

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 19 March, 1981

Stamp Duties Act: Disallowance of Regulation (Personal Explanation)—Petitions—
Questions without Notice—New South Wales Film Corporation (Urgency)—
League of Rights (Personal Explanation)—Technological change (General Business)—
Bills Returned—Printing Committee (Tenth Report)—Questions upon
Notice.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT: DISALLOWANCE OF REGULATION

Personal Explanation

Mr McDonald: Mr Speaker, I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Upon what matter does the honourable member wish to make
a personal explanation?

Mr McDonald: It relates to the fact that I believe my character and integrity
were impugned by the Premier and Treasurer by his claim on Tuesday that I lied
in statements I made regarding his attitude to squeezing the private sector to let
the public sector grow.

Mr SPEAKER: Has the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the indulgence of
the House to make a personal explanation?

Mr Wran: No.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

PETITIONS

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

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act

The petition of certain residents of New South Wales, respectfully
sheweth that:

Section 20 of the Cruelty to Animals Act may prevent the con-
duct of properly organized and supervised bushmen's carnivals and
rodeos.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will take action to repeal section 20 of the Cruelty to Animals Act.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Osborne, received.

Aboriginal Land Rights

The Aborigines of New South Wales have been dispossessed of their lands for almost 200 years.

The present New South Wales Labor Government established a select committee of the Legislative Assembly to inquire into land rights in New South Wales.

The select committee has completed its report on land rights and the report was tabled in Parliament on August 13, 1980.

The report recommends the implementation of Aboriginal land rights legislation in New South Wales and Premier Wran has committed the Government to the principle of land rights.

Now we the undersigned, strongly urge the New South Wales Government to implement without delay the recommendations of the select committee of the Legislative Assembly on land rights.

This your Petitioners humbly pray.

Petition, lodged by Mr Hills, received.

Pulp Mill for Brewongle

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

That the proposed **export** softwood pulp mill at Brewongle will worsen existing water supply problems, require the planting of more publicly subsidized softwood plantations, lower water quality in the Fish and Macquarie rivers, and cause the loss of 800 acres of productive farmland.

Therefore we humbly request that your Assembly **will:**

- (1) Instruct that the proposal for establishing the pulp mill at Brewongle be dropped in favour of a more environmentally suitable location. **e.g.**, on the coast.
- (2) Instruct that the maximum size of any pulp mill be dictated by the size of the current softwood planting programme in the Bathurst forestry district of 54 000 hectares maximum.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Osborne, received.

Road Courtesy

The petition of certain concerned citizens of New South Wales, respectfully sheweth:

That New South Wales drivers are far too aggressive **and** show a lack of courtesy and patience. These bad characteristics contribute significantly to the shocking road toll.

Your Petitioners therefore **humbly** pray that the Government design and implement a long term advertising campaign to educate the driving public on road manners and that questions on the road courtesy be made compulsory for all licence tests.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Smith, received.

Rydalmere East Public School

The petition of the parents, citizens and friends of Rydalmere East Public School, respectfully sheweth:

That with school grounds covering some 25 acres and only 260 pupils we are continually fighting a losing battle to keep them in order. The grass is at present cut by the weekend detention prisoners from Silverwater gaol. This has proved a very satisfactory arrangement but the perimeter of the grass around the borders and garden beds are left unattended. During the hot months impetigo is a problem with the children and the small pre-school yard, that is always poorly maintained, is at times not fit for the children to use safely.

In an area such as **Ermington–Silverwater** pleasant surroundings are hard to find. The school grounds are very large and could be made very attractive with a little care. Our children deserve better than a harsh view of Silverwater over unkempt school grounds.

We your Petitioners therefore **humbly** pray that your honourable House provide for a full time general assistant or gardener to maintain the grounds of Rydalmere East Public School.

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

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

Traffic Signals at Mount Kuring-gai

This petition of certain citizens of New South Wales, respectfully sheweth:

There is an urgent need to improve safety for motorists wishing to join or cross the Pacific Highway from **Glenview** Road, Mount **Kuring-gai**.

Your petitioners therefore **humbly** pray that your honourable House will give urgent consideration to gaining safe entry on to the highway from **Glenview** Road by either installing traffic signals at **Glenview** Road, or providing vehicular access to Nyara Road; and that it make an early announcement on this matter in order that the safety of the people using the intersection be protected.

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

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

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

KINGS CROSS PROSTITUTES

Mr MASON: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Police and Minister for Services. Will the Minister explain to the House what powers the twenty police in the new prostitute squad will have that have not been available to the police in Kings Cross since the repeal of the Summary Offences Act? Was Assistant Commissioner Abbott wrong when he wrote to the honourable member for Bligh last December and stated that because of the Offences in Public Places Act the police had difficulty in taking action against prostitutes? Does the Government intend to alter this law, or will it support the motions of the honourable member for Lane Cove so that there can be no doubt that police have authority to deal with the disgraceful situation at Kings Cross?

Mr CRABTREE: As is customary, the Leader of the Opposition is wrong. We have not formed a new prostitute squad.

Mr McDonald: What about the statement by the Premier and Treasurer in this Parliament about it passing through?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRABTREE: The honourable member for Kirribilli should not talk about passing through. Honourable members have heard enough about his passing through North Sydney under the Landlord and Tenant Act. I have been waiting for a week for him to get off his backside and ask a question. I shall deal with the matter raised by the misinformed Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Mason: Is there no new police squad?

Mr CRABTREE: There is no new prostitution squad. As the Premier and I announced yesterday, the new squad that has been formed is called the juvenile crime squad.

Mr Dowd: Does it not affect adults?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Lane Cove should read standing order 166. As he has been called to order and has not responded to that call, my next action will be to rule that he is acting disorderly and I shall have to ask that he be removed from the Chamber.

Mr CRABTREE: I should inform the House that yesterday the honourable member for Bligh said to me publicly that he was pleased about the positive action being taken by the Government, the police and the Lord Mayor of Sydney. It seems that the honourable member for Bligh is at odds with other members of the Opposition, such as the honourable member for Kirribilli, the honourable member for Lane Cove and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Mason: Will the Minister tell the House what powers the new squad will have?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has asked the Minister a question and should allow him to answer that question.

Mr Mason: It is to be hoped that he will answer it.

Mr CRABTREE: The chattering of the Leader of the Opposition reminds me of the sounds that emanate from the parrots' cage at Taronga Park Zoo.

[Interruption]

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

Mr CRABTREE: The juvenile crime squad will have great powers and I **shall** inform the Leader of the Opposition of them. The squad has been instructed to use those powers. As late as this morning members of the squad were in the **Kings Cross** area and as a result of their activities eleven persons have been charged. Under enlightened legislation introduced by the Government, six intoxicated persons were dealt with, and another eight young persons were spoken to by members of the squad,

[Interruption]

Mr CRABTREE: It is a strange Opposition, whose members seem to suggest that it is a terrible thing for a police officer to speak to a young person but not apprehend him. Does the Opposition oppose that approach?

Mr Mason: Were they indulging in sexual acts in public?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order and ask him to set an example to other members of the Opposition. It would be disappointing for me to have to direct that he be removed from the Chamber.

Mr CRABTREE: I should add that two of the young persons apprehended last night were charged with being exposed to moral danger. In their wisdom the police thought that the other eight young persons should not be charged—not because of anything of the sort that is in the filthy minds of Opposition members, but because the police felt that the young persons should be spoken to and given another chance.. The hypocritical Leader of the Opposition wants to crack down on every young person who is found on the street. That will not happen.

I shall now deal with the powers available to the juvenile crime squad. I can speak on behalf of the Commissioner of Police on this matter. He and I believe the squad has sufficient power. I have had discussions with the Commissioner of Police and leaders of the community. I am proud to have been present at the conference held yesterday. The honourable member for Lane Cove will be **embarrassed** when the motion that he has on the notice paper is debated by the House. I shall inform the House about some of the legislation that can effectively deal with the situation at Kings Cross. Sections 91 (a) and 91 (d) of the Crimes Act and sections **6** and **7** of the Prostitution Act give the police some powers.

Mr Mason: What does section 7 of the Prostitution Act provide?

Mr CRABTREE: I repeat that the Leader of the Opposition is **misinformed**.

Mr Mason: What does the section say?

Mr CRABTREE: I am informing the House of the powers available to the police in various Acts. The Leader of the Opposition should know what that section provides.

Mr Mason: The Minister does not have a clue about what section 7 of the Prostitution Act provides.

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

Mr CRABTREE: In addition to section 6 and section 7 of the Prostitution Act, other legislation that the police can use effectively to deal with offences at Kings Cross includes section 62 (5) (d) of the Landlord and Tenant Act, section 5 of the Offences in Public Places Act and regulation 85 under the Motor Traffic **regulations**.

Section 72 of the Child Welfare Act is also available. The Leader of the Opposition has made some idiotic remarks. He asked a question and I am answering it. The briefless lawyer from Lane Cove might advise him later on this matter. The sections to which I have referred are being applied. Already eighty-seven charges have been laid under them, and all charges have been found proved by magistrates. Today another eleven charges will be laid under those provisions. I hope that satisfies the Leader of the Opposition. The courts have upheld the decisions of the police to prosecute those **persons**.

MAIL ORDER FIRMS

Mr A. G. STEWART: I address a question without notice to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. Is the Minister aware of the cleverly designed advertising programme of a mail order company operating in my electorate, seeking to sell diamonds of mediocre quality at **outrageously** high prices? **Will** the Minister inform me what action is being taken to protect consumers from being **taken** in by those advertisements and wasting their money?

Mr Mason: Why does not the honourable member ask about the sewage at Manly? Is he not concerned about that?

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The conduct of the members of this House has a considerable bearing upon the respect that the public has for Parliament. The fact that from time to time we are a noisy assembly womes the public. I ask **all** honourable members to try to conduct themselves with decorum and set an example to others.

Mr EINFELD: The entry of the honourable member for Manly into this House has strengthened considerably the Government's ranks. In his penetrating manner he has raised examples of malpractice and has been responsible for having them investigated. On a number of occasions he has brought to the attention of my department matters involving exploitation of the community. The question he asks is no exception to his dedicated approach to such matters. Although his opponent at the forthcoming State elections already has two persons **working** full time to prepare his electoral campaign, even 10 000 such persons would not prevent the honourable member for Manly from being returned to this place with a big majority at the next elections.

I am delighted to have the opportunity to tell the honourable member for Manly and all honourable members that my attention has been drawn to advertisements relating to alleged valuable diamonds. Those advertisements have appeared in a number of journals, including the copy of a journal that I have here, namely, the Women's **Day**. The advertisements are by a company known as **Mailex** International, which gives its address as 14 Sydney Road, Manly. They are headed "Do you read small ads like this?" **But** the space occupied by those advertisements measures about 24 centimetres by 19 centimetres. They state that if a person sends \$10 and a \$1 for postage, a "genuine .5 17-facet round diamond" will be supplied. It states also that each diamond "will be accompanied by our Certificate of Authenticity".

My officers have seen almost identical advertisements that have been prepared but not yet published by another company. The **difference** in its advertisements is that it suggests that the diamonds it advertises measure ".25", and the cost is \$8.99 plus \$1 for postage. Those advertisements are intended for the Sunday newspapers, but they have been withdrawn because the executive of that company is in the process of supplying my department with information on the claims made in the advertisements.

The Mailex advertising campaign has been investigated by officers of my department and consumer affairs departments in other States. Indeed, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs in Western Australia has already denounced that sort of advertising as misleading. Those who respond to those advertisements are throwing away good money. The item described as a "genuine .5" diamond is in fact only one half of one-hundredth of one carat. By contrast, an average engagement ring has diamonds measuring about one-quarter of one carat. In other words, the advertised diamond is an ordinary industrial diamond, that is, about the size of the ball point of a pen and worth no more than 25c.

The certificate of authority is really the company's own document. It is meaningless and valueless on an open market. These advertisements are a cynical attempt to part consumers from their hard-earned money. On my instructions, the department is investigating whether any breach of the law has occurred in regard to misleading advertising. I have also asked officers of the department to interview the editors of journals with regard to their responsibility not to publish advertisements that are definitely unethical, if not illegal. It would be ludicrous to suggest that the editor of a newspaper should examine the authenticity of every advertisement that appears in each publication, particularly classified advertisements, but sizeable advertisements that appear in magazines or newspapers of repute cast a responsibility on the editors. I do not believe that editors should accept without some investigation advertisements that are obviously misleading and meant to deceive.

I have already asked the officers of my department to interview the editors of some of the more reputable magazines, periodicals and newspapers. Often people will send a cheque or money to buy goods on mail order if the journal in which the advertisement appears is of good repute. I suggest that in the meantime consumers should keep their money and not try to buy these absolutely useless and almost valueless diamonds.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr PUNCH: I direct a question without notice to the Premier and Treasurer. As the Government claims to be concerned about youth unemployment, why was it underspent by \$6 million on unemployment relief schemes in 1979–80 and why did it fail to allocate funds for the special council employment scheme for young people during this financial year? Though the youth of the western region of Sydney have ready access to city jobs, do they have a special assistance scheme to alleviate problems associated with unemployment? If they do, and as the unemployment situation in rural New South Wales is far more severe than in the metropolitan areas why does the Government not have the same scheme for the country where each young jobless person has to compete with between fourteen and 318 other job seekers compared to only four in Sydney?

Mr WRAN: The unemployment scheme was not underspent by \$6 million in 1979–80. The matter has been raised on more than one occasion. I thought it had been answered to the total satisfaction of everybody, apart from the Leader of the Country Party. It is a matter of allocation of money to the councils involved. On other occasions I have explained to the House that all the money allocated for unemployment that year was spent but that some councils were either slow, or there were problems, in processing claims made in relation to the allocation of funds for unemployment. In the result, though the accounts might have shown that at the end of the year \$6 million was still available, all of that money had been committed to the unemployment schemes for which it was originally intended.

As to the next matter raised by the Leader of the Country Party, that is, **the** failure of the Government to allocate funds in respect of youth unemployment **in** the current year, the Leader of the Country Party either seems to be unaware **of**, or to ignore, the fact that this year the New South Wales Government is spending more money for this purpose than ever before. That is regrettable. I say that it is regrettable because no one can be satisfied with the level of unemployment in **Australia**. Despite that fact, New South Wales has the best record of any State. It is regrettable that the Government has to tackle the problem at State level, as it does.

This year more money has been allocated to youth unemployment than ever before in the history of this State. The result is that at present about 20 000 young people in New South Wales are undertaking skilled or semi-skilled courses in technical colleges as well as pre-apprenticeship training and pre-employment courses. It is quite false for the Leader of the Country Party to endeavour to establish that there is some differential treatment given young people in country New South Wales and to those in the Sydney metropolitan area. The Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy has been assiduous in his attempt to ensure that the millions of dollars the Government has poured into pre-employment schemes, which are designed to prepare young people for useful work when such work becomes available or to heighten their level of skills to the point where they will be able to get jobs, will provide such training throughout the entire State.

As one who travels to the four corners of the State whenever possible, I can say that in this respect the Government's efforts on behalf of country people are much appreciated. I deplore the attempt by the Leader of the Opposition, or rather the Leader of the Country Party—I made a Freudian slip—to try to show that, in some way, young people in the western suburbs of Sydney are being treated differently from those in the country. Obviously where there is a concentration of population, the problem can be tackled in a different way from when we are dealing with a sparse population. The Government is proud of its record in attempting to alleviate the problem of unemployment and, in particular, the problem of youth unemployment. The Government is extremely proud that a significant proportion of the funds available for youth employment schemes go to country areas of this State. Indeed, in this respect the Government has done more for country people and their children **than** any other State government has done for them.

Though the Leader of the Country Party may endeavour to drive a wedge; of division between the people of this State, he should remember always that we are all Australians. We are not any different because we live in a particular part of New South Wales or Australia. The main commitment of all people of good will is to further the interests of our country and not to raise bogeys and create divisions, as **the** Country Party does. It is well known that because of the fading influence of the Country Party as a political force in this State, in recent times it has aligned itself with the League of Rights. The Leader of the Country Party is a well-known participant in the activities of the League of Rights—in fact, he is a confidant of the leaders of the League of Rights in this State. Everyone knows that the League of Rights is **a** neo-Fascist organization designed to create divisions in this country and to get us back to the atmosphere of the early 1930's. If that happened some people could play upon the misfortunes of others in poor economic circumstances; they could make capital out of unemployment and similar problems and develop a body such as the New Guard, which existed in this State in the 1930's. This is the first occasion for some time that I have seen the honourable member for Clarence smiling. I thought the honourable member had more problems on his hands in the Supreme Court than would permit him to smile. I repeat, the Government's record in supporting the youth of country

New South Wales is second to none. I am surprised that the Leader of the Country Party has not made himself and the troglodytes who support him aware of the Government's programmes.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

Mr **McGOWAN**: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Transport. Are current bus, rail and ferry fares relatively cheaper than when the Labor Government came to office? Has there been a massive increase in the patronage of public transport? If **so**, what has been the effect on revenue from that source?

Mr **COX**: The honourable member for Gosford has always **taken** a **keen** interest in transport, especially in his electorate, and I am grateful for that. Recently I directed to be published a number of statistics showing increased passenger journeys on public transport and comparisons of fares charged. I shall deal first with the situation in the Gosford electorate. During the period between 1973 and 1976—that is, when the former Liberal Party-Country Party Government was in office—the cost of a return **journey** from Gosford to the city went up **58c**. Under **this** Government there has been no increase in the cost of that return journey. Between 1973 and 1976 the price of a weekly ticket between Gosford and Sydney rose by \$1.40; **under** this Government it has increased by **90c**. Obviously the people of Gosford have received substantial monetary gains in rail travel from this Government. I shall refer now to rail fares from **Hornsby** to the city for I **know** that the honourable member for **Hornsby** needs any help he **can** get. The **cost** of a return journey from **Hornsby** to the city between 1973 and 1976, that is under the former Government, went up **28c**; since the Labor administration came to office the price has gone down by **10c**. I do not know what happened to cause that result. A worker's weekly ticket for that journey between 1973 and 1976, during the former Government's term of office, rose by \$1.10; since the Labor Government took office the price of that ticket has increased by **20c**.

Between 1973 and 1976 the cost of a return rail ticket from Mount Druitt to the city rose by **54c**, but it has risen by only **10c** under this Government. The cost of a worker's weekly ticket for that same journey, which rose by \$1.25 between 1973 and 1976, has increased by only **40c** since the Labor Government came to office. The cost of a return journey from Meadowbank to the city rose by **18c** between the years I have stated but since this Government came to office the price has increased by only **10c**. The cost of a worker's weekly ticket from Meadowbank to the city between 1973 and 1976—again during the former Government's administration—rose by \$1.25; since then the price has risen by **40c**. The cost of a return journey from Concord West to the city rose by **36c** between the years I have stated, but since then it has increased by only **10c**. The price of a worker's weekly ticket from Concord West to the city rose by \$1.35 between 1973 and 1976—again during the former Government's period in office—but the cost of that ticket has gone up only **60c** since this Government came to office.

I shall make a comparison of the cost of some other rail journeys. The price of a worker's weekly ticket from Katoomba to the city went up by \$2 during 1973 and 1976, when the former Liberal Party-Country Party Government was in office, but it has risen by only **40c** under this administration. Statistics show that between 1973 and 1976, under the former Government, passenger journeys decreased by 41 million. The Labor Government has increased passenger journeys by 39 million since coming to office.

Mr Mason: How many of those increased journeys were on the eastern suburbs railway?

Mr COX: I am glad the Leader of the Opposition has raised that question. If ever anything was in a shambles when I became Minister for Transport it was the eastern suburbs railway. The situation was so bad that we had to appoint a board of inquiry headed by Mr Campbell and two public servants to inquire into that railway. The previous administration did not even have a project plan, although it had spent \$90 million on the work. On coming to office the Labor Government spent \$70 million on the eastern suburbs railway and finished it in two years.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition waffling in the House yesterday about the eastern suburbs railway. If the Opposition parties were still in office, that railway would not be open today. I say that on the basis of the way in which they were implementing that programme. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for reminding me of the eastern suburbs railway. If the Wran Government had not come to power, it would never have been finished. The revenue from bus fares in 1979–80 was \$143.1 million. In the last year of the former Government the revenue from rail and bus fares was \$117.4 million, a difference of \$45.5 million.

The former Liberal Party–Country Party Government had a succession of Ministers for Transport; namely, the Hon. M. A. Morris, Mr Fife, the late Mr Ruddock and the honourable member for Tenterfield. Since then Mr Viney, the honourable member for Lane Cove and the honourable member for Mosman have been Opposition spokesmen on transport matters. The Opposition parties have had seven people in ten years dealing with the administration of the public transport systems of this State. Those parties were thrown out of office because of the scandal associated with their administration of public transport. I am grateful to the honourable member for Gosford for his question. The figures I have quoted clearly show the success of the policy of the Labor Government in setting a fare structure that is reasonable in order to attract people back to public transport. An increase of 39 million passenger journeys in a period of four years illustrates that success. The Government has had a clear demonstration of the public's confidence in it.

COURT DELAYS

Mr DOWD: My question, which is without notice, is addressed to the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice. Have the committal proceedings against four policemen and Sergi for conspiring to pervert the course of justice, aborted as a result of the actions of Mr Cummins, Q.C., been set down for 3rd November, 1981? Is this eight months' delay typical of the delay in the working of the Department of Justice under the Minister's administration? If not, will he now intervene to make available a magistrate to expedite the hearing of this case, which dates back to 1974?

Mr WALKER: I should have thought the honourable member for Lane Cove would have been moving urgency on the two bills standing in his name on the notice paper, but he is noted in the House for his lack of intestinal fortitude. I am not the least surprised that he asks a rather innocuous question about delays in courts of petty sessions. There is no doubt that at the moment there are considerable delays in courts of petty sessions. There are many reasons for those delays. Some of them should be enunciated in the House for the enlightenment of honourable members and the general public.

One of the main problems in the central court of petty sessions is the number of lengthy conspiracy trials at present before the court. To take one example, the federal Government has been conducting a persecution of Greek members of the community and that matter has engaged the attention of the deputy senior magistrate for two years so far.

[Interruption]

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

Mr WALKER: The legal aid system in this State, introduced by the **Wran** Government, has at last provided justice for people in criminal matters. For **the first** time in the history of New South Wales defendants are being properly **repre-**sented, but for that very reason their cases are taking longer to dispose of. The latest study shows that defended cases are now taking up to three times as long as they did before this Government came to office, simply because persons charged **are** getting adequate representation and receiving justice. That has caused some **prob-**lems in the system.

Another difficulty is caused by the legal profession. These important cases often involve two, three or even four senior counsel as well as a number of junior counsel. They are the cream of the bar, the most capable people, and they are very busy. They have briefs that will occupy most of their time for the remainder of the year. When an adjournment is agreed to there is great difficulty in arranging a future sitting date suitable to all counsel involved.

During the year magistrates take on a number of important cases and **fix** their dates ahead, which also causes difficulties. I agree with the honourable member for Lane Cove that matters of the sort he mentioned should be dealt with expeditiously. The fact that the case to which he refers was not completed was unfortunate and regrettable, but that is a matter for other tribunals. I say only that I shall examine the matter raised by the honourable member, and if there is any way in which it **can** be expedited I shall see that it is done.

WHEAT POOL PAYMENTS

Mr CURRAN: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation. It was announced recently that the Australian Wheat Board payments from wheat pools would be made as follows: \$2.11 a tonne on the 1975–76 pool on 6th March; \$3.39 a tonne on the 1976–77 pool on **11th** March; and \$5 a tonne on the 1978–79 pool on 16th March. Is the Minister aware that those payments have not been made? Has the federal Minister for Primary Industry approved those payments? If there has been a technical hitch in making them, has the Australian Wheat Board informed wheatgrowers in New South Wales? Is the Minister able to say why the payments were not made on the announced dates?

Mr Fischer: On a point of order. I submit that the question asked by the honourable member for Castlereagh is out of order on two counts. First, it is too **long**. Second, the **first** part of the question, in effect, gives information rather than asks a question. I invite you to rule on the form of the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Although the honourable member for Castlereagh gave information in his question, he gave no more information than was necessary to explain **it**. I rule that the question is in order.

Mr DAY: I compliment the honourable member for Castlereagh on his dedication to the interests of his constituents and congratulate him on his tenacity in pursuing matters on their behalf and in trying to reach a solution to problems faced by those in primary industry.

[Interruption]

Mr DAY: Members of the Liberal Party do not care a fig about these things, but they are matters of moment to the honourable member for Castlereagh and to farmers throughout the State. Perhaps I should remind Opposition members that New South Wales has been suffering one of the worst droughts in history and farmers' resources have been strained to the limit. It behoves the Opposition, the Australian Wheat Board and the federal Government to be sensitive to those problems and to be sympathetic, **energetic** and enthusiastic in resolving them. I **am** informed that an unidentified technical hitch has occurred in the last stages of the payment process so that payments have not been made on the announced dates. I understand that the Australian Wheat Board is engaged in consultations with the federal Minister for Primary Industry about the matter.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Orange and the honourable member for Northcott to resume their seats.

Mr DAY: It may well be that the so-called technical hitch is occurring at a level within the control of the federal Minister. I understand that the federal Minister has not yet approved most of the payments. However, I gather that the 1978–79 fourth payment was credited to bank accounts on Tuesday, not on Monday as originally stated. It is true that other payments are running late. The honourable member for **Castlereagh** referred to the final payment of \$2.11 a tonne on the 1975–76 pool which was expected on 6th March, and the final payment of \$3.39 a tonne on the **1976–77** pool which was expected on 11th March. The payments have still not been made. The attitude of the Australian Wheat Board and the federal Government shows a total lack of sensitivity to the conditions that face the men on the land.

A number of technical matters are to be considered in any of the staged payments made to wheatfarmers by the Australian Wheat Board. Wheatfarmers should be rewarded for the terrible conditions that they have endured. I thank the honourable member for his question. I shall pursue the matter with the Minister for Agriculture, who no doubt will take it up with the appropriate federal authorities.

—

NEW SOUTH WALES FILM CORPORATION

Urgency

Mrs FOOT (Vaucluse) [11.12]: I move:

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

That the Government refer for investigation and report the whole question of the accountability and financial administration of the New South Wales Film Corporation to the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee chaired by the honourable member for Heffron, Mr L. J. Brereton.

When submitting to this House that it is a matter of urgency that the affairs of the New South Wales Film Corporation be investigated by the Joint Committee upon Public Accounts and Financial Accounts of Statutory Authorities, I make it clear that the concern of the Opposition is the waste of taxpayers' money on the excessive and unjustifiable costs of administering and running this corporation. The Opposition is not concerned about losses incurred by the corporation in fulfilling its legitimate function of promoting the New South Wales film industry, unless it is found that directors or staff of the corporation caused money to be spent on projects in which they had an undeclared interest.

Mr Walker: On a point of order. The honourable member for Vaucluse is speaking to the substantive motion. She is not giving reasons why the business of the House should be set aside to enable her motion to be dealt with. Honourable members may have to vote on the motion of urgency. The honourable member for Vaucluse should explain to the House why this matter is so urgent that it should be debated today and not at some other time when the standing orders available to her can be used, such as on private member's day.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is substance in the point of order taken by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice. At this time the honourable member for Vaucluse should be speaking only to urgency and explaining why government business should be set aside today to enable her motion to be dealt with. The honourable member for Vaucluse must demonstrate to the House why the matter is urgent.

Mrs FOOT: This matter is urgent because there is excessive wastage of at least \$500,000 a year by the New South Wales Film Corporation. Yesterday the honourable member for Castlereagh moved an urgency motion because he believed that money was needed for health care, and for two years I have been campaigning for more money to be spent to upgrade sewage treatment facilities at Bondi, Malabar and North Head. Money can be saved by preventing the waste indulged in by directors of the New South Wales Film Corporation on luxury dinners and luxury travel. In the interests of the taxpayers of the State I have a responsibility to move this motion of urgency. I preface my further remarks by quoting my leader, who on 7th June, 1977, said:

Certainly there will be no criticism from the Opposition if there are some failures and some occasions when the corporation runs the risk of an unknown and on a film that may not bring public response.

I know a considerable amount about film making. Recently I was involved in the making of a documentary film——

Mr Wran: On a point of order. I have no doubt that all honourable members are interested in the ability of the honourable member for Vaucluse to make films; we should be delighted to hear about that on another occasion. However, the honourable member for Vaucluse must address herself to urgency and why the House should debate the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Vaucluse to come to the matter before the Chair.

Mrs FOOT: Because of my current involvement with New South Wales film makers I know how urgent it is that the accountability and administration of the New South Wales Film Corporation be investigated. Most people involved in the film industry are thoroughly dissatisfied and highly critical of the conduct of the corporation's affairs.

When the Premier and Treasurer grants urgency, as he said he would during the last parliamentary sitting week, I shall be able to amplify their claims that the corporation's funds are being wasted on lavish entertainment and luxury accommodation, both in Australia and overseas.

I hope that I shall have a chance also to elicit from the Premier and Treasurer answers to such urgent questions on his pet subject as: Did Mr Thornhill, when a director, in accordance with section 17 of the Act disclose to the board his interest in "The Journalist"? Did he refrain from taking part in any discussions on the proposed contract with F. J. Film Productions Pty Limited, the company in which he was interested and which received \$330,000 for this flop of a film? Has David Roe, production and marketing consultant of the corporation, received an in-house grant to make the film "Kangaroo"? Those matters are extremely urgent.

This matter is urgent because a simple reading of the corporation's accounts and report taken in conjunction with the Auditor-General's reports is like entering *Alice in Wonderland*. The Auditor-General's Report on the public accounts dated 25th September, 1980, contains a detailed report on the corporation, but notes carefully that the figures shown in his report are based on unaudited figures supplied by the corporation. The figures shown in the corporation's audited accounts for the year ended 30th June, 1980, on which the Auditor-General made a report on 3rd December, 1980, differ quite remarkably from the unaudited figures. No honourable member would accept that a big variation in the figures on the audited and unaudited accounts is unimportant, whether they relate to a small body like the New South Wales Film Corporation or a large instrumentality like the water board. For more than four months I have had a question on the *Questions and Answers* paper about the financial affairs of the water board which still remains unanswered.

Mr Einfeld: On a point of order. As the honourable member for Vaucluse is my nearest neighbour on the east side of my electorate I am delighted to listen to her. She has a musical voice and speaks fluently and eloquently in this House. The honourable member has admitted that the Auditor-General's report was published on 3rd December last year, so the matter cannot be urgent today, some three months later. I submit that the business of the House should not be interrupted to consider something that could not be urgent. Notwithstanding points of order taken by my colleagues, the honourable member for Vaucluse has not advanced one reason why urgency should be granted. There is no reason why the matter could not have been brought before the House by way of section 49 or some other procedure. Yet the honourable member seeks to delay the proceedings of the House so that she may talk about the film industry, which of course she is quite entitled to do at an appropriate time. I think the honourable member would make a wonderful heroine in a film and the Leader of the Opposition would make a great villain.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Matters occurring months previously and recently brought to notice may require urgent discussion. The onus is upon the honourable member to prove to the House that the matter should be discussed as a matter of urgency, even though it occurred months before. The honourable member for Vaucluse is entitled to give a precis of some of the matters she would raise in a substantive motion and to inform the House why the matter is urgent.

Mrs FOOT: I thank you for your indulgence, Mr Speaker. The report of the New South Wales Film Corporation was tabled in this House only two weeks ago. It was not until then that any honourable member had the opportunity to compare the audited accounts with the unaudited accounts. It is for this reason that I have mentioned the *Alice in Wonderland* figures. The Minister for Consumer Affairs has displayed considerable gallantry towards me, as the Premier and Treasurer has

done during the whole of my first term of office in this Parliament. I ask that **the** same courtesy be extended by Government supporters to other Opposition members. **As** recently as two weeks ago the Premier and Treasurer said that he hoped for more cohesion among the Opposition. If I am isolated as a member of Parliament by having unnecessary gallantry bestowed upon me I shall not be part of a cohesive team.

I shall return to the subject of urgency. Without going into too much detail, I shall give some particulars. In the interests of clarity I shall cite figures to **the** nearest thousand dollars. The annual loss was shown originally as \$205,000 but it had to be increased to \$331,000, mainly because it was found necessary to make provision for default on loans made by the corporation for production and marketing. Salaries and what are called special allowances were shown originally as \$223,000 but are now admitted to have been \$256,000, an increase of no less than 60 per cent over **last** year—and not including huge salaries paid to staff of the corporation's luxury establishment in Los Angeles.

The cost of this establishment, Australian Films Office Incorporated, **was** shown in the non-audited accounts included in the Auditor-General's Report as not **less** than \$226,000, but in the audited accounts this amount is concealed under **the** heading "Promotion of the industry **internationally**" and has miraculously increased to \$311,000. In the unaudited accounts \$128,000 is shown for promotion, advertising and entertainment but has completely disappeared in the audited accounts and is presumably hidden under two **different** headings. Such highly suspicious and gross variations between the New South Wales Film Corporation—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has exhausted her time.

Mr WRAN (Bass Hill), Premier and Treasurer [11.22]: In last week's *Sunday Telegraph* the honourable member for Vacluse was reported as **making** a number of allegations of gross waste by the New South Wales Film Corporation which, the newspaper reported, were certain to create uproar in Parliament this week. It is highly unbecoming of any member of Parliament to talk about accounts being suspicious when that member is well aware that the Auditor-General has endorsed the financial statements of the accounts. The report of the Auditor-General dated 11th March, 1981, reads as follows:

My report on the accounts of the New South Wales Film Corporation for the year ended 30th June, 1980, is forwarded herewith. The financial statements endorsed with my certificate have been returned to the Chairman of the Corporation.

As was mentioned by the honourable member for Vacluse, earlier in the Auditor-General's report of the accounts he said:

Adequate internal control procedures have not been maintained for most of the year in a number of accounting areas. This matter was brought to the attention of the Chairman, who put into effect appropriate and prompt remedial measures. Subject to this observation, the result of the audit was satisfactory and the financial statements endorsed with my certificate have been returned to the corporation.

At the end of his report of 11th March the Auditor-General said:

I wish to acknowledge the courtesy and assistance extended by officers of the Corporation in the conduct of the audit.

It is wrong for any honourable member to try to denigrate the role of the New South Wales Film Corporation. The corporation has been responsible for involving New South Wales and Australia in the production of two of this country's greatest films—"My Brilliant Career" and "Newsfront". The corporation has been associated with many other films on a major or minor basis. **All** in all, the record of the New South Wales Film Corporation is extremely good. The honourable member for Vaucluse asked me, first, whether Mr Thornhill disclosed his interest in the film "The Journalist". The answer is, yes, and he did not vote on that matter.

Mr Mason: Did the Premier and Treasurer knock him back?

Mr WRAN: The standards of some Opposition members---and I exclude the honourable member for Vaucluse—are extremely poor. They approach the **affairs** of government in a strange way; they seem to find something sinister in everything the Government does.

Mr Mason: Let us hear the words of the Premier and Treasurer.

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

Mr WRAN: Mr Thornhill is the only director of the corporation who has received a grant. I should add that Mr Thornhill is a distinguished film director, and for the honourable member for Vaucluse, who is now espousing some acquaintance **with** the film industry—albeit newfound—to describe the film as a flop shows that she really does not understand the nature of the industry or of returns from films. **The** film "The Journalist" has been sold to television interests alone for \$100,000. Anyone with a passing acquaintance of the film industry would know that it takes several years to gain a return from films that at first do not exhibit great profit-making potential.

Mrs Foot: That is elementary.

Mr WRAN: It might be elementary, but the honourable member should be more precise when she raises matters in this House. A few weeks ago in response to a question without notice asked by the Leader of the Opposition I told the House that the best film ever made in New South Wales, according to some critics, "My Brilliant Career", had only in the past few weeks began to show a profit.

Mr McDonald: That could be guaranteed.

Mr WRAN: The honourable member for **Kirribilli** should not try to tell members how to make profits. He is pretty good at taking money.

[Interruption]

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

Mr WRAN: The next question asked by the honourable member for Vaucluse was about David Roe. I want to answer the honourable member's questions quickly, for some of the media representatives might race away and report her remarks but not the answers to the questions she asked. The next question was whether David Roe, as an employee of the corporation, received an in-house grant for the film "Kangaroo". I can assume only that the honourable member picked up that idea from some gossip. Surely the honourable member would know that "Kangaroo" is a Tim **Burstall** project that was developed by the corporation. Mr **Burstall** decided that as the project was too big he did not want to——

[Interruption]

Mr WRAN: I thought the honourable member was interested in films. Your brother is, and has recently received a grant from the organization.

Mr Mason: He has not. That is another lie in the Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order and ask him to withdraw the remark "That is a lie".

Mr Mason: At your request, Mr Speaker, I shall do so, but the facts speak for themselves.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have called the Leader of the Opposition to order on four occasions. Ordinarily he should be removed from the Chamber. I caution him that he has had his last warning.

Mr WRAN: Mr Speaker, I urge you not to eject the Leader of the Opposition. He is more beneficial in the Chamber. The honourable member for Vacluse should listen. She has made an allegation but is now talking to the nitwit Leader of the Opposition about films. I repeat that Mr Burstall decided that as the project was too big he did not want to produce and direct the film. By mutual agreement the corporation decided to release David Roe from his contract as a marketing consultant with the corporation, to allow him to produce the film for the corporation and its investors. Mr David Roe will not receive any consultancy fee during the period of his absence. The honourable member for Lane Cove sees more conspiracies and plots than anyone I know, but fails to produce evidence of them. In case he sees something wrong with that arrangement, I should inform the House that the corporation has a significant financial investment in "Kangaroo". I think it is good business for the corporation to release one of its consultants to be the producer of such a film. I should think that would be a most sensible thing to do.

In the article in the *Sunday Telegraph* to which I have referred the honourable member for Vacluse was reported as having made a number of allegations. When the House grants urgency I shall give the honourable member ample opportunity to develop those allegations. One of the assertions she made relate to the use of private aircraft. That should set the standard of the debate. In its history the corporation has only once used a chartered aircraft, and that was on 8th December, 1980, for the purpose of carrying five persons, including journalists, producers and corporation executives, to Bathurst and return. The cost was \$410. If individual return tickets to Bathurst had been purchased at \$82 each, the total cost would have been exactly the same, except that a return aircraft might not have been available and the whole party of persons might have been obliged to stay overnight, at an additional cost of \$150 to \$200.

Far from being a corporation that is wasteful in its activities, the New South Wales Film Corporation runs a tight ship. So that the standard might be set, I should inform honourable members that the deficit in 1979–80 for the New South Wales Film Corporation was \$331,000. The deficit for the Australian Film Commission was \$2,461,000-odd and for the South Australian Film Corporation \$757,000. The Government will agree to the grant of urgency.

Motion of urgency agreed to.

Suspension of Standing Orders

Suspension of so much of the standing orders as would preclude consideration of the motion forthwith agreed to on motion by Mrs Foot.

Motion

Mrs FOOT (**Vaucluse**) [11.32]: I move:

That the Government refer for investigation and report the whole question of the accountability and financial administration of the New South Wales Film Corporation to the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee chaired by the honourable member for Heffron, Mr L. J. Brereton.

When the New South Wales Film Corporation Bill was introduced into this House in 1977 it was supported by the Opposition, as the Premier and Treasurer well knows. Before the war the industry thrived. It then withered. The Australian Film Corporation, which has already been denigrated by the Premier, followed by the New **South Wales** Film Corporation and many other State film corporations, has endeavoured to fulfil the following objective: to encourage and assist the making, promotion, distribution and exhibition of films. As Sydney is the cultural centre of Australia, and as entrepreneurial talent abounds in this city, it is sensible that the corporation exist and that it be properly administered. I shall not elaborate at great length on my very modest venture into the **film** industry, except to say that before I have entered any financial venture I have examined the pitfalls and problems of it. I did this with the film industry for I realized that it was most important that the venture have **potential box office** prospects as well as artistic merit. They are hard to assess. But any **conscientious** film producer knows that he or she must control so-called promotional expenses and administrative overheads. I am suggesting that the New South **Wales Film Corporation** does not do this as responsibly as it should in the interests of the New South Wales taxpayer.

Excessive expenditure is hidden away under the strange heading "**audited** accounts and costs associated with salaries included in salaries" but the separate figures are not shown. I shall be most interested, when the Premier and Treasurer responds to me, to hear about the special allowances in addition to direct remunerations and what is hidden under the \$85,000 cited as promotion of the industry in Australia. We now have **Mr Rudy Pendersdorf** replacing Mr Gelfman as president of **Australian Films Office Incorporated** in Los **Angeles**. He receives a somewhat reduced salary, a mere **US\$70,000**, whereas his predecessor, Mr Gelfman, received **US\$75,000**. At a **time** when the Premier was out of the State, the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports was reported by the press as being quite amazed that such a vast salary was being given to someone for such minor work in a statutory corporation.

Mr Riomfalvy, the chairman of the corporation, said that the salary should never have been disclosed because it was "showbiz". Mr Riomfalvy considers many things to be showbiz. Therefore I think it proper to make some mention of Mr Riomfalvy. Members have been given a detailed explanation by the Premier and Treasurer of his contribution to the Australian film making industry after 1949. It is perfectly simple to read about what Mr Riomfalvy did before 1949 for it is set out in the interim New South Wales Film Commission report and recommendations to the Premier and Treasurer dated January 1977. Before 1949 he worked for the Hungarian state film studios, which, as all members know, was a propaganda organ of the communist government under the brutal Stalin regime. I have heard many **rumours** concerning this gentleman.

Mr Wran: The honourable member is repeating them.

Mrs FOOT: I do not intend to repeat them in this House. All I wish to do is read the answer that the Premier gave to a question posed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in September 1979. The question was:

Did Mr Paul Riomfalvy, Chairman of the New South Wales Film Corporation, state at a New South Wales Agent General's reception in London two months ago that he had found it "relatively easy to persuade German tax shelter sources to put up risk coins for Australian films?"

The answer the Premier gave to that question was that what Mr Riomfalvy said in that statement was substantially correct. The remark made by that gentleman, the source of which he acknowledged, speaks for the sort of person he is. Quite apart from that, I have often heard the Premier refer in this House to individuals whom he claimed had collected funds for the coalition parties, both the Liberal Party and the National Country Party. It is well known in Australia and in New South Wales that Mr Riomfalvy is a bagman for the Labor Party.

Mr Wran: I should like to investigate that. The Government is not getting any of it.

Mrs FOOT: That is what the Premier says. I shall now move on to Mr Thornhill. The Premier claimed that last year Mr Anthony Buckley received funds for making "Caddie" when he was a member of the Australian Film Commission, as did Mr Graham Burke for several films when he was a member of the A.F.C. The Premier suggested that a conflict of interest might have been involved. That was said in answer to a question from the honourable member for Drumroyne last year about "My Brilliant Career". I am interested in the pleasure that the Premier derives from restating the phrase "My Brilliant Career" so often. He may have himself in mind when he continually repeats this phrase. There could also have been some conflict of interest in respect of the New South Wales Film Corporation, in that **\$330,000** went to F.J. Film Productions and Mr Thornhill helped draw up the contract as an interested party. I have been told by a reliable source that the script for "The Journalist" was appalling, and was partly written by a clerk in the Department of Health, a certain Edna Wilson. I understand that she now has a senior position in the corporation.

I should like to discuss further the matter of conflict of interest so that honourable members will realize that I do understand how difficult it is in Australia, with a population of only 14 million people, to get a sufficient number of people with expertise in the arts to sit on commissions and corporations. Many of them are probably capable of directing films, producing plays and writing books. As a member of the Australia Council for a period of one year—before I had to resign to stand for Parliament, as that is an office of profit under the Crown—I was often perturbed by the fact that if someone went out of the room for three minutes or so while a vote was taken on a matter in which that person had a declared interest, it was assumed that that person had not taken part in any of the normal lobbying that goes on if one really wants something. If the Premier is serious—and we in New South Wales are responsible for the New South Wales Film Corporation, we are not responsible for the Australian Film Commission—he may come up with a better suggestion for resolving this question of conflict of interest. As a member of this House and a person vitally concerned with the arts, I am worried about the position. For some two or three years the Government has been trying to enact legislation dealing with the pecuniary interests of members. Because it has not been able to find a procedure for getting the legislation through the Parliament, it is using the device of holding a referendum on the issue instead of on the public funding of elections. I hope that when the Premier and Treasurer replies on this debate he will come up with some stunning and original thought on the matter, for which politicians are not renowned.

Mr Wran: I am waiting for the honourable member to inform the House of something stunning and original.

Mrs FOOT: I now move to Mr Stapleton, the third director of the New South Wales Film Corporation. Mr Stapleton is a union official who, I am reliably told, spends most of his time recruiting members to join the Australian Theatrical and Amusement Employees Association. He is a great entertainer at luxury restaurants who usually prefaces an invitation by saying "I hardly ever go out" but when he walks into a luxury restaurant he is recognized by every head waiter and every waitress.

Miss Jenny Woods has been elevated to the role of director since Mr Thornhill's resignation and also is the general manager. Her qualifications have been outlined though many in the industry claim that she does not possess the necessary expertise to enable her to fulfil her dual role as director and general manager. Provision is made in the Act for the appointment of a chief executive officer. I suggest that the Premier and Treasurer has been derelict in his duty in not seeking out someone of substance to fill that position. I say that because in another answer to a question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the Premier cited in great detail the salaries of the three directors and said that the reason for their being greater than they may have been was that they were all acting as part-time chief executive officers. The Premier and Treasurer should give serious thought to this appointment and relieve Miss Jenny Woods of what the industry considers rather too great a burden for her experience and capabilities.

Mr Wran: I do not think it is good for the honourable member for Vacluse, a woman who wants to be regarded as an equal and whom I regard as an equal, to denigrate another woman.

Mrs FOOT: The Premier and Treasurer's interjection and my opportunity to make remarks regarding the Minister for Consumer Affairs and his gallantry prompts me to say: I took very careful stock before I made remarks about Jenny Woods. Only 3 per cent of the women in the nation are decision-makers. As a woman I protect women to the hilt, but on this occasion it would be quite derelict of me to criticize Mr Riomfalvy, Mr Thornhill, Mr Stapleton and to leave Jenny Woods out.

Mr Wran: What is wrong with her?

Mrs FOOT: I have been told by those in the industry that she does not have sufficient qualifications. It is the duty of the Premier and Treasurer to define more fully the qualifications of these directors. Also, it is his duty to answer more fully specific questions such as those raised in the *Questions and Answers* paper by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in late 1979. At the end of the last fiscal year the New South Wales Film Corporation had three part-time directors. The general manager of the corporation, Miss Jenny Woods, is shown to have been an acting director at that time. According to the Premier and Treasurer in his answer to the Leader of the Opposition a fortnight ago the part-time chairman, Mr Riomfalvy, was receiving the truly princely salary of \$27,500 plus, of course, allowances for his part-time services. The Premier and Treasurer said that the other two directors were receiving approximately \$5,000 each. They were the words that the Premier and Treasurer used.

Mr Wran: Which words?

Mrs FOOT: The prince we are referring to is Mr Riomfalvy. Honourable members know that he is a prince, according to the Premier and Treasurer's way of thinking. That is a total of \$37,500 for part-time directors and, of course, travel and entertainment are included. It is puzzling indeed that the accounts audited by the Auditor-General show as remuneration and what are called special allowances only \$25,000.

Did poor Mr Riomfalvy get only part of his \$27,500? The Premier and Treasurer considers that amount for part-time chairmanship to be a pittance for a man of the wide experience of Mr Riomfalvy. That experience was gained while Mr Riomfalvy served in the Hungarian state film studios and that was followed by experience, by way of contrast, in such a capitalist organization as J. C. Williamson. Were Mr **Thornhill** and Mr Stapleton denied their \$5,000 emolument? Mr Riomfalvy in his review in the report of the New South Wales Film Corporation claims that **the** establishment of the Australian Films Office in Los Angeles was one of the **most important** marketing events during the rebirth of the Australian film industry. **In his** review of the past financial year Mr Riomfalvy does not even try to explain what Mr **Gelfman** and his staff have achieved with \$250,000 but promises that during the next two years the AFO **will** expand considerably. I shall read an extract from the review of the report that was tabled recently. I propose to do that because I do not believe that we are being given the sort of information that we should receive about forward planning. The report to which I referred contains this statement:

The **AFO's** activities will considerably expand during the next two years, especially in the field of packaging and film projects and will involve a determined drive to infiltrate the cassette and cable TV markets. Apart from the **Los Angeles** office there is a home-away-from-home office with facilities available for film makers in the New South Wales Government's premises in New York. The corporation's sales activities in New York will also be increased in the near future. The corporation has a permanent representative, Mr **Wilf** Beaver, at New South Wales House in London. Mr Beaver **has** been a London resident for more than twenty years and speaks French and Italian.

In Europe that is regarded as a modest accomplishment. Many people in those sorts of jobs speak five languages. The report continues:

The corporation has extended its representation to Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany and France.

Honourable members are told nothing about what the various people in these cities are doing for the corporation, but if they are run on the luxurious lines of the **Los Angeles** establishment the matter is, as I said before, one of **extreme** urgency.

In my speech justifying urgency I have given **sufficient** examples to prove to the House the urgency of a proper and thorough investigation of the New South Wales Film Corporation's strange ways of financial administration and control. I do not wish to elaborate unnecessarily on my illustrations of the palpable wastage of taxpayers' money. I shall, however, repeat this: up to the end of June 1979 the corporation had already incurred a loss of \$463,000 mainly because of unnecessary oversea travel, lavish entertainment expenses and the Los Angeles luxury establishment. The additional loss of \$331,000 last year could easily have been avoided. It was incurred mainly because of continued mismanagement and frivolous waste of taxpayers' money. For instance, a script writer was flown from London to a **Hilton** Hotel reception in Sydney. That incident was reported to me.

In the same way as the voluntary organizations of the State are most unwilling to be named because of their fear of reprisals from the Minister for Youth and Community Services, even good friends of mine in the Australian film industry are not happy to be named in the Parliament to substantiate my criticisms of the New South Wales Film Corporation. I am willing to bear the whole burden for my accusations regarding mismanagement by the Minister for Youth and Community Services and **also** mismanagement by the New South Wales Film Corporation, without naming the individuals who have provided me with this information. I think that is a proper

approach if someone supplies information to an honourable member and the member **knows** that the job of that person is on the line if their identity is revealed. Only a standover government would enforce such a situation. Extravagant **as** expenses were in **the** year ended 30th June, 1979, they rose in the year ended 30th June, 1980, by no **less** than 25 per cent. However, instead of a return on equity investment in films of **only \$60,000** in 1979, 1980 brought a return of \$788,000.

Mr Wran: That is a 1 200 per cent rise.

Mrs FOOT: The Premier and Treasurer is attempting to take words out of my mouth. As the Premier and Treasurer told the House the other day, it was a 1200 per cent increase. That was a splendid return on the money invested by the corporation in the film "My Brilliant Career". That **film** established, along with "News Front", "Breaker Morant" and "Picnic at Hanging **Rock**", that excellent films can be made in Australia, and receive international recognition. If it were not for completely unnecessary waste of money and indulgence in luxury, the New South Wales Film Corporation would have shown in the most recent financial year a modest surplus instead of another big loss. In addition to an equity investment in films of \$2 million and loans to the film industry of \$1.3 million—amounts that have been capitalised and shown as an asset in the balance sheet of the corporation—the corporation is showing **as** expenses an amount of \$439,000 under the heading of script and project development, compared with an amount of \$135,000 shown for that purpose in the previous year.

Mr Wran: Does not the honourable member for Vaucluse agree that young writers should receive a chance?

Mrs FOOT: It is, of course, part of the corporation's legitimate function to support the development of promising scripts and projects, but the amount of \$439,000 is so large and the possibility of conflict of interest so great that full details of projects and funds given to these projects should be looked into. I come now to some further questions for the Premier and Treasurer. He should get his pen ready—

Mr Wran: I do not want questions; I want facts.

Mrs FOOT: The Premier has given most evasive answers to the probing questions that have been placed on the *Questions and Answers* paper by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. One of them dealt with the criteria for grants for script writing and film making. The Opposition is naturally concerned when it hears that a friend of the Premier and Treasurer, a Mr Bob Ellis, has received a substantial grant to write a package of film scripts when grants for single scripts are more the normal practice. Also, anonymous script assessors are employed by the corporation. The Australian Film Commission gives reasons for the refusal of grants for script and film making projects. That has not been the practice of the New South Wales Film Corporation. If the corporation genuinely wishes to encourage talent and to teach people to learn from their mistakes, they might have the grace to put forward some reasons when they knock back grants. So that the Premier will not say in his reply that the Opposition is totally destructive and not creative, let me expand on our genuine interest in creativity.

The Minister for Youth and Community Services said that the Government regarded me as one of its secret weapons in Canberra. I am delighted to be a secret weapon for the Premier and Treasurer since he **does** not enjoy the most amicable relationships with the Prime Minister, nor do I think he ever will. The federal Government, on its own initiative has decided to allow as a taxation deduction up to 150 per cent of the sum invested in **films** in the first year of expenditure. After the film **is** completed that Government plans to allow 50 per cent tax of the income to be tax **free**.

I think that is a great incentive *to* film makers. But it is the fear of **all** those **in** the industry—and I hope the Premier and Treasurer shares this fear—that if the **film** industry is swamped with money some **poor** quality American-type films **might** be made. I wonder whether the Premier and Treasurer was honest in the answer he **gave** in November 1979 to a question from the honourable member for **Drummoyne** about the **film** "My Brilliant Career". I now ask the Premier and Treasurer whether he **was** genuine **when** he answered that question in this way:

The Government and the New South Wales Film Corporation **would** welcome greater co-ordination and co-operation between State and Commonwealth organizations concerned with the production and subsidizing of films. In other words, Australia cannot **afford** to have six film industries: the film industry should be a national one and the day is not far away when the organizations that have been set up by the Commonwealth Government and State governments will work **towards** that end.

The New South Wales Film Corporation must first put its own house in order before the Premier and Treasurer's talk about the need to rationalize the film industry will be taken seriously. I have been informed by reliable persons that at the **Cannes** film festival last year the New South Wales Film Corporation acted in opposition to—and not in co-operation with—the Australian Film Commission.

I return to my motion regarding the necessity for the Government to refer to the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee for investigation and report the whole question of the accountability and financial administration of the New South Wales **Film** Corporation. May I remind the House of the strange story of the disappearing travelling expenses. Honourable members will recall that almost \$68,000 **was** spent in the previous year, and only \$12,000 was cited in the unaudited accounts last year. This expenditure vanished from the audited accounts of the New South Wales Corporation report tabled two weeks ago. I have been told by informed sources that the sum **was** much higher last year though no specific figure was cited in the audited accounts. Was it really necessary to raise a State-guaranteed loan of \$1.2 million with \$200,000 in long-term interest bearing deposits and \$1 million in short-term securities when cash at bank at 30th June, 1980 was \$590,000, current debtors were \$587,000 and current liabilities only \$521,000? The result of those financial manoeuvres was **an** interest bill of \$126,000 compared with only \$31,000 in the previous year. The interest received was only \$99,000, compared with the interest of \$120,000 received in the previous year.

Is it really sound financial management to add unnecessarily nearly \$100,000 to an interest bill? I hope the House will forgive me for quoting these figures, but I know that the Premier and Treasurer will be pleased that I have gone **into** these matters in some detail. He will know that I have taken the matter seriously and that I have not come here merely to dish out scuttlebutt. I sum up by saying that the New South Wales Film Corporation has an important and useful role to fulfil. The corporation can and must fulfil its task without any extravagant waste of the money that rightly belongs to the taxpayers of this State. I remind the Premier and Treasurer that at the end of his second reading speech on the New South **Wales** Film Corporation Bill of June, 1977, he said:

The Government wants the money to go into the industry and not to the Film Corporation. The Government is intent on seeing that spending of the money provided is **justified**.

Mr **WRAN** (Bass Hill), Premier and Treasurer [11.55]: It is difficult to address oneself to the motion because of the vagueness and imprecision of what was said by **the** honourable member for **Vaucluse**. It seems **that** the honourable member

has no material or facts to advance in support of the motion. The only source material she used apparently came from people she recognizes as the industry—and they are not the persons in the industry to whom I speak.

[Interruption]

Mr WRAN: I do not want the debate to develop into a slanging match between myself and the honourable member for Vaucluse who, I repeat, is one of the more admirable members of the Opposition. However, at the outset I shall rebut a few of the points she has made. I thought the honourable member for Vaucluse was being singularly unfair and bordering upon an ethnic bias to refer to the fact that thirty-two years ago a migrant to **this country** worked for a State film studio in a country from which he **later** escaped. That attitude **seems** to be almost bordering on **McCarthyism**.

I **am** shocked that the honourable member for Vaucluse should condemn the chairman of the Film Corporation, first, because he was born in Hungary and, second because he worked for an instrument of that State in 1949, when he escaped from that system and became a citizen of this country. Another matter that was not becoming of the honourable member for Vaucluse or any other Opposition member is the unsubstantiated attack upon the general manager of the Corporation, Ms Jennie Wood. Again this attack was made because someone in the industry had told the honourable member for Vaucluse that Ms Wood could not do the job and she should be got rid of.

[Interruption]

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

Mr WRAN: I suppose there would be plenty of people who could say that sort of thing. The fact is that those members of the industry with whom I am **familiar** regard Ms Wood as a competent and capable person with a close knowledge of the industry and with much to contribute to it. The next matter that I should deal with—because I consider such an approach to be unfair in this sort of debate, if we are to be objective—is that it seems a half-hearted attempt has been made to denigrate or crucify Mr Riomfalvy or Ms Wood or indeed anyone with anything to do with the management of the New South Wales Film Corporation. It is improper for the honourable member for Vaucluse to categorize Mr Riomfalvy as a bagman for the Labor Party. I thought that term was the exclusive property of the party to which the honourable member for Vaucluse belongs. The honourable member categorized Mr Bob Ellis as a friend of mine. I have probably met that person three times in my life, and I would not have had said more than thirty words to him in an exchange of conversation. If one makes allegations, one ought to be accurate. Everyone knows that Bob Ellis is a writer for the various arts, and the sort of person that one meets on some occasions. He certainly does not regard me as a friend and I do not regard him as one.

An assertion was made that a script writer was **flown** to Australia and that he stayed at the **Hilton Hotel**. I know nothing of that, but my reply is, so what? In the film industry, if there is someone with expertise who can contribute some special knowledge to writers in Australia, and if that person happens to be English, French or American, the only way to bring him here—that is, if you do not want him to come by **ship**—is by aeroplane. I find it not surprising that such a person was brought by aeroplane to attend a seminar at the **Hilton Hotel**.

The attack being made on Mr Stapleton is apparently that, although he is a union official, he eats in decent restaurants. It seems the honourable member for Vaucluse takes the view that if one is a union official, one should wear **blucher** hoots

and eat meat pies. The assertion that Mr Stapleton is, in some way, doing something wrong is both veiled and obscure. From the New South Wales **Film Corporation last** year Mr Stapleton earned the princely sum—I shall use that term because it has some appeal to the honourable member for Vaucluse—of a little more than \$5,000; it was certainly less than \$6,000. To earn that sum he attended about fifty-one meetings during the year and did a lot of work on behalf of the corporation.

I have already spoken of Mr **Thornhill**. If people who know something about the film industry are needed by the New South Wales Film Corporation, they must be drawn from the industry. If people who know nothing about films are appointed to the corporation, there would be no conflict of interest. The conflict of interest mentioned by the honourable member for Vaucluse occurred once, and once only, and the film concerned is now starting to earn money. The honourable member spoke of the loss made by the corporation. I should like to repeat what was said by the chairman of the New South Wales Film Corporation—and it was also stated in the **Auditor-General's Report**—that the sum mentioned is not a loss; it is a deficit.

Incidentally, the Government is not in the film business. The New South Wales Film Corporation is subsidizing the making of Australian films. The corporation is trying to establish the industry in this country. If it were in the film-making business it would be making films. The New South Wales Film Corporation helps Australian **artists**, producers, directors and cameramen to make films for the purpose of establishing a permanent film industry in Australia. I have said earlier that what the honourable member for Vaucluse described as a loss is a deficit, because the corporation has had a 1 200 per cent increase in revenue this year. That could go down or rise in any succeeding year, depending upon the return from the films with which the corporation is associated. I **am** a trifle disturbed that an organization that has done a great deal to put Australian films on the map is being attacked in this way. Mr Rudy Petersdorf, who receives a salary of \$70,000, is a man of great skill and capacity in the film industry. There has been some criticism of the salary he receives.

Mr Cameron: The Deputy Premier does not think that.

Mr WRAN: That is the Deputy Premier's reaction. My reaction is that we are lucky to have a man of the capacity of Mr Rudy Petersdorf for a salary of \$70,000. For a man of such expertise, that is not a great salary in the United States of America. If we want a man of that calibre associated with the corporation, it is necessary to pay **that** salary. One would not expect to take studio executives, who are earning between \$250,000 and \$500,000 a year, to a **milkbar** for lunch, or to a McDonald's hamburger restaurant on the nearest corner. I should have thought that a person of the educational standard and sensitivity of the honourable member for Vaucluse would have realized that. I should have believed that she would have found nothing untoward at all—in a sense of entrepreneurial salesmanship—in matching the sort of person you wish to have with the standards to which they are accustomed. I **am** disappointed that the honourable member chose the course she adopted.

Since the honourable member for Vaucluse said nothing of the subject today, I feel I should respond to some of the publicity she secured for herself in last Sunday's issue of the **Sunday Telegraph**. I have mentioned the use of the private aeroplanes of which the honourable member spoke. The honourable member was reported in that newspaper as having heard of this, **or** having heard of that, but the allegations she makes seem to have no basis of fact. The honourable member for Vaucluse said she had been told that corporation officials regularly used private aeroplanes and that government limousines were used to drive staff to and from work. The only vehicle the corporation has is a **Holden Commodore**, which was purchased for \$6,124.85 and is used in the

general work of the corporation. That vehicle is used only to pick up certain staff, including the chairman and the general manager of the corporation. Of all the vehicles that could be so described, no one could really call a **Holden** Commodore a limousine even though it is an excellent Australian car with a high sales record. This puffing up of minor matters by the honourable member for Vaucluse is quite absurd.

The New South Wales Film Corporation has been described in the media by the honourable member for Vaucluse as the Premier's pet project. In fact I rather like the film corporation, which has done great work for the film industry in Australia. But I do not see how it could be called the Premier's pet project when the allocation for its operating costs for 1979–80 was less than in the previous year despite inflation and increased general costs. It has been claimed that the salaries paid to officers of the corporation are huge. A most embarrassing point is that the chairman of the corporation reports he receives regular complaints from his consultants and executives that they are paid less than their counterparts in other organizations. Apart from the fee paid by the Government to the chairman—which, incidentally, under a determination made in the past few weeks, rose from \$27,000 to \$30,000—it is believed that the general manager received a lower fee than his counterparts at the Australian Film Corporation, the South Australian Film Corporation and the Victorian Film Corporation.

The New South Wales Film Corporation has a small number of permanent staff. Executives are engaged on a 1-year or 2-year basis. After that time there is no further obligation upon them or the corporation. As for luxury offices referred to by the honourable member for Vaucluse, I invite any member of the Opposition to visit the film corporation's offices, which are perhaps the most **spartan** of any within government departments or instrumentalities. The chairman of the corporation has said that all members of this House are welcome to inspect those offices to see the degree of so-called luxury in which the staff are wallowing. He has said they will see only cramped premises and a minimum of facilities.

The luxury office described as being in Los Angeles simply does not exist. What does exist there is the office of the New South Wales commissioner in Los Angeles. The corporation's representative has a good office in that suite of offices but the accountant sits in a windowless room that was formerly a filing room, and the secretary sits in a corridor. Mr Beaver, who was referred to by the honourable member for Vaucluse, is a **full-time** public servant employed at the Agent-General's office. The amount of time he devotes to the affairs of the corporation ranges between 1 per cent and 3 per cent of the whole of his activity. That person deals with trade sources as do representatives in Italy, Germany and other countries. Everyone knows that the Government is making a bid to increase trade for New South Wales and Australia. The services of overseas trade representatives are utilized, in furtherance of the objectives of the corporation, as they are utilized by all departments and instrumentalities.

It is disturbing that the Opposition is performing a great **disservice** to the industry by trying to create some panic among the investment community. In view of some of the things that have been said, I want to make clear the financial position of the New South Wales Film Corporation. It should be pointed out that the return on equity investment in films by the New South Wales Film Corporation rose **by** 1 203 per cent between 1978–79 and 1979–80. In the current financial year the corporation has already received returns of \$700,000 on films in which it **has** invested. To analyse the deficit of \$331,490 in 1979–80, certain factors must be taken into account. First, in 1979–80 the corporation increased its expenditure on script and project development by \$300,000. That is clearly an investment in future productions and that figure alone accounts for almost all the deficit for that year.

I emphasize that if we are to build up a film industry we must have **writers**, scriptwriters, technicians and other specialists. The film corporation enters into the field of script and project development as part of its overall function of supporting the film industry. The operating costs of the corporation include expenditure that cannot be charged against individual films. For example, in 1979–80 the Government documentary division had running expenses of \$90,000. That sum included salaries. Perhaps that explains something which puzzled the honourable member for Vacluse when she made her comments. Next, the corporation's financial performance in 1979–80 was in a time of change in the interest rate situation which has nothing directly to do with film production. In 1978–79, net interest earned was \$90,000, while in 1979–80 net interest expense was \$27,000—a reversal of \$117,000.

As to the claim about the corporation being a badly-run, run-down, impecunious and wasteful organization, let me reveal its position at the bank. The financial position of the New South Wales Film Corporation at present is solid. It has \$2.5 million in interest-bearing deposits, spread between the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited, the Bank of New South Wales and the Rural Bank. In addition, it has cash at bank totalling \$500,000. All this is the result of careful management of funds. The cash at bank and the interest-bearing deposits enable the corporation to provide 100 per cent cash flow on film production until money becomes available from private investors. For instance, the corporation cash-flowed the production of "Hood-wink", which has a production budget of \$1.15 million, although the actual final investment of the corporation will be less than \$300,000. That reflects the healthy position of the film corporation and a good situation in relation to its conduct.

I repeat, it must be borne in mind that more often than not it takes several years for a film to exhaust its commercial possibilities. A film made in 1979–80 may yield little financial return until 1980, 1981 or 1982. A further point is that though the New South Wales Film Corporation tries to ensure that films in which it invests will be profitable, other justification for investment can be established. "The Night the Prowler", for example, has been a commercial flop so far, but the corporation is proud of the fact that it financed the film of the first screenplay of Nobel Prize winning author Patrick White. Similarly, "Stir" was a film of immense social significance, quite apart from the commercial importance involved in the production.

An assertion has been made—mostly outside the House—by the honourable member for Vacluse about flops in investment by the film corporation. Let me explain that the corporation has been the major investor in seven feature films since it was established in 1979. It is too early to calculate the final results from two of those films, namely, "Stir" and "Maybe this Time", but of the remaining five films, two—"Newsfront" and "My Brilliant Career"—will certainly return a profit. Even if one regards "Stir" and "Maybe This Time" as loss investments, this still gives a success ratio of 1 to 3.5 films, which is more than twice as good as the average success ratio for investment in Australian films and compares favourably with the internationally accepted norm of one out of nine or one out of every ten success probability with film investment.

What has been overlooked by the honourable member for Vacluse and other members of the Opposition who have looked at this question is that the corporation has been a minority investor in association with majority investment by other government film-funding bodies—such as the Australian Film Commission, the South Australian Film Corporation and the Victorian Film Commission—in eight other feature films. The final performance of those films has varied from full return on investment in "The Money Movers" to a total loss in "Dimboola". Between those extremes there has been a partial return of investment in films such as "The **Odd Angry Shot**", "**Tim**"

Mr Wran]

and "Cathy's Child. As to films in which the corporation has been a majority investor, there will be partial return of investment on some, even if this falls short of total recoupment. The much criticized Michael Thornhill film "The Journalist", for example, was sold recently to Australian television for \$100,000.

By way of comparison, the Australian Film Commission was compelled to write-off film investments of \$4.5 million in its 1978–79 report. It was quite improper for the honourable member for Vacluse to assert, as she did, that I was denigrating the Australian Film Commission. I did no such thing in anything I said inside or outside this House. The Australian Film Commission has played a great role in the support of the Australian film industry. I do not resile from the assertion I made that it would be a great thing for Australia if, instead of having several film industries in the various States, there was one Australian film industry. I am certain that all people interested in the Australian film industry and its future development would be working towards that end. All honourable members know that that situation has not been arrived at and is probably some considerable time away. However, trying to pull down one's own film corporation because one is probably tangled up with some people on the periphery of the Australian Film Commission is not a good way to develop the sort of environment that is necessary to achieve the ultimate aim of a successful, continuing and resourceful film industry in this country. A successful industry will make available to the great wealth of talent that we have in all aspects of film making the opportunity for permanent employment and career enrichment.

I repeat, the Australian Film Commission lost \$4.5 million in 1978–79. That compares with the \$300,000 deficit of the New South Wales Film Corporation. The \$4.5 million was written off by the Australian Film Commission. That commission has **been** reluctant to write-off its investments, even when it was clear that a film **had** failed after a long commercial life. In contrast, the New South Wales Film Corporation adopts the conservative accounting procedure of writing off all equity investment in films in the first three years after their release.

There is not a great deal more that I need say except that it is strange, after all the thumping of tubs and beating of drums suggesting that there would be some revelation of great scandals within the New South Wales Film Corporation, that all the House got from the honourable member for Vacluse was some scuttlebutt—that she picked up at Lavender Bay. I should not ask what goes on there for, like the honourable member for Vacluse, I would not engage in the spreading of rumours. Be that as it may, it is sad that one of our more successful enterprises in the field of the performing arts, which has done so much for the encouragement, employment and development of Australian talent, has to be subjected to this sort of banal attack in this Parliament.

All honourable members should be proud of what Australians are doing and what they are attempting to achieve, instead of denigrating daily the sporting stars, the singers, actors, producers and directors of this country. Judy Davis, the star of "My Brilliant Career", in addition to the other honours that have been attracted by this magnificent film, which was supported by the New South Wales Film Corporation, has recently been nominated for two British academy awards—namely, best actress and most outstanding newcomer—and she is a strong candidate to win them both.

The script of "My Brilliant Career" was hawked round Australia. It is a matter of sensitive judgment whether a script will be made into a good film and be a success at the box office. It is no reflection on any of the experts who originally rejected the script as lacking in box office potential that when the film was supported by the New South Wales Film Corporation, it was successful. I am sure nobody wishes to denigrate the efforts of so many of our fine actors and directors. I have a whole list of peopel who have been in touch with the New South Wales Film Corporation.

The list **consists** of people in the industry—actors, directors and others who have worked in it. Their feelings are exemplified in the following message sent to me by Graeme **Blundell**:

I am sure I reflect the views of Australian film actors in deploring the unfounded attacks on the New South Wales Film Corporation. The corporation has played an innovative and important role in helping to ensure the success of our industry.

I find the attitude of the honourable member for Vacluse extraordinary. She has attacked the report of the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General has acknowledged the courtesy and assistance extended to him in the conduct of his duties by officers of the corporation. As the report is a public document, it is strange that the honourable member should seek to impugn the integrity of the Auditor-General. There can be no doubt about the objectivity and impartiality of the Auditor-General, and he was satisfied with the conduct of the accounts and with the affairs of the corporation.

Mr McDonald: What about the unaudited accounts?

Mr WRAN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is as excited as he gets when he sees a process server walking through his front gate.

Mr McDonald: On a point of order. I appeal to you for your guidance because I find the remarks of the Premier and Treasurer offensive and sick.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps I may ask the Premier and Treasurer to say to what point his remark was directed.

Mr WRAN: I was speaking about excitement. I **find** it extraordinary that attacks and innuendoes are directed at the Auditor-General. It is deplorable that a body which is a credit to New South Wales and which has injected life into the performing industry of Australia is the subject of slander, innuendo, allegation, suspicion, and even veiled charges of fraud and self-aggrandizement. However, when the maker of those allegations faces the acid test in this Parliament, she has neither the powder nor the shot to put into her gun. The honourable member for Vacluse **relies** solely on scuttle-butt. If such matters are to be debated in future, I hope that the House will be supplied with a few facts rather than the unfounded **rumours** and imprecise material of the sort now put before it. I am shocked by the attitude of the honourable member for Vacluse, who has a few bob invested in a **film** which received no support from the New South Wales Film Corporation. She might tell us whether she got any support from the Australian Film Commission. Her attitude is shocking and I know that her motion will be rejected.

Mr McDONALD: Mr Speaker—

Mr FLAHERTY (Granville), Government Whip [12.25]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 56

Mr Akister
Mr Anderson
Mr Bannon
Mr Barnier
Mr Bedford
Mr Booth
Mr Brereton

Mr Britt
Mr Cavalier
Mr Cleary
Mr R. J. Clough
Mr Cox
Mr Crabtree
Mr Curran

Mr Day
Mr Degen
Mr Durick
Mr Egan
Mr Einfeld
Mr Face
Mr Ferguson

Mr Gabb	Mr Maher	Mr Rogan
Mr Gordon	Mr Mair	Mr Ryan
Mr Haigh	Mr Mallam	Mr Sheahan
Mr Hills	Mr Mochalski	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Hunter	Mr Neilly	Mr K. J. Stewart
Mr Jensen	Mr O'Connell	Mr Walker
Mr Johnson	Mr O'Neill	Mr Webster
Mr Johnstone	Mr Paciullo	Mr Wilde
Mr Keane	Mr Petersen	Mr Wran
Mr McCarthy	Mr Quinn	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr McGowan	Mr Ramsay	Mr Flaherty
Mr McIlwaine	Mr Robb	Mr Wade

Noes, 35

Mr Arblaster	Mrs Foot	Mr Punch
Mr Barraclough	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Boyd	Mr Greiner	Mr Schipp
Mr Brewer	Mr Hatton	Mr Singleton
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Healey	Mr Smith
Mr Bruxner	Mr King	Mr Sullivan
Mr Cameron	Mr McDonald	Mr Toms
Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Mason	Mr West
Mr Dowd	Mr Murray	Mr Wotton
Mr Duncan	Mr Osborne	Tellers,
Mr Fischer	Mr Park	Mr Caterson
Mr Fisher	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion be agreed to---proposed.

Mrs FOOT (Vaucluse) [12.30], in reply: The Premier and Treasurer either did not listen to me or failed to understand me when I outlined in detail the difference between the audited and unaudited accounts of the New South Wales Film Corporation. I did not seek to impugn the Auditor-General. I was pointing out that the Auditor-General found it necessary to alter much of the material that had been submitted in an unaudited form. The substance of my motion related to the financial accountability of the corporation. The corporation is **almost** entirely under the control of the Premier and Treasurer, and he **does** not exercise properly the power he has over it. He is a busy man with the problems of the State on his shoulders, but the fact is that he does not have the some sort of power over a number of other bodies as he has over the New South Wales Film Corporation. I have outlined the reason for urgency. It is offensive that this matter should not be referred to the Public Accounts Committee, which could examine the situation and assist the New South Wales **Film** Corporation in submitting better accounts.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Vaucluse must be heard in silence.

Mrs FOOT: I comment on the attack made on me by the Premier and Treasurer because of my mention of Mr Riomfalvy. If my memory serves me right, last year the honourable member for Woronora asked the Dorothy Dix question about Mr Lyonko Urbanchich and his activities in other parts of the world prior to his coming to live

in Australia. If the honourable member for Woronora was permitted deliberately to provoke slanderous remarks about Mr Urbanchich in this House, why should I not be permitted to allude to Mr Riomfalvy's activities before he came to Australia in 19491
[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Vaucluse is speaking in reply to her motion and must confine her remarks to matters already raised; she **cannot** introduce new material.

Mrs FOOT: It is certainly reasonable for me to cite what was mentioned in the 1977 interim New South Wales Film Corporation report about Mr Riomfalvy. The Premier and Treasurer refused to answer my query about the chief executive officer's position, for which provision is made in the Act. I claimed that Ms Jenny Woods had the dual roles of general manager and director to fulfil and suggested she could be relieved of some of her excessive workload if the Premier and Treasurer **took** advantage of the provisions of the Film Corporation Act and appointed a chief executive officer. Filmmakers are leaving the New South Wales Film Corporation and are taking their projects to the Australian Film Commission. I am part of the State Liberal Party-Country Party **coalition** and although my links are far **closer** with the federal Liberal Government and the Australian Film Commission of New South Wales than with the State Labor Government and the New South Wales **Film** Corporation, it is my responsibility to probe in this Parliament the conduct of any New South Wales statutory corporation. The speech I made today indicates that I have gone into considerable detail in an attempt to do just this.

I refer to the \$439,000 that has been allowed for script writing. I ask the Premier and Treasurer why no criteria have been established; why anonymous script assessors are employed and why no explanation has been given about Mr Bob Ellis who was given funds to write a package of scripts and not only one script? I raise that matter whether or not Mr Ellis is a friend of the Premier and Treasurer.

Mr Wran: The honourable member for Vaucluse said that he was; is she withdrawing that assertion?

Mrs FOOT: Who else will the Premier and Treasurer disown? I can give the House a long list of persons who live in my electorate whom the Premier and Treasurer may choose to claim or disown to suit the occasion. The Premier and Treasurer went to great lengths to detail films while I referred to three films only. My urgency motion was not concerned with the relative merits of films, but sought to draw attention to matters of financial administration, accountability and the luxurious entertainment engaged in by the directors of the New South Wales Film Corporation. The Premier and Treasurer has not taken it upon himself to exercise control over those directors and the senior persons in that organization.

The Premier and Treasurer asked me one question only: from where did I receive the additional funds to make the film "Lampad of Bali" in which I was an investor? Early in 1978 I visited Bali at the time a Balinese artist died at 115 years of age. I put up sufficient funds to obtain a work print of his cremation rites. The Bushell organization—a private organization—with the backing of the Australian National University, provided the balance of the necessary funds. When the film was in a saleable form, the Australian Broadcasting Commission undertook the editing of it in return for the Australian rights.

I ask the Premier and Treasurer not to dwell so much on personalities but to assume his responsibility for final accountability of the New South Wales Film Corporation. He is ultimately responsible for this \$4 million corporation as well as the entire budget of this State. The Premier and Treasurer should refer the question of the

accountability and financial administration of the New South Wales Film Corporation to the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee as it is evidently beyond his capacity to cope adequately with the matter himself.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 35

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

Noes, 56

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

[*In Division*]

[*Interruption*]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Illawarra to order. I remind honourable members that standing orders apply during divisions.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion negatived.

[*Mr Speaker left the chair at 12.41 p.m. The House resumed at 2.15 p.m.*]

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Personal Explanation

Mr Punch: I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER: Upon what matter does the Leader of the Country Party wish to make a personal explanation?

Mr Punch: In relation to unfounded charges made this morning by the Premier and Treasurer about my association with the League of Rights.

Mr SPEAKER: Has the Leader of the Country Party the indulgence of the House to make a personal explanation? There being no dissent, the honourable member may proceed.

Mr Punch: This morning in question time the Premier and Treasure made an untrue allegation that I was, to use the Premier's words, a well-known participant in the activities of the League of Rights and confidant of the leaders of the League of Rights. Also, he said that the League of Rights is a neo-fascist organization.

Mr Sheahan: Is not that correct?

Mr Punch: The clear inference in each assertion is that I personally must be a neo-fascist. I have never been a member of the League of Rights. I have never been to a League of Rights meeting. I have never been a neo-fascist.

Mr Sheahan: Has the Leader of the Country Party been to one of the functions of the League of Rights?

Mr Punch: If the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport listens he will learn something. I have **just said**—

Mr Sheahan: You said you had never been to a meeting of the League of Rights.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport to order.

Mr Punch: To satisfy the Minister, I state that I have never been to one of its functions. The Minister is being smart.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Country Party to return to the subject matter of his personal explanation.

Mr Punch: The Minister is making stupid remarks. I would not know who are the leaders of the League of Rights. To me, that assertion by the Premier and Treasurer is another example of his repetitive attempts at unfounded vilification of members of this House by making quite untruthful statements.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Mr ROGAN (East Hills) [2.18]: I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should be commended on its approach to technological change which demonstrates a clear appreciation of the social and economic implications from changes occurring in industry.

In introducing this motion on technology it could be fairly said that we in New South Wales and Australia are on the threshold of **an** era of either vastly improved **living** standards for all members in the community and a more fulfilling and self-satisfying work environment for those engaged in the production and distribution of goods, or chaos, with rapidly worsening unemployment and its attendant evils of crime, poverty and reduced living standards. It was as a consequence of the foresight that is so much a feature of this Government and its natural concern for people, that in September **1978** the Premier and Treasurer, in delivering the State Labor Party's policy speech, said:

We are entering a new era of technology which for all its great promise and benefits threatens the way of life of thousands of Australian families. If there is no planning and preparation for this new industrial revolution the result will be unparalleled dislocation and disruption. New South Wales must provide leadership.

The Premier and Treasurer then announced that the Department of Industrial Relations would be expanded to establish an advisory unit with experts in the field of automation and technological change. He said its role would be to advise the Government on ways to offset the disruptive effects of change and to co-ordinate the activities of employers, trade unions and other community bodies in their efforts to deal with the impact of technological change. The Premier and Treasurer said the Department of Labour and Industry would be renamed and become the Department of Industrial Relations and Technology. He continued:

The task before us ail, Government, unions and business, is to make technology work for the people, to harness the new technology to the needs of the community so that the new industrial revolution now upon us means not more unemployment but more opportunities for all.

The Government took action to fulfil its election promise to establish a department of technology, and now has the first Minister for Technology in Australia. The responsibility of the new ministry was given initially to the Minister for Industrial Relations, the Hon. P. D. Hills. In October 1979, as Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Technology, he announced the establishment of a technological information and research unit. That is now known as the Technology and Research Unit. Its establishment, together with the reconstituting of the New South Wales Science and Technology Council as a statutory body with extensive functions, was a positive affirmation of the Government's policy pledge.

I should mention also that those measures received strong bipartisan support. That support was clearly evidenced by the enthusiastic comments made by honourable members on both sides of both Houses during the second reading debates on the legislation to establish the Science and Technology Council. On that occasion members, in addition to speaking on the Science and Technology **Bill**, spoke glowingly of the Government's decision to establish also the unit of technology. The establishment of the Ministry of Technology and within that ministry the Technology and Research Unit, together with the reconstitution of the New South Wales Science and Technology Council as a statutory body, demonstrated quite clearly the appreciation of the Government for the social and economic changes resulting from what has been termed the technological revolution. Approval of those actions of the Government has been seen in newspaper reports in the past twelve months.

No one authority, person, group or body can accurately say how many persons have been displaced by technology or just what the future holds, but the reading of various articles, speeches and pronouncements gives some idea as to the general picture of what is perhaps in store for us if we merely slide into this new era without proper and adequate advance planning.

The Australian Council of Trade Unions, using experience gained overseas, prepared the following table forecasting the number of jobs that would be lost to computers in 1984: in the occupational group, technicians would lose 36 820 jobs; other technical workers 48 000; clerical workers 359 560; telecommunications workers 26 650; postal workers 19 560; and process workers 1 398 230—making a total of 1 887 820 persons who would lose jobs in Australia. As New South Wales is the largest manufacturing State in the Commonwealth, it is only reasonable to expect that the highest percentage of the forecast job loss would occur in this State.

Employment in the manufacturing industry has declined most of all. In 1966, 26.7 per cent of the Australian work force was employed in the **manufacturing** industry; by 1977 the figure had dropped to 21.8 per cent. Between 1974 and 1977 200 000 jobs were lost in the manufacturing industry. **The** biggest decline in employment has been in the textile industry, which is down 27.6 per cent. A rapid decline in employment has occurred in those industries. In the **metal** industry, the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union put out a booklet, which included this statement:

Computerisation of production and process control in the metal industry however will take greater investment to unfold than where the application is in commerce. Consequently the pressure for "concentration" of capital is intensive. This can be seen in heavy engineering, electrical white goods and auto production.

That article refers to the cost of word processing machines for banks, insurance companies and other **offices**. It is said that the cost of a machine is \$15,000, whereas some engineering machinery costs about \$1 million and even more for some multistage machines. The trend therefore has already been established and the metal industry will be increasingly under the threat of the impact of computerization. It is estimated that since 1974 in the manufacturing industry 209 000 jobs have been lost. Of these, about 65 000 were lost to the metal industry. Heavy job losses occurred also in the service industries, banks, insurance and supermarkets. What is the consequence of this job loss? The *Australian Financial Review* in an article published on 29th October, 1980, quoted Mr J. K. Sandilands, the assistant secretary of the Vehicle Employees Federation, in these terms:

A Puma (programmable universal machine for assembly) developed by **Unimation**, Inc will cost **from \$US25,000 to \$US30,000** when produced in large quantity.

The cost of a Puma, when amortised over eight years, would work out at around \$US4.20 an hour, compared with some \$US14 per hour of a human assembly line worker.

General Motors' two brand-new US plants will be able to build 150 cars per hour with no more manpower than it took to build 115 units per hour in the older plant.

Even the medical field does not go untouched. **An** article published in the *Daily Telegraph* of 23rd February this year, entitled "Doctors Join Space Age", states:

Some years ago Professor Vance **Gledhill**, now Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics and Computing Science at the New South Wales Institute of Technology carried out a remarkable and innovative experiment.

Having programmed a computer with a wide spectrum of medical knowledge he pitted its skill against that of a number of general practitioners in analysing and diagnosing the symptoms of a sick patient.

The computer won!

Mr Rogan]

What is the fate of these workers? A further article in the *Australian Financial Review* in **January** this year had this to say:

The task of identifying new jobs in the economy created by structural **change has begun to focus on** occupations **with** low productivity, **shorter hours** and less wages.

Far from high technology industries absorbing those workers displaced **from** manufacturing, they appear to be heading for the **bottom** of the pile in service areas.

Is it any wonder that with these dire forecasts and predictions that on 13th March last year, the ACTU—the peak council of the labour industry of this nation—had this to say:

The ACTU will toughen its stand against the introduction of new technology.

The ACTU executive meeting in Perth yesterday resolved that unions would **not** co-operate in the introduction of new technology if there was no prior consultation with them.

The executive also resolved to urgently launch "a sustained campaign" based on ACTU Congress policies on the economy and technological change "to focus attention upon mass unemployment to which the developing **technological** revolution contributes."

That union's policy document, produced in 1979 and recommitted this year, stated:

Technological change cannot be seen as simply the introduction of new machines to society, but must necessarily be seen in a wider context which encompasses the application of equipment and processes which affects the way in which work is performed.

The document continues:

The failure of Governments and employers over a period of 15 years or more, to give other than lipservice to the need for planning the introduction of beneficial new technology, **or** for the social consequences that flow **particularly in the current** economic circumstances, **can** only be interpreted as a rejection of the trade union movement's appeal for, and willingness to participate in, the planned introduction of new technology.

The ACTU has said that it is not opposed to the introduction of new technology; it is not opposed to technological change as such, provided that the workers are consulted and that the benefits flow through to the worker and the community. It reinforced its policy this year when it said:

This conference of ACTU affiliated trade unions records with deep and growing concern the increasing effects upon employment and unemployment being made by rapid technological change in almost every industry. This is occurring with no prospect of adequate alternative employment emerging in other industries to create sufficient job opportunities and to absorb those being displaced. It affects employment in both private and public sectors.

It is noteworthy that the unions have not opposed the introduction of technology where it can be demonstrated it is beneficial to the worker and to the community, **but** they insist—and rightly so---that their members be consulted. Too often the worker is made aware of the introduction of new technology only when he receives his

dismissal slip. Clearly this is not good enough. In December 1978, the federal Government, acting not with foresight but with the usual knee jerk reaction, set up the **Com**-mission of Inquiry into Technological Change in Australia, better known as the Myers committee. The report of the inquiry, comprising more **than** 1 500 pages, was released in July 1980. As the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology said last year in this House when making a ministerial statement:

It is a report that has met with little approval except from the federal Government which set up that committee. In fact it has been widely dubbed a disappointing and deficient document.

As evidence of that, I quote further articles which have appeared in the *Australian Financial Review*. The first was in January of this year. The opening paragraph above the heading of the article said:

The debate on technological change in Australia and its effects on employment has been inconclusive. But one thing is agreed upon by nearly all participants in the debate—the report of the Myers Committee of Inquiry settled nothing, and contributed little to the debate.

Then the heading of the article appeared:

Much heat and little light in the technology debate.

The report continued:

Far from meeting its **political** purpose of settling questions about technological change in Australia, the Myers report appears to have had the opposite effect. Apart from the criticism which the committee of inquiry into technological change has attracted, its impact on the general debate has begun to show up.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* of 17th September, 1980, contained an article under the heading, "Watered-down version requested. Government ditches income plan in Myers Report". The article continued:

The Government is opposed to the main proposal of the Myers Report on new technology—income maintenance for retrenched workers.

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of that is that we can see the fate of the report and what will be achieved from it. I predict quite confidently that no such report commissioned by this Government will suffer such an inglorious fate. It is important at this point, so there will be no misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of the New South Wales Technology and Research Unit, to spell out its functions. These are fourfold. First, it will obtain information about the interaction between technology and society, and especially about the effects of technological change on the level and quality of employment. It will carry out research to obtain this information where this is not available. Information will be obtained not only from groups and individuals, but from information data basis through the **midas** system operated by OTC. Second, it will **analyse** this information and the issues relating to technological change to obtain a better understanding of what these are about. Third, it will have a disseminating role to provide information, not just to the Minister but to the whole community, and promote informed and constructive public discussion. Fourth, it will have a policy development function to suggest priorities and constructive government action.

Pursuant to these responsibilities, the technological research unit has undertaken many activities. Before mentioning some of these I should state that the unit is now completing the publication of a book and discussion papers to promote public awareness on the issues arising out of the Myers report on technological change. The unit has completed a survey on the use of word processing in the public service and has

Mr Rogan]

developed draft guidelines on the introduction and use of word processors. These draft guidelines will be valuable both to management and staff in any word processing activities, whether in the public or private sector. Another major study well under way is examining technological change in the banking and insurance industries. This will provide up-to-date knowledge and information on technological change in these industries and will be available equally to management and union interests.

Work has been done by the unit also on the industrial relations problems resulting from technological change. It is clear that new technology, if introduced without adequate consultation between management and unions, can cause considerable industrial unrest. The initial Telecom dispute revealed that only too clearly. The unit has been involved in a working party on industrial relations and technological change to examine these important problems. Additionally it has carried out its own research and has recently completed a comparative study of Australian and overseas legislation relevant to industrial relations and new technology. Other activities of the unit have included the educational implications of technological change, implication and possible use of the domestic communication satellite, contributions to the work of various inquiries, and active effort through participation in numerous seminars, conferences and meetings, to raise the level of public awareness and help to promote informed and instructive debate about technological change.

I shall say something now about the New South Wales Science and Technology Council, the other arm of the Ministry of Technology. The council was established on 22nd February, 1980, with the appointment of members and proclamation of the Science and Technology Council Act, 1979. Its first annual report covering the period from 22nd February to 30th June, 1980, was tabled in Parliament on 22nd October, 1980. The report provided the House with details of the council's work programme and included a statement of strategy by the chairman. The legislation enables the council to offer advice on encouraging the potentially beneficial application of science and technology—for example, creating opportunities for new employment or fulfilling community needs; monitoring and protecting society from the possible negative effects of science and technology—for example, occupational health and use of pesticides et cetera; and the formulation of a framework which will relate science and technology to the social and economic forces and needs of the community.

A number of the council's projects are examples of the types of technology that it is considered desirable to stimulate. These include technology to assist disabled persons, as part of the State's contribution to the International Year of Disabled Persons. The council is examining the degree to which science and technology may directly aid disabled persons. They include also the electric vehicle industry. Honourable members will be aware, from *Hansard* for 15th October, 1980, that the council is represented on the trolley bus task force established by the Minister for Transport to examine this technology for Sydney's public transport. They include also solar energy research and development. The council has undertaken a survey of New South Wales solar energy research and development and proposed a means for encouraging this technology in New South Wales. This report is under Government consideration.

Another of the council's projects is the conversion of coal to methanol. The council, in liaison with the Energy Authority, is examining the feasibility of conversion of coal to gasoline through the methanol route, compared with other alternatives. The council's projects include also the reduction of hydatid disease in New South Wales. Recent technological advances have allowed a means for the reduction of this disease, which is of particular concern in rural areas. A ministerial task force has

been established on this matter, following a report by the council. On 12th January, 1981, a press release was published by the *Sydney Morning Herald*. This report is under consideration also by the task force.

The council is investigating also broad, **long-term** aspects of science and technology. Two of these broad projects are particularly important for the future of science and technology in this State. I shall now say something about research and development in New South Wales. Information on the allocation of funds, private and public, to research and development activities is also being obtained. This should lead to a strategic appreciation of areas and measures to encourage appropriate stimulation of science and technology in the State. I should mention also training and education. The extent to which training and education facilities and priorities need to adapt to the requirements of future scientific and technological developments in the State is being assessed.

It would be foolish to expect too much by way of immediate results. The issues with which the unit and council must deal are conceptionally complex. The areas of concern—industrial relations, employment, health, education and training, and so on—are largely areas of responsibility of other arms of the Government, and are areas requiring discussion and negotiation with many community groups such as unions and employers. Further, in a country with a federal constitution in which many matters of economic responsibility lie with the Commonwealth which shares with the States interests in industrial relations, health and education, there are limits to what one State can do alone. What is important is that this State has been the first to recognize the challenges of new technology and to see not only the benefits they bring but also the potential for disruption if technological change proceeds in a haphazard way. The job is being addressed with enthusiasm and commitment. Last year Professor Peter Karmel, in a paper to a seminar arranged by the Commonwealth Education Research and Development Committee, spoke about technological change. Professor Karmel is a highly respected economist and statistician. A former Vice-Chancellor and Chairman of the Universities' Commission and more recently of the Tertiary Education Commission, he has been a valued adviser on education to several federal Governments. One passage in his paper reads:

It is important to emphasize that the problems of technological change are not technological. Technological problems are solved by technological change. The real problems of technological change are human, economic and social. The Myers Report did not face up fully to these problems. The human problems relate to what to do about displaced workers in bankrupt businesses that cannot compete with the new technology. The main economic problem is: do the benefits outweigh the cost? There certainly are costs, including the cost of protecting the weak. Thus, without adopting a Luddite approach, it is still sensible to ask whether the rates at which new technology are introduced should be influenced by subsidization or taxation.

Later in the paper Professor Karmel said:

However, the social questions continue to be the most profound and most difficult. How much will society have to adjust to make living with the new technology acceptable? What measures are needed to ensure equitable distribution of the greater production made possible by the new technology among members of society, between work and leisure, between material goods and the quality of life? Is it possible within our given social structure to solve these distributional problems. These issues are vitally related to the distribution of income as indeed is the all-persuasive problem of inflation. They reflect deep conflicts in society.

If the Myers Committee in more than 18 months with a \$1 million budget, a large secretariat, and access to submissions by many interest groups, and to expert advice from consultants and academics, produced a disappointing report, we should be glad that the much more low key groups set up in New South Wales by the New South Wales Government do understand the problems are human and social. The Government is to be commended for its initiative in coming to grips with this major challenge and for establishing the technology portfolio. As it addresses these complex issues we look forward to more specific initiatives.

Mr SCHIPP (Wagga Wagga) [2.44]: It is an age-old tactic that if a person has something to hide, he sets up a smokescreen. This motion is yet another attempt by the Government to put up a smokescreen to fool the people of New South Wales. This is being done so that electors will not be able to point a finger of condemnation at the Government for its failure to cope with technological change. Not so long ago the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology in a pathetic ministerial statement was embarrassed out of the House following the hiding he took from my colleague the Leader of the Opposition. Obviously this motion attempts to recover some of that lost ground.

The honourable member for East Hills has moved a puerile motion. Indeed, when the lady who carries out research for me saw the motion she said, "What on earth does it mean? It merely seeks to pat the Government on the back." I thought that we could expect some new initiative so that the Government's policy would be known.

Mr Egan: The Labor Party is the only party that has done anything about it.

Mr SCHIPP: I shall come to that. Government supporters have told a pack of stories about where this initiative developed, as I have proved on a number of occasions. The honourable member for East Hills did not mention one new initiative taken by the Labor Government, nor did the Minister in his statement to this House some time ago. I repeat that this motion is a smokescreen to try to get the public off the Government's tail because it is doing nothing about technological change. The motion is also a sop to the union movement. The unions know that the Government has no policy and members of the Government are embarrassed and do not know where to hide their heads. They are a bunch of parasites with not one original thought.

It was said that the Labor Government established the Science and Technology Council. However, it is well-established in the history books that the council was established by the previous State Government. It followed a recommendation by the Hon. J. G. Beale in 1972 and with the assistance of two former Premiers, Sir Robert Askin and the Hon. T. L. Lewis, the council was formed and has continued ever since. The implication by the honourable member for East Hills that the setting up of the council flowed from what the Labor Government had done in 1979 was nonsense. The original legislation was amended to widen the council's framework but the council itself was already in existence. Government supporters should not try to steal others' ideas and adopt them as their own. I propose to move an amendment to this motion because my federal colleagues deserve recognition for what they have done. I move:

That the question be amended by inserting the word "Federal" before *the* word "Government".

I shall show how the federal Government has moved on *the* topic of technological change; indeed, the figures speak for themselves. But first let me put forward a few thoughts on the subject of technology and attempt to point to the general

framework. Change or “**progress**” has been with mankind since the days of the cave **man**. Variously it has been described as invention, innovation, industrial revolution, the machine age, the computer age, automation or, more recently technological change. This advance has brought with it many benefits and some problems. Until recent times the forces of change were relatively——

Mr Egan: On a point of order. The honourable member for Wagga Wagga is reading verbatim an article he wrote that was published in the *Wagga Wagga Daily Advertiser* on 21st February this year.

Mr Schipp: On the point of order. I understand that an honourable member is entitled to read in a debate **material** of his own authorship. Every day in this **House** honourable members read speeches into the record. I am owning up and telling the House that this is entirely my own work; I am not reading the words of anybody else. These words are of my authorship.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question of authorship does not enter into the matter. The first question is whether an honourable member accepts responsibility for the statements contained in an article or other document from which he wishes to read. Second, it has been ruled that an honourable member must not read newspaper articles, though he may refer briefly to them. I hope that he will not read the whole of a newspaper.

Mr SCHIPP: I shall not read the article. The honourable member for Cronulla has taken a bad point of order. I am merely stating my views on technological change and developing them. I do not understand why I should be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not question my ruling. Surely it is **unnecessary** for him to read verbatim an article in a newspaper if that article is of his own composition. I take it that the honourable member is not reading from a press statement.

Mr SCHIPP: It is not a press statement. The point I am making is that technological change has accelerated since World War II. Obviously this has happened as a result of greater expectations in the community. Competition has been engendered throughout the world and the machines have been devised to meet the demands of the community caused by that competition. Without those machines we should all have a lower standard of living. The rush to machines has been brought about by the **unreliability** of labour. **All** honourable members know that there are far too many industrial disputes and excessive wage demands. In such circumstances employers introduce systems by which they can stabilize their costs and rid themselves of the problems associated with employing labour.

Automation has cost benefits. Many more jobs would have been lost through business failures than have been lost as a result of automation in the form of machines. One may argue that cost-saving methods have provided advantages for the people. The increased leisure time and spending power flowing from productivity increases brought about by the new technology have opened other doors. They lead to alternative job opportunities. The tourist and leisure markets are examples of those additional opportunities. Also, employment opportunities **are** available in producing the new technology.

Unfortunately, Australia is not producing enough technology of **its** own. It can do much better, not only by the production of computer items but also in the production of agricultural goods and equipment **and** irrigation systems, about **which** Australia has a great deal of expert knowledge. These commodities are required

throughout the world. Australia has a lot of homework to do to take advantage of those demands. **Also** increased technology will provide a relief for employees now performing monotonous jobs. The degrading and often soul-destroying simple and repetitive tasks are rapidly disappearing from the workplace. All honourable members should applaud this change. These workers are now available for more interesting, satisfying and rewarding tasks. On many fronts the introduction of technology has benefited mankind. Yet its effects on employment opportunities have created problems and brought about a demand by unionists for a slowing down of the pace of technological change.

With the support of the New South Wales Government, a large section of the union movement is digging in its toes, asserting that it **does** not want any change at all. That attitude has shown up in decisions taken by the Australian Council of Trade Unions which fly in the face of remarks made by Mr Hawke in 1979. The **ACTU**, with its new leadership, has reverted to the policies of thirty or forty years ago. One is not seeing a modern, progressive attitude to opportunities that could be most **important** to our lives. Mr Hawke was quoted as saying that Australia must accept new technology. I am sure his view would be supported by the majority of Australians. I note that Mr Hawke's views were supported by Mr **Hayden**, the federal Leader of the Opposition. It is one of the few times that they have seen eye to eye. Newspapers commented that Mr Hawke and Mr **Hayden** had buried the hatchet. The *Daily Telegraph* of Tuesday 13th May, 1980, had the comment, "Hawke backs swing to new technology". These two gentlemen were not digging in their toes in a regressive way. They were asserting that we must have this new technology otherwise all citizens **will** suffer the consequences.

I referred to the problem of unemployment. One cannot stop change because of unemployment. One must take other action, to which I shall refer later. If we were to hop off this technological bandwaggon, as some people choose to call it, it would result in our isolation. That would be the height of folly for it would cause **an** unacceptable slump in the standard of living of every Australian. If Australia were to leave the technological hurdy-gurdy, its ability to sell overseas would be seriously damaged, perhaps permanently. Export dependent nations such as Australia cannot turn back the tide of change and attempt to live in a cocoon. Australia has **too** small an economy to go alone. Further, new and increased **trading** opportunities are necessary to maintain and improve our standard of living. As I said, Australia must stay with the pace and make internal adjustments to meet the inevitable, but not necessarily insurmountable problems. This generation has an obligation to future generations to maintain and if possible improve the nation's knowledge of available technology and use of it. To do otherwise would be to sell out our birthright and the **trust** placed in us to hand over a progressive and vibrant nation for future Australians. The necessary protection of those vulnerable to the forces of change can be ensured providing government, employers and employee organizations communicate with each other so that each is aware of the changes, the reasons for them and the likely effects.

Those comments set the background to my thought. There are ways that these matters can be accommodated and put into place without the fear that was generated originally by the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, **who talked** about 30 000 peasant people living on the outskirts of Sydney. The Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology adopted the same theme. He criticized the Myer report, perhaps because he did not initiate it and chose not to take advantage of its findings. To illustrate the high regard in which the federal Government is held, I remind the House that this very day the Hon. D. S. Thomson, the federal Minister for Science and the Environment, is speaking in Paris as the lead speaker in the debate that is taking place among member countries of the Organization for

Economic Co-operation and Development. That is a great compliment to the Australian Government and illustrates the reputation that it has built throughout the world. The Australian Minister has been chosen to lead the debate that will take place between twenty-four of the most developed countries in the world. Honourable members will recognize when they read Mr Thomson's speech that the federal Government has taken this matter most seriously and has put forward the most positive ideas to that august organization.

Mr Egan: What are they?

Mr **SCHIPP**: I have not a copy of Mr Thomson's speech. He will say that we must be positive about the need for technology and for everyone to expand their knowledge of it and adapt to it. Mr Thomson will speak also about the need for further assessment to take place to identify the possible effects of technological change and to look, first, at the effects, the advantages of which far outweigh the disadvantages. Mr Thomson will **consider** also the other side of the picture to ascertain what must be done to ease new technology into the system so that it does not unnecessarily hurt people.

The federal Government's representative will advise the representatives of the twenty-four countries that it is not the policy of the Australian Government to be swept along unnecessarily with change without having a say in what is occurring. He will also warn the meeting that any country that is in any way developed or has a reasonable standard of living that it wants to maintain must not be left behind. No honourable member can doubt the wisdom of those views. As I said earlier, once one leaves the hurdy-gurdy, one is left behind and one can never deliver the goods that the community is adjusted to receiving and expecting. The federal Minister will warn of the grave social consequences that will flow unless the matters to which I have referred are taken into account.

Mr Egan: How do you know that?

Mr **SCHIPP**: The honourable member will be able to read the Hon. D. S. Thomson's speech tomorrow. I have amended the motion to include the federal Government. I said that I did not do that lightly. I commend the federal Government for what it is doing in the areas of science and technology. This year some \$82 million will be spent in those broad areas. This is an increase of 150 per cent on the figures that I gave to the House in 1978 when it debated the Science and Technology Council (Amendment) Bill. At that time I informed the House that the expenditure on science and technology was \$34 million.

Let us compare the **allocation** in the State Budget for science and technology. One will see immediately that it is a disappointing figure. An absolutely pathetic amount of \$135,000 has been allocated for expenditure by the Science and Technology Council and a miserable \$245,000 by the Technological Information and Research Unit—a total grant of \$380,000. That is from a government that pats itself on the back for initiatives taken in science and technology. It is an absolute disgrace that the honourable member for East Hills should move this motion and that other Government supporters should support it. It is an indictment on a lacklustre Minister. The honourable member for East Hills spoke about the low-key State technology unit and Technological Information and Research Unit. It is low key because it has been suppressed by the Government, for the unit steps on the toes of the giant union movement, which will not tolerate control.

Federal spending on science and technology totals \$82 million. In 1981, \$16 million of that amount will be spent on the Australian research grants scheme, which is a 25 per cent increase in funds for that scheme compared with last year. For research into the energy, marine and industrial fields, the 1981 Budget allocates \$66 million, which is five times the 1978 allocation of \$13.6 million. Added to those figures is almost \$200 million in funds for programmes carried on by the CSIRO, though most of them are related **more** particularly to the applied sciences relating to social problems. However, those funds are in addition to the \$82 million I have already mentioned. Yet the hypocritical Opposition supporters attempt to heap credit upon themselves for what the New South Wales Labor Government is doing. The fact is that it is allocating a miserable \$380,000.

The Commonwealth department administered by the Minister for Science and the Environment co-ordinates all aspects of science and technology and CSIRO research. In addition, the Australian Science and Technology Council reports **directly** to the Prime Minister. That is a **two-pronged** attack by the federal Government on this matter. The federal Minister for Science has been invited to lead the debate on **this** subject at the conference of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. This shows how highly regarded are the policies of the Australian Government, whose policies are firm and decisive. They compare more than **favourably** with the drag-your-feet approach of the New South Wales State Government.

The federal Government's policy recognizes changes in society. There has been change ever since man has been on earth. Generally, changes are for the better. However, the change of government in 1976 is a change that New South Wales could have done without. The federal Government's policy reflects the necessity for research and development to meet changing needs and that research and development must have relevance to national priorities. That is a particular aim of the federal Government. These days we cannot ignore the need for fundamental research to extract information about our people and what is happening on this earth. The research policy must be formed in association with broad economic policies. That is happening, for example, in the energy field, in association with the energy pricing policy forced on to the federal Government by changes to the world oil situation.

In addition to direct Government spending in the areas I have mentioned—and I spoke of funding of about \$282 million—we can look forward this year to \$1 billion being spent on industrial research and development in Australia. About 70 per cent of that will be spent by the Government and 30 per cent by private enterprise. What does the negative Labor Government in New South Wales want to do with that expenditure? Apparently it believes that projects that show promising results should be varied because they will bring change to technology. The people will not tolerate such changes.

Criticism has been made of the Myers inquiry into technological change initiated by the federal Government. That criticism is not justified as the Myers inquiry did two great services for Australia. First, it highlighted the problems associated with the development of technology and, second, it sparked off new rounds of debate on this important subject. I dare say if the hypocritical Government supporters were able to encourage the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology, a . absolute failure in this field, to get off his tail there would have been no need for the motion before the House. At least the Myers report prompted the Minister to make a ministerial statement last year.

The federal Government has accepted most of the recommendations made in the Myers report. The only matters that have not been implemented but which are still being resolved are those dealing with funding of redundancies. Any thinking person would know that governments cannot lightly fund redundancy, for it is difficult to

isolate what is a true redundancy and what is a change in favour. By introducing some of those recommendations the Government will be seeking to minimize the **effects of** change and maximize the benefits. I applaud those objectives. It is a **refreshing** outlook to the whole matter. Let us compare that to the attitude of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, which has declared openly and emphatically that it will not co-operate in the implementation of the recommendations in that report. In other words, unless that organization makes the rules and controls the whole matter, it will not co-operate. The New South Wales Government is toadying to the union movement. It will not take positive measures. The honourable member for East Hills said, "We do not want to be called modern-day **Luddites**". What else can one call them? They are negative **people**.

Considerably more publicity needs to be given to the Australian Industry Research Development Incentive Board. Many companies do not know that incentive schemes are available to them. The board supports research and development of industry and will encourage and help them in research activities into new markets, new products, exports, and the provision of new employment opportunities. If the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology were doing his job correctly, he would be promoting the incentive schemes offered by that board. There are considerable benefits to be gained from them. Last year the board distributed about \$34 million in incentive payments. This year the figure will be increased to \$53 million, a 55 per cent increase in one year. That is another indication of federal responsibility and federal initiative in this matter.

By way of information to honourable members I should state that the companies themselves claim that the money spent through those incentives is highly productive in its results, including new or replacement markets of about **\$234** million in domestic markets this year and a further \$250 million in increased exports. It involves about 16 million man hours to research those objectives. Yet the Government decides not to take advantage of that research. Another factor is the extremely high success rate of projects funded by the scheme. Some 55 per cent of them have led to new products or processes, and 38 per cent are expected to lead to success after further development. That will be a gigantic **93** per cent success rate. I should like to remind the Minister how that board operates in the hope that he will take more positive action in the field of technology.

It is typical of the projects funded through the incentive scheme that DSL Engineers Pty Limited has developed a dam strand anchor to stabilize existing unstable dams. Dam anchors are used to tie down dead weight dams and thus extend a dam's life or increase its capacity. A further example of what has occurred because of the incentive given by the federal Government is that **Dalmison** Australia Pty Limited of Wyong is developing a high voltage line insulator combining the strength of metal with the insulating properties of a polymer. That project is attracting worldwide interest from electricity authorities.

Another company, Ligg Pty Limited, is developing a diabetic blood glucose testing machine with a digital readout and memory attachment. This will enable diabetics, in particular diabetic children, to lead a more normal life. The Government would not want that to happen. That is new technology. Closer to home, Australian Training Aids Pty Limited of Albury is developing a weapons training system that is able to freeze and then display the image seen in the rifle sight at the moment of firing, so that it can be used to advantage to correct faults and improve the marksmanship of the Australian soldier. Those are positive moves by the federal Government to create new projects and provide jobs.

Government supporters should hang their heads in shame because of the way the Government has treated technological change. It has buried it in the background and has tried to throw a smokescreen over the true situation. Government supporters can only gabble on about employment and unemployment. Every indicator will show the Government that new technology leads to the creation of more and more jobs. The Government will not acknowledge that more and more people are seeking employment. New technology will create job opportunities and accommodate more people in the work force. If technological change is not undertaken, jobs will not become available. **If** manual labour solely is relied upon in many areas touched upon in this debate, there will be no jobs at all. Jobs will be taken by our near northern neighbours who have the resource, technology and dedication, and work longer hours.

The New South Wales Government supported moves for a 35-hour week for employees under various State awards. The **Government** should examine what that will do to the Australian economy and what it will cost the community. The Government's supporters are hypocrites. They have talked about loss of jobs through new technology and yet **will** not even face up to the fact that the 35-hour week **will** bundle huge numbers of people out of work. These people may never be able to regain admittance to the work force. The working hours of Australians are among the lowest in the world, yet workers are seeking more and more reductions in working hours. The Government does not care about unemployment but looks after only the paid-up members of the union movement and not other members of the work force.

The Government has the option of taking many positive approaches to this problem. Effective educational programmes have to be instituted to inform people what is happening about employment opportunities. Manpower training schemes have to be established and counsellors **will** have to be appointed. Liaison will have to take place between employer and employee organizations and governments. I have given the House information regarding initiatives and action undertaken by the federal Government in handling technological change. I have moved and commend to the House an amendment that names the federal Government as the one that deserves commendation for its actions in regard to **technological** change.

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

Question—That the word be inserted—put*

Amendment negatived.

Mr EGAN (Cronulla) [3.14]: Honourable members have just witnessed an abysmal effort by the honourable member for Wagga Wagga to persuade the Parliament that its members should get on—and I use his expression—the **technological** hurdy-gurdy. The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines hurdy-gurdy in these **terms**:

Musical instrument with droning sound, played by turning handle; especially one with rosined wheel turned by right hand to sound **drone**-strings, and keys played by the left hand.

That does not sound like a very enticing future. But, apparently, it is what the honourable member for Wagga Wagga would commit us to. In the half hour that he addressed the House on not one occasion did he make any mention of the possible pitfalls associated with the too rapid introduction of technological change. According to the honourable member the only effect of technological change is to accrue all sorts of benefits to the community at **large**. He fails to give any attention to the fact that obviously many existing jobs will be lost. He fails to give any attention to the fact that jobs, which would otherwise have arisen as the result of the normal growth of

economic activity might not arise. Also, he fails to give any consideration to the fact that people who **have** specialized skills in certain areas might find that these **skills** have become obsolescent. He does not give any consideration to the fact that the implementation of technological change and the closing down of some industries and the opening of others will place tremendous **pressures** on people who will have to uproot themselves from communities in which they have lived, for the whole of their **lives** in many instances, and will be forced to move to other areas. He does not give any consideration to the possibility that these marvellous benefits of technological change of which he speaks, might, without active intervention and regulation by government, fall unevenly on members of the community.

The honourable member claimed that the motion was nothing more than a smokescreen for the Government's failure in technological change. Yet the New South Wales Government is the only government in Australia that is doing anything about monitoring the effects of technological change, assessing their effects and formulating policies that will enable the community to cope with those changes.

Mr Caterson: Rubbish.

Mr EGAN: The honourable member for The **Hills** interjects, "Rubbish". I should like to read something that the federal Minister for Employment and Youth **Affairs**, the Hon. R. I. Viner, said in answer to a question asked in federal Parliament in March 1979. He said this:

The Department of Employment and Youth Affairs does not collect on a regular basis statistics that indicate the number of people who have been retrenched from industry or who have lost their jobs as the result of the introduction of automated techniques.

That indicates a bewildering complacency on the part of a federal Minister and the federal Government. Surely it is clear evidence that the federal Government is doing nothing to monitor the effects of technological change and nothing to devise means of coping with it.

Unfortunately, the federal Government appears to have adopted the blindly optimistic view that this House heard today from the honourable member for Wagga Wagga. No consideration at all has been given to any of the problems that technological change may bring. The honourable member simply claims that new technology leads to more and more jobs. Yet his assertion is completely unsubstantiated by any argument or evidence. He simply puts it forward as an article of faith.

It interested me that at no stage did the honourable member for Wagga Wagga **tell** the House how these jobs would come about or specify the new industries that would provide them. In times past when the world has gone through rapid industrial and **technological** change it has usually been possible at some stage to anticipate new industries that would provide jobs. For example, during the first industrial revolution in the late eighteenth century it was obvious that before long there would be a number of new major employing areas including steam power, textiles, shipping, mining and railways. Similarly, during the second industrial revolution it was obvious that the provision of urban utilities such as water, electricity, gas, public transport and the embryonic motor vehicle industry at that stage, as well as telephones, sewing machines and things of that nature would open up vast new areas for employment. But what is the equivalent today of the motor vehicle industry? I shall be interested to hear.

Usually we are told that it is the computer industry. I have seen figures which show that in the past few years the computer industry in Australia has been responsible for the addition of about 78 000 jobs. That, I am certain, is true, **but** the people who put it forward as an argument neglect to consider whether **it** is a net gain. They fail to consider that the introduction of computers has also cost many jobs, particularly in the clerical field. A recent study by Dr Thornton, head of the School of Mathematical Sciences at the New South Wales Institute of Technology, estimated that there had been a net loss of 150 000 jobs as a result of the introduction of computers. The report was entitled "Report on Computers in Australia, Usage and Effects". Dr Thornton drew the conclusion, working from the capital investment on computers, that about 200 000 jobs had been eliminated in offices alone. If one allows for the fact that about 53 000 people were involved in data processing and operating, about 150 000 low grade clerical jobs have been abolished as the net result of computerization.

It should be borne in mind that the computer industry is virtually the only industry that the people who use this argument can point to in support of it. I suggest it is incumbent upon them to specify the new industries that will arise. I shall be interested to hear whether the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai is able to do that. One of the assumptions that optimists about employment growth use is that computers will lead to cost reductions, which in turn will lead to a growth in demand for goods and services. But experience in recent years has shown that there is no longer any automatic link between demand and employment. Certainly there is no automatic link between investment and employment; indeed, the reverse seems to be the situation. What has been apparent, particularly during the 1970's, is that during times of economic growth there are also higher levels of unemployment.

The argument is not simply whether technology is good or bad. No one on this side of the House is arguing that we should obstruct the introduction of new technology. We are simply pointing out that it is incumbent on governments to start planning now for the obvious changes that technological advances will have on all facets of society, not only on the economy but also on the social fabric where their effects will probably be the most pronounced. We must also face the fact that, even if the introduction of new technology does have a positive net overall effect on employment growth, it will affect particular industries at different rates. To that extent, the different demographic groups which are disproportionately concentrated in different industries and occupations will face a completely differing situation in terms of job displacement. Technological change implies the reallocation of resources, **both** labour and capital. Technological change causes persistent changes in the structure of the economy, in the deployment of resources and in the distribution of output across industries and regions. In an article in the *Australian Quarterly*, by Joy Selby Smith, senior tutor in economics at the Australian National University—and I point out that the article is optimistic about the overall employment effects of new technology—the writer says:

For labour especially, structural change means adjustment on the part of some workers who will be displaced from their particular occupations and industries and from their particular places of work. Even if this adjustment process is achieved voluntarily and there are no retrenchments it can result in capital losses in workers' investment in their skills as their current jobs are outcompeted by the new machines. They must therefore change jobs and adapt to new jobs at lower relative wages. Workers may also suffer capital losses on property as they move from one location to another.

Finally the **adjustment** process may imply, for some marginal workers, total withdrawal from the paid labour force. This is a particular feature of female workers who are said to have a low labour force 'attachment'.

It should be quite clear that even if some sections of the community stand to gain from technology, there are some sections of the community that **will** be victims. Unfortunately, one of the hallmarks of the present federal Government is its callous indifference to the welfare of society's victims. For example, we have a Minister for Youth and Employment, the Hon. R. I. Viner, who boasts that his Government is philosophically opposed to the creation of jobs and we have a Prime Minister who has gone on record as saying that the creation or stimulation of jobs for the unemployed is an outdated, discredited economic pipedream. We often hear of sportsmen who play a percentage game. Honourable members have to face the fact that the Fraser Government has elevated the percentage game to a political art form. So long as the majority of the electorate are doing well, why bother about a minority who may not be, especially if the majority can be presented with the argument that it is at their expense that help will be provided to the minority.

This is why we have a federal Government that is willing to tolerate Australia's highest postwar unemployment and to tolerate 100 000 families on the welfare housing list. It is also the reason, I suggest, that the federal Government is blithely unconcerned about the impact that the accelerating rate of technological change will have on Australia and Australians. The simple fact is that without government action, the benefits of the rapid introduction of new technology—and there are many—will accrue overwhelmingly to what the Fraser Government perceives as its political constituency. Equally there is little doubt that the victims—the people who have to wear the lost jobs, the dehumanized work routines, the dislocation of **family** and social life—will be the groups of people who hitherto have never commanded even one iota of interest or attention from the Fraser Government. These are the migrant working women, the educationally deprived, the unskilled and the unemployed young. They are the **people** whom the Fraser Government is prepared to let **suffer**, the people in relation to whom the effects of technological change are of no concern to that Government.

The honourable member for Wagga Wagga said that the federal Government was spending \$82 million on science and technology. I was amazed that he could not tell us precisely how the money was being spent. It was certainly not spent on assessing the impact of technological change or on identifying new industries that might become major job creators; it was not spent on evaluating the employment or social effects of the new technology being implemented here and now. It was a figure the honourable member just used as a throw-away.

The honourable member then spent ten minutes or so telling us what the federal Minister, the Hon. D. S. Thomson intended to say at an OECD conference. He said that the Minister was about to make proposals to that conference but he did not say what the proposals were. He spoke for ten minutes on that topic, but could not tell us of even one specific proposal. The honourable member mentioned the Myers **report**—one of the greatest whitewashes in recent years. It was almost exclusively **technology**-oriented and did not consider sociological aspects. In fact, its staff included no sociologist, historian or philosopher. Its staff were experienced only in the technical areas of the technology issue.

If the honourable member for Wagga Wagga had read the report—and obviously he failed to do so—he would have been amazed at the methodology adopted by the Myers committee. It made assumptions; it then went away, consulted bodies and interviewed people round the world, in order to obtain evidence to support its assumptions. Nowhere in the report are the contrary views set out or is there any questioning of the

effects of new technology. Furthermore, the Myers report does not differentiate between types of technology; it treats technology as a single entity. It ignores the fact that some changes may be desirable but others deleterious. It takes a facile approach to employment generation. The Myers report makes this clear in one passage:

The Committee . . . does believe that the available historical evidence shows that technological change has in the long term created wealth and employment and that future changes will continue to have this effect.

That is the only attention given by the Committee in its whole report to the subject of employment. No evidence is produced and no arguments are adduced to back that assertion. In any event the claim is historically wrong. The fact is that in the last 200 years there has been only one period of thirty years in which full employment has been the norm. Most of the time the world has **suffered** from less than full employment. The Myers report ignores completely the breakdown in the relationships between demand and employment and between investment and employment. There are some areas of employment that are acutely sensitive to demand, but in others there seems to be an inverse **relationship**——

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

Mr GREINER (Ku-ring-gai) [3.34]: I move:

That the question be amended by leaving out all words after the word "be" with a view of inserting in lieu thereof the words "censured for its approach to technological change".

I wish to deal first and briefly—for brevity is all they deserve—with the **comments** of the honourable member for Cronulla. He spent the first two or three minutes detailing a list of supposed failings in the speech of the honourable member for Wagga Wagga. Almost every item he listed concerned the failure to put technology **in** its broad social and economic framework. Surely that failure should be laid at the door of the Labor Government. I shall return to that issue in a moment.

The honourable member for Cronulla made the fantastic point that the federal Government should instruct its department to keep figures giving the reasons for unemployment. He wants the Commonwealth Employment Service to keep accurate figures and to separate them out in order to show how many people are out of work as a result of technological change. Even somebody with the immense intellect of the honourable member for Cronulla should realize that that is an impossibility. It is impossible to expect businesses to provide that information. Furthermore, presumably one would not obtain that information satisfactorily from those who have been thrown out of work and there appears to be no other source from which that information could wme.

The honourable member for Cronulla then got on to the normal tack of government members when he said that technological change is different from other changes in the history of the world. He referred to all the technological changes that had occurred from the time of the Luddites—whom he might well seek to represent—but said that the nation now had to face a new kind of change, namely technological change, with totally different ramifications for unemployment. That is a nonsense in logic and deserves no further attention.

Mr Sheahan: On a point of order. The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai has moved, or indicated that he is about to move, an amendment. As one amendment has already been defeated by default, it surely would be courteous to make a copy of the new amendment available to the Government.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER (Mr **Quinn**): The honourable member for **Ku-ring-gai** has provided the Chair with a copy of the amendment.

Mr GREINER: The honourable member for Cronulla suggested that **the** terrible federal Government in Canberra was not concerned with the minority—in other words, with the unemployed. Indeed, he added that federal policies embracing new technology had the effect of accentuating unemployment. But if there is any single group in the community that shows complete disregard for the wishes of the unemployed, it is surely the trade union movement. That movement has consistently sought to further the interests of the **94** per cent of the work force who are in jobs at the expense of those who are out of work. It is well known that the current leader of the federal Labor Party now agrees with that statement. A former Labor federal Treasurer, Mr Frank Crean, said that one man's pay increase is another man's loss of **a** job. Therefore, if there is any single group in the community that does not care for the minority, it is not the Fraser Government but the Australian Council of Trade Unions and some of its more militant members.

I refer next to some of the matters mentioned by the honourable member for Cronulla. The honourable member spoke about the structure of industry. The honourable member for Cronulla invited me to discuss the particular industries that will grow. Obviously New South Wales has a concentration of heavy industry, including heavy manufacturing industry, and to a lesser extent, service industries. One has to ascertain how the resources boom, basically **coalmining**, may be used to spread benefits to other industries. Though the Opposition agrees with the need to develop coal deposits in the Hunter Valley, the development raises problems as well as possible benefits. The Government has failed to direct its attention to those problems. The Government should be concerned for the effects of new technology on the traditional industries in New South Wales. Unfortunately, the Government is largely ignoring those industries and their industrial structure. I quote from the *Bulletin of Labour* of December **1980** by Professor Kaspar which stated:

Large capital inflows and, from the late **1980s**, substantial new mineral exports will at first improve Australia's terms of trade. This will have welcome effects on our private incomes and on government revenue (or ease our tax burden). But we will have to face the situation that, sooner or later, more exports have to be matched by more imports. It **can** be **confi-** dently expected that this renewed import competition will hit the least efficient, most labour-intensive parts of the manufacturing sector.

Mr Egan: The honourable member is contradicting his own argument.

Mr GREINER: I ask the honourable member for Cronulla to be patient. The article continues:

If we are not careful and do not start to take preparatory action now, we shall be faced—as in the 1970s—with a situation in which mining exports may create fewer jobs than the corresponding import surge wipes out.

I refer next to the professor's comments on technology, as in a sense they summarize the debate:

Another challenge to job security seems to **arise** from the spread of new technologies that save labour. In particular, the spread of micro chip technology is bound to affect numerous jobs in production-process control, quality control, information processing, etc. Unlike the past, when technical change mostly affected agriculture and industry, but only a few service sectors like transport, we can expect future technology to have pervasive effects on the service sector as **well . . .**

That is the point made by the honourable member for Cronulla. A responsible government considering industry in New South Wales would need to ask itself, "Where do we go from there?" It is axiomatic that if in the 1980's jobs are to be provided for all who want them, including those who are unemployed and those who will join the labour force in the future, the economy must grow at the rate of some 5 per cent a year. The only alternative to that is to accept virtual stagnation of the real value of take-home pay, pensions, unemployment benefits and our standard of living. If industries do not grow at an average of 5 per cent a year, obviously the economy **cannot** grow at that rate. If Australia retains its resources in industries in which growth prospects are not bright—and that includes many manufacturing industries in New South Wales—the chance of achieving an average growth rate of 5 per cent is largely reduced.

We must get out of industries that cater for a protected domestic market at a time of slow population growth; industries that produce products with low income elasticities of demand. We must consider the structure of industries and withdraw from these lame ducks and enter activities that have bright prospects. Before the honourable member for Cronulla asks me to specify them, I remind the honourable member that there is a large variety of literature identifying the industries that have growth prospects, which include petroleum and coal refining, basic non-ferrous metals, non-agricultural machinery, paints, drugs, industrial electrical machinery, industrial chemicals and metal goods. It is possible, and it is incumbent upon the Government to identify the industries that have the brighter growth prospects. The Government must develop an economic policy in New South Wales. It must ascertain the various strengths and weaknesses of the industries. It must direct its attention not only to manufacturing and mining industries from which we draw our natural resources but which do not create sufficient jobs to solve the unemployment problem, but also to encouraging other industries.

When the Wran Government first came to office the Premier and Treasurer was advised by some good economists. They suggested the setting up of an inquiry to ascertain where the structure of industry is going in New South Wales and its ramifications for the next ten years. The McFarlane report was the findings of a variety of distinguished economists from inside and outside the public sector. As the report referred to many difficulties, naturally the Premier and Treasurer did not release it. The Opposition has challenged the Premier and Treasurer to release the report, which is now three years out of date. It deals specifically with the sorts of problems to which the House is referring. If the honourable member for East Hills and the honourable member for Cronulla are concerned about identifying the industries that should be encouraged, they should suggest to the Premier and Treasurer that he table the report, and allow the House to consider what the experts say about the direction in which industry structure in New South Wales is heading. I challenge Government supporters to inform the House what has happened to the report and **give** one good reason why it has not been tabled in the House.

I refer next to the Budget Papers, which is the major economic strategy document of the New South Wales Government. Repeatedly I have said in this House that the Budget Papers in New South Wales are, without exception, the worst in Australia in terms of setting out the matters about which we are talking, namely what particular industries should be encouraged, the State's prospects and the demographic implications. The Budget Papers make no mention of any meaningful approach to the total economic development of New South Wales. This work is done by the Treasury. I ask the honourable member for Cronulla to take up my cause and have the economic policy papers prepared for the Treasury tabled in this House. That is done by every other government in Australia. Why has the Government not done it?

Mr Sheahan: What about the former Government?

Mr GREINER: Progress comes but slowly. Even the Victorian Government, which according to members of the Labor Party is in a great deal of trouble, has undertaken in the past six months an economic strategy assessment and it has published this strategy for the development of Victorian industry. In the context of the impact of technology on industries that are concentrated in Victoria, such as the textile and shoe industries, that Government has published a strategy to show how it will cope with the impact of technological and other economic forces on those industries. If the House is to engage in a meaningful debate about the economic and social implications of new technology, the New South Wales Government should do the same thing. I do not know why the Government refuses to do so.

I refer next to the actions of the Government as a result of its supposed concern for the introduction of new technology. First, it encourages a 35-hour week. I know of no other single action that would give greater encouragement to industry to invest in labour-saving devices and in capital intensive procedures. I regret that the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, who is a major proponent of that concept, has left the Chamber. The Government could take no single action that would be more inclined to encourage the investment in new technology and thus reduce the number of employees than a 35-hour week. That concession flies straight in the face of the concern expressed about the social and economic implications of new technology.

I refer next to payroll tax. I assert that the second most stupid thing one could do to encourage investment in labour-saving technology would be to impose a tax on employment. New South Wales has the worst but one exemption level of all the States in Australia. In other words, if one wished to encourage investment in labour-saving technology one would impose the highest taxes on employment of any State administration in Australia. The Government has limited as much as possible the exemptions from payroll tax and has taxed employment as much as possible.

Those facts indicate clearly a brilliant insight into ways of preventing employers from investing in new labour-saving technology. The Government's attitude is a joke. One of two main economic areas in which the Government could make an impact would be to make it less attractive for employers to invest in labour-saving technologies. It takes the opposite approach, which encourages any rational employer to invest in as much labour-saving technology as possible. The other approach would be to put technical education high on the priority list. But what does the Government do? I admit that the Budget contained a slight increase in the allocation for technical education.

Mr Caterson: Technical education colleges are knocking back applicants for technical courses.

Mr GREINER: Precisely. That is at a time when there has been a reduction of 100 million part-time teacher hours. The people being thrown out of work, part-time teachers in technical colleges, are almost by definition those who are in industry and at the face of technology, those who are using the new technology and are best equipped to train young persons to cope with the impact of new technology in their work situation. What does the Government do? It discriminates against part-time teachers in the interests of having some increase in full-time teaching hours. Employers must be encouraged to invest in labour-saving technology. Equipment in technical colleges is, by anyone's standards, outdated. That is by today's standards; it is even more outdated by the standards of tomorrow and five and ten years time, which is really what we are debating.

Clearly, if the Government, which expresses concern about technology and its impact on young people's job prospects, were serious about education policies, it would be expanding and improving technical education. It is not doing that. I should refer to the attitude of the ACTU. Last week that organization met in Perth and decided to get tough on new technology. The honourable member for Cronulla said the Myers report was the most nonsensical he had ever read, though the ACTU executive accused the New South Wales Government of failing to adopt the Myers report recommendations. They cannot both be right. Obviously the ACTU is taking the troglodyte attitude that the honourable member for East Hills and the honourable member for Cronulla have been espousing this afternoon. It is not an attitude that will help people to obtain or maintain jobs. It will lead to a reduction in employment in the future and to divisiveness between those who are in work and those who are out of work.

I shall deal now with the Department of Technology. I have sympathy for the Minister, who has received some criticism in this matter. Unfortunately, the Minister is not the House at this moment. However, I shall examine what the Minister has done in his technology portfolio since it was assigned to him more than twelve months ago. I took the trouble to go to the library and look at the Minister's file on technology matters. Honourable members would be delighted to know that in the past twelve months the Minister has made two statements considered worthy of attention in newspaper articles. On 31st October last he said that robots were beginning to threaten many jobs in New South Wales. He stated they could be socially disruptive. His other statement was that robots were used in factories to carry out dangerous and repetitive work. Apparently the Minister is opposed to them.

Another contribution worthy of reporting in a newspaper article was a speech in which the Minister said, "We should have a national slowdown week". Is not that a brilliant contribution from the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology? That shows clearly the deep understanding and concern he has for the problems of technology. The House should censure the Government. Though it makes superficial attempts to deal with problems of technology and makes nice statements about that matter, it makes no impact by its performance in practical terms, and in terms of economic and social change. It has failed dismally.

Mr CAMERON: Mr Speaker —

Mr FLAHERTY (Granville), Government Whip [3.54]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 54

Mr Akister	Mr Degen	Mr Johnstone
Mr Anderson	Mr Durick	Mr Keane
Mr Bannon	Mr Egan	Mr McCarthy
Mr Barnier	Mr Einfeld	Mr McGowan
Mr Booth	Mr Face	Mr McIlwaine
Mr Brereton	Mr Ferguson	Mr Maher
Mr Britt	Mr Gabb	Mr Mair
Mr Cleary	Mr Gordon	Mr Mallam
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Haigh	Mr Mochalski
Mr Cox	Mr Hills	Mr Neilly
Mr Crabtree	Mr Hunter	Mr O'Connell
Mr Curran	Mr Jensen	Mr O'Neill
Mr Day	Mr Johnson	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 Wilde

Mr Wran

Tellers,
 Mr Flaherty
 Mr Wade

Noes, 32

Mr Arblaster
 Mr Boyd
 Mr Brewer
 Mr Bruxner
 Mr Cameron
 Mr J. A. Clough
 Mr Dowd
 Mr Duncan
 Mr Fischer
 Mr Fisher
 Mrs Foot

Mr Freudenstein
 Mr Greiner
 Mr Hatton
 Mr Healey
 Mr King
 Mr McDonald
 Mr Mason
 Mr Murray
 Mr Osborne
 Mr Park
 Mr Pickard

Mr Punch
 Mr Rozzoli
 Mr Schipp
 Mr Singleton
 Mr Smith
 Mr Sullivan
 Mr West
 Mr Wotton
Tellers,
 Mr Catterson
 Mr Taylor

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Question—That the words stand—put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 54

Mr Akister
 Mr Anderson
 Mr Bannon
 Mr Barnier
 Mr Booth
 Mr Brereton
 Mr Britt
 Mr Cleary
 Mr R. J. Clough
 Mr Cox
 Mr Crabtree
 Mr Curran
 Mr Day
 Mr Degen
 Mr Durick
 Mr Egan
 Mr Einfeld
 Mr Face
 Mr Ferguson

Mr Gabb
 Mr Gordon
 Mr Haigh
 Mr Hills
 Mr Hunter
 Mr Jensen
 Mr Johnson
 Mr Johnstone
 Mr Keane
 Mr McCarthy
 Mr McGowan
 Mr McIlwaine
 Mr Maher
 Mr Mair
 Mr Mallam
 Mr Mochalski
 Mr Neilly
 Mr O'Connell
 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 Wilde
 Mr Wran

Tellers,
 Mr Flaherty
 Mr Wade

Noes, 32

Mr Arblaster
 Mr Boyd
 Mr Brewer
 Mr Bruxner
 Mr Cameron

Mr J. A. Clough
 Mr Dowd
 Mr Duncan
 Mr Fischer
 Mr Fisher

Mrs Foot
 Mr Freudenstein
 Mr Greiner
 Mr Hatton
 Mr Healey

Mr King	Mr Pickard	Mr Sullivan
Mr McDonald	Mr Punch	Mr West
Mr Mason	Mr Rozzoli	Mr Wotton
Mr Murray	Mr Schipp	Tellers,
Mr Osborne	Mr Singleton	Mr Caterson
Mr Park	Mr Smith	Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—proposed.

Mr **SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck)**, Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [4.8]: It is an interesting situation that the first amendment attempted to be moved in this debate today was that moved by the shadow minister, the honourable member for Wagga Wagga, and it passed without division. On the other hand, the amendment moved by the new honourable member for Ku-ring-gai was made the subject of a division and was effectively negatived by the House. When one of the new members of the Opposition—one of only two back-bencher-in the Opposition—moved an amendment, the honourable member for Northcott attempted to make a contribution and a division was called to dispose of the matter.

There is not much division on technical change, because the Country Party members have not been present in the House, except for one of their new members who congratulated the honourable member for Wagga Wagga on his speech. No member of the Country Party has endeavoured to contribute. I point out also that an indication of what can be expected from today's debate was obtained by the honourable member for Bankstown who telephoned the Liberal Party secretariat to see whether there was available publicly any document outlining the stand of the Liberal Party or the Opposition generally on its policy towards **technological** change. He was told by the Liberal Party secretariat that they did not have a paper and all that could be made available to the honourable member or anyone else was a pile of newspaper clippings. The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai did not even know that the Liberal Party secretariat had a pile of news clippings. He asked the Parliamentary Library if it had anything on technological change. It was clear from the speeches made today that between now and the next election we cannot expect any statement of policy on technological change to be given by the Opposition.

I am delighted to hear of the contributions that were made by the first Minister for Technology in Australia, now the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, and by the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for **Technology**—the honourable member for Penrith—who is absent from the House today and whom I represent in the debate. It is fairly clear that the work being done by the New South Wales Government will be uncontested by the Opposition when its members come to account for themselves at the next election.

All the House will hear from the honourable member for Wagga Wagga when he gets the opportunity to speak about technological change is a recycled version of his discredited article in the *Wagga Wagga Daily Advertiser*. Today he endeavoured to read into *Hansard* the whole of that inane, stupid, badly intended article. He should have read to the House an account of his dissertation to his electorate in the *Wagga Wagga Daily Advertiser* of 16th July, 1980, when he did not realize that the Minister for Local Government had become the Minister for Roads in 1978 and that the Minister for Transport was no longer responsible for the Department of Main Roads.

He should perhaps have read from the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 10th July, 1980, an article dealing with the shadow ministerial situation known as industrial relations, technology and energy, then held by the honourable member for Wagga Wagga, which had proved to be one of the most vulnerable areas for the Opposition. That was why the sensitive part of it—industrial relations—was taken from him and given to another member of the Opposition. Now that we have a full time shadow minister for industrial relations in the Opposition, we should have expected some knowledgeable contribution to this debate and not a recycled discredited newspaper article or an admission from the Liberal Party secretariat to the honourable member for Bankstown that there was no policy paper dealing with the matter. We should have expected a far better contribution from the honourable member for Wagga Wagga.

I know that the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai had a difficult debut in **this** Parliament. He complained that a polling booth in his electorate could not be used for the by-election as it had been booked for a 21st birthday party. Nevertheless, he has made some meaningful contributions since then. Alas, today he has revealed to the House that we cannot expect much from him either on the subject of technology. The situation was that the Opposition could not muster a voice, let alone the numbers, to have a division on an amendment. As a very poor second best the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai moved that this State Government, which established the first portfolio of technology in Australia to deal with this **complex** matter, should be censured.

Much of the material that has been presented to the House today in the excellent contributions of the honourable member for Cronulla and the honourable member for East Hills, who moved the motion, indicates why this Government saw fit to establish the portfolio of technology. It is the earnest desire of the Government that the beneficial effects of new technology will flow to the whole community. The honourable member for Wagga Wagga read from newspaper articles which purport to have been written by him—we do not know whether they were or not—to show that members of the Opposition believe that all change flowing from or associated with computerization and automation is automatically progressive and in the interest of the community.

Unfortunately, all too often technological changes that have been and are being introduced destroy interest in jobs and downgrade the **skills** needed in the jobs that remain or introduce new occupational health hazards. Instead of giving more leisure for all, technological change presents for many people the prospect of a divided society in which some—the unemployed—have enforced and hence soul-crushing leisure while others fail to see how they benefit.

Mr Cameron: The Minister is terrified of change.

Mr SHEAHAN: The House was treated also to the routine and knee jerk reactions of the honourable member for Northcott. One can see how technological change has already **affected** members of the Opposition when we **talk** about robots and such like. What we need is not a crass, simplistic acceptance of all technology as progress, nor a blanket rejection of all technology. What is needed, and what my colleague the Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology is committed to, is a serious attempt to determine which kinds of technological change are of value. These and only these we should encourage through a selective and discriminating policy. What the Labor movement wants is not to slow down the pace of technological change, but to achieve change by consent after due consultation and negotiation.

In view of that statement of policy by this Government, what have we from the Opposition? We have this meaningless claptrap and from the honourable member for Wagga Wagga and the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai a misrepresentation of the policy of the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! As it is now fifteen minutes after four o'clock, p.m., the debate is interrupted. Pursuant to Standing Order 122A, the motion lapses.

BILLS RETURNED

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

Stock Diseases (Swine Branding) Amendment Bill
Swine Compensation (Swine Branding) Amendment **Bill**

PRINTING COMMITTEE

Tenth Report

Mr Cleary, as Acting Chairman, brought up the Tenth Report from the Printing Committee.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr Sheahan, at 4.16 p.m.

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

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

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation—

(1) What was the value of advertising placed through the Department of Agriculture with the advertising agency Mullins, Clarke and Ralph during the financial years 1976–77, 1977–78 and 1978–79?

(2) What was the total amount of advertising placed through other agencies during each of these periods?

(3) What was the total amount of advertising placed directly with media outlets during each of these periods?

(4) What was the basis of selection of Mullins, Clarke and Ralph for any advertising placed with that organization?

Answer—

(1) The value of advertising placed by Departments and Statutory Authorities presently within the administration of the Minister for Agriculture with the advertising agency Mullins, Clark and Ralph Pty Ltd during the financial year was—

1976–77—Nil.

1977–78—\$17,791.

1978–79—Nil.

(2) and (3) The total amount of advertising placed through other advertising agencies and directly with media outlets by Departments and Statutory Authorities presently within the administration of the Minister for Agriculture during each of those periods was:

1976–77—\$40,328.

1977–78—\$52,856.

1978–79—\$55,721.

(4) In 1977, the Government approved the introduction of a Master Media Agency Scheme to handle Government advertising. Detailed investigations had demonstrated that the introduction of such a scheme would result in the saving of thousands of dollars annually when compared to other modes of operation.

The scheme operates at no cost to the Government.

Submissions were sought from leading advertising agencies within the State which were assessed for appointment as Master Agents according to demonstrated expertise and capacity to effectively handle the operations involved. On this basis, Master Agents were appointed in three (3) categories of Government advertising, *viz.*:

- (a) Electronics (radio and TV).
- (b) Press display advertising.
- (c) Classified advertising.

Mullins, Clark and **Ralph Pty Ltd** were appointed, in competition with other agencies, as the Master Agents in Category (b) for a period of three years from October, 1977—this period also applying to the appointments of the other Master Agents. **Mullins, Clark** and **Ralph Pty Ltd** were not appointed as a Master Agent in either of the other two categories.

PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

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

(1) What appointments have been made to the staff of statutory corporations, Government instrumentalities, his Department or Authorities under his control, including his personal staff, from former officers (either permanent or temporary) of the South Australian Public Service, since the defeat of the Corcoran Government?

(2) What is (a) the name of each such officer, (b) the position occupied, (c) the salary scale paid and (d) the qualifications for the position?

(3) What position was occupied by each such officer in South Australia, together with the comparable details of salary scale?

Answer—

- (1) Nil.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Not applicable.

