

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 24 March, 1981

---

Petitions—New South Wales Police Force (Urgency)—Questions without Notice—Heroin (Ministerial Statement)—Anti-Discrimination Cognate Bills (second reading)—Motor Vehicles (Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill (second reading, third reading)—Totalizator (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Police Regulation (Superannuation) Cognate Bills (second reading, third reading)—Bills Returned—Lord Howe Island (Amendment) Bill (second reading)—Bills Returned—Adjournment (Dundas Migrant Hostel Site)—Questions upon Notice.

---

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

### PETITIONS

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

#### 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 conduct 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 McCarthy, received.

#### Rainforests

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

That rainforests maintain a greater diversity of vegetation and animal life than any other forest type. There is worldwide concern for their preservation. The logging policies of the New South Wales Forestry Commission do not protect the ecological integrity of our rainforests. **At** the present rate of logging the State's remaining rainforests will be exhausted within fifteen years. Workers employed in the logging of rainforests will become unemployed from 1982 onwards.

Therefore we humbly request that there be an immediate cessation of logging in all the remaining rainforests in New South Wales and that steps be taken to ensure that employment schemes, such as reforestation and use of alternative timber supplies, be implemented for displaced workers.

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

Petitions, lodged by Mr Egan and Mr McCarthy, received.

#### Traffic Signals for Mt 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, Mt Kuring-gai**.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will give urgent consideration to gaining safe entry onto the highway from **Glenview Road** by either installing traffic signals at **Glenview Road**, or providing vehicular access to **Nyara Road**; and that it makes 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.

### NEW SOUTH WALES POLICE FORCE

#### Urgency

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [2.20]: I move:

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

That this House calls on the Government to increase the strength of the New South Wales Police Force by 1000 instead of reducing the level of police protection to the community and commends the members of the New South Wales Police Force for their dedication to duty.

**This** matter is of extreme importance because the police force is becoming **less** and less able to provide protection and security for the people of this State. Its ability to do so has been strained to the limit. The matter is of extreme importance and urgency because the thin blue line between the community and the criminal is getting thinner and thinner. Last year the Commissioner of **Police** sought an increase in police strength of **350** men. So pathetic was the influence of the Minister for Police with his Cabinet colleagues that he was able to get only 100 extra staff. Though other Ministers increased their departmental strength, the Minister for Police stood by and saw the priority of the police pushed lower and lower. At the same time the Minister has stood by helplessly and watched the champion of the trendies, the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, rip out of the laws of this State the support for his police officers. Gradually changes such as the repeal of the Summary Offences Act and the Bail Act **will** eat away the ability of those fine men under the Minister's control to safeguard the community.

This matter is urgent because New South Wales police are working under extreme pressure. So serious is the shortage of police that right now most officers are working up to twenty-four days without so much as a day off. Their rosters are so tight, and the pressure upon them so great, that non-commissioned officers in particular have virtually forgotten what it is like to have a day off. The stress and tension of being in the front line of community protection are beginning to take their toll. Last year there was a massive increase of 31.1 per cent in resignations from the police force. In that year a staggering \$14.3 million was paid to police in overtime. Has the Government made no allowance for the demands it puts on its police force when, for instance, a strike occurs in the prison system? Overtime payments incurred because of strikes in the prison system cost \$500,000. Some 75 000 man-hours were spent in a search by police for escaped criminal Raymond Denning, and 40 000 man-hours of overtime were occasioned by staff shortages, which cost about \$420,000. How long does the Government expect officers of the police force to work under those conditions? Certainly there is already a serious increase in absences through sick leave. Unless the Government takes urgent action, more and more officers will succumb to the tension and pressure that is already beginning to evidence itself. Later the House will debate legislation that will allow police officers to retire earlier. The need for such legislation demonstrates the pressure and tension that is building up within the New South Wales police force.

**This** matter is urgent because we have reached the alarming stage where **police** are unable to give the protection that the community is entitled to expect. There are not enough police to man car patrols and provide adequate **staff** to keep open our police stations. For some time nineteen stations have been closed at night. Now, twenty-one more stations are to be left unmanned at night. The situation is more serious **than** that. **Recently** the homicide squad was able to roster only one detective for day duty. Other specialist squads are being weakened because their non-commissioned officers must go to major police stations such as Chatswood simply to keep those stations open by undertaking general duties.

Recently a harassed senior superintendent told me that all the police could do was answer complaints, and that crime prevention, community relations and education have had to be neglected. On 12th March the director of the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics, Dr Sutton, made a call, which I **am** sure would be echoed by people throughout the State, for a **return** to **foot** patrols by policemen in order to improve security on the streets. Most senior policemen to whom I have spoken would like to be able to send men out on street patrol again but that is a forlorn hope. In Victoria, Queensland and in the other States one sees policemen on the streets, instilling confidence into the citizens and by their presence providing a warning to criminals. New South Wales has fallen so far behind the other States in police strength that there is no hope of returning to police street patrols. It is urgent that police strength be increased just to man the cars that are parked at police stations night after night because there is no one to drive them.

It is urgent that police **strength** be increased to a level necessary to ensure that policemen are not sent out on assignments alone. That intolerable practice has led to the loss of lives of policemen in more recent **times**. It is a practice that nobody should accept for one moment, but unfortunately it has been forced on the police of New South Wales. In the interests of the community, police are putting **their** lives at risk, and are bearing the burden by being the front line of protection for citizens. The horrible stage that has been reached is that not enough policemen are available

to do the work that has to be done. The police are facing risks, uncertainty and the possibility of death when they go out alone in answer to calls, as they are required to do regularly.

The matter is urgent because crime in New South Wales is on the increase. The latest figures available show that, since the Labor Government assumed office and police manpower started to decline, armed hold-ups have increased by 78.8 per cent in New South Wales, non-aggravated assaults have increased by 42 per cent, offences of breaking, entering and stealing from dwellings have increased by 19 per cent, offences of breaking entering and stealing from other places are up 14.8 per cent, and car thefts have risen by 40 per cent. Other offences, which include arson, malicious injury, damage to property, possession of unlicensed pistols and similar crimes have increased by 43.2 per cent. Does the House need more facts to convince it of the need to increase the size of the police force by 1 000 officers?

More than twenty months ago His Honour Mr Justice Lusher was appointed to carry out an inquiry into the administration and staffing of the police force. What has happened to that inquiry? It has become a joke among members of the police force. Is the Government unable to procure that urgently needed report, which could give some guidelines on the need for change and the direction in which change should be effected? Why is it not pressing for production of *the* report? Why has it not demanded that His Honour Mr Justice Lusher produce the report? If it did so, that could be at least some intimation of concern from the Government for the community and for the police who act in the interests of the community.

The police are most loyal servants of the Government. They put aside the problems arising from wages and working conditions that take hold of other parts of the public service and bring condemnation from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports. The police work their hearts out and give up their days off in the interests of the people of New South Wales. Yet the Government cannot get the Lusher report twenty months after the inquiry started. The report, which should have taken only a couple of months to produce, may have provided relief for the hard-pressed policemen of the State.

We are not debating some aspect of public service that could be set aside for a while. Will the Premier and Treasurer and the Government suggest that there are not aspects of the Government's administration that could wait for an increase or for some development? Could we not wait before setting up a new anti-discrimination tribunal, under legislation now before the Parliament? Could we not wait for some new additions to the Health Commission bureaucracy? Could we not wait for a further massive increase in the number of inspectors in the Department of Consumer Affairs? Could we *not* wait until new planning requirements are forced upon the community? Are not all these matters of less importance to the community than the provision of additional members of the police force for the safety and security of New South Wales citizens, their families and their homes? I doubt whether there is any more urgent matter.

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

Mr WRAN (Bass Hill), Premier and Treasurer [2.30]: It is good to have before the House a motion in respect of at least part of which the Government can agree with the Leader of the Opposition. The Government certainly agrees with that part of the motion that commends the members of the New South Wales police force for their dedication to duty. I do not suppose there is any police force in

Australia with a better record than the New South Wales police force. I wish that, rather than having an exhibition of crocodile tears from the Leader of the Opposition, he would call into line some Opposition members--such as the honourable member for Lane Cove—who seem to make a practice of attacking members of the New South Wales police force, under the cloak of privilege, when they **see fit**.

I wish also that rather than making untrue statements about the police force—and at the same time alarming the public as to its performance—the Leader of the Opposition would be a little more careful in handling the truth. The introduction to the last police report tabled in this House has this paragraph under the name of James T. Lees, Commissioner of Police:

Compared to 1978, the total number of crimes reported to Police in 1979 increased by only 0.7%. It is also pleasing to report that the overall clear-up rate increased from 28% to 30%.

Under the guise of attempting to help the police force, the Leader of the Opposition referred to a jumble of statistics—some false, some partly false, some partly **true**—in an endeavour to cause public alarm and at the same time to pretend that he redly is putting a case for the police. The reality is, of course, that the police are doing a remarkable job in this State. No one says for one moment that their job is not difficult, that they are not men and women of courage who at times risk their safety and indeed their lives. No one for a moment says that **they** do not receive proper recognition for the tasks that they are called upon to undertake. If we are to look at statistics, it is relevant to compare the rate of growth of the New South Wales police force in the past five years and its rate of growth in the five years before then, the earlier five years being a period of Liberal Party-Country Party Government, the latter five years being a period of Labor Government in New South Wales. The average annual increase in the appointment of officers from 1971 to 1976 was 164, compared with 216 from 1976 to 1980.

It cannot be said for one moment that the Government in any way has been derelict concerning the necessity to ensure that the numbers in the police force grow commensurately with the population and problems that such a population throws up in a sophisticated metropolis like Sydney. Under the Liberal Party-Country Party Government in this State police officers were forced to perform their duty, in many instances, from police stations that were nothing short of a disgrace. The working conditions in those police stations would not have been tolerated for one moment had they occurred in ordinary industry. Tens of millions of dollars have been spent and will be spent to rectify this, at Tweed Heads and other places.

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr WRAN: That money has been spent, and will be spent, to ensure that police stations and equipment available to police officers are constantly upgraded. This Government inherited those problems from the previous Government, which had not even bothered to get a helicopter for the police force. The 1970's saw a police force in this State responsible for five million people but with neither a fixed wing aircraft nor a helicopter at its disposal. Tens of millions of dollars have been spent on acquiring new equipment and helicopters and on better police stations.

I know what has caused this mock, hypocritical motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition: this morning the Commissioner of Police, Mr Lees, spoke of activities conducted by police from small police stations on the night shift, between

11 p.m. and 7.30 a.m. The Commissioner of Police reported to the Minister that he had decided to close certain small police stations between those hours, but had not made that decision lightly. In his report to the Minister, Commissioner Lees said:

**An indepth** work value study was carried out following which the matter was **fully** discussed at a Commissioners' meeting (that is a full and frank discussion with all commissioners and chief superintendents present)—

And **including** the deputy commissioner and assistant commissioners. The report continued:

—and it was then decided in order to give greater service to the public and make more efficient use of the Police, that we would close some small Police Stations between the times I have stated because there is very little use made of them by the public.

In his report, Commissioner Lees continued:

For example, it was found some only received one or two callers during the whole eight hour night relief and very few telephone calls. By closing these Police Stations it will mean that we will have extra Police on the night patrol out on the street, instead of sitting behind a desk at a Police **Station—**

I hope that that statement satisfies the query raised by the honourable member for Pittwater. In his report to the Minister, Commissioner Lees continued:

—**and I** can give a definite assurance that that is the idea: it is not to give **less** policing but rather more effective policing to the people of the metropolitan area.

It is not intended to reduce staff in any Police district and in point of fact the proposal will increase street patrols.

Special attention has been given to the provision of radio equipment to give all patrol vehicles an immediate link with Police radio headquarters.

The Government has provided **\$1.7** million to modernize radio equipment in the metropolitan area, and a total of **\$3.76** million for the same purpose on a Statewide basis.

The commissioner has informed me that the metropolitan head stations are better equipped now than at any other time in their history, both with motor vehicles and personnel. When stations are closed an Eaglefone system will provide visitors with immediate contact with the head station through a press-button system, and **all** telephone calls will be automatically transferred. To put it in a nutshell, the plan **will** provide for more police on the **streets** to help curb **crime**. Police will **be on** patrol rather than sitting in police stations waiting for reports to filter through. The very matter which is at the threshold of the urgency motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition is the purpose of the move by Commissioner Lees to close between certain hours the police stations referred to, because of lack of requirement for **police** activities from those stations between **11 p.m.** and **7.30 a.m.**

**Though** it is fairly **typical** of the irresponsibility of the Opposition, **I do not know** how the Leader of the Opposition can come into this Chamber, without any consultation with the Commissioner of **Police—who** is always willing to talk with members of the Opposition—and make the assertions that he did. Nor do **I** know, in these **times** when teachers are seeking increased salaries, when nurses are imperilled because of federal Government cutbacks, as are the education system and most of the

**Mr Wran!**

welfare systems of this State and other States of Australia, how the Leader of the Opposition can blithely demand that an extra 1000 police officers be put on the beat. This would cost, at the very least, \$20 million in the first year.

I am certain the Leader of the Opposition has looked carefully at what areas of Government activity could be cut down. Does he suggest, for instance, that the **Dubbo** Hospital should be **affected** more than it has been already by federal Government cutbacks? Does he suggest that the rail service to the west should be any less than it is already? What does he really mean? There is only so much money to be distributed each year. I can only compliment the Minister for Police and Minister for Services on ensuring that the police force, in terms of its numbers, equipment and facilities, received a good slice of the financial cake in the allocations from the New South Wales Budget. In relation to the Lusher report, the Government has been somewhat concerned at the **time** it has taken. However, His Honour has advised that the task of preparing the report was of much greater magnitude than **was** originally foreseen, but it **will** be in the hands of the Government before Easter. Then, perhaps, the House will have the opportunity of a meaningful debate.

Question of urgency put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 35

Mr Arblaster  
Mr Barraclough  
Mr Boyd  
Mr Brewer  
Mr J. H. Brown  
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 Toms  
Mr West  
Mr Wotton  
*Tellers,*  
Mr Catterson  
Mr Taylor

Noes, 56

Mr Akister  
Mr Anderson  
Mr Bannon  
Mr Barnier  
Mr Bedford  
Mr Booth  
Mr Brereton  
Mr Britt  
Mr Cahill  
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 Haigh  
Mr Hills  
Mr Hunter  
Mr Jackson  
Mr Jensen  
Mr Johnson  
Mr Johnstone

Mr Jones  
Mr Keane  
Mr Knott  
Mr McCarthy  
Mr McGowan  
Mr McIlwaine  
Mr Maher  
Mr Mallam  
Mr Mochalski  
Mr Neilly  
Mr O'Connell  
Mr Paciullo  
Mr Petersen  
Mr Quinn  
Mr Ramsay

Mr Robb  
Mr Rogan  
Mr Sheahan  
Mr A. G. Stewart

Mr K. J. Stewart  
Mr Walker  
Mr Webster  
Mr Wilde

Mr Wran  
*Tellers,*  
Mr Flaherty  
Mr Wade

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion of urgency negatived.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### INTEREST RATES

Mr FLAHERTY: My question without notice is directed to the Premier and Treasurer and relates to yesterday's announcement by the federal Treasurer of an increase in the interest rate for Australian savings bonds. Will yesterday's announcement lead to pressure for an increase in housing interest rates? Is the federal Treasurer's claim that the increase in Australian savings bond interest rates is the result of wage increases a completely new aspect of federal economic reasoning? What will be the effect of the announcement on home buyers of this State?

Mr Cameron: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I submit that the question is dominated by requests for opinions. The last two segments of the question are requests for opinions and for that reason it should be ruled out of order.

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

Mr WRAN: There is no doubt that yesterday's announcement by the federal Treasurer will lead to pressure for an increase in housing interest rates. Indeed, lending organizations such as building societies, banks and other bodies have foreshadowed already that this will be the effect of that announcement. The second part of the question refers to the federal Treasurer's claim that any increase in Australian savings bond rates is the result of wage increases, and that is a completely new aspect of federal economic management with which I shall deal in more detail shortly. The effect of the federal Treasurer's announcement on the homebuyers of this State—and I take it that the honourable member was referring to homeowners, most of whom have a mortgage—and those who hope to become homeowners, will be that they will be paying more for the same house than they would have paid as of yesterday. In other words, the extra interest payments that will result from yesterday's announcement will represent an extra payment out of the pockets of the wage and salary earners of Australia without any visible benefit to them.

It is worth while remembering the Fraser Government's record on interest rates. In November 1977, before a federal election, Mr Fraser promised that interest rates would fall by 2 per centage points over the course of the next year. Since that promise was made the following increases in rates have occurred: Commonwealth government bond rates have gone up 3 per cent to 13.1 per cent; Australian savings bond rates have increased by 3 per cent to 12.25 per cent; interest on savings bank housing loans went up 2 per cent to 11.5 per cent; interest rates on finance company loans, which include second mortgage finance for homebuyers have increased by 3f per cent to 16.5 per cent; and the interest rate on solicitors' funds, which are used extensively for home loans, has gone up 3 per cent to 15 per cent. The effect of interest rate rises since November 1977 is that a first homebuyer who can raise a 10 per cent deposit on a modest house—and I say modest in the current circumstances of a house costing \$50,000—will pay at least \$20 a week extra. The same percentage loan on a house costing \$75,000 will mean the homebuyer will pay \$30 a week more.

Increases in interest rates will mean that the buyer of a family car who uses hire purchase finance will pay \$6 a week extra. Moreover, the federal Government's petrol import parity pricing policy means that the average **family** motorist pays an extra \$10 tax every time he fills his petrol tank. A small businessman, about whom the Government is much concerned, who borrows \$10,000, pays an extra \$60 a week interest because of the Fraser Government's high interest rate policy of the past three years.

Can anybody forget Mr Fraser's comments published in the *Australian* newspaper of 28th November, 1977, when he was reported as saying that he was confident that cuts in interest rates for individuals could amount to 2 per cent within a year. He said also that interest rates were important to all Australians and could have an immediate and direct impact on the quality of life; that they particularly affected young people wanting to buy a home and families trying to get loans to improve their homes; and that they were of special interest to small businesses and farmers who relied on borrowed money to keep operating and to expand. Mr Fraser said also that a key part of the federal Government's economic policy had been to reduce interest rates substantially in every area. Those words ring hollow in view of the constant and persistent re-appraisal of interest rates in the past three years. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 28th November, 1977, this statement appeared:

Mr Fraser's assurance on interest rates follows that of the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Anthony, who said on Friday he would eat his hat if there was not a 2 percentage point fall in interest rates over the next year.

I know that the House will be interested to know that today the federal Treasurer said that the main reason for the credit squeeze and increases in interest rates has been the recent trends in wages. In his press statement today Mr Howard said:

I have recently emphasized that, particularly in the light of recent trends in wages, the Government intends to maintain a strong monetary policy as a key element in the anti-inflationary strategy.

I remind the House that in the year to December 1980 average weekly earnings rose by 14 per cent. It is worth while remembering that in the 1976 Budget speech Mr Lynch—now Sir Phillip Lynch—said that tax indexation was introduced for wage policy reasons. Mr Lynch argued that with tax indexation, as incomes rose with inflation employees would not have taxes reducing their take-home pay. He said also that tax indexation is a brake upon financial profligacy and is a major step towards keeping governments honest with taxpayers. Yet the fact is that tax indexation has now been abandoned by the federal Government. That Government broke its undertaking to taxpayers not to take a larger share of their incomes as they were pushed up by inflation.

The federal Government, by its policy as adumbrated yesterday by the federal Treasurer, intends to use intimidation as the theme of its policy to control wages. That Government argued for the end of wage indexation, and the announcement it made yesterday is an admission of the failure of its economic policy. Now that Government is pinning its hopes on a policy based on the most doctrinaire form of monetarism. Homebuyers, businesses, young job-seekers and, indeed, wage and salary earners should not pay the penalty for the failure of other parts of the federal Government's economic policy. Finally, I assure the House and the public of New South Wales that this Government has constantly opposed increases in interest rates, and it now opposes the foreshadowed increase in interest rates. At every turn this Government has opposed measures introduced by the federal Government designed to make ordinary wage and salary earners pay more while its friends, the tax dodgers and avoiders, pay less.

## ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr PUNCH: Is the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy aware of a reported statement that by the end of May Liddell power station will have to reduce its electricity output by **38** per cent? Would this reduction in output be due to inadequate supplies of cooling water resulting from the Government's failure to provide sufficient water storage to cater for the needs of Liddell and the new Bayswater power station and to plan properly the development of electricity generation in the Hunter Valley? As Liddell normally provides the State with one-third of its power needs, will the Minister state what power rationing will be forced on consumers throughout the State in the approaching winter months if the reductions are implemented?

Mr HILLS: The Labor Government in New South Wales will not introduce power rationing. Since the Wran Government came to office in **1976**, there has been no power rationing. That cannot be said of the former Liberal Party-Country Party Government when it was in office. The Leader of the Country Party would have been in the House when my colleague the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources introduced the Glennies Creek Dam legislation. Glennies Creek Dam will provide additional water for the new Bayswater power station.

Mr Wran: The Leader of the Country Party is too busy taking water from the Chichester River.

Mr HILLS: As has been suggested previously in this House, the Leader of the Country Party has a keen interest in water. He takes it from his neighbours. I assure him that New South Wales will not have power rationing under the Labor Government. As to the reduction in output from Liddell power station, as alleged in the question, I remind the honourable member that when the Opposition parties were in office plant availability stood at **47** per cent whereas it is now **70** per cent, thereby saving the State about **\$20** million a year.

## HEALTH SERVICES

Mr DURICK: I ask a question without notice of the Minister for Health. Last week in this House did the honourable member for Clarence allege that the Government had failed to allocate adequate funds for the provision of health and medical services in New South Wales? Will the Minister tell the House the factual position about finance for those most important services?

Mr K. J. STEWART: I am indebted to the honourable member for Lakemba, whose keen interest in the Government's budgetary situation is unique, especially by comparison with that of some Opposition members; the honourable member for Lakemba understands budgetary principles. However, it is obvious that the honourable member for Clarence does not have any understanding of budgetary provisions for hospital and health funding in the State. Not long ago I read a newspaper report that the honourable member for Clarence said that since the Labor Government came to office in **1976** funding for hospital and health services had decreased by **7** per cent.

That statistic is almost unidentifiable when one seeks to check it. In case the people of New South Wales might be misled by the lack of budgetary expertise of the honourable member for Clarence, I inform the House that in **1978-79** the federal Government provided **\$414** million for health services in New South Wales. In **1979-80** that figure was increased to **\$459** million, and the estimate for **1980-81** is **\$515** million. The total increase over those three financial years has been **24.4** per cent.

In the same period the New South Wales Government's funding of health services has increased from \$478 million in 1978–79, to \$581 million in 1979–80 and \$659 million in 1980–81, a rise of **37.9** per cent.

I emphasize to honourable members, especially members of the Opposition, that the hospitals cost-sharing agreement will expire on **30th** June this year. New South Wales faces the prospect of having hospital funding absorbed into the tax reimbursement formula, which would cost the New South Wales hospital system \$91 million. **I should** spell out that aspect of the formula a little more clearly. It will mean that under what the Government considers could be the new Commonwealth formula for 1981–82, New South Wales will receive \$91 million less for the funding of hospital services. It is time Opposition members—especially those who represent country electorates—did something to help the Government ensure that it receives its correct share of the tax dollar for the funding of hospital and medical services.

#### SOUTH SYDNEY COUNCIL

Mr BARRACLOUGH: I address my question without notice to the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads. Does the Labor-controlled South Sydney council have the highest local government rates in the metropolitan area? This year, does the council face a deficit of almost \$1 million? Is the Minister aware that the ratepayers and residents of the municipality are greatly concerned about the management of the council and have they called for the resignation of the mayor, aldermen and the chief planning officer? In view of the serious allegations made against the council, will the Minister take action similar to that implemented at the Blue Mountains City Council of appointing a local government inspector, in this instance to conduct an intensive investigation into the affairs of the South Sydney council and table in this House the report of the investigator?

Mr JENSEN: It is true that some ratepayers of South Sydney council have expressed some dissatisfaction about the conduct of that council's affairs. Last September the present incumbents were elected emphatically at the local government elections. That is an indication of support by a substantial majority of ratepayers for the kind of extensive welfare services that the council provides. I have no knowledge of any deficit in the council's financing arrangements, but I undertake to examine that aspect. Until a substantial reason is given for conducting a more thorough investigation into the affairs of South Sydney council, I propose to do no more than to establish the facts on the allegation that the council is running into a heavy deficit. If that is so, I undertake to report to the House the outcome of my inquiries.

---

#### HEROIN

##### Ministerial Statement

Mr WRAN: In December last year a committee was appointed to investigate and report on overseas treatment practices for heroin addicts through the use of addictive drugs. The committee consisted of Professor James Rankin of the division of drug and alcohol services of the Health Commission of New South Wales, Mrs Vivienne Holst of the St John of God Hospital, the Reverend John McKnight of the network of alcohol and drug agencies, Miss Sandra Moait of the New South Wales Nurses Association, and Mr Anthony Rae of Newington College. Committee members visited the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Canada. They consulted key individuals and visited a number of institutions.

The committee set out with the basic intention of **determining** whether the legal provision of heroin could be an effective way of reducing the involvement of professional criminals in heroin **trafficking** as well as the street crime associated with heroin use, and whether such action would yield any other advantages. The committee concluded that there would be no substantial reduction in the heroin black market or in street crime **unless** heroin were made available to anyone who seeks it free or at very low cost. The committee could not support heroin being freely available because it felt that the social costs would be extremely great and any reduction in the heroin black market would probably be offset by increased trading in other **drugs**.

The committee concluded also that any kind of restricted provision to some addicts or all addicts would not have any significant effect on street crime, and the so-called British system of heroin maintenance no longer exists, heroin as a maintenance drug having been superseded by methadone. It further concluded that if a patient is to be maintained on an opiate drug, for both social and therapeutic reasons it should be methadone; and heroin might effect some improvement in the general health and quality of life for hard-core heroin dependants who, after repeated attempts at seeking improvement through methadone maintenance and other forms of treatment, remain firmly addicted to heroin.

The committee has recommended that the New South Wales Government institute research into the value of administering heroin on humane grounds to the small proportion of opiate-dependent individuals for whom repeated attempts at treatment have failed over a number of years. The objective of this administration of heroin would be to improve the general health and quality of life of these individuals, and decrease their criminal involvement.

It recommended also that otherwise the New South Wales Government not make heroin available to opiate-dependent individuals. The committee included in its recommendations a number of other measures concerned with issues of government drugs policy and methods of improving the availability and quality of services for the treatment of opiate-dependent individuals as well as measures for potentially reducing heroin-related crime.

The Government accepts in principle the committee's major recommendations that a research programme for the purpose mentioned be carried out and that otherwise heroin not be made available to opiate-dependent individuals. The Health Commission will have the responsibility of designing an appropriate research programme, and preliminary action for it will begin in the very near future. At the end of the research programme my colleague the Minister for Health will bring forward for the Government's consideration recommendations on future policy to be followed. Before heroin can be provided for research, an amendment to the Poisons Act will be required. The Government will be seeking the comments of the community on the other recommendations in the committee's report and those comments will be taken into account in formulating future policy. I table a copy of the report.

Mr MASON: I thank the Premier and Treasurer for giving me the opportunity just before the House sat this afternoon to have a quick look at the recommendations in the report. The recommendations appear to be relatively tame and based primarily on a proposal to institute research into the merits of administering heroin on humane grounds to that small proportion of opiate-dependent individuals with whom repeated attempts of treatment have failed over a number of years. The recommendations do not go to the crux of the issue, that is, the Government's continued failure to make inroads on organized crime or to make a convincing attack on the organized rings that spread heroin and other drugs throughout the community.

**When the** Premier and Treasurer announced the setting-up of the committee I am sure that all honourable members knew what the result would be. The Premier and Treasurer said that the Government would give the police new powers to deal with drug pedlars. That was reported widely in the press. It should be noted that the Government has wretched on that proposal completely. Labor lawyers backed down on warrantless searches, despite the call from a Royal commission that new powers be given to the police in order to deal with the problem. The report tabled in the House says nothing that goes to the core of the problem. At the core of the problem are those who trade upon the weakness of their fellow men and inflict drugs upon people which ruin them and destroy life in the community. It should be a matter of concern to all honourable members that it took the Victorian Government to get under way a joint Commonwealth-State inquiry into crime in New South Wales. Once again, a Royal commission will look at these matters.

Some of the recommendations in the report are pathetic. Recommendation twelve is a weak and mealy-mouthed effort to address the problem of organized crime. The recommendation reads:

That the New South Wales Government, in conjunction with the Australian Government, explore the possibility of monitoring large-scale cash transactions in order to identify those associated with organized drug trafficking.

How pathetic it is that after all the concern that has been expressed in the House and in the community, the Government now has a report that says that the possibility should be explored of trying to identify these parasites on fellow human beings, **who** destroy life and get rich doing it. The Government continues to refuse to give to the **police** powers to deal with the problem. Though I have sympathy for those who, for whatever reason, become heroin addicts, I do not believe that the answer is to make heroin available to drug addicts in an effort to eliminate organized crime from the chain of addiction and crime. Anybody who has read of the experiments conducted in England knows the result that would follow adoption of such a recommendation. The experiment was a disaster in Britain as it will be wherever it is tried.

The Opposition will study the recommendations in the report in detail but, at first glance, the report is a great disappointment. It is tame. It still talks about research and investigation in some of the critical areas in which the Opposition believes that the Government should have proceeded with determination and strength.

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

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION (AMENDMENT) BILL  
 DEFAMATION (ANTI-DISCRIMINATION) AMENDMENT BILL  
 STATUTORY AND OTHER OFFICES REMUNERATION (ANTI-  
 DISCRIMINATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 17th March, **vide** page 4649) on motion by Mr Wran:

That these bills be now read a second time.

Mr WEST: Mr Speaker —

Mr FLAHERTY (Granville), Government Whip [3.15]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 57

Mr Akister	Mr Face	Mr Neilly
Mr Anderson	Mr Ferguson	Mr O'Connell
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 Jackson	Mr Rogan
Mr Cahill	Mr Jensen	Mr Sheahan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Johnson	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Cleary	Mr Johnstone	Mr K. J. Stewart
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Jones	Mr Walker
Mr Cox	Mr Keane	Mr Webster
Mr Crabtree	Mr Knott	Mr Wilde
Mr Curran	Mr McCarthy	Mr Wran
Mr Day	Mr McGowan	
Mr Degen	Mr McIlwaine	
Mr Durick	Mr Maher	Tellers,
Mr Egan	Mr Mallam	Mr Flaherty
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mochalski	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 Catterson
Mr Fisher	Mr Pickard	Mr Taylor

Resolved in the **affirmative**.

Question—That these bills be now read a second time—proposed.

Mr WRAN (Bass **Hill**), Premier and Treasurer [3.20], in reply: I **thank** all honourable members who have participated in the debate. It would appear that the Opposition's basic objections to the bill are: **first**, that the **Government** has no role to play in the way in which social and commercial intercourse is conducted; and **second**, and in particular, that registered clubs should not be subject to legislative involvement in their domestic affairs. These types of arguments are the same as those that the Opposition presented in this House when the original Anti-Discrimination Bill was introduced in 1976–77, although I must say that at that time the arguments, unfounded as they may have been, were presented more logically and more coherently.

The concept of the New South Wales Discrimination Act goes much further than attempting to change undesirable community attitudes by legislation alone. The Act provides for a research and educative function on the part of the Anti-Discrimination Board, but it is far more important that the Act gives immediate relief to those

who have **suffered** or are **suffering** unreasonable discrimination on the grounds **specified** in the Act. One must ask whether the Leader of the Opposition would have women, immigrants, or handicapped persons await the passage of years—or perhaps for ever, if other members of the community share the views of the honourable member for Byron—before **community** attitudes were sensitive enough to **end** the undoubted **dis-**crimination that they experience. Would members of the Opposition justify the view that the Government should remain impassive when large sections of our **community** have suffered, and continue to suffer, most unreasonable treatment because of their sex, race, marital status or physical handicap? "No," the Leader of the Liberal Party says, "Let things stay as they are. Let the strong **get** stronger and the weak get weaker." That is not the Government's view.

This important piece of social reforming legislation will undoubtedly create a much better attitude in the community and a much better environment for persons who will be affected by it. I do not wish to take up much time on the point, for it does not seem to be important, but the Leader of the Opposition said that the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia had made representations to the Government about the provisions of the bill dealing with employment of the physically handicapped as they relate to industry—induced disease and workers' compensation. He said also that the Government had given an undertaking to the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia that the bill would be amended. As no departmental records can be found on the matter, communication was made with the association, which said that it had made no representations to the Government about the anti-discrimination legislation. It had made representations to the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice about an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act and industry-induced disease, and it had received a letter from the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice saying that it would be kept informed about **its** representations. A check **has** been made with the Attorney-General's office, which confirms that a letter was written to the Metal Trades Industry Association on **11th** December, 1980, to that effect. However, the representations by the association had no direct relationship to the proposals contained in the anti-discrimination legislation. Once again, it is extremely wrong of the Leader of the Opposition to mislead the House, in the painful way in which he has misled it about this subject. I did not think any member of the House would have stooped so low in an endeavour to make cheap political capital.

Some observations were made about disabled persons and the fact that this is the International Year of Disabled Persons. We all know that the aim this year is to encourage the rehabilitation of all persons who suffer from some form of physical or mental impairment, to ensure that **all** possible action is taken to prevent the onset **of** disability in the handicapped, to create an awareness or understanding of problems faced by disabled persons, and to provide them with training and guidance to enable them to take their full place in the community. The New South Wales Government is leading Australia in the formulation of programmes for the International Year of Disabled Persons. Already it has allocated about \$50,000 towards those programmes. This is not the **time** to discuss them, but **I am** certain that in due course all honourable members will want to join with the Government—inside and outside this House—in raising community awareness of the problems and aspirations of persons suffering from physical or mental impairment, and ensuring that every effort is made to allow disabled persons to enter the mainstream of community life.

I was a little surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition criticize the Government about the **provision** of access to public buildings and facilities in them for disabled persons. I thought he would have been aware that at the time the Anti-Discrimination Board released its report **on** discrimination against the physically

handicapped, the building regulation advisory committee, which is within the administration of the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads, had formulated a draft amendment to Ordinance 70 of the Local Government Act, requiring facilities for disabled persons in new public-use buildings. As a result of the release of the report, a special working party of that committee, including representatives of the Anti-Discrimination Board and other interested parties, was set up to review the proposed amendment. The review process was divided into three stages; first, for new public access buildings; second, for new single dwellings and residential flats; and third, existing building stock.

Proposals for the amendment of Ordinance 70 in relation to the new public-use buildings went on exhibition on 1st October, 1980. They were the subject of a comprehensive publicity campaign, and the public was invited to make submissions, which closed on 31st December, 1980. In addition, all Ministers of the Crown were invited to make independent comments on the proposal. Since then the submissions have been scheduled and are expected to be considered by the working party in the next few weeks. The recommendations will then go to a full meeting of the building regulation advisory committee—probably in March or April—before being submitted to the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads. The proposals will then be examined by the Government.

I commend to all honourable members and indeed to all persons interested in the International Year of Disabled Persons the brochure issued by the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads on access for disabled persons. It is hoped that on a reading of the brochure the reaction and understanding of the proposals will be such that adequate amendments will be made to Ordinance 70 to encompass the matters that are the subject of the inquiry.

Criticism was made of the establishment of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal, it being said that it was unnecessary. That assertion reveals a grave misunderstanding, indeed an ignorance of the way in which the Anti-Discrimination Act has worked thus far and is a challenge to the Anti-Discrimination Board in its quasi-judicial functions. Under the Act the Anti-Discrimination Board has three main areas of responsibility; research, community education programmes, and a quasi-judicial role in the resolution of complaints. The case of *Harrison v. Watson* was the first heard by the board. The respondents raised the issue of bias against the board, suggesting a conflict between its community education programmes and its quasi-judicial role. Because of a change in the composition of the board, this matter was not taken before the Supreme Court.

In December 1978 I referred the practice of the Department of Education, in preferring female applicants for the position of principals of girls' high schools and male applicants for the positions of principals of boys' high schools, to the board for examination under section 120 of the Act. The report, presented to me on 13th September, 1979, was released for public discussion on 7th October of the same year. Five complaints by male deputy principals were referred to the board by the counsellor for equal opportunity. They claimed they had been discriminated against in the department's promotion practices. While those claims were being heard the report was released. In the report the board made a series of statements and recommendations on practice. Had the hearings of those complaints continued it would have been extremely difficult for the board to refute any allegation of bias as there were public statements of the board's conclusions upon practice. Those cases have been stood over generally or disposed of in various other ways.

The examples I have given have led the Government to consider a method of constituting various functions under the Anti-Discrimination Act to avoid any possible conflict or allegation of bias. The method determined by the Government and included

*Mr Wran*]

in this bill is the formation of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal. The only other matter I need to reply to concerns reactionary philosophy relating to registered clubs. There has been lengthy debate though much of the argument of the Opposition was un-informed. The Opposition's argument, as I understand it, was that registered clubs are formed by voluntary associations of a number of individuals who group together in a **common** purpose, and the Government should not seek to interfere by telling clubs how they should conduct their domestic affairs. Let us see whether the Opposition has been consistent in its attitude.

The Liquor (Amendment) Act, **1969**, was passed by the Liberal Party-Country Party Government. The main provisions of that legislation were first, to force registered clubs in New South Wales to become incorporated under the Companies Act, **1960**, or the Co-operation Act, **1923**; second, to impose maximum limits upon the number of members each club could admit. One of the first things the Labor Government did when it came to office was legislate for a relaxation of the provision concerning maximum membership **limits** and to restore to the Licensing Court a discretion which the Liberal Party-Country Party Government had taken away. The Registered Clubs Act was passed in **1976** by the Liberal Party-Country Party Government before it lost office, and before the bill was brought into operation it was modified in minor respects by the present Labor Government. In the main that legislation incorporated provisions on many matters which were already effective in clubs, and introduced some new provisions. Among other things, that Act, and I refer specifically to section **30**, regulated the composition of club management committees or boards of directors. Also, it regulated the holding of committee meetings, prohibited proxy voting in clubs, controlled the method of acceptance of members to clubs, restricted the admission of honorary or temporary members, imposed limits on minimum annual subscriptions and regulated the admission of visitors to club premises. I could go on and on. This was the Liberal Party-Country Party Government legislation. One might ask, is that, by definition, interference in the domestic affairs of registered clubs? Of course it was and of course it **is**.

Registered clubs in New South Wales are the creation of legislation; they depend for their existence upon it. The way in which they conduct themselves is subject to regulation. I should like to make it clear that it was the Labor Party which took the initiative and had the foresight to foster the registered club movement in New South Wales. Labor is proud of that earlier legislation for it has brought club facilities, amenities and a wide range of social, sporting and recreational enjoyment to hundreds of thousands of people who would not otherwise have had the opportunity to enjoy such privileges. Though it may be true that registered clubs have proliferated since they were established by the Labor Government, and there are now 1.5 million club members in this State, had that legislation not been introduced by the former Labor Government there would have been no registered clubs in New South Wales. Hundreds of thousands of people who enjoy the benefits and advantages of membership of those clubs would not otherwise have had that right or privilege. Good and valid reasons exist for Government involvement in the conduct of registered clubs. As any honourable member who knows anything about the liquor industry will appreciate, or as any honourable member who avails himself of the *Hansard* report of the debate on club legislation can easily ascertain, this Government applauds the achievements of registered clubs and the role they have played in community life in this State.

Quite apart from the amenities they have provided for their members, clubs have undoubtedly played an important and significant role in sporting, recreational, cultural and charitable activities. Opposition members would like to regard clubs as their forebears did in the early part of the century, as the exclusive preserve of the privileged few. It took the action of Labor Governments in 1946 and **1954** to facilitate

the establishment of new clubs to which any member of the community could belong should they so choose. It must be acknowledged that the roles clubs play in the social life of this State exert significant influence on community life. Their membership **has** long exceeded 1 million people. A large number of clubs count their membership in tens of thousands of members. The club industry is a huge commercial entity in itself. Dozens of service industries rely upon the financial viability of clubs to maintain their own stability. In this context the Government does not consider it reasonable that registered clubs should be exempted from an Act designed to remove **discrimination** from all areas of our community.

Clubs cannot be dealt with in legislation as being small private concerns when, in reality, most of them are nothing of the sort. The Opposition displayed much misconception and misunderstanding of the practical effect of this bill upon registered clubs. That misunderstanding may be simply because during the past few months members have not taken the opportunity to read the bill or to discuss it with those who may have been able to explain its intentions to them. The bill lay upon the table of this House for some months before it was actually debated. What has taken place today appears to be a deliberate attempt by the Opposition to mislead and misinform the public as to what the bill is **all** about.

The tactic of the honourable member for Northcott, for instance, in seeking to introduce an issue about little girls playing football—something that has nothing to do with the main bill—was dishonest in **the!** extreme. Let me **explain** once **again**—for those who have not read the bills, my introductory speech and the documents which I tabled in November last year—that the legislation does not apply to single sex clubs or ethnic clubs; it will not affect sporting clubs or competitions organized exclusively for males or females. The bills will not **affect** the basic aims and objects of clubs. The principal objectives of this legislation are to **allow** women and certain minority groups to have some representation—if they so **choose**—in the conduct and management of a club. The principal object is to vest in women and other classes of members a democratic right to have a say in how their club is conducted, should they wish to do so.

Because of **the** obvious misconception and ignorance of members of the Opposition, I shall refer back to my previous speech and to the documents I tabled, which set out quite clearly that the main bill will not affect the basic qualifications for membership. I shall give an example. Say that an RSL club provides in its rules that the only persons eligible for full membership are male persons who have served overseas in a theatre of war. Very few reasonable **people** would dispute the contribution made by women who served overseas for their country during periods of war. If a woman who fulfilled that qualification, other than in respect of her sex, applied for full membership of that club, the main bill now under consideration will operate to make her eligible for full membership, notwithstanding that the rules previously limited that class of membership to men. Any woman who does not have that **qualification**—that is, who did not serve overseas in a theatre of war—will be no more eligible for full membership of that club than any man who did not serve overseas.

This is a basic principle of these proposals. If a woman has the same qualifications prescribed in the rules as a man, and is at present prevented by the rules from being admitted to a certain class of membership while the man is not so prevented, then the measures before the House will remove that impediment. This does not mean that a women member of a club must be transferred to a different class of membership, should she not desire it. It simply means that if she desires to be admitted to full membership; if she desires to contribute or vote at general meetings

or by standing for the board of directors; if she desires to participate in all the activities of the club as a full member, then this measure will remove any anachronism or unreasonable restrictions which prevent her from doing so.

It is basically dishonest for the Opposition to raise issues about access to club facilities in the nature of billiard tables or sauna baths. The situation simply is this; a club may prescribe different conditions and different facilities for **different** classes of members. However, it may not discriminate on the basis of sex between members of the one class. So, if it is not practicable for male **full** members and female full members to use a particular facility at the one time—for example, sauna baths—then, the club must make reasonable arrangements to provide access to those facilities to male members and **to** female members, on the basis of the numerical ratio between **the sexes** and the demand for the use of these particular facilities by the respective sexes and any other relevant criteria.

Members of the Opposition have attempted also—dishonestly, I repeat—to raise in debate the issue of single sex sport. The honourable member for Northcott gave an example of a woman golfer being compelled to compete in **men's** competitions. I draw to the attention of the House the provisions of section **38** of the principal Act, which is not affected by the main bill, and specifically excludes the application of anti-discrimination legislation to sporting activities. There is nothing in these proposals which **affects** in any way the conduct by registered clubs or any other **sporting** group or association of sports for members of either sex, either separately or together. If a golf club accepts full members of either sex, the facilities of the **golfcourse** must be made available on a reasonable basis to members of either sex. By that I mean a club should not limit the use of the course to prevent women full members from playing on weekends. Rather it should ensure that women full members should be allocated reasonable use of the course, once again on criteria which **will** necessarily relate to the proportional numbers of members of either sex, the demand for use of the course on a **particular** day and any other relevant features.

I have not the slightest doubt that, as this legislation comes into operation and is widely applied, it will be welcomed by people of good will and people of sensitivity throughout New South Wales. My view is, based on long and wide experience of the membership of clubs in this State, that the overwhelming majority of club members are decent, fair-minded members of the community who would **not** want to be in a different position from anyone else in relation to discrimination against women, minority groups and so on. This legislation in all respects is highly acceptable to the overwhelming majority of club members and the community of this State. I **am** certain that it will improve attitudes and the environment in which we move in our society.

Motion agreed to.

Bills read a second time.

#### In Committee

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will deal first **with** the **Anti-Discrimination (Amendment) Bill**.

#### Schedule 1

Mr MASON (**Dubbo**), Leader of the Opposition [3.48]: Schedule 1 deals basically with discrimination against handicapped people on the ground of their physical impairment and the problems associated therewith. Members **of** the Opposition will be supporting the schedule, of course, for—as I said when speaking at the second reading stage—this is the International Year of Disabled Persons and we welcome the intention of the legislation. However, I believe that in Committee the Government must spell

out the implications of the legislation. It is all very well for honourable members to agree in principle that these high sounding ideals ought to be attained in the life of our community. However, some extremely difficult practical situations will arise and I believe the Government has an obligation to inform the House how its ideals will be implemented. For example, there is the problem of superannuation.

I dare say that most honourable members know young people with brilliant academic achievements, possessing all the qualifications, the ability and the temperament that fit them to take on their desired vocation of teaching. They come with their parents into our offices because, having been required to take a medical examination by the State Superannuation Board, they discover they have, say, a skin complaint called psoriasis. As I suffer from it also, I would have been discriminated against had I wished to become a teacher. The list of matters that prevent young persons from becoming teachers is endless. It is not through lack of teaching ability but the physical requirement of the State **Superannuation** Board. Both sides of the House seem to be united on this: we want no discrimination against handicapped persons, but the Opposition would like an intimation from the Government on how this problem of entry into the State Superannuation Fund will be handled. Will young people be prevented from entering the public service because of some physical impairment? That is what the schedule is all about. I object most strenuously to the cheap way in which the Premier and Treasurer twisted what I said about the Metal Trades Industry Association.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is not permitted in Committee to debate matters that were raised during the second reading debate.

Mr MASON: If you rule me out of order, Mr Chairman, some dissent motions will be moved.

Mr Walker: Is that a threat?

Mr MASON: Yes, it is. I am entitled to raise physical impairment, for that issue is involved in the Workers' Compensation Act. That is what I intend to deal with.

Mr Walker: On a point of order. It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to threaten the Chair, but proposed new section 49M provides that nothing **in this part** renders unlawful discrimination against a handicapped person on the ground of his physical impairment in the terms or conditions appertaining to a superannuation or provident fund or scheme. I put it to you, Mr Chairman, that the honourable member would be out of order if he followed the line he wished to pursue.

The CHAIRMAN: The question raised by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is at this stage one of debate. If the Leader of the Opposition is basing his remarks on a false premise, that is his problem.

Mr MASON: That is no answer to the question. I said quite clearly that the Metal Trades Industry Association had approached the Government about the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act. The association propounded the point that I raised, which is that employers have been conducting pre-employment tests largely because of the possibility of an existing condition, particularly a predetermined range of deafness, and in appropriate cases sending applicants back to their previous or current employers to make a claim, or—and this is the point that I raised—not employing them at all. **This** is a real dilemma. The Workers' Compensation Act is designed to do the right thing by these people and has been doing so for a number of years. Persons who suffer from some form of industrial deafness are adequately catered for.

The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice will have to give a better explanation than he has given us so far, for this legislation will prohibit entirely discrimination on the ground of physical impairment.

This is an illustration similar to the one I gave about the teaching profession, and I am sure there are many others. These illustrations show clearly that the Government will have to give a good deal of thought to this problem. It will have to review the Workers' Compensation Act and the requirements of superannuation funds if the high ideals aimed at in the legislation are to be given practical effect. I hope the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice will be able to tell the House how the Government can find a way out of the dilemma, or will there be a continuation of rejection on the ground of physical impairment of young persons who fulfil an employer's requirements in every other respect?

Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [3.55]: Superannuation is a matter that is dear to my own heart as well as that of the Leader of the Opposition for, having been an asthmatic as a child, I was ineligible to gain admission to the New South Wales Public Service. I understand that now a new medical board reviews these cases and it is hoped that the new form of review will result in a more equitable degree of justice. The Government has under review the entire question of superannuation in these circumstances and I hope the problem will be resolved. Like all superannuation matters, which involve huge sums of money, it is difficult and complicated; there are many anomalies. The Government hopes to have that matter resolved in the near future.

As to workers' compensation, I have before Cabinet at present a bill that deals specifically with a number of important issues raised some time ago by the Anti-Discrimination Board and the Ethnic Affairs Commission. About two years ago they raised the matter that the Leader of the Opposition seems to believe was a new issue when the Metal Trades Industry Association raised it. It has been raised on many occasions by trade unions as well. Though the matter has not been resolved, recommendations dealing with an entirely new scheme for the assessment of boilermakers' deafness or industrial deafness will, if accepted, eliminate the existing problems. They will not eliminate some of the problems associated with section 11 (2) of the Workers' Compensation Act which deals with partial incapacity, such as where it is alleged that people are not being employed because they suffer an incapacity that may be aggravated by their new employment. Legislators may never be able to get round this difficult problem but the Government is meeting the challenge. The Government has done more in the field of workers' compensation than any other government except the Labor Government that introduced the Workers' Compensation Act.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [3.58]: I thank the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice for that explanation. It is a pity that the Premier and Treasurer did not make a similar kind of rational response instead of seeking to play politics and make a little cheap political capital out of an important situation. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice has admitted this legislation, which he claims is a great reform, will be desperately difficult to put into effect. That is the point the Opposition wants to make and it is why we believe this legislation is a nonsense. It would have been far better to deal with this matter on the same basis as the Privacy Committee. It is impossible to legislate for this type of situation. As the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice said, it will be extremely difficult and will test the skill of lawyers. The Government, having adopted this legalistic approach, will make a rod for its own back. Great distress will be caused in the community as a result of the promise that has been held out to people but cannot be fulfilled.

It is with great pleasure and relief that the Opposition notes that proposed new section 49F brings the trade union movement into the field of discrimination. The Government has attempted to protect the trade union movement. The remainder of the legislation fails to face up to what is probably the worst area of discrimination in this State---that is, discrimination against people who do not want to belong to a trade union. The discrimination against such persons and the pressures that they are placed under are unbelievable. No longer will the trade union movement be able to discriminate against handicapped persons or those with a physical impairment. It is a shame that the Government does not realize that mental and spiritual discrimination is just as important as physical discrimination. It is encouraging that the schedule binds the trade union movement, especially when the Government is so assiduously protecting it from the remainder of its anti-discrimination legislation.

Page 11

- 30 (b) would in order to carry out that work, require services or facilities which are not required by persons who do not have the same physical impairment as the handicapped person and

**Mr WALKER** (Gwrages River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [4.1]: I move:

That at page 11, lines 32 and 33, the words "do not have the same physical impairment as the handicapped person" be left out and there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "are not handicapped persons".

This is one of four identical amendments I shall move. The purpose of those amendments—and although I shall speak only to the first, my words are applicable equally to all the others—is to overcome a drafting error. **Discrimination** against the Handicapped person involves treatment of the handicapped person and a person who is not handicapped. The words sought to be deleted imply that the test for discrimination involves a comparison between treatment of a handicapped person and that of a person who did not have the same physical impairment. For those reasons the amendment is felt to be appropriate.

Amendment agreed to.

Page 12

- 25 and which would not be or are not required by persons who do not have the same physical impairment as the handicapped person.

Amendment (by Mr Walker) **agreed** to:

That at page 12, lines 26 and 27, the words "do not have the same physical impairment as the handicapped person" be left out and there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "are not handicapped persons".

Page 13

- 30 ties which are not required by students who do not have the same physical impairment as the handicapped person and which, having regard to the circumstances of the case, cannot reasonably be provided or accommodated by the educational authority.

Amendment (by Mr Walker) agreed to:

That at page 13, lines 28, 29 and 30, the words "do not have the same physical impairment as the handicapped person" be left out and there be inserted in lieu thereof the words "are not handicapped persons".

Schedule as amended agreed to.

## Schedule 2

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [4.4]: The Opposition objects to schedule 2 as being unnecessary. It will create a new bureaucracy. This provision shows the stupidity of the Government's approach to the whole issue of **anti-discrimination**. The result will be that New South Wales will have yet another mass of bureaucracy and legislation. The Opposition believes that anti-discrimination can be administered effectively and simply without all this nonsense. We have just had the situation in **this** Parliament where the Government has turned down an appeal to appoint more police to give protection to the people. This schedule will result in the creation of another new tribunal and a consequent bureaucratic back-up. The difference between the approach of the Privacy Committee, which has cost the State a pittance, and the massive legalistic jargon and nonsense that we are getting in this anti-discrimination legislation, is unbelievable. Schedule 2 and schedule 3 will exacerbate those differences. The Opposition opposes the whole concept of this schedule.

Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [4.5]: The Premier and Treasurer, in his reply, highlighted the Opposition's nonsensical approach to this provision. The chairman of the Anti-Discrimination Board has been carrying out his duties and function. The reasons for the proposed **reconstruction** are sound and obvious, and any lawyer in this State would tell the Leader of the **Opposition so**. Unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition **does** not have sufficiently competent lawyers on his side to advise him. It is nonsense to suggest that the schedule will result in increased bureaucratic red tape. From a simple reading of the schedule, it is obvious that the proposed equal opportunity tribunal is hardly likely to sit every day; it will sit from time to time. The tribunal will use the services of an already appointed judge, so there will not be any further drain on the taxpayers' money. The tribunal will have part-time members attached to it, so that it will not impose any great drain on taxpayers' funds. There will be no increase in the amount of red tape or bureaucracy. The bill seeks to rationalize a situation that exists already. As the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice in this State, I see it as a sensible and appropriate way to deal with this matter.

Question—That the schedule stand—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 55

Mr Akister  
Mr Anderson  
Mr Bannon  
Mr Barnier  
Mr Bedford  
Mr Booth  
Mr Breerton  
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 Gordon  
Mr Haigh  
Mr Hills  
Mr Hunter  
Mr Jackson  
Mr Jensen  
Mr Johnson  
Mr Johnstone  
Mr Jones  
Mr Keane  
Mr Knott  
Mr McCarthy  
Mr McGowan  
Mr McIlwaine  
Mr Maher  
Mr Mallam

Mr Mochalski  
Mr Neilly  
Mr O'Connell  
Mr Paciullo  
Mr Petersen  
Mr Quinn  
Mr Ramsay  
Mr Robb  
Mr Rogan  
Mr Ryan  
Mr Sheahan  
Mr K. J. Stewart  
Mr Walker  
Mr Webster  
Mr Wilde  
  
*Tellers,*  
Mr Flaherty  
Mr Wade



Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [4.16]: Again the Premier and Treasurer, in his comprehensive reply at the second reading stage, dealt more than adequately with the arguments advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. I shall not add further comment to those arguments other than to say that any person who has been a member of this House for any reasonable length of time would know that, traditionally and quite properly, on innumerable occasions the club movement has been regulated by this Parliament. I remind Opposition members that when the former Liberal Party-Country Party Government was in office it legislated to regulate the number of members that each club shall have and to pass many laws relating to liquor licensing and other matters that were most regulatory of the club movement. That was done by the Parliament in the public interest, in the same way that the bill is quite properly and appropriately presented to the Parliament in the public interest.

Question—That the schedule as amended stand—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 55

Mr Akister	Mr Face	Mr Mochalski
Mr Anderson	Mr Ferguson	Mr Neilly
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 Jackson	Mr Rogan
Mr Cavalier	Mr Jensen	Mr Ryan
Mr Cleary	Mr Johnson	Mr Sheahan
Mr R. J. Clough	Mr Johnstone	Mr A. G. Stewart
Mr Cox	Mr Jones	Mr K. J. Stewart
Mr Crabtree	Mr Keane	Mr Walker
Mr Curran	Mr Knott	Mr Webster
Mr Day	Mr McCarthy	Mr Wilde
Mr Degen	Mr McGowan	
Mr Durick	Mr McIlwaine	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Egan	Mr Maher	Mr Flaherty
Mr Einfeld	Mr Mallam	Mr Wade

Noes, 34

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

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

## (8) (a) Section 24 (1A)—

After section 24 (1), insert:—

- 25 (1A) For the purposes of subsection (1), but without limiting the generality of that subsection, the fact that a woman is or may become pregnant is a characteristic that appertains generally to women.

Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [4.26]: I move:

That at page 42, after line 27, there be inserted the words

## (b) Section 24 (2)—

Omit "occurs are not of the same marital status.",  
insert instead:—

"occurs"—

(a) are a woman who is pregnant and a man; or

(b) are not of the same marital status.

The amendment relates to the definition of sex discrimination in regard to pregnancy. Under the present law governing discrimination against a woman on the ground of her pregnancy a doubt exists under section 24 (1) about discrimination that involves a comparison between the treatment of that woman and a man in the same circumstances or in circumstances that are not materially different. The argument is that the test cannot be applied because a man can never become pregnant and the formula "in the same circumstances" cannot operate. To overcome that doubt it is necessary for the statute to provide that the comparison between a woman who is pregnant and a man does not in itself involve materially different circumstances.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [4.28]: One would not be able to find a better illustration of the stupidity of the proposed legislation than the amendment proposed by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice. Section 24 (1A) will now be couched in this marvellous language:

For the purposes of subsection (1), but without limiting the generality of that subsection, the fact that a woman is or may become pregnant is a characteristic that appertains generally to women.

**How** ridiculous and stupid will legislation become if such **nonsenses** are allowed to be incorporated in the statute book of New South Wales? When I became aware that the Minister proposed to move an amendment I hoped that he would remove the gobbledegook and nonsense from the measure. Legislation is pathetic if it contains the puerile statement that pregnancy is a characteristic that appertains generally to women. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice should hang his head in shame over the drafting of the bill. If he cannot get the message over in a more intelligent way, he should have the decency to do what many people in New South Wales believe would be to the benefit of the State.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [4.30]: By schedule 5 private education authorities are to be exempted. Obviously the Government has been under pressure to protect the private school sector from some of the worst aberrations of the legislation. Some persons in the community should not be forced upon any educational institution. They want to get into the schools to influence the lives of

the students, but they have no right to be there. Society ought to be protected from them. The legislation recognizes that by providing that such people will be kept out of private educational institutions. But, what about the public schools? Are they not as entitled to the same protection? Is the Government admitting by the schedule that the quality of education is at stake but that it will not be able to protect the public school system?

The Government is again making a drastic mistake. It will put the education system of the State at risk. Honourable members know that one or two of these people in a school could ruin the reputation of the school, destroy the confidence of parents in the school and lower the whole tone of the school. I hope that some honourable members read *Education*, the journal of the New South Wales Teachers' Federation. In the past few weeks a classic illustration of this problem has occurred. One teacher has undoubtedly lowered the reputation of all teachers in the public school system by writing a letter that should never have been printed. Had any editorial responsibility been shown, that letter would have been put in the waste paper basket where it belonged. Most honourable members who have seen the foul, wretched, putrid letter to which I refer would agree with that. So one person puts in disgrace a whole profession.

I warn the Government that it may be making a tragic mistake by not excluding the public school system from the operation of this legislation. The Government has seen fit to exclude the private schools because of risks that have been drawn to attention, but what about the public school system? All my children went through the public school system. I believe in it. I have confidence in it. However, I can understand why a growing number of parents are deserting the public school system, when the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is willing to protect private schools but will not afford the same protection to public schools. Some way-out creatures will be able to get into the public schools as teachers and they will prove a disgrace to the profession. Honourable members should be seeking to build up and uphold the teaching profession. We should be concerned to see that the public school system is elevated in the eyes of the community.

I fear that the **Government** may have a tiger by the tail. The Government has not thought through this simple legislation, as occurs with so much legislation. **The** Attorney-General and Minister of Justice and the Premier and Treasurer have said time and time again in the debate that the Opposition does not understand the bill and has not read it but I warn the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice and other Government supporters that some tragic mistakes have been made in the measure. The Government has rightly recognized the need of private schools to have protection from this provision but it is a grievous error to provide a hole through which obnoxious creatures may crawl. One can understand why so many parents are turning to private schools and church schools. They see in them quality of education, the maintenance of standards, and teachers who are dedicated and understand the need to develop spiritual values in children. If the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice persists in his proposal, he will be letting down the public school system.

Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [4.34]: Honourable members should be asking the Leader of the Opposition what people he has been referring to in his speech. With his sly sneers, filthy innuendoes and gutter-sniping tactics he has attacked teachers in the public education system of New South Wales. He is even more narrow in his attack because the Anti-Discrimination Act refers only to women and to discrimination on the grounds of race, marital status or physical impairment. All these slights and innuendoes that flood forth from him deal only with the women—not the men—who teach in the schools of New South Wales. **They** are the finest group of women in the teaching services of Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition smears them generally by that sort of innuendo, and by references to persons of different racial origins, persons from ethnic backgrounds, who are in the **teaching** profession. He seeks to separate them by smear and innuendo, as he does those in the service who happen to be **married** or have a physical impairment.

That is unacceptable to the Government. It is the sort of thing the Act was introduced to prevent. By referring by innuendo to racists and sexists the Leader of the Opposition blackens the name of every decent teacher. No wonder his own party members are planning yet another attack on his leadership. No wonder the honourable member for Lane Cove at this very minute is going behind the back of the Leader of the Opposition to do that. I have never **heard** a more heartless attack on the teaching profession of New South Wales. Not every profession has 100 per cent perfection in its members but the teachers are a good group and should not be subjected to this sort of nonsense.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [4.37]: If the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is honest and genuine in what he has just said, doubtless he will tell the Committee why the Government has chosen to exempt the private school sector and private school institutions from this clause.

Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [4.38]: The answer to the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition is that when the original legislation went through the Parliament, the private school sector was exempted. At that time the Leader of the Opposition supported such an approach. **Does** he now ask that the private sector be included? Of course, he does not. That sort of rhetorical question is the sort of nonsense that will bring his leadership to an end.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

#### Adoption of Report

Anti-Discrimination (Further Amendment) Bill reported from Committee with amendments, and Defamation (Anti-Discrimination) Amendment Bill and Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration (Anti-Discrimination) Amendment Bill reported from Committee without amendment, and report adopted on motion by Mr Walker on behalf of Mr Wran.

### MOTOR VEHICLES (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

#### Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 25th February, *vide* page 4167) on motion by Mr Cox:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman) [4.42]: This bill is extremely short. It has been quite some time since the bill was introduced. The only purpose of it is to amend the Act by inserting after the definition of authorized insurer, the definition that bodily injury includes, in relation to a person, damage to the person's crutches, artificial members, eyes or teeth, other artificial aids or spectacle glasses. Although there was an anomaly in the legislation, the effect of which was to exclude such items, I am doubtful that any insurer would have refused to pay a claim for them. The NRMA Insurance Company has always met such claims, perhaps out of a sense of social responsibility. I imagine that the main third party insurer, the Government Insurance Office of New South Wales, has always met them or at least I should hope so.

I invite the attention of the Minister, in the broader scene of the third party insurance, to the increased cost of premium rates for third party insurance. A decision handed down in the High Court within the past week or so may double some of the insurance claims, eventually causing the doubling of premium rates. What we ought to have is an inquiry into third party insurance in this State today. Costs in New South Wales are higher than in any other State, and claims here are also the highest. Some sanity must be brought back into third party insurance costs and claims. The Opposition supports the bill but renews its request to the Minister for an inquiry into third party insurance rates, which are governed by unusually large claims for compensation. That inquiry should be undertaken to assist the motorist.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

### Third Reading

By leave, bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Sheahan on behalf of Mr Cox,

## TOTALIZATOR (AMENDMENT) BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 3rd March, *vide* page 4300) on motion by Mr Booth:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Mr BREWER (Goulburn) [4.46]: The main object of the bill is to amend the Totalizator Act to provide for the rounding off, up or down, of dividends where the calculated amount is less than the unit of investment, and to provide the means whereby the difference between the calculated dividend and the unit-of-investment-money-back dividend can be met from consolidated revenue. This will assist the Totalizator Agency Board in its operations.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member for Goulburn leading for the Opposition in this debate?

Mr BREWER: *Yes*. The bill makes provision also for validating payments that have been made from consolidated revenue since 22nd April, 1971, a feature brought about by amending legislation in 1971. I should like to know from the Minister the amount that needs to be given validation. That is rather important. On 12th March a meeting was held with the Trotting Authority to discuss funding of sires' stakes and of the Trotting Authority itself. What was asked for on that occasion was an additional 1 per cent of the turnover from the TAB, which would have yielded sufficient moneys to fund the authority, provide for a sires' stakes, and increase prize money in New South Wales.

The Minister performed the thimble-and-pea trick. He gave the industry what it already had. The use to which the available money could be put was merely changed. The galloping industry's share of the surplus from the TAB became 70 per cent but that is an insecure method of obtaining financial assistance. Without secure funding it is not possible to increase prize money in the trotting industry in New South Wales. One result of what happened on 12th March may be that the Minister will rob Peter to pay Paul. We shall thus see another failure to help the trotting industry in this State. If that is done, the Minister will soon become aware of the great discontent in the industry and will be compelled to bring in legislation to overcome the dearth of trotting prize money. Many more horses will be entered for events at Moonee Valley than Harold Park.

The Minister either underrated the intelligence of the persons who formed the deputation to **him** or he has failed to understand the facts put to **him**. I doubt whether anyone in the trotting industry was overjoyed at the decision to redirect funds that previously went to the trotting and the coursing industry. It was an **insult to** the persons who met the Minister that he did not take into consideration the needs of the industry but simply redirected the funds. However, legislation on that matter will be introduced in the near future and I understand the industry is to have a meeting to discuss it. The Minister will hear more about it then. The industry was insulted by the contents of the document that was handed to the deputation; it was amazed at the redirection of funds. Soon the trotting industry will consist of **only** the Trotting Authority, **which** is formed from persons at the top of the industry. The Opposition supports the bill because it is necessary and will correct an anomaly that was brought about by another piece of legislation.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

### Third Reading

By leave, bill read a third time, on motion by Mr Booth.

## POLICE REGULATJON (SUPERANNUATION) AMENDMENT BILL

### POLICE REGULATION (RETIREMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

## POLICE ASSOCIATION EMPLOYEES (SUPERANNUATION) AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 5th March, *vide* page 4523) on motion by Mr Hills:

That these bills be now read a second time.

Mr FACE (Charlestown) [4.53]: This legislation will effectively bring to a close many decades of effort and frustration of members of the police force of New South Wales, for they will be able to enjoy what is commonly known to them as optional early retirement at 55, provided that they have served for thirty years. Many people have played a role in the introduction of this legislation. Others have been completely inactive. The legislation will bring to finality a matter that I have been raising since I entered this House eight and a half years ago. On 1st November, 1906, when the Police Regulation (superannuation) Bill was introduced by the Hon. J. H. Carruthers, Colonial Treasurer, he said:

The bill proposes to carry out a promise which has for a considerable time been made by, I think, all sides in politics towards the police of this country.

While reading that speech I could not **help** but **think** how many times I had read *Hansard* reports of debates on amending bills. I noted the similarity between the problems that members were trying to rectify at those times and the situation today. **The** speech of 1906 to which I have referred sets out many of the conditions that existed at that time. Much of our thinking on those matters is the same today as it was then. The Hon. J. H. **Carruthers** went on to say:

I think it will be admitted that if there is any class of public officers who deserve the best treatment in regard to their old age, or their incapacity, it is the police force who have to protect the lives and properties of *the*

people of the country. Those of us who have travelled either in the Australian States or abroad will **admit** that in the police service of New South Wales we have a body of men of whom this country can be very well proud.

To any fair minded and reasonable person those remarks are as applicable today as they were in 1906. I include women because of the important role that women now play in the police force. The Hon. J. H. Carruthers added:

Parliament, ever since the establishment of responsible government, has made or endeavoured to make provision for pensions of **police**.

That highlights what I have said in this House previously: the police superannuation scheme and its predecessor, the police reward fund, which were blended in the 1906 bill, are among the oldest superannuation schemes in existence. The bill of 1906 highlighted the anomaly of the previous legislation in omitting the state guarantee of the Police Superannuation Fund. The debate that took place in 1906 dealt with the need to reduce the retiring age for police from 70 to 60 and its effects on the efficiency of the police force. Discussion took place also on optional retirement after thirty years service. The opposition to it in those days makes extremely interesting reading. A large section of the debate was devoted to increasing the percentage payments from 2 per cent to 4 per cent. This legislation will increase it to 6 **per** cent.

After the passing of the 1906 bill nothing constructive occurred about earlier retirement benefits. In 1966 the Act was amended to provide increases in low police pensions. In 1970 further amendments were made in regard to existing pensioners and their widows, but an anomaly occurred in that about thirty widows were left outside the effects of that legislation. It is beyond my understanding why the Government of the day did not increase the payments to serving members to 6 per cent, as this legislation proposes. Problems were created for the widows. On 9th September, 1970, the Minister who introduced the bill, the honourable member for Young, is reported at page 5707 of *Hansard* as saying:

. . . the Police Superannuation and Reward Fund, which is not **actuarially** based, is already very heavily subsidized from consolidated revenue and the provision of additional benefits for police pensioners must therefore be very closely related to the State's capacity in the light of the overall **financial** position to meet the full cost involved.

At that time I was still a member of the police force and I was active in Police Association affairs. Though not every member of the police force would have agreed with the increased percentage deduction, it was freely mentioned as a method of **bringing** about better superannuation conditions. That applied not only to optional early retirement but also a whole host of benefits that are contained in this legislation. Evidently the supposed brilliant economic geniuses of the Liberal Party and the Country Party were not listening to the Police Association and the Officers Association and their retired members, as this Government is doing, or it would have introduced that provision in 1970. **The** Liberal Party-Country Party Government had another go in November 1972, five days **after** I was elected to Parliament. Naturally, at that time I was awaiting the return of the writ for my entry to the House. On 23rd November, 1972, as reported at page 3097 of *Hansard*, Sir Robert **Askin** said:

A detailed review of police superannuation benefits generally has since been made and I had thought that by this time I would have placed before the associations proposals for what would be the **first** major restructuring of **police** superannuation benefits **since** the establishment of the present scheme

in 1906. Because of the very many aspects to be thoroughly examined, this unfortunately has not been possible in the time that has been available . . . but I hope to be in touch with the associations in this connection at an early date.

No restructuring took place, but about thirty widows did not benefit from the 1970 legislation. On that occasion the honourable member for **Rockdale** asked about the superannuation restructuring and the delay of twelve months that occurred between when the bill was first announced and when it was introduced in 1972. In 1974 further amendments were made to streamline payments. The Minister of Justice, the Hon. J. C. Maddison, is reported at page 2050 of *Hansard* as saying:

Proposals for what would be the **first** major restructuring of police superannuation benefits since the establishment of the present scheme in 1906 have been under detailed consideration and I will be in touch with both the associations in the near future to place before them a comprehensive scheme for bringing police superannuation more in line with the retirement benefits enjoyed by other governmental **employees**.

The present Minister for Mineral Resources and Minister for Technology, who led for the Opposition on that occasion, moved an amendment to provide for retirement at 55 or after 30 years service. Naturally, that failed. In my speech on that bill I referred, apart from other matters, to optional early retirement. I had raised the matter with the relevant Ministers since my entry to Parliament in 1972. I quote from a speech I made on 27th March, 1974, which is reported at page 2059 of *Hansard*:

Last year the former Leader of the Opposition attended the Police Association conference and caused great excitement by announcing that the Labor Party would consider making it part of its policy that a policeman should be able to retire at age fifty-five if he had had thirty years' service. The Premier and Treasurer followed suit during an election campaign. Consequently, there has been much expectation about this response to a request made by the Police Association over a long period of time.

In 1973 the first steps in breaking the deadlock on the issue came when a former Leader of the Opposition, now the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, wrote to the association stating that the Labor Party had adopted as policy the introduction of a system of optional retirement for members of the police force. I had drawn his attention to the fact that the goal of optional retirement for members of the police force is as old as the association itself. A resolution calling for the introduction of this benefit was passed at the first annual conference of the association in February 1921, and has been a leading agenda item and confirmed at every conference since that date. In the past fifteen years it has been a major objective of the Police Association of New South Wales and the Police Officers Association. However, over the years attempts to achieve any semblance of the policy objectives were futile, until the statement in 1973 to which I have just referred.

It is interesting to note that even though the present Premier and Treasurer had continued the adopted Labor policy of optional early retirement and, as the former Minister for Police, played a role along with the present Minister for Police and Minister for Services, in bringing about its fruition, the present Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy—as the person who originally grasped the **nettle**—had the final negotiations with the Police Association and the Police Officers Association that brought about its introduction into this Parliament. I pay tribute to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy for his undoubted ability to tie up all the loose ends for this package which amounts to the restructure now before the House. The Minister found the solution by increasing percentage payments

*Mr Face]*

to 6 per cent, to enable better benefits for all. This was a situation that the Opposition could not grasp. The Minister for Police and Minister for Services played an exceptional role in negotiations to reach a conclusion. It proves the esteem in which the Minister is held by members of the New South Wales police force.

I continue the story of the Liberal Party. At the 1974 annual conference of the Police Association of New South Wales—no doubt as a result of the Labor Party's policy—the Premier then, Sir Robert Askin, announced that the Government was looking at the matter and would shortly announce its policy. At the conference the present Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy reaffirmed the undertaking of the Labor Party to introduce this benefit and pointed out that early retirement would provide not only benefits to those persons who wished to take advantage of it, but would also offer prospects for promotion, and result in much younger persons entering the police force. This forecast has assumed greater significance with the changes in the system of promotion in the force. Emphasis is now on merit rather than seniority. Optional retirement affords an opportunity to those who see themselves as disadvantaged by the system to leave and make way for younger men. Not to be deterred, on 27th November, 1974, the Liberal Party—Country Party coalition Government had another try. I quote the remarks of the former Minister of Justice, the Hon. J. C. Maddison, at page 3386 of *Hansard* when speaking to the Police Regulation (Superannuation) Further Amendment Bill:

. . . this measure deals with one matter only and that is to provide for the automatic annual adjustment of pensions payable to police and their widows.

I quote also the remarks of the Hon. J. C. Maddison at page 3387 of *Hansard*:

In the debate earlier this year on the Police Regulation (Superannuation) Bill I foreshadowed a restructuring of the police scheme. Pending the introduction of the automatic adjustment principle into the police scheme further consideration on the restructuring proposals has been left in abeyance, but in the light of the additional drain on the State's revenue resources it is intended to press on with proposals which will bring the Police Superannuation Scheme more into line with other schemes than it is today. Whether in the ultimate it will involve increased contributions I am at this stage unable to say but nevertheless the possibility remains.

On that occasion I raised again with the Minister early retirement. Honourable members have just heard what was said by that Minister. On that occasion I raised also with him the situation of approximately thirty widows who were not covered by the 1970 amendment. This matter had been brought to my attention not only by the Police Association and Mr John McCormack, the assistant secretary and research officer of that association, but also by several widows who were placed in that situation, one of them being a person I knew who lived in my electorate. In 1974 I was not completely sure of the facts. However, I drew the matter to the attention of the Hon. J. C. Maddison. I refer honourable members to the reply I received, reported in *Hansard* of 27th November, 1974, at page 3389:

In regard to the thirty widows mentioned by the honourable member for Charlestown, certainly the Government will have a look at that problem. I realize that they could be in a serious plight and the Government will see if it can sympathetically view their case.

I heard nothing more from the Minister, even though I drew the matter to his attention by letter on at least one more occasion. So much for the efficiency of the Liberal Party—Country Party coalition Government, which boasted always that it helped police and their families. I raise the matter concerning the widows for another reason.

When the Labor Government gained the Treasury benches I brought this matter to the notice of Premier Wran, then Minister for Police. I had received further information of case histories of the widows concerned supplied by Miss Maureen Taylor, a welfare officer with the Police Association of New South Wales.

I raised the matter also with the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, because one of the ladies agitating for the rectification of the anomaly for these women, who had been deserted by the former Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Government, was a constituent of the Minister. By that time the number of widows had been reduced from thirty to twenty-three. As I had raised this matter in Parliament in 1974 and nothing had been done by the Minister responsible then, one could understand my amazement when in December 1979 the Leader of the Opposition jumped on the bandwaggon and attempted to make a big fellow of himself by at last finding out that these widows existed. The four newspaper clippings that I have, quoting what the Leader of the Opposition claims the Wran Government has not done, when the former Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Government had turned its back on these widows, are typical of his fantasies and how low he will stoop in an attempt to make cheap headlines out of the misery of a few widows, which was caused by the coalition Government of which he was a member. The Wran Government has been doing **something** about the matter. By his actions the Leader of the Opposition has been branded for ever on that issue as devoid of **all** moral worth.

I return to the continuing story of the inactivity of the former Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Government. In 1974 Sir Robert Askin's Government offered the association an optional retirement package with a right to a pension of 45 per cent of salary at age 55, with increases to age 60. Initially this proposal was rejected **by** the association's executive, which sought to negotiate with the Government for an improved offer. The reaction of the Government of that day was to withdraw the offer and reject further overtures on optional early retirement and for continuing discussions. The fact is the Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Government did no more on that matter.

In March 1974 I outlined fully the sliding scale optional early retirement starting at 45 per cent as a result of representations made to me by the former Newcastle branch of the Police Association of New South Wales. I still have that printed submission. In 1970, through the same branch and with others, I put a **similar** proposition to the Police Association of New South Wales for possible consideration of the amendments to the Act that were about to take place. In 1970 in the police force, and in 1974 in this Parliament, I brought optional early retirement to the notice of the Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Government for consideration and as a possible point at which to start talks. However, that Government reacted like the three monkeys.

In 1975 the present Minister for Planning and Environment and I put to a seminar held by the Parliamentary Labor Party a complete policy on the police force. **Our** policy on optional early retirement as part of that overall policy was put once again. In 1976 at the annual police conference, just prior to the general election, nothing was said on this matter by the Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Government. However, after the 1976 general election, at the 1977 annual **conference of the** Police Association of New South **Wales**, Premier Wran restated the policy of the Labor **Party**. The Premier and Treasurer stated **that** the matter **was being** reviewed in conjunction with proposals for **changes** in superannuation benefits for public servants.

*Mr Face]*

A round of discussions then commenced with Government Ministers **responsible** for the superannuation portfolio, culminating in an offer from the Government of optional retirement at age 55 with a pension of 46.99 per cent of salary, with a graduated scale on completed years of service to age 60. The association sought to have this offer extended, and the Government agreed to continue negotiations, which is to its credit. This resulted in a further offer with a wider range of benefits, which **necessitated an** increased contribution by police and an increase in the level of exit pension at age 55 to 50 per cent. This package was accepted by the Police Association of New South Wales and the Police Officers Association.

What I have said already will go a long way in assisting to destroy some of the myth that has grown up in the past ten years about how good the **Askin** Government was to police. I have heard that a thousand times; how it originated one **will** never know. If history is researched, it is not proved, as I have shown today. I have no desire to denigrate Sir Robert **Askin**; he was a good friend to police **generally**, but when one looks for action by way of words espoused over the years, it was light on. Sir Robert **Askin** made adjustments to police officers' wages just prior to each election; he did not grant what the Police Association of New South Wales sought—which has been granted by the **Wran** Government—access to the Industrial Commission of New South Wales seeking wage justice, which put them on **an** equal **footing** with other workers in this State and brought them into the twentieth century.

Before its term of office is concluded, the present Labor Government will **have** done more in five and a half years to improve the conditions for police than have former governments of all political flavours in the past eighty years. Whether they like it or not, with all due respect to them, on occasions police have short memories and need to be reminded so that the myth that grew up around the **Askin** Government it dispelled. I should say something about the achievements of the Government since **it** came to office five years ago. I shall mention only a few of them, as time will not **permit** me to include all of them in this contribution. Apart from the present measure and the provision of access to the Industrial Commission of New South Wales, **the Government** introduced hurt-on-duty compensation benefits, a matter on which police were discriminated against. That legislation was foreshadowed and implemented by the Premier and Treasurer.

The number of women police was increased and women members of the police force were given equal opportunities. **Record** funds were provided for the construction of police buildings and the commencement of the Sydney police centre, the Newcastle police complex and the Penrith police complex which are enormous undertakings. A new appeal system for promotion of police was introduced. Police strength has been increased by more than 800 persons since the **Wran** Government came to office, an average of 216 member a year, compared with an average increase of 160 in the last year of the former coalition Government's term of office. The Government has restructured senior officers' ranks and created considerably more senior positions. It has provided further rescue facilities in Sydney and major country centres. It has established the police air wing and purchased three helicopters. It has expanded the drug squad and criminal intelligence unit. It has expended record sums on computers and police communications. Inservice training and oversea experience have been expanded. Record funds have been provided for the police and citizens boys club movment. I hope the review by Mr Justice Lusher of police administration will come to an end soon and enable the Government to plan for the future. I could go on further, but what I have said demonstrates the Government's achievements compared with the myth that had been built up over the **Askin** Government's supposed actions.

I shall deal now with the provisions of the bill. The police superannuation scheme provides superannuation benefits for all persons serving in the New South Wales police force. The scheme includes also hurt-on-duty benefits for police, who are excluded from normal workers' compensation arrangements. It should be noted that with one minor exception the amendments refer to the superannuation aspects of the scheme. In 1979 the hurt-on-duty provisions were revised and improved substantially by this Government. Under the voluntary early **retirement scheme** the amendments provide that on retirement at age 55 police officers will receive 50 per cent of their final salary as a pension; at age 56, they will receive 54.22 per cent; at 57, 58.61 per cent; at 58, 63.16 per cent; at 59, 67.87 per cent; and at age **60** they will receive 72.75 per cent. The conditions imposed are that eligibility will be restricted to members with **thirty** years' service or more at retirement; that all ranks up to and including superintendents may participate and that the final salary is to be calculated by disregarding salary increases received as a result of promotion between ranks within two years of retirement, and within a rank one year before retirement.

Widows' pensions will be increased from 50 per cent of the pension received by the late husband to 62.5 per cent of that pension. The need for that most important provision of the bill has been brought to my attention by many widows in the years that I have been attending functions of the former Retired Police Association, which **is** now known as the Associates Branch. A widow who survives her husband is **left** with the expenses of running a home and other incidental expenses that occur whether or not a husband is alive. In other words, in the past merely reducing a pension by half has placed wives at a disadvantage. The proposed change has been welcomed by the wives concerned. It is interesting to note that for reasons better known to himself, last Christmas someone started a scurrilous rumour that the Government would not proceed with the proposal to increase widows' pensions. That **rumour** obviously was politically motivated and caused a lot of unnecessary anxiety to widows who had already been assured that they would be given this increase.

It is proposed to retain the present formula for breakdown **benefits** for **officers** hurt when not on duty but to limit the amount to a minimum of twenty-four months' pay. The present formula is one month's pay for each year of service up to twenty years and then a sliding scale of pension is applied ranging from 48.5 per cent of salary for officers with twenty years of service up to 72.5 per cent of salary for officers with thirty years of service.

It is proposed to retain the present formula for the calculation of the lump sum gratuity to widows whose husbands have died in the service, but with a minimum of twenty-four months' pay. The present formula is one month's pay for each of the first ten years of service and two months' pay for each subsequent year of service, up to a maximum of sixty months' pay. The measure will reinstate benefits for widows on the termination of a subsequent marriage. It is proposed that women who lose their second or subsequent husband should have their pension benefits reinstated. That provision was overlooked and obviously that was never the intention of any of the bills that have passed through the House in past years. It would not have been in line with **the spirit of the legislation** to have allowed that situation to occur. Two close friends of mine found themselves in that situation. Their names are irrelevant, but I **say** simply that both are extremely decent persons. One is a retired policeman of some note. His wife passed away and some time after retirement he married a lovely woman. **She** was a police widow. If he passed away before she did, she would not have had her pension reinstated and could not have received any of his pension because he had retired **prior** to marrying her. That **highlights** an **anomaly that was** never intended.

**Mr Face]**

The proposal to maintain benefits payable to the widow of a police officer **who** is employed in the police force will go a long way towards correcting an obvious anomaly. It is proposed to provide for the retention of a widow's benefit should she be employed or re-employed in the police force. That provision also was never meant to be incorporated in the legislation, but I know of an instance where such a situation **could** have **occurred**. In that case the person had to join the police force and sympathetic consideration was given to enabling her to support herself and her son. That instance has been known for some time, but successive governments have failed to do anything about it. I welcome the provision that will overcome such an anomaly.

Under the legislation it is proposed that when calculating widows' and dependants' benefits account be taken of cost of living increases from the date of a member's exit to the date of **his** death. That provision will take into account modern circumstances whereby a person can be left behind after having been on a pension for some time.

It is proposed to increase the contributions that I mentioned earlier from 4 per cent of salary to 6 per cent of salary for all ranks. The measure includes a requirement that after age **60** all commissioned ranks will pay the proposed increase of 2 per cent and all new appointees to commissioned ranks will pay the full **6** per cent. A minority of younger officers in the police force are not pleased about the increase in contributions from **4** per cent to 6 per cent. That is understandable. It is difficult for persons under **30** years of age to appreciate the value of long-term benefits. They probably regard the extra money as being needed more in other areas of their budget. The majority of police officers who are over **40** would agree to increased contributions for the benefits that they would receive. People who are now over **40** plan better for their retirement than did people of my father's era. The measure will allow more alternatives for planning for the future.

**I know** that the Minister said that after the scheme has had time to settle down and its precise ramifications are known fully, it will be reviewed once more, as requested by the Police Association of New South Wales. Concern about commutation and further increased benefits will then be considered further. Early retirement and other benefit improvements as well as increased contributions have been extended to Police Association employees covered by the Police Association Employees (Superannuation) Act, 1969. One would expect the Government to support that provision, as it is a government that believes in equal opportunity. Those who will benefit by the provision are **all** former serving policemen who left that career to take up a position in the Police Association and should be afforded benefits similar to those available to their counterparts who have remained in the force. The rate of their **pension benefits** will be judged on the rank that they may have been expected to attain if they had remained in the police force.

The amendments to the superannuation provisions necessitated changes to the **Police Regulation (Retirement) Act**. It is proposed to remove the power of the Minister for Police to retain the services of officers other than those of commissioned rank after they attain **60** years of age. The powers of the Minister for Police to retire an officer of commissioned rank will be restricted to those officers of or over **60** years of **age**. **Those** amendments have been developed in consultation **with** the Minister for Police. He and the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy have got the proposals to **the** Police Association and the Public Service Association, **representing** commissioned police officers. Those organizations support the **proposed** legislation.

I pay tribute again to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, the Minister for Police and Minister for Services, and the Premier and Treasurer, who have recognized the need for the changes that involve virtually a **total** restructuring of the Police Superannuation Fund. The anomalies that existed from the time when the original legislation was passed in **1966** have been recognized. Former governments got into **trouble** because they did not consult with the Police Association of New South Wales or with the association which represents commissioned ranks. The Police Superannuation Fund had been promised by successive governments. The former Liberal Party and Country Party government made promises and is probably not very proud of its record in that regard. That may be one of the reasons why the coalition parties are in opposition. Those parties did absolutely nothing about this matter from the time they came to power in **1965**. The coalition parties continually made promises until **1970**. In **1974** the issue was brought to their attention on two occasions but nothing was done. The bills deserve the unanimous support of the House. They are a milestone in legislation in New South Wales.

Mr ROZZOLI (Hawkesbury) [5.22]: In his contribution to the debate the honourable member for Charlestown sought to contrast the achievements of the Government with those of former governments. He said that more had been done in this field in the past five years than had been done by the administration of **all** former governments. That is typical of sweeping statements that are made to present a false picture to the community. The circumstances are not capable of close comparison. If the honourable member made that sort of statement as a person in private industry, officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs would castigate him tomorrow for making a false and misleading statement.

What the honourable member for Charlestown forgot in presenting his case was that in earlier years police administration and awards of the Industrial Commission of New South Wales affecting policemen took place in a **different** atmosphere of industrial conditions and feeling among members of the community about what workers **generally** were entitled to receive. One could not expect former governments to introduce this type of legislation. I applaud the measure as being a big step forward in the granting of better conditions to officers of the police force. When one considers the origin of the police force in New South Wales and **its** development over the years, it **is** too simplistic to say that what has been done in the past five years has been much greater than what was done during another period. To do that would be to attempt to create an erroneous impression.

That is not to say that I have any disagreement with the honourable member for Charlestown in his approval of the conditions granted by the terms of the Police Regulation (Superannuation) Amendment **Bill**. I doubt that any honourable member **would speak** against the **provision** of **better conditions** for the **police** force. **I, along** with most other honourable members, have a great admiration for the work that members of the police force do. Often the work of a policeman is carried out in most arduous and unpleasant conditions. The police do many jobs which no one else in the community would want to do. Over the years the police have received precious little credit for the selfless devotion they give to their task, which is necessary in any community. In many instances initial contact with the community by a policeman is one in which the person being dealt with is not happy. An adverse impression of the police is created among citizens. That is an erroneous impression. Anything that can be done to elevate the police force should be done.

I am not so happy about some minor aspects of the bill. They relate not so much to what is given by the bill as to disagreement with some of the restrictions incorporated in it. Schedule **1** relates to the retiring age for policemen. It provides for their retirement upon reaching **60** years of age, with an optional retiring age

of 55 years. I have no objection to the option of early retirement if an officer wants to retire at an earlier age. The provision for retirement at age 55 is more than adequate. If a policeman has served for 35 years, since the age of 20, has given good service but is tired and has gone as far as he wants to go in the force and is tending to lose interest, it is better for him to retire at age 55 than to go on to 60 or 65 years of age. That was the provision in the Act formerly. However, if provision is to be made for a lower optional retiring age, one should consider seriously making the retirement age open-ended at the other end.

The officer who reaches 60 years of age should have the option of applying to remain in the police force. That should be possible in circumstances in which the person has something worthwhile to contribute. Not every policeman is burnt out at 60 years of age. In some fields of administration and expertise a person aged 60 is at the peak of his career. Those honourable members who have followed the activities of some of the better-known members of the police force could doubtless bring to mind policemen who retired at their peak. It does the community a great disservice to be arbitrarily deprived of the services of those officers. If the concept of lower optional retirement is to be embraced, we should consider the other end of the scale as well. We should be looking at taking away the compulsory absolute retiring age.

Recently I read a press report about the compulsory retirement of members of the Australian Labor Party who are also members of the Parliament. Some of the members who will be in that category are still capable of making a worthwhile contribution after they pass the compulsory retirement age. To assess a person's capacity arbitrarily, by putting an age limit on it, is unfair and unwarranted. I do not intend to move amendments directed to changing that, but the Minister might consider that aspect when future legislation on that subject is to be introduced.

Many persons are dedicated to their jobs and they remain so until the day they retire; that is their way of doing things. They may not have planned their retirement as they have been too busy doing the work they were paid to do. Often a great disservice is done to such persons by compelling them to retire and giving them nothing to fill the gap then left in their lives. Generally, such persons can still make a great contribution to society. Obviously there is a valid case for an open-ended retirement policy to match the lowering of the optional retirement age. When one gets to 65 one is considered to have reached the retirement age. Perhaps that age is the appropriate time for most people to retire although this is not always the case. The common retirement age is 60 years and the optional retirement age is now 55. Many persons, who have not reached the peak of their working career when they retire, use their skills in other forms of employment and continue working. If they had remained in their original occupations, their expertise and skill would have been of continuing benefit to the community.

Another matter to which we must direct attention in legislation concerning industrial conditions is the special allowances for different types of training and work performed by members of the police force. That aspect has particular bearing upon this proposed legislation. Working conditions influence a person's decision as to when he should retire. Obviously the tougher the working conditions, the more likely the employee will retire early. Those comments are based on information given to me by police in my electorate over a period of time. I should like to place this information on record because it is contrary to the opinion expressed by the honourable member for Charlestown.

The view of many rank and file members of the police force is that the Police Association does not represent them in many aspects of **working** conditions as they **would** wish. I do not suggest that the association is not able to understand the **complaints** of the rank and file. The fact is that there is always an inherent weakness in representation by umbrella bodies. They go out on one of the spokes of the umbrella **to** the extent that they do not interpret properly the opinion of the rank and **file**. The Minister who introduces legislation often says that he has had representations from some association supporting the provisions of a particular bill. In fact some members of such an association disagree with proposed legislation and they often complain to the Opposition that their views are contrary to those held by the umbrella organization referred to by the Minister.

Let us not take it for granted that any umbrella organization necessarily represents the opinion of the rank and file. On many occasions the Police Association has been criticized by police in my electorate for being involved in many unimportant issues, while it has turned a deaf ear to some matters they had raised as being important problems. Some years ago the highway patrol was issued with Valiant Charger motor vehicles. Many officers found those vehicles unstable when driven at speed. The result was that they had the option of not attempting to apprehend offenders **or** of taking extreme **risks** for their own safety and those of other drivers on the roads in high-speed police pursuits. They may have ended up being involved in an accident with a telegraph pole or perhaps with some other car.

At that time a number of police attached to the highway patrol told me of numerous representations they had made to the Police Association for improvements in those vehicles. To prove their point those police officers invited me to travel a few miles with them in one of those vehicles under conditions in which they were compelled to operate. There is no doubt that once those vehicles exceed 90 kilometres or **100** kilometres an hour they had a tendency to fishtail, and that placed the occupants, and possibly other road users, in great risk of danger. A matter of embarrassment to the same officers was that often they would get in a vehicle to pursue an offender and have to wait for perhaps 90 seconds after turning the ignition key before anything would happen, and by that time the offender was miles away.

Those matters were raised by those policemen with the Police Association five or six years ago. Many such police officers felt their requests fell on deaf ears. Some of the working conditions of police still need attention. I sincerely hope that, as well as considering police working conditions from the industrial aspect, the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy will consider their work as it lies within his portfolio. In many instances police are not paid special allowances for work of an extra hazardous or dangerous nature.

Mr Face: The honourable member for Hawkesbury is not right, and if he continues to misstate the position, he will read all about it in the *Police News*.

Mr ROZZOLI: If what I have said is disputed by the Government and the Police Association, I shall go back to the police officers upon whose information I have made this part of my contribution to the debate and tell them they should not give misleading information to members of Parliament. However, I am **willing** at this stage to rely on the information they have given me. Some of those police officers are attached to one of the police rescue units in the Sydney metropolitan area and I am willing to accept their word at face value. If I am proved wrong I shall certainly admit to being wrong. I am placing this information on record as I believe it is important and it was given to me in good faith. The police rescue unit, which has its headquarters at **Marrickville**, is staffed by permanent officers. From memory, some part-time police rescue units are based at French's Forest, Blacktown, Sutherland, **Liverpool** and Pennant Hills.

Members of the police rescue unit are grouped round the outskirts of Sydney. In this way they are better able to reach the scene of most emergencies than if they were all stationed at Marrickville. The officers attached to the units do a **4-week** intensive training course at **Marrickville**; then they have a further 3-months probationary period on a **part-time** unit, and then they go on to what might be called a permanent part-time basis, when they are attached to the police station to which the rescue unit is attached. The officers concerned are placed on the strength of **various** police stations on a part-time basis, and they are required to carry out general duty work as well as police rescue work. There is nothing wrong with that. However, I am assured by officers who are attached to those units that they receive no remuneration above that given to the general duties officers **with** whom they work. There is nothing to compensate them for the extra training they have undertaken with the police rescue unit. Moreover, they receive no extra allowances for periods when, though they are off duty, they are on call. Those units are part-time bodies most of which are understaffed. The only way those units can operate is by having their officers on call when they are off duty.

Many industrial awards contain provisions that give special allowances **to** employees who are on call for long periods. I have in mind the award governing the conditions of nurses. A nurse is paid an allowance for each night she is off **duty but** on call. That sort of provision could be introduced for police officers. The honourable member for Charlestown appears to be trying to make an interjection to the effect that allowances are paid to police officers in some circumstances. That aspect **should** be examined, for it would be unfair if allowances were paid in some areas and not in others.

In some occupations massive allowances are paid to employees who work under unpleasant conditions. I instance the work of some sewerage technicians, **who** staged a strike recently that had disastrous consequences for the community. Those sewerage technicians were seeking an increase in their salary by way of special allowance for working under conditions that are frequently unpleasant. No one would contend that officers of the police rescue unit perform their duties under pleasant conditions. **Many** times their conditions are horrific. **I have in** mind the Granville train disaster and other serious accidents that cause fatalities. Frequently the mental health **of** police officers has been affected by working under such conditions, and they should receive an allowance for performing that type of duty.

The relevance of those matters to the proposed legislation is obvious when police officers are subjected to horrifying conditions. It would be interesting **to** examine the marriage break-up rate among police officers whose work requires them to be on call for long periods. There can be no doubt that such conditions impose a great strain on family life. The penalties paid by those officers are high. Additional remuneration for that aspect of a person's employment has been built into a number of awards. Persons required to work under conditions that are less than ideal may welcome an earlier retirement age. I wonder whether the optional retiring age should be reduced to 55 or whether there should be a number of stages at which **an** officer may elect to retire with certain benefits. Members of the defence forces sign up for terms of seven years or fourteen years, and they have the option of signing on again after a certain period. Perhaps it would be better to approach the question of optional retirement upon an employee's length of service. An employee might be given the option of retiring after fifteen years with certain benefits. In the past twelve months there has been a reduction in the optional retirement age of members of Parliament. The period of service has been reduced from fifteen years to ten years. There is no question of an age limit or of saying that a member of Parliament can retire voluntarily a year earlier than previously after he reaches

the age of 55. Retirement for members of Parliament has been based, quite rightly, on years of service. The desirability of extending the scheme to police officers should be examined.

The Opposition has no intention of moving any amendments to the bills but I should not like it to be thought that it believes this legislation covers the situation as well as Government supporters would have us believe. It is a step in the right direction, but there is still a long way to go. I hope when the Opposition parties return to office in the not-too-distant future they will continue the examination of this legislation. When this Government took office it continued the planning and the investigations that had been done by the former Government. When the Opposition parties again assume office they will continue to do the same type of work. **The** Government cannot rest on its laurels and believe it has given the police the ideal conditions to which they are entitled. I am pleased that I have had the opportunity in this debate to place before the Government and the people of New South Wales my suggestions on how conditions for police officers might be improved.

Mr ANDERSON (Nepean) [5.48]: I am amazed that the Opposition should criticize--or even comment upon--the optional retirement provisions for the police officers of this State. During the eleven years the Opposition parties were in office they did nothing in this area. Though some preliminary planning had been done before Labor came to office, the offer of assistance was later withdrawn. For the Opposition to criticize this plan in any way is appalling. In 1906 police officers were treated differently from the rest of the work force in that they had a retirement age of sixty instead of sixty-five. That was seventy-five years ago. In 1921 the Police Association was formed, and part of its platform was to obtain optional retirement. Now, sixty years later, the Wran Government is giving police officers that benefit. During the eleven years the Opposition was in office it did nothing about optional retirement despite repeated approaches from the Police Association and many members of the police force. In South Australia a police officer makes a contribution to the retirement fund of 5.4 per cent of his salary at age 57; the benefit is 40 per cent of his salary at age 55; and it is 45.3 per cent at age 56. [*Quorum formed.*]

It is interesting that the Opposition should attempt to silence me **when I wish** to compare the scheme sought to be introduced by this bill with that existing in the other States. It is interesting to note that before the quorum was formed only one member of the Liberal Party and one member of the Country Party were present in the House. For eleven years the former Government ignored the police retirement scheme. I was saying earlier that in South Australia at age 57 the benefit is 50 per cent; at 58, it is 55.3 per cent; at 59 the benefit is 61.3 per cent; and at 60 it is 66.7 per cent. In Tasmania on a contribution rate of 5.5 per cent the benefit is 49.1 per cent at age 55; it is 50.6 per cent at 56 years; the figure is 52.3 per cent at age 57; 53.9 per cent at 58; 55.4 per cent at 59; and 57 per cent at age 60. In Queensland for a contribution of 8.5 per cent of salary the benefit is 46.9 per cent at age 50; it is 50.2 per cent at 56; and 53.5 per cent at 57 years. The figure is 56.9 per cent at age 58; 60.5 per cent at 59 and 64.1 per cent at 60 years.

In Victoria, which has a Liberal Party–Country Party Government, for a 9 per cent contribution the benefit is 37.5 per cent at 55 years; 42.8 per cent at 57; and 66.7 per cent at age 60. This compares with a proposed contribution rate of 6 per cent of salary in New South Wales and a benefit of 50 per cent of salary at age 55 and 54.22 per cent at age 56. At 57 the figure is 58.61 per cent; it is 63.16 per cent at 58; 67.87 per cent at 59 years; and 72.75 per cent at the age of 60. Those figures are based upon a median age group of persons joining the force at 24 years. There is no

comparison between the proposed scheme incorporated in this bill and the schemes that exist in **those** other States. The exceptions are the police force in Western **Australia** and the Commonwealth **police** force, which have no provision for optional retirement.

A comparative study of the retirement schemes operating in the police forces **of different** countries **shows** a wide variation in attitudes toward this important subject. The age at which retirement becomes mandatory varies by as much as fifteen years. For example, in the Los Angeles and London police forces retirement is obligatory at the age of 55 years, though in London an extension on a yearly basis can be granted until the age of 60 years. At the other extreme, agents in the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation are not compelled to retire until they reach the age of 70, though in practice most volunteer to do so between the ages of 55 and 60.

In every force a percentage of police officers lose interest in their work after a variable number of years or they become inadequate for the duties required **of** them. This inadequacy may arise from a number of reasons, including indifferent health—although indifferent health is not sufficient reason to warrant officers being boarded out of the service. Another reason for the inadequacy to which I refer involves disorders **commonly** seen in the 40 to 45 age group. Such inadequacy may not be apparent earlier when the person concerned was serving in a different capacity but becomes so when he is confronted with the increased responsibility that goes with seniority. Another reason for this inadequacy is failure to maintain an adequate level of physical fitness, thereby increasing proneness to a disability arising from one or more of the above causes. The flow on from an optional retirement plan will mean fewer people on light duties, thereby keeping stations more completely manned with fit personnel to carry on their duties; a decrease in the number of police seeking to be boarded out; a younger police force, and therefore one that could be expected to be more physically active; and fewer disgruntled, apathetic, middle-aged policemen setting a bad example to the younger men on the force. It is economically sound to reduce the dead wood in the police force.

Few can deny the contention that police work is **becominug** more **difficult** and that the stresses on police officers are increasing. Many factors contribute to the tension. These include: the increase in dissident groups within the community and their readiness to resort to violence; the readiness of the mass media to criticize and condemn police action and their reluctance to present the police point of view in some situations; and the responsibility of enforcing laws that are unpopular with large segments of the community. By far the most serious factor is the apathy of the general public towards assisting the police in their investigations, and especially in providing support when police are required to physically engage offenders. I have said here before that some people suffer from the Ned Kelly syndrome: they believe that Ned Kelly was the good guy and the policeman who went after him was the bad man. The police officers of New South Wales protect the community, and it is for the community to respond.

I recall that three or four weeks ago a police officer died at 49 years of age. Some years ago that officer had gone to the assistance of a person at Kings Cross who was being **kicked** by a number of so-called courageous individuals. On the arrival of the policeman they decided not to kick the person any more—they decided instead to assault the policeman. The unfortunate policeman was **kicked** and hit with bottles. On that occasion some members of the public were arrested for failing to render assistance to the constable. That action was taken under a provision of the Act that should be used

more often. The police force protects the citizens of New South Wales. If people want something more done about crime and other serious problems in **our** society, they must assist police officers to detect crime and be willing to give evidence if necessary; they must assist police officers to be part of the community which they wish to serve and protect.

A less traumatic but nonetheless irritating aspect of police service involves the inconvenience of shift work and transfers from city to country for an indefinite period. A police officer may be transferred to a country town where he purchases a home at a reasonable price. Ten years later he may be transferred again, and then finds that a comparable home in the metropolitan area of Sydney will not cost him \$45,000 **but** \$100,000. It may be that a police officer's children have commenced high school and he has the problem of taking them from that school to one in the Sydney metropolitan area. It may well be that the officer has reached a point in his police service where **his** children are about to leave school and there is not sufficient employment opportunity for them in the country. In the past few years that matter has been given every consideration by the Wran Labor Government. The children of a police officer in the country may come to the city to find employment. The parents of those children may want to come to the city to be near their children. Those are some of the problems met by police officers. It is recognized generally that the **rigours** of police service are such that pension schemes covering police officers should be designed to allow those who so wish to take the option of retiring before the normal retiring age.

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

Mr ANDERSON: I was discussing comparisons between schemes that operate in some other States of Australia and the proposed scheme for optional retirement in New South Wales. For example, in the Royal Hong Kong police force the normal retirement age is 55. In the New York Department of Police the normal practice is for police to retire on pension after twenty years' service, but there is an option to retire after fifteen years' service. Retirement pension is not paid until the member would have reached **twenty** years of service. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police may retire after twenty years' service, but if promoted to commissioned rank may retire only after thirty-three years' service. Vancouver city police have an optional retirement age of 55, provided they have at least twenty years' service. The State of Hawaii police service has optional retirement after twenty-five years' service. Los Angeles city police have optional retirement after twenty years' service. In the United Kingdom the police force has optional retirement after twenty-five years' service for those who joined the force prior to 1953, optional retirement after thirty years' service for those who joined after that date, and a compulsory retirement at age 55 for London metropolitan police. That trend is becoming more evident overseas, with police officers being compelled to retire in their early to mid 50's because of the strain of the occupation.

A host of authors maintain that the complex need structure and societal pressures inherent in **affluent** societies have a particularly adverse effect upon members of the police service in their occupation. To measure the degree of alienation among **736** members of the New York City Police Department who included patrolmen, detectives and superiors, in 1975 Milton Jirak used the Dean scale for measuring alienation which provided a total score. He maintained that policemen feel alienated as an occupational group due to lack of support from institutions such as political groups, press, courts and the community at large. His conclusions were that officers with ten years' to fifteen years' service had the highest mean score on total alienation. Generally, older policemen were more alienated than younger ones, with alienation and powerlessness increasing with length of service and not declining until officers had reached their fifteenth year of service. Patrolmen were generally more alienated than

were detectives; and patrolmen and detectives were more alienated than superiors. According to **Jirak**, those findings substantiate hypotheses previously proposed by Niederhoffer in **1967** that police tend to feel more isolated than powerless or normless, but that alienation generally rises throughout their career, reaching its peak at the **fifteenth** year of service when retirement and pensions are within sight, and that subsequently feelings of alienation diminish.

Certainly research findings in the United States of America have shown that police as an occupational group have one of the highest divorce rates in the country. **Though** in America divorce rates are on the increase in the overall population, in **1976 Stratton** maintained that the high rate of divorce in police marriages compared with other occupational marriages was due specifically to specialized occupational stresses that can create difficulties that do not exist in other marriages. That situation exists in the New South Wales police force and other police forces in Australia. In **1974 Rafky's** survey of **100** police wives revealed that between **one-fifth** and one-quarter of them were dissatisfied with their husband's career generally and reported that particular aspects of the job resulted in family arguments. In **1974 Kroes** and others in their survey found that seventy-nine of eighty-one married police officers felt that police work had an adverse **effect** on their home life and listed as problems **in** order of importance: that being a policeman retards non-police friendships; being unable to plan social events; taking the pressures of the job home; that wives **worry** about the officers' safety; negative public image affects wives and children; that wives dislike being left alone at night; and that police work hardens emotions so that policemen become less sensitive to their families.

Similar occupational stress influences have been found in British police families. In a detailed study by Cain in **1973** most of the results indicated tension between home and work, suggesting that family life suffered because of work. Police wives from rural and urban areas felt that their children suffered from the constantly changing shifts, as they rarely saw their fathers. Certain authors have demonstrated that enhanced family conflict is related to the social isolation often felt by a policeman and his family. Various studies have shown that often police are regarded with reserve, **suspicion**, and sometimes hostility, even when off duty and at private social functions. British and American studies have found that owing to those strong negative pressures, family conflicts arise as the police family becomes isolated and that policemen and their wives tend to make friends among other police officers and their families **who** understand and share their problems.

From American and British research findings it can be hypothesized that the Australian police family is being subjected to the same type of police occupational stressors as are their American and British counterparts. In **1974** in their study of the family in Australia Krupinski and Stroller found that only **14** per cent of their marriage guidance clients quoted the interference of their husband's work as being a major problem in their marriage. I hypothesize that in the Australian police situation the degree of family and marital disruption due to factors associated with the policeman's job would probably be greater than the population norm. One of the great problems for a police officer and his or her family, according to the writer Kroes, is the physical danger that can result from line of duty and crisis situations in which a threat to an officer's physical well-being may overwhelm him emotionally. That is a specific police stressor that is not shared by other occupational groups. Fear of serious injury and disability or even death can make police work a hazardous environment and it is probably a major job stress.

When I joined the police force in **1967** pistol practice consisted of taking aim and firing a single shot at an imaginary offender. About five years ago when I was last in the police force and did pistol practice the instructor pointed out that **90** per cent

of police officers who are killed receive their fatal wounds within a range of 15 feet of the assailant. Because of that short range within which **most** police officers in the world are killed, the recommended action is to drop to the combat crouch position and empty one's pistol without aiming.

I suggest that it is both the clustering of the various dimensions of physical threat, such as brawls, impersonal violence and domestic interventions, and the implications of the officers' actions in response to physical danger, such as court appearance, litigation and liabilities, that are likely to be unique to police careers. Thus the policeman, unlike the fireman, prison guard or military man, is likely to have a unique set of **stressors** with regard to physical dangers, such as intensity, frequency, duration, consequences of action and reaction, and a fear of faulty decisions due to implication. That fairly puts the position in which many police officers find themselves these days. I recall that when I joined the police force in New South Wales, to become a policeman one had to have a haircut. In those days long hair was **the** go and one was readily identified by one's short haircut as being either a member of the armed services or a member of the police force. I found among my peer group a strong resentment at the fact that I was a member of the police force.

Mine was not an isolated instance. It was by far the most difficult thing one had to accept. When the coalition parties were in office, a 19-year-old police recruit had to undergo six weeks of initial training. That has been almost doubled under this Government's administration so that now a prospective police officer must undertake eleven or twelve weeks' training before being put on the streets with one hundred Acts of Parliament in his mind, a warrant card in his pocket, a pair of handcuffs, a baton and a pistol. I might add that my pistol jammed with regularity, as did those of other police officers who were using Baretts, Brownings and other obsolete weapons. Officers now use .38 Smith and Wesson pistols. One was put on the street and confronted by matters ranging from the Wildflower and Native Plants Protection Act to traffic accidents or an armed offender. One was expected to **act** in a split second, correctly, in accordance with the law and police practice. In those days the two most important things were the powers of arrest and the use of police firearms. That has not changed. It **was** an unenviable duty for a 19-year-old constable to convey a death message. I know that doctors, nurses and other members of the community must carry out such unpleasant tasks. It does not matter how many times one does it, the duty does not **become** any easier.

Some people find it difficult to view a dead body. At the age of 19 I found it **difficult** to do so but today a dead body does not particularly upset me. If honourable members and citizens in the community had to do what 19-year-old police officers do, that is, witness a 3-cavity post mortem, it would turn their stomachs. At the start of the Quincy programme on television Quincy pulls a cover back from a body and a number of trainee police officers faint. That is not amusing; it is depressing. **A** most depressing aspect of police duties is coronial inquiries. One is then dealing with the misery and suffering of other people. That is not confined to coronial inquiries; one is **always** dealing with human misery and **suffering** and must become used to it. Some police officers perform duties in questionable neighbourhoods on a Saturday night and, when lining up to play junior league or other sport the next day, they are confronted with three or four people who are also lining up for the kick off and had been locked up by that police officer the night before.

Allegations are frequently made against police officers for a variety of reasons. The stage has been reached in the past ten years in which people complain even about the manner in which a constable or sergeant of police has closed his notebook. The most prevalent allegation is that police officers take bribes. The great majority of police officers are honourable people who do not take bribes to neglect their duties

*Mr Anderson]*

and who perform their duties to the great credit of the citizens in the community and their own families. It should be remembered that a police officer cannot take a bribe unless someone offers him or her a bribe. I become concerned when I see that persons convicted of offering bribes receive lenient sentences. If a police officer is charged with taking a bribe he is dealt with most seriously, and that is proper. Despite what is said about them, police officers have pride in themselves and in the performance of their duties.

Knowing that this debate would be taking place today I wore a tie which has only recently become available. It is the tie of the police prosecuting branch. It has on it the eagle of the police force and the scales of justice. I am proud to wear that tie. It is available only to present and past members of the police prosecuting branch. It is possibly the only honour that a police officer will receive if he is appointed to that staff. Over a period of years many officers have been trained to become prosecutors. The police prosecutors assist magistrates and work in other capacities in the courts of New South Wales, day in, day out. They provide a magnificent service. The service is provided at a much lower cost than if qualified lawyers were engaged for the purpose. I have said before, and I repeat, that many qualified lawyers could not hold a candle to the senior officers of the police prosecuting branch in New South Wales. I am proud to have been a member of that branch.

I mention also the great difficulty that is faced by police officers in memorizing evidence. They must do that because it may be three or four months before they are required to give evidence. The matter in relation to which he is memorizing his evidence might not be the only matter for which the police officer is required to attend court during that week. He may have been working on the night shift or may have been recalled from annual leave to give evidence. It may be the annual sports day of a son or daughter of the police officer and the family commitment is for him to attend that event, but he must go to court when required. At the court, police officers are subjected to extensive cross-examination by trained lawyers. I make no complaint about that as it is part of the British judicial system, but it places a great stress on the police officers concerned, who come from a wide variety of backgrounds.

When I joined the police force in 1967 there were 166 trainees in my class. For a number of reasons, only seventy or eighty of them are still members of the force. The committee of inquiry headed by His Honour Mr Justice Lusher is the most forward-thinking step that has been taken with regard to the police force in New South Wales. I am delighted that the Government commissioned that inquiry. I do not mind if the report takes considerably longer if it means that career opportunities will be provided for men and women who wish to serve the community and if it involves changes to some existing practices. This is 1981 and it is no use living in the days of the razor gang or in the depression years. Police officers must be enlightened. They must be given the opportunity to do their jobs properly.

Citizens overlook the fact that when a police officer leaves his home to commence duty his family does not know whether he will return. Any honourable member who recalls the murder of Adam Schell at Hornsby or the shooting of policemen McDiarmid and Riley by a criminal named Clark at Toongabbie will know that emotive considerations apply. I spoke to the police officer who shot Clark dead. I asked him how he felt. He said that he felt sick to death but there was no other way out of it. He said, "It was him or me. He had a gun pointed at me, and I knew he had killed two other people." Police officers do not like shooting firearms or killing or injuring people. That is not a pleasant experience. I have had to draw my pistol. I did not like doing so. I have been in a shoot-out. It is a harrowing experience.

I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition has decided to take part in the debate. I wish to speak about police accommodation. Despite promises relating to the Springwood police station made by the Liberal Party and Country Party coalition Government over a period of eleven years, nothing was done about the accommodation there. The station had two small fibro rooms. I am proud to belong to the Government and to have had a part in the construction of the new police station at Springwood. The new accommodation was provided only after the Premier and Treasurer had a look at the problem. In recent weeks a \$5 million police station has been opened at **Penrith**. Extensive renovations have also been made to the Katoomba, **Riverstone** and Warragamba police stations. I am delighted that that work is taking place.

During the last year in office of the former Government \$3.78 million was spent on police accommodation. This year the Government will spend \$16.1 million on police accommodation. In its last year in office the former Government spent \$682,000 on police communication and computers. This year the Government will spend \$1.9 million on those matters. As the Premier and Treasurer said earlier, when the coalition parties held office no helicopters or fixed wing aircraft were available to the police. Now ~~the~~ police have the use of three helicopters. Every country detective is given a course in **drug** detection.

In 1967 I worked at No. 10 division at Bondi Junction, Bondi and Rose Bay. There was no siren on the police vehicle. The radio took three or four minutes to warm up. Some people may think that is amusing but if they needed the services of the police on a Saturday night they may not consider it humorous.

Honourable members have spoken about unmanned police stations. When I was on duty at the age of 19 years as a probationary constable I was the senior man on night shift. Another fellow aged 19 was the station constable. Another probationary constable worked with me. If a citizen was arrested and had to be bailed out under the Bail Act—which the Government has changed—one had to get the driver from Paddington to come down to sign the form. He was a first class constable. Let there be no hypocrisy about that matter. Since the **Government** came to office 865 additional police officers have been appointed. I am proud to have been a serving member of the police force. It does a magnificent job for the community. My wish is that the police of New South Wales will be assisted and given the right facilities to enable them to perform their duties well.

Mr **J. A. CLOUGH** (Eastwood) [7.48]: The Opposition will not oppose anything that improves the lot of members of the police force. While I was listening to the speaker who preceded me in the debate, the honourable member for Nepean, it came to my mind that often a new member of the Parliament is much behind in what has taken place in the Parliament in earlier years. Though it is not my endeavour, as a longer serving and older member of this House, to say we have heard it all before, I must point out that the Opposition, when in government, did much for the members of the police force. The contribution made by the honourable member for Nepean was good; he was most sincere and zealous in what he said but he was a little carried away in continually asserting that the Opposition when in government from 1965 to 1976 did nothing to improve the lot of members of the police force. That is not so. It is utterly untrue and can be disproved. **I am** not here to enter a long dissertation about the past, except to say that I mix a good deal with members of the police force. I have had a close association with a number of their organizations, especially the Guild of Saint Christopher. Many times I have been invited to chair retirement functions of departing and retiring senior officers; indeed **I shall** do so once more shortly, at Chatswood. Thus I know that the police force in this State is a good one.

As well, I know that the Askin Liberal Party–Country Party coalition Government did much for the police force. Police officers have told me so themselves. It is probably true to say that it did not, and could not, do all at once, just the same as one may perceive this measure will not do all at once. It is important to note that retired widows must receive a Commonwealth social security pension in order to be entitled to certain benefits under this legislation. Thus, an element of hardship must first exist before the advantages of this measure are held out to widows. I shall not debate the rights or wrongs of that except to say there are always difficulties in providing benefits for members of any organization. The parliamentary **superannuation** fund has encountered difficulties of a similar sort.

I observe that the pension contribution of **police** officers is to be increased from 4 per cent to 6 per cent. It has been the former since 1906. I do not condemn that increase. It has been said that the average period of service of parliamentarians is about eight years and their superannuation fund is geared to this, but members of the police force must perform service for many years before being entitled to a pension, unless they retire hurt on duty or are boarded out medically unfit. Obviously, the structure of the parliamentary superannuation fund had to be different from that of the police. Members of the police force, like men serving in the army, navy and air force, are often placed in situations that are not **the** lot of the ordinary person in the community. On this side of the House we do not object to their lot being improved.

Provision is made for voluntary early retirement at the age of 55 years on a reduced pension if the member of the police force has thirty years' service. That was talked about for a long time, even when the Opposition was in government. Present Government members ask why we did nothing like that. The answer is that it takes time to achieve these things. The capital fund must be considered, its restructuring, how contributions will be made to it, by whom and how much. These things take time. It so happens that after the effluxion of time the present Labor Government **is** in office when the measure **comes** before the House. I **am** certain that had we still been in office this legislation would have been presented by us to the House. It was an ongoing process. It is not over yet. It is perhaps nearer to completion, for it is obvious, from the Minister's second reading speech, that the persons involved in the anomalies dealt with by this legislation are decreasing in number. The changes envisaged in this legislation should overtake and reduce the number further and with the effluxion of time, and the demise of people concerned in the anomalies, there will be a continuing diminution of those entitled to funds under this provision.

The honourable member for **Charlestown**, and the honourable member for Nepean perhaps, said that the previous Government, of which I was a member, did not consult the Police Association about the changes incorporated in this legislation. What a lot of hogwash. The previous Government was in constant consultation with the Police Association and responsible police officers about these matters, and **did** much to improve their lot by way of increased pay and better conditions. When in Government we increased the numbers in the police force; whether they were adequate is a matter of opinion. That members of the Government should say the previous Government did nothing at all is tripe and complete nonsense. It is good to **know** that the widows of former police officers **will** be better taken care of. The percentage payable will be on a sliding scale but will be increased to 65 per cent. If a widow remarries and then becomes a widow for a second time, there is provision for her to enter the entitlement scheme once more. These are all good provisions. We would not argue about them at all. Were I to say more it would be unnecessary repetition and I **shall** not cover **the same ground**.

The Opposition supports the measure and hopes it will bring better circumstances for the officers themselves. It will enable those who, **for** one reason or another, wish to retire earlier to do so, **with** smaller benefits ranging from 50 per cent to 72.75 per cent of final salary. **The** bill will also bring justice to widows who have not enjoyed it hitherto. It is onerous and unpleasant to sit on the Opposition benches and hear one **Government** member after another say that the Opposition, when in Government, did nothing for members of the police force of New South Wales. Records shows it was equally as concerned for them as is the present Government. The Opposition will support this measure or any other measure brought forward that will improve the conditions of members of the police force. When we return to Government at the end of this year we shall do even better.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [7.59]: I do not propose to keep the House for long but I want to register words of commendation for **this** legislation. We do not do enough for the people who serve the community in tough, hard jobs; we ask a tremendous amount of them and, by and large, they are the people who suffer most within the community. We have a police force of which we can all be proud. Anything we can do to help these people ought to be done. I commend the Minister for introducing these improvements. I hope they will not be the last and we shall be able to do more to help members of the police force. They are under stress. Resignations from the force have increased by 31 per cent. Great problems face those men. But, as I listened to two members of this House who told us they had been members of the police force, I felt it was obviously a good **while** since they had been in touch with realities. The police are under great tension; they are at the front line of the security and safety of the people. The honourable members I have mentioned, rather than trying to promote themselves—which is obviously what they were doing—should have been expressing more concern for the plight of the police.

It worries me greatly that members of the nursing profession are not properly remunerated. Members of many other professions and callings in the community are in the same situation. However, I commend the Government for this legislation, which I fully support. It is a great pity that the Government did not introduce it earlier. Two Government supporters have ranted and raved in their efforts to use these bills as a basis for attacking the former Government. The fact is that this Government has had five years to do all these things. Now that the legislation has been introduced, I hope it will bring relief to many police officers who want to retire early. The Opposition is **particularly** delighted that the widows of former police officers will be cared for in a better and more responsible way.

Mr HILLS (Phillip), Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy [8.1], in reply: I thank the honourable member for Charlestown, the honourable member for **Hawkesbury**, the honourable member for Nepean, **the** honourable member for **Eastwood** and the Leader of the Opposition for their contributions to this debate. All honourable members feel grateful for the work carried out by the New South Wales police force. It was my pleasure to negotiate with members of **the** Police Association and the senior officers' association on the provision of early retirement on a graduated scale for police. I thank those persons for the co-operation they gave me and the officers who assist me in the administration of police pensions. My colleague the Minister for Police and Minister for Services was also most co-operative in this respect.

When two former members of the police force, the honourable member for **Charlestown** and the honourable member for Nepean, who have **been** frustrated for many years over delay in these **reforms**, take part in this **debate**, they should not be criticized for doing so. Honourable members should understand their feelings and the

frustration of many members of the police force. The honourable member for Charlestown and the honourable member for **Nepean** have advised me as Minister responsible for this scheme, because obviously I could not know the details of the many problems involved in it. I was receptive when the Police Association approached me and quoted a letter about early retirement, which I had written to that organization when I was Leader of the Opposition. The association said to me, "If you supported early retirement then, surely you support it now". At that time I had not long been responsible for police superannuation matters. I agreed readily. Unlike the former Government, the present Government has been able to resolve many of the problems facing retired police officers and the thirty widows mentioned by the honourable member for Charlestown. Unfortunately, that number was reduced by death to twenty-three. I am delighted that on a future occasion when I take action to further improve superannuation benefits for police, I shall have the support of the Leader of the Opposition—in fact, all Opposition members.

Mr Mason: The Opposition will soon be back in office.

Mr HILLS: The Opposition will not be in office for many years. I shall have retired before that happens. Again I thank honourable members for their contribution. I **am** sure members of the New South Wales police force appreciate the attitude of members on both sides of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Bills read a second time.

#### Third Reading

By leave, bills read a third time, on motion by Mr Hills.

#### BILLS RETURNED

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

- Dog (Amendment) Bill
- Local Government (Dog) Amendment Bill
- Consumer Protection (Amendment) Bill

#### LORD HOWE ISLAND (AMENDMENT) BILL

##### Second Reading

Debate resumed (from 12th November, 1980, vide page 2702) on motion by Mr Gordon:

That this **bill** be now read a second time.

Mr MASON (Dubbo), Leader of the Opposition [8.6]: After listening to **the** Minister's second reading speech and reading the convoluted provisions of the bill, I can only be thankful that this State does not have any oversea empires to **administer**. When I **was** Minister for Lands in 1975 I introduced into this House a bill that **dealt** with this subject-matter. At that time the Premier of the day said **to** me: '**We are** under great pressure. We do not want to keep members here all hours of the night'. Because of my concern for my colleagues I agreed to let that measure stand over. As the vicissitudes of politics would have it, I did not have **the** opportunity to proceed

with the bill and it was not heard of again until a bill in the same terms was introduced by the new Government. I might add that the bill I introduced in 1975 caused a great amount of discussion. The Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy was **the** member for Lord Howe Island and he and I worked in close **consultation** and had agreed on the amendments. It is extremely sad that only now are we finally dealing with this piece of legislation. I say it is sad, for it is a minor matter that affects a handful of people, and there is nothing earth-shattering in it. In fact, in many ways the bill is a much poorer measure than the one I wanted to have passed in **1975**. Why the Government has dithered and waited for year after year is beyond me.

This indicates to me that the Labor Party has **a** problem over this island. I can only conclude that it concerns the vexed question whether or not it should be declared a national park. There was much rushing about within the Labor Party because the Premier and Treasurer had promised a national park to the people who were his supporters. Then attitudes changed, for the honourable member for Murrumbidgee **and** the honourable member for Casino are experienced hard-liners in these matters. When they got to work on this issue the situation became difficult. The granting of rights and natural justice to the people concerned have been held up for five years because of a petty squabble within the Labor Party. When one reads the **bill** one can be in no doubt as to the reason why natural justice has been denied to Lord Howe Island and its people for so many years. It is an absolute scandal and the Government should be condemned for it. Successive Ministers who have held this portfolio since 1976 have failed to have the legislation passed, with the **result** that many people have been made to suffer injustice.

**Mr McCarthy:** The Leader of the Opposition ought to state some **facts**.

Mr MASON: The honourable member for **Armidale**, who has been a regular visitor to Lord Howe Island, should listen if he wants to hear some facts. I have come to the conclusion that the sooner the Government rewrites the bill in simple language, the better it will be for all concerned. The principle of the bill, which affects only a handful of people, will receive the support of the Opposition. The Government has had since **1975** to prepare this small bill that will **affect** a couple of hundred persons, yet even now it seeks to introduce more amendments, which the Opposition will examine closely. I imagine that those amendments will be necessary in an endeavour to tidy up the bill.

The Opposition agrees with the object to extend the description of Lord Howe Island to include **Ball's** Pyramid and certain other islands. I call on the **Miter** in his reply to state his views on restricting access to those places. Unrestricted access **will** present real risk of environmental damage and serious accident to climbers. Restrictions should be imposed so that only experienced climbers or persons in the company of experienced climbers are permitted near Ball's Pyramid, which is one of the most unique places in the world.

Recently I had the privilege of having a week off and travelling by container ship to New Zealand. To relax completely for a week was a beautiful experience. The ship had a little time to spare as there was some problem about berthing in New Zealand, so I talked the captain into proceeding close to Lord Howe Island, which he had never seen. We had a great trip around the island and were able to observe Ball's Pyramid. The members of the crew, who were all Americans, were amazed at this phenomenon, which is **one** of the most unique places in the world. I ask the Minister in his reply to inform the House whether he is able to find some way to protect this area. It would be a tragedy if some restriction were not placed on persons who may wish to climb that rare place.

The issue that is central to this legislation and one that has probably bedevilled it in many ways, is the definition of islander. Persons who have been interested in Lord Howe Island and are familiar with it would realize that the majority of representations have been made on this question. The Government now has the opportunity to come to grips with the problem. I admit that, over the years, I have vacillated on this matter. At times I wondered why one group of New South Welshmen should be treated differently from others. I wondered why they should not have the same rights and privileges and why there should be any form of discrimination. At other times I have thought that probably there is some case for such discrimination. I make it clear, however, that I have believed always that the protection of the island itself is not concerned only with the definition of islander.

The protection and preservation of the island are concerned with the management, planning and controls to be placed upon its growth and development. When I was Minister for Lands I was delighted to have Mr Nigel Ashton prepare plans for the island. All honourable members owe Mr Ashton a debt of gratitude—as do the people of the island—for the work he did there. He laid down the basis of protection, which is a most important point. I could never get enthused with arguments about the term islander. It seemed to be that the important thing was to preserve the island and protect it from irresponsible development and abuse. That has always been the most important aim. However, most of the representations received by the Opposition have concerned the definition of islander.

One of the main complaints that I have received is that the Government has not arranged for sufficient consultation on this issue. Lack of consultation is the hallmark of this Government. Doubtless the Minister could recite all the consultations he has had on this matter. I have always tried to consult with everybody interested in this island. Probably there will never be agreement on this matter. I can see problems with the definition of islander. I do not believe that this legislation will solve the problems involved in the definition of islander. All islanders, as they are defined under the present legislation, are particularly worried about this proposal. They see a considerable risk to their residency being heightened by this legislation.

The Opposition raises no objection to proposed new section 3 (a), but thereafter all the problems multiply. This multiplication of problems has created fear among many Lord Howe islanders who have two important questions. The first is whether the legislation will mean that islanders now classified as such, who are living off the island because of the lack of job opportunities or the acquisition of family responsibilities elsewhere, will lose their islander status. The second point is whether islander status could be granted to persons who are not wanted by the island community at large in view of the pressure of the island's resources. The answer to the first central point is, yes; those persons could be cut off. The answer to the second question probably is a more guarded, yes.

With respect to the first question, I refer to the case of a Lord Howe islander girl who marries a mainlander and they live elsewhere. She may have met her husband while he was visiting the island on a holiday from Perth. One can easily imagine such a situation. Because of the proposals contained in the legislation, that girl stands to lose the right to return to her home to live as an islander in case of death, divorce or separation. I refer to another case of an islander who takes up a highly skilled profession. He may be a brain surgeon, a computer technician or a politician. Under this legislation that person stands to lose his islander status. There are no such occupations available on the island. To effect a break in the practice of a profession merely to maintain islander status would cause such a person severe damage.

There are the sad cases of persons who have to leave the island to get jobs. There are not sufficient job opportunities on the island and some persons feel compelled to seek work elsewhere. Are those persons to be denied their islander status because the law of labour supply and demand is not tilted their way? Though such persons should not lose that right, the legislation does not cover that situation. The bill contains a 10-year provision, but that may not be long enough in some cases. Many persons are sent to the island to take up a position there.

Under the proposed amendments no problems will arise if a person has lived on the island continuously for the five years immediately preceding the commencement of the legislation or if he resides there, and has continuously so resided during the immediately preceding period of ten years. One strange provision seems to give the Minister an overriding power which is unsatisfactory and will not meet the situation. A number of situations will arise that will call for the Minister's attention because of that special clause. That worries me. The Minister has not found an answer that **will** resolve the problem. People will claim to have a case of natural justice to **be** allowed to return to the island. If for some reason they are out of kilter with the Minister of the day, that might cause problems. I do not make any allusions to the present Minister, for I am sure he will deal with the matter fairly and squarely. It is not **difficult** to imagine that, on personal grounds, someone might not agree **with** a Minister or **with** a member of the board. Those things happen, especially in a small community such as that which exists on the island. A board might turn down an application based on natural justice. The Minister might say that it is unlikely, but it could happen.

Islanders who live away from the island **need** to be given more protection than this measure will give them. They should have an unequivocal and irrevocable right to resume their status as islanders when they return. Not to allow them to do so would be to deny them natural justice, particularly those islanders who wish to return to care for aged parents, to take up a bequeathed leasing right or to retire to the place where they grew up, where their relatives, family and friends are whom they might have left because of the lack of opportunities on the island. In administering the proposed legislation the Minister should **keep** those persons in mind. No one should be prejudiced because of those factors. Some ultimate appeal clause should be inserted in the bill. An applicant who is qualified in all the ways to which I have referred and is turned down by the board or by the Minister should have a right of appeal.

The proposal to change the **composition** of the Lord Howe **Island** board is supported by the Opposition. The provisions seem to meet the needs of democracy. It is a shame that we have had to wait so long for the changes to be brought about. There is to be a break in the arrangement that the local member should be involved **with** the board. The composition of the board that is proposed seems to be good. **Three** of the members will be islanders. They must be people who have been part of the island in every way. Two members **will** be drawn from government departments. One of such persons shall be **an** officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the other **an** officer from the department administering the **Act**. That is a sensible approach.

I **turn** now to that **part** of the legislation that obviously has beggared the Labor **Party**. The Government has opted to declare the land and adjoining islands of Lord Howe Island a permanent preserve to protect them in some way. That is a new concept. Obviously Labor Party members have had to scratch their heads to **find** a compromise. That will not fulfill the promise made by the Premier and Treasurer for a national park. The Government has given in to those of its supporters who exerted pressure upon it. The Minister for Police and Minister for Services, who previously was responsible for Lord Howe Island, wanted to call the **island** a reserve.

He made no real effort to preserve it. At least the present **proposal** makes an **attempt** to recognize the need to have something more than a reserve. I **am** sure the environmental groups that were so concerned about Lord Howe Island for so long **would** have listened to the rantings and ravings of the Premier and Treasurer and other persons who declared that the delicate and fragile environment would have to become a national park. They will watch the development with interest.

Mr CATERSON: The Premier and Treasurer has been rolled by the party.

Mr MASON: Of course he has. The Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources is one of the old group of hard-liners who have had their way. The Premier and Treasurer and the other trendies have been rolled. Lord Howe Island is a repository of great scientific curiosity in relation to its geology, pedology, botany and flora. It should be protected and preserved. It is significant and important that that should occur. The Opposition looks forward to the new scheme that the Government has concocted. The concerned community generally will watch to see what protection the measure takes to control the feral animals on the island. In saying that, I invite the Minister, in his reply, to outline his plans and to give the House a concept of how the special permanent park preserve will deal with problems caused by tourists and the delicate creatures that inhabit the island. All honourable members are aware of the Lord Howe Island **woodhen** community. The Premier and Treasurer has spoken of that matter in sepulchral tones and said that he would establish a national park on the island to protect the **woodhens**. It would be a tragedy if those creatures were jeopardized any further.

The Minister should inform the House of the actions that will be taken under the new provisions. All honourable members have so far are the words of the legislation. The Parliament is entitled to a comment from the Minister on the adequacy **of** fines to prevent damage to the island's unique flora and fauna as well as its littoral zone. The penalties should be reviewed. The Minister might give an assurance that penalties will be strongly enforced in view of the propensity of some irresponsible **tourists** to make a once-only visit to the island and to go on a **souveniring** binge. The Opposition is anxious to hear how the Minister proposes to protect the delicate balance that exists on the island. Another provision in the proposed legislation deals with land tenure. From my own experience I know that those provisions of the bill contain a hornet's nest. I congratulate the Minister on his fortitude in dealing with a difficult task. He appears to have achieved good results and most of the anomalies have been dealt with satisfactorily.

I **am** concerned about land that is used for agriculture. Not much land on Lord Howe Island is used in that way. How valuations will be reached is a matter of concern on the island. I do not think that valuations should be made in the normal way. I ask the Minister to consider valuing agricultural land for leasehold purposes on the basis of the prospective net income from the enterprises that may be conducted on that land. The enterprises are small. There is a small dairy industry and a vegetable garden. The Minister probably knows how limited those activities are. It would be a shame if they were lost to the island because of excessive valuations being placed on the land. They are almost cottage type industries, different from anything anywhere else. I hope that the Minister will accept this as a helpful suggestion and will look at the prospective net income that may be available, when setting rents and values. I trust that the Minister will look sympathetically at valuations for the little areas of land that have been set aside for agricultural pursuits.

The Minister has done as good a job as could possibly be hoped for in dealing with the difficult question of tenancy. It seems that he has found formulae that will work in the case of deaths, multiple ownership and so on. Some anomalies may **still**

continue but it seems that many of the most serious anomalies will be overcome. The Minister should consider that the period of two years for an application for a lease to be transferred from a lineal ancestor is not long enough. I ask him to look at that matter again sympathetically. A clause should be inserted to the effect that a period of two years will apply unless contact is not effected with the nominated lineal descendant of the deceased lessor. In that case the period could be extended to four years. I suggest that because I am aware of contact not being made within two years on the mainland when a beneficiary has been absent from Australia. It is difficult in some instances. To adhere to the period of two years on the island probably creates added hardship. I do not propose to move amendments on those matters but I put them to the Minister and hope that he will consider them.

I had intended to seek from the Minister clarification on proposed new section 23 (12). I intended to do so because of representations received on behalf of Mr Rodney Thompson, from Connah Steed and Co., solicitors. I understand that only yesterday a reply was received in relation to representations on that matter. The Minister cut it fine. He could not have left it longer. From the reply that has been received——

Mr Gordon: There have been ten replies.

Mr MASON: We received one on this matter only yesterday. As obviously the Minister proposes to move an amendment to resolve that problem, I do not propose to pursue it further. The House has before it legislation that it should have had five years ago. I had it ready to bring into the House, but the political wheel turned. I had the agreement of the Opposition on what I proposed to do. It was a great shame that the measure did not come before the House then. It is an even greater shame that the Government has taken nearly six years to get around to it in order to correct some of the anomalies. Obviously there has been some rolling in the Labor Party caucus over the matter and probably there are some sore heads. I imagine that the people who are concerned with the environment will be watching what the Government is doing with the measure and making a judgment as to the hypocrisy of the Government in these matters. The Opposition has general approval for the bill but I hope that the Minister will give sympathetic consideration to the matters I have raised. That could avoid anomalies and overcome some difficulties which affect the lives of people on the island.

Mr McCARTHY (Armidale) [8.36]: I enjoyed a holiday on Lord Howe Island with the Leader of the Opposition and the former honourable member for Maitland. My enjoyment stemmed from a number of sources. We walked around an island that was relatively uninhabited; we were able to rest and to look at the coral reefs that surround the island. We were able to go on enjoyable fishing expeditions. I admit that the Leader of the Opposition and the former honourable member for Maitland caught more fish than I. I wonder how much the Leader of the Opposition saw of the environment, how much he heard from the various social pressure groups there and how he came away with the ideas he has put forward tonight.

The measure deals with complex questions of property and inheritance rights which have existed for many years. No simple way is available to legislate on such matters or to make a decision about which department should control such an island, whether it should be the Department of Lands or the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It is difficult to make decisions about inheritance rights and who should control the affairs of the island. The proposals before the House tonight follow representations made in discussions with the island's committee and a review of existing and proposed legislation.

The intention of the Government is embodied in the legislation before the House. The Government proposes to amend the Lord Howe Island Act, 1953, in the following ways. It proposes to provide a land use and land management planning scheme binding on all persons who are residents, and proposes to empower the board to enforce that planning scheme. The Government proposes also to provide that present resident islanders, persons who qualify by continuous residence on the island for five years prior to commencement of the amending Act or by ten years bona fide continuous residence, be classified as islanders. The Government proposes also to provide that islanders who have left or may leave the island for educational purposes or work experience should not lose islander status; that the period for education purposes be unlimited but that work experience be limited to ten years.

The Government proposes to provide that children of islanders who are the beneficiaries of wills should be allowed two years to return to the island and to obtain formal transfer of a lease. It is proposed that the holder of the lease upon whom devolves a second lease under the will of one of that person's parents may, with the Minister's consent, hold the additional lease for the benefit of his children. The Government proposes that the Lord Howe Island Board shall consist of **three** elected islanders, one person who is an officer of the department responsible for the administration of the measure, and one person, nominated by the Minister for Planning and Environment, who is an officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, **all** appointments to be limited to three years.

The Government proposes to dispense with the Island Committee, and to provide for the State Electoral Commissioner to conduct the election of the island board members. It is proposed that only persons who are residents of the island shall be enrolled in the State electoral roll for the island, and be entitled to be enrolled to vote in island elections. The Government proposes to provide for the dedication of areas for the preservation of native flora and fauna and for the prohibition of the erection of any building, work or structure or the leasing of any land in the dedicated area, the dedication being revocable only by Act. The Government proposes the dedication of the northern and southern parts of the island, of the small islands offshore from Lord Howe Island and Ball's Pyramid and the small adjacent islands, as the Lord Howe Island permanent park preserve for the preservation of native flora and fauna.

The Government proposes to provide that the rental of the new leases be granted and determined by the board. It is to be provided that the rental of all leases be reappraised two years after the commencement of the legislation and at 10-year intervals thereafter. The maximum rental payable at the first reappraisal shall be \$100 per hectare. It is proposed that the minimum rental for any lease be as prescribed, the initial sum to be prescribed at **\$20** per annum. Eligible pensioners are to be required to pay only the minimum rent for leases. Leases may be held jointly but joint owners must reside on the lease. All applicants for land, or transferees, shall be **18** years of age. Additionally, the unimproved capital value of the land is incorporated in the consideration of transfer as determined by the Minister on the recommendation of the board.

The Government proposes that increased penalties apply up to a maximum of \$500, and for a continuing offence **\$50** a day; that the increased penalties apply under the regulations to a maximum of **\$400** and for a continuing offence **\$40** a day. A number of other amendments are also provided for within the legislation. Listening to the Leader of the Opposition it appeared to me he was particularly confused about matters dealt with in the bill. It was obvious he had not envisaged the scope of the legislation outlined here tonight and previously; that he had not taken the time to absorb the measure before he came to the House. All people who know Lord

Howe Island realize it has a fragile environment. What the Opposition does not realize is that the Government has considered these matters over a number of years; that, in consultation with various experts in the fields of environment and land administration, this Government has come to a decision which provides that the Minister for Lands and the Department of Lands in New South Wales shall be responsible for the administration of the island.

Another matter that has been overlooked entirely by the Leader of the Opposition is that this Government is giving to the residents of the island an opportunity to govern their own affairs, their own living standards, according to levels acceptable to the Department of Lands and the National Parks and Wildlife Service through the board to be elected by the residents of the island. In effect, the board will be no **different** from any other local government body in New South Wales. How members of the Opposition can raise objections I do not know, nor does any other reasonable person in this State or on Lord Howe Island.

I said earlier that Lord Howe Island has a fragile environment. I have **been** there on a number of occasions with members from both sides of the House, and the atmosphere was restful and conducive to discussion between members of the Opposition and government supporters. Rarely were we at variance in **our** opinions about the administration of the island. I have another close association with the island in that the superintendent was a vice-president of a soldier settler association of which I was president. He was also an officer of the Soil Conservation **Service** of New South Wales who had graduated from the Hawkesbury Agricultural College. He is quite conversant **with** fragile environments all over Australia. He is a practical **farmer** who has had much experience in all of the fields I have mentioned. **If I** have any reservation it **concerns** his position on the island. In my estimation, made as objectively as **possible**, he has done an extremely good job. The former superintendent also gave outstanding service to the island community. The island provides a unique experience for all who live on it or visit it. The legislation is designed to preserve the future of the island.

The matters raised by the Opposition have little merit. I do not deny them altogether, because, apart from having a feeling for the people on the island who are engaged in business, and for those who are committed to preserving the environment, I have an attitude that permits me to see the grey areas between the black and white. The Government's proposal is a **reasonably** good solution to the problems that exist on Lord Howe Island. It is not perfect and it is possible to come up with a better solution. Taking an objective view, one must conclude that the Government has been put in a fairly difficult position. People who know the island intimately may have some doubts, but everyone who considers the matters I have raised this evening will agree that the Government's solution is the best one possible.

The bill refers specifically to Ball's Pyramid, a delightful place that should be protected. It is unique in southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands. It is a rock that reaches towards the sky like a pyramid reminiscent of the type of pyramid that my military colleague the honourable member for Byron and I have seen in the desert. **He** and I can appreciate Ball's Pyramid to the full because we have seen similar sights elsewhere. The provision to ensure that eligible pensioners will pay a **minimum** rent for a lease is particularly important because some residents on the island **are** ex-servicemen and age pensioners who cannot afford to pay more. The redetermination of the rent of **all** perpetual leases on the island is necessary. The provision **in** the bill requiring the consideration for transfer of a lease of land on the island to be **fixed** by the Minister on the basis of fair market value of the land and improvements **in** appropriate cases is particularly important.

Many other provisions contained in the bill are important. I visited the island during the past four or five months and I was concerned at the increase in motorized transport. It appears to me that many persons who claim to be environmentalists are seeking registration of motor vehicles on the island. I stood at a particular part of the island and counted the number of motor vehicles that passed in an hour. On that day 170 vehicles passed, on an island of miniscule size. This is a matter that the island board when it is constituted should examine closely.

I am concerned that the wildlife preservation scheme on the island is not working as I should like it to work. I am concerned also that the woodhen breeding experiment is being constrained for a number of reasons. There is some conflict between some persons who have a real interest in the experiment. In certain circumstances it is difficult to look at such a project and say that it should be curtailed for certain reasons. As I understand it, the woodhen is the eleventh most endangered species in the world. The important point in such a breeding project is to give the species a satisfactory environment. The blackmarket has suggested that \$250,000 is not too large a price for a woodhen from Lord Howe Island. That is a fair indication of the value of the woodhen on the world blackmarket.

Lord Howe Island has given me a refuge and an opportunity to get away from the hustle and bustle of Australian life and my electorate. It has given me an opportunity to be anonymous in an outpost of the State. The island has given me an opportunity to sleep, read, rest, think, swim, walk, and to enjoy myself, which I would not have found possible elsewhere. It has given me the opportunity to get away from people and from pressure, in an environment where I can relax and regenerate. I hope that future generations of Australians will be provided with this opportunity that my wife and I have been fortunate enough to enjoy. Under the watchful eye of the Wran Government this island will be preserved for the future benefit of all Australians.

**Mr OSBORNE (Bathurst) [9.4]:** This not a lengthy bill. The reconstituted board that will be responsible for the care and management of Lord Howe Island is dealt with in the bill. The provision to include three islanders and two other representatives makes sense. The Leader of the Opposition suggested to the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources that he might consider having the member representing Lord Howe Island appointed to the board in a non-voting capacity. There is merit in that suggestion. The status of persons described as islanders has posed many problems. However, looking at the bill, I cannot see that those problems will be great. The Leader of the Opposition raised one or two matters to cover extreme situations.

The point of great controversy surrounding this bill concerns the environmental control of the island. Most honourable members have been bombarded with points of view expressed by trusts and environmental groups. I wonder what people mean when they say, "I am an environmentalist." Lord Howe Island has much beauty and charm. If one accepted the view of the extreme conservationist, the island would be wrapped up so no one could go near it and its charm would be preserved. If that were done so that people could not look at it and enjoy it, what would be the point? Conservation means having something of great beauty to which people can have access without destroying it. When that situation is reached we will have arrived at a happy stage.

I remember once going into a rugged, attractive area. To get there the going was tough. The person with me said, "This is lovely; why do you not try to get this opened up?" I said, "No way." As soon as a good road is put into that area the

local boys will go there and say, "This is beautiful" and out will come half a dozen cans of beer. They would probably proceed to destroy the area. Genuine people will put up with hardship to inspect something that is beautiful. In that way there is a good chance of preserving remote areas. Lord Howe Island is probably as good an example of this as one would find. The island has many unique features and it possesses great beauty—the things that people like to see.

It has been claimed here that the Government probably had problems trying to decide in which direction to go. Many representations have been received. Opposition members spent much time on this matter and listened to divergent views on the best way with which to deal with the island. Representations were received from sincere persons who had definite views to express. Some persons believed that it would be better to have the whole island administered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service; others did not care for that proposition; they believed that the suggestion in the bill is the best way to preserve the island and allow people reasonable access to its charm and beauty so they are able to enjoy a happy life there either as residents or visitors.

In 1975 Mr Nigel Ashton carried out a study of the island and made many recommendations that have been adopted by the Government. That must be of some consolation to those who thought the legislation should go further. Mr Ashton is a respected man in a variety of fields. Many people would draw comfort from the fact that he visited the island and studied conditions there. Mr Ashton recommended setting aside both ends of the island and designating them as permanent park reserves. He suggested that the reserves be administered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service which has many qualified, experienced and dedicated officers. Though they are specialists in the field, they might have difficulty in managing that part of the island where people would want to live in a semi-urban atmosphere.

The Lord Howe Island board will have among its members a representative of the National Parks and Wildlife Service who will draw up the plans for the management of the island. At all times the board will include a component of local people who will have a say about what is to take place on the island. To some that might seem to be an unfortunate mixture, but when one is faced with the problems of preserving the environment and providing for human habitation, one must have a committee that will represent both points of view. The officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service are skilled and experienced in one field. They should not be called upon to manage a semi-urban area. I support the concept contained in the legislation, but I respect the viewpoint of a number of people who have suggested that management will be difficult. If that happens, the Minister and the Parliament have power to make adjustments to rectify any difficulties.

Though I respect the point of view of those who foresee problems, in my opinion the Minister's proposal will be fair to the islanders; it will preserve the island for those who live there and those who want to visit it and enjoy its beauty. I have no dispute with the proposals in the bill for the protection of the environment of Lord Howe Island. Last year I received a number of deputations from persons who were concerned about various matters of a legal nature affecting tenancies and what might happen to tenants when a will devolved property upon them. The problems were varied and complex. I submitted them to the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources, and I thank him for giving them consideration. I am sure some of the proposed amendments have arisen from the representations that were made to him. In such a delicate situation it is pleasing to realize that almost all of the matters that were raised with me were passed on to the Minister. His replies should satisfy those who made the representations to me.

Because of the many conflicting points of view it has not been easy to draft the legislation. The Minister has met almost all of the requests made by persons involved. Irrespective of whether people approve of the plan, I hope they will try to make it work before prejudging the adequacy of the legislation. It will take some time for the scheme to be put into operation. Those who live on the island as well as those who visit it and have an interest in it should allow the plan to develop; they should study it, and if amendments are required later, they **can** be attended to. Those who have the interests of Lord Howe Island at heart should give the environmental plan a fair trial.

Mr HILLS (Phillip), Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy [9.16]: As a member of the Lord Howe Island board it is appropriate that I should make a few comments about the legislation. Honourable members would know that the island is within my electorate. Under the present legislation I am a member of the board. Honourable members would be aware also that the Act provides that the chairman of the board shall be the under secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department. That department has not existed for some years and therefore the board is short of one member. At each meeting of the board an acting chairman must be elected. Obviously something must be done about the construction of the board, even if it is for that purpose alone.

For some time the Government has considered that local people should have better representation on the board and should have the right to elect at least a majority of the board members as their own representatives. The bill will make provision for that. The reconstituted board will consist of three persons elected by those who are entitled to be enrolled under State electoral law. Those persons will **have** the right to vote for members of the Lord Howe Island board. Only persons termed islanders under the legislation will have the right to stand for membership of the board. Three such members will be elected. The other two members will be persons nominated by the Minister, one of them being the under secretary of the Department of Lands and the fifth member being a person representing the National Parks and Wildlife Service. That will bring a balance to the administration.

The question might be asked, why are all board members not elected by residents of the island? As a person who served on the board of the island, I should say that there is a need for continued experience of a high level and calibre on the board of administrators. The under secretary of the Department of Lands will bring to the board that experience. As well, the board will have the benefit of the experience of a senior officer from the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I believe the newly reconstituted board will do an excellent job. A number of the islanders have asked why I have been anxious not to continue as a member of the board. I must say my experience as a member of the board has been most pleasing not only when meetings of the board have been held on the island but also when alternative meetings have been held in Sydney.

The people on the island should elect a board democratically, rather than have me represent them. I have 30 000 people in my electorate. Only about 156 persons have the right to vote on the island. I felt that they should have direct representation. In my view they can do the job competently. An island committee of four members, which is an elected committee, is in existence but is to be abolished. People gradually will **have** ~~ained~~ ~~cunerie~~ ~~being~~ involved in administration. The present board **has** delegated a number of matters to the island committee, such as applications for the development of land on the island. The island committee has had the opportunity to pass on views to the board, which are invariably accepted. The board always meets with the island committee prior to holding its own meeting, so that it has at firsthand the advice of people who have served on the island committee. It is not a question of

people being thrust suddenly into the administration of the board. People have had the opportunity of continuing service. The island member on the board is the chairman of the island committee. That has been the position on a number of occasions since I have served on the Lord Howe Island board. This is a transition stage and I think it will be of advantage in future administration of the island.

A matter which seems to have occupied the minds of most people is whether the island should be administered entirely under the national parks and wildlife legislation. Not only as the local member but also from my experience on the board, I was opposed to such a proposition. Obviously the area has been developed over a long period and there is a resident island population—people who are called *islanders*—as well as those who work for the Commonwealth Department of Transport or meteorological personnel. In my view it would have been *almost* impossible for one department to administer the area which could be described as the inhabited part of the island and to have parts outside the area of urban development controlled by the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

One can imagine the conflict that would have arisen with the two ends of an island, which is seven miles long and three-quarters of a mile wide, controlled by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the part in the centre controlled by a board such as the Lord Howe Island board. That would have been almost like the position that pertained in India and Pakistan when those countries separated. I felt also that the national parks and wildlife legislation did not give the sort of protection that the island should have. For instance, under that legislation it is possible for the Minister for Lands to allocate areas for development within national parks. Honourable members know that ski lodges exist in the Kosciusko national park area. That sort of thing can happen, but it would be impossible under the terms of the bill.

The areas designated in the bill will be protected for *all* time unless the Parliament subsequently amends the Act. It would not be possible for the Minister for Lands or his successors to do the sort of thing that can be done under the terms of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. That provides an added protection for Lord Howe Island which would not exist if it were brought under national parks and wildlife legislation. The National Parks and Wildlife Service co-operates with the board. Provision is made for a person representing the National Parks and Wildlife Service to be on the Lord Howe Island board, and that co-operation will continue to exist. There is co-operation between the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Lord Howe Island board. The board has two rangers on its staff who were trained by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. Those men have had experience in the National Parks and Wildlife Service and they bring that experience to their work for the board. *Nevertheless*, they deal with questions through the eyes of people with national parks and wildlife experience. The board will be representative of the people on the island. Three out of five members of the board will be elected by the local people. *All* persons enrolled under the terms of New South Wales electoral laws will be entitled to vote. Islanders will be elected to the Lord Howe Island board.

In the years I have served on the board there has been some criticism of aspects of the management of the island. Some parts of the island were not preserved by accident. Former boards that operated over a long period have been mindful of the need to protect the island. Co-operation between the board and its predecessors—particularly the present board and its immediate predecessor—with those involved in breeding the woodhen has been considerable. Those who have lived on the island for a long time have been cynical about some other persons who have come there. That happens in every community.

*Mr Hills]*

I do not have to **spell** out the sort of criticisms that are made. For example, two woodhens were brought down to the flat and one of them was killed by an owl. The local people said that they knew it would happen as no steps were taken to protect those woodhens from the owls. A shelter was built and an additional woodhen was brought down for breeding purposes. The breeding programme has been successful and thirteen chicks have been hatched and maintained on the island. The next stage of the programme is to take those woodhens, which have been bred in a confined space, and establish them in their own domain. The chicks, which have been bred in a sheltered environment, have to be taken and put in other places on the island. Many pigs, goats, feral cats and owls are also on the island. They threaten the chicks, which are bred in confined spaces. A need exists for people involved in this work to seek the co-operation of the Lord Howe Island board and its staff to ensure that the work is undertaken successfully. The birds must be protected when they are put into the area where they will live in the future. One cannot keep them in captivity forever.

The board has been involved in the elimination of feral pigs. Originally pigs were put on the island by passing sailors to ensure a future supply of fresh meat. The same was done with goats. As the pig population had expanded almost to plague proportions, the board had to take action to eliminate them. Apparently one pig is left on the island and attempts are being made to eliminate it. It is hoped the pig is not a pregnant sow, carrying the start of a future pig population.

The honourable member for Armidale spoke about co-operation between departments. This work has been achieved by co-operation between the employees of the Lord Howe Island Board and those responsible for developing **the programme**. However, we have not overcome difficulties encountered in re-establishing the woodhen population on the island merely by breeding the birds. The programme must continue until woodhen numbers are substantial. Their protection must be assured. The board must decide whether to be involved in the elimination of owls, for they pose a threat to the woodhen's survival. Such questions, revolving about the woodhens' possible extinction, mean that decisions must be taken to eliminate birds or animals that cannot **live** together. A species such as the woodhen must be protected. **Unfortunately**, although owls may be considered fine birds by some, they pose a danger to the woodhen. Problems such as these constantly face the board.

Additional powers have been given to the board. One was mentioned by **the** honourable member for Armidale: the present board has no control over the number of motor vehicles on the island, whether motor cars, trucks or motor bikes. This measure gives the board power to make regulations to control their number. It **also** gives the board control of removal of flora or fauna from the island and destruction of or damage to the coral reef. Those powers have been somewhat doubtful in the past but this legislation will clarify them. As honourable members are probably aware, the main source of income for the Lord Howe Island Board is the sale of kentia **palm** seeds. At times sales have been quite lucrative. However, like all crops, the amount of seed available varies from time to time. Although on some occasions **the** income to **the board** has been fairly substantial, at other **times** it has **not** been so good. **Nevertheless**, a number of people on the **island** earn a full-time **living** from **the** collection of kentia palm seeds.

The best market for kentia seeds is in Europe where they are grown in hot-houses and nurseries. Eventually they become attractive palms for which people pay substantial sums of money. The proposition by the board, a policy it is already following, is to develop all seedlings and trees in its own hothouses for **the purpose** of increasing income. Like all organizations, from time to time the board must be

engaged in major project works. One project, in which the Government is **co-operating**, and in which the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports has been involved, is the design of a new wharf for the island. The shipping service is the mainstay of the island, particularly in the cartage of heavy goods. On occasions weather has been so bad that shipping must pass to the other side of the island to unload cargo.

A substantial amount of fuel is burned on the island to generate electricity. Honourable members may complain about recent increases in electricity costs but my constituents on Lord Howe Island pay 10c a kilowatt hour for their electricity whereas those who reside in the Sydney County Council district pay 3.5c a kilowatt hour. Were the islanders charged the full cost, they would pay about 35c a kilowatt hour. That gives some idea of the cost of transportation of oil and the generation of electricity by diesel sets compared with costs on the mainland with an availability of coal for major power stations.

In concert with a consideration of the environment on the island, recently when I was at a meeting with the Lord Howe Island Board, Mr John Dembecki, the chairman of the Energy Authority of New South Wales, examined investigations already carried out by a university in Sydney into the possibility of using windpower to generate electricity on the island. That proposition seems feasible. The question of electricity generated by windpower, after my discussion with Mr Dembecki, raised also the possibility of having electrically driven vehicles on the island instead of those consuming fuel. An electrically powered vehicle will be sent there, for the board has decided that the next vehicle to be acquired will be electrically powered. **Even** with the present generating sets operating on the island, during the dead of night the batteries of the vehicle can be recharged.

The average distance travelled by a vehicle on Lord Howe Island is about 65 kilometres in one day. It is a small island which lends itself to the use of electrically powered vehicles having that range. The batteries can be topped up during the night when windpower is being used to generate electricity, or failing that, with the present power system. All this fits into the environmental approach that the general public has for Lord Howe Island. The bill will provide a regulating power for the Lord Howe Island Board to limit the number of vehicles on the island. We believe, if it is possible, we should also convert all vehicles being used on the island to electrical power. If the windpower energy proposition can be developed, which seems to have a **75** per cent possibility of success, that also fits in with the Government's general attitude on the island's environment.

Another provision in the bill will allow regulating powers for the licensing of island accommodation. Obviously, as the island becomes more popular, more accommodation will be sought. We believe there is an upper limit to which **accommodation** can be permitted to grow. That was provided for in the scheme that Nigel Ashton, a former head of this State's planning authority—it has had about four names while I have been a member of Parliament—worked on. Nigel Ashton was an experienced and competent person who was invited by the board, with the acquiescence of the Minister, to go to Lord Howe Island to draw up a planning scheme. That scheme has been on exhibition on two occasions and is at present being reviewed, particularly in the light of this legislation which defines quite clearly areas on the island that are to be preserved for all time. No one can alter it unless Parliament agrees.

That is a good feature of the protection under this bill. No other legislation that I know of in New South Wales holds the tight rein that this bill holds on development in areas that are to be preserved as parks. **The** planning scheme would ensure that the island is not overdeveloped. For example, at its last meeting the

board considered whether the size of blocks of land should be increased. Incidentally, land can be developed only by persons who are specified under the legislation as islanders. The Lord Howe Island Board will have to give its support to development applications and finally the applications must go to the Minister for Lands to determine whether an allocation of the lease will be made.

At its recent meeting the board discussed whether block sizes should be increased, but honourable members must bear in mind that the island is tiny. It is 7 miles long by three-quarters of a mile wide and the legislation deals with the allocation of three-quarters of it for park land. A fair amount of the island is used for **residential** purposes and agricultural pursuits, as the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members mentioned during the debate this evening. Obviously, a limited amount of land is available for development. Whether buildings being constructed by people who are successful in having an allocation made to them should be cheek by jowl or blocks should be half an acre or three-quarters of an acre must be considered. Of course, islanders have families and those families will also want blocks of land on the island. There are those complications, but the power dealing with the licensing of all public accommodation and commercial undertakings on the island is extremely important, for it will ensure that the island will not be overdeveloped, despite the fact that large numbers of people want to visit it.

In earlier days **people** travelled to the island by flying boat, the journey taking from four to four and a half hours depending on headwinds. Sometimes aircraft had to leave Sydney Harbour in the early hours of the morning to be able to land on the **lagoon** at high tide. Obviously whether an aircraft **could** land or not depended **on** the state of the tide in the lagoon. Sometimes after travelling to the island pilots were instructed that they could not land and had to return to the mainland. When the flying boat service was discontinued it became necessary to build an airstrip. That caused a number of misgivings because of the length of the runway, which is **3 100** feet. The type of aircraft that use the airstrip must be capable of taking off and landing in that restricted length. The island has been fortunate in the type of service that has been provided by existing aircraft but developments have occurred in the aircraft industry. Now an aircraft called the Dash 7 or the De **Havilland** STOL aircraft can land and take off with larger numbers of passengers. This raises the important question whether it is desirable to have large numbers of persons travelling to and from Lord Howe Island and whether, if that happens, the environment will be destroyed.

I congratulate the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources on introducing the bill. While I have been on the Lord Howe Island Board about four or five Ministers for Lands have attempted to bring this legislation into the Parliament. The former Minister for Lands, now Minister for Police and Minister for Services, invited the former member for **Maitland** to sit on the Lord Howe Island Board because of his experience. The introduction of the legislation has not been easy but the Government has finally introduced a bill that is acceptable to the islanders and those who are interested in protecting the beauties of Lord Howe Island for all time.

Mr ROZZOLI (Hawkesbury) [9.46]: Like a number of other honourable members, I have waited a long time to speak on this bill. **The** Lord Howe Island Act was passed in **1953** but it has not prevented a number of administrative problems. It has taken twenty-eight years to get to this stage and, for a number of reasons, this legislation has had a gestation period of five or six **years**. The significance of this legislation transcends the smallness of the island and the number of persons who inhabit it. As well as being significant, the legislation is also unique. Unique is a word that is misused by many people but Lord Howe Island is a place to which the word can be justly and correctly applied. Because of its uniqueness what happens on the

island is important not only to the islanders but also to the people of Australia and, indeed, the peoples of the world. Lord Howe Island is part of the international heritage. It is fairly unusual for a State government in Australia to have jurisdiction over an island that is as far from the mainland as Lord Howe Island. I and most other honourable members would fight to the end to ensure that it stays under New South Wales administration. The New South Wales Government has done a good job for the island over the years.

I find that I disagree with the Government and, up to a point, **with** the Opposition on this legislation. I believe the permanent park preserve concept—which also is unique because this State has never done it before—is totally unacceptable for Lord Howe Island. It is an abrogation of the Government's responsibility to the people of Australia and the peoples of the world to preserve this priceless piece of our environmental heritage. I intend to take the somewhat unusual course of moving two amendments in Committee as a private member to express the level of concern I feel at the Government's serious failure to accept its responsibilities and to establish reserve areas on Lord Howe Island and offshore islands and a marine zone around the islands as national parks in the fullest sense of the term.

The **amendments** that I foreshadow are that the care, control and management of any reserve as notified in section 19A (1) shall be by the National Parks and Wildlife Service; that any such reserve **will** be declared a national park or any nomenclature as allowed by the National Parks and Wildlife Act; that such reserves will have a plan of management prepared by the director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service **as soon as possible** after the passage of **this** Act; and a consequential **change** of name. I intend also to move an amendment to schedule 7 because the delineated areas in that schedule are not satisfactory. They take no cognizance of the necessity for a marine **reserve** around the island and they exclude Transit Hill from the permanent park preserve. There is an almost unanimous opinion among environmentalists and scientists that Transit Hill should be an integral part of the preserve.

Much has been made of the dual administration that might be created by the preserved areas of the island being administered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the remainder of the island—the settled or occupied parts—being administered by the board. I see no difficulty in this. I take the opposite view to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, who said that it would lead to chaos; it would work well. There is no lack of precedence for dual administration in Australia. Many forms of multiple administration exist on the island. State and Commonwealth services on the island work satisfactorily side by side. **The people** of Lord Howe Island could work harmoniously with the National **Parks** and Wildlife **Service**. There is great value in the delineation of the responsibility that must be held by the body administering the park area and that held by those administering the **settled** areas. The Lord Howe Island Board is a version of a local government body, though it is not referred to as such and it is not fully elected, but has a partially elected representation. The fact that there are to be three locally elected representatives and two departmental representatives indicates the measure of control to be placed in the hands of local people.

**The** board will be a local administration body that will have principal **charge** of **the day-to-day affairs** of the island, policies for the control of the island that develop tourism, policies that develop such industry as may be on the **island**, and all the other things that go to make up that part of the island that touches on the activities of the human population. **The body** that has to place **consideration** of those matters high on its **list** of priorities cannot administer **also** the park areas to the satisfaction of the State and the world. Many times the requirements **of** the **settled** parts of the island will be in direct conflict with those in the park section

**Mr Rozzoli**

of the island. If one needs a single illustration of the **failure** of the present board to control satisfactorily all aspects of the island, one has only to walk along the beach that fronts the **lagoon** and observe the garbage tip. If ever there was **an** indictment of local administration, it is the tip that has been developed under the authority of the Lord Howe Island Board.

I have been to Lord Howe Island on a number of occasions. I am extremely attached to the island. Anyone who has been there will know that one of the most pleasant parts of the island is the lagoon. If one goes along the beach of the lagoon from the end of the airstrip towards the main settled area, one sees the tip right on the beachfront. The tip is not administered under the sanitary land fill method that is used on the mainland. The tip would not be allowed to exist on the mainland; it does not meet any of the requirements of the State Pollution Control Commission and is an environmental disaster. The fact that the Lord Howe Island administration **has** chosen to dispose of rubbish in that way does not encourage one to take the view that its administration of the park section **would** be as enlightened as one would hope.

On the question whether there should be a national parks administration for the preserved areas or whether they should be **controlled** by the board, one is confronted by the differences of opinion based on the personalities of the persons involved and their attitude at the **particular** time. However, one is not talking about particular persons and this moment in time; one is talking about an item of our environmental heritage that must be preserved for all time. It behoves this Parliament on behalf of the people of New South Wales to **look** into the future and at the way in which this priceless item of our environmental heritage will be administered.

Transit Hill is a major area that should be included in the park preserve and is an area different from most of the island; it is different in character from the **low**, basically settled portion, and different from the high country at each end. It is a much more gently sloping hill, largely covered by virgin forest and with a certain amount of cleared land. It has been relatively undisturbed by feral animals. It is criss-crossed by a number of walking trails and vehicle tracks which, on the recommendation of the report made by the Australian Museum, should be allowed to return to a natural state. It was envisaged by the Australian Museum when it carried out a most thorough and responsible study of the island, that Transit Hill should be included in any preserve area.

The definition I envisage for the park areas is: the whole of the land masses of Lord Howe Island and the islands delineated between certain latitudinal and longitudinal **lines**, with the exclusion of certain delineated **portion numbers that** cover the settled areas of the island and the parts that have been set aside for special recreation areas. It should include a marine reserve, which I would describe as adjoining Lord Howe Island commencing at a point on mean high water mark on the southernmost point of Phillip Point—North Head—and bounded thence on the south-west by a line bearing southeasterly to the mouth of the creek in **Erskine** Valley between Mount Gower and Mount Lidgbird; thence generally on the east, northeast and north by the mean high water mark of Lord Howe Island to the point of commencement. There should be also a marine reserve adjoining Lord Howe Island commencing at a point on mean high water mark at the most northerly point of Lord Howe Island and bounded thence on the northeast by a line bearing southeasterly to mean high water mark at the eastern end of the headland north of Hells Gates; thence generally on the south and west by the mean high water mark of Lord Howe Island to the point of commencement.

The Australian Museum, in its study, recommended that a survey be undertaken of the marine environment, but said also that this was not a matter of high priority, because there **was** no immediate threat to the marine environment. However, action can be taken before there is any risk. Why should the marine environment be disregarded until it is at risk before making a move to preserve it for all time?

The delineation that I read to the House is not one that would **adversely** affect the fishing industry, such as it is, on the island. Recreational fishing can be undertaken in the lagoon or near the island and is easily encompassed within the plan of management envisaged for the marine reserve. I do not intend to develop my arguments as to why the island should be a national park rather than a reserve, which is proposed by the bill. **An** enormous amount has been written about the island, and numerous recommendations have been made that administration of the reserve should come under the National Parks and Wildlife Service because of the recognition that would give the island at an international level. Admittedly the National Parks and **Wildlife** Service is extremely well-equipped—and it is becoming better equipped—to deal with specific problems. The service has the back-up support of many scientific organizations throughout the world. Those facilities might well be available to the Lord Howe Island board, but might not necessarily be requested by the board with the same alacrity as they would be by the National Parks and Wildlife Service. In many instances those facilities may not even be deemed necessary by the board. Despite the fact that it will work within the provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, the board is not bound by the Act as firmly as it would be if those sections of the island were under the control of the service.

I shall deal now with another part of the bill. The national park issue is paramount in my mind. I am not in so much of a contrary position to Government **supporters—or** even to some of my colleagues on this side of the House—but I should touch upon a number of other matters that concern that part of the bill which affects the **people** of the island. I commend the Government for the amendments that the Minister has said he intends to introduce. They cover many of the areas of genuine concern that the islanders had for the bill in its previous form. Late last year I flew to Lord Howe Island to discuss some of those matters with the islanders. I concede that I played only a small part in the process of bringing about those amendments, but I take some of the credit for the work that went into assisting the islanders to express their thoughts on what they felt was wrong with the original bill and the solutions that they **suggested**.

I **compliment** the Premier and Treasurer for ensuring that the legislation did **not** pass through the Parliament at the end of last year and that time was allowed to consider this important issue. To a large extent many of the difficulties have **been** overcome. I retain some doubts about the way the matter has been handled. **Some** parts of the proposed legislation have not been altered. I am not as **willing to go** out on a limb on them as I am on the national park issue. The definition of islander is rather curious, for it has a number of **qualifications**. I do not understand the reason for establishing the different terms of qualification. I should think **that** the simple 10-year qualification period to obtain islander status would be **sufficient** to **allow** for all eventualities. I note that the change to part (d) of the definition of islander is an improvement, for the board may make recommendations **to the** Minister as to who should acquire the status of islander in special circumstances. In view of other changes in the bill, that discretionary provision is not necessary and a blanket 10-year period would have been acceptable for all purposes.

*Mr Rozzoli*]

I take issue with the provisions of the bill that relate to the nature of the hard, especially the provision by which the board will elect its own chairman. Concern has been expressed that the three islanders will constitute a majority on the board. I defend the right of the islanders to have a major say in their destiny. However, the section should have been amended to provide that the officer representing the department responsible for administering the Act should be the chairman of the board. The Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy made the pertinent point that the officers who have fulfilled positions on the board as government representatives, and the under secretary of the former Chief Secretary's Department who was the chairman of the board, brought expertise and stability to the control of matters on the island. Though I support the majority representation of islanders on the board, it would have been advantageous and a further gesture towards balancing interests if the chairman were the officer of the department administering the Act.

I am concerned about the openness of voting at elections. I note that the method of voting is to be by prescription. That method is not available to other people in New South Wales. The system of local government voting in this State would suit most islanders. Most of those to whom I spoke agreed that they would prefer to have much more certainty than the bill will provide. A significant feature of the bill is that many residents of the island are Seventh Day Adventists, and therefore Tuesday has been the traditional day for holding elections on the island. One can see no reason why, to conform with what applies in the rest of New South Wales, the elections should not be conducted on a particular Tuesday on a triennial basis—it might be the third Tuesday in September—which would be the closest one could get to the local government elections held in the rest of this State. Islanders would then know that board members had a fixed term and that elections would proceed at a predetermined time.

Last year I attended a public meeting on the island. It was conducted by Mr Llewellyn. The outline of the voting that it is intended to introduce by prescription left the islanders baffled about how it would work and how they were supposed to express their preferences. On a small island with so few eligible voters, the simple first past the post method would be preferable to the complicated system of put and take that is envisaged. Some of the other matters discussed at that time have been incorporated in the proposed amendments. I am pleased with the clarity that has been introduced by the use of the words jointly or as tenants in common. Though the islanders were assured that this was the intention of the terms of the 1980 bill, they were not happy about it. Their concern has been well conceded.

I am pleased that changes have been made in the residency provisions and those dealing with the capacity to hold land leases jointly. They overcome some of the real problems that were experienced by residents. The extra discretion that is given in that provision, which concerns the taking up of land by a beneficiary within a 2-year period, is welcome. In many instances it was impractical for the former scheme to work. The lineal descendants of the people who live on the island should have rights of inheritance similar to those of mainland residents. A mainlander who has land bequeathed to him here is not told that he must take up occupation within a certain time.

Lord Howe Island is unique. A balance is required to try, by legislative rules and regulations, to look after the interests of those people who are traditionally islanders. They must be given the opportunity to be away from the island for the purpose of seeking further education or to learn a trade. Limited employment opportunities are available on the island. In order to get a job many young people go away from the island. While on the mainland an islander may marry and settle down; he may not want to take up an inheritance on the island until later.

Those sorts of problems presented a great challenge to legislators to try to put into words a system that will give the maximum amount of **protection** and **flexibility** and, above all, remove the possibility of takeovers by outside interests. Those who have been on the island will doubtless agree that, to maintain its essential character, it is important that development be restricted. One cannot imagine the time when 7-storey or 8-storey motels, with **all** the paraphernalia that goes with them, will be built on the island. If that came about 747 jumbo jets carrying 560 people at a time may make four or five flights a day to the island. That would mean the end of Lord Howe Island as we know and love it.

A restriction must be placed on the extent to which the island may be allowed to develop. If it transpires that people from the mainland cannot visit the island as they would like, that will be a small price to pay for keeping it in its correct perspective. Trying to balance those considerations has been no mean feat for the legislators. I do not criticize the persons responsible for preparing the legislation for the time it has taken to do it.

I wish to touch briefly on valuations. Though it is satisfactory to assess the value of leases at **current** market value for most other purposes, it is not really satisfactory so far as the island is concerned. Of the seventeen leases that were transferred recently only three went to islanders on the island. When living on the island it is extremely difficult to gather any great wealth. Valuations based on a fair market value may price local people out of the capacity to buy into their own heritage. The situation may arise in which a young person wishes to remain on the island and take up land but cannot do so; he has put himself in that situation by staying on the island.

The position should be reviewed to see if in some way a concession can be given in regard to purchases by people who have put their continuing faith and commitment into the island. This is not an easy problem and I do not pretend that it **is**. It is like having one law for one set of people and a different law for another. That is the essence of the problem affecting legislation for the island, which is unique and requires a special set of circumstances.

Though it has taken twenty-eight years from the time of the earlier legislation to introduce this amending legislation, I do not believe that some matters have been resolved as well as they might have been. A big step forward has been made but I should hate to have to wait for another twenty years until **all** the problems have been solved. I should like to think that it will be the responsibility of the board to review these matters and take upon itself the responsibility of putting suggestions to the Minister about how the provisions of the legislation can be improved in order to protect the interests of those who have their future in the island.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Face.

#### BILLS RETURNED

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

- Co-operation (Amendment) Bill
- Credit Union (Amendment) **Bill**
- Government Guarantees (Co-operation) Amendment Bill
- Housing Indemnities (Co-operation) Amendment Bill
- Landlord and Tenant (Rental Bonds) Amendment Bill
- Permanent Building Societies (Co-operation) Amendment **Bill**

## ADJOURNMENT

## Dundas Migrant Hostel Site

Mr GORDON (Murrumbidgee), Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources [10.17]: I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr WILDE (Parramatta) [10.17]: I wish to discuss a matter that is of concern to me and is of great urgency. It concerns a proposal by the Housing Commission of New South Wales to acquire from the Commonwealth Government a property known as the Dundas migrant hostel site in Bettington Road, Dundas. As the name implies, a migrant hostel was formerly operated on the land. That hostel became disused many years ago. The buildings were demolished five or six years ago and the land was subsequently offered by the federal Government to the New South Wales Government for housing purposes. That offer was refused originally at an administrative level, without coming to my knowledge as the local member. The first knowledge I had of this issue was when it was reported in a Sunday newspaper that certain federal members of Parliament had made efforts to have withdrawn the offer by the Commonwealth Government to hand the land over to the Housing Commission.

Following my interest in the subject the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport re-examined the matter. On 11th September, 1979, the property was again offered to the New South Wales Government by the Department of Administrative Services for the sum of \$327,000 and on 30th October, 1979, it was accepted by the Minister for Housing at that price. That was acknowledged by the Commonwealth Government on 14th November, 1979. On 22nd February, 1980, the federal Department of Administrative Services confirmed that it was awaiting ministerial approval to transfer the property to the New South Wales Government. However, on 22nd November, 1980, the Minister for Administrative Services advised the State Minister for Housing that the offer had been withdrawn for the reason—which I submit is a spurious one—that he had ascertained that the land was to be zoned for medium density housing and that put a higher value on the site than had been envisaged. He withdrew the offer for sale.

On 23rd January, 1981, the New South Wales Minister for Housing renewed the offer to purchase the land and gave an unconditional undertaking that the land would be used only for cottage development. One would have expected the Commonwealth Government to honour its former undertaking to sell the land and to transfer it to the State Government, but that was not to be the case. The next thing that happened was that on Monday 16th March, the federal member for Dundas, Mr Phillip Ruddock, and the Minister for Administrative Services in the Commonwealth Government, the Hon. K. E. Newman, visited the site. Last Saturday, 21st March, the federal member for Dundas organized a protest meeting with Mr Zammit, the Liberal candidate for the State seat of Parramatta.

Although I was not there for the whole of the time, I understand 100 people attended the meeting. I was busy at another function and got there in time to see a disgraceful performance. The federal member for Dundas had whipped up a feeling of hatred among the people who reside near the site; he had them terrified about the alleged loss in value of their properties should the so-called dreadful Housing Commission people settle in their midst. I was amazed at the way the local residents were carrying on. They appeared to be emotionally disturbed. Mr Ruddock, the federal member for Dundas, has a great deal to answer for.

Mr McIlwaine: He is a fraud.

Mr WILDE: The federal member for Dundas is indeed a fraud, as the honourable member for Yaralla has so rightly observed, for the despicable manner in which he behaved at that meeting. One woman came to me and said an estate agent had told her that the loss in value of what she termed the ordinary houses across the street would be \$10,000 if the Housing Commission ever built on the subject site. She said to me: "What do you think it would do to my home? My home is worth much more than those modest houses across the street." I said, "Where do you think those people should live?" She said: "Let them go out to Mount Druitt or Campbelltown; there is plenty of space for them there. That is where they should be put." There was talk about taking up a petition to seek to have the land rezoned, and requesting the federal Minister for Services to order that it be given to the State on the condition that it was used for recreational purposes. There is a great deal of open space in the immediate vicinity of this site. The proposal by the Housing Commission would require 1½ hectares of land being made available for open space.

Some people at the meeting spoke about the lack of open space and the need for recreational facilities which the site could provide. I asked those people, "Are you really genuine about the need for recreational facilities, or is it a case of you not wanting more Rousing Commission people living in the area?" More than one person replied, "We are really concerned at the social stigma of living near people in Housing Commission accommodation, which brings with it many social problems." To their eternal shame, the federal member for Dundas and the endorsed Liberal candidate for Parramatta did not say a word to dissociate themselves from the disgraceful attitude of those people. At least the meeting had one result: it brought Mr Ruddock, the federal member for Dundas out in the open and it confirmed his despicable action, as reported in the *Sun-Herald* in March and April, 1979. On those occasions a news commentator, Mr O'Reilly, broke the story that certain members of the federal Government were doing their best to keep the Housing Commission from acquiring surplus Commonwealth land.

On 14th January, in a letter to a local newspaper, Mr Ruddock denied he had applied any pressure on the federal Government to withdraw its offer. Now that he is out in the open we can see what he has done about this issue. Perhaps he was trying to get at the Housing Commission from another angle. In the Parramatta State electorate there are 3 385 Housing Commission dwellings. Ryde, which is also within the federal member's constituency, has 2 946 Housing Commission dwellings. In other words there are 6 331 properties developed by the Housing Commission in the electorate that member represents. A substantial proportion of those dwellings are cottages which were sold to former tenants and in many cases they again changed hands subsequently. New owners or potential purchasers of those homes have never evidenced any consciousness or concern at the alleged social stigma of residing alongside Housing Commission tenants. It was a direct insult to people who live in those homes—or indeed those who have resided in them—that their federal representative should take such a despicable attitude towards them. In fact, Mr Ruddock said that the land would be handed to the Housing Commission of New South Wales only over his dead body. The Liberal candidate for Parramatta said he would be writing to the federal Minister for Services to object to the proposals.

The need for housing is pressing. In fact, it is the cause of more representations to members of parliament than almost any other need. There is a desperate need for Housing Commission accommodation. The problem should be approached on a bipartisan basis. We should do all we can to provide homes at the lowest cost and in the best possible locations. The land in issue will provide an opportunity to build modest homes on perhaps twenty to thirty-five sites. The federal member, who suggested that persons in need of homes should be sent to Mount Druitt or Campbelltown, must realize that he is supposed to represent all his constituents and not only the

**affluent** members of his electorate. I deplore the manner in which he **and his** Liberal Party colleagues have sought to divide the community. They have set about whipping up a false campaign to cook up a petition to take to the federal Minister for Services to boost the stand he has already taken, namely, not to make this land available for Housing Commission accommodation.

Mr Ryan: It is a play on human emotions.

Mr WILDE: I agree. There are at least fifty Housing Commission dwellings within half a kilometre of this site, but they do not seem to have had any detrimental effect on the value of nearby homes. I believe that nearby residents are not concerned that more Housing Commission tenants will come to the area. Some residents have had their thinking influenced by the type of person they have been associated with in the past. I am pleased to welcome Housing Commission tenants into the Parramatta electorate. The vast majority of such persons evidence great pride in their homes and they make a valuable contribution to the community. I am sure that the objections raised have been expressed by only a small group of people, and that the vast majority of residents would welcome the presence of Housing Commission tenants in that small area. I am sure the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport will not be deterred by the callous, selfish, and despicable attitude of the federal member for Dundas and the Liberal candidate for Parramatta. I **press for the** immediate transfer of this land and its development by the Housing Commission.

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

Mr SHEAHAN (Burrinjuck), Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport [10.27]: The honourable member for Parramatta is well-known for the sincere way he represents his constituents **and for the** great interest he takes in the provision for persons in his area—and in New South Wales in general—of suitable Housing Commission accommodation if they cannot satisfy their housing needs independently. The honourable member for Parramatta described some aspects of this matter as spurious, and indeed they are. Those of us who had a warm regard for the father of the present member for Dundas are amazed to hear what the honourable member for Parramatta has said about that member. Obviously he is responsible for the federal Government pulling out of the original deal made with a State authority some considerable time ago regarding the provision of **this** worthwhile site for the needs of the New South Wales Housing Commission. The false claim about a need for recreational space is typical of the attitude taken by those who wish to resist the provision of much-needed housing at this site. It sounds like what we have come to expect from the federal member for Dundas. It comes as no surprise that the attitude of those persons who support that member is that they object to the social stigma of having **people** living nearby in Housing Commission accommodation.

I commend the honourable member for Parramatta for raising this issue and for judging the federal member for Dundas guilty of a direct insult to his constituents and those persons who need Housing Commission accommodation. I am disappointed to hear that the federal member for Dundas has also apparently retracted his published comment regarding this site and his attitude to it. The honourable member for Parramatta said that, although the federal member for Dundas is obviously anti-Housing Commission and its tenants, he has more than 6 300 commission dwellings in his electorate—that is, 15 000 of his constituents are in homes provided by the Government. A quarter of his constituents reside in Housing Commission accommodation. The honourable member for Parramatta has disclosed a disgraceful situation. According to my officers and the honourable member for Parramatta, this land is eminently suitable for Housing Commission development. Further, other Housing Commission buildings are in close proximity to the area. The residents of those homes

have been insulted by the actions of the federal member for Dundas—and by the honourable member for The Hills, who has attempted to interject during the course of this debate.

Residents of the Parramatta electorate, and particularly those persons who have a pre-emptive right to be housed by the Housing Commission in that area, are aware that there is a waiting period of three years because of federal Government cutbacks in funding—no doubt supported by the honourable member for Dundas as they are by the honourable member for The Hills, the honourable member for Northcott and other members of the Opposition in this Parliament. As well as being guilty of complicity in this callous cutback in funding, the federal member for Dundas has taken the short-sighted and narrow-minded attitude of opposing the endeavours of the New South Wales Government, the Housing Commission and the honourable member for Parramatta to ensure that this valuable piece of land on which housing accommodation could be provided for **needy persons** is used to the best advantage. The honourable member for Dundas has taken a callous attitude towards this proposal, but that is typical of the lack of co-operation this Government expects from the Commonwealth. At ministerial conferences on housing the voting is usually one to seven—that is, the Commonwealth voting against all the States.

I commend the honourable member for Parramatta for bringing this serious matter to the attention of residents in his electorate and those in the federal electorate of Dundas. The issue has been taken out of our hands while delicate negotiations have gone on between the State and Commonwealth authorities. Correspondence has **passed** between me and the federal Minister for Administrative Services. However, up to the time I walked into this House this afternoon I had received no reply to my most recent letter. The people of the district have been told by the federal member for Dundas that they will have Housing Commission accommodation in that area only over his dead body. I hope it will not be long before the honourable member's **political** death is achieved and this worthwhile project, which is supported by the honourable member for Parramatta, can go ahead.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at **10.31** p.m.

---

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

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

#### PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

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

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

**Answer—**

The answer is provided in the attached schedule under the **headings** of **Classification and Salary Range; Duties; Qualifications and Experience; Number of Applicants.**

**PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT**

**Classification and Salary Range—Assistant Exhibitions Officer, Elizabeth Bay House; \$11,429—\$11,974.**

**Duties—Assist in the design, construction and mounting of temporary exhibitions; create special display effects, models, assist in the design of posters, catalogues, and in the display, cleaning and conservation of the permanent collection. Responsible for the packing and storage of exhibition items. Applicants will need to be versatile and undertake a wide range of duties.**

**Qualifications and Experience—Essential, demonstrated practical experience in the construction of displays, exhibitions, or stage sets. Desirable—completion of a general design course.**

**No. of Applicants—21.**

**Classification and Salary Range—Stenographer, Grade 1, Secretary to the Director, Australian Museum; \$12,137—\$12,479.**

**Duties—Secretary to the Director, including typing of correspondence and reports, preparation and despatch of agendas and minutes of meetings, filing of correspondence, arrangement of appointments and organizing travel arrangements.**

**Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Shorthand speed of 100 wpm and typing speed of 60 wpm and experience in a wide range of secretarial services. Applicants must pass shorthand and typing tests prior to entry on duty and satisfy medical requirements for permanent appointment to the Service. Desirable—previous executive secretarial experience, ability to communicate at all levels and experience in office procedures.**

**No. of Applicants—16.**

**Classification and Salary Range—Translator/Interpreter-in-Charge (Chinese Language Translating and Interpreting Section), Ethnic Affairs Commission; \$15,662—\$16,892.**

**Duties—Responsible for the initial establishment and operation of a Chinese Language Translating and Interpreting Section. The Section is being established to provide a high standard translating and interpreting service in the Chinese language for the public and private sectors.**

**Qualifications and Experience—Essential—proven administrative ability, training and experience as a translator and interpreter from and into the Chinese language (Mandarin dialect) at N.A.A.T.I. Level III. Must be an effective oral and written communicator in English and Chinese and possess initiative and an ability to lead and motivate staff. Ability to use (or to be trained to use) Chinese Typewriter facilities. Ability to liaise with people at senior level in both the public and private sectors. Desirable—appropriate tertiary qualifications, commercial experience, especially in international trade.**

**No. of Applicants—25.**

**5066 ASSEMBLY—Questions upon Notice**

Classification and Salary Range—Translator/Interpreter (Chinese Language Translating and Interpreting Section), Ethnic Affairs Commission; \$9,867—\$15,206.

Duties—Responsible for the re-writing, editing and translation of material in the Chinese and English languages; high level interpreting duties as required; assist the public and private sectors in matters which involve written and oral communication in the Chinese and English languages.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—proven interpreting and translating ability from and into the Chinese language (Mandarin dialect) at N.A.A.T.I. Level III, Higher School Certificate or equivalent. Ability to use (or to be trained to use) Chinese typewriter facilities. Desirable—Appropriate tertiary qualifications, commercial experience, especially working across languages.

No. of Applicants—57.

Classification and Salary Range—Administration Officer—N.S.W., Government Office, Tokyo. \$20,495—\$22,521; (Plus a representation allowance).

Duties—Responsible to the Commissioner for the management of the Office and its day-to-day administrative operations; liaison with the Australian Embassy and various Japanese and New South Wales commercial and Government organizations; assistance with the provision of hospitality to visitors; undertakes field promotional activities and investigations as required.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—broad administrative experience at senior level, a good general knowledge of the Government's functions and activities, must be an effective communicator and have a genuine interest in promoting New South Wales.

No. of Applicants—77.

Classification and Salary Range—Project Officer (Aboriginals)—Anti-Discrimination Board; \$17,994—\$18,538.

Duties—Disseminate information about the Anti-Discrimination Act, 1977, and how Aboriginals can exercise their rights under it; work with the Aboriginal community and the wider community in the elimination of discrimination against Aboriginals; undertake field trips, investigations and special projects concerned with discrimination against Aboriginals; participate in public meetings, seminars and workshops as part of the Board's community education programme.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—applicants must have had experience in Aboriginal affairs; have the ability to communicate with Aboriginal people and possess an understanding of the discrimination which Aboriginals suffer. Formal qualifications are not essential but applicants must be able to demonstrate an ability to carry out the required duties. Desirable—good knowledge of Government functions and the sociological structure of the community generally.

No. of Applicants—72.

Classification and Salary Range—Director of Protocol; \$27,955—\$29,447.

Duties—Responsible for arranging the reception and entertainment of distinguished visitors to the State, the organization of Royal Visits and State functions, advising on questions of Protocol and Ceremonial, co-ordination of recommendations for

Honours and Awards, completion of formalities associated with the appointment of diplomatic and consular representatives. Preparation of major submissions to the Department Head and the Premier. Duty beyond normal hours and at weekends is involved.

Qualifications and Experience—The Director needs to have the capacity to give positive leadership and direction to a small group of Protocol officers and must possess a good presence, sound judgment and ability to communicate effectively at all levels. Must have broad administrative experience and an appreciation and understanding of the protocol role in the affairs of Government. Previous experience in Protocol Administration would be an advantage.

No. of Applicants—31.

Classification and Salary Range—Records Administration Officer, Archives and Records Management Office; \$19,205—\$21,135.

Duties—Responsible for the administration of the Records Management function; co-ordination and oversighting of a Service-wide records management programme; formulation of records management policy; initiation of new programmes to meet the needs of departments and to reflect modern trends in records management; promotion of the services offered through liaison with Service personnel, addresses and lectures. The selected applicant will be required to maintain an awareness of developments in information retrieval systems and to represent at relevant conferences and association meetings.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—extensive knowledge of modern records management theory and practice; experience in administration; demonstrated ability to co-ordinate an existing Service-wide records management programme and to initiate new programmes; ability to liaise at all levels.

No. of Applicants—12.

Classification and Salary Range—Staff Development Officer, Grade 6/7 Management Division; \$17,994—\$19,747.

Duties—This is a challenging position offering the opportunity to initiate and carry through innovative programmes over the broad range of activities under the Department's administration. The appointee will be responsible to the Co-ordinator, Equal Employment Opportunity and Staff Development programmes, providing advisory services to management, and career counselling for all staff members.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—an appropriate degree, diploma or equivalent. Substantial experience in the training and development field, and an understanding of the staff development function in the Public Service. Desirable—experience in management training and in the use of experiential learning techniques, an understanding of organizational structures coupled with some administrative experience and communication and advisory ability.

No. of Applicants—15.

Classification and Salary Range—Industrial Marketing and Research Officer, N.S.W. Government Office, Tokyo; \$20,495—\$22,521 +Representation Allowances.

Duties—Promotion of overseas trade and investment; research into matters relating to Japanese legislation, Government administration, business practices, new products and trends in technology and the economy; liaison with Government and commercial organizations.

Qualifications and Experience—Broad experience in marketing and trade promotion; a knowledge of industry especially in the manufacturing sector; research experience at a senior level; a good knowledge of Government functions; a genuine interest in promoting New South Wales; and tertiary qualifications in an appropriate discipline.

No. of Applicants—31.

Classification and Salary Range—Senior Administrative Assistant—Grade 12, Cabinet Secretariat and Public Service Division; \$27,955—\$29,447.

Duties—In addition to the supervisory role and Committee work, duties include examination of a wide range of matters relating to Government policy and administration, provision of advice and recommendations on such matters; development of Cabinet Minutes and submissions, preparation of major submissions and correspondence and of legislative proposals.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—sound experience in areas of major policy development and implementation. Must be creative, an effective communicator, able to work with considerable initiative and to contribute effectively to top level decision making. Must possess a sound knowledge of the functions of Government and of Government organizations. Desirable—experience in analysing matters relating to Government policy and Public Service Management. Experience in, and sound knowledge of, organization structures and functions including an understanding of the theory and practice of evaluating management strategies and organizational performance. Appropriate tertiary qualifications.

No. of Applicants—11.

Classification and Salary Range—Principal Archivist, Archives and Records Management Office, Sydney; \$27,189.

Duties—Responsible for the control and management of the State Archives and public records and for the Government records management programme. Preparation of reports and policy submissions for the Archives Authority.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—relevant tertiary qualifications and extensive administrative experience in the control of a public archives and records management programme.

No. of Applicants—1.

### *Royal Botanic Gardens*

Classification and Salary Range—Gardener, Leading Hand, \$11,703; plus appropriate Leading hand allowance.

Duties—Responsible to the Foreman for the maintenance of a collection of plant material of scientific and horticultural value; utilization and maintenance of specialized equipment; supervision, control and training of staff.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—possession of Horticulture Certificate from Ryde School of Horticulture or equivalent with a sound knowledge of ornamental plants. Desirable—previous experience in general horticulture and gardening activities with experience in the control and direction of staff.

No. of Applicants—14.

Classification and Salary Range—Gardener (3 positions) \$10,982 range \$11,703; according to qualifications and experience.

Duties—Responsible to the Foreman for horticulture practices and routine operations associated with the maintenance and development of the Royal Botanic Gardens and associated areas.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Horticulture Certificate from Ryde School of Horticulture or equivalent and completion of indentures in the Horticulture industry. Desirable—previous experience in maintenance of public gardens with emphasis on trees and shrubs in a wide variety or in the propagation and production of plant material.

No. of Applicants—23.

Classification and Salary Range—Technical Officer (Scientific); \$10,714—\$12,901.

Duties—Curation of herbarium specimen collections. Assistance in various aspects of botanical research and in botanical and advisory work.

Qualifications and Experience—Qualifications—completion of two years of Science or Agriculture degree course or completion of Biology certificate or equivalent with appropriate training in systematic botany essential. Experience in research procedures relevant to systematic botany in herbarium curation and plant identification.

No. of Applicants—42.

Classification and Salary Range—Groundsman; \$11,271.

Duties—Responsible to the Superintendent for the maintenance and development of sports fields and all phases of allied work including marking and preparation. Ensuring correct use of materials and equipment, supervising and directing staff.

Qualifications and Experience—Possession of Horticulture Certificate or Green-keeping Certificate from Ryde School of Horticulture or equivalent essential with a sound knowledge of turf maintenance. Experience in the maintenance of playing fields and general sports areas and in the direction and control of staff desirable.

No. of Applicants—2.

Classification **and Salary** Range—Gardener (Temporary); \$10,982—\$11,703 according to qualifications and experience.

Duties—Responsible to the Foreman (Landscape Section) for landscape development and maintenance of landscape projects within the Royal Botanic Gardens and associated areas.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Horticulture certificate from Ryde School of Horticulture or equivalent and completion of indentures in the horticulture industry. Desirable—previous experience in landscape construction and maintenance in public gardens. Also experience in the use of a range of appropriate equipment and light machinery.

No. of Applicants—5.

*Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences*

Classification and Salary Range—Restorer/Preparator (2); \$10,399—\$14,238 (Temporary position).

Duties—Restoring Museum's collections, especially Transport and Engineering and Technology items in locomotives, vehicles, furniture, musical instruments and clocks.

Qualifications and Experience—Trade or similar qualifications in an appropriate skill with a high manipulative ability. Experience in restoration work or with a wide range of materials highly desirable.

No. of Applicants—23.

*Australian Museum*

Classification and Salary Range—Cadet Preparator Junior \$6,702—\$8,617, Adult \$9,574—\$9,950; Assistant Preparator \$10,399—\$11,970; Preparator \$12,393—\$14,238.

Duties—Responsible to the Chief Preparator to assist in the preparation of natural history specimens for presentation in the Museum's exhibition galleries.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—New South Wales School Certificate or equivalent. Experience in preparation of specimens for display by taxidermy. Desirable—knowledge of some other exhibit preparation method in modelling; moulding and casting, model making, metal and plastic fabrication.

No. of Applicants—8.

Classification and Salary Range—Technical Officer (Scientific) Anthropology; Junior \$8,303—\$9,642; Adult \$10,713—\$14,472.

Duties—Assist with all aspects of the **curation** of, and research into, the Pacific Islands' anthropological collections of the Museum, and provide general **office** assistance.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—completion of a course in Anthropology equivalent to the Biological Technicians Certificate Course, or other relevant tertiary qualifications. Desirable—Training and experience in Museum practices and the material culture of the Pacific Islands.

No. of Applicants—21.

Classification and Salary Range—Education Officer; \$12,047 range **\$18,142**.

Duties—To organize and conduct educational programmes on the Museum Train for school classes and general visitors at N.S.W. country centres. To undertake for each term the organization of the Train's itinerary, publications, publicity, co-operation of local schools, etc. The Museum Train consists of two railway carriages—one for the exhibition itself, a second carriage with a teaching area and self-contained living space.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—degree or equivalent in Science, Arts or Education with Anthropology, Biology or Geology as major subjects. Desirable—teaching experience at infants, primary or secondary level.

No. of Applicants—24.

***Sydney Opera House***

Classification and Salary Range—Maintenance Programme Co-ordinator; \$15,817—\$16,829.

Duties—Supervise the preventive maintenance and scheduling of work programmes and maintain associated drawings. Prepare and analyse building management system data and supervise service contracts.

Qualifications and Experience—Appropriate trade certificate plus certificate in Electronics or Electrical Engineering. Experience in preventive maintenance and scheduling of work programmes. Basic knowledge of computers and programming.

No. of Applicants—8.

Classification and Salary Range—House Services Assistant, Grade 1; **\$9,975—\$10,192.**

Duties—Typing, attending to telephone inquiries, overlooking lost property register and prepare daily lists for parking.

Qualifications and Experience—30 wpm typing. Experience in handling inquiries, direct from public and by telephone.

No. of Applicants—12.

Classification and Salary Range—Electrical Fitter/Mechanic (two positions); \$245.90 p.w.

Duties—Maintain all electrical installations and repair electrical motor breakdowns and rewiring.

Qualifications and Experience—N.S.W. Electrician's Licence. Experience in building electrical maintenance and installation.

No. of Applicants—15.

**AUDITOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT**

Classification and Salary Range—Assistant Auditor (various positions); **\$14,235—\$15,549.**

Duties—The conduct of minor audits (including the examination of and reporting on balance sheets and profit and loss accounts) and country inspections where the officer is not under any immediate supervision or direction. Assisting on major audits and working in conjunction with and under the direction of senior officers. Direction, discipline and supervision of support staff assigned to the audit.

Qualifications and Experience—Successful completion of the three stages of the Commerce Diploma Course of the N.S.W. Institute of Technology or qualifications deemed by the Public Service Board to be appropriate and equivalent thereto. A sound knowledge and experience of book-keeping and accounts and of the principles of accountancy and auditing. Capable of understanding and applying the provisions of Acts of Parliament and Regulations. Experience in auditing or accounts inspection work. Capacity to supervise assistants and to carry out audit work involving contact with all levels of staff of departments and statutory corporations. Ability to write accurate, clear and concise reports.

**No. of Applicants—32.**

**PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Classification and Salary Range—Senior Project Officer; \$19,205—\$21,135.

Duties—Responsible for the development of special training packages and programmes relevant to equal employment opportunity; and the production of English and multilingual information and publications on personnel policies. Advise on, or arrange and conduct, training programmes for appropriate Departmental officers, and supervise a small number of staff.

Qualifications and Experience—Demonstrated competence in the preparation of effective training and/or information packages. Awareness of current issues relating to personnel policy, equal opportunity, and the needs of disadvantaged groups. Ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing. Relevant tertiary qualifications.

No. of Applicants—8.

Classification and Salary Range—Assistant Director, Audit and Investigation; \$30,972 + \$329.

Duties—Responsible to the Director of the Division for the conduct of a programme of efficiency audits of functions and activities of Departments and Declared Authorities as approved or directed by the Premier; participation as may be required in special inquiries; required to ensure the effective utilization of the Division's resources.

Qualifications and Experience—Appropriate tertiary qualifications, Broad management experience and proven performance at a senior level. Possession of communication and analytical skills.

No. of Applicants—17.

Classification and Salary Range—Assistant Director (Legal) Industrial Relations; \$30,972 + \$329.

Duties—Responsible for the preparation of submissions involving legal advice to the Board in regard to industrial and associated matters; and Discipline and promotion appeals and supervision of staff undertaking these activities. Supervision of the preparation and presentation of matters before the Industrial Commission, Crown Employees Appeal Board and Promotions Appeal Tribunal involving discipline and appeals.

Qualifications and Experience—Legal qualifications essential. Applicants should also be experienced in the industrial relations field.

No. of Applicants—8.

Classification and Salary Range—Senior Policy and Advisory Officer; \$20,495—\$23,905.

Duties—Senior Officer responsible for a wide range of personnel policies, practices and procedures, with particular reference to entry policies relating to recruitment, selection, permanent appointment, including employment of disadvantaged groups. Supervise and co-ordinate the activities of a small team of Policy and Advisory Officers. Review and monitor personnel practices of Departments and Declared Authorities, provide advice and assistance, and conduct special projects and programmes as required.

Qualifications and Experience—Demonstrated awareness of current issues relating to personnel policy and equal opportunity and competence in the preparation of written material. Relevant tertiary qualifications.

No. of Applicants—17.

Classification and Salary Range—Apprenticeships(Award Rates).

Duties—167 Apprenticeships covering 24 different trades—various Departments.

Qualifications and Experience—Currently in Year 10; having completed Year 10, or equivalent interstate or overseas; enrolled in a pre-apprenticeship course; OR having completed a pre-apprenticeship course.

No. of Applicants—3,746.

**N.S.W. TREASURY—(Head Office)**

Classification and Salary Range—Poker Machine Review Officer; \$17,994—\$19,747.

Duties—To advise on the suitability of poker machines for licensing, and other policy matters relating to poker machines.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Tertiary qualification incorporating a major or specialization in statistics and/or mathematics. Must have a thorough knowledge of theory of probability and other statistical techniques. Demonstrated ability to advise on policy matters, and be capable of maintaining effective liaison on a person-to-person basis with managements of poker machine suppliers and clubs. Desirable—Advantageous to have had experience in poker machine matters.

No. of applicants—5.

Classification and Salary Range—Economic Assistant; \$13,367—\$17,341.

Duties—Assist in research and policy studies in the Economist's Branch of the Treasury relating to the domestic and international economy and financial markets, inter-governmental financial relations and economic and financial analysis of development projects policy proposals and taxation.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Degree in economics, commerce or arts (economics) or equivalent. Desirable—Some experience in the interpretation and analysis of official statistics or accounting information, and the preparation of reports thereon.

No. of Applicants—29.

**GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE**

Classification and Salary Range—Cost Control Officer; \$10,696—\$11,301.

Duties—Advise Motor Vehicle Assessors and Branch Managers of Motor Vehicle spare parts costs, examining repair accounts to ensure an effective control over costs and parts and preparing accounts for payment.

Qualifications and Experience—Applicants should have had at least 5 years experience as a Senior Parts Officer with a Motor Car Distributor or a Trade Accessory House and should be capable of preparing correspondence.

No. of Applicants—3.

Classification and Salary Range—Investigating Officer (2 positions); **\$10,548–\$12,985.**

Duties—Carry out investigations and obtain statements in respect of third party and motor vehicle insurance claims.

Qualifications and Experience—Previous experience in investigating work, preferably in the insurance field. Must be prepared to undertake some country work and must have a current driver's licence.

No. of Applicants—34.

Classification and Salary Range—Clerk, Supervisor Marine Section; **\$14,235–\$15,548.**

Duties—Responsible for the efficient running of the Marine Section engaged in the underwriting, renewal and adjustment of marine, engineering and construction insurances.

Qualifications and Experience—Sound knowledge of Marine insurances, positive approach to and understanding of sales and marketing strategies, ability to supervise staff effectively, ability to draft documents and prepare reports and a knowledge of engineering and construction insurances desirable.

No. of Applicants—6.

Classification and Salary Range—Legal Officer (3 positions); **\$14,859–\$22,200.**

Duties—Preparation of defence of third party actions in the Supreme or District Courts.

Qualifications and Experience—Eligible for admission as a Solicitor or Barrister to the Supreme Court of N.S.W. and sound experience in Third Party litigation desired.

No. of Applicants—19.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr EGAN asked the Minister for **Industrial** Relations and Minister for **Energy**—

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

(2) What were the duties of, and qualifications and experience required for, each position?

(3) How many applications were received for each position?

*Answer—*

(1), (2) and (3) *The* following schedules set out the information requested from my administration:

A. Electricity Commission of N.S.W.

B. Energy Authority of N.S.W.

- C. Department of Industrial Relations.
- D. State Superannuation Board.
- E. Local Government Superannuation Board.

**DETAILS OF POSITIONS ADVERTISED OUTSIDE THE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION IN  
JUNE AND JULY 1980**

Schedule A

Position—Professional Engineer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$264.00–\$495.00.

Qualifications—Engineering.

Duties—Engineering associated with the planning, design, construction or maintenance of transmission lines or high voltage substations, planning of major power projects, power plant design and administration of associated contracts and operation and maintenance of Power Stations.

Experience—From graduate engineer to engineer of some years' experience capable of supervising professional engineers and sub-professional staff.

No. of Applicants—47.

Position—Architect,

Current Weekly Salary—\$264.60–\$397.20.

Qualifications—Architecture.

Duties—Preparation of sketch plans, working drawings, details and specifications for industrial type buildings.

Experience—From graduate architect to architect with some years' experience, capable of supervising sub-professional staff.

No. of Applicants—5.

Position—Coal Geologist.

Current Weekly Salary—\$264.60–\$432.10.

Qualifications—Degree in Science with major in Geology.

Duties—The exploration for, evaluation and development of coal resources.

Experience—Exploration and coalmine geology.

No. of Applicants—2.

Position—Helicopter Pilot.

Current Weekly Salary—\$430.50.

Qualifications—Current Commercial helicopters pilots' licence.

Duties—Operate and administer a helicopter service on routine and emergency patrolling of transmission lines throughout the State.

Experience—Have a minimum of 1 200 hours' helicopter command experience and experience on Bell 206B or similar light turbine helicopters and experience in low level operations.

**No. of Applicants—10.**

Position—Industrial Officer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$472.30–\$485.70.

Qualifications—Qualifications at Degree, Diploma or Certificate level in an appropriate field.

Duties—Assistance at senior levels in the handling of industrial matters including advocating as directed before industrial tribunals.

Experience—Experience in Industrial Relations, personnel or timekeeping work, preparation of reports and submissions, formal advocacy or the presentation of submissions orally.

No. of Applicants—7.

Position—Valuer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$311.20–\$472.30.

Qualifications—Corporate membership of the Australian Institute of Valuers.

Duties—Valuation duties in respect of real estate.

Experience—Experience in a wide range of real property valuations and property negotiations.

No. of Applicants—35.

Position—Property Inspector.

Current Weekly Salary—\$295.60–\$323.50.

Qualifications—Diploma or Certificate Course in valuation of Real Estate, or qualifications in Agriculture.

Duties—Interviewing Property Owners or Legal Representatives in respect of Acquisition of Land or Easement Right.

Experience—Experience in property negotiations.

No. of Applicants—79.

Position—Drafting Officer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$259.60–\$336.10.

Qualifications—Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—Preparation of Design and Detail Drawings for plant and equipment associated with major power stations or transmission plant and equipment.

Experience—3 years' drafting experience.

No. of Applicants—30.

Position—Technical Officer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$275.10–\$336.10.

Qualifications—Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate plus the Electrical Engineering Certificate or completion of an Apprenticeship and possess the Electrical Engineering Certificate or have completed 3 years on an appropriate part-time degree or diploma course.

Duties—Generally assist Engineering Staff in technical duties.

Experience—Appropriate practical technical experience.

No. of Applicants—22.

Position—Inspector Power Station Construction Sites.

Current Weekly Salary—\$382.70–\$430.50.

Qualifications—Fitting and Machining (General Engineering) Trade Course Certificate plus the Mechanical Engineering Certificate or completion of 3 years of a part-time degree or diploma course.

Duties—Inspect and test mechanical plant for power stations.

Experience—Appropriate practical technical experience. Experience in various welding techniques.

No. of Applicants—4.

Position—Technical Assistant.

Current Weekly Salary—\$259.60–\$311.20.

Qualifications—Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate **or** the Fitting and Machining (General Engineering) Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—Ordering and recording of parts and materials and carrying out routine inspections.

Experience—Experience in equipment maintenance as used in large industrial undertakings and maintaining records of such equipment.

No. of Applicants—3.

Position—Technician.

Current Weekly Salary—\$275.10–\$336.10.

Qualifications—Radio Trade Course Certificate or the Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate. Electronics and Communications Certificate is a desirable qualification.

Duties—Instal and maintain communication **and/or** telemetering equipment in the Wagga Region.

Experience—Experience in one or more of the following: telephony, carrier speech and data transmission systems; U.H.F. radio systems; V.H.F. and H.F. radio systems and digital electronics as applied to electronic control systems or **electronic** data processing equipment.

No. of applicants—11.

5078 ASSEMBLY-Questions upon Notice

Position—Power Station Technician.

Current Weekly Salary—\$295.60—\$336.10.

Qualifications—Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate plus the Electrical Engineering Certificate.

Duties—Maintenance of on-line computer and data logger including internals, peripheral equipment and associated detectors and transmitters, solid state electronic automatic control equipment and general power station instrumentation.

No. of Applicants—4.

Position—Clerk.

Current Weekly Salary—\$154.30—\$283.70.

Qualifications—Higher School Certificate.

Duties—Clerical duties in country and metropolitan centres.

Experience—Previous experience in clerical duties including timekeeping, paying duties, stores work and accounts or administrative work.

No. of applicants—95.

Position—Stenographer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$154.30—\$231.50.

Qualifications—Ability to type at 40 w.p.m. and write shorthand at 80 w.p.m.

Duties—Typing and stenographic duties.

No. of applicants—3.

Position—Machine Operator.

Current Weekly Salary—\$154.30—\$224.10.

Qualifications—School Certificate.

Duties—Routine data entry of commercial and technical source records.

Experience—Two years experience in Punched Card and/or key to tape operations.

No. of Applicants—12.

Position—Electrical Fitter.

Current Weekly Salary—\$231.50.

Qualifications—Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—Maintenance and installation of electrical equipment, including High Voltage Switchgear, transformers, relays, motors and lighting services.

No. of applicants—75.

Position—Carpenter.

Current Weekly Salary—\$233.30.

Qualifications—The Carpentry and Joinery Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—General joinery and maintenance work.

No. of applicants—12.

Position—Instrument and Control Fitter.

Current Weekly Salary—\$264.20.

Qualifications—Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate OR Fitting and Machining (General Engineering) Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—Maintain power station instrument and control systems.

No. of applicants—15.

Position—Certificated **Boilermaker/Welder**.

Current Weekly Salary—\$233.40.

Qualifications—Boilermaking Trade Course Certificate; Department of Industrial Relations and Technology permits in accordance with Australian Standard Code AS 179611975.

Duties—Boilermaking work.

No. of applicants—30.

Position—Painter.

Current Weekly Salary—\$229.60.

Qualifications—The Painting and Decorating Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—General painting work.

No. of applicants—6.

Position—Fitter and Turner.

Current Weekly Salary—\$229.20.

Qualifications—Possess the Fitting and Machining (General Engineering) Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—General Fitting and Machining associated with boilers, turbines and auxiliary equipment.

No. of applicants—6.

5080 ASSEMBLY—Questions upon Notice

Position—Signwriter.

Current Weekly Salary—\$233.00.

Qualifications—The Painting and Decorating Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—Signwriting and painting work.

No. of applicants—1.

Position—Plumber.

Current Weekly Salary—\$233.50.

Qualifications—Plumbing Trade Course Certificate.

Duties—Water, gas and drainage work, plumbing maintenance and installations.

No. of applicants—1.

Position—Apprentices—Various Trades.

Current Weekly Salary—\$114.70–\$177.90.

Qualifications—School Certificate.

Duties—To be trained in various trade vocations including Electrical Fitter, Fitter and Turner, Carpenter, Boilermaker, Motor Mechanic, Painter, etc.

No. of applicants—5,791.

Position—Storeman.

Current Weekly Salary—\$201.20.

Duties—Receipt, Issue and Custody of Stores.

Experience—Experience in receipt, issue and custody of stores.

No. of applicants—22.

Position—Tradesmans Assistant.

Current Weekly Salary—\$193.70.

Duties—Assisting trades staff generally.

Experience—A knowledge of tools and equipment used by electrical and construction trades staff.

No. of applicants—13.

Position—Auxiliary Plant Attendant.

Current Weekly Salary—\$233.80.

Duties—Assisting in the operation of power station plant.

Experience—Electrical or Mechanical trade experience.

No. of applicants—58.

Position—Labourer.

Current Weekly Salary—\$192.50.

Duties—General cleaning and labouring duties associated with a Power Station or Transmission Centre.

No. of applicants—341.

Position—Material Handler.

Current Weekly Salary—\$202.50.

Duties—Movement of stores and equipment.

Experience—Desirable they have experience in the receipt, issue and custody of stores.

No. of applicants—30.

Position—Junior Messenger.

Current Weekly Salary—\$82.90–\$156.60.

Duties—General messenger type duties.

No. of applicants—60.

#### Schedule B

Classification—Senior Research Officer.

Salary—\$19,268 range \$19,844.

Duties—Responsible for investigations in a full range of energy policy areas including energy statistics, modelling, pricing. Organize and undertake comprehensive studies of energy supply options and policy issues and implement accepted strategies. Prepare technical and non-technical statement brochures and booklets relating to energy and energy resources.

Qualifications—Professional qualifications in a discipline appropriate to energy policy and research projects.

Experience—Experience in the development and evaluation of detailed policy issues involving technical economic and social aspects. Practical experience in the energy field.

Applications received—9.

Classification—Engineer, Grade 3.

Salary—\$19,723 range \$21,742.

Duties—Responsible for the investigation, research, and evaluation of the potential for conversion of coal to liquid fuels in New South Wales. Maintain close liaison with industry, and authorities of the Commonwealth and the other States on all aspects of coal conversion. Responsible for the activities of the officers in the Coal Conversion Section.

Qualifications—Professional qualification in engineering, preferably chemical or mechanical, acceptable to the Institution of Engineers, Australia for corporate membership.

Experience—Experience in the oil, coal, or chemical industries. Ability to communicate at a senior level, and lead a small specialist team of professional and technical staff. Experience with, or a knowledge of, the New South Wales coal industry, processes for liquefaction or gasification of coal, or the manufacture of liquid transport fuels. Experience in policy formulation and implementation, and in the preparation of reports.

Applications received—8.

Classification—Engineer, Grade 1/2.

Salary—\$12,315 range \$18,726.

Duties—Investigation of fuel economy related aspects of motor vehicle technology, including engine developments, emission controls, and fuel specifications. Investigation of vehicle response to alternative fuels. Establishing liaison with government, commercial and industrial sectors on these issues.

Qualifications—Professional qualifications in engineering acceptable to the Institution of Engineers, Australia for graduate membership.

Experience—Experience with motor vehicle engine technology, fuel technology, or vehicle emissions control.

Applications received—3.

Classification—Engineer, Grade 4.

Salary—\$22,743 range \$24,108.

Duties—Responsible for the day-to-day administration of the Gas and Electricity Act, and related matters. Maintain liaison with gas undertakings, Government Departments and industry. Represent the Authority on Committees associated with gas industry matters. Arrange for, and sit on Boards of Inquiry into gas company tariffs, and advise on the management of the New South Wales gas industry in all respects.

Qualifications—Qualifications in a branch of engineering which would satisfy, without further examination, the Institution of Engineers, Australia, for the grade of Corporate Member.

Experience—Demonstrated ability to negotiate within industry at a high level on technical and commercial matters. Considerable experience in the gas or related industry.

Applications received—4.

Classification—Inspector E.A. (2 positions).

Salary—\$13,250 range \$17,663.

Duties—Inspect and report on procedures followed throughout N.S.W. in carrying out overhead line work. Inspect equipment submitted by manufacturers for use in overhead line construction. Assist in field training of overhead line workers.

Qualifications—Electrical Fitters and Mechanics Trade Course Certificate or equivalent, plus Electrical Engineering Certificate or equivalent **or** completion of 3 years of an appropriate part-time degree or diploma course plus appropriate practical technical experience or Electrical Engineering Certificate or equivalent plus completion of an apprenticeship.

Experience—Experience in overhead line construction and maintenance. Experience in report writing and lecturing.

Applications received—3.

Classification—Engineer, Grade 5.

Salary—\$25,139 range \$25,638.

Duties—Responsible for the provision of services to Energy Authority Management, Government and Industry and individuals on energy related matters. To lead a small specialist team to give management and technical support to senior Advisory Committees of the Energy Authority, to arrange the evaluation and investigation of energy related inventions and new technology and to co-ordinate assessment of energy data from the public and the private sector.

Initiate new functions within the staff and facilities available to the Energy Authority and participate in integration of the organization as required, the collection and presentation of energy related statistics and the publication of such special information.

Qualifications—Professional qualifications in Engineering equivalent to the requirements for Member Institution of Engineers Australia.

Experience—Considerable experience in negotiations at a senior level involving Government and Industry. Proven ability in oral and written communication at senior communication level. Training and experience related to the production or use of energy over the range of significant resources available in New South Wales.

Applications received—7.

#### Schedule C

#### JUNE

Position—Educational Planning Officer, Youth Employment Unit.

Salary—\$11,852 p.a. range \$18,142 p.a. (\$79.60 wage base).

Duties—Effective implementation of specific aspects of the job skills programme including micro-manpower studies in metropolitan and provincial areas, locating minor job skills in short supply and preparing curricula or course outlines for short training courses to equip unemployed persons with such skills. Confer and liaise with Federal and State Departments, including Technical and Further Education, Trade Unions and employers.

Qualifications and Experience—Tertiary qualifications. Honours or Masters in education an advantage. Technical education or industry training experience preferred.

Applications—In Service 4. Out Service 16.

Position—Typist, General Scale, Vocational Guidance Service, Armidale.

Salary—\$4,965 p.a. range \$9,781 p.a. (\$79.60 wage base).

Duties—Typing of reports, filing and associated clerical duties for professional staff. Answer telephone and counter enquiries from the general public.

Qualifications and Experience—Minimum typing speed of 30 w.p.m. Suitable office/clerical experience desirable.

Applications—In Service 2. Out Service 37.

Position—Industrial Inspector Sydney (3 positions).

Salary—\$11,148 p.a. range \$14,664 p.a.

Duties—Investigation and reporting of complaints alleging breaches of awards and industrial legislation administered by the Department. Required to take country tours.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Provenability to carry out investigations and interview employers and employees and write detailed and concise reports in relation to matters under the Industrial Arbitration Act and other legislation administered by the Department relating to the non-payment of wages and other monies to employees. A current driver's licence. Desirable—Knowledge of awards and industrial legislation and bi-lingual ability an advantage.

Applications—In Service 7. Out Service 8.

Position—Industrial Inspector Wollongong Inspectorate.

Salary—\$11,148 p.a. range \$14,664 p.a.

Duties—Investigation and reporting of complaints alleging breaches of awards and industrial legislation administered by the Department. Required to undertake country tours.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Provenability to carry out investigations and interview employers and employees and write detailed and concise reports in relation to matters under the Industrial Arbitration Act and other legislation administered by the Department relating to the non-payment of wages and other monies to employees. A current driver's licence. Desirable—Knowledge of awards and industrial legislation and bi-lingual ability an advantage.

Applications—In Service 6. Out Service 7.

#### **JUNE AND JULY**

Position—Apprenticeship Supervisor (Wollongong).

Salary—\$12,328 p.a. range \$16,299 p.a. + \$299 allowance.

Duties—Supervise the adequacy of training of apprentices in employers' workshops and advise and assist employers in the improvement of on-the-job training. Advise on training programmes and modern training techniques. Conduct training courses for instructors in industry. Conduct investigations regarding award conditions governing apprentices. Conciliate in disputes between employers and apprentices.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Completion of an apprenticeship in a major trade including the complementary technical college course. Experience in a technical or training position closely related to the work of craftsmen and apprentices. Desirable—Completion of a Certificate course in Engineering, Industrial Relations, Management or Personnel conducted by the Department of Technical and Further Education or equivalent.

Applications—In Service 4. Out Service 34.

Position—Apprenticeship Supervisors, Sydney (19 positions).

Salary—\$12,328 p.a. range \$16,229 p.a.

Duties—Supervise the adequacy of training of apprentices in employers' workshops and advise and assist employers in the improvements of on-the-job training. Advise on training programmes and modern training techniques. Conduct training courses for instructors in industry. Conduct investigations regarding award conditions governing apprentices. Conciliate in disputes between employers and apprentices.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Completion of an apprenticeship in a major trade including the complementary technical college course. Experience in a technical or training position closely related to the work of craftsmen and apprentices. Desirable—Completion of a Certificate course in Engineering, Industrial Relations, Management or Personnel, conducted by the Department of Technical and Further Education or equivalent.

Applications—In Service 27. Out Service 129.

## **JULY**

Position—Casual Tester, Maitland, Vocational Guidance Bureau.

Salary—Non-Graduate with 1 year psychology—\$6.26 per hour (\$79.60 wage base). Graduate with at least 1 year psychology—\$6.42 per hour (\$79.60 wage base). Graduate with major in psychology—\$6.96 per hour (\$79.60 wage base). (Rates to be reviewed.)

Duties—Testing of applicants for vocational guidance. Time involved will be subject to variation and up to a maximum of 30 hours per week during peak periods. Applicants must be prepared to travel within the District.

Qualifications and Experience—Appropriate formal qualifications in psychology at university level. A good speaking voice and experience in the supervision of people under examination conditions. Driver's licence and possession of own car essential.

Applications—In Service Nil. Out Service 14.

Position—Senior Research Officer, Youth Employment Unit.

Salary—\$22,549 p.a. (\$79.60 wage base).

Duties—Responsible to the Director for managing and undertaking long and short term planning and research tasks in the Unit. Supervising the activities of research and professional staff, planning and directing evaluation procedures for all programmes in the Unit, developing plans and policies relating to measures to combat the problems of unemployment.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—A degree in one of the social sciences, preferably with some statistics content. Experience and knowledge in human resources and training (or education) and the ability to lead and support other research officers. Sincere interest in youth problems.

Applications—In Service 4. Out Service 13.

Position—Research Officer, Youth Employment Unit.

Salary—\$12,047–\$18,142 p.a. (\$79.60 wage base) with progression to \$19,962 p.a. by way of two annual allowances, subject to meeting certain conditions.

Duties—Maintain statistics on the employment situation and carry out analysis and reports. Identify the effects of technological change on the employment prospects of all persons, especially young persons. Confer with employers and experts in the computer field on the progress of the Computer Industry Training Programme and the need for additional courses for programmers. Ascertain current training methodology in the Programme and prepare recommendations. Assist in the formation of new programmes for the unemployed.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—A degree in one of the social sciences. Knowledge of industry. Desirable—Experience or interest in industrial training.

Applications—In Service 11. Out Service 76.

Position—Apprenticeship Supervisor, Newcastle.

Salary—\$12,328 p.a. range \$16,229 p.a. plus \$299 allowance.

Duties—Supervise the adequacy of training of apprentices in employer's workshops and advise and assist employers in the improvement of on-the-job training. Advise on training programmes and modern training techniques. Conduct training courses for Instructors in industry. Conduct investigations regarding award conditions governing apprentices. Conciliate in disputes between employers and apprentices.

Qualifications and Experience—Essential—Completion of an apprenticeship in a major trade including the complementary technical college course. Experience in a technical or training position closely related to the work of craftsmen and apprentices. Desirable—Completion of a Certificate course in Engineering, Industrial Relations, Management or Personnel conducted by the Department of Technical and Further Education or equivalent.

Applications—In Service 5. Out Service 26.

Position—Technical Inspector (Boiler and Pressure Vessel Section) Sydney.

Salary—\$12,611 p.a. range \$16,229 p.a.

Duties—Examination of Engine Drivers and Boiler Attendants, investigations under the Engine Drivers' and Boiler Attendants' Regulations, review of design and specifications of Boiler and Pressure Vessels. Country tours of inspection involved.

Qualifications and Experience—First class M.O.T. Certificate steam or motor with steam experience or completed apprenticeship in an engineering trade and have subsequently obtained: (1) an approved Technical College Certificate in Engineering; and (2) at least three years experience in running and maintaining steam plant. Experience with refrigeration and internal combustion engines an advantage. Driver's licence essential.

Applications—In Service Nil. Out Service 1.

Schedule D

**STATE SUPERANNUATION BOARD**

Question 1—"Public Service Positions"

During June and July, 1980, there were a total of five positions advertised in the Metropolitan Press:

*Assistant Company Investment Manager*

Salary: Negotiable to \$26,463 according to qualifications and experience.

Duties: Responsible to the Company Investment Manager for monitoring and predicting economic trends and for the formulation of the Board's investment strategy and the subsequent implementation of its investment policy in relation to equity and **fixed** interest investments in the commercial sector and the optimal management of the public sector securities portfolio.

Qualifications: Essential—Recent and detailed experience over a lengthy period in the fields of equity and fixed interest investments with a financial institution, merchant bank or stock broker; appropriate tertiary qualifications.

Number of Applicants: Inside Service (3) Outside Service (1).

*Administrative Officer, Grade 6-7*

Salary: \$17,994 range \$19,747.

Duties: Assist in the management of the Branch; plan and supervise the **day-**to-day operations of the staff and personnel, training and staff development sections; oversight the service areas of records, document reproduction, pool vehicles and functions associated with the Board's **owner/occupier** status of its office premises including tenancy matters; participate in major reviews of systems and procedures and conduct investigations into the application of new technology.

Qualifications: Essential---Completion of a recognized tertiary **qualification**; experience in management, and demonstrated ability to ensure a wide range of services to management.

Number of Applicants: Inside Service (7) Outside Service (4).

*Supervising Legal Officer (Administration)*

Salary: Negotiable to \$25,148 according to qualifications and experience.

Duties: Negotiation and drafting of documentation associated with the **Board's** major investments other than property. Provision of advice on aspects affecting the administration of the State Superannuation Fund. Supervision of legal officers and ancillary staff engaged in these areas.

Qualifications: Essential—Admitted as a Barrister or Solicitor of the Supreme Court of N.S.W.; a minimum of three years' relevant experience in the field of corporate sector financing. Desirable—Experience in the management of legal activities in a commercial environment and the demonstrated capacity to provide top level legal advice.

Number of Applicants: Inside Service (1) Outside Service (5).

***Assistant Services Officer***

**Salary:** \$9,348 range **\$9,801.**

**Duties:** Responsible for the maintenance of the State Superannuation Board's vehicles and driving members of the Board to various metropolitan destinations; provide a courier service within the city and adjacent suburbs.

**Qualifications:** Possession of a current N.S.W. driver's licence is essential.

Number of Applicants: Inside Service (—) Outside Service (15).

***Legal Officer***

**Salary:** Negotiable to \$18,932 according to **qualifications** and experience with the opportunity to progress to \$21,346.

**Duties:** General legal work associated with the Board's investments in property and the capital market; advisings in relation to the Superannuation Act, 1916.

**Qualifications:** Essential—Admitted or qualified to be admitted as a Barrister or Solicitor of the Supreme Court of N.S.W. Desirable—Experience in one or more of the following areas: corporate finance, property investment or interpretation of statutes.

Number of Applicants: Inside Service (—) Outside Service (5).

Schedule E

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUPERANNUATION BOARD**

**Question—“Public Service Positions”**

During June and July, 1980, there were a total of three positions advertised in the Metropolitan Press:

***Assistant Internal Auditor***

**Salary:** \$14,800 **p.a.**

**Duties:** Assisting with implementation of Board's internal audit programme.

**Qualifications/Experience:** Completion or partial completion of appropriate accounting course and at least two years previous audit experience.

Number of Applicants: 16.

***Typist/Clerk***

**Salary:** \$10,500 **p.a.**

**Duties:** Typing of reports, statistical and financial schedules and legal documents.

Some clerical and filing duties.

**Experience:** Previous experience as a **typist/clerk.**

Number of Applicants: 7.

**Research Officer**

Salary: \$17,450 p.a.

Duties: Required to plan and develop a research programme including policy recommendations in respect to the administration and development of the **Local** Government Pension Fund.

**Qualifications/Experience:** Mature person with sound administration experience. Ability to **analyse** and resolve complex problems and write **high** level reports. Ability to work and liaise with staff at all levels.

Number of Applicants: 9.

**ELECTRICITY CHARGES**

**Mr HATTON asked** the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for **Energy**—

- (1) What is the average unit cost of electricity supplied to industry in New South Wales?
- (2) What is the unit charge for electricity supplied to
  - (a) the Alcan Aluminium Smelter at Kum;
  - (b) the **Alumax** Aluminium Smelter and
  - (c) the Pechiney Aluminium Smelter?
- (3) Will other electricity consumers be subsidizing the aluminium smelters?
- (4) If not, where is the revenue to provide cheap electricity to come from?
- (5) What is the approximate number of units of electricity used in the conversion of bauxite in its final stages to yield one tonne of aluminium metal?
- (6) What is the estimated number of units of electricity either used, or to be used, annually by—
  - (a) the Alcan Aluminium Smelter at Kurri;
  - (b) the **Alumax** Aluminium Smelter and
  - (c) the Pechiney Aluminium Smelter?

*Answer—*

(1) The average unit costs of electricity supplied by New South Wales county councils to industrial class customers, comprising large and small users, in the 1979 calendar year was 3.32 cents/kWh.

It is to be noted, however, that very large industrial customers would pay considerably less than these amounts. For instance, a customer with an energy intensive load of about 20 MW capacity would have paid 2.5 and 2.3 cents/kWh in the Sydney and Newcastle areas, respectively.

(2) The tariffs at which electricity is to be supplied to the Alumax and Pechiney aluminium smelters and at which it is being supplied to the Alcan smelter have been the subject of confidential commercial negotiations between the

Government and the companies concerned. Such information is regarded by the parties concerned as commercially sensitive information in regard to their trading activities and it has been the policy of successive governments that, in accordance with the agreements entered into, there should be no disclosure of the details of the applicable tariffs. However, as I said in the House on 24 February last in answer to a question on Electricity Charges, "On recent occasions the Premier and Treasurer and I have stated that at an appropriate time details of the tariffs arranged with the smelter companies will be made available. Those details will be released by the Premier and Treasurer or me either in Parliament or in a public statement."

(3) No.

(4) In supplying power directly to the aluminium smelters, the Electricity Commission gains a number of advantages which provide operating cost benefits. For instance, power to a smelter is supplied at a constant rate which is advantageous for load scheduling and gives the Commission a greater opportunity to use its most economical generating plant. Furthermore, supply to the smelters can be interrupted instantaneously by the Commission and this type of operation provides substantial economies in regard to the extent of reserve standby generating capacity needed. It should also be noted that domestic, commercial and small industrial customers take supply from electricity distribution councils, and tariffs charged to these customers must therefore cover the additional costs involved in retailing supply via a distribution network. Such costs are not reflected in the tariff to smelters as they take supply at very high voltage direct from the Commission.

(5) Approximately 14 000 kilowatthours of electrical energy are consumed to produce one tonne of aluminium from alumina.

(6) The annual energy consumption in 1986, the first year that all three smelters are planned to be operating at their full capacity, would be—

Alcan—2 200 million kWh.

Alurnax—3 200 million kWh.

Pechiney—3 200 million kWh

#### CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION

Mr ROBB asked the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice—

(1) Will appropriate educational programmes be developed for legal and medical practitioners to study the implications of compensation payments for physical and emotional injuries suffered by victims directly or indirectly as a result of criminal offences?

(2) Will victims, defendants and witnesses unfamiliar with court procedures be given an explanatory leaflet setting out in a full and comprehensive way, and yet in simple language, (a) the procedure in the court in which the matter would be heard and (b) what is expected of the person concerned?

(3) (a) Is the present scale of compensation to victims of crime adequate?  
(b) If not, will (i) the present scale be abolished and (ii) compensation be paid in accordance with increases in other compensation schemes?

(4) Will victims of crime have an express right of appeal to a court against inadequacy in compensation or error of law?

*Answer—*

(1) The quantum of compensation awards for physical and emotional injuries suffered by victims directly or indirectly as a result of crimes of violence, is determined in accordance with the ordinary common law principles for the assessment of damages so far as applicable to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme.

It is assumed members of the legal and medical professions are familiar with these principles, although it is acknowledged that injuries flowing from a crime of violence would sometimes contain distinctive characteristics.

A general review of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme is presently being undertaken within my administration and the question of educational programmes will be borne in mind as part of that review.

(2) Brochures explaining the nature and operation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme are distributed throughout the state as **an** on-going exercise. These brochures include brief particulars relative to the applicant's role in relation to Court procedures, and are readily available to interested parties.

In addition, Court officials are available to assist parties and witnesses as required and legal aid is provided in many instances.

It is acknowledged there is a continuing need to promote public awareness and understanding of Court procedures. The procedures may be **altered** as a result of the current review. Accordingly, it is proposed to consider what further assistance may be required by parties and witnesses in the course of that study.

(3) I should point out that prior to the present Government gaining office, the maximum payable under the scheme was \$4,000.00. In addition, spouses and other close relatives of persons killed as the result of violent crime were not entitled to claim. This Government effected substantial improvements to the scheme by extending it to provide such an entitlement, and by increasing the upper limit to \$10,000.00.

In the great majority of cases this limit provides adequate compensation. Nevertheless it obviously does not enable victims who sustain very serious injuries to be fully compensated.

It needs to be borne in mind that unlike most other compensation schemes in this State, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme is financed directly from Government funds. Hence budgetary considerations must obviously determine the extent to which it is possible for the Government to monetarily compensate victims. As I have said before, the only way that adequate compensation could be provided in all cases, would be through a national compensation scheme.

As part of the current review of the scheme, consideration is being given to the possibility of providing increased benefits. The honourable member may be assured this question **will** receive sympathetic consideration to the extent that the financial resources of the State will allow.

(4) Legislative provisions are available which enable questions of law to be reviewed by way of stated case to a superior Court. However, a victim currently has no express right of appeal against inadequacy of compensation, although such a right of **appeal** is available to the Attorney-General under the Criminal Appeal Act, 1912. Re-consideration of awards made under the Ex Gratia Scheme may also be requested.

The subject of appeal rights is also receiving consideration under the current review.

