr Booth	Mr Einfeld	Mr Johnson
Mr Brereton	Mr Face	Mr Johnstone
Mr Cahill	Mr Ferguson	Mr Keane
Mr Cleary	Mr Flaherty	Mr Kearns
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Gordon	Mr McGowan
Mr Cox	Mr Haigh	Mr Maher

Mr Mallam	Mr Renshaw	Mr Wilde
Mr Mulock	Mr Rogan	Mr Wran
Mr O'Connell	Mr Ryan	
Mr Paciullo	Mr Sheahan	
Mr Petersen	Mr Stewart	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Quinn	Mr Wade	Mr Gabb
Mr Ramsay	Mr F. J. Walker	Mr Whelan

Noes, 44

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

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

Mr COLEMAN: I seek the indulgence of the House to repair a regrettable omission. In paying tribute to the various members who will not be contesting the next elections I omitted to mention my good friend the respected member for Cessnock. We will always remember George Neilly favourably. He is a former member of the Legislative Council and one of the most respected members of this House.

[Mr Speaker left the chair at 12.45 p.m. The House resumed at 2.15 p.m.]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! General business, notice of motion No. 1 standing in the name of the honourable member for Gordon.

Mr Mason: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I invite your attention to Standing Order 103 relating to the order of business as it appears on the proof business paper available to members. It would appear that some unfortunate printing error has occurred. In fact, the notice of motion standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition should be notice of motion No. 1. I cannot explain how this has occurred but it is my belief that there has been some unfortunate printing error and that the business before the House should be that business contained in notice of motion No. 2.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am informed by the Clerk that following long-established practice, the notice of motion of the Leader of the Opposition should appear ahead of the notice of motion submitted by the honourable member for Gordon. Therefore, I must uphold the point of order and call upon the Leader of the Opposition.

REBATES TO TAXPAYERS (PERSONAL INCOME TAX) BILL

Introduction

Mr COLEMAN (Fuller), Leader of the Opposition [2.19]: I move:

That leave be granted to bring in a bill for an Act to authorize provision to be made for there to be allowed a rebate of a portion of the Commonwealth income tax levied on the residents of New South Wales.

Mr Maher: It is a bit late.

Mr Mason: Are you not in favour of this?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr COLEMAN: Since I have only ten minutes in which to speak I shall have to speak fast. The object of the bill is to permit a rebate of income tax to New South Wales taxpayers. It is made possible by the Commonwealth Income Tax (Arrangements with the States) Act, 1978, which permits any State to allow a rebate under State law of the Commonwealth income tax levied on residents of the State. The fact is that because New South Wales is already the highest taxed State in Australia the income tax relief offered in the bill is needed more in New South Wales than in any other State. On a *per capita* basis people in this State pay 25 per cent higher State taxes than Western Australians, 22 per cent higher than South Australians, 33 per cent higher than Tasmanians and a massive 41 per cent higher than people in Queensland.

The Opposition believes this trend must be arrested and reversed. This can be done by the bill, which allows an income tax rebate to New South Wales taxpayers. The bill will reduce the total tax collections in New South Wales to the acceptable levels that preceded this Government's term of office.

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. I am amazed that this measure is being debated. We are all aware that there cannot be debate on a money bill unless there is first received a message from the Governor. From statements made by the Leader of the Opposition we are all aware of the nature of his bill. It is aimed at providing a mechanism for the State either to increase income taxation or to decrease income taxation. As I understand the Constitution and the standing orders, before an honourable member may obtain leave to introduce into the House a measure such as this one, a message must first be received from the Governor.

Mr Maddison: On the point of order. Mr Speaker, I invite your attention to the fact that the motion seeks leave to introduce a bill entitled Rebates to Taxpayers (Personal Income Tax) Bill. The comments by the Attorney-General might well be relevant if the bill were one that imposed a tax; in those circumstances it would require a message from the Governor before leave may be granted. However, there is no suggestion either in the title of the bill or in the motion itself that that is the situation. There is no suggestion whatever that the bill is to enable the State to impose a surcharge on income tax.

Mr F. J. Walker: On the point of order. It is perfectly clear to all honourable members that there is only one way that this State may introduce a bill to deal with income tax. New South Wales is subject to the uniform tax legislation and the Commonwealth Constitution. The only way by which such a measure may be introduced is with the Commonwealth's consent. The Commonwealth Government has facilitated that possibility by passing legislation through the Commonwealth Parliament to allow us to put a bill before this Parliament. The only way such a measure can be put before this Parliament is by drawing up a bill along the lines and in the terms allowed by the Commonwealth Government in its enabling legislation.

The Commonwealth legislation is a matter of public record. I am sure all honourable members have read it and know its terms. It provides for the State to get an increased share in taxation or to provide for a rebate. When introducing a bill the Leader of the Opposition is constrained to produce one in the same form. If I were to put a bill before this House in the form that the Commonwealth Government has allowed, it would potentially increase taxation. This is a bill to raise taxation and the **only** way it can be brought on is by first receiving a message from the Governor.

Mr Coleman: On the point of order. To put it briefly, the bill provides an administrative procedure; it does not appropriate money.

Mr Cahill: On the point of order. I refer you, Mr Speaker, to Standing Order 247 which reads:

The House will not proceed upon any Bill for granting any money, or for releasing or compounding any sum of money owing to the Crown, until the proposition shall have been first recommended by Message from the Crown.

At the present time money is owing to the Crown, and I submit that this bill is designed to release money owing to the Crown. Therefore, the Leader of the Opposition **should** be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: The difficulty facing the Chair is that so far I have heard only a short address by the Leader of the Opposition. The points raised by the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai fairly well sum up the position, that the proposed bill is to reduce taxation, not to put an impost on the State or to change the position of appropriating money for the State. The point taken by the Attorney-General is clearly that it is not permissible for any honourable member to introduce such a bill, because of section 46 of the Constitution Act, which states:

It shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to originate or pass any vote, resolution, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund, or of any other tax or impost to any purpose which has not been first recommended by a message of the Governor to the said Assembly during the Session in which such vote, resolution, or Bill shall be passed.

This is supported by Standing Order 247 which provides:

The House will not proceed upon any Bill for granting any money, or for releasing or compounding any sum of money owing to the Crown, until the proposition shall have been first recommended by Message from the Crown.

The Leader of the Opposition proposes to introduce a bill to reduce taxation and at this stage he is in order. Financial bills which reduce taxation do not require a message.

Mr COLEMAN: When the present Treasurer, as Premier, lost government in 1965, the people of New South Wales paid \$52 a head in State taxes—higher than in any other State. During the eleven years of Liberal—Country party government *per capita* State taxes rose at a slower rate in New South Wales than in all other States except Queensland. The States with the highest rates of increase in *per capita* State taxation during that period were South Australia and Tasmania—both Labor States. In the past two years New South Wales has again shot to the lead as the highest-taxed State in Australia.

The present bill will call to a halt that **Labor** trend and will guarantee to reduce the tax load carried by the people of New South Wales. The bill will also halt **this** Government's policy of rapid public sector growth at the expense of the private sector. It will return as much taxpayers' money as possible to those who first earned it. Under this Government numbers on the public payroll have increased by 6 per cent in a Whitlam-style trend towards big government. This has been at an additional direct cost of \$250 million to taxpayers of this State. This is all the more striking when we recall the Premier's promise of June 19, 1976, to cut the public service by between 5 per cent and 8 per cent in twelve months. That promise has been completely dishonoured.

It is time that the trend toward bigger government was reversed in order to give relief to taxpayers and to provide breathing space for the private sector. This bill will achieve both objectives. It will roll back the taxation burden and make way for a reallocation of resources from the public sector—that is, from government—to the more productive sector which has been forced to contract as the government payroll has grown.

Mr Whelan: On a point of order. I am loth to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition, but after listening to his further remarks it is apparent to me that he fails to make the distinction between a reduction and an increase in taxation. I submit that pursuant to Standing Order 247 the word grant can encompass the meaning of any reduction and any increase in tax benefits to the State. I submit the Leader of the Opposition should be ruled out of order.

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

Mr F. J. WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General [2.29]: The first thing to note about the bill is its title. The title is falsified. It is not a bill to reduce taxation, as the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai tried to argue: it is a bill to provide a mechanism for the State to impose an income tax surcharge. It is designed to create a position of double taxation in New South Wales.

Mr Mason: You are reflecting on the Chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Coleman: On a point of order. The bill is entitled Rebate to Taxpayers (Personal Income Tax) Bill, and it is an authorizing measure to enable rebates to taxpayers. Following upon your recent ruling, Mr Speaker, the Attorney-General has risen and said it is a double taxation bill. He is flouting your ruling and I submit he should be brought to order.

Mr SPEAKER: I cannot see that. That is the Attorney-General's interpretation of the bill, and he is entitled to argue his points in this debate.

Mr F. J. WALKER: In April 1976 the Premier promised in his policy speech that under no circumstances would we impose double taxation on the people of New **South** Wales. That promise resulted in a victory for the **Wran** Government. Time and time again the Premier has given a solemn undertaking to the people that in no way **will** the Government create a situation where they shall pay double tax. The Leader of the Opposition seeks to bring before Parliament a bill that will increase by **many** percent the rate of taxation on people in New South Wales. If the bill's provisions are implemented an average worker in New South Wales could pay \$10 to \$15 a week more in taxation.

Mr Pickard: On a point of order. The motion before the House refers to a rebate of taxation. All the House has heard so far is tedious repetition by the **Attorney-General** which is misleading the House and the people of New South Wales. The

Attorney-General has not yet come to the matter before the House, which is a motion seeking the introduction of a bill to enable a rebate of taxation. It does not refer to double taxation. I submit, Mr Speaker, that you should ask the Attorney-General to stop misleading the House and the State of New South Wales and to come to the motion before the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! When seeking leave to introduce the bill, the Leader of the Opposition spoke on a number of matters. The Attorney-General is presenting counter arguments on the matters that have been introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. I shall listen intently to what the Attorney-General says.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Apparently the Opposition needs a **lesson** in constitutional law, although I regret having to waste the time of the House in giving it. As a result of the uniform taxation case in the 1940's the prerogative of imposing income tax has resided with the Commonwealth Government. In recent times Mr Fraser introduced a new **concept** into our economic society called Fraser federalism.

Mr Pickard: On a point of order. I submit that the Attorney-General, in a thinly disguised fashion, is ignoring your ruling, Mr Speaker, on the constitutionality of the motion before the House. In a thinly disguised way the Attorney-General is flouting your ruling. I submit that he should be called to order.

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

Mr F. J. WALKER: The honourable member for **Hornsby** took a frivolous and vexatious point of order. In introducing his new federalism, Mr Fraser has produced in the federal Parliament a mechanism whereby the States can do one of two things: they can increase taxation by a surcharge, or decrease the share of income tax that comes to the States. The only legal and constitutional way that a bill **can** be brought before the House is in the **form** prescribed by Mr Fraser. I explained this to the Opposition but they could not see the point.

Mr Coleman: On a point of order. The Attorney-General may, if he is sufficiently foolish or ill-informed, take that **point** when leave is granted to bring in the **bill**. He is attacking the form of a bill when he is completely ignorant of its contents. I ask that he be called to order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has taken the point of order that the **bill** is not yet before the **House**. It is pertinent to consider the bill and decide whether it should be ruled out of order **on** the grounds mentioned by the Attorney-General.

Mr F. J. WALKER: If it is not in the form prescribed by the Australian Constitution—

Mr Coleman: It is.

Mr F. J. WALKER: Obviously, the point of order I took earlier was correct. The Leader of the Opposition concedes that the bill he seeks to introduce is in the form prescribed by law that passed through the Commonwealth Parliament. That **bill** provides for an income tax surcharge or a double taxation. The Leader of the Opposition admitted that he is about to produce in this Parliament a bill that would **allow** him, if he became Premier, to put through the Parliament a bill that would **double** or perhaps treble income tax in New South Wales. In other words, by its own admissions, the Opposition has revealed that it is about to double taxation. I shall have a great deal of pleasure to go out on the hustings, particularly into the electorate of **Fuller**, and tell the people about this **Coleman** double taxation. This is just the sort of issue on which one would like to fight an election, if there is to be one.

Mr PUNCH (Gloucester), Leader of the Country Party [2.38]: I am amazed that the Attorney-General should rant and rave about a most constructive proposal put before the House. For many years members of all parties in all State Parliaments—

Mr FLAHERTY (Granville), Government Whip [2.39]: I move:

That the question be now put.

[Interruption]

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

Mr J. A. Clough: On a point of order. The Leader of the Country Party was well advanced in his speech before the Government Whip moved that the question be put. The Leader of the Country Party had been given the call and was on his feet. I submit that the Government Whip is out of order in moving at that stage that the question be put. There is an alternative of which you, Mr Speaker, would be aware.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry that the honourable member for Eastwood, who has been a member of this House for a long time, is not aware of the standing orders relating to the motion that the question be now put. It can be put at any time.

Mr J. A. Clough: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr J. A. Clough: Mr Speaker said—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

[In Division]

Mr Mason: This is the greatest disgrace of all time. Free speech has gone out the window.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn honourable members that the rules governing order in the House apply also during divisions.

The House divided.

Ayes, 48

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

Noes, 43

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Osborne
Mr Barraclough	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Park
Mr Boyd	Mr Hatton	Mr Pickard
Mr Brewer	Mr Healey	Mr Punch
Mr Brown	Mr Jackett	Mr Rofe
Mr Bruxner	Mr Leitch	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Cameron	Mr Lewis	Mr Schipp
Mr Caterson	Mr McDonald	Mr Viney
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr McGinty	Mr N. D. Walker
Mr Coleman	Mr Mackie	Mr West
Mr Cowan	Mr Maddison	Mr Wotton
Mr Dowd	Mr Mason	
Mr Doyle	Mrs Meillon	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Murray	Mr Moore
Mr Fischer	Mr Mutton	Mr Singleton

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That leave be granted—proposed.

Mr **COLEMAN** (Fuller), Leader of the Opposition [2.45], in reply: The Government has shown contempt for the Parliament time and time again during the current session. Question time has been destroyed and honourable members have seen the suspension of standing orders in order to torpedo legislation through the House. There has been the parody of a budget debate without the Auditor-General's Report. The House has sat for twenty-nine or thirty days out of a possible 250 days this year, and now the Government is opposing leave to introduce a bill. I can understand the Government, having granted leave, opposing the bill, but the Government is using the standing orders to oppose leave to introduce and is gagging the debate. It is doing that because it is a Government of high taxation. The federal Treasurer summed it up well when he said that the policy of Labor is that the public has to be educated to welcome high taxation, and the idea of reduced taxation is anathema to a Labor Government. The Attorney-General has demonstrated the real policy of the Government. This is a bill to reduce taxation or to enable the reduction of taxation. That is anathema to a party which has lived on the lie, as the Attorney-General well illustrated, of double taxation.

If there is any double taxation it is that which has been imposed by the Government through massive increases in charges, particularly those administered by the Attorney-General. The essential feature of the federalism policy that the Opposition espouses is the reduction of income tax. For the first time since 1942 it is possible for the State to pass legislation to allow income tax reductions in New South Wales. The Liberal Party and Country Party coalition stands for that and is committed to it. When it regains office that is what it will do. But the concept of a reduced income tax fills the socialist mind with horror. Socialists want more and more taxation to finance more and more bureaucracy and government workers. By any standard, what is needed in New South Wales at the moment is a tax concession of some significance. In the light of the pathetic Budget produced by the Treasurer, which gave total concessions of 0.3 per cent out of a \$3,500 million budget, a serious attempt must be made to give tax concessions. That is abhorrent to a government of high taxation. It is abhorrent to socialist governments anywhere.

This enabling bill is essential to the economic recovery of New South Wales because it will offer further incentive to work and it will encourage individual effort. It will raise disposable incomes, and spending power will be increased. Demand for goods and services will rise. That will be done without adding to inflation. It will

permit consumers to spend more and thereby will stimulate production and generate employment. The New South Wales economy is in such a **parlous** state that the bill must be given a chance to assist recovery. The rate of unemployment has increased by 30 per cent since the Government came to office. A Government economy study group predicted that the unemployed will double by 1981. It said also that people are leaving the **State**—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is introducing new arguments. He should be using his time for reply by answering the argument raised by other members in the debate. I ask him to come back to a proper form of reply.

Mr COLEMAN: Without canvassing your ruling, Mr Speaker, I am attempting to meet the argument that was advanced, however feebly, by the Attorney-General. I am drawing attention to the need for this measure in the context of the economy, with people, especially young people, leaving the State at a great rate, like they did last century when they joined the goldrush to **Victoria**—

Mr F. J. Walker: On a point of order. In my contribution I raised one simple matter—the question of double taxation. The bill will enable a government to impose a tax surcharge. I submit that the Leader of the Opposition is confined to **replying** to that.

Mr COLEMAN: I **am** replying to that. This is an income tax rebate bill and it will have certain effects on the economy in New South Wales. In the present circumstances, 38 000 jobs have been lost from the private sector during the Government's term of office. Housing commencements are **running** at the lowest point since **World War II**. Home unit commencements have fallen **32** per cent in two years. Work done on **commercial** buildings has fallen 17 per cent in the corresponding period.

Mr Einfeld: On a point of order. The House is being subjected to the monotonous repetition of a speech made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition which has nothing to do with replying to the argument put by the Attorney-General. Why should honourable members waste the time of the honourable member for Gordon, who has a vital private member's motion to move? The Leader of the Opposition should confine himself to the debate or shut up. He should not be telling ridiculous untruths and uttering wild exaggerations that have no relevance to the subject under discussion.

Mr Mason: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, the Attorney-General took a point of order and the Leader of the Opposition was speaking to that point of order when you allowed a Minister to **interrupt** him and speak to another point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General took a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition rose and said he was getting to the points raised by the **Attorney-General**. Therefore, I did not rule on the point of order because I assumed that the Leader of the Opposition was continuing with his reply. I shall now deal with the point of order taken by the Minister for Consumer Affairs and Minister for Co-operative Societies. When replying to the debate, the Leader of the Opposition cannot introduce new matter, **as** he is attempting to do. I am aware that he is reading from his prepared address which he did not complete when moving for leave to introduce. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to come back to **his** reply, and to conform with the rules.

Mr COLEMAN: I **am** referring to notes I have made. The principle enshrined in the bill is to reduce income tax. It is aimed at reducing income tax. It is not double taxation, as the Attorney-General pretends to pretend. I say pretends to pretend because the Attorney-General does not believe his own pretences. The principle of reduced taxation, which is enshrined in the bill, **will** restore a balance between public and private sectors, increase take-home pay, increase **spending**, increase private capital investment,

increase production and increase the number of jobs available. This bill is aimed at reducing taxation. That would be an indispensable aid to the recovery of the economy in New South Wales. The bill is a rebate measure and nothing else. It has nothing to do with increases in taxation. In the bill there is no possibility of an income tax increase. It is an income tax rebate bill from beginning to end. The economy needs significant taxation concessions. It was the Premier himself who in this House in October 1974 said:

We believe . . . that too much revenue is raised and that in any event a much higher deficit could be carried and relief given from some of the taxes.

That is what this bill does. Under the Labor Government taxes and charges have gone up. This bill is designed to reduce taxation. I have quoted what the Premier said as Leader of the Opposition four years ago when State taxes were 56 per cent less than they are now. In December 1975, during the Wagga Wagga by-election campaign, the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, again promised cuts in taxation. He has done nothing to honour his promises. Here is a chance for this Government to honour promises it has made about reducing taxation. In the election campaign of 1976 the Premier promised to keep taxes down. In fact they have gone up in real terms, to use the Premier's own phrase. In the past week or so we have seen the Premier even incite a crowd to riot over the high level of income tax. Despite this, he remains all words and no action. The Government has done nothing to reduce income tax. The Government's record is one of high taxation and increased charges to fund rapid public sector growth. The Premier said of this bill, even before he saw it, that it was an insult to anyone's intelligence. After analysing what the Premier has said over the past four years about tax relief one need hardly wonder just who is insulting whose intelligence. The Premier has endeavoured to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds. He professes to stand for lower taxes though New South Wales maintains the highest taxes in Australia. Should the Government oppose leave to introduce **this** measure, it will be just another form of its **rank hypocrisy**.

Motion agreed to.

Bill presented and read a **first time**.

ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH

Mr **MOORE** (Gordon) [2.55]: I move:

That this House calls on the Government to present legislation to control the use of animals for experimental research in New South Wales based, in general terms, on the Animals For Research Act, 1968-69, of the Canadian Province of Ontario and **calls** on the Minister for Services and the Minister for Health to implement immediately, as an interim measure, the formation of an adequate statistical base and reporting system on animals used for experimentation in New South Wales including animals used in the **LD-50** test.

I bring forward this motion as an expression of the concern I hold and have raised in this House over a considerable period with regard to the use of live animals for research, particularly that of a non-medical nature. It is quite possible that the **number** of animals destroyed in this State is relatively small and perhaps even insignificant. However, no statistical information is kept with regard to the number of animals used in any form of experimentation, including both the **LD-50** test and the **LC-50** test. If such information were available it would enable a rational public

examination both of the use and wastage of lives of animals and suffering caused to them. Further, it would allow rational examination of whether such experimentation is necessary.

Richard Ryder in a book dealing with animal experimentation instances many cases in the United States of America of people **killing** large numbers of rats, white rabbits and other animals merely to prove that those animals felt pain. Mr Ryder refers to rats being made to run across a red-hot wire grid on the floor of their cage so that the conclusion may be drawn by the intelligent, gifted Ph.D. student who received his doctorate on this experiment, that rats do feel pain and do not like to run across red-hot grids. I believe that there is more wastage of animals and pain suffered in killing of animals than has been disclosed by the Minister for Health in answers to questions that I asked in this House earlier this year and previously.

One thing that distresses me greatly is the use of animals in research projects that might not be regarded as legitimate medical research projects and the wanton killing of animals for the production of women's cosmetics. I see no reason why there should not be a law in this State prohibiting the use of, killing and causing pain to animals merely to produce a more efficient mascara for women to use as eyeliner. I oppose vigorously the killing of animals in order that hair colourings such as Grecian 56, or whatever other brand of hair dye is used by the Premier, might be manufactured. There is no justification for killing animals to produce cosmetics whether for use by males or females. The Animals Research Act of 1968–69 of the Canadian province of Ontario provides, among other things, for standards to be observed with regard to housing animals involved in experimentation. It provides in section 20 that every animal used in registered research and experimentation likely to result in pain should be anaesthetized to prevent that animal from suffering. There is no such provision in any law in New South Wales.

There is a need to outlaw or regulate certain forms of experimentation, particularly those related to cosmetics. There is also a need to control and regulate experimentation for which there is a legitimate and valid medical requirement. The proposition put before the House is twofold. First, experimentation should be outlawed when it causes unnecessary pain to animals and there is no valid medical reason for the experiments. This falls into two classes—not merely the production of cosmetics but also the repeated conduct of experiments in some academic institutions. as Richard Ryder evidenced in the United States, whereby animals are killed to prove such nonsensical things as that rabbits do not like getting their ears cut off, or rats feel pain, and similar trivial matters.

Particular consideration should be given to experimentation when the life given to an animal is destroyed, and generally in the process pain is caused to it. In most of the experiments evidenced the principal objective is to cause pain and measure that pain in order to draw some conclusion of a repetitious or trivial nature. In this State there is no standard laid down for the **Billing** of animals in genuine, legitimate medical research, where the basis of the research is an operative treatment of the animal. There is no standard of post-operative care required following such experimentation. Indeed, there is no mandatory provision to ensure that animals used in experimentation should be destroyed humanely, should the pain and suffering caused to such an animal make it likely that its continued life would be one of further pain and suffering.

The Governor's Speech contained an indication that the Government intends to legislate in this disappearing session of Parliament—and I condemn the Minister for not having had the good grace to give notice of a bill in this respect—to deal not with animal research paralleling the Ontario Animals for Research Act, 1968–69, but with other areas of animal welfare where, admittedly, there is a need for major

Mr Moore]

legislation. The problems in regard to the Ontario Act, which require it to be altered before legislation of a similar nature can be introduced in this State, are principally in the area of non-provision of an oversighting board to justify animal experimentation. There is a need to set up a board to supervise animal experimentation. It should have representatives from animal welfare organizations who would represent the interests of animals used. It should have an independent chairman presiding over representatives of the Australian Veterinary Association, the Australian Medical Association and other responsible academic bodies. The board's role should be to require justification of proposed schemes of animal experimentation.

The proposal put forward is that the onus of proof should be on the person or organization seeking to conduct the experimentation to prove a need for experimentation. That would include proof that the experiment could not be conducted by other means, such as photochemical spectography and similar measures. Where major scientific breakthroughs are anticipated in the future and a number of experiments—particularly in the cosmetic field—can be conducted without the use of animals, the board should require that the organization seeking permission to experiment prove that the research is not a duplication of oversea experimentation.

In answer to a question on notice the Minister for Health has acknowledged that the federal Government, which requires evidence of studies having been carried out before therapeutic substances can be released on the Australian market, will accept the results of oversea experiments. The Minister informed me that the Health Commission had made no arrangements to obtain information concerning a symposium being conducted in London by the Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments this year. That organization has an active and socially responsible group in this State. In conjunction with the Royal Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Animal Welfare League of New South Wales, the World League for the Protection of Animals, the Australian Veterinary Association and Animal Liberation, it is making submissions to the Government. They have evidence that there are satisfactory alternative tests to the LC-50 and LD-50 tests and a variety of forms of experimentation conducted on animals. This House has a responsibility to adopt the principle contained in this motion, to ensure that no animals are killed in this State or subjected to deliberate and wanton cruelty if there is an alternative or if information and the results of experiments are already available overseas and Australian experiments would merely duplicate that information.

I am aware that an argument was advanced that some sections of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1901, as amended, might cause some of the powers that might be sought in a codification in an animal research Act to be largely a duplication of the existing statute. That is an argument that does not warrant a great deal of attention. It is desirable that the law dealing with the use of animals in experiments be codified and brought under one simple, easily read and understood Act. The Ontario Animals for Research Act was some considerable time in drafting and proclamation. It provides a suitable basis for a similar Act in this State. I have reservations about the style and drafting of the Canadian Act, which arose from the concern of citizens in that province over the useless intentional killing of animals, as detailed by Richard Ryder in his book.

I speak on behalf of the Opposition in this matter. It is the wish of the Opposition to let the Government know that there is a need here for an Act covering the care of and provision for animals for research. We are not submitting that the Ontario Act is the be-all and end-all of things. The Opposition is saying that in the absence from the Governor's Speech of any notification of the introduction of legislation and the total silence on the matter by the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier, a bill should be drafted and then allowed to lie on the table for a period

of three or six months to enable discussion to take place and enable concerned organizations, including universities, who could be regarded as the users of animals for experiments, to comment on the proposals and to reach a consensus. I am sure that those who use animals for experiments do not do so for sadistic motives or from any desire to kill merely for the sake of killing. Obviously, there is a genuine desire by experimenters to do something that they consider worth while. However, there is need for an independent tribunal, such as a board under an animals research Act, to require a justification for experiments.

I am aware that the Minister has had extensive discussions with animal welfare organization in New South Wales, but there has been no announcement or statement by him. The Opposition's motive in raising the matter is to try to goad the Minister, who in the past has shown in a number of matters that he is not all that anxious, except through the stimulus of public pressure, to raise an issue. Certainly I have no wish to apply to the Minister the sort of electronic or other pain-producing stimuli that are needed to goad animals involved in experiments into performing the often meaningless, painful and repetitive tasks inflicted upon them by people seeking to waste their lives. I commend the motion to the House and hope the Minister will respond in a positive fashion.

Mr HAIGH (Maroubra), Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier [3.14]: The Government is most interested in the use of animals for research. It is concerned to ensure that the inhumane methods used in the United States of America in sadistic experimentation, as referred to by the honourable member for Gordon, should not be used in New South Wales. The honourable member for Gordon has not matured. He said that the only reason the matter was brought before the House was to goad the Minister into making some statement. He said that he was well aware that the Government had had lengthy and detailed discussions with animal welfare organizations. It might well be that he learned the word goad in his more youthful days. He probably obtained a lot of pleasure from goading poor defenceless animals during his childhood.

Mr Moore: On a point of order. I find the Minister's remarks personally offensive and I ask that he be directed to withdraw the allegations that I experimented on animals in my youth. The Minister is making an unwarranted supposition and I find the remarks offensive. He suggested that some time in the past I obtained pleasure or other forms of gratification from carrying out experiments or sadistic or other malicious acts on animals.

Mr Mallam: That would be right.

Mr Moore: I have never done so. Unlike the honourable member for Campbelltown, I did not pluck the wings off flies when I was a child. I find the Minister's remarks offensive and I ask that he be directed to withdraw them.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before an honourable member can be asked to withdraw remarks they have to be shown to be reasonably capable of giving offence. The honourable member quite clearly intimated that he feels it is quite in order for him to make remarks about another honourable member, yet at the same time he asks that similar remarks referring to himself be withdrawn. In the circumstances I shall not ask the Minister to withdraw.

Mr HAIGH: There have been detailed discussions with animal welfare groups on this subject. As well as examining the **Animals** for Research Act of the Province of Ontario, Canada, one must consider also other aspects related to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act of this State. Unlike the previous coalition Government, this Government has taken the initiative of **asking** animal welfare organizations to meet

with it and discuss matters of concern to them and, I am sure, to all citizens interested in animal welfare. The initial discussions took place over twelve months ago. The whole subject must be carefully considered in detail to ensure that any proposed amendments to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act or any new measure similar to the Ontario legislation is fully assessed and analysed. Further, people who over the years have been involved in the protection and welfare of animals should be included in discussions and encouraged to make submissions.

On 23rd June last I met a number of representative groups, including one from the Australian Veterinary Association. That meeting, which was a culmination of earlier meetings, was fruitful and purposeful. The members of the deputation who saw me in my office on that occasion were Mr McCaskill from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Mr Plant of the Australian Veterinary Association, Mr J. Parkes from the World League for the Protection of Animals and Mrs Morris of the Animal Welfare League. They were representative of those in the community who are concerned about the welfare of animals. They put to me their views about a separate animals for research Act in this State. On that occasion I had available submissions that were the result of their diligent work over a period of twelve months. The submissions included certain proposed amendments to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. The deputation furnished me also with a copy of the Ontario Act.

At the meeting all agreed that the material presented to me, including the Ontario legislation, should be studied in depth so that a proposition could be made that would be acceptable to all. By this means any proposed legislation would reflect the opinion of all those concerned with animal welfare. The material presented to me showed agreement among the organizations represented at the deputation on the need for separate legislation. The Canadian Animals for Research Act was considered a suitable model on which to base a new Act in New South Wales.

The suggestion has been made that the legislation should not just be blandly accepted so my officers and I are examining the Ontario legislation in detail. Broadly speaking, it establishes controls over the sources of supply of animals for use in experiments, research establishments, the manner in which the animals are to be treated and the method of transportation. Subsequent to my meeting with representatives of animal welfare organizations and the Australian Veterinary Association, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals submitted to me an initial draft of an animals for research Act substantially similar to the Ontario Act. My officers are considering it in conjunction with the submissions made to detail matters most suited to circumstances in New South Wales. The society indicated that the Australian Veterinary Association, in consultation with animal welfare organizations, is willing to proceed with the formulation of a more detailed draft and then seek the views of other interested parties, such as universities and other tertiary institutions, primary and secondary schools, commercial organizations, research groups including the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and State government departments.

Apart from my administration, proposals for new legislation relating to animals in research would affect the administration of my colleague the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries and the Minister for Health. I have sought their views on the proposals. An immense amount of work has been done on the subject by members of the animal welfare organizations and the Australian Veterinary Association and I am most grateful to them for the offer to prepare more detailed proposals and to seek the views of other interested parties before submitting them to the Government.

The honourable member for Gordon indicated that there was no control over the infliction of unnecessary pain on animals used in experimentation in New South Wales. The regulations under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1901, which refer to surgical operations on animals, provide that a surgical operation may be performed on an animal only when the animal has been rendered insensible to pain by anaesthetic. Where permanent injury or discomfort results or is likely to result to an animal from any operation, the animal is required to be destroyed after completion of the operation in a manner that will inflict as little suffering as possible upon it.

The honourable member said that he appreciated that people generally accept the fact that animals are being used for experiments, but he was concerned that unnecessary pain should not be inflicted on them. That was the intention of the legislation introduced as far back as 1901. When operations on animals are conducted for physiological or pathological investigations, or in the nature of feeding experiments, and the operation is likely to cause the animal pain that can be relieved by means of an anaesthetic, the person performing the operation is required to use an anaesthetic. As to other operations on animals, provision exists in present legislation for the method of inoculation. So the legislation is there.

I have a soft nature in two ways. The first is my love of children and the second is my love of animals. Invariably when one sees a group of children happily enjoying themselves at play one will see a dog tagging alongside. Only this morning on my way to my office I noticed some children crossing Gardeners Road at the stop lights. There were two boys on small bikes and another two children. A black Labrador was guarding the children as they moved across the road. Wherever there is warmth and an understanding of the finer aspects of life these sentiments and feelings show through, and the same feeling is shown towards animals.

The honourable member for Gordon drew attention to the fact that certain standards should be laid down for experiments undertaken on animals. I draw his attention to an important national group that is representative of all citizens in the Commonwealth. It is known as the National Health and Medical Research Council. That council has brought down a code of practice from which I read:

The Council's policy regarding animal experimentation, and the production, provision and care of experimental animals is set out in detail in the publication 'Code of Practice for the Use of Animals in Research in Australia, 1978'. Applicants for NH & MRC Research Grants must accept the following 'Guiding Principles', and are referred to the above publication for further details.

The principles set down are that experiments using animals should be conducted only when the aims of research cannot be achieved by methods or techniques other than animal experimentation. The wide of practice continues:

- (1) All animals used for experiments must be lawfully acquired, and their retention and use must be in strict compliance with Federal and State laws and regulations.
- (2) Experiments using animals should be designed to keep the numbers of animals to a minimum.
- (3) At all times animals used in experiments must be housed in appropriate conditions, and fed, watered, cleaned, handled and transported in a fashion least likely to cause stress or discomfort, and in accordance with accepted international standards.
- (4) All experiments on animals, surgical and non-surgical, must be carried out in as humane a manner as possible. Procedures likely to cause pain of more than trivial extent must not be carried out

Mr Haigh]

- without the administration of an anaesthetic, adequate and appropriate for that species of animal, until the procedure is terminated.
- (5) Neuromuscular blocking agents must not be used in the absence of appropriate anaesthesia, and the experimental procedures must be shown not to occasion distress or pain.
 - (6) In experiments not involving surgical interference or painful procedures requiring anaesthesia, every care should be taken to minimize the degree of discomfort or stress to which animals are subjected.
 - (7) Experiments, conducted under anaesthesia, which involve serious disturbance of, or interference with, structure or function must be terminated while the animal remains anaesthetised. Any animal which is the subject of a recovery experiment must be killed painlessly if undue pain and suffering cannot be relieved quickly and adequately.

Institutions undertaking research which involves the use of animals should have an Animal Experimentation Ethics Review Committee on which at least one of the members is a person not connected with the institution. All applicants for NH & MRC research grants involving animal experimentation should submit their applications to this ethics committee for review and approval.

Experiments on animals are carried out in New South Wales at the University of Sydney for the purposes for which the guidelines are prepared and laid down by the National Health and Medical Research Council. Experiments are supervised by qualified persons who ensure that the principles set down in the codification are applied. The codification and legislation designed to protect animals ensure they are treated in a humane and purposeful way to obviate suffering either during the course of experimentation or in their general keeping. It is obvious that to draft the type of legislation for which the Government is searching there must first be detailed consultation.

Various animal welfare organizations have been working for more than twelve months compiling recommendations. They are still adding to their recommendations to rectify inadequacies they see in the legislation relating to cruelty to animals that has been on the statute books for some years. Arising from these discussions there has been a deep appreciation of the situation. Proposals have been put forward for the introduction of an Animals for Research Act. I welcome the discussions and the submissions that have been made. The situation now is a far cry from the attitude adopted by the Opposition when it was in Government.

I will not be goaded or hurried into bringing into this House sloppy and inadequate legislation. Before any further action is taken there will be proper consultation with the people. Consideration of their submissions will be thorough. I assure the House that when legislation is brought to the Parliament it will be effective. I have intimated to animal welfare organizations that I propose to bring before the House legislation covering a wide spectrum of animal welfare. That measure will ensure humane and proper attention in the care and welfare of animals. The legislation will be brought forward only after it has been prepared in draft form, and further consultations held with those who represent organizations with expertise in this subject.

With regard to LD-50 testing, I have consulted with my colleague the Minister for Health and his officers about this type of test. It is used to determine the concentration of substances in animals. This type of experimentation necessitates killing 50 per cent of test animals. It is used to determine the toxicity of the substance by

inhalation, the oral toxicity in certain species by administering the substance through the feed for short periods and, in the case of fish, the concentration of the chemical which, if carried into waterways, is likely to harm fish.

My colleague the Minister for Health has advised that he is not aware of any LD-50 experiments being undertaken in New South Wales. LD-50 data is not regularly determined for new chemicals. Where considered necessary by Australian authorities—for example, as an indication of toxicity by inhalation for the effects on fish—oversea data is accepted. Testing laboratories throughout the world have intimated that they would welcome alternative tests which would not involve the use of laboratory animals. Analytical tests are used wherever possible. They are cheaper and much more convenient than animal tests. However acute, toxicity in animals cannot be measured by analytical tests. Little, if any, LD testing is carried out in Australia principally because of its cost and the fact that Australian authorities are willing to accept LD-50 data derived overseas. In the circumstances, there would be little point in this Government providing funds on the large scale necessary to develop alternative forms of testing.

The attitude I have adopted and will continue to adopt is to review legislation designed to maintain humane and proper methods of control over experiments undertaken in research on animals. I have been examining submissions from animal welfare organizations with regard to an Animals for Research Act. I have studied the Ontario legislation. I give an assurance to the people of New South Wales that in the determination of obvious improvements that will result from a study of submissions and proposals put forward by various organizations and individuals every care will be taken to ensure that problems experienced and brought to notice will be overcome. The honourable member for Gordon suggests in his motion the formation of an adequate statistical base and reporting system on animals used for experimentation in New South Wales. That proposition is included in a submission that has already been presented to me. Not only have the organizations with which I have been in contact suggested the formation of such a system but also they have raised matters that cover a very broad spectrum.

If nothing more has been achieved by the honourable member bringing forward this motion, it has at least offered me the opportunity to inform the House of action already taken in the move forward to improve the lot of animals. I have the greatest concern for animals whether they be feline, dog, bird or other species. This is a most important matter. It is necessary that the widest possible investigation should be carried out and the views of all interested parties taken into account before anything further is done. The matters put to me are under consideration and attention by myself and other Ministers whose area of ministerial control will be affected.

The Government looks forward to receiving the final proposals from the animal welfare organizations. Those submissions will be examined so that legislation of the nature sought for many years by the people of New South Wales can be prepared. I am confident that the work done by the animal welfare organizations in conjunction with the Australian Veterinary Association will assist to introduce legislation which will be the best in Australia. As an animal lover I shall then take pride and pleasure in saying that I had a part in this legislation, along with the animal welfare associations, the Australian Veterinary Association and so many other people in the community who have written to me. Many worthwhile suggestions from animal lovers have been submitted to the Government, and I take this opportunity of thanking them for their valuable contributions. I also thank the groups of people in organizations who have done such wonderful work over many years.

Mr Haigh

Mr VINEY (Wakehurst) [3.44]: It is unusual in this Parliament for there to be absolute unanimity between Government and Opposition in expressing gratitude to the organizations which have tendered submissions and offered expertise to ensure that this legislation would be introduced. The Minister read the National Health and Medical Research Council's code of animal experimentation. It is a desirable code but needs the support of legislation. However, NHMRC will not approve a research grant unless a researcher agrees to bind himself to carry out the code. That is all very well for the legitimate researcher seeking government funds. However, the Animal Welfare League, the Australian Veterinary Association, the RSPCA and other groups are concerned that experimentation is carried out by organizations that will never apply to the NHMRC for financial assistance. Those organizations may not want it to be known that they are doing research. The legitimate researcher is never very wealthy and must go to the Medical Research Council for approval of funds. To obtain them he must agree to observe protocol during his research. The code will always be honoured by legitimate researchers seeking funds, but legislation must be introduced to control organizations using animals in product testing, forced dosing and other areas.

The Minister drew attention to legislation covering existing operation techniques. It does not involve forced dosing or product testing. The Minister would have received deputations regarding horrifying experiments such as testing chemicals on rabbits' eyes to find out whether a new cosmetic would be acceptable. Those experiments will not be covered by the code or the laws governing operation techniques. The Minister and the honourable member for Gordon suggested that the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act should be updated. On 19th June several animal welfare groups made a submission to the Minister and met him on 23rd June regarding the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. Apart from the legislation concerning animal experimentation I am somewhat amazed that the Minister did not seek a priority from the Parliamentary Counsel to bring in amending legislation. It could have been taken to the second-reading stage and left on the table for comment. That would have advanced the cause of those seeking the prevention of cruelty to animals.

Mr Naigh: That is not their final submission. They have asked me to delay.

Mr VINEY: That may or may not be so, but the Minister has obligations to the community. It is well known that major legislation affecting diverse groups of people has been brought into this House in the best form that could be devised by the department, the Minister and his advisers. Debate on the proposed legislation has been adjourned and the measure remained on the table for three months so that people with skills might read it and make submissions. That is not an unusual procedure; indeed, it should be adopted more frequently. All too often proposed legislation is brought in at the end of a session and rammed through both Houses without the community being given an opportunity to see what the Parliament is doing. The same thing applies to regulations. Of course, government by subordinate legislation is an even worse form of government.

The animal welfare groups have made worthwhile suggestions that could have been brought forward as amending legislation. No matter how hard one researches, one does not necessarily uncover all the wisdom that can be drawn upon. Community groups wishing to make submissions to the Parliament should apply themselves as diligently as the animal welfare groups. The RSPCA, the Animal Welfare League, the World League for Protection of Animals, the Australian Veterinary Association and the Animal Liberation group collectively have done an excellent job. They not only proposed that legislation should be changed but suggested the changes that should be made. Obviously they have had good legal advice. That is all I wish to say about

the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. Honourable members on both sides of the House should be aware that the Act is not designed to cover the problem outlined in the motion by the honourable member for Gordon.

I appreciate that the Ontario legislation may not be adequate for New South Wales. At least someone in the world has done something by bringing it to the attention of government and suggesting a change. One must make provision for constant evaluation of research involving animals. One could draft some tight laws and regulations that may frustrate research on animals that is vital to the welfare of human beings and that could be done in no other way. The principle expounded by the interested groups was that the discipline should be self-regulatory. People of high standing should be on an advisory committee enforcing the provisions, with the support of the Government. Research should be evaluated by those who can properly do so. They would then agree that the research should be carried out. It may be a one-off area of research that has not been done before.

I bring to mind the work of a brilliant microsurgeon in Australia whose patient was a child with severed vocal chords. The problem was to know which nerves should be joined together. Medical history had no records to assist. The surgeon knew that the vocal cords of a dog were similar to those of a human being. Before an attempt was made to restore the child's voice it was necessary to cut the vocal cords of dogs and to note carefully those nerves that when joined together and were healed enabled the dog to bark again. After several attempts the right nerves were found.

In a changing world, legislation should not impede proper medical research, which should be done in accordance with the proposals of the National Health and Medical Research Council, with the support of legislation. All available animal research material should be placed before the evaluation committee. Some of the reasons that the National Health and Medical Research Council was formed were to have discipline among researchers and to prevent unnecessary duplication of research with its attendant waste of public funds. The need for this type of discipline became evident when it was fashionable for universities to research cannabis. Finally the NHMRC put its foot down and said that the research was not on unless it was new and had not been done anywhere else in the world.

Concomitant with legislation is the need for all State governments, the Commonwealth Government and the National Library to ensure the best possible reference library on research throughout the world. Information must be available by computer. If a committee were to say a proposed research sounded great, it could then ascertain whether it has been done anywhere else in the world, whether the motives are acceptable and whether there is a good reason to repeat it. That is a natural part of the legislation. Government money would be best spent in ensuring that the information back-up is of the highest order. Governments have never found appealing the type of legislation that calls for self-regulation. Public servants in particular see some evil in an industry or a group of people regulating themselves. Government attitude is to have the big stick so that all decisions are made by the bureaucracy.

The submission made to the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier shows that the interested animal welfare groups were quite strong in their view that there was a need for self-regulation and better definitions of research. The committee said quite frankly that research should be more clearly defined. There is what might be described as pioneer research which is not carried out for any reason other than to see how far knowledge can be extended. The welfare groups do not see a need for experiments for that purpose to be carried out on animals.

Mr Viney]

In other words, if research is to be done on animals it should be for the purpose of having a perceived benefit and not merely gaining knowledge for knowledge's sake. On that subject the committee had this to say:

The Committee has opted for a system which depends principally for its efficacy in self-regulation. The onus of ensuring propriety within an institution rests to a large extent on the institution itself. However, a number of safeguards have been built into the proposed system.

There is a discipline within the organization. There is a need also for further safeguards. These are normally provided by a representative of government being involved to see whether, through carelessness or otherwise, the principles of the legislation are not being upheld. I can understand there may be delay in regard to this legislation. The Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier said he is awaiting further consultation. As the Minister admits, the motion has given the Government a platform to say that it is moving ahead. The question will be how fast it moves ahead.

I regret that the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier introduced some personal abuse into the debate. I should have thought that debate on this important matter would have proceeded with total unanimity. To demonstrate that he was the Minister, he made offensive and totally unfounded remarks about the honourable member for Gordon. Because the honourable member for Gordon answered an interjection by the honourable member for Campbelltown, who endorsed what the Minister had said, the Minister was not asked to withdraw his remarks. I should have thought that all political parties would be in agreement and admit that those interested in the legislation had done a first-class job. I suggest to the House that the result of the committee's work to be found in the document to which I referred was also first class. I suggest that the Parliamentary Counsel would require no more than five minutes to look at the proposed amendments to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. He would appreciate the technical expertise that went into the recommendations. The bill could have been printed by the Government Printer and brought into this House by way of notice of motion. If the Government thought there were some other areas to be considered, little expense would have been involved in having the bill printed and made available at the second-reading stage to permit the community at large to consider the bill's provisions.

That is a practice that all future governments who control this Chamber must adopt. There must be a longer period after the introduction of legislation to permit study of it by the Opposition and by members of the community who will be affected by it. In that way there will be far better legislation and a far happier community. I commend the honourable member for Gordon for moving the motion. I do not know what the Government would have done for business today if the honourable member for Gordon and the Leader of the Opposition had not had private members' motions on the notice paper. The honourable member for Gordon has assisted the Government to stay in business today and to keep the Parliament functioning. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr FACE (Charlestown) [4.0]: I commend the Minister on the meeting that took place in June. The honourable member for Wakehurst told honourable members that it was a simple matter to get the necessary expert advice and to have the Government Printer print the bill. I draw to his attention the Governor's Speech in which the Governor said:

A comprehensive programme of legislation has been prepared for your consideration during this session . . .

Amendments will be sought to the law relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals.

The Government is working towards this end. On some occasions honourable members say that the policy should be one of self-regulation but in the next breath they say that regulations should be brought down. That seems to be a paradox. The honourable member for Gordon seems to be arguing against himself over the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. Any sincere member of Parliament will agree with what the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier said. Revision of the Act is long overdue. It is all very well to whip up emotions on this subject but the Government has not held office for ten years. If it had, things would be different today.

The Ontario legislation was passed in 1969. The former Government held office for eleven years from 1965 but did nothing about that legislation. That is strange. As the honourable member for Gordon was not a member of the House then perhaps he can be excused on that score. The Hon. Sir Eric Willis, a former Premier, often told new members here that it is not a simple thing to get legislation before the House. Now that the Liberal Party and the Country Party are in opposition its representatives here suggest that introducing a bill is a simple matter that can be attended to without the intervention of the Parliamentary Counsel and without the assistance of legal opinion, and that a bill can be printed and straight-away put on the table of the House. Such a suggestion is totally irresponsible. That would be a cock-eyed way to prepare legislation.

I commend the activities of animal welfare organizations. I have been a member of Parliament for nearly six years and though for the first three the Labor Party was in opposition, during the whole of my period here such organizations in my electorate have been talking about this matter. It seems strange that the Opposition is now trying to whip up emotions about the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. When the former coalition Government held office considerable pressure was brought to bear on it, but it did absolutely nothing about the legislation. Honourable members opposite have referred to the Ontario Act. That Act went through that provincial Parliament in 1969, so the former Government, which held office until 1976, had plenty of time to do something about the matter. It seems hypocritical for the Opposition to say that this Government is not moving fast enough.

In the past year considerable consultation has taken place on a draft bill covering experimentation on animals and cruelty. The problem with governments of all political persuasions has been that the people most affected are often the last to be consulted about any legislation. In the community much divergence of opinion exists, and the Government is consulting all organizations affected. Though each organization may not concede everything, there should be an input from a cross-section of the whole community. The honourable member for Wakehurst said that provisions to protect animals should not be made at the expense of human life. In other words, medical experimentation should not come to a standstill because of anything that the Government might introduce making experimentation impossible. That point will be readily conceded by all honourable members: it would be foolish to do that, particularly with the sophisticated experimentation that must be conducted because of advances in medicine.

Once upon a time people rarely left Australia to visit other countries until they reached retiring age. Nowadays it is not unusual for young people to travel the globe. This changed pattern opens up the possibility of more diseases being introduced into this country. Those engaged in experimentation on diseases should not be hamstrung. Many people have written to me about cruelty to animals in

Mr Face]

experimentation that over the past three or four years has gained momentum. Legislation that would do more harm than good and that is inadequate in some areas should not be introduced.

Though the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier is responsible for legislation relating to cruelty to animals, naturally the Minister for Health also is involved to a large extent. More than one government department is affected. I do not think that any honourable member from a rural area would appreciate the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries not being consulted on a wide-ranging bill that could have repercussions on primary industry. It is not just a simple matter, as the honourable member for Wakehurst suggested, of printing a bill and bringing it into the House. It is necessary that the Parliamentary Counsel approve legislation brought here. The honourable member for Gordon in speaking to his motion referred to the LD-50 test. That must be a figment of his imagination. That test virtually does not exist in New South Wales.

About twelve months ago the Parliament went through a farcical exercise when the honourable member for Gordon brought forward a notice of motion relating to the Children of God. That was more a subject of his imagination than fact. It concerns me that the motion now before the House has been brought forward merely for political expediency. The honourable member for Wakehurst obviously undertook some research on the matter. His concern over the welfare of animals was apparent from his remarks today. As a human being and as a member of Parliament he showed real concern, but I have my reservations about the motives of the honourable member for Gordon. Everyone should be concerned about the welfare of animals.

The Minister for Lands is a wonderful example of someone who has taken considerable interest in animal life. No doubt he will be consulted before any new legislation is brought forward. His views and great experience on fauna will be sought. If ever a Minister will go down in history as having taken a tremendous interest in the welfare of fauna, it will be this Minister for Lands. The Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier has started a move in the right direction. Legislation will be introduced for the benefit of animals. *[Quorum formed.]* I congratulate the honourable member for Gordon. In calling for a quorum he has made one of his better contributions to this House. It is interesting to see some members of the Country Party entering the Chamber to hear about matters relating to experimentation with animals. This subject should be of great interest to them. The attitude of members opposite underlines the insincerity of the motion. The honourable member for Gordon has addressed the Parliament without forethought and without prior deliberation, a fact that the honourable member for Wakehurst brought to light. He had done his homework. The Government is already moving in the right direction.

It is a pity that honourable members opposite when in government did not consult people before bringing forward new legislation. For some time the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier has been consulting people on a proposed bill. On many occasions the former coalition Government should have consulted people but failed to do so. The subject under debate is most important. Every member on the Government benches has a love of animals. If the proposals of the honourable member for Gordon were adopted, more harm than good would be occasioned. Medical experimentation would be seriously affected. Labor is in office in New South Wales and it will still be in office after the next elections, which will probably take place before the end of the year. Obviously, legislation acceptable to all sections of the community will be brought forward in the next Parliament. It will be the result of consultation with the people.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! It being fifteen minutes after four o'clock, p.m., the debate is interrupted pursuant to Standing Order 122A and the motion lapses.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF WOLLONDILLY

Resignation of the Honourable Thomas Lancelot Lewis

Mr SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have this day received a letter from the Honourable Thomas Lancelot Lewis resigning his seat as member for the electoral district of Wollondilly.

Vacant Seat

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

That the seat of the Honourable Thomas Lancelot Lewis, member for the electoral district of Wollondilly, hath become, and is now, vacant by reason of the resignation thereof by the said the Honourable Thomas Lancelot Lewis.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

Fourth Report

Mr McGowan, as Chairman, brought up the Fourth Report from the Printing Committee.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr Crabtree, at 4.18 p.m. until Tuesday, 26th September, 1978.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

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

BUSH FIRE BRIGADE PUMPS

Mr VINEY asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

- (1) In his Press Statement of July 19, dealing with the acceptance of a tender for the supply of Bush Fire Brigade pumps, he mentioned that the successful tenderer, Davey, a division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd, was located at Auburn?
- (2) Are Davey Pumps manufactured in Victoria?
- (3) What amount of preference for a New South Wales manufacturer was allowed when the various tenders were being evaluated?

Answer—

- (1) No.
- (2) The pumps are manufactured in Victoria, engines imported from the United States of America, and final assembly of the pumping units carried out at Auburn.
- (3) 3.2 per cent.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr VINEY asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

- (1) For the financial year 1977–78, did the Commonwealth Government reimburse the New South Wales Government for the salaries of sixteen officers of the State Emergency Services?
- (2) If so, what are the duties of those officers?
- (3) Were any of them involved in the administration of the N.S.W. Bush Fire Brigades?
- (4) What other financial assistance for the year 1977–78 did the Commonwealth Government provide for the State Emergency Services of New South Wales?

Answer—

- (1) During 1977–78 the Commonwealth Government through the Natural Disasters Organization reimbursed the New South Wales Government for salaries of 36 officers of the State Emergency Services and not for 16 as mentioned by the honourable member.
- (2) The primary responsibility of 22 of those officers is to assist the volunteer State Emergency Services Divisional Controller in the performance of his responsibilities. The remaining 14 officers are specially trained to co-ordinate communication of warnings of the occurrence or likely occurrence of an emergency.
- (3) No.
- (4) No direct assistance. However, the Commonwealth Government provides assistance in the form of civil defence plant, publications and officer training.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

What representations have been made by the directors of the State Emergency Services to which Ministers concerning the need for an artificial canoeing course to be incorporated into the construction of the Eraring power station and its possible use for training for flood-boat crews?

If no such representations have been made, will he have an investigation made into this as a matter of urgency and the results of it made available to the Minister for Mines and Minister for Energy and Lake Macquarie Municipal Council?

Answer—

There have been no representations made along the lines raised by the honourable member, nor is there anything before me to suggest the need for such an investigation.

BYRON ELECTORATE PLANNING

Mr BOYD asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

As (1) the enrolment in Byron Electorate has increased by 6 823 in the last five years, and

(2) building approvals in the last six months total 27.5 million dollars compared with 35.6 million dollars in the previous year,

what special provisions in planning and finance have been made by his Department to provide departmental facilities and works to cope with this rapid growth?

Answer—

Insofar as my Department is concerned, no special provisions in planning or finance have been made for the Byron Electorate. However, the honourable member may be assured that development in that area will be kept under review.

FIREARMS

Mr SCHIPP asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

(1) What restrictions, if any, apply to residents of New South Wales purchasing firearms and weapons from interstate?

(2) Are reciprocal arrangements available that require direct or mail order purchasers to produce evidence of holding a firearms licence in New South Wales?

(3) If not, has any action been initiated by him or his interstate counterparts to reach agreement on reciprocity?

(4) What is the position concerning purchase of replica firearms and weapons?

Answer—

(1) Except in respect of pistols the purchase of which is strictly controlled throughout the Commonwealth, there is no restriction in New South Wales legislation on the purchase of firearms from interstate. However, a New South Wales resident must hold a shooter's licence to use, carry or have in his possession a firearm (not being a pistol, prohibited weapon or prohibited article) except when the firearm is used, carried or in his possession solely on his own property. In every case a resident of New South Wales must hold a pistol licence or a permit to have possession of a pistol or prohibited weapon or prohibited article.

(2) Except in respect of pistols, as previously mentioned, there are no reciprocal arrangements between States regarding the licensing or purchasing of firearms.

(3) The question of reciprocity was recently the subject of discussion at the 1978 Police Commissioner's Conference, where it was agreed that reciprocity would be dependent upon uniformity of legislation. Previous efforts to achieve uniformity of firearms legislation have been unsuccessful.

(4) Any imitation or replica of a pistol, blank fire pistol, shortened firearm, machine gun or sub-machine gun, unless it is a child's toy of a type, class or description approved by the Commissioner of Police, is prescribed as a prohibited article under the Firearms and Dangerous Weapons Regulation. It is an offence for a person to purchase or otherwise have possession of a prohibited article unless he is the holder of a permit issued by the Minister.

RURAL ASSISTANCE BOARD

Mr FISCHER asked the **Treasurer**—

(1) What is the average time between receipt of application for Farm Build Up Assistance from the Rural Assistance Board and advice of either approval in principle or rejection?

(2) What is the average time from the date of approval of applications for Farm Build Up until final settlement, when the moneys are made available to the vendor?

(3) Has there been an increase in the time taken for the Rural Assistance Board to process both Farm Build Up and Debt Reconstruction applications over the last two years?

(4) How many applications were lodged with the Rural Assistance Board for each of the last five years in the following categories:

- (a) Farm Build Up; and
- (b) Debt Reconstruction?

Answer—

(1) Just under 9 weeks.

(2) Just under 22 weeks. The moneys are available to the vendor immediately upon approval of the advance subject to the completion of normal conveyancing requirements by solicitors for the parties.

(3) No.

	<i>Year ended</i>					<i>No. of applications</i>
(4) (a)	30th June, 1974	183
	30th June, 1975	376
	30th June, 1976	311
	30th June, 1977	361
	30th June, 1978	459
(b)	30th June, 1974	453
	30th June, 1975	403
	30th June, 1976	245
	30th June, 1977	250
	30th June, 1978	215



The following questions upon notice and answers were circulated in *Questions and Answers* to the date of dissolution.

EAST LINDFIELD HIGH SCHOOL SITE

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What are the long-range plans of the Department of Education for the designated East Lindfield high school site at the foot of Wellington Road, East Lindfield?

(2) If the department has no plans to utilize this site, why is it not released for some other form of community or education development?

Answer—

(1) It has been decided that the East Lindfield school site at the foot of Wellington Road is surplus to the needs of the Department of Education.

(2) This decision has been conveyed to the Property Advisory Committee which has been established by the Government. As early as practicable a decision will be made concerning an alternative use for the site.

ROAD SAFETY AT WOLLONGONG SCHOOLS

Mr COLEMAN asked the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways—

(1) Do over 3 000 pupils attend Wollongong High School, Keira Boys' High School and Wollongong Technical College?

(2) Is the serious **traffic** congestion occurring near these institutions during their morning and evening commencement times compounded by the failure of the Government to commence the building of the proposed adjacent northern suburbs distributor?

(3) Do many pupils run great risks crossing the road outside entrances to these institutions because of the attendant congestion?

Answer—

On 23rd June, 1978, in reply to a similar question asked last session, a letter was forwarded to the Leader of the Opposition in the following terms—

"At present, minor congestion occurs for a limited period in the morning peak near Wollongong High School, Keira Boy's High School and Wollongong Technical College. The average delay to through traffic is minimal, however, and the congestion will be eliminated following construction of the North Wollongong interchange.

Approximately 3 000 pupils attend these institutions daily and, provided they use one of the three signalized pedestrian crossings in the vicinity, they should be able to cross the road **safely.**"

BUSH FIRE BRIGADE PUMPS

Mr VINEY asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

(1) In relation to the tender for the supply of power pumping units for Bush Fire Brigades, which closed on 31 May, 1978, how many manufacturers tendered for the supply of (i) Light Weight "Mop-up" Pumping Units; (ii) General Purpose Portable Type Pumping Units; (iii) Fast Filling Pumping Units; and (iv) Tanker Type Pumping Units?

(2) In each instance (i) to (iv):

- (a) What were their names?
- (b) In what State of the Commonwealth does each manufacturer build its pumps?
- (c) Was this information sought from each tenderer? If not, why not?
- (d) Did each manufacturer's pump meet the performance test on the first occasion?
- (e) If any did not meet the test on the first occasion, how many times was each manufacturer's pump tested before it passed the performance test?
- (f) Was each manufacturer permitted to have a representative in attendance during the performance tests?
- (g) If so, which companies had representatives present?
- (h) If any manufacturer's pump failed to meet the performance test for the first time, what period of time was that manufacturer given to modify his pump before the next test took place?
- (i) What period of warranty was offered by each manufacturer?
- (j) Of the anticipated requirement for the Year 1978–79, how many pumps did the successful tenderer promise to deliver by the first of September, 1978? What will be the monthly delivery for October and onwards?

Answer—

(1) (i) Six (6).

(ii) Four (4).

(iii) Four (4).

(iv) Two (2).

- (2) (a) (i) Crommelins Australia.
Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd.
Fire Fighting Equipment.
Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty Ltd.
G.A.A.M. Engineering Pty Limited.
Pacific Pump Company.
- (ii) Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd.
Fire Fighting Equipment.
Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty Ltd.
G.A.A.M. Engineering Pty Limited.
- (iii) Crommelins Australia.
Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd.
Fire Fighting Equipment.
Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty Ltd.

- (iv) Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales **Pty** Ltd.
Fire Fighting Equipment.
- (b) Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd—Victoria.
Crommelins Australia—Japan.
Fire Fighting Equipment—Japan.
Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty Ltd—New South Wales.
G.A.A.M. Engineering Pty Limited—Victoria.
Pacific Pump Company—New South Wales.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) No.
- (e) (i) Light Weight "Mop-Up"—pumps tested—Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd—3 times.
(ii) General Purpose—pumps tested—Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty Ltd—Failed—2 times.
(iii) Fast Filling Type—pumps tested—Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd—3 times.
(iv) Tanker Pump-only one pump tested—Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd—2 times.
- (f) Yes. However, manufacturers' representatives were not allowed to participate in testing.
- (g) During testing pumps were delivered by representatives from Davey, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd, Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty Ltd and G.A.A.M. Engineering Pty Limited. It is not known whether these representatives remained in attendance during testing.
- (h) No time limit was stipulated since performance test failures were considered to be due to lack of quality control and not design faults. The Davey pumps (items (i) and (iv)) were available for retesting in four (4) working days and the Firefighting and Agricultural pump (item (ii)) in nine (9) working days.
- (i) Crommelins Australia—Parts and labour, engine and pump for six (6) months or 500 hours.
***Davey**, A Division of Pye Industries Sales Pty Ltd—Twelve (12) months on pumps.
Fire Fighting Equipment—Twenty-four (24) months on pumps.
***Firefighting and Agricultural Pumps Pty** Ltd—Twelve (12) months on pumps.
***G.A.A.M.** Engineering Pty Limited—Twelve (12) months on pumps.
***Pacific Pump Company**—Six (6) months on pumps.
*Each of these manufacturers' pumps are fitted with Briggs & Stratton engines which are covered by a twelve (12) months warranty.
- (j) Nil. Variable, depending on orders placed.

HIGH SCHOOL FOR BELROSE

Mr HEALEY asked the Minister for Education—

- (1) Has the Ralston Avenue site been acquired for a new high school at Belrose?
- (2) When will plans of the new buildings be available?
- (3) When is it planned that the school will open?

Answer—

Action is proceeding towards acquisition of a new high school site at Belrose. The Regional Director has recommended that construction of the school commence as early as practicable and with this in mind planning of the new school will be commenced in the near future. As soon as documents have been completed, funds will be made available to allow invitation of tenders for construction of the new school.

STOCKINBINGAL LEVEL CROSSING

Mr SHEAHAN asked the Minister for Transport and Minister for Highways—

When will "Stop" signs be erected **at** the level crossing on the "Friendly Way" **at** the Temora end of **Stockinbingal**?

Answer—

It is proposed to construct an overbridge at the railway level crossing on Trunk Road No. 84, 0.8 km west of Stockinbingal. Design plans are at present in hand. Unfortunately, I am not in a position at this stage to indicate when construction work will commence.

However, in the meantime I have asked that the question of erecting "Stop" signs at the crossing as an interim measure be pursued and **arrangements** have been made for the matter to be discussed at the next meeting of the Cootamundra Council Traffic Committee.

IRON COVE DREDGING

Mr MAHER asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports—

Does the Maritime Services Board intend to dredge Iron Cove regularly to avoid a build-up of silt?

Answer—

The recent dredging of Iron Cove was the subject of an agreement between the Maritime Services Board, the Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board and the **Ashfield** and **Drummoyne** Municipal Councils. Any future dredging of the Cove would be subject to a similar arrangement. However, it is not anticipated that there will be a rapid build-up of siltation in the area, and no further dredging has been programmed at this stage.

BLACKBERRY

Mr SHEAHAN asked the Minister for Decentralisation and Development and Minister for Primary Industries—

What is the current position of research into the development of a beetle (or other predator) to help in the eradication of blackberry?

Answer—

This State is not directly involved in research into the development of a biological agent for the eradication of blackberry. However, it maintains a close liaison with the Victorian Vermin and Noxious Weeds Destruction Board which is involved in the development of such a programme. At present most of the effort by the Victorians is into the location of potentially useful organisms in overseas countries.

The programme has only been in operation for about two years and it is far too early to assess its success or otherwise. It is understood that some useful leads have been discovered and are presently being followed. However, a number of commercial fruits and flowers belong to the same botanical family (Rosaceae) as the blackberry. They will make the location and evaluation of a sufficiently selective parasite most difficult.

BUSH FIRE PUMPS

Mr VINEY asked the Minister for Services and Minister Assisting the Premier—

(1) Did the Bushfire Council at its meeting on 16 March, 1978, resolve that as a matter of urgency an approach be made to him to request that the prevailing method of councils making their own choice of "approved list" bush fire pumps be continued for another twelve months?

(2) Did he receive that request? If not, will he urgently make inquiries to ascertain why?

(3) If he did receive the request, will he indicate his reasons for turning down advice from some of the most experienced bushfire fighters in New South Wales?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) In the administration of the Bush Fire Fighting Fund, State Emergency Services, as a Government Department, must comply with Public Service Regulations concerning the purchase of equipment.

COMPANY FAILURES

Mr McDONALD asked the Attorney-General—

(1) How many New South Wales companies were wound up in the last financial year?

(2) Does this number constitute an increase or decrease on those previous years?

Answer—

(1) 1 592.

(2) An increase.

