

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 22 October, 1980

Distinguished Visitors—Questions without Notice—Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Fund (Business of the House)—Crown Lands Titles Bills (Introduction, second reading)—Motor Vehicles (Taxation) Bills (third reading)—Water (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Building and Construction Industry Long Service Leave Payments (Amendment) Bill (second reading, third reading)—Bill Returned—Land Commission (Amendment) Bill (second reading, third reading)—Appropriation Bill (second reading)—Adjournment (Housing Commission Accommodation)—Questions upon Notice.

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

Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

Mr SPEAKER: I invite the attention of honourable members to the presence in the gallery of distinguished visitors, the Hon. M. Qionibaravi, C.M.G., Speaker of the Fijian Parliament and President of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and Mr John Davis, Consulate General for the United States of America.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PRISON OFFICERS

Mr MASON: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Corrective Services. Is New South Wales facing another crisis in its prison system because of the Minister's indecision? Are prison officers threatening to walk out if prosecutions are proceeded with against officers named in the Nagle report? Have prisoners threatened to burn down Maitland gaol and to go on a rampage if those prison officers are not charged? In view of the crisis, what course does the Minister propose to take? What plans has he made to ensure that prisons are kept secure and the community will not be endangered?

Mr HAIGH: The prisons of the State are secure. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned part of the Nagle report and a decision on the people named in it. The Premier and Treasurer and I will be meeting representatives of the Public Service Association of New South Wales and prison officers this afternoon. A statement will be made after that meeting.

BUSHFIRES

Mr McCARTHY: I address a question without notice to the Minister for Police and Minister for Services. Is it a fact that New South Wales faces a season of grave bushfire danger? Will the Minister inform the House what action the Government is taking to deal with this serious situation?

Mr CRABTREE: The honourable member for Armidale has raised a matter of concern to every citizen of New South Wales. All honourable members will realize that this matter is too important for political point scoring. As usual, the honourable member for Armidale has raised the issue in a responsible manner.

Mr Mason: The Minister gave him a copy of the question.

Mr CRABTREE: The Leader of the Opposition hee-haws like a donkey every time he enters the House. As for the Leader of the Country Party, he could improve his standing in the House and in the community if he emulated the dignity and demeanour of the honourable member for Armidale. Last night, in a disgraceful performance, the Leader of the Country Party again set aside the truth in an attempt at cheap political point scoring. His action was completely irresponsible, having regard to the fact that a threat is posed to lives and property in New South Wales. Instead of supporting the Bushfire Advisory Council, which is representative of all sections of the community, and giving moral support to the endeavours of the volunteer bushfire movement, the Leader of the Country Party endeavoured to smear, not the Government, but all sections of the community. It is obvious from his comments that the closest the Leader of the Country Party has come to a fire in recent times has been the burning of champagne cartons in the incinerator at his Darling Point home.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members on both sides of the House to desist from noisy interjections and to allow the Minister to answer the question in silence.

Mr CRABTREE: New South Wales faces a potentially disastrous bushfire season and it would be a mistake for anyone to be lulled into a sense of false security by the mild weather conditions we have experienced recently. This year more Government action has been taken to prepare for bushfires than in any other year. The volunteer bush fire brigade and emergency services generally are better prepared than they have been in the past.

[Interruption]

Mr CRABTREE: The Leader of the Opposition appears to agree. Already the people of Dubbo have acknowledged the wonderful job the Government has done in relation to bush fire brigades and State emergency services.

Mr Barraclough: That did not show up in the vote last Saturday.

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

Mr CRABTREE: Funding is a yardstick the Opposition likes to use in measuring success. As far as bushfires are concerned, this Government has an unchallengeable record. This year volunteer brigades will receive \$6.4 million in Government-sponsored allocations—a 100 per cent increase on the last allocation made by the former Liberal Party—Country Party Government of which the Leader of the Country Party was a prominent member. As far as equipment is concerned, the Government has streamlined orders and delivery services. The long delays that councils and brigades experienced under the Askin—Punch Government have ceased.

Mr Cameron: On a point of order. The Minister for Police and Minister for Services is deliberately using question time to answer a matter raised in the budget debate. The Minister has not yet taken part in the budget debate. He will have abundant opportunity to use the debate for what it is properly intended. If he wishes to reply to another honourable member he may do so, but in effect he is completely wasting question time and misusing it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The only control that the Chair has over the Minister is to ensure that his reply is relevant to the question. I rule that the Minister is in order in replying to the question in this way.

Mr Smith: The Minister should tell the House about the delay of eighteen months in the delivery of a fire truck at Wamngah.

Mr CRABTREE: I shall deal with that interjection shortly.

[Interruption]

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

Mr CRABTREE: The honourable member for Pittwater knows all about the matter he just raised. In fact, he is co-operating with my department at the moment. A demonstration will be held this week into the use of agricultural aircraft in some grassland fire situations. The honourable member for Pittwater has applauded my department for the work it is doing in this field. The honourable member should not enter this argument; he should let the Leader of the Country Party—the honourable member for Darling Point—stew in his own juice. In July orders for equipment were placed and deliveries began immediately. The Leader of the Country Party and other members of the Opposition seized on water bombing of bushfires as an issue in the belief that they can create controversy. I shall now state the truth and let the House know what is happening in connection with this matter.

Mr Punch: The Minister is a joke.

Mr CRABTREE: The Leader of the Country Party is the biggest joke. In fact, he could not even stand on his own legs.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Lane Cove and the honourable member for Bligh to order. I said last night, and I mention it again today, that this House is judged by its conduct. Though we might have a vibrant democracy, and we expect to have a vibrant Parliament, that does not go so far as having members on both sides of the House making a noisy show in front of the public. I ask honourable members on both sides of the House to contain themselves and allow the Minister to answer the question.

[Interruption]

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

Mr CRABTREE: I was saying that the Leader of the Country Party and other members of the Opposition have seized on water bombing of bushfires as an issue in the belief that controversy can be created. A telex received by the Premier and Treasurer from the Prime Minister on 20th September, 1980, was in these terms:

We recognize quite clearly that fire fighting is a State responsibility. However, because of the tremendous potential for loss of life and property and stock damage associated with bushfires, the Government has decided to invite the States to participate in the evaluation of specially equipped aircraft

to combat bushfires. I understand that the lack of suitable lakes and dams may limit the direct **application** in Australia of techniques of water bombing fires—as practised in North America—but it may well **be** possible to modify the techniques to suit our conditions.

The Premier and Treasurer considered the matter and three days later, on **23rd** September, replied to the Prime Minister in this way:

I refer to your telex of 20th September, 1980, concerning the proposal that an evaluation of specially equipped aircraft to combat **bushfires** be carried out through the CSIRO.

The State Government is prepared to contribute **all** practical assistance to an evaluation along the lines proposed and nominates Mr W. E. Hurditch, chief co-ordinator of bush fire fighting, Department of Services, as contact officer.

The Leader of the Country Party—the honourable member for Darling Point—claimed in this House last night that the Government was not willing even to consider the water bombing of bushfires.

Mr Punch: It is like the drought; the Government has done very little about it.

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

Mr CRABTREE: The New South Wales Government has agreed to co-operate with the Commonwealth in planned investigations and **trials** with **large** aircraft as a weapon in fighting bushfires.

Mr Mason: Question time is slipping away.

Mr CRABTREE: The Leader of the Opposition is slipping away, whether he knows it or not. The honourable member for Lane Cove is laughing because he is about to take over the leadership of the Opposition. The Prime Minister sought the co-operation of this Government which is eager and ready to assist in any way. Mr Hurditch has been nominated by the Government as the officer from this State to assist and co-operate in this project. He is as keen as I am about this project—and I am the Minister with this responsibility. The Government also is keen to ensure that New South Wales has the best possible facilities and techniques for **bushfire** control.

It is quite false for the Leader of the Country Party to create—as he did last night—confusion and uncertainty in the mind of the public about water bombing of **bushfires** in particular and about **bushfire** control in general. His approach has been criminal. The Government recognizes that millions of dollars will be lost this year because of bushfires. The Leader of the Country Party stands condemned for creating confusion and uncertainty on a false premise. This Government has done everything possible to build up the State's emergency services. Moreover, it is always ready to examine and consider any innovation or change that will mean greater security and safety for the people of New South Wales. In conclusion, might I again pay tribute to the honourable member for Armidale for his conduct over this issue and in other matters affecting the rural community of this State.

EXPO 1988

Mr PUNCH: My question without notice is directed to the Premier and Treasurer. Has he made any further approaches to Canberra regarding the holding of Expo since his submission in September? In view of the tremendous benefits that would accrue to this State and its people if Expo were held here, will the Premier

stop blaming Canberra for not having acted and get on an aeroplane and personally see the Prime Minister to resolve this critical issue? Has the Premier had an opportunity to correct his wrong impressions of which he spoke yesterday, and has he had referred to him my remarks in this House on 21st August when I emphasized the need for the New South Wales Government to ensure that Expo is held in Sydney? Will he indicate that he and his officers will do something more positive than again display a total paranoia about the federal Government?

Mr WRAN: An approach was made to the federal Government on 12th September. It was reinforced on 20th September and has been reinforced further since I spoke about this matter in the House yesterday. There is no question that Expo should be held in Sydney. There is no point in the Leader of the Country Party now trying to avoid the anti-New South Wales attitude that he displayed in the House yesterday. Far from my hopping on an aeroplane and personally going to Nareen, where I do not think I would be very welcome anyway, I should hope that the Leader of the Country Party would, for once in his life, join with the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House—

Mr Punch: I will join with the Premier if he will go to see the Prime Minister.

Mr WRAN: That is a generous offer, but I know the honourable gentleman will not be offended when I say that I would rather be without his company. If he can arrange a meeting with the Prime Minister, I shall meet him at Nareen. That is a fair enough offer. The Leader of the Country Party is a man of great influence.

Mr Ferguson: It will be the first time in years that he has been on a farm.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRAN: I wish I had said that.

Mr Cameron: Try to answer the question, as an alternative.

Mr WRAN: Try to behave yourself. Ever since you have grown your hair like that you have become a bit of a larrikin.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WRAN: Clearly there is a move by an influential clique in Melbourne, allied to the Liberal Party, to put pressure on the federal Government to pervert the only course available in the interests of Australia; that is, that Expo must be held in Sydney, the birthplace of the nation. The Government has placed its submission before the Prime Minister, **not** once, not twice, but several times. I understand the embarrassment that the Prime Minister is suffering, with all the pressure from the Melbourne Club, the Melbourne clique and the Premier of Victoria. This matter transcends politics. It is a matter of national interest. The Government will continue to pursue what it thinks is the only logical and sensible result; that is, that Expo be held in Sydney.

TEACHER TRAINING SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr RAMSAY: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Planning and Environment, representing in this House the Minister for Education. Will the Minister inform the Minister for Education that a number of students and parents in my electorate are concerned that no advice has been given of the number of teacher

training scholarships that will be available next year? Will he request the Minister for Education to advise me and the Parliament, as a matter of urgency, the number, if any, of teacher training scholarships that will be available next year?

Mr BEDFORD: I shall convey the question to our colleague in another place for a more definite reply, but I have pleasure in advising the honourable member for Wollongong that I do know a decision has been made about the number of teacher training scholarships that will be offered next year. Though in almost every other State the scholarships have been abandoned, the Government of New South Wales is continuing to offer scholarships to some students in our colleges. A decision has been made on the number of scholarships to be offered and the Minister for Education will be making an announcement soon.

KINGS CROSS

Mr BARRACLOUGH: I direct my question to the Minister for Planning and Environment. Did the Minister make a statement on Monday that Kings Cross has deteriorated from a Greenwich village-type neighbourhood into a sleazy Soho and that he and the city council intend to clean it up and restore it to its original charm?

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BARRACLOUGH: Mr Speaker, it is difficult to ask a question with all these interjections being made. Would you like me to start again?

Mr SPEAKER: No. The honourable member should continue.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: Is the Minister aware that last month the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice described as absolute rubbish my statement on 16th September that Kings Cross had become a den of vice and had lost its village atmosphere? Will the Minister for Planning and Environment invite the attention of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice to the similarity between our views on this matter? Will he ask the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice to help clean up Kings Cross by amending section 5 of the Offences in Public Places Act?

Mr BEDFORD: Last Monday a joint statement was issued in the name of the new Lord Mayor of Sydney, Alderman Sutherland, and me concerning proposals that the city council will shortly be submitting to the Government on zoning regulations affecting sex shops and adult movie cinemas. The city council has been considering these proposals for some time. It contends that there should be a provision in local environmental plans to restrict in certain places the sort of development to which I have referred. Indeed, the press statement that was issued gave information on how that provision could be effected.

The terms used in the press statement drew attention to the fact that for some time the city council has been aware of the need for improvements in the sort of development that is occurring in Kings Cross and other areas under its control. I am not aware of the nature of the statements made by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice on the date the honourable member for Bligh mentioned but that is a matter that the honourable member might take up directly with that Minister. Furthermore, if he wants to pursue the possibility of alterations to the law in another Minister's administration, it would be appropriate for him to approach that Minister.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr AKISTER: I ask the Premier and Treasurer whether in a speech yesterday the Leader of the Country Party referred to the provision of funds by the State Liberal Party-Country Party Government in 1965-66 and the following two years for drought relief. Will the Premier and Treasurer inform the House of the background to that expenditure?

Mr WRAN: It is a fact that yesterday the Leader of the Country Party mentioned some figures relating to drought relief provided by the State Liberal Party-Country Party Government in 1965-66. For some weeks the Leader of the Country Party and a number of his colleagues, particularly the Deputy Leader of the Country Party, have been peddling figures round the State about the efforts made by the former Liberal Party-Country Party Government to help farmers and country people during the 1965-68 drought. The figures are untrue and the use to which they are being put is pernicious in the extreme. The simple facts are—and I challenge the Leader of the Country Party, the Deputy Leader of the Country Party and any other member of the Opposition to gainsay the accuracy of these figures—that in the period from 1965-66 to 1968-69 payments from Consolidated Revenue Fund for drought relief totalled \$43 million. In that period the State received from the Commonwealth Government in respect of drought relief the huge sum of \$56.5 million. The Commonwealth Government recouped the State for all expenditure incurred on drought relief—which amounted to \$43 million—and provided a further \$13.5 million to help meet the downturn in Government revenue resulting from the drought.

Mr K. J. Stewart: Is that true or false, Wally?

Mr Murray: False.

Mr WRAN: The honourable member for Barwon stamps himself a liar twice, by that response to my colleague.

Mr Murray: On a point of order. The Premier and Treasurer described me as a liar. That word is unparliamentary and I ask you to direct him to withdraw it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Barwon takes offence at the use by the Premier and Treasurer of the word liar in referring to him. He asks that it be withdrawn.

Mr WRAN: I cannot withdraw it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members of Parliament have the right of free speech, but if one member objects to the use by another member of an unparliamentary expression in referring to him, he may request the Chair to direct that it be withdrawn. It has been ruled many times in parliaments operating on the Westminster system that expressions such as "deliberate liar", "You are a liar," or "That is a lie" are unparliamentary. I ask the Premier and Treasurer to withdraw the word "liar".

Mr WRAN: I am indebted to you for that lucid exposition of the practice of Parliament, but I submit that I am entitled to be heard on the matter.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! In other circumstances it would be in order for the Premier and Treasurer to explain the way in which he used an expression. However, the expression about which complaint is made on this occasion has for long been held to be unparliamentary and I cannot allow the Premier and Treasurer to give any explanation of the way in which he used the phrase.

Mr Pickard: The Premier and Treasurer has been asked simply to withdraw.

Mr WRAN: Behave yourself, please. Mr Speaker, in deference to your direction I withdraw the remark. As you were speaking to the Clerk at the time. I should point out that I did not call the honourable member for Barwon a liar. I said that he stamped himself as a liar twice. That is a totally different thing.

Mr Pickard: It is not different at all.

Mr WRAN: Calm down. One could use the word in respect of the honourable member for Hornsby every day.

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

Mr WRAN: He is always *sniffing* around Long Bay gaol for some of those parcels that are left over.

Mr Schipp: The Premier and Treasurer is getting down into the gutter now.

Mr WRAN: The honourable member for Wagga Wagga always has his nose in the gutter. He is one of the most snivelling creatures in this Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I give members of the Opposition their last warning. I have noted the names of several of them three times for disorderly conduct. If those members offend again, **they** will be removed from the House for the rest of the day.

Mr WRAN: I am indebted to you, Mr Speaker, for endeavouring to bring this rabble to order.

Mr Cameron: We know that the Premier and Treasurer lost the federal election, but he should try to act like a Premier.

Mr WRAN: The honourable member's candidate Fred Nile did not do very well. I wish to repeat that not only did the Commonwealth recoup the State for all the expenditure incurred on drought relief but **also** it provided **\$13 million** to help meet the downturn in Government revenue arising from the drought. Anybody who says that that is not true is a liar. The facts speak for themselves. The Country Party and its leader and deputy leader stand condemned for the deception they are practising on the people of New South Wales. Although I was not a supporter of the late Sir Robert **Menzies**, I should point out that at least he, unlike the present leaders in the federal Government, had some concern for country people.

KEMPSEY TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr J. H. BROWN: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Planning and Environment representing in this House the Minister for Education. Did I raise with the Minister in this House last week objections by the people of Kempsey to the proposal of the Department of Technical and Further Education to transfer the machining and fitting course from Kempsey to Taree? Is the Minister aware that a petition has been signed by every member of the staff of Kempsey High School protesting against such a move? Is the Minister aware also that the advisory committee objects to the transfer? As a matter of urgency will the Minister ask the Minister for Education to direct that the course continue to be conducted at Kempsey?

Mr BEDFORD: Yes.

TENDERS FOR LOCOMOTIVES

Mr JONES: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Transport. Has the Government accepted a tender of \$130 million by Comeng to build railway locomotives at Bathurst? Did an editorial in the *Newcastle Herald* on 18th October state that this tender was let to Comeng to assist the Labor Party in its effort to win the marginal seat of Calare in last Saturday's federal election? Did the editorial state also that the city of Newcastle is not held in high regard because of its strong Labor representation in Parliament? Will the Minister tell the House and the people of Newcastle that the assertion is incorrect?

Mr COX: Recently Clyde Engineering Company Proprietary Limited was awarded a contract for the supply of eighty diesel locomotives at a cost of \$130 million. That followed an evaluation of tenders from nineteen companies. To ensure that the tenders were fully evaluated, the Government brought to this country a representative of British Metal Transmark Limited, the consultant group, to join officers of the State Rail Authority in an exhaustive examination of the various tenders. Following that examination I received a recommendation that Clyde Engineering Company Proprietary Limited should be awarded the contract. That company submitted the lowest tender; in fact its tender was \$14,000 a locomotive lower than its nearest rival.

I am aware that the Newcastle company, A. Goninan and Company Limited, has expressed concern that it was not the successful tenderer. I was disappointed that during the period of evaluation of the tenders Goninans wrote to the Premier and Treasurer, and to other honourable members, saying that if that company were not awarded this contract, it would be forced to dismiss employees. The Wran Government has treated Goninans well by purchasing from it rolling stock for the State's transport system. At present Goninans are completing a contract for the supply of 150 double deck carriages. Speaking from memory, I think the supply of four carriages remains to complete the contract. Early this year that company received a further contract to the value of \$82 million to supply an additional 100 double deck carriages. It is providing also fifty container flat waggons at a value of \$2.2 million, of which nineteen have been supplied. As well, the company has been awarded a number of contracts for the supply of freight waggons. These comprise a \$1 million contract to provide ten side tipping waggons, an \$11 million contract for the supply of thirty wheat waggons and a \$3 million contract for the supply of 100 coal waggons.

This financial year tenders will be called for the supply of a further 800 coal waggons at a cost of \$25 million, 125 container flat waggons at a cost of \$6 million, twenty-five cement waggons at a cost of \$2 million, and fifty wheat waggons at a cost of \$3 million. Goninans will have the opportunity to submit a tender for those waggons. As well as being the lowest tenderer for provision of the locomotives that are the subject of the question asked by the honourable member for Waratah, Clyde Engineering Company Proprietary Limited stated that it will manufacture them at Bathurst and will spend \$2 million in extensions to their plant in that city. The company has stated also that it will spend \$500,000 on plant improvement to produce agricultural equipment to serve the rural needs of New South Wales. The contract will mean the creation of jobs for 1 300 people in Bathurst. That fact alone demonstrates the importance of the contract.

The honourable member for Newcastle also raised this matter with me. I can understand the concern of honourable members whose electorates are in the Newcastle area that Goninans were not the successful tenderer. A full and proper evaluation was made of all the tender documents and the tender submitted by Clyde Engineering was successful as it was the lowest and the company's technology compared favourably with that of any other tenderer.

HOME HELP SERVICE

Mrs FOOT: Last week did the Minister for Health state in this House that reduction of government health costs depended on domiciliary care being provided for elderly persons by supportive organizations? In view of the State Government's inadequate funding of the Home Help Service for this financial year, will many elderly people now face longer periods in hospital or neglect and isolation in their homes? As the federal Government matches half this State Government's expenditure without an upper limit, will the Minister press for this essential funding to assist his own hospital rationalization programme?

Mr K. J. STEWART: Last week when I answered a question asked by the honourable member for Drummoyne I noticed the agitation of the honourable member for Vacluse. I thought she may have asked me a question last Thursday or yesterday; I have been expecting the question that she has asked. My information is that the federal Government does not contribute towards the funding of the Home Nursing Service, which is based at Glebe. Indeed, it is an organization that is funded wholly and solely by——

Mr J. A. Clough: That is not what the question is about.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Health needs no assistance from the honourable member for Eastwood.

Mr K. J. STEWART: Certainly not. I am delighted that the honourable member for Eastwood is advising the Leader of the Opposition. That is a natural disaster and should be funded as such by the federal Government. If the honourable member for Vacluse is suggesting that the Sydney Home Nursing Service is funded in any way by the federal Government, she is incorrect.

Mrs Foot: On a point of order. I base my point of order on relevance. My question related to the Home Help Service and not to the Sydney Home Nursing Service.

Mr K. J. STEWART: If the honourable member for Vacluse has asked a question about the Home Help Service, she should ask it of the Minister for Youth and Community Services.

Mr Mason: The Minister is a squib.

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

HOME SAVINGS GRANT SCHEME

Mr BRERETON: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport. Has the Commonwealth Government yet confirmed its announced intention to amend the home savings grant scheme? Will the Minister inform the House how the revised scheme could assist homeseekers in New South Wales?

Mr SHEAHAN: I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that on several occasions I have informed the House of my representations to the Commonwealth authorities regarding the inadequacies of the present home savings grant scheme. The answer to the first part of the question is, no, the Commonwealth has not yet communicated to New South Wales its intentions, as announced during the recent election campaign, to raise the ceiling for the home savings grant scheme as it applies to New South Wales.

Over the years one of the difficulties with the scheme has been the number of inequities and inequalities in the community that have resulted from the strict implementation of the national criteria for eligibility. The announcement made during the recent federal election campaign was the second foreshadowed increase in the eligibility figure for the home savings grant scheme. The first increase was announced at the time of the recent federal Budget when the federal Government's home savings grant scheme was the subject of much criticism. The ceiling had been set artificially low, particularly when one considers the cost of housing in New South Wales. The criteria meant also that the major beneficiaries of the scheme were homeseekers in States where the values of homes have not increased as markedly as in New South Wales.

To attract a grant under the Commonwealth scheme it is necessary for applicants to have an exemplary savings record. As mentioned by the honourable member for Heffron, the ability of young homeseekers to accumulate the necessary savings to attract a grant has been seriously hampered, first by general economic conditions, and second by the fact that in New South Wales there has been an extraordinarily accelerated growth in private sector rents. Honourable members will be interested to learn that in the past two years the average weekly earnings in Australia increased by 18 per cent, and in the same period in New South Wales rents in the private sector increased by 30 per cent. The honourable member for Heffron and the honourable member for Cronulla have expressed concern in the House about escalating home rents which have caused a major problem for homeseekers in this State. Recently in the House I answered a specific question on that matter asked by the honourable member for Cronulla.

In broad terms the home savings grant inflates the market to the extent to which the grants might be made available to homeseekers. In that regard the policy initiatives announced by my federal colleagues in the Australian Labor Party towards subsidizing interest payments of young homeseekers are a far more effective proposition than the scheme announced by the federal Government. The short answer to the second part of the honourable member's question about whether the home savings grant scheme will assist young homeseekers in New South Wales is, no. The New South Wales Government will continue to press the federal Government to institute a system whereby interest payments, particularly by young homeseekers, if not subsidized by Commonwealth authorities, are certainly made deductible, or at least mortgage premiums are made deductible so that young home buyers obtain a genuine benefit from the limited assistance made available under the scheme.

The attitude of the federal Government to the home savings grant has been consistently to impose the national criteria on home values, which limits the extent to which the grant can be attracted. Those criteria have always been adjusted after it has become public knowledge that the cost of housing, particularly in the Sydney metropolitan area, has outstripped the figure set by the Commonwealth. It is not an accident that, despite the fact that an increased allocation for the home savings grant scheme was announced in the federal Budget, the appropriation made to cover payments under the revised scheme was less than had been made available in the preceding financial year. Young homeseekers in New South Wales must look **only** to the New South Wales Government for assistance in mortgage repayments and certainly cannot rely upon the Commonwealth home savings grant scheme.

WEEMELAH STORM DAMAGE

Mr MURRAY: I address my question without notice to the Minister for Youth and Community Services. Is the Minister aware that on Monday evening the village of Weemelah was almost totally destroyed by a windstorm? What assistance can the Minister's department and the Government give to provide temporary relief to the residents of that village and general assistance to help them to recover?

Mr JACKSON: I am aware of the windstorm that occurred at Weemelah on Monday evening. It demolished two of the seventeen houses in that town, badly damaged two churches and the railway station, and destroyed a cottage of the Australian Wheat Board.

Mr McDonald: What about the hotel?

Mr JACKSON: This is a serious matter for many of the people of Weemelah. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition laughs and jokes about it. His comments are typical of the attitude that his party adopts to such matters. That is why he is well qualified for leadership of the Liberal Party—a party of no humanity. His laughter is typical of that inhumane part of the House. As his actions and behaviour are being conveyed outside the House, he can look forward to an unhappy future in politics.

As a result of that freak storm, some persons have been rendered homeless or placed in a serious situation. The honourable member for Barwon, who represents that area, had the decency to inform the Department of Youth and Community Services that the windstorm had occurred. As a result, I directed officers of the Moree branch of the department to go immediately to that area and render all possible assistance. I assure the honourable member that no one will suffer serious hardship as a result of that storm. Though that type of storm does not entitle those affected to the normal flood or bushfire relief, the department will provide all necessary assistance. Of course, the windstorm could have been covered by storm and tempest insurance and the Government expects persons to insure their property in that manner. Nevertheless, the Department of Youth and Community Services has been authorized to provide all necessary assistance and material to alleviate the immediate hardships. Later I shall confer with the honourable member for Barwon about persons who require permanent assistance. I assure him that the Government will be sympathetic to the people of Weemelah, as it has been since it came to office to anyone affected by disaster.

PARLIAMENTARY CONTRIBUTORY SUPERANNUATION FUND

Motion (by leave, by Mr Walker) agreed to:

That in accordance with section 14 (1) (b) of the Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Act, 1971, Timothy Andrew Fischer be and is hereby appointed a Trustee of the Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Fund in place of David Bruce Cowan.

REAL PROPERTY (CROWN LAND TITLES) AMENDMENT BILL
 CROWN LANDS (LAND TITLES) AMENDMENT BILL
 CLOSER SETTLEMENT (LAND TITLES) AMENDMENT BILL
 MISCELLANEOUS ACTS (CROWN LAND TITLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Motion (by Mr Gordon) agreed to:

That leave be given to bring in the following cognate bills:

- (i) A bill for an Act to amend the Real Property Act, 1900, to enable the Registrar-General to bring Crown land and alienate Crown land under the provisions of that Act without the issue of a Crown grant; and for certain other purposes.
- (ii) A bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, consequent on and in connection with the enactment of the Real Property (Crown Land Titles) Amendment Act, 1980.
- (iii) A bill for an Act to amend the Closer Settlement Acts consequent on and in connection with the enactment of the Real Property (Crown Land Titles) Amendment Act, 1980.
- (iv) A bill for an Act to amend certain Acts consequent on and in connection with the enactment of the Real Property (Crown Land Titles) Amendment Act, 1980.

Bills presented and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr GORDON (Murrumbidgee), Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources [3.12]: I move:

That these bills be now read a second time.

Within the State three parallel systems of recording ownership of land exist, namely, the Torrens register, the register of deeds, in which transactions with old system title land are recorded, and the record of tenures kept under the various Acts dealing with the alienation and occupation of Crown lands. In relation to Crown land tenures there are approximately 20 000 purchase tenures in the course of sale under the instalment system, 34 000 perpetual leases for which Crown grants have not yet issued and 10 000 leases other than perpetual leases. Crown grants would ultimately issue for the perpetual leases, other than those administered by the Western Lands Commission, and for the purchase tenures, but there is a considerable lapse of time between the creation of such tenures and the issue of the grants. This is particularly so in the case of tenures purchased under the instalment system as, under the present law, the grant cannot issue until all moneys have been paid and all conditions attaching to the tenure have been complied with.

The holders of Crown land tenures for which Crown grants have not issued have a statutory title which enables them to deal with their holdings. However, dispositions of the holdings involve many of the features of old system title conveyancing, and registration of a transfer does not carry with it any statutory guarantee of title. In addition, the scale of conveyancing costs is considerably higher than comparable transactions for Torrens title land. It has been the policy of successive governments

that all land capable of being brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900, be incorporated in the Torrens register as soon as practicable. In accordance with this policy the Government introduced legislation in 1976 with the object of eliminating all old system land titles as quickly as possible.

The bills are primarily designed to enable the Torrens title system to be extended to all Crown land holdings. This measure will further rationalize the recording of ownership of land and facilitate the searching of title details, and will reduce the conveyancing costs applicable to dealings with Crown land holdings. Also, it will confer upon the persons having an interest in the holdings the added security of title that is a feature of the Torrens system.

In order to achieve this object, the principal bill, the Real Property (Crown Land Titles) Amendment Bill, will authorize the issue of titles under the Real Property Act, 1900, to persons who are in the course of purchasing land from the Crown under the instalment system. Though these purchasers will obtain an estate in fee simple in the land prior to the payment of the balance of the purchase money, the holding will become liable to forfeiture in the event of non-payment of moneys due to the Crown or non-compliance with conditions attaching to the tenure.

Naturally it will not be possible to convert all these holdings to the Torrens title system immediately. Conversion of incomplete purchases will be undertaken at the discretion of the Registrar General and the rate of conversion will depend upon the resources that can be allocated to the task.

Also the bill will authorize the issue of certificates of title for leases in perpetuity under the Western Lands Act, 1901, and will enable leases from the Crown for a term of years to be brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900. The Registrar General is engaged in a programme for the issue of Crown grants for leases in perpetuity, other than those under the Western Lands Act, 1901. This programme is inhibited to some extent because, as the law stands, grants may issue only where all conditions attaching to the holdings have been complied with and all money due has been paid. Consequently, the bill will authorize the issue of certificates of title for all leases in perpetuity, although money due may not have been paid or conditions attaching to a holding may not have been complied with.

These measures are not limited to the incorporation of Crown land holdings into the Torrens system, for the bill also provides for bringing unalienated Crown land under the provisions of the Real Property Act. The main purpose is to enable the mass production of titles for land in Crown subdivisions in similar fashion to that carried out in freehold subdivisions after registration of a deposited plan. Dispositions of lots in these Crown subdivisions will then be completed by a transfer under the provisions of the Real Property Act in favour of the person entitled. This process will be faster and more economical than the current method of preparation of individual Crown grants as and when the purchase of each parcel of land is completed. If the land is to be dealt with by way of lease this may be effected by means of the execution of an ordinary lease under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900, and the holding will thereafter be dealt with on a Torrens title basis.

Though the disposal of Crown land on a Real Property Act basis is the major reason for the inclusion of unalienated Crown land in the Torrens system, this facility is not confined to Crown land set aside for disposal. It is proposed that, generally speaking, any defined area of Crown land should be capable of inclusion, thus enabling particulars of the parcel to be readily ascertainable through a search of the Torrens register. Whenever unalienated Crown land is brought into the Torrens system by the

Mr Gordon]

issue of a title for such land the registered proprietor of the land will be shown as "The State of New South Wales", thus clearly indicating that the land is held by the Crown in the right of the State.

Crown land is alienated by means of a formal Crown grant signed by the Governor. In future, where Crown land that has been brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act is to be disposed of, this disposition will be evidenced by way of an ordinary Real Property Act instrument registered on the certificate of title, and the Crown grant will become redundant.

There is no reason, other than that of convention, why the title of all purchasers; and perpetual lessees from the Crown could not be evidenced by a certificate of title rather than by a Crown grant. The registered proprietor of land in a certificate of title has a title that is every bit as conclusive as that obtained by the grantee in a Crown grant. Nearly every Crown grant is ultimately cancelled and replaced by a certificate of title. Consequently, the cognate bills dispense completely with the requirements under various Acts for the issue of formal Crown grants, and the principal bill provides for the title of any purchaser or perpetual lessee from the Crown to be evidenced by ordinary certificate of title. This measure will further rationalize and simplify title documents and will expedite the issue of such documents.

As a corollary to the facility to bring Crown land into the Torrens system, the principal bill will enable the retention within the Torrens system of freehold land that reverts to the status of Crown land. At present, upon transfer, surrender or forfeiture to the Crown or upon resumption for Crown land purposes, the relevant certificate of title or Crown grant is cancelled and the land is removed from the ambit of the Real Property Act, 1900, in many cases only to be brought back into the Torrens system later by the issue of a fresh Crown grant. The retention of Crown land within the Torrens system will eliminate this inexpedient practice.

Apart from the major measures that I have just outlined, the bills contain **also** various ancillary provisions designed to improve procedures in respect of Crown land holdings. Provision has been made for a uniform scheme for the determination of the conditions that will attach to holdings at the time of issue of certificates of title for those holdings, and for the recording on the titles of alterations to those conditions. Further provision has been made for the carry over of proprietary interests affecting a leasehold tenure under the Torrens system upon the conversion of that lease to a purchase, and the conversion process will be expedited by removal of the necessity for a formal surrender of the holding to the Crown before creation of the purchase tenure.

The facility has also been provided for persons to acquire a title under the Real Property Act to a Crown land holding by virtue of long-term possession of that land. This measure will overcome a longstanding problem faced by persons who have been in possession of a holding without a documentary title to the land and will be complementary to provisions, introduced by the Government in 1979, enabling possessory titles to be acquired in respect of Torrens title land. I have given a broad outline of the bills and explained the major proposals. For the assistance of honourable members in their understanding of the bills I table additional explanatory information. I am sure honourable members will appreciate the benefits to be achieved by these bills, which I commend to the House.

Real Property (Crown Land Titles) Amendment Bill, 1980

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive of the Bill are machinery provisions relating to the short title, date of commencement, recital of principal Act and arrangement.

Clause 5 authorizes the Registrar General to amend certain folios of the Register and certificates of title where, before the commencement of the Bill, certain registered proprietors of leases in perpetuity were recorded as holding estates in fee simple. This provision will overcome the confusion caused by a previous practice of giving perpetual lessees a certificate of title for an estate in fee simple.

Clause 6 is a transitional provision which will authorize the issue of a certificate of title notwithstanding any existing contract or agreement to issue a Crown grant.

Clause 7 is a transitional provision in respect of surrenders to the Crown pursuant to the conversion to a purchase tenure of any lease in perpetuity where the conversion application had not been finally dealt with before the commencement of the Bill.

Clause 8 is a savings provision enabling the issue of a Crown grant in certain circumstances after the commencement of the Bill.

The Bill omits Part III (section 13) of the Real Property Act, 1900 and inserts a new Part III consisting of sections 13-13M, the provisions of which are as follows—

Section 13 defines the land to which Part III applies, this land being, basically, Crown land tenures and unalienated land of the Crown.

Section 13A provides for the creation by the Registrar General of folios of the Torrens Register in the name of persons entitled to estates in fee simple in land to which Part III applies, thus bringing the land under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900. The Registrar General must create such folios for land in respect of which the purchase money and any other money due has been paid and any conditions attaching to the land have been complied with. In other cases the power of the Registrar General to bring the land under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900 is discretionary.

Section 13B makes, in relation to Part III land held under perpetual lease from the Crown, provisions similar to those in section 13A.

Section 13C empowers the Registrar General to require any instrument of lease brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900 to be lodged for cancellation.

Section 13D enables the Registrar General, by creating a folio of the Register in the name of "The State of New South Wales", to bring under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900 Part III land not covered by sections 13A and 13B. If the land is dedicated or reserved land or land held under a lease for a term of years or a licence, permit or occupancy he may record such particulars thereof in the folio as he considers appropriate. In the case of a lease, he may create a separate folio of the Register for the lease in the name of the person who, in his opinion, is entitled to be the registered proprietor.

Section 13E carries forward the provisions of existing section 13 (3) of the Real Property Act, 1900 relating to the death of persons entitled to be registered proprietors.

Section 13F deems certain amendments to have been made to section 39A of the Real Property Act, 1900 (registration under the Real Property Act, 1900 of mortgages or charges executed before the land is brought under the Real Property Act) for the purposes of its application to Part III land.

Mr Gordon]

Section 13G empowers the Registrar General to record in folios of the Register and upon certificates of title such particulars of conditions, provisions, etc., attaching to Part III land as he considers appropriate and to cancel or remove any such recordings. The section also carries forward provisions in existing section 13 (6)–(8) of the Real Property Act, 1900 relating to the recording of conditions, provisions, etc., applicable to a folio, on a document separate from the folio.

Section 13H replaces section 49 of the Real Property Act, 1900 (relating to the procedures to be adopted where land subject to the Act becomes Crown land). In future, such land will remain subject to the provisions of the Act and the Registrar General may record "The State of New South Wales" as the registered proprietor.

Section 13I provides that a revocation of a dedication or reservation of land, or the cancellation or revocation of any Crown grant, does not effect a cancellation of the relevant folio of the Register under the Real Property Act, 1900.

Section 13J provides that "The State of New South Wales" shall be recorded as holding an estate in fee simple in any lands of which it is the registered proprietor under the Real Property Act, 1900.

Section 13K empowers the Registrar General to create such folios of, and make such recordings in, the Register as, in his opinion are necessary upon the conversion, purchase, subdivision, etc., of a holding under the Crown Lands Acts or another Act (being a holding which has been brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900). The section makes further provisions relating to the carrying over of interests, such as mortgages and easements, when such a holding is converted, purchased, subdivided, etc.

Section 13L contains provisions relating to the execution of transfers, etc., of land of which "The State of New South Wales" is the registered proprietor.

Section 13M allows the Registrar General to register, after land is brought under the provision of the Real Property Act, 1900, certain instruments executed in respect of that land prior to the bringing of the land under the Act.

Schedule 1 (6) inserts new subsections (7), (8) and (9) in section 45D of the Real Property Act, 1900 for the purpose of enabling a title to be acquired to a Crown land holding by virtue of long-term possession. In such a case the existing provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900 relating to the acquisition of title by possession will apply and any period of possession prior to the land being brought under the Act may be taken into account in order to determine whether there has been a sufficient period of possession under the Limitation Act, 1969.

Crown Lands (Land Titles) Amendment Bill, 1980

Clause 1. Short title.

Clause 2. Commencement provisions.

Clause 3. Provision explaining that the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, is referred to in this Bill as the Principal Act.

Clause 4. List of 10 Schedules contained in the Bill.

Schedules 1 to 10 inclusive

Provide for:

- (a) the repeal of all existing provisions requiring the Government to issue Crown grants in respect of purchase, perpetual lease and homestead selection tenures and reserved and dedicated land.
- (b) a person who, under the Crown Lands Acts, has purchased or contracted to purchase land from the Crown or who has acquired land from the Crown by way of exchange (other than a person who has acquired land under a lease from the Crown by way of exchange), to have, subject to the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, an estate in fee simple in the land.
- (c) certain land to be transferred to persons or to the Commonwealth in substitution for existing provisions requiring Crown Grants to be issued.
- (d) any certificate of title, perpetual lease grant or homestead grant issued in respect of various lease tenures or a homestead selection to be forwarded with an application for conversion or purchase thereof in substitution for existing provisions requiring a document of surrender to be executed and forwarded.
- (e) the repeal of numerous provisions requiring the issue of certificates of conformity, or certificates of compliance with or performance of conditions attaching to various tenures.
- (f) the repeal of provisions requiring the issue of a certificate of confirmation in respect of a conditional purchase being a conversion of a conditional lease.
- (g) any certificate of title issued in respect of a conditional lease, Crown-lease, special lease or residential lease to be forwarded with an application for extension of the term of any such lease.
- (h) any perpetual lease grant or certificate of title issued in respect of a weekend lease to be forwarded with an application to purchase such a lease.
- (i) the Minister, in substitution for existing provisions, to create, subject to such conditions and terms as he thinks fit, easements over prescribed lands in the manner provided in—
 - (i) the Real Property Act, 1900, or in section 88B of the Conveyancing Act, 1919, where the prescribed lands are subject to the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900; or
 - (ii) section 88B of the Conveyancing Act, 1919, or by notification published in the Gazette under section 136L of the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, where the prescribed lands are not subject to the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900.
- (j) the Minister to release certain easements over lands vested in Her Majesty.
- (k) the addition of lands within an irrigation area to any land comprised in a purchase under Part VI of the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, which has been completed.

Mr Gordon]

- (l) conditions, etc., attaching or applying to land by virtue of the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, not to cease to attach or apply by reason only of the issue of an instrument of title or the creation of a folio of the Register kept under the Real Property Act, 1900, in respect of the land.
- (m) the Minister to direct, either before or after the creation of a folio of the Register kept under the Real Property Act, 1900, in respect of a holding, that any covenant, condition, reservation or provision of the holding shall cease to attach or apply thereto.
- (n) any lapsing of an after-auction purchase, a tender purchase or an after-tender purchase to be notified in the Gazette and to take effect as a forfeiture.
- (o) the exclusion of minerals from the sale of land by the Crown under purchase tenures in substitution for existing provisions requiring reservation of minerals.
- (p) the exclusion of minerals from the lease or other disposal of land by the Crown under the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913.
- (q) other amendments of a minor, consequential or ancillary nature.

Closer Settlement (*Land* Titles) Amendment Bill, 1980

Clause 1. Short title.

Clause 2. Commencement provisions.

Clause 3. List of 5 Schedules contained in the Bill.

Clause 4. Provides that the Closer Settlement Act, 1904, is amended in the manner set forth in Schedule 1.

Clause 5. Provides that the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1909, is amended in the manner set forth in Schedule 2.

Clause 6. Provides that the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1914, is amended in the manner set forth in Schedule 3.

Clause 7. Provides that the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1919, is amended in the manner set forth in Schedule 4.

Clause 8. Provides that the Closer Settlement Amendment (Conversion) Act, 1943, is amended in the manner set forth in Schedule 5.

Schedules 1 to 5 Inclusive

Amend the provisions of 5 of the Closer Settlement Acts and provide for:

- (a) the repeal of all existing provisions under the Closer Settlement Acts requiring the Governor to issue Crown Grants in respect of purchase and perpetual lease tenures and reserved and dedicated land.
- (b) a person who, under the Closer Settlement Acts, has purchased or contracted to purchase land from the Crown or who has acquired land from the Crown by way of exchange (other than a person who has acquired land under a lease from the Crown by way of exchange) to have, subject to the Closer Settlement Acts, an estate in fee simple in the land.

- (c) the repeal of numerous provisions under the Closer Settlement Acts requiring the issue of certificates of conformity or certificates of fulfilment of conditions attaching to various tenures.
- (d) the Minister, in substitution for existing provisions under the Closer Settlement Act, 1904, to create, subject to such conditions and terms as he thinks fit, easements over prescribed land in the manner provided in—
 - (i) the Real Property Act, 1900, or in section 88B of the Conveyancing Act, 1919, where the prescribed land is subject to the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900; or
 - (ii) section 88B of the Conveyancing Act, 1919, or by notification published in the Gazette under section 39A of the Closer Settlement Act, 1904, where the prescribed land is not subject to the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1900.
- (e) the Minister to release certain easements over land vested in Her Majesty.
- (f) the provisions of section 21 (5) of the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1909, and the regulations under the Closer Settlement Acts relating to the variation, modification and revocation of, and the addition to, conditions attaching to settlement purchases, to apply to and in respect of the terms and conditions attaching to land disposed of under subsection (6) of that section or section 4 (1) of the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1914.
- (g) the forfeiture of land and the reversal of such forfeiture in substitution for the existing provisions empowering cancellation of the contract for sale or lease of land entered into in pursuance of section 21 (6) of the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1909, or section 4 (1) of the Closer Settlement (Amendment) Act, 1914, where default is made in payment of moneys or terms and conditions applicable to the sale or lease have not been or are not being complied with.
- (h) the Minister, upon application, to alter modify or revoke any conditions attaching to a settlement purchase lease or group purchase lease, or without application, to add to those conditions with the consent of the holder.
- (i) any perpetual lease grant or certificate of title issued in respect of a settlement purchase lease, group purchase lease or closer settlement lease to be forwarded with an application for conversion in substitution for the existing provision requiring a document of surrender to be executed and forwarded.
- (j) the exclusion of minerals from the sale of land by the Crown under the authority of the Closer Settlement Acts in substitution for existing provisions requiring reservation of minerals.
- (k) the exclusion of minerals from the lease or other disposal of land by the Crown under the authority of the Closer Settlement Acts.
- (l) conditions, etc., attaching or applying to land by virtue of the Closer Settlement Acts or the War Service Land Settlement Act, 1941, not to cease to attach or apply by reason only of the issue of an instrument of title or the creation of a folio of the Register kept under the Real Property Act, 1900, in respect of the land.

Mr Gordon]

- (m) the Minister to direct, either before or after the creation of a folio of the Register kept under the Real Property Act, 1900, in respect of a holding under the Closer Settlement Acts, that any covenant, condition, term or restriction of the holding shall cease to attach or apply thereto.
- (n) other amendments of a minor, consequential or ancillary nature.

Miscellaneous Acts (Crown Land Titles) Amendment Bill, 1980

Clause 1.—Short title.

Clause 2.—Commencement provisions.

Clause 3.—Provides that each Act specified in Schedule 1 is amended in the manner set forth in that Schedule.

Schedule 1

Amends the provisions of 46 Acts and provides for—

- (a) the repeal of all existing provisions in the Western Lands Act, 1901, the Public Roads Act, 1902, the Returned Soldiers Settlement Act, 1916, the Prickly-pear Act, 1924, the Glen Davis Act, 1939, the Land Acquisition (Charitable Institutions) Act, 1946, the Aborigines Act, 1969, the Zoological Parks Board Act, 1973, the Colleges of Advanced Education Act, 1975, and the Chipping Norton Lake Authority Act, 1977, requiring the Governor to issue Crown Grants in respect of land;
- (b) certain land to be transferred under the Western Lands Act, 1901, the Glen Davis Act, 1939, the Land Acquisition (Charitable Institutions) Act, 1946, the Aborigines Act, 1969, the Zoological Parks Board Act, 1973, the Colleges of Advanced Education Act, 1975, and the Chipping Norton Lake Authority Act, 1977, in substitution for existing provisions in those Acts requiring a Crown Grant to be issued;
- (c) any certificate of title or perpetual lease grant, as the case may be, issued in respect of a lease under the Western Lands Act, 1901, the Returned Soldiers Settlement Act, 1916, or the Prickly-pear Act, 1924, to be forwarded with an application for extension of the term thereof and/or conversion or purchase of the lease;
- (d) conditions, etc., attaching or applying to land by virtue of the Western Lands Act, 1901, the Prickly-pear Act, 1924, or the Glen Davis Act, 1939, not to cease to attach or apply by reason only of the creation of a folio of the Register kept under the Real Property Act, 1900, in respect of the land;
- (e) the Minister to direct, either before or after the creation of a folio of the Register kept under the Real Property Act, 1900, in respect of a lease under the Western Lands Act, 1901, or the Prickly-pear Act, 1924, or of land sold, leased or disposed of under the Glen Davis Act, 1939, that any condition etc., attaching or applying to the land shall cease to attach or apply thereto;

- (f) the exclusion of minerals from the transfer of Crown land exchanged under the Western Lands Act, 1901, or from the sale or other disposal of land by the Crown under the Public Roads Act, 1902, and the Prickly-pear Act, 1924;
 - (g) the exclusion of minerals from the sale, lease and/or other disposal of land under the Returned Soldiers Settlement Act, 1916, and the Glen Davis Act, 1939, in substitution for existing provisions in those Acts requiring reservation of minerals;
 - (h) a person who has purchased, or contracted to purchase, land under the Returned Soldiers Settlement Act, 1916, or the Glen Davis Act, 1939, to have, subject to the applicable Act, an estate in fee simple in the land;
 - (i) the repeal of a provision in the Returned Soldiers Settlement Act, 1916, requiring a local land board to certify that conditions attaching to a purchase granted under section 4A of that Act have been complied with;
 - (j) the repeal of a provision (not yet in operation) of the Water, Crown Lands and Other Acts (Amendment) Act, 1970, permitting the Water Resources Commission to issue a certificate of conformity relating to the compliance of conditions of a lease granted under Part VI of the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913;
 - (k) either sections 181A and 182 of the Crown Lands Consolidation Act, 1913, or sections 15C and 15D of the Closer Settlement Amendment (Conversion) Act, 1943, relating to the continuation of conditions, etc., attaching or applying to holdings and permitting the Minister to direct that any of those conditions, etc., shall cease to attach or apply, to apply to land and holdings comprising land disposed of under sections 4, 4A or 4B of the Returned Soldiers Settlement Act, 1916; and
- (1) other amendments of a minor, consequential or ancillary nature.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Osborne.

MOTOR VEHICLES (TAXATION) BILL

MISCELLANEOUS ACTS (MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION) REPEAL AND AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bills read a third time, on motion by Mr Jensen.

WATER (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 17th September, *vide* page 1095) on motion by Mr Gordon:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr FISCHER (Murray) [3.22]: At the outset I make it clear that generally **the** Opposition supports the bill. I am delighted that my second speech in the Legislative Assembly as the honourable member for Murray is to be on a water bill.

This measure is of particular interest to me because although it has general ramifications, it stems in part from the first of the group licences issued under the Private Irrigations District Act, 1973, to the West Corugan private irrigation district. West Corugan is located on the boundaries of the Sturt and Murray electorates. I have been associated with that scheme nigh on the ten years that I have been a member of this Parliament.

The bill seeks to allow the statutorily incorporated private irrigation districts to pay their renewed group licence fees in equal instalments over a period rather than in one lump sum. The Opposition welcomes this aspect of the bill for it will confer a much-needed benefit on the persons affected in the West Corugan private irrigation district. That scheme was planned in the 1960's by men of splendid foresight. In 1967 work began on this magnificent project west of Corowa. Water is pumped for 70 miles from the Murray River to the north of the Oaklands and Berrigan areas through a very dry part of the Riverina to provide a great deal of drought security, especially during the present period of low rainfall.

As I have said, work on the scheme commenced in 1967 and pumping started in 1969. It caters for 232 farmers in the Riverina holding 282 water rights. Unfortunately, the rising cost of pumping and other services has placed this group licence scheme in some difficulties. Those difficulties are not insuperable but certainly some problems have to be overcome to enable ends to be met and costs kept down for the farmers involved in the scheme. The amendment of the Act to permit of payments of group licence fees by instalments is indeed welcome. It will ease a burden on the farmers concerned. When the storage level of Dartmouth Dam returns to normal this irrigation district will receive additional water allocations.

Another purpose of this amending legislation is to empower the Water Resources Commission to waive certain requirements for the fitting of water meters, as explained by the Minister in his second reading speech. Again the Opposition has no criticism of this aspect of the legislation. It is assumed that the commission will use that provision responsibly. I expect the commission to err in the direction of requiring the installation of meters rather than not. The Minister is seeking to overcome the practice in New South Wales of issuing irrigation licences on the basis of land area rather than water quantity. For example, to receive an allocation of water for 162 hectares, a person seeks a licence for 400 acres—on a land measurement factor rather than water quantitative measurement.

The Opposition strongly supports the gradual conversion of all water licences in New South Wales to a basis of water quantity. There should be no alternative to that procedure. An analogy in the allocation of electricity to power ten radiators would be to measure the number of Kilowatt-hours of electricity used. It is not practical or wise to have a continuing water licence system based on the area of land in use rather than on the actual quantity of water used. The Opposition wants the Government to continue with its scheme of conversion to volumetric water allocations. Much has been done in the Murray River area and elsewhere on this matter, but a great deal more needs to be done. The Minister has set up an anomalies committee. It deals with the Murray scheme but it has been rather slow moving on the matter of volumetric allocations. I hope there will be a breakthrough in resolving some difficulties of the scheme. I realize that the task of water allocations is never an easy one. In many parts of the State it would be sensible to adopt the principle of quantitative allocations. The Minister has previously emphasized the progress that the Government has made towards that end.

West of the Great Divide controversy will soon rage about water allocations, irrigation licences, objections to the grant of licences and delays in land board hearings. The same controversy has occurred throughout many drought-stricken river valleys in New South Wales. In some areas a state of almost civil war threatens to break out between some irrigators who have conflicting interests. Similar controversy is taking place along the Darling River system. A real problem exists as to water quality in the Wentworth area. Objections have been lodged by licence holders against the issue of further licences elsewhere in the State. Planned irrigation schemes are held up and cannot be implemented because of those objections. Many land board hearings have not been completed with the result that a number of objections to the issue of licences have not been decided. Those delays have continued for far too long. Urgent legislation may be required to overcome some of the problems that have occurred.

It is ridiculous for farmers in one part of the northwest of the State to have water notionally allocated to them in water storages, but be unable to get access to it in the middle of a raging drought because of an unresolved legal situation that has arisen over competing applications for licences. The Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources has a clear and massive responsibility to overcome these problems and to make firm decisions concerning them. He has a responsibility to remove the massive delays taking place in determining whether licences will be issued or whether objections will be upheld. The Minister's responsibility is clear cut. He has the opportunity in this debate to explain to the House what he intends doing about this massive problem area which affects the drought-stricken valleys of New South Wales, especially in the northwest of the State. In that area some applications for licences have been delayed for many years and a number of land board hearings require expedition. My simple request is that all outstanding land board hearings should be expedited.

The final part of the bill seeks to extend powers under the Water Act to allow the commission and the Government to vary charges in licences without waiting for their expiry or for other variations to be implemented. It is understood that with rolling instalment payments for licences there is difficulty in effecting any increase or decrease in charges. I am delighted to see that the Minister has referred to the possibility of a decrease as the result of this measure. Honourable members know that I am somewhat of a pessimist, but I feel I shall not live to see the day when a decrease will be implemented under this clause. It is most likely that severe increases in charges will be imposed. I should like to sound a note of warning. In agreeing to the passage of this part of the bill the Opposition expects a measure of responsibility from the Government. The Opposition hopes that the Government will not impose excessive or irresponsible increases.

Although it is tenable that this provision should exist administratively—and the Opposition accepts and supports that proposition—the Government has a responsibility to make sure the provision is not abused by group licence schemes, and other schemes, so that there is no proper means of overcoming any hardship created. That portion of the bill requires a great measure of responsibility from the Government, the Minister and from the Water Resources Commission. I give notice that the Opposition will be carefully monitoring that aspect. The Opposition will observe how the bill is administered to ensure that the primary producers of this State, particularly the irrigators covered by this clause, are not wiped out as a result of sudden and savage increases in charges. The ability of the West Corugan and other scheme users to pay massive increases in charges is extremely limited. Those persons run a tight ship. The cost structure is high when considering the initial lift of water from the Murray River into the scheme, and that is why there must be no excessive increase in charges.

As I said at the outset, in general the Opposition supports the bill. It recognizes the importance of water in New South Wales, particularly for irrigation west of the Great Divide. A terrible drought is wreaking great damage throughout New South Wales. To some extent the effects of that drought can be overcome by irrigation. The Government must be urged to continue providing whatever assistance it can through irrigation. To some extent this measure is a step in the right direction. A great deal more needs to be done, not the least of which is to have improved water storage facilities in the major river valleys west of the Great Divide.

Mr FISHER (Upper Hunter) [3.37]: Briefly, I wish to comment upon the remarks of the honourable member for Murray upon this bill. I commend the provisions which acknowledge that the Water Resources Commission is willing to waive the requirements of the Water Act concerning the fitting of meters. That acknowledges, at long last, the impracticability of fitting meters in many river systems. Some years ago the commission introduced a system requiring all licensed irrigators to fit a meter to their pumps. Though that practice was adopted quickly, many of those meters wore out in a few months. Because of sedimentation in many rivers, the types of meters then available were not practical. I am pleased that the commission adopted the system of calibration of many pumps which, for the purpose of imposing a charge, was an adequate method of requiring irrigators to pay some contribution towards the amount of water they used. The bill acknowledges the need for some compromise. A volumetric method of measurement, such as the use of a meter, may not be practical. However, the calibration system does work and enables water users to be subject to a certain charge. One provision of the bill which concerns me to some extent is the apparent acceptance by the Water Resources Commission that a method of volumetric allocation should be needed at all times and on all rivers.

I trust the Minister acknowledges the difference between irrigating from rivers—such as the Hunter—which run towards the sea and from those west of the Great Dividing Range. The rivers in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area are fed by a series of dams and require the distribution of water through a complex system of channels, in most cases constructed by the commission, delivering water at a moderate fee to the irrigators. The commission delivers water into rivers such as the Hunter and the Namoi, and irrigators are licensed to pump for irrigation, domestic and stock purposes. In most cases the cost of delivering that water to the farms is borne by the irrigator. In those situations the imposition of a volumetric allocation at all times is impractical. I trust the Minister will not impose for ever the present volumetric means of regulating the restricted supply of water on irrigators. There must be some method of allocating a scarce resource in times of drought. I do not believe the volumetric system will prove to be the most practical method.

Irrigation methods have become much more complex in recent years. In spray irrigation areas the travelling irrigator method is often used in preference to the spray line, but it does pose some problems. In previous times of water shortage the commission simply restricted the number of hours that each irrigator was allowed to pump. That was an equitable way of allocating water to irrigators. It was fairer than allotting a volume of water to each irrigator, which he could use over a period of twelve months. Under that system the irrigator could determine, as a matter of management, how he should use his allotted volume of water. I foresee many difficulties arising along rivers such as the Hunter and Paterson from the introduction of this method of allocation. I suggest that irrigators should be allowed to use the amount of water that their pumps are licensed to provide and that they should pay a fee based on the calibration of their pumps. That system has operated in the past and I believe it is the most equitable that can be imposed in normal times.

This debate highlights the need for construction of further water storages. I deplore the action that this Government took when it came to office in reducing expenditure on the construction of dams. Much of the difficulty now facing the Government results from the fact that the construction of dams such as Windamere, Split Rock and Cudal—which had been started by the previous Government—was virtually brought to a standstill. Had the construction of those dams continued, much of the difficulty now confronting many irrigators would not have arisen. One purpose of government is to provide storages so that adequate water can be provided in river systems in times of drought. The construction of water storages is the most effective long-term insurance against drought. I trust the Government has learnt a lesson and that it will now proceed with the construction of water storages along the rivers of the State with the greatest possible expedition, rather than try to reduce expenditure in country areas. Many water storages are being reduced to a dangerously low level. As a consequence the prosperity of many people who depend on the conservation of water is being endangered.

Mr GORDON (Murrumbidgee), Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources [3.47], in reply: The honourable member for Murray said that the West Corugan scheme was in some difficulty. The Government is aware of that fact. The scheme is a private one. When it was inaugurated it was given an allocation of water from the Murray and it was promised a further allocation when Dartmouth Dam became operational. The Government has fulfilled that promise. This will no doubt improve the allocations available in the West Corugan scheme. The honourable member referred also to spreading over five years payments for the licence fee. The sum involved was about \$38,000. The members of the scheme found difficulty in meeting the payment when it became due. This legislation will deal with that situation. The honourable member for Murray disagreed with the honourable member for Upper Hunter about the method of measuring the quantity of water used by irrigators. There is only one way to measure anything—that is, by volume. If it is a mass, it must be weighed. Most rivers have been converted to volumetric measurement.

Mr Fisher: But that does not work.

Mr GORDON: I know the Hunter region has problems with sand and silt. In that case volumetric meters are not practical, as they cut out. The legislation is designed to meet that situation. The honourable member for Upper Hunter need not worry about the effects of this bill. In times of drought the Water Resources Commission wants every irrigator to get a fair supply of water. That can be achieved only by the use of volumetric measurement. The honourable member for Upper Hunter suggested that each irrigator should be allowed a number of hours in which to pump water. If one person has a 2-inch pump and another a 6-inch pump, how can the honourable member's scheme be administered? One property on the Murray has two 32-inch pumps. Another property may have a 4-inch pump. How would the honourable member deal with that situation? The only way the commission can be sure of how much water a particular irrigator uses is to measure it.

Mr Fisher: The measurement is related to the area licensed.

Mr GORDON: That is right, but that is not accurate enough. The only practical method is to measure by volume. The commission takes an aerial photograph and runs a tape around the area licensed. The honourable member for Murray said that the anomalies committee has been slow in its activities. I do not know what the Government can do about that. The committee includes representatives of the Water Resources Commission and the local water users, who give their time to serve on that body. I accept that delays occur.

The honourable member for Murray mentioned the delay in land board hearings because of the number of objections. Most of the objectors come from his electorate. At present the Water Resources Commission has approximately 450 licence applications which have attracted objections by persons who consider their interests may be adversely affected if the licences are granted. Approximately 400 of those objections have been lodged by one person on the lower Murray River. He has mounted a crusade against further irrigation development on any river or stream that in theory is a tributary of the Murray River. Objections have been lodged to applications that propose irrigation of small areas of only 15 hectares. Those areas are on small unregulated streams some of which are located more than 1 000 kilometres from the objector's property. All of those applications will have to be referred to local land boards for public inquiries to be held to determine whether they should be granted. Because each applicant has a right to seek an independent hearing, the inquiries arising from those objections alone could be expected to involve up to 700 or 800 sitting days.

The commission has thirty-four cases before local land boards, and ten of those matters have been listed for hearing. The South Australian Government, which has also joined the crusade, has appeared at inquiries and sought to be heard. I understand that at a recent inquiry the chairman of the land board ruled that he would not permit that Government to participate in the hearing. Since that time the South Australian Minister for Water Resources has personally started to lodge objections against applications. To date he has lodged twenty-six such objections. The abuse of the objection provisions of the Water Act by those remote and politically oriented objectors will effectively delay any further worthwhile irrigation development in this State for a considerable time.

In New South Wales any person has a legal right to object, but a citizen of New South Wales cannot object in South Australia or in Victoria. In Victoria an objector must be a neighbour or someone who can show that he will be affected by the granting of an application. As has been suggested by the honourable member for Murray, it appears that New South Wales will have to introduce legislation to bring its methods of hearing objections into line with those in other States. I and the commission are considering an amendment to the Act.

The honourable member for Murray spoke about the variation of charges during the currency of a licence. Under its present power the Water Resources Commission is able only to vary charges for the right to take and use water when each licence or authority comes up for renewal. The fact that renewals are made every five years stops the commission from varying such charges even when varying costs make this desirable. The situation can develop where adjoining property-owners could pay different sums for the same quantity of water extracted at any one time. Steps are therefore being taken to amend the Water Act to empower the Water Resources Commission to vary charges from time to time and to have any decreases applied simultaneously during the currency of licences and authorities. In effect the proposed legislation will permit the commission to vary charges under section 22c of the Act at any time during the currency of single licences, group licences, permits and authorities.

Both the honourable member for Murray and the honourable member for Upper Hunter mentioned the possibility of drastic increases in water charges. In 1966 the charge was fixed at 28 cents a megalitre. The honourable member for Upper Hunter was critical of the Government and its efforts towards building dams. I do not know why the Opposition persists in that kind of attack, for the Government's record is far better than that of any former government. This Government is spending more money than was spent previously on the building of dams, and it has

provided a bigger staff for that purpose. If members of the Opposition did their homework they would not make such silly comments. I shall mention some of the projects that the Government has completed. Copeton Dam on the Gwydir River is **nearing** completion. The Chaffey Dam is another such dam.

Mr Fisher: Who started that dam?

Mr GORDON: The previous Government started it. I might add that **all** of these dams are in Country Party electorates. The previous Government did not start dams in Labor electorates.

Mr Fisher: The Minister should not bring party politics into this important debate.

Mr GORDON: There is no room for party politics in a debate such as this. Honourable members opposite claim that a Liberal Party-Country Party government commenced building Windamere Dam and Cudal Dam. Not a stone was turned at Cudal and only one property had been resumed when the Labor Government came to office. The previous Government had stopped all work on Windamere Dam and the dam work force had moved out.

Mr Fisher: That is nonsense.

Mr GORDON: It is not nonsense. If honourable members will bear in mind what I am saying, they will not make those silly accusations. As I said in this House last week, the present Government has a tight programme to finish Windamere Dam.

Mr Fisher: It will take another five years.

Mr GORDON: It will be finished sooner than five years, weather permitting, and if the Government is able to keep to its programme. The federal Government is not giving any assistance. Before the federal election that Government trumpeted about how it would assist the State Government to build Split Rock Dam. The previous Government did no work on that project. One property has been resumed, again by this Government. The owner demonstrated undue hardship. I made an offer to a deputation that if it could get some assistance through the national water resources programme for Split Rock Dam this Government would match that assistance. The figure mentioned as providing a reasonable start for the first year was \$4 million. Before the federal election the federal Government made a gesture—and I remind honourable members that the dam is in the electorate of the Deputy Leader of the Country Party—but the best it could do was to provide \$500,000. It will be difficult for the State to meet the long list of conditions imposed by the federal Government. The sum of \$1 million is not the kind of start that I should have liked.

For the record, this Government completed the Copeton Dam and the Chaffey Dam. It called tenders for the wall and built it and paid for it. The present Government started the Buronga salinity control works which had been contemplated since 1970. The former Government did nothing about those works. The Government rebuilt the Euston and Wentworth weirs on the Murray River, the Mollee, Gunidgera and Weeta weirs on the Namoi, weir number 8 on the Darling near Walgett and the Gwydir River distributory works. The Glennies Creek Dam is under construction in the Upper Hunter Valley.

Mr Fisher: The water from that dam will be used for industrial purposes.

Mr GORDON: Pumps cannot be operated without electricity. Part of the storage will be used for industrial purposes and part for generation of electricity, but water will go to the City of Newcastle and neighbouring towns. The Newcastle water board will receive a supply of water to distribute and water will be available

for irrigation. Without electricity the water will be of no use because the pumps will not be able to function. The previous Government vacillated for a considerable time over the Hay weir and the Wakool—Tulakool salinity control west of Deniliquin. The federal Government is paying for half of that project and has provided some money for the Buronga and Berriquin drainage works. The honourable member for Upper Hunter talked about bringing politics into the debate, but he cannot tell the House of any Labor electorate to which the federal Government is giving assistance.

Though I support that expenditure of \$82 million on the Burdekin scheme, I do not support all the money that we pay to the **Commonwealth** going to **Queensland** or Tasmania. In other words I support provision for works but I do not favour money being juggled and sent away from New South Wales. The total value of the works in progress on the drainage scheme at Berriquin amounts to \$200 million. The Opposition is hard to please when it says that the Government has done nothing in the construction of water storages. This is the biggest programme the State has ever had.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

By leave, bill read a third time, on motion of Mr Gordon.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY LONG SERVICE LEAVE PAYMENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 17th September, *vide* page 1102) on motion by Mr Sheahan:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr BOYD (Byron) [4.3]: I move:

That the Question be amended by leaving out the word "now" with a view to adding the words "this day one month".

I wish first to express my appreciation to the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport for his courtesy in making available to me in advance a copy of his second reading speech and the attached notes. A continuation of that practice will lead to a much more objective debate and all will benefit from it. Though the Opposition has elected to move to amend the motion I must point out that there is much that is good in this bill. Its provisions will be welcome to any body involved in the day-to-day representation of an electorate. Many problems have occurred in administering the fund, and they have been apparent for some time. It is most satisfactory that at least some of those difficulties are being rectified by this legislation. The bill, like the curate's egg, is good in parts. In fairness, perhaps I should deal with the good bits first.

It has long been recognized that many administrative problems need to be tidied up and it is good to see some of them being facilitated by the bill. Workers from another State or workers who are on State borders will now be catered for in this legislation. Members who represent country border electorates appreciate the difficulties that can arise when construction operations leapfrog from one side of the border to the other. These factors are part of the scheme; they affect employees and are

part of the concept of this legislation. I note from the examples included in the Minister's notes that he regards most of these matters as one-off cases, but in the border areas these things are happening all the time and are continually throwing up problems. It is to be hoped that these amendments will help to solve them.

For example, workers engaged on contracts of employment receive long service credits for certain absences from work due to illness or injury. The Opposition subscribes to the changes proposed by the Government in that respect. It appreciates the difficulty of a worker who has made contributions but has not had five years' service in the industry. In the past such a man has had a pretty rough deal. It is most desirable that such people should be given full consideration.

On the subject of returns, the Opposition is pleased to see that administrative provision has been made to give a little flexibility so that returns may be made every three months. One understands that this is to be implemented where circumstances justify. I hope that there will be justification in most cases. The provision will save reputable employers a great deal of administrative costs. It will be a much more manageable scheme if judgment is exercised sensibly, as I am sure it will be. As for the extension of time allowed to employers in paying long service charges or to pay them by instalment, we all know what happens in the building industry. People fall on hard times and find themselves in trouble when they cannot meet their commitments at short notice. Therefore, I am glad that flexibility is to be the order of the day as it is much better to keep a builder in business employing labour than for him to become bankrupt and thus taken out of the employing market. Everybody will welcome the amendment in that sense.

The provisions relating to sickness and disability are excellent. Again, there will be flexibility of labour and this is a well-deserved, humane and sensible amendment. The Minister will have the authority to fix fees and allowances without reference to the Treasury. This will remove an anomaly. A Minister should be regarded as having the competence to fix fees without reference to the Treasury. This will provide streamlining and greater flexibility. The original legislation provided for annual notice of service to be delivered personally or by certified mail. Records show that in one year 128 000 items were mailed and 30 000 items were returned unclaimed. The figure of 30 000 is incredible, but an adequate explanation was given and justified the amendment. The whole purpose of contact and communication is to inform, but often this process does not take place. It is wise to so organize the administrative process that notification as laid down in the original legislation is given. No honourable member would quarrel with the provision made for sickness. The humanity contained in that measure is obvious. The Opposition has not found any bad provision in this bill. It is sad that there are one or two things with which the Opposition does not agree.

Mr Egan: The Opposition does not agree with the whole concept of the bill.

Mr BOYD: That is a point I shall come to shortly. The reason for the Opposition seeking that this debate be deferred for a month is that investigations have been made into the operations of the long service leave payment fund. It was of concern that I noticed that the Auditor-General made some remarks about the management of the fund. When debating alterations to an Act dealing with the administration of the fund, it is pertinent that honourable members should pause to consider some of these matters. The debate would be more purposeful if it were delayed for a month to allow the tabling of the report, which has become available.

Mr Sheahan: What report?

Mr BOYD: The McKinsey report is the report to which I am referring.

Mr Sheahan: That report will not be tabled; why does the honourable member say it will be tabled?

Mr BOYD: The Opposition would like to see it.

Mr Sheahan: That is bad luck for Opposition supporters.

Mr BOYD: The Opposition believes that it will assist the debate and the Parliament. I refer the House to page 224 of the Auditor-General's report where the Auditor-General has said:

It was necessary to include a qualification in the audit certificate on the accounts of the Long Service Payments Fund for 1978–79 year in the following terms:

"Due to the inadequacy of the Board's records and unreliability of its systems, it is not possible to form an opinion as to the accuracy of the 1978–79 figures for income from long service charges and employer debtors and creditors. Loss of income, the extent of which cannot be determined, has resulted from the Board's failure to charge interest on outstanding long service charges as prescribed by the Act and from the absence of action to identify and recover unpaid long service charges."

The Auditor-General then went on to say:

Computer system repair projects have been undertaken and it is evident that these projects have been approached enthusiastically and systematically. However, the deficiencies persisted throughout 1979–80 and a similar form of qualification appears necessary in respect of the 1979–80 accounts.

Those comments are pertinent to this debate. It is obvious that the Auditor-General needs reassurance, and if he needs it, then it is needed by the Parliament.

Mr Egan: What has this to do with the bill?

Mr BOYD: If the bill is to be debated objectively—and there are many administrative objectives in the bill pertinent to the functioning of the long service leave fund—it can be done more effectively if a copy of the McKinsey report is made available. The Opposition has moved the amendment on that basis. It may be, as the Minister suggests, that the report is too hot to handle.

Mr Sheahan: I did not say that.

Mr BOYD: The Minister said the Opposition would not see it.

Mr Sheahan: If the honourable member tells lies about what I have said that will bring to an end the courtesies previously shown to him.

Mr BOYD: The Minister said across the table to me that Opposition supporters would not see the report. I assumed from that that it is too hot to handle.

Mr Sheahan: The report has already been handled.

Mr BOYD: The Opposition is entitled to see it. The report reflects upon a substantial amount held in trust by an instrumentality of government on behalf of many people in New South Wales. If there is nothing in the report of which the Minister is afraid he should not object to making the report available to Opposition members.

Mr Sheahan: There is nothing to be afraid of in the report.

Mr BOYD: If there is not, I wonder why the Minister does not wish the Opposition to see it. It is only natural that the Opposition would wish to peruse the report. If it were made available, any suspicion that there is something to be covered up would be dispelled. That is the purpose of the Opposition's amendment. When one looks at the fund, it will be seen that for the year 1979–80 long service leave contributions were \$7,978,166. That is a substantial amount of money to be flowing into a fund on an annual basis. In 1979–80 long service leave payments totalled \$730,178. These are small outgoings compared with the income from contributions paid by employers. In 1979–80 management salaries amounted to \$1.3 million, an incredibly large amount. There were difficulties with the fund, but the administration charge of \$1.3 million is excessive when one takes into account that the fund paid out only \$730,000.

There is need for some investigation. The Parliament should be satisfied that such large expenditure is justified. The total cost of administration for 1979–80 was \$2.5 million. This is an abnormally large expenditure to manage a fund that has accumulated funds of \$33.9 million and last year returned to industry employees only \$730,178. It is significant that since 1975 when the scheme commenced \$1.9 million has been paid out in long service payments and that administration costs amounted to \$10.1 million. There is a degree of disquiet in the figures. Combined with the remarks of the Auditor-General, it suggests there is justification for asking that the debate be deferred for one month so that the Opposition may have access to the McKinsey report. If the report is innocuous, no harm will be done. It would make many people in the public arena more content if they knew there was nothing in the report of which the Government is ashamed. What is the point of having a report if it is not made available to the Opposition?

Mr Sheahan: I get a hundred reports a day.

Mr BOYD: So do I.

Mr Sheahan: I make better use of them than the honourable member.

Mr BOYD: Some of them are useful. This is a report to which the Minister has exclusive access. Members of the public, members of the Opposition and, I dare say, Government supporters do not have access to it.

Mr Sheahan: Nobody does, except me.

Mr BOYD: Opposition members would be willing to spend their time reading the report. That would not be a great burden. It is part of an honourable member's duty to read and comprehend reports, and be advised by them. Recently in the House I mentioned the concern of the Opposition that more funds should be made available for housing. Though \$33.9 million is a large sum, the Minister was reported in the media as being willing to consider making further funds available for housing in a broader sense.

Mr Sheahan: I made that comment in the House, not in the media.

Mr BOYD: The Minister made the remark in the House in answer to a question that I asked. The Minister said \$10.8 million was available in some form or another to the building industry. The Opposition accepts that the first duty in the management of the fund is to return a reasonable profit. At present the profit figure is 10.6 per cent, which is creditable. There is a moral obligation to use the fund to the best advantage of the building industry. There is merit in the suggestion made by the Minister that an interest subsidy be made available to terminating building societies. These societies struggle to get outside finance—and I know that some of them are absolutely barren of this type of finance. Provision must be made to ensure that the fund does not suffer

unduly through provision of this type of money to terminating building societies. An interest subsidy from the Treasury or from some other source should be made available to ensure a steady flow of money back to the terminating building societies to provide assistance and help to the low income family **groups** who have been spoken about many times in this House.

The Opposition asked the Minister to give this important matter special consideration as the many persons who contribute considerable sums of money to the fund would be content if they knew that some of it was flowing in a steady stream back into the building industry, thus ensuring that certain types of building proceed. The Auditor-General's report shows that out of \$33.9 million some \$200,000 was advanced by way of loans to building societies. I assume that was not available to terminating building societies but to the permanent building societies, which appear to do fairly well in obtaining finance anyway. The Opposition is concerned about the shortage of homes in New South Wales, particularly welfare housing. I ask the Minister to make funds available from the \$33.9 million, not to the extent of being detrimental to that sum, to which the Opposition would not subscribe, but to provide a subsidy to service the building industry and assist those who are in need of welfare housing.

The Opposition is concerned also about certain aspects of the retrospectivity provisions contained in the bill. In Committee the Opposition will move an amendment, to which other Opposition members will speak as they feel most strongly about the Government's proposal. There must be some degree of consistency in the administration of all Acts of Parliament. The Opposition would be reasonably satisfied if it were to receive an assurance from the Minister that there will be consistency in the application of this amending legislation. The Opposition will deal more fully with that matter in Committee.

The provisions of the bill include certain people on the fringe of the building industry such as those building swimming pools and erecting fences. This may be a mechanical provision in that previously there was not a clear delineation of where long service leave payments started and finished. I assume that the intention is to provide a clear division. However, a committee of Opposition members has expressed a hope that the proposal is not an attempt to drag in people engaged well outside the general ambit of the building industry and make them contribute to the fund. Although my feeling is that that is not the Government's intention, I have been asked to express that concern. The building industry is a major one. The Opposition would not wish those who may be considered to be on the extreme fringe of the industry, such as persons doing odd jobs who would not normally be regarded as part of the building industry, to be dragged into the legislation when they do not wish to be contributors, nor should that be so.

Some minor provisions refer to a 35-hour week or a 9-day fortnight. This has been suggested by Government supporters as a reasonable proposition as some awards provide already for a 9-day fortnight. Other Opposition members who are more knowledgeable than I on awards will speak on this matter. If it is suggested that there should be an introduction of a 35-hour week into the building industry, that would naturally be resisted by the Opposition. Because of the added costs that would be incurred, a 35-hour week should not be considered in many of our industries. The Opposition is concerned about the cost factor; it is not anti-union or anti-worker. On many occasions both in the House and outside of it the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport has compared the total cost of building in New South Wales to the cost in other States. The Minister stated that in New South Wales, and Sydney in particular, an average home costs \$72,700 and a comparable home in other places is about \$36,400. For example, in

Queensland it is about \$34,500. One must be objective when referring to these costs. Many factors contribute to costs in an industry. The purpose of the debate on this bill is not to inquire into where some of the costs in the building industry are accruing and for what reason, or why they are not accruing in other States. However, it is quite pertinent to suggest in this debate that we must not accept that a 35-hour week is the ultimate aim without subjectively analysing the effect that it will have on costs.

Mr Egan: What has that to do with the bill?

Mr BOYD: If the honourable member had read the bill he would understand. I am referring to some matters raised by the Minister's notes to the bill. I suggest that if the honourable member has not read those he should keep quiet. I remind the honourable member that he is yet to honour the \$100 debt that he incurred recently as a result of being a loud mouth. He said that the federal Labor Party would win the recent election, for which he was practically fleeced of \$100. If the honourable member were a little more attentive and did more reading he may save himself money rather than merely betting on wild chances. My colleagues commented that they did not think that one was born every day. The Minister for Consumer Affairs was a little more experienced and did not fall for the trap. I suggest the honourable member for Cronulla should listen and cease interjecting. If he were to do a little more homework and read the bill and the notes, he would understand what I am saying.

Because of the cost involved, the Opposition will oppose any provision that is designed to give a shorter working week, such as a 9-day fortnight. It concerns me—and it must concern the Government—that the cost of buying a home in Sydney is now \$72,200, compared with \$36,400 in South Australia and \$34,500 in Queensland. That is sufficient warning for the Government to acknowledge that housing is a major problem and that the costs of buying a home must be contained wherever possible. It is not good enough to blame another government. The Government and the Minister are responsible; they must find a means by which the cost of buying a home can be reduced to an amount comparable with the costs of other States. The Opposition will be examining this matter in detail. It might provide the Government with material showing why the cost is too high, but this is neither the time nor the place to do so.

Many of the provisions of the legislation are good. They are welcome, and I commend the Minister for proposing them. They will give relief and tidy up anomalies that have existed for a long time. Honourable members will be aware of those anomalies, for no doubt numerous representations have been made to them on the subject. It is good that some anomalous provisions are being removed and others are being amended to produce a better administrative system for the benefit of all.

Mr MOORE (Gordon) [4.33]: When the Building and Construction Industry Long Service Payments Act became law a considerable number of problems arose, particularly in what is known colloquially as mixed enterprise industry. That was because of the wording of some definitions, particularly the definition in section 4 (1) (i), which included structures, fixtures or works for use in any building or works referred to in paragraphs (a) to (h) of the definition.

The bill will make formal the practice of the Building and Construction Industry Committee of granting exemptions in proper cases. A provision is now to be made for such determinations to be printed in the *Government Gazette*. Provision is to be made also for the publication of the reasons for determinations. In addition, judicial cognizance will have to be taken of such decisions when they are published. On behalf of private industry I say that is commendable. I was involved with an employer organization when the Act first operated. Considerable difficulties arose over interpretations. Subsequently a number of industries that arguably should not have been brought within the compass of the scheme were included because of the broadness

of the definition. I refer particularly to the display manufacturing industry and some parts of the furniture manufacturing industry which, on the ordinary English meaning of the words, would not fall within a definition of the building and construction industry.

It is to the credit of the administrators of the Act that the initial rate of 3 per cent has been reduced to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It would be helpful to Opposition members if the McKinsey report, to which the honourable member for Byron referred, were made available to them. I understand that the board has made at least one generous loan to a somewhat deserving employer organization for the construction of a new building. I am informed that the McKinsey report mentions some serious problems about the long service payment fund and the board in general. I support the deferment of debate for a month to allow the Minister to publish that report in the interests of the public and especially of employees in the building industry. It is as much the fund of those persons as it is the fund of employers. It is much more their fund than it is the fund of the Minister or of the body administering it.

Two provisions of the bill cause some concern. The first of them is the one that will give retrospective long service leave rights to plant operators who were not entitled to have their names entered in the register of foundation workers because they were unable to find work in the industry, were temporarily outside the State in that industry, or were ill or injured, and but for those reasons would have been so employed in January 1979. In those circumstances the Opposition finds it difficult to understand why employees admitted on 1st February, 1977, should have no retrospectivity.

The second matter of concern to the Opposition and to a number of employer organizations is the gradual expansion of the scheme to include employees permanently employed in the construction industry, as distinct from persons who traditionally have been affected by problems of the follow-the-job concept as well as other major industrial problems in the building industry. As the scheme has been expanded well beyond the limits originally intended, it could be the precursor of some sort of **universal**, totally portable scheme of long service rights of employees in this industry or a series of other industries. Its incursion into what is regarded traditionally as mixed enterprise employment concerns the Opposition. The Minister should state clearly that the intention is not to expand the purview of the scheme continually, but to define the limits of operation of the legislation in the building and construction industry. The Opposition hopes those limits have been reached.

Mr GREINER (Ku-ring-gai) [4.38]: Briefly I should like to reinforce a couple of points canvassed by the two previous Opposition members who spoke to the debate. The first concerns the broad conceptual aspects of what is happening to the Builders Licensing Board. There is no doubt that the Government is fairly well along the way to creating a bureaucratic nightmare. The long service leave division of the board has about 100 employees and funds invested of about \$33 million. In the past year the long service leave licensing division had a \$7 million surplus. It appears to have all the earmarks of an absolute bureaucratic monster.

The matters raised in the Auditor-General's report are simply a symptom of that to which I refer. They are a symptom of what the long service leave division is trying to do. It is trying to control and enforce a set of regulations that, in practice, are virtually unenforceable. I do not believe for one minute that simply by repairing a computer system the problem will be resolved. It is a symptom of the old garbage-in-garbage-out syndrome. In that circumstance it is too easy to blame the computer. The Department of Health and the Department of Education also are blaming computers for similar organizational deficiencies. I am willing to bet the Minister that this time next year the problem will not have been solved. The only way to enforce the existing

interpretation of the long service leave provisions in the building industry is by establishing a massive inspectorate. The inspectorate has already grown considerably. Yet as we can see from the Auditor-General's Report—and as anyone in the field will tell **you**—it is simply not possible for the inspectors to enforce adequately the provisions of the legislation.

I come now to my second point, which was alluded to by the honourable member for Gordon. It concerns the thin-edge-of-the-wedge principle. We have some cleaning up to do with builders of swimming pools, fences and other related structures. I have no objection to the inclusion of those persons within the purview of the bill. However, I am concerned about the way the legislation is being interpreted by the inspectors and the Builders Licensing Board. It is continually expanding the scope of the legislation to encompass not only those in permanent employment, but also those in continuing permanent off-site employment in factories who are clearly covered by existing long service leave provisions.

In the residential building industry in New South Wales—in Sydney and also on the Central Coast, to my knowledge—there is a conscious effort by inspectors of the Builders Licensing Board to tell builders they must make sure that their suppliers of kitchen cabinets, windows, wall frames, and a whole variety of products made almost exclusively in factories are produced by persons who are covered by the processes with which we are concerned. Those employees already have long service leave rights. The legislation introduced by the former government obviously was designed to cope with the problems of people who have to follow job opportunities in the building industry—with all the in and out periods of employment that the vagaries of that industry produce. It was not intended to add another layer of bureaucratic regulation, another set of exemption applications to the burden of small manufacturing companies. The way, in practice, that the legislation is being enforced is to push continually outwards the boundaries within which people are said to be subject to the provisions of the legislation. In practice, what happens is that manufacturers who are doing no on-site work of any sort are required to make application to the Builders Licensing Board—no doubt to one of the 100 employees or more engaged in reviewing such applications, and usually approving them. What possible purpose is served by that process?

The Government is not giving long service leave protection to anyone who does not have it already. The only possible point of the exercise is to build up a bureaucracy and a double layer of protection when a single layer of absolutely foolproof protection is already provided. I ask the Minister to examine the whole aspect of how the committee will make a determination on eligibility under these provisions? How is it to carry out this work? He should define clearly and explicitly where the boundaries are to be drawn—if they are to be drawn, as I hope they are. Unless that happens, what we shall have, by way of machinery legislation designed to tidy up a few loose ends, will be a continuing process of extending yet again legislation that serves no purpose at the limits of its functioning, except to place added burdens on employers in the building and building supplies manufacturing industry.

Mr HATTON (South Coast) [4.47]: I strongly support the principles behind the Builders Licensing Board legislation. I have always done so. I come from a retirement area and have seen many tragedies when people have invested a significant part of their savings for retirement or the proceeds from selling their original home, or savings that they have accumulated over a long period, in another dwelling in which they intend to live. They have run the risk of losing money because a builder did not do the right thing.

I am concerned about the long service leave provisions of this bill. They still need much tidying up. I commend the Minister for getting down to the problem. I commend him also for the provisions of the bill covering apprentices for an injury or death after only 55 days' employment. I am concerned about the flow on of benefits to an apprentice who has served in the industry and then is employed in private enterprise. I am concerned also about the accumulation of unused benefits for people who work in the industry for a short period and then leave. What happens to their accumulated benefits? I am concerned also about the contributions asked from some builders, subcontractors and tradesmen. I refer to the money they will contribute to the long service leave fund and the amount of repayments they will receive from that fund. I am told constantly by builders and subcontractors that they can get a better deal from a private insurance company than from the Builders Licensing Board. I should like to hear the Minister make a statement on that aspect. However, it is the position of subcontractors that has caused me quite a deal of thought in this matter. If a subcontractor working on his own is willing to accept responsibility for his long service leave, why should not the amendments of the bill be extended to cover such a circumstance? Why should we make it so complicated?

Why is the Government making the scheme unnecessarily complicated? I find that builders support the idea of the Builders Licensing Board. It gives them a feeling of belonging to an industry that has some standards, and that there is an Act of Parliament by which those standards can be enforced. Equally, there is a feeling among builders that under the Act they are being compelled to foot the bill for a minority of people who do not do the right thing. There is also a feeling among builders and people who work for builders that the level of payment into the fund is too high when compared with the benefits received. There are people who move in and out of the industry, who make contributions but do not remain long enough to get the benefit of those contributions. That is the main thrust of what I wish to say.

Dealing with the principal Act, I am concerned about the delays that are now occurring and particularly about the reluctance of builders to be involved in tendering for work that results from the shoddy work of another builder. This is so in the electorate of South Coast despite the fact that there is widespread unemployment in the area and that many unemployed persons are registered with the **Nowra** and **Bega** offices of the Commonwealth Employment Service. Builders are reluctant to tender for work that is available because inspectors from the Builders Licensing Board find something wrong with a building and call for tenders to rectify it. There is also dissatisfaction on the part of the owners of buildings, for invariably there is a protracted argument about the value that should be placed on the work the owner wants done to restore the building to what he believes it should have been if the original builder had completed the job in a qualified and tradesmanlike fashion.

Mr **SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck)**, Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [4.52], in reply: I thank the honourable member for Byron for agreeing that I need speak once only in replying to debate on the motion and commenting on the amendment, which would adjourn the second reading debate for one month. The Government will not agree to the amendment. The irony is that the delay in bringing forward the legislation—which was caused mainly by drafting difficulties—is the reason for the retrospectivity clause to which some objection is taken. I do not propose to allow the legislation to be delayed for another month simply to enable the honourable member for Byron and his cohorts to wait for the McKinsey report, as it has been called. That is an internal document. It is a management and strategy review of government departments, another innovation of the Government to monitor the performance of the public service.

There is much of merit in the McKinsey report that has been adopted by the Government and by me, and has been implemented by the board. I pay tribute to the chairman of the board, the director of long service leave, and the other senior officers of the board for the way in which they are functioning. I do not propose to table the report. To do so would be unprecedented. I do not propose to allow the debate to be adjourned so that I can have another month to think about the legislation in the light of the report. The honourable member for Byron was concerned about some parts of the legislation. He said much of it was good and welcomed the part of the legislation covering additional groups of workers and making improvements in administrative flexibility.

The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai pointed out that the legislation was introduced by the previous Government. It was a unique, trailblazing measure which we of the Labor Party wholeheartedly supported from the Opposition benches at the time. The legislation did something that had never been done before. Many teething problems have been experienced with it. It seems that the honourable member for Byron and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have not quite formulated a unanimity of view about the way in which the board has complied with the requirements of the Auditor-General. The other night the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that the ship was in a bit better shape this year. The McKinsey report, if it were tabled, would not shed a great deal of light on that matter. There have been administrative difficulties that I venture to suggest would have occurred regardless of which government was in power. They are being rectified. Beyond that there is little point in exploring either the Auditor-General's comments or the possibility of tabling the McKinsey report.

It is easy for the honourable member for Byron to say that the fact that the report will not be tabled—and I have said it will not be—means there has to be a lot of suspicion that there is something wrong with the board, and that the Government is ashamed of the report. Knowing the imagination of the honourable member, as evidenced by some other contributions he has made in recent times to debates in the House, I suppose he will suggest that this means some of the money has gone astray. The Auditor-General's Report makes it perfectly clear that there is no suggestion of any misappropriation of funds. Therefore I want to put the lie to bed immediately, that there is anything to hide about the operations of the board. The board has had an administrative situation that resulted from the enactment of trailblazing legislation that was supported by members on both sides of the House.

The honourable member for Byron raised the matter of my considered reply to his question the other day about investment in building societies. The \$200,000 that I referred to is invested in a permanent building society. He rightly concluded from my statement that the money is not invested in a terminating building society. Good for him. He said the Government should invest this money to the best advantage of the building industry. That is essentially true. It is the sort of consideration that will be given to any future investments by the board, but it has to be taken in the context that the money is necessarily deposited in a permanent building society at an interest rate that would be very different from the interest rate in any alternative investment. We have to balance that against the job-producing potential of the concessional interest rate that would be paid by a terminating building society.

Without prejudging the debate on the suggested amendment, of which the honourable member for Byron gave notice, to the retrospective part of the plant operators' provisions, I can say that the undertaking to make that retrospective was given by my predecessor in the housing portfolio, the Minister for Consumer Affairs. I confirmed it and I support it. The Government will not be changing it. Because that section of the industry was caught up in an anomaly and was unduly disadvantaged by

Mr Sheahan]

the delay in correction of the anomaly an undertaking was given on behalf of the Government that the plant operators would be covered retrospectively. That is the way the Government sees the situation up to this moment. In committee I shall be interested to hear whether the honourable member has found himself to be over concerned about that matter.

I shall deal next with the median cost, not the building cost, of houses. The honourable member may be interested to know that there is a big geographic factor involved in the median cost of housing. In the inner city suburbs—that is those within 6 kilometres of the General Post Office—the median cost is \$96,300. In the middle distance suburbs it is \$89,824. In the outer suburbs—that is, those more than 25 kilometres from the General Post Office—it is \$54,000. So when the honourable member reflects on the fact that building costs are high, he should keep in mind that the Government is endeavouring to contain them. That matter is not directly relevant to the provisions of the bill before the House.

The honourable member for Gordon commended some parts of the legislation, and particularly the provision that will enable the board to reduce the rate of contribution. He referred also to the McDonnell report, and I have dealt with his comments on that matter. The honourable member made a curious remark to the effect that the board had made a loan to an employer organization. He described that organization as being somewhat respectable, but he did not name it. No such loan has been made to an employer organization. In about 1976 the Master Builders Association sought finance by way of mortgage to erect a new building. The board's investments elsewhere attracted interest at 14 per cent per annum, and as the Master Builders Association was able to obtain a better deal elsewhere, it did not proceed with any formal approach to the board.

The honourable member for Gordon expressed concern that the scheme could become the precursor to a universal right to long service payments in mixed industries. That may or may not be the case in future. This legislation was introduced because one major industry employing a larger number of workers was not giving benefits to its employees under the Long Service Leave Act of 1955. In fact, the anomaly was corrected by a previous government. This Government supported that move and it will continue to do so. One must have some kind of industrial equity for all people in the work force and one must be flexible when schemes are available elsewhere. However, that is not the issue that is now before the House.

The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai spoke of a bureaucratic nightmare that may be developing at St Leonards and the administrative cost of the fund as against the benefits paid; the honourable member for Byron made similar comments. The fact is that the long service payment scheme has been in operation for five years. At this stage it is obvious that a heavy administrative cost is involved and that few benefits will be received until those concerned have established their eligibility. I take this opportunity to congratulate the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai on his maiden speech. He and I first met at the end of 1963 when we were sitting for the leaving certificate examination. Later we joined a community-based organization. We attended lectures together at university and now our careers have again crossed. I welcome the honourable member to the House. He has an enormous task to fulfil in following the Hon. J. C. Maddison, a distinguished parliamentarian. I welcome his contributions to our deliberations. I do not say that I agree with everything he said, but I welcome suggestions from anybody—and this applies also to the honourable member for South Coast—about my administration. I am always glad to get the

views of other people. If I am told in a debate that something is wrong with the way I run some part of my administration and the person concerned does not say how it can be put right, such an attitude is not constructive. I welcome the opportunity to consider any constructive suggestion.

The honourable member for South Coast referred to the dilemma of sub-contractors in the industry. He said that the Government had commissioned an inquiry into the terms of employment in the building industry. That inquiry was conducted by a former conciliation commissioner, Mr Burns. The report of that inquiry is not yet available. The honourable member for South Coast suggested that the report should deal in some detail in particular with the position of subcontractors and employees. I commend to the honourable member the report of the McDonnell inquiry into the road industry. That inquiry faced a similar dilemma. The Government has not made changes in the subcontractor-employer relationship in anticipation of the Burns report.

The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai said that all workers were covered by the 1955 Act and that they had an option to elect under which Act they received benefits. I do not think the honourable member's remarks on that topic require a great deal of embellishment from me. He said there would not be opposition to expansion of the coverage of the scheme. I shall certainly not go out of my way to give the honourable member ammunition to use against me on a future occasion. The Leader of the Country Party is on record as saying that the scheme and the board are a disgrace and both should be abolished. An extraordinary article containing comments made by that honourable member appeared in the *Cape Hawke Advocate* on 24th April. I suggest that the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai should examine that article because his colleague the Leader of the Country Party is not in the House today to speak on this bill. When Sir Eric Willis introduced the scheme in 1974, he said:

The purpose of this bill is to confer on workers in the building and construction industry in this State long service payments as a reward for their services in the building and construction industry on a basis generally equivalent to the standard which other workers in this State are presently able to receive under the provisions of the Long Service Leave Act, 1955, as amended.

The introduction of a scheme to provide long service benefits for workers in the building and construction industry has been sought for many years since the introduction of the Long Service Leave Act in 1955.

The Government is pleased to be able to introduce this legislation which will extend the benefit of long service leave to employees in the building and construction industry . . . The Government is happy to be able to play its part in this co-operative effort just as it is always prepared to make every effort to achieve greater co-operation and harmony in the industry area. I am sure that this proposed legislation will be welcomed by all members and I commend the bill to the House.

Obviously the Leader of the Country Party does not share the same enthusiasm because he made no comment in the House during debate on the legislation. He remained strangely silent until he was confronted by a meeting of sixty people involved in the building industry in his electorate. The meeting was reported in the *Cape Hawke Advocate* on 24th April 1980. Although he has made no comment in this House on this legislation, when he attended that meeting in his electorate he said:

The present undemocratic application of the guillotine in State Parliament was allowing these ill conceived acts to become law without proper debate and publicity.

Mr Sheahan]

He promised his full support in any attempt to overthrow what he called "this crippling and unfair legislation". The original legislation was introduced by Sir Eric Willis in 1974 and was supported in Parliament by all parties. That legislation was rushed through; it was not given as fair a go as this bill is being given. Neither the gag nor the guillotine has been used. There has been no sign in this debate of the Leader of the Country Party. We have seen only the honourable member for Byron.

The honourable member for Byron is out of step with the Leader of the Country Party and the rank and file of that party. When the original legislation was introduced the Leader of the Country Party supported it. The chairman of the Country Party branch in the area represented by the honourable member for Byron, Mr Duncan Dark, was reported as saying that this sort of attack on private enterprise will continue while Labor is in office in this State. He is Dark by name and dark by nature; certainly he is in the dark on this issue as the legislation was introduced and supported by the parliamentary members of the party to which he belongs. The aims of the bill are not opposed by the honourable member for Byron. Although the Leader of the Country Party is having difficulty walking, I suggest that when he is able to return to Cape Hawke he should inform the sixty people from the building industry who were present at the meeting and Mr Duncan Dark that the legislation was conceived, introduced and the amendments to it supported by the parliamentary members of the Country Party and by the Opposition generally.

Obviously Mr Dark and the Leader of the Country Party were a little unhappy about the things that had been said by some members of the building industry. The Opposition's present attitude is part of a concerted campaign against the scheme being waged on the lower North Coast. The Government is doing the best it can to assist those who do not understand the legislation and did not take the trouble to inform themselves about it. One of the convenors of the meeting that was attended by the Leader of the Country Party said he could not understand how the legislation got through the Parliament. The Leader of the Country Party, who was a Minister in the former Government and participated in the decision to introduce the legislation, did not allay that person's fears. The Government is attempting to deal with the problems that have emerged following the operation of the Act. The bill is one method of resolving those problems. I welcome the support of those honourable members opposite who stated that they did not oppose the principles of the bill or the necessary administrative improvements that it will bring. I commend the bill.

Question—That the word stand—put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 54

Mr Akister	Mr Degen	Mr Johnstone
Mr Anderson	Mr Egan	Mr Keane
Mr Bannon	Mr Einfeld	Mr Knott
Mr Barnier	Mr Face	Mr McCarthy
Mr Bedford	Mr Ferguson	Mr McGowan
Mr Booth	Mr Gabb	Mr McIlwaine
Mr Brereton	Mr Gordon	Mr Maher
Mr Cavalier	Mr Haigh	Mr Mair
Mr Cleary	Mr Hatton	Mr Mallam
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Hills	Mr Mochalski
Mr Cox	Mr Hunter	Mr Mulock
Mr Crabtree	Mr Jackson	Mr O'Connell
Mr Day	Mr Jensen	Mr O'Neill

Mr Paciullo	Mr Sheahan	Mr Wilde
Mr Petersen	Mr A. G. Stewart	
Mr Quinn	Mr K. J. Stewart	
Mr Ramsay	Mr Walker	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Robb	Mr Webster	Mr Flaherty
Mr Rogan	Mr Whelan	Mr Wade

Noes, 29

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Pickard
Mr Barraclough	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Boyd	Mr Greiner	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Healey	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr McDonald	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr Mason	Mr West
Mr Cameron	Mr Moore	Mr Wotton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Murray	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Osborne	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Park	Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

Schedule 1

Mr MOORE (Gordon) [5.22]: During the second reading debate the Opposition said that it would not support the granting of the retrospectivity which would be provided by proposed new sections 11 (3) and (4). In his reply the Minister gave a curious explanation about the proposed retrospectivity. First, he said that the former Minister for Housing had given a certain undertaking. Second, he said there had been problems in drafting the amendments to the Act. I have far greater respect for the ability of the Parliamentary Counsel than to think it would take two years to draft those amendments. On behalf of the Opposition, I move:

That at page 9, all words on and from line 10 down to and including line 35 on page 10 be left out.

Mr SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [5.24]: I said at the second reading stage that the honourable member for Byron should have given notice that the Opposition intended to move this amendment, which is unacceptable. A former Minister for Housing gave an assurance that those people who were badly disadvantaged by their anomalous exclusion from the benefits of the Act would have the benefit of retrospectivity. I commend the schedule.

Question—That the words stand—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 54

Mr Akister
Mr Anderson
Mr Bannon
Mr Barnier
Mr Bedford
Mr Booth
Mr Brereton
Mr Cavalier
Mr Cleary
Mr R. J. Clough
Mr Cox
Mr Crabtree
Mr Day
Mr Degen
Mr Egan
Mr Einfeld
Mr Face
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gabb

Mr Gordon
Mr Hatton
Mr Hills
Mr Hunter
Mr Jackson
Mr Jensen
Mr Johnstone
Mr Jones
Mr Keane
Mr Knott
Mr McCarthy
Mr McGowan
Mr McIlwaine
Mr Maher
Mr Mair
Mr Mallam
Mr Mochalski
Mr Mulock
Mr O'Neill

Mr Paciullo
Mr Petersen
Mr Quinn
Mr Ramsay
Mr Robb
Mr Rogan
Mr Ryan
Mr Sheahan
Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr K. J. Stewart
Mr Walker
Mr Webster
Mr Whelan
Mr Wilde

Tellers,
Mr Flaherty
Mr Wade

Noes, 30

Mr Arblaster
Mr Barracrough
Mr Boyd
Mr Brewer
Mr J. H. Brown
Mr Bruxner
Mr Cameron
Mr J. A. Clough
Mr Duncan
Mr Fischer
Mr Fisher

Mrs Foot
Mr Freudenstein
Mr Greiner
Mr Healey
Mr McDonald
Mr Mason
Mr Moore
Mr Murray
Mr Osborne
Mr Park
Mr Pickard

Mr Rozzoli
Mr Schipp
Mr Singleton
Mr Smith
Mr West
Mr Wotton

Tellers,
Mr Caterson
Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Schedule agreed to.

Adoption of Report

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Sheahan.

BILL RETURNED

The following bill was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment:

States Grants (Rural Adjustment) Agreement Ratification (Amendment) Bill

LAND COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 17th September, *vide* page 1104) on motion by Mr Sheahan:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr BOYD (Byron) [5.35]: I appreciate the Minister's courtesy in providing me with a copy of his speech and a copy of his notes. In his second reading speech the Minister dwelt at length on the purpose of the Land Commission of New South Wales and what it was designed to achieve. He said:

The commission has a prime function to acquire land for present or future urban development and for public purposes and, in the performance of its functions, to make residential land available to home-builders at the lowest price the commission considers practicable, having regard to the costs incurred by the commission in relation to the land and the financial resources available for the commission's continued operations.

The Land Commission has been functioning for a considerable time, and it would not do any harm for Parliament to take the opportunity occasionally to assess whether the commission was achieving its objective. Apparently the Land Commission has now spent \$54.7 million, which is a steep increase on the expenditure shown in the commission's last annual report. I have been informed that as at 30th June, 1980, the Land Commission had placed on the market 3 113 blocks of land. Large areas of raw land are still available to the commission. If the same amount of money had been given to the Housing Commission, it could have built about 2 000 houses.

Mr Sheahan: For how much?

Mr BOYD: For something better than \$20,000 a house, which was the figure the Premier and Treasurer gave earlier as the gross unit cost when he spoke of putting some State funds into housing. I am taking somewhere about middle ground to make my comment. The Land Commission is providing land only when we could be getting a home as well. It is an interesting exercise. The work of the Land Commission was supposed to be to provide home sites at a reasonable cost. In some parts of the report of the Land Commission the commission says it has done that. It claims to have reduced the cost of land in certain areas by \$2,000 or \$3,000 a block. That is startling when one thinks about it. In effect, what the Land Commission is doing is providing land in many cases, on which young couples can build their first home, at prices \$2,000 to \$3,000 below the market value.

Mr Mallam: Does the honourable member know why the land is cheaper?

Mr BOYD: That is an interesting point. I shall think about it. When the Land Commission Bill was introduced in this House in 1976 I was recorded as saying I was sure from my experience that private enterprise could do this job just as effectively as the Land Commission, and could do it cheaper. I cited a big land development project in the electorate I represent in order to prove the point. What I said is recorded in *Hansard*. I shall not go over it again. It is a fact. If the Government is proposing to outlay \$54.7 million, it might do better to subsidize young people who want to put up their first home.

Mr Mallam: The honourable member's argument is ridiculous.

Mr BOYD: That is exactly what the Government is doing by this legislation. It will provide a subsidy to people who are putting up their **first** home or a home. That is what this legislation is all about, if the honourable member for Campbelltown

will think about it. The Government is paying a subsidy to some persons in the community to enable them to put up their first home. The honourable member says my argument is ridiculous.

Mr Mallam: I am surprised at the honourable member.

Mr BOYD: I quote from the *Australian Property Investor* of September 1980, what someone else has said about it:

Sydney has, over the last 18 months, experienced land price increases unprecedented in history. Prices for developed allotments have increased almost 100 per cent over the 18 months with prices moving from \$14,000 to \$28,000 at Fairfield, from \$28,000 to \$56,000 at West Pennant Hills and from \$50,000 to over \$100,000 in prime locations such as East Pymble. Any person who has tried to purchase a house or land in Sydney over this period is aware of the magnitude of these price increases.

Property Investor in its issue 1979 first started to draw its readers' attention to the reason for these increases, and, to repeat, the reason is the oldest economic law—"supply and demand".

Property Investor's information suggests that for the five years ending June 1980 there were over 40 000 more houses built in Sydney than there were new allotments of land produced. Currently, with housing commencements recovering and likely to be above 18 000 for 1980, it is unlikely that 10 000 allotments will be produced in the same period. In Property Investor's view there was a healthy surplus of allotments available to purchasers until 1978. This surplus tended to stabilize developed allotment prices as sellers had to fight to make a sale in a competitive market place. Today sellers can sell a whole stage of a development, say 30–50 allotments, over a weekend. Today, supply of new allotments is barely meeting half the consumption rate indicated by new housing starts.

This situation has been obvious to many builders and others in the construction industry for some time. In June the Housing Industry Association took the unusual step of calling a press conference on this subject. Yet the surprising aspect of this situation is that it has not attracted much political comment a remarkable failure of the State opposition parties when it is many key Labor seats in the Western Suburbs which are the most affected. The massive escalation in housing prices in Sydney over the last year has left people already on the housing cycle i.e. owning a house, better off, but the problems of those not on the cycle are starting to emerge. The minimum price for a very basic house and land in the outer Western Suburbs is over \$50,000, companies and the public service cannot transfer staff to Sydney without making massive housing cost adjustments to income. Housing prices are now the major influence in encouraging persons owning homes to sell up and shift from Sydney and to discourage persons to shift to Sydney.

Property Investor sees the current land and housing price boom as basically being derived from a shortfall in supply of developed allotments for at least the last five years. At no time over these five years, even at the bottom of the "crash" in 1977, has supply of allotments been more than two thirds consumption as indicated by housing commencements.

The failure of the supply mechanism can be laid very fairly at the feet of the Government. There is not sufficient land zoned for residential development in Sydney and much of what is zoned is unavailable for development due to bureaucratic delays such as the failure of local government to produce control plans over areas released for development.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! It is not in order for the honourable member to quote at length from newspaper articles or editorials in journals. He can make only brief reference to such a document. Similar rulings have been given on many previous occasions.

Mr Sheahan: On a point of order. In the context of the ruling you have just given, Mr Deputy-Speaker, I point out that in my second reading speech I did make reference to the unquestioned success of the Land Commission, but the bill is merely administrative in effect, and deals with two specific matters. Much of the argument of the honourable member for Byron is outside the order of leave of the bill.

Mr Boyd: On the point of order. I was merely replying to the comments of the Minister when introducing the bill, and I thought I was perfectly in order.

Mr Sheahan: My speech was brief.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Byron must confine his remarks to the motion, that the bill be now read a second time. The objects of the bill are limited and his remarks on it must be within those limits.

Mr BOYD: I thought my point was pertinent to the opening remarks of the Minister. There does seem to be some disquiet about giving the Land Commission powers greater than those it already has. That disquiet has been conveyed to me. I have been told by many people that they do not mind trading in fair competition with the Land Commission, but a considerable number of them complain that the Land Commission does not comply with local government ordinances and that it gets special privileges.

Mr Mallam: That is not true.

Mr BOYD: I am stating the complaint that has come to me.

Mr Sheahan: Where did the honourable member get the complaint from?

Mr BOYD: If it is not true, the Minister has made his point.

Mr Sheahan: And the honourable member has told a lie.

Mr BOYD: I have not told a lie. I have stated the complaint that has come to me.

Mr Sheahan: Where did the honourable member get the complaint from?

Mr BOYD: Does the Minister not understand that I am saying the complaint has come to me. I am telling him that and he is saying that it is a lie.

Mr Sheahan: It is wrong.

Mr BOYD: If it is a lie, it is a lie. I am merely stating the complaint that has been conveyed to me.

Mr Sheahan: Where did the complaint come from?

Mr BOYD: It has come to me from many members of the Opposition who are active in local government. If the Minister wants to follow it up with them, that is his privilege. As the Opposition spokesman on this bill, I am telling the Minister that the complaint has come to me and I am expressing it in my contribution to this debate.

Mr Sheahan: Whether it is true or not.

Mr BOYD: The Minister can do what he likes about it. If he wants to say the complaint is a lie, that is his privilege. Those concerned would not have said it unless they believed it was true and had some evidence of it. The bill provides for the

Land Commission to trade under conditions designed to ensure that there is no abuse by speculators of the availability of land at subsidized prices. Neither I nor anybody else would have any quarrel with that. Appropriate provisions in the contract of sale to cover that matter should be sufficient. However, the Government has seen fit to go further and provide for public notification of each deal. If there have been any signs of abuse in trading in these blocks, we should like to hear about them. I have no evidence of it. No doubt there must be some justification for these provisions, otherwise they would not be included in the bill in order to close a loophole. I have no objection to closing loopholes if one is dealing with subsidized land.

Mr Sheahan: It is not subsidized.

Mr BOYD: The Government has spent \$54.7 million to put 3 113 blocks on the market, and it is selling those blocks below cost. Of course the land is subsidized.

Mr Sheahan: Who said it is being sold below cost?

Mr BOYD: The substantial sum of \$8 million is accounted for by deferred liability payments. If that is not a form of subsidy, perhaps I may be told what is. Also, the scheme has had the benefit of Commonwealth Government finance amounting to \$16.9 million, which is a fair subsidy, and the New South Wales Government has made grants of \$15 million.

Mr Sheahan: Is the honourable member saying that is a subsidy?

Mr BOYD: I am quoting the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr Sheahan: It is not a subsidy by way of advance.

Mr BOYD: I am talking about grants. I am now told that it is an advance. Let me read to the House the phrase used in the documents. It is, "a New South Wales Government grant of \$15 million."

Mr Sheahan: The honourable member was speaking about a subsidy by way of advance.

Mr BOYD: The word that was used was grants. That is the problem. There were also loans of \$10 million, which is a great deal of money. If the Government is outlaying a figure of \$54 million to provide 3 113 blocks, there should be no abuse of privilege. Therefore, I have no quarrel if it now seeks to close loopholes. A great deal of government money is being poured into this effort. When do these advantages stop? When will the Land Commission begin to trade evenly and competitively with other people in the market? These are questions that are being asked. When the Land Commission legislation was first introduced I took the view that there were many land developers in New South Wales who had put at risk their own money and had taken not a penny of Government money. They had put their own money on the line and had accepted the losses and had taken the gain. That is what the market place is all about. In that way they provided cheap land. Cheap land has been provided by private enterprise in some cases at half the cost of Land Commission holdings.

Mr Sheahan: Where?

Mr BOYD: In probably one of the best subdivisions one has ever seen, and that is at Brunswick Heads.

Mr Sheahan: That is a fair way away from Sydney.

Mr BOYD: It is, but the extraordinary thing is that virtually all the people who are retiring to Brunswick Heads are former city dwellers who could not buy supposedly cheap blocks of land in the city. How much of that \$54 million has the Government spent in the country?

[Interruption]

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The honourable member for Byron should ignore interjections. If Government supporters wish to take part in this debate, they should seek the call and I shall try to accommodate them later.

Mr BOYD: I apologize, Mr Deputy-Speaker, for allowing myself to be distracted. Some of the interjectors have been persistent.

Mr Sheahan: Is the honourable member ready to talk about the bill?

Mr BOYD: I am talking about the purpose of the bill, which is to give the Land Commission the opportunity of closing some of the loopholes that apparently exist. I did not hear the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport give examples in his speech of those loopholes. Surely it is reasonable for him to agree that there has been some abuse of the system. If there have been abuses, we should like to know where they occurred. We are interested in the future of the State and we want to see steady progress.

Mr Sheahan: The honourable member is not interested in the future of the Land Commission.

Mr BOYD: I am, but I want to see it perform correctly. I want to ensure the utilization of funds in this State to the best possible advantage. The Opposition does not want to see money squandered on a grandiose scheme that serves only a small section of the community. So far only 3 113 families have received benefits from an investment of \$54 million. No doubt others will benefit in future but to date they are the only beneficiaries. The Land Commission's operations appear to be confined to the greater metropolitan areas of Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong—

Mr Sheahan: Read the report.

Mr BOYD: Perhaps we can be told where all the money is going. We in the country do not see much of it. To my knowledge, nothing has been spent on the far North Coast. Some money has been spent in the western towns close to Sydney but very little has been spent outside the metropolitan area. We should like to spread the money round the State a little. There are many people who cannot get a decent block of land in Sydney. People are coming into my electorate to buy land offered by private enterprise organizations and they are happy to come there. One wonders why that should be so.

The Opposition is opposed to the bill in principle only. We are concerned that the Land Commission has not yet done what was expected of it. Some people believe that the criteria used for selecting applicants for Land Commission blocks are unfair in that they discriminate unreasonably. I do not take that view. I have no objection to the closing of loopholes if it can be demonstrated that they exist. I hope we shall be told where the loopholes and the abuse exist. It is important that we should know. If there is a need to gain a special advantage over commercial undertakings, industry in general, land development firms and similar enterprises, the Government should give the House instances where it has been disadvantaged and assert that these are the reasons for requiring special provision to close loopholes and thus ensure that the system is not abused. I ask the Minister to provide that information, which the Opposition would be happy to receive.

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

Mr ANDERSON (Nepean) [7.30]: I am amazed that Opposition members should say that they oppose the bill in principle when for the eleven years they were in government they did nothing to promote the type of activity being undertaken by the Land Commission. The statements the Opposition made prior to the dinner adjournment demonstrate its appalling ignorance of the operations and effect of that commission. I agree that as at 30th June this year some 3 113 lots had been sold. By the end of the year that figure will increase to 5 000. The Land Commission has control of some 18 000 potential residential lots. One can well imagine the plight of many young couples and other prospective purchasers of homes and land if the Land Commission had not been established to acquire land and make it available. I well recall the problem that faced my wife and me shortly after we were married about ten years ago. Because we were newly married and had little money, properties in the eastern suburbs, where we were residing, were too expensive for us to purchase. After looking round we bought a property at Emu Plains. I have never regretted that, and I hope my constituents have not regretted it. That is typical of the problems that faced young married couples at that time. The problems they face today are of even greater magnitude.

The purchasers of Land Commission land are mainly young married couples, the majority of whom have either no children or one or two children. The Land Commission affords them the only opportunity to purchase a block of land or a house at a price which permits them to lead a reasonable way of life. Prior to the dinner adjournment the honourable member for Byron referred to the reasons for increases in land prices that appeared in the publication the *Australian Property investor*. Most persons would know that the cost of homesites has increased because there is insufficient land suitably zoned and released for sale. The Land Commission has had a significant impact by making available land for purchase.

I have raised with the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport, and the Minister for Planning and Environment the Housing Commission's holding at Regentville, which is also referred to as South Penrith. That holding consists of 4 000 lots. The Land Commission should acquire the land and develop it. It should include a Housing Commission component. One difficulty is the opposition to the activities of the Land Commission and the Housing Commission. At various times some persons, who are either independents or members of the Liberal Party—depending on the type of campaign that is current—oppose the activities of the Land Commission and become quite hysterical at the mere mention of the Housing Commission. If those persons were to visit my electoral office or that of other Government supporters they would learn of the plight of the many citizens who require Housing Commission accommodation or wish to purchase Land Commission land. Opposition members claim that the Land Commission has not had any significant impact on the cost of land.

Mr Greiner: That is correct.

Mr ANDERSON: I inform the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai that the price paid for land at St Clair this year was less than the price that Cambridge Credit asked for it in 1974. The 1980 price does not take into account any indexed adjustment; it is the basic price of that land. Notwithstanding inflation and other factors that have increased costs, the Land Commission is selling land at St Clair for less than the price at which a private developer was selling it six years ago. If persons who suggest that the Land Commission subsidizes the purchase of land were to learn of the operations of the commission, they would know that is not possible. The commission purchases land and when it is re-sold one can see in the selling price components

for the acquisition of the raw land, the servicing and management costs, administration and marketing, and a small component which one might term profit. The difference between the operations of the Land Commission and private developers is that the commission does not seek to make excessive profits from the land it puts on to the market.

About 20 per cent of the land that has become available in recent times has been made available through the Land Commission. Some persons suggest that councils give the Land Commission special treatment. I am a member of the Council of the City of Penrith. That council has had the greatest Land Commission development of any council, and I can assure honourable members that the commission does not receive special treatment. Although the officers of the Land Commission would agree that there have been long and heated discussions between that council and the commission about the commission's activities, and relations between them were strained, the problems have been resolved to the satisfaction of both parties. This is reflected by the extensive Land Commission activities at York, St Clair and Werrington Downs, of which the commission, the council and the people who have been fortunate to purchase land and commence living there, are proud.

One factor that is often not taken into consideration when comment is made about the cost of land sold by the Land Commission is that it has electricity, water, sewerage, kerbing and guttering, roads and community facilities, all of which were not provided—and were not required to be provided—as part of the developments that proceeded when the Government supported by Opposition members was in office. As I have had to wait for nine years for the sewer to be connected to my home, I have considerable feeling for those who are in a similar predicament. That does not happen with Land Commission homesites. The Government's planning policies will not allow it to happen. If those honourable members opposite from the North Shore and the inner city areas, who are smiling, had to suffer the inconvenience of not having kerbing and guttering, sewerage and in many cases no water or an inadequate water supply, which was the situation under the former Government, they would have a different view.

I do not know how young married couples are able to cope financially. I have informed the House briefly of the problems my wife and I had ten years ago. Young persons acquiring land and building a home usually have two mortgages, a personal loan, probably some money borrowed from their parents, and a motor car on hire purchase to enable them to travel to and from their place of work and do their shopping. The sooner that Opposition members and others outside the Parliament who criticize the Land Commission are aware of the realities of the problems of purchasing land or property, the sooner they will lend their assistance to the many thousands of young people who wish to acquire their own homes.

Australians have a greater proportion of home ownership than people in most developed countries. That is something that the federal Government ought to be assisting people to achieve. But the fact that 35 000 homeseekers are on the Housing Commission waiting list because of the so-called housing policies of the federal Government, makes the activities of the Land Commission much more important. I hope the commission develops as soon as possible the thousands of potential blocks it has at its disposal. I hope also that it doubles its output, because it will provide the only opportunity that many young people will have to purchase land and a home. I have spoken to many representatives of building and construction companies. I well recall the opening of the St Clair estate in 1977 or early 1978. Builders of project homes were delighted to provide those homes. The former Liberal Party-Country Party Government compelled many people to move into unsewered areas.

[*Interruption*]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Kirribilli wishes to participate in this debate he should seek the call and I will ensure that he gets it. At present the honourable member for Nepean has the call.

Mr ANDERSON: For the first time in thirty years New South Wales has a government that recognizes the problems of people in the greater western area of Sydney, not the outer western area of Sydney or the sticks—as Opposition members prefer to call it.

Mr McDonald: The Government cannot spend all of its appropriations.

Mr ANDERSON: There were no appropriations for housing under the former Liberal Party—Country Party Government. Complaints have been made that the Land Commission has been indulging in massive activity in the Penrith and Campbelltown areas. That activity is justified. In the past nineteen years the population of the city of Penrith has trebled and it will double in the next nineteen years. Councils in the area are willing to co-operate with the State Government because they recognize their responsibilities. The Land Commission is willing to take a punt with Penrith and similar places.

I congratulate the Government upon its endeavours to overcome the considerable home purchase problems that face the young people of this State. The commission deserves praise, not condemnation, for the services it provides for the people of New South Wales. In particular, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to some former Ministers for Housing. Those Ministers now hold the responsible positions of Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Ministers for Ports; Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology; and Minister for Consumer Affairs. I pay tribute also to the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport. All those Ministers have played a major role in the formation and performance of the Land Commission. It has been suggested that the bill is necessary to close loopholes. After hearing what the Minister had to say, one realizes that it is designed to simplify procedures and overcome delays. That will make it easier for homeseekers to buy land. Surely it is desirable to assist people to buy land and to acquire homes.

Mr Schipp: We shall see how the commission performs.

Mr ANDERSON: I am not surprised that the honourable member for Wagga Wagga wants to see the commission's performance; for eleven years there was no performance from the former Liberal Party—Country Party Government. The honourable member should talk to his colleague the honourable member for The Hills and ask him what price was being asked for land in the residential subdivision at Baulkham Hills. It was certainly not \$10,000 to \$12,000, which the Land Commission is asking for the land it is providing. Private developers would ask between \$30,000 and \$40,000 a block for that land.

Mr Schipp: Private developers would ask the same price.

Mr ANDERSON: The honourable member for Wagga Wagga cannot produce a tittle of evidence to support that claim. He should speak to the honourable member for The Hills.

Mr Schipp: Does the honourable member claim that land at Baulkham Hills will be sold by the commission for \$10,000?

Mr ANDERSON: The honourable member for Wagga Wagga has great difficulty going beyond the figure ten. Prices paid to the Land Commission are lower than those paid for comparable land in the same area, and I am delighted about that. The proposed amendment to section 29 (1) is designed to overcome the delays occasioned by marketing and conveyancing procedures. I support the bill, which will improve some aspects of the Land Commission's operations. I reiterate my praise for the activities of the Land Commission and I commend the Government for having introduced the legislation that established the Land Commission. I hope to see more activity by the commission. I would welcome the Land Commission's developing land for residential purposes in or near my electorate.

Mr GREINER (Ku-ring-gai) [7.46]: First I shall make a few comments on the matters raised by the honourable member for Nepean. He began by recounting his family history, which I found interesting and educational. I agree entirely with his description of the problems facing young families seeking homes in New South Wales in 1980. The problems concerning land and construction prices are considerable. The issue is simply whether the solution that the Government is pursuing through the operation of the Land Commission is effective or appropriate in dealing with the problem aptly described by the honourable member for Nepean. Of course, the answer is that it is neither effective nor appropriate. The operations of the commission have not had a significant effect on the supply or price of homesites. It was convenient for the honourable member for Nepean to concentrate on the price of land when the principal problems are of supply and production.

The honourable member for Nepean said he was in favour of the Land Commission's developing homesites for the Housing Commission at Regentville, or what he called Penrith South. I agree entirely with that type of approach. I commend to him to try to convince the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport that the simple pursuit of Housing Commission development policies are totally unproductive, even in the commission's traditional role of providing homes for the bottom 10 per cent of the electorate, in terms of welfare housing and income.

Mr Sheahan: Did the honourable member really mean the bottom 10 per cent of the electorate?

Mr GREINER: The Minister is not able even to get to the figure ten.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will have the opportunity to reply at the conclusion of the debate. The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai has the call.

Mr GREINER: It would be an entirely commendable approach for the Government to move away from the traditional approach whereby the Housing Commission attempts, on its own, to meet the requirements of even the 10 per cent who traditionally seek welfare housing. This the commission has failed abysmally to do. A far better solution would be for the Minister to consider the suggestion of the honourable member for Nepean and examine the possibility of a combined effort in the Regentville area. I suggest that a fresh approach to Housing Commission activity is overdue. It is clear that the approach adopted in 1949–50, which was somewhat effective then, is totally inappropriate now. That is an aside to the matters to which I wish to address myself. I am merely replying to comments made by the honourable member for Nepean. Let me give some indication of the true position relating to development of residential land allotments in Sydney. First, I shall examine the three years before the Labor Government came to office. For this purpose I shall quote statistics in the report of the

Indicative Planning Council for the Housing Industry for the period 1980–81 to 1982–83. For 1973–74, the number of lots produced in what the council chose to call **the** fringe area was 9 065. The number of houses commenced was 6 422. In other words, there was a surplus land production of about 2 600 blocks.

In 1974–75, the surplus in allotment production was of the order of 4 000. In the next year, which was the last year in office of the Liberal Party–Country Party Government in New South Wales, the surplus was of the order of 600. Let me examine the situation thereafter. In 1976–77 a deficit occurred. In other words the number of lots produced was 2 708 less than the number of private houses commenced. So that about 3 000 fewer building blocks were available in New South Wales in the fringe areas, the major building areas around Sydney. In the following year, 1977–78 the deficit was 2 706, and in 1978–79 it was 2 454. The figures for the Sydney statistical division show the deficit for the 1976–77 year as 5 846. That is the record of the Government in the production of building blocks in New South Wales. The deficit for the Sydney statistical division in the three years before last year is of the order of 20 000 blocks. That represents a net loss in the stock of building allotments of 20 000 in the first three years of the Labor Government in New South Wales. My mind boggles at the suggestion that that is a satisfactory record.

Mr Sheahan: What would the honourable member do about it?

Mr GREINER: If the Minister gives me time, I shall tell him. I shall concentrate my efforts for the moment on the Land Commission. It is a typical sledge-hammer approach that produces peanuts.

Mr Sheahan: The commission caters for 20 per cent of the market.

Mr GREINER: I beg to differ with the Minister; it produces something like 10 per cent of the market. The report reads:

Trends in lot consumption in the first part of 1979–80 strongly suggest that the stock of developed lots is still contracting, with the shortfall being increasingly felt outside the area covered by the 1968 Sydney Region Outline Plan.

In other words, the shortage is increasingly being felt in the areas in which the honourable member for Nepean evinces a great interest, those areas on the periphery of the traditional definition of Sydney. That is the situation in New South Wales. A continuing trend is seen, with fewer and fewer blocks being produced, compared with consumption in terms of houses being built. The council concludes:

The main obstacles to an increase are service delays and the long lead times involved in satisfying planning requirements.

That is where the answer lies. It does not lie in the sort of approach being adopted by the Land Commission. I shall look now at the efforts of the Land Commission. The honourable member for Nepean said that the commission has produced a total of 3 113 blocks of land. In the past year a major increase occurred, with 1 369 blocks being produced. That number is about 10 per cent of the total number of blocks produced. That was achieved in what one may term the easiest areas, not in the areas of greatest need in terms of land production; it was achieved in the areas where the private sector would have done it anyway. That result was achieved in the areas where the young people are going—in the area represented by the honourable member for Nepean and parts of Campbelltown. Far from doing a difficult task for the common good, and achieving something that was not being achieved—and would not have been achieved if the matter had been left in the hands of the private sector—the Land

Commission took the easy way out. Let me look at the price of land sold by the commission. I accept the figure that has been bandied around by the Minister. He claimed the Land Commission has effected a saving of \$2,000 a block.

Mr Sheahan: I did not say that.

Mr Anderson: The figure of \$3,000 was stated.

Mr GREINER: The figures are fictitious anyway. In terms of the point I am trying to make, it is totally irrelevant whether the figure I take is \$2,000 or \$3,000. Funds employed by the Land Commission to 30th June, 1980, totalled \$50.8 million. Let me assume that for each of the 1 369 blocks a saving of \$2,000 occurred. If one assumes that there should be community support for the young people about whom honourable members on the Government benches are concerned, it means that in social returns, a return of about 5 per cent is involved. If one takes \$2,000, multiplies it by the 1 369 blocks and relates that to an investment of funds of \$50.8 million the return is of the order of 5 per cent. No government, socialist or otherwise, would suggest that a 5 per cent return on that investment is reasonable. The Minister has asked what the answers are.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai needs no assistance from the honourable member for Kirribilli.

Mr GREINER: The first area in which the Government should be taking steps is in the delay between land being zoned for residential use and the time it becomes available for housing. I shall not take too long on that aspect as, unlike Government supporters, other Opposition supporters wish to speak in this debate. The time lag of about seven years is a fundamental problem. It is a problem that the Government has been totally unwilling to attempt to redress. It is not an easy problem. I do not suggest that any magic solutions exist. An effort needs to be made to produce a diminution of two years in the lead time. That would make a significant impact on the problem.

The second broad area to which I direct attention relates to charges for specifications, the methods of construction of the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board and other statutory bodies, as well as the Electricity Commission of New South Wales, Telecom and a variety of authorities that impinge on land development. Attention should be given to the Local Government Act and to the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Act to see if ways can be found to attack the problems that exist and to ascertain the fundamental reason why they are so great. A substantial part of the answer to the land price problem in the greater Sydney area will then be found.

The third broad problem concerns local councils. I have no doubt that demands by councils in terms of subdivision roads are excessive. A variety of demands are made by councils in terms of land to be gifted in association with development applications for social benefit. Undoubtedly social benefit is involved in some of the gifting but that is totally outweighed by the increase in cost which is passed on to young home-seekers about whom honourable members on both sides of the House are genuinely concerned. The Land Commission should be doing something—but it has done little, if anything—about medium and high density land. The answer to the housing problem in Sydney will not be found in having an ever-increasing geographical spread. The more difficult problem which, frankly, the private sector has had difficulty in solving since the mid-1970'—is the availability of land for medium and high density housing within 10 kilometres of the city of Sydney. What has the Land Commission

done about that problem? A whole complex of government and semi-government authorities exists in this area. The Land Commission might have had a significant advantage over the private sector in making land available. It is just not good enough to shunt people like the honourable member for Nepean to areas like Penrith and to tell them to go as far as they can. That is not the answer. The answer lies in part, at least, in increasing densities of development in areas closer to the city centre. Though the Land Commission should be doing something of that nature, it has made no attempt to address the problem. West of Penrith might be a good place for the honourable member for Nepean, but a difficulty exists in terms of relative proximity to social facilities. Moreover, in that situation inadequate use is made of the infrastructure that exists closer to the city centre.

I suggest that the direction of the Land Commission should not be simply towards making a marginal impact—and it is making some impact—on land prices in the western and southwestern corridors. Development would take place there anyway. The Land Commission is using large sums of taxpayers' money to earn only a small return. I suggest attention be given to attacking the more difficult and more appropriate problem of inner city land or close to city land available for medium and high density development. If the Land Commission undertakes some activity in that regard it will have done something worth while. Its impact so far on land prices is at best marginal and is insignificant in the total effect. The Land Commission is not worth retaining in its present size and with its present goals. The whole matter needs to be rethought.

Mr CAMERON: Mr Speaker —

Mr FLAHERTY (Granville), Government Whip [8.2]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 53

Mr Akister	Mr Gabb	Mr O'Connell
Mr Anderson	Mr Gordon	Mr O'Neill
Mr Bannon	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Barnier	Mr Hills	Mr Petersen
Mr Bedford	Mr Hunter	Mr Quinn
Mr Booth	Mr Jackson	Mr Ramsay
Mr Brereton	Mr Jensen	Mr Robb
Mr Cahill	Mr Johnstone	Mr Rogan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Jones	Mr Ryan
Mr Cleary	Mr Keane	Mr Sheahan
Mr Cox	Mr Knott	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Crabtree	Mr McCarthy	Mr Walker
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	Mr Webster
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	Mr Whelan
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	Mr Wran
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mair	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Face	Mr Mochalski	Mr Flaherty
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	Mr Wade

Noes, 28

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Barraclough	Mrs Foot	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Greiner	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr Hatton	Mr West
Mr Cameron	Mr Healey	Mr Wotton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr McDonald	
Mr Dowd	Mr Moore	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Osborne	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That this bill be now read a second time—proposed.

Mr SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [8.10], in reply: At the outset I should like to ask the honourable member for Temora, the Country Party Whip, to convey the sympathy and best wishes of members of the Government for the speedy recovery of the honourable member for Byron who, after leading for the Opposition in the debate on this bill, fell ill during the dinner adjournment. In view of that, I shall not say all I had intended to say in reply to the honourable member. I shall answer only part of his contribution to the debate on the bill. I repeat my request to the honourable member for Temora to convey the sympathy and best wishes of those on this side of the House to the honourable member for Byron who is at this moment a patient in the adjoining Sydney Hospital. During the course of his speech the honourable member for Byron had much to say about land prices and the role of the Land Commission. In his absence, and with respect, I must say it was rather artificial for that honourable member to compare the unit lot price of land in Land Commission areas with other developed areas.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr SHEAHAN: As I was saying, it was rather artificial for the honourable member for Byron to compare the unit lot price of land in the Brunswick Heads area with the unit lot prices of land in areas where the Land Commission has been involved. The honourable member for Byron indicated that the Opposition was not opposed to this measure which essentially concerns two central machinery matters.

Mr McDonald: The Minister has it all wrong.

Mr SHEAHAN: Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition going to vote against the measure? Leading for the Opposition, the honourable member for Byron—in the absence of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and of most of his colleagues—said the Opposition was not opposed to the bill. He stated he appreciated the opportunity to make a contribution to the debate on the general role of the Land Commission. All that this amending bill seeks to do is to tidy up two machinery, or administrative, matters. They are of continuous interest to the Land Commission and present it with difficulty in carrying out its statutory functions. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition interrupted and suggested that the Opposition is not in favour of the measure. We already know that. The Opposition is on record as being opposed to the Land Commission and is committed to its abolition.

In October 1979, in an address to the Housing Industry Association forum, the Leader of the Opposition attacked the Land Commission and promised its abolition by a future Liberal Party-Country Party administration. On 21st November, 1979, the chairman of the Land Commission wrote to the Leader of the Opposition inviting him to attend a briefing session with Land Commission officers on the activities of that commission. No response was received. On 10th January, 1980, the chairman of the Land Commission again wrote to the Leader of the Opposition and invited him to visit the commission and discuss its performance and record of achievement. That invitation was ignored. On 27th February, 1980, the Leader of the Opposition received a similar invitation, this being the third. Again, no response was made.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SHEAHAN: That proves that the Land Commission is being condemned by the Liberal Party and Country Party in this Parliament without the commission being given the opportunity to plead its cause. Further, those parties have not taken advantage of an offer by the Land Commission to have discussions as to its role, its future and its priorities. The honourable member for Byron referred to closing loopholes. The amendments, in so far as they deal with section 14 of the Land Commission Act, exist simply so that problems occasioned by the lack of endorsement on the title, and the dependence upon that endorsement on contracts of sale on certain conditions pertaining to the sale of land, should not delay settlement in sales of land by the Land Commission. The first part of the amendment is designed to obviate delay. The second part of the amendment deals with the right of the Land Commission to delegate to officers of other administrations—in particular, officers of the Department of Lands—the power to execute documents and to do other machinery matters to facilitate dealings with Land Commission managers on behalf of those authorities and on behalf of the Crown and, as was said by the honourable member for Nepean, in the interests of the people of New South Wales.

Let us look at the record of land prices. During the six months period to April of this year lot prices for land in the Penrith and Campbelltown areas, where the commission has been selling land, rose by between 12 per cent and 16 per cent compared with rises of between 15 per cent and 28 per cent in the privately developed areas of Blacktown and Fairfield. In the developing areas of Gosford and Wyong, as the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads well knows, in that same period prices of land rose between 18 per cent and 36 per cent. Hence, the development activities of the Land Commission can be seen to have had a significant impact on price stabilization. The honourable member for Campbelltown wanted to speak in this debate but has had to attend an important function.

Mr McDonald: Nobody else believes that, except the Minister.

Mr SHEAHAN: The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai, in his contribution to the debate, said that the maximum saving in land price in his electorate was between \$2,000 and \$3,000. The honourable member for Campbelltown has established that in the areas of his electorate where the Land Commission has been developing land alongside the private sector, the savings in land prices are between \$7,000 and \$9,000 a lot when purchased from the commission.

[Interruption]

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

Mr SHEAHAN: There is no doubt that the record of the Land Commission, in the areas where it has been active, has been extremely successful in establishing to everyone except members of the Liberal Party that savings can be made. The honourable member for Byron did not attack the Land Commission for that at all. The Land Commission has convinced everyone that it is possible that, by putting on the market through its small public enterprise operation some suitable, well developed land with good title, a much lower price can be achieved than that by private developers. Thus the commission has an effect on stabilization and moderation of land prices. The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai—

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SHEAHAN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was not here when the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai spoke. I paid a tribute to that honourable member earlier, though he did not thank me for it. The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai endorsed some comments made by the honourable member for Nepean regarding the possibility of the Land Commission and the Housing Commission developing jointly, in some way, publicly owned land for housing purposes. Obviously, the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai did some research; he ought to have been able to discover that under the administration of the present Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology when he was Minister for Housing in 1977 and 1978, a direction was given to the two commissions to rationalize their landholdings for that very purpose. As the honourable member for Lake Macquarie knows, there is a huge area of Housing Commission land in his electorate and pressure has been mounting for its development by the two commissions, which have acceded to a transfer from the Housing Commission to the Land Commission of a substantial proportion of the land for development and use as housing land.

Mr McDonald: How many blocks of land will there be?

Mr SHEAHAN: That is a good question. This legislation, where the Government decides that Crown land holdings should be rationalized in this way, will permit the Land Commission to bring that land on to the general market for sale.

Mr McDonald: How many blocks of land will there be?

Mr SHEAHAN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition missed his opportunity to speak in this debate. The other point of interest made by the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai was that the main delays in the land market in the metropolitan area were occasioned by delays in servicing and in the planning process. He neglected to tell the House that the Land Commission suffers from those as much as, if not more than, private developers. Despite those delays it has been able to improve its record of achievement in the markets where it has been active. It has been suggested that the Land Commission could become active in inner city areas, but the ability of the Land Commission to engage in grandiose medium density and high density development schemes in inner areas, of the type envisaged by the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai, is hampered by the form in which the legislation finally emanated from this House in 1976.

The Legislative Council, at that time under the domination of members of the Liberal Party and Country Party, deleted from the original bill the powers of resumption and compulsory acquisition and watered down the power of the commission with a two years' notice of intention to acquire procedure which, even if implemented on the most conservative of bases, seriously impedes the ability of the Land Commission to become active in developed areas where there is not a great deal of raw or vacant land. As a result, the commission has concentrated its efforts in the outer

areas of the major centres of Sydney and the Illawarra and Hunter regions where the land market problems have proved to be most intractable. The honourable member for Byron asked when the Land Commission will become involved in an area outside the Sydney metropolitan area and the Newcastle and Wollongong areas. The fact is that the Land Commission has been co-operating with councils in the electorate of the honourable member for Upper Hunter with a view to being geared up for the major industrial developments that are on the horizon for that area. There has been some talk about the volume of investment and the honourable member for Byron quoted a figure of approximately \$54 million. Though there is not a great deal of pressure on land prices in most country areas, \$7 million of that investment has been concentrated outside the Sydney metropolitan area.

Mr Schipp: Big deal.

Mr SHEAHAN: The honourable member for Wagga Wagga wants to abolish the commission. The honourable member for The Hills wanted the Land Commission to become actively involved in his area. I have had an approach from the Mayor of Wagga Wagga, who is a member of the Liberal Party, to become involved through the housing administration to discuss a joint project home development with him while I am visiting Wagga Wagga for a Cabinet meeting early next month. The honourable member for Wagga Wagga never writes to me about anything like that.

Mr Schipp: He is a disgrace if he has done that.

Mr SHEAHAN: The Mayor of Wagga Wagga has written to me on behalf of his council and has asked me to have investigated by my officers the prospect of his council and the housing administration generally—not merely the Land Commission but the housing administration—becoming involved in making available homes and home sites on low interest finance for the people of Wagga Wagga. The honourable member for Wagga Wagga has been arguing about the cost of dividing fences between his subdivision and the land of a lady in Wagga Wagga. The mayor contacted me direct. He sent me a submission and plans, which I am having examined by officers of my department prior to the Wagga Wagga Cabinet meeting. The honourable member for Wagga Wagga wants to abolish the Land Commission. He is supporting the Leader of the Opposition who refused an invitation to examine the records of achievement of the commission. Obviously pressures are developing in some areas of the Wagga Wagga electorate. The financial side of the operations of the Land Commission is not important in terms of the bill, but the honourable member for Byron and the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai devoted a great deal of time to that matter. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition carries his copy of the Auditor-General's report with him for much of the time.

Mr McDonald: At least I have read it, which is more than the Minister has done.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is disappointed that he did not make a contribution to the debate, but he cannot do so now. He should remain silent.

Mr SHEAHAN: In the year ended 30th June, 1980, in the fringe areas—as they have been described by the honourable member for Byron and the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai—the Land Commission's output was 26 per cent of total lot production. It gained 20 per cent of the production of serviced land in the Sydney region.

Mr Cameron: The Minister wants it to be 100 per cent.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: The honourable member for Northcott has been in this House long enough to realize that when this legislation was introduced in **1976** it was made clear by the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works, Minister for Ports and Minister for Housing that the commission was to be a moderating influence on the market, not to take 100 per cent of the market. The role of the Land Commission has not changed.

Mr McDonald: Land prices have jumped 25 per cent.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is cranky because some people have not made windfall profits at the expense of homeseekers. He is disappointed that they did not have an opportunity to benefit directly from the Land Commission's provision of serviced land. It has proved its value as a public entrepreneurial undertaking operating in the market. Honourable members opposite should not confuse an organization of the size of the Housing Commission, which has thousands of employees and a large stock of homes and property to manage, with the Land Commission, which has a staff of about thirty—a small but highly efficient and highly productive organ of the Government that is helping the people who need help most.

Mr McDonald: It is tying up \$54 million.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: I hear the voice of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition——

Mr Caterson: Who was a land developer.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: I thank the honourable member. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a land developer. The fact is that in the past year the return on \$15 million capital invested by the Land Commission was \$3.5 million. That is more than 20 per cent. The remainder of the commission's capital is borrowed and its returns cover all the interest charged. This government body, operating in a small section of the city, has put developed land on the market at a price thousands of dollars cheaper than bare land put on the market by private developers and it is making a profit that in private enterprise would be considered substantial. Despite that, honourable members opposite want to abolish the Land Commission. They want to abolish it so that all this land can be developed at unbridled prices and sold to young homeseekers at extortionate prices. The honourable member for Bligh has many homeseekers in his area. He is constantly writing to me about housing costs.

Mr Barraclough: And getting very poor answers.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: The honourable member gets answers more promptly from me and from this Government than Labor members got from him and his colleagues when they were in office.

Mr Barraclough: That is not true.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: And he gets more sympathy for his constituents than we got for ours when the coalition parties were in power.

Mr **SPEAKER**: Order! I know the honourable member for Bligh does not want to go home early tonight. I ask him to cease interjecting.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: This simple, machinery piece of legislation has given the opportunity for members of the Opposition to renew their threat to abolish the Land Commission.

Mr Caterson: Correct.

Mr McDonald: We **will** carry it out, too.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: I should not want to hold my breath waiting for members of the Opposition to get the opportunity. But if they abolish the Land Commission or whatever in the twenty-first century is doing the job that we are talking about, it will rest on the heads of honourable members opposite that the people of this State are not getting the benefits that have accrued to the community generally by putting home ownership—which is what the Liberal Party claims to be all about—more readily within the grasp of those people who seek it most. In 1976 land prices were one of the most significant factors that gave the Labor Party the opportunity to govern this State. They were one of the most significant factors in the decision of the electorate at that time.

[Interruption]

Mr **SHEAHAN**: The Leader of the Opposition did not accept the invitation to go and see what has been achieved.

Mr McDonald: I have been out there.

Mr **SHEAHAN**: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not read the annual report. The Opposition says that it would abolish the Land Commission, which has done a great deal for this State. The legislation seeks to facilitate the operations of the commission in its role of securing within a reasonable time land that becomes available for development. That land and Crown land can then be made available to young home-seekers. I commend the bill.

Question—That this bill be now read a second time—put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 55

Mr Akister	Mr Gabb	Mr O'Connell
Mr Anderson	Mr Gordon	Mr O'Neill
Mr Bannon	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Barnier	Mr Hatton	Mr Petersen
Mr Bedford	Mr Hills	Mr Quinn
Mr Booth	Mr Hunter	Mr Ramsay
Mr Brereton	Mr Jackson	Mr Robb
Mr Cahill	Mr Jensen	Mr Rogan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Johnstone	Mr Ryan
Mr Cleary	Mr Jones	Mr Sheahan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Keane	Mr A.G. Stewart
Mr Cox	Mr Knott	Mr Walker
Mr Crabtree	Mr McCarthy	Mr Webster
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	Mr Whelan
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	Mr Wran
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mair	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Face	Mr Mochalski	Mr Flaherty
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	Mr Wade

Noes, 28

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Barraclough	Mrs Foot	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Greiner	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr Healey	Mr West
Mr Cameron	Mr McDonald	Mr Wotton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Moore	
Mr Dowd	Mr Osborne	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Park	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

Clause 2

The CHAIRMAN: The question is, That the clause as read stand a clause of the bill.

Mr CAMERON: Mr Chairman——

Mr FLAHERTY (Granville), Government Whip [8.40]: I move:
That the question be now put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 53

Mr Akister	Mr Gabb	Mr O'Connell
Mr Anderson	Mr Gordon	Mr O'Neill
Mr Bannon	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Barnier	Mr Hills	Mr Petersen
Mr Bedford	Mr Hunter	Mr Quinn
Mr Booth	Mr Jackson	Mr Ramsay
Mr Brereton	Mr Jensen	Mr Robb
Mr Cavalier	Mr Johnstone	Mr Rogan
Mr Cleary	Mr Jones	Mr Ryan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Keane	Mr Sheahan
Mr Cox	Mr Knott	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Crabtree	Mr McCarthy	Mr Walker
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	Mr Webster
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	Mr Whelan
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	Mr Wran
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mair	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Face	Mr Mochalski	Mr Flaherty
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	Mr Wade

Noes, **29**

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Pickard
Mr Barraclough	Mrs Foot	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Brewer	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Schipp
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Greiner	Mr Singleton
Mr Bruxner	Mr Hatton	Mr Smith
Mr Cameron	Mr Healey	Mr West
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr McDonald	Mr Wotton
Mr Dowd	Mr Moore	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Osborne	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Park	Mr Taylor

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the clause stand—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 55

Mr Akister	Mr Gordon	Mr O'Neill
Mr Anderson	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Bannon	Mr Hatton	Mr Petersen
Mr Barnier	Mr Hills	Mr Quinn
Mr Bedford	Mr Hunter	Mr Ramsay
Mr Booth	Mr Jackson	Mr Robb
Mr Brereton	Mr Jensen	Mr Rogan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Johnstone	Mr Ryan
Mr Cleary	Mr Jones	Mr Sheahan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Keane	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Cox	Mr Knott	Mr Walker
Mr Crabtree	Mr McCarthy	Mr Webster
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	Mr Whelan
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	Mr Wilde
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	Mr Wran
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mair	
Mr Face	Mr Mochalski	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	Mr Flaherty
Mr Gabb	Mr O'Connell	Mr Wade

Noes, **28**

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Barraclough	Mrs Foot	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Greiner	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr Healey	Mr West
Mr Cameron	Mr McDonald	Mr Wotton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Moore	
Mr Dowd	Mr Osborne	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Park	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Adoption of Report

Bill reported from Committee **without amendment.**

Mr **SHEAHAN** (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [8.55]: I move:

That the report be now adopted.

Question put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 55

Mr Akister	Mr Gabb	Mr O'Connell
Mr Anderson	Mr Gordon	Mr O'Neill
Mr Bannon	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Barnier	Mr Hatton	Mr Petersen
Mr Bedford	Mr Hills	Mr Quinn
Mr Booth	Mr Hunter	Mr Ramsay
Mr Brereton	Mr Jackson	Mr Robb
Mr Cahill	Mr Jensen	Mr Rogan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Johnstone	Mr Ryan
Mr Cleary	Mr Jones	Mr Sheahan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Keane	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Cox	Mr Knott	Mr Walker
Mr Crabtree	Mr McCarthy	Mr Webster
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	Mr Whelan
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	Mr Wran
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mair	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Face	Mr Mochalski	Mr Flaherty
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	Mr Wade

Noes, 28

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Barraclough	Mrs Foot	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Greiner	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr Healey	Mr West
Mr Cameron	Mr McDonald	Mr Wotton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Moore	
Mr Dowd	Mr Osborne	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Park	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

Report adopted.

Third Reading

Mr **SHEAHAN** (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [9.0]: I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Question put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 55

Mr Akister	Mr Gabb	Mr O'Connell
Mr Anderson	Mr Gordon	Mr O'Neill
Mr Bannon	Mr Haigh	Mr Paciullo
Mr Barnier	Mr Hatton	Mr Petersen
Mr Bedford	Mr Hills	Mr Quinn
Mr Booth	Mr Hunter	Mr Ramsay
Mr Brereton	Mr Jackson	Mr Robb
Mr Cahill	Mr Jensen	Mr Rogan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Johnstone	Mr Ryan
Mr Cleary	Mr Jones	Mr Sheahan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Keane	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Cox	Mr Knott	Mr Walker
Mr Crabtree	Mr McCarthy	Mr Webster
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	Mr Whelan
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	Mr Wran
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mair	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Face	Mr Mochalski	Mr Flaherty
Mr Ferguson	Mr Mulock	Mr Wade

Noes, 28

Mr Arblaster	Mr Fisher	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Barraclough	Mrs Foot	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Greiner	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr Healey	Mr West
Mr Cameron	Mr McDonald	Mr Wotton
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Moore	
Mr Dowd	Mr Osborne	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Duncan	Mr Park	Mr Caterson
Mr Fischer	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 21st October, *vide* page 1897) on motion by Mr Wran:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr McCARTHY (Armidale) [9.6]: Having had twenty-five hours to reflect on the speech delivered last evening by the Leader of the Country Party, I inform the House that it made me feel ill as it **was** full of putrescence, lies and half lies. It **was** a disgrace. Often the Leader of the Country Party has complained about honourable members who abuse the forms and procedures of this House. In his speech he stooped to the lowest by assassinating the characters of four Ministers. He questioned their ability to administer their portfolios. I repeat, last night the Leader of the Country Party used lies, half lies, innuendos and putrescence.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Armidale is using strong language. I ask him to refrain from using such unparliamentary expressions as lies and half lies. I am sure the honourable member can express his feelings without using unparliamentary language.

Mr McCARTHY: In the two years that I have been a member of this House I have never made personal attacks upon any honourable member. Though I have endeavoured to be fair, I have not hesitated to hit hard when the procedures of this House have been abused or an honourable member's ability has been questioned. The actions of the Leader of the Country Party last evening were a travesty of justice. Time and again he has objected to that type of behaviour in this House. I was disgusted by his remarks, and all honourable members should ensure that the level of debate is not dragged down to such a low level. I shall justify my assertions. New South Wales is privileged to have a good government and a good leader.

[Interruption]

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

Mr McCARTHY: Last evening the honourable member for Northcott said in one breath that the Government had money running out of its ears, and in the next breath that it spent too much. The honourable member for Northcott is more concerned with rhetoric than with the accuracy of his statements. The honourable member's assertions to which I referred were a contradiction **and** were incorrect. The Leader of the Opposition said that last financial year the Government had made available only \$3.5 million for drought relief. Again that is a half lie. This morning the Premier and Treasurer **informed** the House that the Government had spent \$13.4 million on drought relief.

As he has done on many occasions in the House, the Leader of the Country Party has quoted figures that related to a portion of last year. I have proof that he has told untruths. He suggested that the former coalition Government had done more than the Wran Government to assist drought-stricken farmers. That is not so. The Leader of the Country Party has criticized members for lowering the standards of the House, yet he has done exactly that himself. In a 4-year period \$43 million was allocated from consolidated revenue and \$56.5 million in Commonwealth reimbursements for drought relief. That funding was not on a \$-for-\$ basis. What has the Auditor-General said about that? *[Quorum formed.]* Time and again the Leader of the Country Party has protested that the procedures of the House have been abused. I prepared a speech to present to the House in my contribution to the debate. Having listened to the Leader of the Country Party drag this Parliament to the lowest depths, I have chosen to depart from that prepared speech.

I am aware of the drought conditions in New South Wales, particularly in the north of the State. Ordinarily the State's wheat crop would yield about 7 million bushels. Only about 1.5 million bushels of wheat will be harvested this year. The State Rail Authority will lose something like \$60 million in revenue otherwise gained from freight for the carriage of wheat. Many country people will not have sufficient funds to finance their farming activities next year. In April, forty-eight areas of the State were declared to be drought-stricken. The Minister for Agriculture toured the worst affected areas. Upon his recommendation a rail freight concessional rebate of 50 per cent is allowed for stock and fodder transportation, and the qualifying distance for eligibility for road freight concessions has been reduced from 60 kilometres to 30 kilometres. The Government has introduced a 50 per cent rebate on road freight concessions for stock and fodder movements. A similar rebate has been granted for the cartage of water and the subsidy for the slaughter of drought-affected stock has been increased from \$10 to \$15 a head.

The Leader of the Country Party suggested that the Government had allocated only \$3.5 million for drought relief. I shall state the facts. Before 1978 the New South Wales Government received \$5 million under the Commonwealth's national disaster scheme. After 1978 the State has received \$10 million on a \$-for-\$ basis; the Victorian Government was allocated \$3.5 million before 1978, and after 1978 received \$7 million; in Queensland, before 1978, \$1.5 million was provided and after 1978 the amount was \$4 million. The Leader of the Country Party has lauded those State governments for their contributions to assistance for drought relief. The record of the other States is nowhere near as good as that of the Wran Government. Once again the Leader of the Country Party has resorted to half-truths and untruths. Country people will not be impressed by his statements.

Mr Cameron: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House and ask you to exercise your discretion in favour of forming a quorum.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Armidale will continue to address the House.

Mr McCARTHY: The New South Wales Government's involvement in drought assistance is unquestionable. Between 1st January, 1980, and 30th September, 1980, \$11.06 million was provided for that purpose. Of that amount \$6.47 million was for loans to 757 farmers in carry-on advances and to 32 dairy companies for lending for fodder purchases. Road, rail and fodder subsidies amounted to \$4.59 million. In the House the Leader of the Country Party persisted with his assertion that the Wran Government had spent only \$3.5 million on drought assistance in New South Wales. That is untrue. His assertion does nothing for the House, the Government or for any honourable member.

Mr Cameron: Can the honourable member prove that the assertion of the Leader of the Country Party is untrue?

Mr McCARTHY: The honourable member for Northcott knows it is untrue. I have waited twenty-five hours for the opportunity to contribute to the budget debate. Last night the Leader of the Country Party said that the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources deliberately and continually told untruths in the House. That is the sort of character assassination that took place here last night. I do not know why points of order were not taken on such statements. The Leader of the Country Party attacked a Minister whose honesty and integrity is above reproach. The Leader of the Country Party said also that the Minister's record in water conservation is abysmal. He claimed that the former Liberal Party--Country Party Government had built nine major dams in a period similar to the time in which the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources has held his portfolio. That untrue statement must not go unchallenged. The former Liberal Party-Country Party Government built a succession of small dams the total storage capacity of which was less than half that of the Glennies Creek Dam, which is now under construction in the Hunter Valley. I have here a list of the untrue assertions of the Leader of the Country Party but I shall not refer to them all as I have more important matters to raise.

The honourable member for Northcott said that the Government has money running out of its ears. Then he claimed that it is spending too much money. Let us compare the record of the federal Government with that of the New South Wales Government. These are the facts. The Commonwealth budget deficit in 1976-77 was \$2,740 million. In 1977-78 it was \$3,333 million; in 1978-79 \$3,478 million; in 1979-80 \$2,034 million, and in 1980-81 it is estimated that it will be \$1,566

million. **This** is the so-called good accounting that the honourable member for Northcott suggests the Government should be using. Of course his suggestion is ridiculous; the Government has exercised good management and it is doing a splendid job.

The next matter I wish to talk about is excise duties on crude oil and liquefied petroleum gas. In 1977–78 those duties raised \$476 million. In 1978–79 they brought in \$1,226.7 million; in 1979–80, \$2,270.2 million; and in 1980–81 it is estimated that they will total \$3,157 million. Criticism is made of the management of the Wran Government. Let us examine the management record of the federal Government. Bear in mind that every petrol bowser is a branch of the taxation office. It passes on the higher cost of petrol to the people, particularly those in country areas. That impost contributes to inflation. It certainly does nothing to assist the farmers and graziers of Armidale, Lismore or elsewhere to keep costs down. The federal Government does not assist such people because it cannot. It is responsible for the high inflation in Australia, yet Opposition members in this House support it and its imposts. I cannot understand why they support that Government.

I shall now deal with income tax. In 1974–75 income tax in New South Wales yielded \$2,391,695,000. In Australia the total tax income was \$6,570,765,000. In 1975–76 New South Wales income tax amounted to \$3,079,010,000; the Australian figure was \$8,767,981,000. In 1976–77, New South Wales income tax totalled \$3,861,348,000, while in Australia the federal Government collected \$10,750,124,000. Those are the sorts of imposts passed on to the people of New South Wales. The honourable member for Northcott asserted that the New South Wales Government had money running out of its ears. That is a contradiction in terms. It is an absolutely incorrect assertion, which should not be made in the House.

Mr Cameron: Mr Fraser said——

Mr MCCARTHY: I do not care what Mr Fraser said. In this House I try not to attack people on a personal basis; rather, I try to examine their record and talk about that. That is what I am doing when I speak about the record of the Fraser Government. Its record is abysmal. The honourable member for Northcott advocates the same sort of procedures for the Wran Government. If his suggestion were adopted, New South Wales would be in considerable trouble.

I shall now have a look at percentage increases in Commonwealth payments to New South Wales and compare them with percentage increases in federal Government revenue. In 1976–77 inflation was 12.3 per cent, compared with a percentage rise in federal Government revenue of 17.6 per cent. In 1977–78, when inflation ran at 13.4 per cent, the increased percentage in federal Government revenue was 10 per cent. In 1978–79 the inflation rate was 7.9 per cent; the percentage increase in federal Government revenue was 9.2 per cent. In 1979–80, with inflation at 8.8 per cent, the percentage increase in federal Government revenue was 15.3 per cent. In 1980–81, with the percentage increase in federal Government revenue standing at 16.2 per cent, inflation was running at 10.7 per cent. Opposition members repeatedly inform the House that because of the untied grants the New South Wales Government is in a good position. Everyone knows that the formula used for that type of funding is the **Whitlam** formula, which this year will be abrogated by the federal Government.

The federal Government examines the tied grants that it makes and then cuts back other grants by an equivalent amount. That is the type of funding that New South Wales receives from the federal Government. The New South Wales Government wants honesty from the Opposition, not rhetoric. It is about time the Opposition produced some of that honesty. State taxation includes payroll tax, stamp duties, probate and death duties, land tax, racing revenue, licences and poker machine tax. In 1975–76 total taxation in New South Wales was \$1,506,190,000. In 1978–79

it was \$2,029,588,000. The figure for 1979–80 was \$2,236,324,000. Over the 4-year period the increase was \$730,134,000. Taxation rose by 48.5 per cent over a period of three years. It is obvious that the increase in funds does not even cover the increase in inflation in that time.

The Government, which is told that it should be doing all sorts of things, is doing a good job of financial management in New South Wales. It is often claimed that the Government lies when it says it has not increased the rate of taxation. The only thing the Opposition can point to—the only thing that looks like an increase—is in the area of motor registration taxation. Otherwise, natural growth in taxation available to the Government has resulted in an increase in the amount received. No increase in the rate of taxation has occurred in New South Wales.

I have received a great deal of co-operation from the Minister for Transport. Over the past five years the Government has spent \$1,000 million upgrading rolling stock, the permanent way and other railway facilities. That action followed a decade of neglect by the former Government. The Government is trying to extend railway services, but it has been compelled to follow a policy that was initiated by the former Government. It is difficult to change that policy midstream. I have informed the Minister for Transport that I should like other things to be done. I give the Minister credit for having sufficient commonsense to look at those matters. It is easier and cheaper to build a mile of permanent way than it is to build a mile of highway.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! Because of a technical fault the warning light is not working. The honourable member's time has almost expired. He has only two minutes in which to conclude his speech.

Mr MCCARTHY: I should have liked to talk for two or three hours. The Budget Speech contains a wealth of material. I should like to expose the untruths and half-truths that were perpetrated in the House by the Leader of the Country Party. Doubtless other members who take part in this debate will do that. New South Wales faces a difficult economic period, which will become more and more of a problem as a result of the financial constraints placed on this State by the federal Government. The federal Government does not want New South Wales to succeed. It would like to see this State go into debt and stagnate. That will not happen because the Premier and Treasurer is a good financial manager, and he has skilled advisers. Competent Ministers are available to give the Premier and Treasurer the necessary fiscal advice. The Government will not take lying down adverse comments made by the Leader of the Country Party or other Opposition supporters.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before the honourable member for Raleigh commences his speech I indicate that, because of the technical fault to which I referred earlier, I shall indicate when he has three minutes of his time remaining.

Mr J. H. BROWN (Raleigh) [9.36]: I congratulate the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai and the honourable member for Bankstown on their maiden speeches. Those honourable members are from opposite sides of politics and they have different philosophies, but I am sure that they will both be assets to the House in the years that lie ahead. I congratulate also the honourable member for Murray on his **maiden** speech as the member for that electorate. When the honourable member first became a member of this House he was the youngest member ever elected to the Parliament. As the honourable member for Sturt, he showed great courage in relinquishing that seat to contest an election for another seat. His judgment was backed up by the electorate. A resounding victory took place in the electorate of Murray and that seat is now back where it belongs. It should never have been lost to the Country Party.

The people in the electorate have shown that they want to be represented by the Country Party. They backed up that wish in a startling fashion in the federal election. The swing last Saturday showed that a strong possibility exists that the seat of Riverina in the federal arena will also return to the fold.

Tonight honourable members heard a most extraordinary speech by the honourable member for Armidale. When he commenced his speech those who were listening to him were stunned. He was racing here and there, singing out and screaming. In fact, he succeeded in emptying the public gallery. The thirty people in the public gallery left. Also, twenty-eight Government supporters gradually left the Chamber. The honourable member looked as though something was **wrong** with him. At the end of his speech only one Government supporter was still in the House. I started my speech with one Opposition supporter present so the position can only improve.

It seems that the speech made by the Leader of the Country Party last night has really worried the Government. Today two long replies were made to Dorothy Dix questions relating to what the Leader of the Country Party said in this House last night. The honourable member for Armidale thought so little of the Budget that he spent a good deal of time attacking the Leader of the Country Party. During the rest of his speech he tried to talk about the so-called poor federal Budget. The honourable member for Armidale tried to analyse the federal Budget. However, that budget was analysed and accepted by the citizens of Australia last Saturday.

The federal Government has been returned with a majority that no Labor Government has had since 1946. Even though the federal Government has lost a few seats, it still has a clear majority. The people of Australia showed, in no uncertain fashion, their support for the economic management by a government that has had the courage to undertake and implement some unpopular measures. The Labor Party thinks it has a springboard for the 1983 elections, but if ever that party was going to win an election it should have been last Saturday. The next elections will be harder for Labor to win because the federal Government will work harder to keep inflation down and get people back to work.

Mr Egan: Inflation is rising.

Mr J. H. BROWN: No member of this House regards the honourable member for Cronulla as an expert on these matters.

Mr Egan: Interest rates are to go up.

Mr J. H. BROWN: Inflation has yet to reach the level it got to during the Whitlam Government's short term of office. That Government sent inflation up from 4.2 per cent to 19 per cent—a rise of about 450 per cent. Since then inflation went down to about 8 per cent and it has now reached 10 per cent. The honourable member for Armidale said that in 1979–80 the inflation rate was about 16 per cent; in fact it was about 10 per cent. The honourable member was given some extraordinary figures by his advisers. The level of unemployment during the Whitlam Government's term of office will never be reached under the Liberal Party–Country Party federal Government. I do not intend to try to sort out where the money comes from in this year's Budget—or even where it is going. Suffice to say that since this Government came to office in 1976 consolidated revenue has increased by approximately \$2,000 million. In 1975–76 consolidated revenue totalled the sum of \$2,638 million. The figure has now reached \$4,630 million, an increase of \$2,000 million. The increases in consolidated revenue each year since 1975–76 were \$279 million, \$381 million, \$210 million, \$502 million and \$620 million.

The Premier and Treasurer is stating that he is doing a little bit more each year. I hope that he is doing a little bit more with the sort of money I have mentioned. He said that State taxes have not increased. He is supposed to be the great manager, the great Premier and the great Treasurer. In 1975–76 State taxes totalled about \$1,140 million. This year the total funds in consolidated revenue for expenditure will have increased by \$1,992 million since 1975–76. There has been about an \$800 million increase in taxes paid by the people of New South Wales. In the same period Commonwealth grants increased from \$980 million in 1975–76 to \$1,838 million for 1980–81, which is almost double. The State coffers are overflowing. We have seen the sleight-of-hand way in which money is being dished out. The Premier and Treasurer did not want to show a big surplus in June so he said, "We shall give \$30 million for housing funds". The Budget provides for the same sum to be allocated to housing.

Anyone who claims that the New South Wales Government has been given a raw deal in regard to housing funds should look at these figures which have been taken from the Budget Papers. These figures have not been conjured up out of midair, as was the \$30 million to be used for housing. Payroll tax imposes a great slug on industry. The Government makes much of what it will do to help and decentralize industry. Under the Wran Government payroll tax has increased by \$359 million. This year, when initiatives are needed to encourage small businessmen to employ people, New South Wales will collect \$100 million more in payroll tax than it did last year. Land revenue will increase by \$43 million. This year general miscellaneous receipts will increase by \$63 million. The increased revenue from payroll tax should enable the Government to reduce the tax burden on the people of New South Wales.

Nothing is affecting the people of New South Wales and Australia more than the present disastrous drought, which covers practically the whole of Australia. Western Australia is in its fifth year of drought. In previous droughts we have been fortunate because they have affected only some parts of Australia. Except for some small areas this drought has had disastrous effects. It is time we stopped bickering about money for drought relief. I hope that the Premier and Treasurer made all the political capital he could before last Saturday's election and that he will no longer try to score points from the federal Government at the expense of the drought-stricken people of New South Wales. The people of this State—particularly those in country areas—are desperate because of the drought conditions. I hope that the Premier and Treasurer will stop bickering and try to help them. The vote in all country areas last Saturday showed that the people of Australia—particularly those in New South Wales—were not willing to accept the sort of propaganda that the Premier and Treasurer was trying to give them about the drought. The Country Party regained every seat it held before that election and it hopes to win one more. That is a magnificent performance when one considers that one area showed a swing to Labor of 10 per cent and another a swing of 7 per cent. The Country Party has more than held its own because it has been honest with the people and has served them well. It is estimated that the drought will cost the taxpayers \$6,000 million. We have to consider the effects of the drought on all those people who for generations have built up properties and cattle and sheep stocks by sound breeding and good husbandry. It may take between twenty years and forty years for them to recover. It does not matter what sector of the rural industry one takes—dairying, beef, rice growing, dried fruits, grains or wool. All rural industries are in great trouble because of the drought.

Farmers have had a couple of good seasons for grain and because of that people presume they should be able to carry on through the drought. But, those farmers were paying debts caused by earlier droughts and so have been left without great financial resources. Beef and sheep markets have been adversely affected by the drought. We must get a national drought policy urgently, one that will come into

operation automatically when a drought is declared. There must be no cheap political point-scoring such as the Premier and Treasurer has attempted recently at the expense of those on the land who are desperate for assistance. We must have a plan which will come into operation when areas are declared drought-stricken. All the States have agreed on that. If New South Wales does not like the agreement, when the Premier and Treasurer goes to Canberra next time he should seek a change. The Premier and Treasurer is reputedly a great man for negotiation and avoids confrontation, so he and other States must negotiate.

The State Government is responsible for the first \$10 million of drought relief in New South Wales and after that receives funds from the Commonwealth at the rate of \$3 for every \$1 spent on that assistance. In answer to a Dorothy Dix question today the Premier and Treasurer used words echoed here tonight by the honourable member for Armidale. The Premier and Treasurer said that in 1965–66 New South Wales spent about \$50 million on drought relief. Some of it was recovered from the Commonwealth Government—in fact quite a lot of it. If this Government takes action and spends \$40 million on drought relief projects it can get \$30 million back from the Commonwealth. But, there must be an end to political bickering. There is no bickering between the governments of Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia and the federal coalition administration. The Queensland Government, under the guidance of that great statesman, Premier Bjelke-Petersen——

[Interruption]

Mr J. H. BROWN: Honourable members on the Government benches may say what they like about Mr Bjelke-Petersen but they must remember what he did to the Labor Party at the federal elections last Saturday. They must wait until 29th November to see what he will do to his opposition in Queensland. The Queensland election on 29th November will be like a Sunday school picnic for the Queensland National Party. That is because the Queensland Premier cares for the people. When drought faced Queensland he immediately raised carry-on loans to \$40,000. Last Friday the Premier and Treasurer in this State, in the hope of getting a few more votes and in a desperate lost cause, raised carry-on loans in New South Wales to \$20,000. But, in Queensland, they have been \$40,000 for a long time. Why cannot they be raised to \$40,000 in this State?

City people have sympathy for those on the land who face drought but they have no realization of what it actually means. City people might see a photograph in a newspaper of cattle dying round a dried waterhole and the scene is poignant and sad, but few realize the long-term effects of drought. If Australia gets good rains now it will still take a minimum of ten years for many farms to recover. Last year the wheat crop in Australia yielded 15.7 million tonnes but this year it will be only about 7.5 million tonnes. It will be reduced by more than half. That means there will be half the usual income circulating in country towns—only half the usual amount of money **available** to be spent. Employment in stores and machinery sales shops and repair shops will be affected. The drought will have an effect on all conceivable things in the country. The Premier and Treasurer has said that freight revenue in this State will be reduced to \$50 million. But, years and years of sweat and toil have been involved in farmers raising their herds and improving their properties, and these have been all destroyed.

Australia needs a national drought policy that has the full co-operation of State and federal governments. That policy must cover rebates, freight assistance, carry-on finance, low interest rates and other matters. The second point is that we must have a national water policy with the States playing a full part and making a full contribution. I remember reading once that the great engineer, Bradfield, who designed the

Sydney Harbour Bridge, came up with a scheme to divert the waters of the coastal rivers back through tunnels to the inland. What has been done about that? Nothing. It is said that we have never had enough money for that but unless we find the money and use it in that way we will not have any Australia. We must be able to produce goods that are badly needed. We have magnificent country west of the ranges which can grow produce to feed millions and millions of people throughout the world if water is available. People are starving in many parts of the world. I am pleased to say we help as much as we can to relieve their plight. But, first, we must have a national drought policy that has the full co-operation of State and federal governments—one that will come into effect immediately droughts are proclaimed.

I repeat: we need a national drought policy and a national water policy with the States playing their full part and making a full contribution. In addition we need a national feed plan. We must have vast stocks of fodder stored in various parts of Australia. It is no use saying, we have got a good reason; we will conserve some fodder. Farmers must be given incentives to grow and harvest fodder and to keep it. The incentives could be provided by taxation deductions or by means of bonds such as the Commonwealth Government issued a few years ago. However it is achieved, we must have a national feed plan. People in some areas are paying up to \$7 for a bale of hay that will only feed a beast for two days to keep it alive. It is an expense that we cannot afford. In my area the Macleay River in its upper reaches is drying up into waterholes. The same applies to the Hastings River. There are no taps. There is only the marksman's bullet when a starving beast goes down. It is extremely sad.

As the summer advances and evaporation increases, pasture feed will become more scarce. The dependence of millions of people on the man on the land will become more and more evident. What the farmer cannot produce cannot be sold. As he goes broke, so does the nation's economy. If there is no wheat to trade, there is no trade. If there is little meat to eat, the price goes up. If the small crops—summer crops like the tomatoes, lettuce, melons and cucumbers—fail, what are the substitutes? There are none. The answer to a national emergency lies in strategies and master plans such as I have outlined to the House tonight. I am certain that if we can devise a fodder scheme and provide incentives to landowners to grow and cut hay, it will be a magnificent help in future droughts. I strongly commend that.

I want to touch on only one other matter and that is the policy of the Department of Technical and Further Education concerning the regionalization or rationalization of technical colleges. The department seems to be hellbent on this policy. The example I shall cite concerns the intention of the department to move the fitting and machining course from Kempsey Technical College, where it has been established for twenty-five years, because the department says it will be cheaper to do that. At present an instructor comes to Kempsey from Taree on one day a week. Local students attend the technical college on that day and then are able to go back on the job.

It is now proposed that students go to Taree for three days of a week. To use the available rail transport they will have to go to Taree on Monday's day train, so they will lose Monday from work. They will spend Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday at the Taree Technical College and return to Kempsey on Friday's day train. So in order to attend technical college on three days they will miss five days' work. At a time when the Government should be encouraging the employment of a record number of apprentices, the implementation of this proposal will deter employers from taking on apprentices, as they will not be able to carry the cost of employees being away from work for one week in every three. I have asked questions about this matter in the House.

I have written to the Minister for Education. I have pointed out the **difficulties**. I seek an urgent reply. It is not fair that any student should have to do this and be away from his home on four nights of the week. Why should the Kempsey Technical College yield its fitting and machining course to **Taree**? Why should it be deemed a benefit to the college and the students to witness the end of a course that has existed for twenty-five years? The department claims that this proposal will not set a precedent for the removal of other courses. Of course it will. Any person who has lived in a country town knows what has happened when a branch of a bank has been moved to another town. The town that has lost it never gets it back. If this course is taken away from Kempsey, it will never be restored. I make the strongest possible plea that this part of the policy of the department be upset. Parliament voted more money for this department and I am pleased it did.

It is all very well for the department to pat people on the head and say that daddy knows best. It is suggested that young men of 16 who are beginning their careers should be obliged to leave their homes and find board and lodging for three days a week every third week. Employers as well as the students are being inconvenienced. The living-away-from-home allowance is quite **insufficient**. When one remembers that apprentices earn little, it is unfair that they should be compelled to put up with a 3-day gap in their schedule. If the department told the truth it would confess that community need is not the criterion for specialist trade courses at this or any other college. It would bring into the frame the broad issues, to use departmental jargon, such as function, size, specialization, complexity, cost-benefit effectiveness and many other considerations described by the same sorts of impersonal nouns. That is the prerogative of the master and the master's daddy whose name is bureaucracy. To use a well-known expression, I will not wear it. The students have written to me and to the newspapers about it.

Mr Jackson: That is an attack on decent workers.

Mr J. H. BROWN: It is an attack on young people to make them stay away from their homes four nights a week every three weeks. It is also an attack on decentralization, but that is nothing new. This Government has given the rough end of the pineapple to country people ever since it came to office. The result of the country vote in last Saturday's election was proof that the people are aware of how they have been treated. The Premier and Treasurer seems to be able to wave his magic wand and put things right at times but in this case he must tell the Minister for Education, if the Minister has not woken up by now, that this move must be stopped.

Petitions galore have been presented on this matter. One contains ninety-four signatures of the teaching and clerical staff of Kempsey High School. Others have been submitted by the chamber of commerce, the students and the shire council. The shire council has offered accommodation to the Department of Technical and Further Education because the department claimed that accommodation was becoming cramped. **If** the accommodation was good enough for eleven students last year, it is good enough for them this year. It is time the Government stopped using propaganda. It should stop crying poor mouth about lack of funds. I pointed out earlier that the Budget this year is \$2,000 million more than it was in the last year that the coalition Government held office. That works out at \$40 million a week more. This year the funds available to the State through vastly increased State taxes and grants from the Commonwealth are almost \$600 million more than they were last financial year. That is \$12 million a week. If one disregards Saturdays and Sundays, the Government has \$2.5 million more every working day this year. If this Government is the manager it claims to be, it should do something to benefit the people of this State. It should increase finance for drought to \$40,000 as the Queensland Government has done. It should give

assistance to country industries and reduce payroll tax, from which it will collect an additional \$100 million this year. The Government should think of New South Wales as one great State and not penalize country areas.

[Interruption]

Mr J. H. BROWN: The Minister for Youth and Community Services can say what he likes, but the Minister for Transport claims to have spent \$1,000 million to upgrade the transport system, and not one carriage has gone past Sutherland or Hornsby or out near the Blue Mountains. Trains are running later than ever in history; the state of the carriages is bad. I am told by the honourable member for Lismore that last Saturday the motor rail to the Gold Coast was running six hours late. Somebody suggested that it was pulling up to let people vote, but I understand it was running late long before the election. The Government should cut the cackle and propaganda and take action.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Mair.

ADJOURNMENT

Housing Commission Accommodation

Mr SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [10.6]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr BRERETON (Heffron) [10.6]: I wish to invite attention to the great difficulties that now face elderly people in securing Housing Commission accommodation. The housing crisis has been well-documented in the press and there have been numerous debates on the subject in this House. All honourable members acknowledge that, in the economic climate of the past few years, people generally have experienced problems in getting adequate housing. The greatest impact of the housing crisis has been on those on fixed incomes. I wish to underline the plight of elderly people who, because of the huge increases in rents for private accommodation, find themselves in considerable difficulty.

I am indebted to the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport for circulating a schedule of waiting times for Housing Commission accommodation on a region-by-region basis. The document from which I wish to quote was sent to honourable members on 20th August this year, I understand that later figures are being compiled, but the figures in this document show the great differences between the waiting times for inner area accommodation and those for accommodation in the outer suburbs. For example, as at 30th June, 1980, in Green Valley accommodation had been allocated to elderly single persons who had been on the waiting list since March 1979. In Ryde-Dundas the date was June 1978; Blacktown, June 1978; Bankstown, June 1978; Liverpool, May 1978; Penrith, April 1978; Mount Druitt and Parramatta, April 1978. The date for East Hills was November 1977; Campbelltown, September 1977; Illawarra, November 1976; the outer eastern suburbs, including Eastlakes and beyond, July 1976; the inner city for high-rise accommodation, May 1976; the inner eastern suburbs, excluding Bondi, February 1976; the inner western suburbs, October 1975; the northern suburbs, May 1975; the inner city, for walk-up accommodation, October 1974; and for Bondi the date was May 1974. Obviously there are great differences between the waiting times in the regions. I wish to examine what this means in practice to people in the inner city areas and in the other places where the waiting times are so long.

People in these areas who are not able to obtain admission to the Housing Commission list until they are 65 years of age and in receipt of a pension must wait up to six years for Housing Commission accommodation in the area of their choice. The area of their choice is the area in which they reside, the area where their friends, social activities, and sporting affiliations are located, and where their lifestyle has been based for the past sixty years. These persons are caught in the web of rapidly rising private rents, which over the past two years have escalated from \$15 and \$20 to \$45 and \$55 a week.

Mr Egan: To \$60 and \$70 in my electorate.

Mr BRERETON: That is so. These people are compelled to accept Housing Commission accommodation at the first available opportunity. They are compelled to seek admission to the Housing Commission list through the special allocations provisions. Honourable members would be aware that access to such a list does not occur until an order for possession has been issued and the tenant is virtually evicted on to the street. The Housing Commission has forced a number of elderly people away from their environment to take up residence in the outer areas of Sydney. These are persons to whom this Parliament, the Government and the Housing Commission owe a responsibility. Many persons who live on the perimeter of Sydney are happy to do so.

I ask honourable members to consider the plight of someone who has lived in Redfern all his life and is evicted from his accommodation when 67 years of age. Such a person may wait until he is 71 years of age for a local Housing Commission flat, or may immediately go to Housing Commission accommodation at Green Valley. Of course, he takes the alternative and goes to Green Valley. I intend no disrespect to Green Valley, but such a move imposes upon a person a sentence for the rest of his days. It is a sad sentence for a person to be forced away from friends, his environment and the lifestyle that he has established. The policies of the Housing Commission on accommodation for the aged in geographically suitable areas have failed this Government and the people of the State.

This is not the first time that I have raised this matter in the House. Two years ago I was given an assurance by a former Minister for Housing that the matter would be assessed at an early stage. The Housing Commission has not responded to that need. To my knowledge no programme has been put forward. The Housing Commission **has** failed to differentiate between the housing needs of the aged and the general housing needs of the remainder of the community. I am well aware, as are all other honourable members, that under the limited housing finance made available to this Government by the federal Government, which has been dramatically cut back over the past three years under Fraserism, the New South Wales Government cannot afford to accommodate in the city all the people on the waiting list of the Housing Commission. The cost of land has spiralled. Elderly people should have been put apart from other persons on the Housing Commission's waiting list. They should have been given special consideration.

Week after week I am confronted in my electoral office by persons faced with the **prospect** of being sentenced to an environment many miles from that to which **they** are accustomed. Generally they accept the first offer made to them. This offer is **made** when they are virtually on the dust heap and requires them to live in an area **at** the back of Green Valley, three miles from the local railway station and not serviced **by public** transport. They could not even pay a return visit to their environment, as

they could if the Housing Commission offered them accommodation in an area close to a railway station. It is time that the Government issued a policy statement on the geographic housing needs of aged persons. I call for the implementation of a building programme that will equalize the waiting time for aged persons seeking accommodation, irrespective of the areas in which they live.

Mr SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [10.16], in reply: One could not fail to be impressed by the argument put to the House by the honourable member for Heffron, whose interest in the aged constituents of his electorate, and in the housing problems of people generally, is well known to all honourable members. I have taken careful note of the challenge that the honourable member has issued to the Government, to the Housing Commission and presumably to me as Minister for Housing, to come to grips with this most pressing problem. In the six months that I have been responsible for housing policy in New South Wales, I have participated with my colleagues in a total review of that policy, for which one of the major priorities was equalization, adjustment and the bringing of justice into the waiting time for elderly persons' accommodation in the metropolitan area. I directed that the figures to which the honourable member referred should be issued to show the waiting times for various classifications of public housing in the Sydney metropolitan area, which would be relevant to the honourable member for Heffron, and in the appropriate towns, which would be of interest to honourable members whose electorates are outside the Sydney metropolitan area.

As the honourable member for Heffron said, in recent months the House has debated the problems created for the community by the housing crisis, the problems it causes to the Government and the performance of State and federal governments. I welcome the opportunity to debate these matters as I regret that the plight of aged persons and others waiting for the allocation of public sector housing is of little concern to many citizens or to the present incumbents of the federal Treasury benches. Although special allocations have been made by the Commonwealth to the States to assist them to provide housing for aged persons, they have been inadequate to resolve the problem. I remind the House of the direction given to the Housing Commission by the former Minister for Housing, who is now the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology, during his term of office in 1977 and 1978 that 50 per cent of the funds spent by the commission in the Sydney metropolitan area should go to established areas for the provision of accommodation.

The figures quoted by the honourable member for Heffron confirm the difficulty of purchasing sites. Not a great deal of unused land is available. Much Housing Commission property was disposed of in the 1950's and 1960's. I assure the honourable member for Heffron that the 1980–81 programme approved for the Housing Commission provides that \$5 million is to be spent acquiring sites for housing in established areas. Some \$5.63 million will be spent on commencing 600 new aged persons' units. A difficulty is apportioning fairly that limited amount of finance and limited building programme among all the classifications of persons waiting for Housing Commission accommodation and among all the locations available. The honourable member would be well aware that the Housing Commission considers every application on its merits.

I have great sympathy for the people on whose behalf the honourable member for Heffron spoke this evening. In the inner city area projects are under way, subject of course to the financial restraints that have been referred to, on the old IXL site at Newtown. The proposed redevelopment at Dacey Gardens, Matraville and Glebe, all of which will provide accommodation for a large proportion of aged persons, will eliminate some of the difficulties that have been referred to. Because of the financial restraints, these projects will have to be carried out over several years.

Recently the programme for decentralization of housing for the aged has been reviewed to ensure that people are not panicked into accepting unsatisfactory accommodation far away from the areas with which traditionally they have been identified. All inner city areas of Sydney need special action to provide adequate housing for the aged. The honourable member for Heffron will be pleased to learn also that recently, as a result of the Government's comprehensive policy review, the Director of Housing was commissioned to conduct in collaboration with local councils, a virtual hunt for appropriate sites that could be developed at reasonable cost by the Housing Commission. In particular, the honourable member for Marrickville, the honourable member for Ashfield, the honourable member for Heffron and the honourable member for Earlwood have identified sites within their electorates that are in proximity to the central business district of Sydney and might be considered for development of low cost housing. That inventory is still being compiled.

I assure the honourable member for Heffron that tomorrow I shall bring his constructive comments to the attention of the chairman of the Housing Commission and the well-intentioned and well-motivated senior officers of the commission who deal with these important matters. I shall do whatever I can to implement the type of programme sought by the honourable member.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

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

MOUNT DRUITT EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMMES

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Youth and Community Services—

(1) Did the Murawina Mount Druitt Early Childhood and Parent Programme lodge an application for funding of a pre-school with the Department of Youth and Community Services in 1977?

(2) If so, what was the response?

(3) Have any other applications for pre-school or other form of funding been made by the programme to the department?

(4) If so,

(a) for what **form** of funding was each application made; and

(b) what **was** the result?

(5) If the centre has no current funding, will he examine ways in which the department can assist the programme?

Answer—

Murawina Mount Druitt Early Childhood and Parent Programme has not applied to my department for funding. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs has provided funds to this organization and the Department of Social Security

is providing funds for the renovation of their premises to enable a range of child care services to be offered. When these **services** are being provided, my department will pay the usual subsidies to this centre.

SPRINGWOOD DEVELOPMENT

Mr R. J. CLOUGH asked the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads—

(1) Were developers known as Coljamar and/or Colgreen Pty Ltd given approval to build flats on Lot 18, Springwood Avenue, Springwood, by Blue Mountains City Council about 1973?

(2) If so,

- (a) was this approval given under delegated authority;
- (b) were any of the signatories to the approval **connected** in any way with the developing body either as a principal or manager;
- (c) at the time of the approval was a new building code for flats being considered by the council;
- (d) when was the approval given, when was the delegated approval ratified by council, and when was the new code adopted;
- (e) did the new code contain any provisions for development which were avoided by the earlier approval, and if so, what were they;
- (f) (i) was it necessary to instal an electrical substation, and if so, what proportion of the cost was met by the developer, and (ii) when was approval for this work given and what was its cost to the council;
- (g) (i) was any provision made for parking, access, garbage collection, and so on, in the approval, and (ii) were there such requirements under the new code; and
- (h) were other applications to build flats in the Blue Mountains City area deferred pending the adoption of the code, and if so, how many?

Answer—

(1) Yes. The approval was in respect of development on Lot 14 (not Lot 18), D.P. 235204, Springwood Avenue, Springwood.

(2) (a) Yes. The first letter of approval pursuant to section 342V was dated **19-4-72**, in respect of nine residential flats and two shops.

Amended plans were submitted providing for fourteen (previously nine) residential flats and two shops. The amended proposal was approved by letter of 2-6-72. The papers disclose that each approval was signed by the three delegates referred to in 2 (b) following.

(b) Yes. In each case the approval was by delegation under section **530A** exercised by the then Mayor (Alderman I. D. Dash), the then Vice-Chairman of the Works Committee (Alderman E. N. **Lesslie**) and the then Town Clerk (Mr J. S. **Pryor**).

The interim development application had been submitted by J. **Benett** on behalf of "Colgreen Pty Limited and others". The Council's policy required that where an interim development application was submitted other than by the owner, the written authority of the owner was to be produced. In this case, the authority read:

"We, Colgreen Pty Ltd, John Stephens Pryor and Margaret Pryor as Joint Owners of Lot 14, D.P. 235204, at Springwood in the City of Blue Mountains, Parish of Magdala and County of Cook, hereby authorize Mr J. Benett of 31 Hawkesbury Road, Springwood to act on our behalf.

(Sgd) Colgreen Pty Ltd C. Greenwell

John Pryor

M. Pryor".

- (c) Yes. A Report on a number of planning issues relating to residential flat development by the Deputy City Engineer/Deputy Town Planner submitted to the Town Planning Committee on 2-2-72 stated, among other things:

"6. *Residential Flat Code*. A Code covering the size, height, set backs, floor space ratios will be prepared for consideration of Council at a later date and a clause in the Scheme Ordinance will require that Residential Flat Buildings must comply with the Code adopted by Council".

At the special meeting of council on 27-4-72 the council considered residential flat buildings and when the meeting concluded the following motion and amendment were before the Chair. Neither had been put to the meeting.

Motion

"That the suggested areas proposed to be zoned 2B be adopted as a basis for further delineation into areas where varying types of flat development may take place and that the town planning staff recommend to council the areas considered suitable for various types of development and that the flat code be prepared as a matter of urgency".

Amendment

"That this proposal of the expanded Residential 2B areas shaded pink be referred to the Town Planning Committee at its next meeting and that it be charged with advising council by written report the reasons for such an apparent large expansion from the 1967 residential 2B proposals."

A report by the Town Planning Committee on this subject dated 10-5-72 was submitted to the Council-in-Committee on 23-5-72 and deferred to 6-6-72. On that date the council resolved that this matter be referred for consideration at a special meeting of council on 20th June, 1972 and the code for residential flat buildings was finally adopted by Council on 26 June, 1972.

- (d) The approval given on 19-4-72 for the nine residential flats and two shops was followed by approval of 2-6-72 of amended plans providing for fourteen residential flats and two shops. The delegated approval was not reported to, nor ratified by the council. The file in respect of the new code shows "Adopted. Council 20th June, 1972 adjourned to 26th June, 1972."
- (e) The code adopted on 26-6-72 was the first comprehensive code adopted by council related to residential flat development. Provisions of the code that would have applied to this development are 12 (a)—car parking and 13—public reserve contributions. In respect of car

parking, nineteen on-site spaces were provided and a cash contribution of \$2,250 was made in lieu of the provision of the additional nine spaces. The terms of the council's approval of the development application did not require a public reserve contribution. Under the code, a contribution of \$50 per bedroom would have been payable.

- (f) (i) Yes. No proportion of cost met by the developer but file indicates that by letter of 3-11-72, Mr S. J. Benett for Colgreen Pty Limited was advised:

"As agreed between the council and Colgreen Pty Limited, a kiosk type substation is to be installed in lieu of a chain wire enclosed substation and having regard to the difference in cost between the two types of substations of \$1,500, the council decided to approach Colgreen Pty Limited with a request for financial assistance towards this cost. Such ~~fin~~ancial assistance would be in addition to the sum of \$200 which has been contributed towards the cost of earthing the substation and the construction of a concrete slab to council's design."

The file note dated 8-11-72 by the then Town Clerk, Mr J. S. Pryor states:

"Mr Halpin verbally informed in reply to council's letter of 3rd November, 1972 that position fully set out in letter dated 3rd October, 1972 from S. J. Benett and Colgreen Pty Limited, unable to make further dedications and contributions to those mentioned in the letter of 3rd October, 1972. Costs of the project had escalated and to make a donation of \$1,500 in addition would mean extra interest of \$3.50 per week or \$180 per annum as finance could only be obtained at 12 per cent which was already straining the resources of the company and other owners."

- (ii) Approval of council given 17-10-72. The recommendation of the electricity committee adopted by the council on 17-10-72 states:

"That council approval be given for the expenditure of \$5,400 plus \$920 totalling \$6,320 for the installation of a kiosk type substation at the site of Colgreen Pty Limited, Springwood Avenue, Springwood, complete with duct work from Springwood Avenue to Macquarie Road, and high voltage and low voltage cable from Springwood Avenue to the substation."

- (g) (i) The approval dated 2-6-72 indicated that nineteen of the **twenty-eight** vehicle spaces generated by the development could be accommodated on the site, payment being required in respect **of** the remaining nine spaces. Payment of \$750 was made **on** 18-4-72 and \$1,500 on 1-6-72, being nine spaces at \$250 per space. Provision for access is indicated on the plan and garbage collection would be by way of that access or from Springwood Avenue.
- (ii) As indicated in (e) above, the code adopted on 26-6-72 followed the first comprehensive review of policy related to residential **flat** development.

- (h) Records of the council do not show if other applications were deferred pending amendment of the code nor do senior staff still with the council, who would have been concerned with development applications, recall applications being deferred for such a reason.

ADMINISTRATION OF REGULATIONS

Mr MASON asked the Minister for Police and Minister for **Services**—

How many regulations were administered by his departments and statutory authorities under his current ministerial control as at:

June **30**, 1976;
June 30, 1977;
June 30, 1978;
June 30, 1979; and
June **30**, 1980?

Answer—

The information sought is not readily available and, in view of the detail required, its collection would require extensive research and be time-consuming.

In the circumstances, the cost and manpower that would be required to secure information to frame a comprehensive reply would make such an exercise unjustified.

REPORTS OF STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

Mr MASON asked the **Minister for Transport**—

- (1) What outstanding annual reports of statutory authorities under his current ministerial control have not been tabled in Parliament in the past 14 months?
(2) When will he table these reports?

Answer—

(1) The annual reports of the State Rail Authority, Urban Transit Authority, Department of Motor Transport and Traffic Authority of N.S.W. for the year ending 30 June, 1980, have not yet been tabled.

(2) These authorities have been asked to expedite the preparation of their respective reports to enable them to be tabled as soon as possible.

NORTH RYDE TRAFFIC

Mr CAVALIER asked the Minister for Local Government and Minister for **Roads**—

(1) In regard to the intersection of Twin Road and **Badajoz Road**, North Ryde:

- (a) What is the latest traffic count;
(b) how many accidents have occurred annually over the last five years;
(c) do his advisers consider (i) that sight-lines are adequate for pedestrians and motorists, and (ii) that the intersection can be negotiated safely;

- (2) does the intersection warrant the installation of **traffic** lights;
- (3) if so (a) has approval been given for their **installation**, and (b) what is the priority, and
- (4) if not, what measures in **traffic** management are contemplated to maintain safety?

Answer—

- (1) (a) The latest traffic count undertaken at this intersection on 23rd September, 1980, disclosed that during the heaviest peak hour between 7.30 and 8.30 a.m., 461 vehicles travelled in Twin Road, 636 vehicles travelled in **Badajoz** Road, 46 pedestrians crossed **Badajoz** Road and 13 pedestrians crossed Twin Road.
- (b) 1976—6 accidents.
1977—3 accidents.
1978—7 accidents.
1979—7 accidents.
to September, 1980—4 accidents.
- (c) (i) Although sight-lines are somewhat restricted by a crest in **Badajoz** Road, southwest of the intersection, visibility is considered adequate.
(ii) Provided normal care and patience are exercised the intersection can be negotiated safely.
- (2) As the honourable member is aware, the need for traffic signals is a matter for the Minister for Transport. In this regard, my colleague has informed me that a warrant does not exist for the installation of signals at this site.
- (3) (a) and (b) see (2) above.
- (4) The accidents appear to have occurred as a result of excessive speed and non-observance of "stop" signs. Conditions at the site are to be examined by Ryde council traffic committee at its next meeting. The committee will make recommendations to Ryde Municipal Council, which will implement any measures deemed necessary.

BRAVERY DECORATIONS

Mr **BOYD** asked the Premier and **Treasurer—**

- (1) Is he aware of the extreme bravery displayed by Jeffery Parkinson, who lost his life saving a woman from a rapist at Cobaki, near Tweed Heads, on 3 February, 1980?
- (2) If so, will consideration be given to proper recognition of Parkinson's bravery?

Answer—

- (1) A report has been received outlining the matters which took place at Cobaki on 3 February, 1980.
- (2) The matters surrounding the death of Mr Parkinson have been forwarded to the Australian Bravery Decorations Advisory Committee for their consideration.

GREEN & SONS

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Consumer Affairs—

- (1) Has action been taken to stop the activities of an organization called "Green & Sons", which was discussed in the 1978–79 annual report of the Department of Consumer Affairs, as well as being commented on by him in the House on several occasions?
- (2) As this organization has reverted to its old trading habits, by exploiting consumers in claiming to have an exclusive stone-cleaning system, have steps been taken with respect to the proprietors and their trading habits?
- (3) Is the Barry John Green noted as the proprietor of "Green & Sons", the same Garry John Green who has been arrested on a variety of charges, including arson and other serious criminal offences?

Answer—

- (1) Yes, on 29 July, 1980, Mr J. Parnell, S.M., placed Marjorie Pearl Green on recognizance of \$500 to be of good behaviour for 3 years in respect of 22 summonses issued for breaches of the Consumer Protection Act, 1969. Additionally, 42 summonses had been served on John Barry Green (also known as Gary John Green and Nicholas Phillips) for breaches of the Consumer Protection Act, 1969. The hearing of these matters was originally set down for 30th June, 1980, but they did not proceed on that date as Mr Green's whereabouts were unknown. The matters are now listed for hearing on 2nd February, 1981.
- (2) To the best of my knowledge, the organization known as "Green & Sons" has ceased trading. However, one of the principals, Marjorie Pearl Green has commenced trading under the business name "Clean As Nu Steam Cleaners" and distributing pamphlets similar to those used for "Green & Sons". My department is closely monitoring this organization's activities and should any breaches of legislation administered by my department be detected, appropriate action will be instituted promptly.
- (3) Yes. Mr Green is currently in custody awaiting trial not only for those matters mentioned in the question on notice but now also for those matters for which he was extradited from Queensland following his faked drowning in the Hawkesbury River just prior to the hearing of the committal proceedings in respect of the arson matters.

FAUNA DEALER LICENCE

Mr MASON asked the Minister for Planning and Environment—

- (1) Can he explain the delay in granting a fauna dealer (kangaroo) wholesaler licence to Bunda Game Processors Pty Ltd of Nyngan?

(2) As the Acting Minister for Planning and Environment wrote to Bunda Game Processors Pty Ltd on 14th January, 1980, stating that a licence would be issued and as the letter was countersigned by the director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and Assistant Director (Wildlife), why has the licence not been issued?

(3) Is he aware that Bunda Game Processors Pty Ltd will employ up to 200 people in Nyngan if a licence is granted?

(4) In view of that, and the investment tied up in associated works which are dependent on the granting of the licence, will he expedite the granting of a licence?

Answer—

(1) There have been no unavoidable delays in considering an application for a fauna dealer (kangaroo) licence by Bunda Game Processors Pty Ltd of Nyngan.

(2) The letter of 14th January, 1980, also advised that the issue of a licence would be conditional on agreement being reached on operating strategies, location and suitability of facilities and arrangements for marketing of products. An application for financial aid through the Country Industries Assistance Fund to enable the enterprise to be established was unsuccessful and consequently the licensing conditions of the National Parks and Wildlife Service were not able to be satisfied.

A further licence application was lodged by the company in July 1980. This application was one of many similar applications for new fauna dealers' licences which were held over pending the completion of an overall review of the kangaroo management programme in New South Wales by the service.

This review has now been completed. It has been approved that, in regard to the issue of additional fauna dealers' licences, applications will be invited by advertisement for the establishment of operations in specified areas. All applications received will be examined by a review committee prior to decisions being taken on the granting of new licences.

(3) I am not aware that the employment potential of this proposal would run to 200-odd jobs.

(4) I have directed that action to advertise for applications be expedited and that the company's application be dealt with in conjunction with the new applications received. The need for urgent action in regard to this and other applications which involve significant capital investment is recognized.

MESSAGE PARLOURS AT TWEED HEADS

Mr BOYD asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Services—

(1) How many message parlours, places of prostitution and sex shops are operating in and around Tweed Heads?

- (2) How long have they been operating?
- (3) Who are the principal organizers of these operations?

Answer—

(1) From inquiries undertaken by the vice squad, it appears that four premises are available for the provision of massage at Tweed Heads and three sex shops are operated. As a result of information obtained during a special visit to the area by the vice squad in July this year, 11 premises in the Tweed Heads area are suspected of being used for the purpose of prostitution.

(2) The operation of massage parlours and sex shops in the Tweed Heads area has been known to the vice squad for some time and a number of arrests have been made. In addition to receiving attention from the local police, massage parlours and sex shops will continue to be visited from time to time by members of the vice squad from the Sydney Criminal Investigation Branch.

(3) Information obtained by police indicates that all of the above premises are being operated independently and, in a number of cases, by persons residing in Queensland.

LAND ADJACENT TO NATURE RESERVES

Mr FISHER asked the Minister for Planning and **Environment—**

(1) In a recent decision of the Supreme Court, did Mr Justice Woodward find that the National Parks and Wildlife Service acted unreasonably in declaring an interest in land held by lease in perpetuity, adjacent to a nature reserve under the control of the service?

(2) Has the National Parks and Wildlife Service expressed an interest in large areas of land in other parts of the State which are adjacent to land under the control of the service?

(3) Did he call for a report from the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service following the decision of Mr Justice Woodward?

(4) If so, will he now make this report available to Parliament?

Answer—

- (1) No.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) **Yes.**

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr BARRACLOUGH asked the Minister for Planning and Environment —

Has he any proposals to increase the importance of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, particularly in conjunction with the tourist industry?

Answer—

The Government has many proposals to enhance the tourist industry in this State and the National Parks and Wildlife Service is instrumental in some of these.

The establishment of the Yuraygir and Bundjalung national parks on the north coast and extensions to a number of other coastal parks in the north, as well as the establishment of two new national parks in the south region, viz., Deua and Wadbilliga national parks, are clear indications of the growing importance of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to the tourist industry.

The recent transfer of administration of state recreation areas to the service is also significant in terms of the service's relationship to tourism.

KOSCIUSKO NATIONAL PARK

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Planning and Environment —

Will he ensure that future management planning for Kosciusko National Park provides for balanced development of commercial on-field ski facilities, together with the continuation of co-operative ski lodges used by families and groups, which are often the only way a family can afford a holiday on the New South Wales snowfields?

Answer—

The current review of the Kosciusko National Park plan of management will include consideration of future development of on-field ski facilities in the park and also the extent of development of ski lodges.

The planning issue statement on resort area development recently issued by the National Parks and Wildlife Service provided the opportunity for the public to comment upon matters such as those mentioned above and further opportunity for comment will be provided when the plan is placed on public exhibition.

So far as ski lodges are concerned, existing leases for ski clubs provide a certain security of tenure and there is no proposal to change this situation.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr EGAN asked the Minister for Consumer **Affairs—**

(1) What was the classification and salary of each position available to outside applicants advertised by his department and authorities under his administration in June and July, **1980?**

- (2) What were the duties of, and qualifications and experience required for, each position?
- (3) How many applications were received for each position?

Answer—

- (1) (i) Inspector, Clerk, Grade 3–5. Council of Auctioneers and Agents. Salary \$14,235 range \$17,341.
(ii) Inspector (General). Salary \$12,031 range \$14,577 with possible progression to \$15,728.
- (2) (i) Duties: Inspection of books and examination of affairs of licensees and real estate agents involving modern techniques of accounting; preparation of reports and submissions; investigation of complaints against licensees.
Qualifications and experience: Essential—Full accounting qualifications which would permit registration with the Public Accountants Registration Board. Previous experience in investigation techniques would be an advantage.
(ii) Duties: Inspection and investigation of complaints under legislation administered by the department including Consumer Protection Act, Motor Dealers Act, Hire Purchase Act, Strata Titles Act, Landlord and Tenant (Amendment) Act and Weights and Measures Act. Appear as department witness at Court.
Qualifications and Experience: Essential—current drivers licence, School certificate or equivalent with a pass in mathematics, science and English. Proven ability to deal with the general public and preparation of reports. Desirable—In-depth commercial experience associated with industry and/or wholesale/retail sales, finance, automotive industries, building trades or real estate; some experience in court prosecutions.
- (3) (i) Three (3) applicants.
(ii) One hundred and eight (108) applicants.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr EGAN asked the Minister for Youth and Community Services—

- (1) What was the classification and salary of each position available to outside applicants advertised by his department and authorities under his administration in June and July 1980?
- (2) What were the duties of, and qualifications and experience required for, each position?
- (3) How many applications were received for each position?

Answer—

Positions available to outside applicants advertised by Department of Youth and Community Services in June and July 1980—see attached schedule.

Position	Salary	Duties	Qualifications and Experience	Number of Applicants
Secretary, Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme.	\$ 15,817 to 16,532	Responsible for the administration and promotion of the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme and for servicing the State Award Committee; linking the Scheme to other Government and Non-Government programmes, supervision of a small staff.	Demonstrated administrative ability and experience in a youth organization either in a paid or voluntary capacity.	16
Typist, Moree District Office..	Junior \$ 5,174 to 8,711 Adult 9,722 to 10,192	General typing duties including audio typing. Preparation of clerical and financial reports; payment of accounts; receipt and registration of mail. Answering telephone and Counter inquiries.	Typing speed of 30 words per minute, School Certificate or equivalent. A knowledge of office procedures.	24
Typist, Port Macquarie District Office.	Junior \$ 5,174 to 8,711 Adult 9,722 to 10,192	As above.	As above.	76
Part-time Clerical Assistant to the Area Supervisor, (West) Dubbo.	Junior \$ per hour 2.56 to 4.45 Adult 4.99 to 5.24	General clerical duties including filing and recording. Required to act as a receptionist.	Experience in general office procedures.	26

Position	Salary	Duties	Qualifications and Experience	Number of Applicants
Consultant, Aged Services, Community Liaison Bureau.	\$ 15,743 to 18,069	Monitor, evaluate and plan social services for the aged in N.S.W., administer aged project grants, consult community groups and other Government support for aged programmes.	Appropriate tertiary qualifications. Experience in programme planning development, community consultation.	12
Social Worker, Minali ..	\$ 12,688 to 18,912	Responsible for casework with children including formulation of long-term plans. Working with residential care staff, field staff and community agencies in planning for the children's return to their families or into foster care or a work situation.	Degree or diploma in Social Work from a recognized school offering an accredited course at tertiary level.	7
Social Worker, Ward Services Branch.	\$ 12,688 to 18,912	As above.	As above.	4
Social Worker, Renwick ..	\$ 12,688 to 18,912	As above.	As above.	6
Executive Director, Family and Child Services Agency.	\$ 29,129 to 30,684	Responsible to the Minister for the direction of the Family and Children's Services Agency and the discharge of its functions.	Degree or equivalent in one of the Social Sciences, Education, Social Work or a related discipline. Demonstrated ability to lead, direct and control professional staff. Initiative to create imaginative and innovative programmes related to development within new policy areas.	20

Position	Salary	Duties	Qualifications and Experience	Number of Applicants
Part-time typist, St Heliers ..	\$ per hour Junior 2.83 to 4.77 Adult 5.32 to 5.58	Typing of letters, reports and submissions for administrative staff and social workers and general clerical duties.	Ability to type accurately at a minimum speed of 30 words per minute.	10
Out of School Care Consultant, Community Liaison Bureau.	\$ 15,743 to 16,201	Responsible for the administration of Commonwealth/State Vacation Care Programme; liaison with community groups on the development of new programmes, investigation of applications for funding and liaison with other Government Departments.	Tertiary qualifications in the Social Sciences, Early Childhood Education or related area, a demonstrated capacity to work with community based organizations in the provision of services.	10
Clerical Assistant, Junior-Grade 5, Singleton District Office.	\$ 4,871 to 12,145	Responsible to Resident District Officer for administration of Family Assistance Scheme within office, maintenance of record system, advance account, compilation of various returns. Other clerical duties.	Experience in working unsupervised and in office accounting procedures.	8
Publicity Officer, Planning Research and Evaluation Branch.	\$ 16,142 to 17,046	To edit the Department's Journal, supervise the production of other Departmental publications, assist with writing and producing pamphlets, reports, etc. Assist with display and audio visual projects and with media liaison.	Journalistic or writing experience sufficient to produce the Department's journal and to assist with the production of other Departmental publications. A current driver's licence.	12

Position	Salary	Duties	Qualifications and Experience	Number of Applicants
Project Officer, Handicapped Persons Bureau.	\$ 12,035 to 18,125	Provide investigatory research in areas that relate to the needs and interests of the handicapped. The work involves project tasks related to field investigation, research of information, and compilation of reports and recommendations.	Must possess appropriate tertiary qualifications in the Social Sciences or related fields. Ability to work with a minimum of supervision in a sensitive field; high level of initiative and ability.	9
Clerical Assistant, Junior-Grade 5, Katoomba District Office.	\$ 4,871 to 12,145	Responsible to the Resident District Officer for the administration of the Department's Family Assistance Scheme within the office. Maintenance of record system, advance accounts, compilation of various returns, handling general public inquiries and other clerical duties.	A demonstrated ability to relate to the general public. Experience in working unsupervised and in office accounting procedures.	7
Programme Supervisor, Mt Penang.	\$ 15,743 to 16,201	Staff training, co-ordinating group work. Supervision Careers Advisor.	Tertiary qualifications in behavioural sciences. Experience in design, implementation and evaluation of programmes for adolescents.	10

Position	Salary	Duties	Qualifications and Experience	Number of Applicants
Youth Workers (12 different locations).	\$ 10,450 to 11,477	Responsible for supervision, support and guidance of a given group of children in a residential setting.	Experience in youth work, group work or supervision . Ability to establish relationships with children and young persons.	Pendle Hill Family Group Home—34 Metropolitan Boys Shelter—31 Tallimba—40 Raith—25 Brush Farm Infants Home—39 Anglewood—33 Ormond—46 Minda—18 Cobham—58 Allanville—20 Yasmar—27 Brush Farm Home—29
Cooks (3 different locations).	\$ 10,907 + 1,255 Yarrowa 10,367 + 1,192 Brush Farm Home 10,367 + 1,192 Weroona	Prepare meals for residents and some staff.	Previous experience in quantity cooking.	Yawarra—10 Brush Farm Home 4 Weroona—2
Part-time Cook (3 different locations).	\$ per hour 5.46 to 7.45	Prepare meals for residents and some staff.	Previous experience in quantity cooking.	Minali—14 Renwick—7 Myee—8
Outdoor Attendant, Werrington Park.	\$ 9,883 to 10,298	Care and maintenance of gardens, lawns and general grounds. General outdoor duties.	Experience in maintaining gardens and lawns. Class 3 driver's licence.	16

Position	Salary	Duties	Qualifications and Experience	Number of Applicant
Storekeeper (2 different locations).	\$ 11,104 at Daruk and Brush Farm	Responsible for requisitioning, receipt, storage and issue of all stores and supplies.	Detailed knowledge of requisitioning, storage and issue procedures.	Daruk—23 Brush Farm—7
Deputy Superintendent, Keelong.	\$ 17,496 to 18,069	Assist the Superintendent in the Centre's total management, including oversight of administrative, accounting and programming practices.	Experience in administration and supervision of staff. Ability in verbal and written communication.	20
Part-time Laundress (2 different locations).	\$ per hour 4.99 to 7.93	Washing, drying and ironing of clothing and linen.	Experience in laundering skills and operation of commercial laundry equipment.	Keelong—18 Clairvaux—14
Houseparents (Married Couple) (2 different locations). (plus allowance for both positions).	\$ House master 11,049 + 2,762 to 12,079 + 3,020 House-matron 10,646 + 2,662 to 11,672 + 2,918	Fulfil a parenting role. Leading team of Youth Workers. Participation in programme design and evaluation.	Previous experience in supervision of staff, liaison with professional staff and promotion of the welfare of children.	Renwick—10 couples Minali—11 couples
Assistant Supervisor, Blacktown Sheltered Workshop.	\$ 11,363 to 11,824	Assisting in supervision of up to 60 intellectually handicapped people. Assisting in maintaining quality control over standard of work.	Experience in working with intellectually handicapped people. Possession of an appropriate certificate from a recognized Technical College preferably in an engineering or carpentry trade.	4

KOSCIUSKO NATIONAL PARK

Mr FISHER asked the Minister for Planning and **Environment**—

(1) Is the National Parks and Wildlife Service reviewing its 1974 Plan of Management for the Kosciusko National Park?

(2) Does this plan propose, as an option, the demolition of almost two thirds of the alpine survival huts in the park?

(3) Has the Kosciusko Huts Association done valuable work in restoring and preserving many of these huts, which have been of assistance in saving lives during extreme weather conditions?

(4) Will he assure that the Service will take cognizance of pleas by the Association and not negate the work done in preserving the facilities of the park?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) No. A number of huts whose continued existence could not be justified on historic grounds or for use as shelter huts, were identified in a Planning Issue Statement on huts, issued by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. This publication was not a policy statement but was issued as an integral part of ~~the~~ overall review of the Kosciusko National Park Plan of Management, to stimulate interest in and comment upon future management of huts in the Park.

(3) Yes. The Planning Issue Statement on huts acknowledges this.

(4) Yes. The Kosciusko Huts Association's submission relating to the future management of huts in the park will certainly be taken into consideration along with the hundreds of other submissions received during the current review of the Plan of Management.

The Association and the public generally will have a further opportunity to comment on the contents of the new Plan when it is placed on public exhibition.

BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS

Mr SCHIPP asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Services—

(1) What was the **staff** establishment of the Board of Fire Commissioners at 30 June in each of the years 1976–1980, inclusive?

(2) How many applications for fire reports were sought in each of the financial years 1 July, 1976, to 30 June, 1980?

(3) What backlog of applications existed at 17 September, 1980, in—

(a) 317J reports; and

(b) Ordinance 70 reports?

(4) When were the earliest of the uncompleted applications lodged with the Board in each of the categories?

Answer—

(1) The authorized strength of the permanent staff of the N.S.W. Fire Brigades at 30 June, in each of the years 1976–1980, inclusive, was as follows:

			Officers	Men	Total
12 months ended 30-6-76	479	1 357	1 836
12 months ended 30-6-77	484	1 367	1 851
12 months ended 30-6-78	501	1 403	1 904
12 months ended 30-6-79	539	1 487	2 026
12 months ended 30-6-80	562	1 513	2 075

(2) Information relating to the fires attended by the N.S.W. Fire Brigades is provided, on request, to Chartered Loss Adjusters acting on behalf of Insurance Companies. The figures for 1976 are unavailable but the approximate figures for subsequent financial years are:

1977–78—162.

1978–79—167.

1979–80—252.

(3) (a) 47.

(b) 156.

(4) (a) July, 1979.

(b) November, 1979.

Many of these uncompleted applications had been partially dealt with and were being held pending the receipt of further information from the applicants. In this regard, some applicants have taken several months to provide adequate information in response to the Board's requests.

BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS

Mr SCHIPP asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Services—

(1) What delay can be expected in receiving reports from the Board of Fire Commissioners in regard to building applications for tall buildings?

(2) If delays of unreasonable duration are being experienced, what action has been taken, or is proposed, to speed up the board's processing of its reports?

Answer—

(1) If a tall building is regarded as one over 25 metres in height, the earliest uncompleted application was received by the Board in July, 1979, in respect of an existing building and in March, 1980, in respect of a building to be constructed.

(2) Priority is given where it is established that delay will result in hardship; this is more often the case with proposed buildings. Existing buildings are dealt with under section 317J of the Local Government Act, as to which see the answer to the next question.

BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS

Mr SCHIPP asked the Minister for Police and **Minister** for **Services**—

- (1) Are there delays of up to 12 months in the Board of Fire Commissioners reporting under section 317J of the Local Government Act?
- (2) If so,
 - (a) why are such long delays being experienced; and
 - (b) is action proposed to speed up the processing of these applications?

Answer—

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) While delays of up to 12 months in the Board reporting under section 3175 of the Local Government Act, have been experienced, the situation has been exacerbated by some applicants taking several months to provide adequate information in response to the Board's requests. Generally, however, delays can be attributed to the Board's increased involvement in the inspection of buildings and the submission of recommendations in regard to fire safety matters.
The volume of work, which is being created by the Board's developing responsibilities in this area, is increasing at an unprecedented rate.
- (b) Yes. Additional staff have been appointed, work procedures have been streamlined following an Organization and Methods survey of the Board's Fire Prevention Department and new techniques such as the microfilming of plans have been introduced.

EAST HILLS TRAFFIC

Mr ROGAN asked the Minister for **Transport**—

- (1) Are current traffic counts available for both morning and evening **peak**-hours on
 - (a) Canterbury Road, between Gibson Avenue, **Padstow**, and Moxon Road, Riverwood, and
 - (b) Henry **Lawson** Drive, between River Road, Revesby, and **Belmore** Road, Riverwood?
- (2) How do these movements compare with other major arterial roads in the Sydney metropolitan area?
- (3) What stage have works programmes for relieving congestion on these roads reached?

Answer—

- (1) Current peak hour traffic counts for the two roads in question are not available. However, Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes (1979) **are**—
 - (a) 32 660 vehicles, and
 - (b) 33 770 vehicles.

(2) The traffic volumes in (1) above are generally representative of Arterial Roads in the Sydney Metropolitan area. However, many of these roads carry much higher volumes of traffic.

(3) Information conveyed to me by the Department of Main Roads states that design plans are being prepared for the reconstruction of the section of Canterbury Road between Gibson Avenue and Exceller Avenue. The work is not expected to commence before 1982.

The section of Canterbury Road between Exceller Avenue and Moxon Road is tied in with design considerations for County Road No. 5016 (Fairford Road/Stacey Street) as grade separation is proposed. Work on the extension of Stacey Street is likely to be commenced first, and all the works are planned for completion by 1984, subject to the availability of funds.

There are no current plans for reconstruction of Henry Lawson Drive between The River Road and Salt Pan Creek. Reconstruction is, however, proposed between Salt Pan Creek and Waldo Crescent, Peakhurst, and is likely to be commenced by Hurstville Municipal Council in 1981–82. (As the question also involves the administration of the Minister for Local Government and Roads, this advice has been prepared in consultation with Mr Jensen.)

EAST HILLS RAILWAY SERVICE

Mr ROGAN asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) Has the number of double-decker carriages on trains serving the East Hills Electorate been reduced since the introduction of the train timetable in June, 1980?

(2) If so,

(a) by what number have these carriages been reduced, and

(b) for what reason?

(3) Is there a programme to phase-out progressively old single-decker carriages on this line?

(4) If so, what is this programme?

Answer—

(1) No.

(2) No. During the morning peak hours between 6.30 a.m. and 9.00 a.m. in the present timetable there are 28 double-decker cars scheduled from the East Hills line to the City, compared with 18 in the previous. Between 4.15 p.m. and 5.30 p.m., the height of the evening peak hour, there are 18 double-decker carriages scheduled for both the present and previous timetable.

(3) Yes.

(4) As the new double-decker carriages presently on order are received they will be placed into service with priority going to the more heavily loaded services. It can be mentioned that Waterfall and Cronulla line services from

the Eastern Suburbs are now fully serviced by double-decker carriages. This priority was necessary because of the heavy grades on the Eastern Suburbs System. However, it is intended to replace all of the old single-decker carriages by 1985.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr SCHIPP asked the Minister for Police and Minister for Services—

- (1) What publications or posters have been printed since 1 July, 1976, relating to departments or authorities within his (or his predecessor's) administration?
- (2) In respect of each of the publications or posters what was the:
 - (a) frequency of publication
 - (b) quantity produced
 - (c) cost of publication
 - (d) date of printing and
 - (e) frequency of use of his and/or the Premier's photograph?

Answer—

The information sought is not readily available and, in view of the detail required, its collection would require extensive research and be time-consuming.

In the circumstances, the cost and manpower that would be required to secure information to frame a comprehensive reply would make such an exercise unjustified.

MYALL LAKES NATIONAL PARK

Mr SMITH asked the Minister for Planning and Environment—

- (1) In view of the drastic effects of the current drought, why is agistment not made available for starving stock in Myall Lakes National Park?
- (2) Are 31 200 acres of good grazing land lying idle at Swan Point and Violet Hill?
- (3) What is the value of this land?
- (4) What will the losses be suffered by the State if the land is not made available?

Answer—

(1) For policy reasons on the grounds of adverse environmental effects.

(2) No. The total area of the land described is less than 1000 hectares and about half of that is timbered and of limited grazing value.

(3) The improved value of the land (on the basis of prices paid on purchases by the National Parks and Wildlife Service) ranges from **\$463** per hectare to **\$3,269** per hectare including areas subdivided for village and small acreage development. Consequently the sums mentioned have little, if any, connection with the value of the land for either grazing or nature conservation.

(4) In terms of grazing potential the area is estimated to be capable of carrying **400** head of large stocks on a permanent basis subject to the continued availability of water supply for stock purposes.

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Transport—

Who are the Members of the State Bicycle Advisory Committee?

Answer—

The State Bicycle Advisory Committee is comprised of:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Representing</i>
Mr G. Messiter (Chairman)	Ministry of Transport.
Mr L. Grayson	Local Government.
Mr R. Davidson	Traffic Police.
Superintendent G. Shaw	Health Commission.
Mrs J. Watson	Department of Environment and Planning.
Mr Z. Michniewicz	Bicycle Institute of N.S.W.
Mr D. Morison	Urban Transit Authority.
Mr R. Graham	Traffic Authority.
Mr B. Hazel	Traffic Accident Research Unit.
Mr B. Vazey	Department of Main Roads.
Mr J. McKerral	Department of Education.
Mr E. Scalley	Department of Sport and Recreation.
Mr W. Gibbs	Minister's Nominee.
Mr L. Rogers (former champion cyclist)	

