

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 27 August, 1981

---

Bills Returned—Petitions—Protection of Industry (Urgency)—Bill Returned—  
Constitution (Referendum) Bill (Committee)—Precedence of Business  
(Suspension of Standing Orders)—Special Adjournment (Valedictions)—  
Printing Committee (Second Report)—Questions upon Notice.

---

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

### BILLS RETURNED

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

The following bill was returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment:  
Constitution (Referendum) Bill

### PETITIONS

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

#### Moral Standards

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

That we, the undersigned, having great concern because of the spread of moral pollution in our State call upon the Government to introduce immediate legislation:

- (1) To give positive support to the Lord Mayor of Sydney and other local government authorities in their attempts to clean up moral pollution in our communities.
- (2) To give local government authorities the power to reject applications from individuals or companies for moral pollution centres which are against the public interest such as so-called sex shops, live sex shows, blue movie cinemas, massage parlours (brothels), escort services (prostitution), et cetera.

- (3) To tighten up the standards used by the New South Wales Indecent Publications Classification Board so as to include the total prohibition of any pornographic publication or **film** containing child pornography, bestiality, sodomy or violent sex acts against women, such as rape and pack rape, sadism and torture, et cetera.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will protect our society, especially women and children from moral pollution and its harmful effects.

Petition, lodged by Mr Barraclough, received.

#### Woollahra Traffic

The Petition of certain residents of New South Wales within the vicinity of Ocean Street, Woollahra, respectfully sheweth:

That we wish to lodge our objection to the overuse by commercial and heavy transport vehicles and buses using Ocean Street as a main road and, indeed, those vehicles used as private vehicles taking Ocean Street as a short cut to the city instead of using that road, namely, Oxford Street.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will take the necessary action to:

Divert traffic from Ocean Street, Woollahra, to Oxford Street, to enable the residents to enjoy the peaceful enjoyment of their dwellings due to excessive use both day and night and continuing over a 24-hour period:

To stop damage being sustained to properties; for example, cracks appearing due to homes shaking as a result of overweight and heavy vehicles racing through the area:

To stop excessive pollution, both noise and environmental, in excess of 28 000 cars a day:

To reduce congestion and inability to park residents' own cars and their visitors' cars:

To prevent their property values being destroyed, as it is noted that a large number of properties are for sale in the street at the moment, evidencing these facts set out.

Please note the main concern is the noise factor, and the fact that they are unable to sleep or enjoy some form of peaceful time over a 24-hour period as cargo carriers, tankers, cement mixers, empty buses use the street at so frequent a rate that they often avoid being counted as there are so many in such a short space of time, even vehicles carrying explosive and inflammable liquids.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Barraclough, received.

Face-to-Face Teaching

The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That teachers in New South Wales primary and infants schools urgently require 20 per cent relief from face-to-face teaching in order to carry out all the necessary professional duties that are important for the provision of quality education to the children of this State.

Therefore, we humbly request that the Government of the State of New South Wales, Australia:

- (1) Immediately grant 20 per cent relief from face-to-face teaching to all primary and infants schools in New South Wales;
- (2) Ensure adequate funding from the Commonwealth and State governments;
- (3) Immediately cease the massive redistribution of funds to the non-government schools.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Cahill, received.

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals

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 Brewer, received.

Teacher Discrimination

The Petition of certain citizens of New South Wales concerned with the employment conditions of women in the infants teaching service in New South Wales primary schools respectfully sheweth:

That gross discrimination is being continued against women in the infants teaching service in New South Wales primary schools, and that delay in overcoming these discriminatory practices greatly exacerbates the disadvantages suffered by those women.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House remove immediately any regulation in the Teaching Service Act which discriminates against women in the infants teaching service in New South Wales primary schools by excluding them from promotion to the position of principal of a school, and ensure that those women receive equality of opportunity in appointments made to primary school promotions positions for the 1982 school year.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Hatton, received.

Manly Vale Housing Commission Development

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

That we, the undersigned, having great concern about the proposed erection upon land having frontage to King Street, Manly Vale, of Housing Commission accommodation, for the reason of a concentrated rental accommodation in an area almost exclusively occupied by home owners would be detrimental to the amenity of the area, and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray that the property be returned to the control of the Land Commission for sale to prospective home owners at prevailing market values.

Petition, lodged by Mr Arblaster, received.

PROTECTION OF INDUSTRY

Urgency

Mr DAY (Casino), Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation [10.34]: I move:

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

That this House immediately convey to the Federal Government its great dismay that savage reduction in protection for Australian industry is now being seriously considered again.

This House joins with car and component manufacturers, the clothing, textile and footwear industries and other Australian manufacturers in indicating complete opposition to such a proposed reduction in protection and also our grave concern for the huge additional unemployment this would create and for the uncertainty and doubt created by this deliberate threat which inhibits forward planning and investment decisions.

This matter is urgent because today is the last sitting day of this Parliament. The motor industry is in complete chaos, with the export facilitation scheme now causing huge concern in the motor car component industry. Also there is a further publicly announced threat by the federal Government to reduce savagely the protection remaining for this industry. The recently announced threat will mean a complete destruction of one of Australia's major industries. If the recommendations contained in the Industries Assistance Commission draft report on motor vehicles which are to take effect after 1984 are implemented, the component industry will be dead, as after 1990 there will remain merely a 35 per cent duty on motor cars coming into the country. All the major manufacturers have said that they will simply become importers, that there will be no local makers of motor cars.

The matter is urgent because within the last couple of weeks the federal Government has announced a special inquiry by the IAC into a general reduction of tariff protection. The inquiry is to be completed within six months. It seems that the recommendations of the IAC into the motor car industry will be accepted and **that** a further reduction in assistance is being contemplated. The motor industry, which has been the subject of recent inquiries, is not exempt from this imposition. One **has** to read only the advertisements in today's newspapers to observe that the matter **is**

viewed seriously. For example, one full page advertisement is signed jointly by the federal secretary of the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation and the managing director of one of Australia's leading motor manufacturers. This advertisement has been published in every daily newspaper in New South Wales and, I believe, in newspapers in most of the other States. It has the headline, "An Australian industry destroyed".

The advertisement asserts that the motor industry is about to be destroyed and that imported vehicles will flood into Australia. It states most clearly that some 200 000 jobs are at risk in Australia. It asserts that with 372 000 people already unemployed, a further 200 000 would place Australia at the depths of a great depression. Yet the federal Government and its supporters suggest that the removal of protection would increase motor vehicle sales and in some way create jobs. I cannot see that car sales would rise with increasing unemployment. If the federal Liberal Party-Country Party Government adopts the proposal, the motor manufacturing industry and all those who rely upon it will be destroyed. It will destroy the ability of the ordinary Australian workingman to purchase an imported car. Indeed, once our **OWN** manufacturing industry is destroyed the importers of cars manufactured overseas will be able to charge what they like. I suspect that prices for these imported cars will be significantly higher than they are now.

A great degree of urgency about this matter I have raised is evident in Albury. The *Border Morning Mail* reports that the mayors of Albury and Wodonga have called an urgent meeting for next Monday night to discuss this grave threat to their local industry. They consider the matter to be of such urgency that the council meeting set down for last Monday night in Albury was suspended to permit the aldermen to attend a meeting at Borg-Warner. The mayor of Albury predicts that some 1 000 people will attend the meeting on Monday night. He said that the alarm that has been evident in the industry has been heightened in the past few days **by** statements from Borg-Warner and General Motors-Holden's that they would wind down their operations drastically. The emergency meeting was announced as pressure mounted for the community to back the threatened company.

The Albury regional promotional council has called upon all business houses to combine to save Borg-Warner from closure. Already it has been reported in this morning's press that the Nissan Motor Company (Australia) Pty Limited has cancelled its contract with Borg-Warner to supply automotive transmissions. That action was brought about by the national Government's irresponsible policies. The matter is urgent because it affects not only the motor car industry, but also the clothing, textile and footwear industries, which only recently were subjected to an exhaustive inquiry by the Industries Assistance Commission. That inquiry recommended savage reductions in assistance, as is the usual insensitive approach of the Industries Assistance Commission, which has become known as the industries annihilation commission. Had the recommendations been accepted by the federal Government, those industries would have been destroyed. The industries were reprieved, though apparently only temporarily, by a decision of the federal Government following massive protests against the recommendations. However, once more industry is threatened by an inquiry. The vehicle industry has not been exempted from the inquiry, as one might have expected following the exhaustive inquiries that have been held.

The grave and immediate threats posed by the new inquiry extend far and wide. They stretch to the white goods, timber and steel industries, as well as many other manufacturing industries. The jobs of hundreds of thousands of Australians are in jeopardy. The inquiries now under way threaten also the assistance given to **the** agriculture, mining and timber industries.

The matter is urgent because last Friday at a meeting in Adelaide of Commonwealth and State Ministers for industry the federal Minister for Industry and Commerce exhibited absolutely no regard for the consequences of those proposals. He said further that the usual procedure of the Industries Assistance Commission of producing a draft report and recommendations, which were then subject in the usual way to comment by the industry affected and by State governments, would not be followed in this instance. He said there would be no chance for State government or industry to comment upon a draft report or recommendations before decisions were taken on them—they would be withheld until decisions were taken. The New South Wales Government would be failing in its responsibility if it did not seize this last opportunity to make a strong protest to the federal Government. For all those reasons, I submit that the case for urgency is established beyond doubt. I ask that the House agree to the debate and the resolution I have proposed.

Mr McDONALD (Kirribilli), Leader of the Opposition [10.44]: Last night the Government turned the functioning of this House into a farce. It continues to do so today. It seems that the Government has realized that the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation has been performing so badly that it had no alternative but to allow that Minister the opportunity to make his final speech in this House. The seats of Casino, Armidale, Clarence, Manly, Wakehurst and Castle-reagh have been forgone by the Government following discussions between a Labor member of the House of Representatives, Mr Paul Keating, the Minister for Education and other Cabinet Ministers. They have acknowledged that those discussions took place. It is quite clear that they felt there was a compelling need for the Government to forgo the traditional formalities of this House and ignore the basic right of the Opposition for its Leader to be given the first call at question time.

The moving of this urgency motion is nothing more than a stunt on the part of the Government. The Government that refused even to debate the Budget, now refuses to get on with the proper functioning of its own administration, and gives no consideration to the proper functions of this House. As a sovereign government it has a responsibility to the people of New South Wales. Surely there are far more important matters of state to which the Government should be addressing itself than this urgency motion.

The Wran Labor Government continually seeks to blame its mismanagement and misdirected priorities upon the federal Government. Why should such a situation continue? This morning the Premier and Treasurer admitted on a radio programme that the Government intends to make federal matters a significant part of its campaign. Surely the responsibilities of the Government should relate to the affairs of this House. Instead of dealing with this motion the Government should deal with more pressing matters affecting the State of New South Wales. For instance, it should try to solve the bickering and problems within its Cabinet. The Government should come clean and get on with matters relevant to this House instead of trying to grandstand to the television media, as it did last night and is doing now. It is trying to give the people of New South Wales the impression that it knows what it is doing.

Part of the urgency motion relates to the supposed concern of the Government for what is described as the additional unemployed. But, what consideration was given by the Government to unemployment in the Budget Speech handed down last night by the Premier and Treasurer? Did that Speech contain any significant undertaking in relation to unemployment? Why was such a significant increase in New South Wales payroll tax revenue foreshadowed in the Budget? This year payroll

tax revenue will increase by more than \$229 million compared with last year's revenue, and an additional temporary surcharge of \$80 million is to be imposed upon all employers whose annual wage bill exceeds \$1 million.

Mr Walker: On a point of order. The standing orders provide that debate must be relevant to the motion before the Chair. Though some four minutes have elapsed since the Leader of the Opposition began to speak he has not touched upon the issue before the House. I submit that he should be directed to refrain from making irrelevant comments.

Mr Cameron: On the point of order. It ought to be equally——

*[Interruption]*

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

Mr Cameron: Equally, a motion before this House should be relevant to the affairs of the New South Wales Parliament. The subject matter of this motion is an issue for another place. This motion has been orchestrated by the Government as a stunt to deprive the Opposition of its rightful first call at question time. The Government is exposed as being totally devoid of the ability to carry out its sovereign responsibilities. It seems that this Government can do nothing but call on debates on federal issues that concern another Parliament.

Mr Wran: On the point of order. I am amazed by the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in relation to relevance. The truth is that because of the federal Government's import-export credit scheme, the Nissan Motor Company (Australia) Pty Limited is threatening to eliminate 1 100 jobs in Albury alone. On the point of order that the Leader of the Opposition is not speaking to relevancy, let me say that earlier this week I asked the Acting Prime Minister to arrange a meeting between the appropriate federal Ministers and the New South Wales Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation in order that representations might be made to the federal Government on behalf of those threatened 1 100 workers employed at the Borg-Warner plant at Albury.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Wran: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke of New South Wales as a sovereign State—as indeed it is. This morning I had discussions with the managing director of the Nissan——

Mr Cameron: How is this relevant to the point of order?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Northcott spoke to the point of order. It is competent for the Premier and Treasurer to refer to matters that the honourable member for Northcott raised in doing so.

Mr Wran: This morning I saw the managing director of the Nissan company and informed him that the Government had suspended all purchases of Nissan motor vehicles by the Government and its instrumentalities until there had been a satisfactory resolution of Nissan's threat to 1 100 Australian workers at Albury.

Mr McDonald: On the point of order. Every time a member of the Opposition moves an urgency motion, the response of the Premier and Treasurer is irrelevant and far removed from the subject-matter. I submit that now, when the circumstances are reversed and a Government supporter has moved an urgency motion, you, Mr Speaker, should extend to me as Leader of the Opposition similar latitude in replying *to* it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition on an urgency motion by a Government supporter are not referred to in the standing orders as constituting a reply, but usually they follow the form of a reply. They need not necessarily be directed to the arguments put forward by the mover, but they must at all times be relevant to the matter under discussion.

Mr Cameron: Mr Speaker, I wish to speak to the point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Northcott to order. I have ruled on the point of order.

Mr McDONALD: It is clear that the Government is sensitive to the **high** incidence of unemployment that will follow its payroll tax surcharges. Borg-Warner and other companies in Albury will be directly affected by the tax. The **motion** by the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation is an attempt to cover up the problems in the manufacturing, clothing, textile, and footwear industries in New South Wales caused by the Government's policies. If the Government does not agree that a discussion about unemployment is relevant to this debate, that is unfortunate. The Premier and Treasurer has now told the House of the threat he made to the Nissan company. The Government made a similar threat to another company when the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation hightailed it to Detroit in the United States of America after General Motors-Holden's announced the closure of its plant at Pagewood. His statements then were rhetorical and empty, as they are now. There is no justification for this urgency motion. The **time** should be used to allow honourable members to discuss other matters.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has exhausted his time.

Question of urgency put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 59

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

Noes, 31

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

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion of urgency agreed to,

Mr Hatton: I rise on a matter of privilege. I put it to you, Mr Speaker, as the protector of the rights of members of this House, that question time is a proud tradition of the Australian parliamentary system.

*[Interruption]*

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Hatton: Question time gives to all backbenchers, no matter to which party or group they belong, the right to ask Ministers of the Crown questions without notice. I invite your intention to the fact that for the first time since I have been in this Parliament and for the first time in many years a device has been used to prevent any questions at all being asked by a member from either side of the House.

Mr Walker: That is not true.

Mr Hatton: I am aware that the standing orders allow for the procedures that have been followed. I realize that though it is the practice it is not obligatory for you to call first upon the Leader of the Opposition. I put to you as the protector of the rights of the members of this House—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for South Coast has risen on a point of privilege. Though it is true that Standing Order 157 allows a member to speak for ten minutes before he moves a substantive motion of privilege, two things arise. First, it is not clear to the Chair whether the honourable member for South Coast intends to move a substantive motion. Second, it would appear to the Chair so far that I would be allowing the honourable member for South Coast to trifle with the House if he continued to speak generally about the procedure at question time and how it affects the rights of members. He has not yet showed to me that his privileges as a member of the Parliament have been interfered with in any way. He will have to show me more clearly and more quickly that there is a matter of privilege involved.

Mr Hatton: The motion that I intended to move in regard to privilege is, That Mr Speaker confer urgently with the Standing Orders Committee with a view to preventing this device being used again.

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

## Suspension of Standing Orders

Mr DAY (Casino), Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation [11.15]: I move:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would preclude the consideration forthwith of the following motion, viz.:

That this House immediately convey to the Federal Government its great dismay that savage reduction in protection for Australian industry is now being seriously considered again.

This House joins with car and component manufacturers, the clothing, textile and footwear industries and other Australian manufacturers in indicating complete opposition to such a proposed reduction in protection and also our grave concern for the huge additional unemployment this would create and for the uncertainty and doubt created by this deliberate threat which inhibits forward planning and investment decisions.

Question—That standing orders be suspended—put.

The House divided.

## Ayes, 60

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

## Noes, 30

Mr Arblaster	Mr J. A. Clough	Mr Greiner
Mr Boyd	Mr Dowd	Mr Hatton
Mr Brewer	Mr Duncan	Mr McDonald
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Fisher	Mr Mason
Mr Bruxner	Mrs Foot	Mr Moore
Mr Cameron	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Murray

Mr Osborne  
Mr Park  
Mr Punch  
Mr **Rozzoli**  
Mr Schipp

Mr Singleton  
Mr Smith  
Mr Sullivan  
Mr Toms  
Mr West

*Tellers,*  
Mr Caterson  
Mr Taylor

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion for suspension of standing orders agreed to.

#### Motion

Mr DAY (Casino), Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation [11.10]: I move:

That this House immediately convey to the Federal Government its great dismay that savage reduction in protection for Australian industry is now being seriously considered again.

This House joins with car and component manufacturers, the clothing, textile and footwear industries and other Australian manufacturers in indicating complete opposition to such a proposed reduction in protection and also our grave concern for the huge additional unemployment this would create and for the uncertainty and doubt created by this deliberate threat which inhibits forward planning and investment decisions.

Mr J. H. Brown: This is a phoney motion.

Mr **Punch**: The Minister is making his last speech in this House.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DAY: I am astonished at the Opposition's attitude. Its members appear to take the view that the motion I have moved does not affect this Parliament. However, for many years it has been the tradition in this State for governments of all political wmplexions to make submissions to Industries Assistance Commission inquiries. The **Labor** Government has readily accepted a responsibility to make such submissions, and indeed has done so in the past. It is an outrage that two major parties in this State do not care what happens to the motor car industry, the textile, clothing and footwear industries, the white goods industry and the timber industry—in fact, any industry subject to inquiries by the Industries Assistance Commission.

When it was made clear by the federal Minister for Industry and Commerce that the inquiry would take six months and that State Governments would not be given the opportunity to make any further submissions, it became incumbent upon the New South Wales Government, and this House, to make a submission to the federal Government expressing concern. From time to time the Leader of the Country Party has pretended to show concern about unemployment in country areas. However, it is hypocritical of him to profess an interest in decentralization and in the plight of the unemployed in country areas while at the same time supporting the view that this Parliament has no responsibility over decisions that will affect 1 100 jobs at Borg-Warner in Albury. The honourable member does not believe that this matter falls within the purview of this Parliament or that it is urgent.

One must consider the position of this massive industry in a decentralized location. It appears to be of no concern to the Opposition that Email in the white goods industry could be affected by this inquiry, which has been set up for the purpose of

reducing federal assistance to Australian manufacturing industry. Apparently, the Country Party supporters make regular statements to the media and in their electorates, but when they have an opportunity to take positive action to save jobs and give assistance to country areas, they consider it to be none of their business.

They accuse Labor of wasting the time of this House. It is outrageous that a major political party should adopt such an attitude. Of course, the welfare of industries in the country and throughout the State is properly the concern of the New South Wales Government. Labor will ensure that these facts are brought home to the Opposition, as the people of this State will want to know where they stand. Both the Leader of the Country Party and the Leader of the Opposition have made comments about my retaining an electorate seat at the forthcoming elections. They have been after my electorate for ten years, but at each election my opponents gain fewer and fewer votes. Old General Jubilation T. Cornpone—the Leader of the Country Party—is obviously a disaster and a catastrophe. He has not yet won a battle. The battle on 19th September will be known as Cornpone's annihilation. The Country Party will lose a tremendous number of seats, and its Leader knows it.

Opposition supporters are terrified of what will happen at the election. This was evident yesterday from the demeanour of Opposition members when my colleague the Premier and Treasurer introduced a **first-class** Budget in **difficult** circumstances forced upon the New South Wales **Labor** Government by the savage cuts emanating from Canberra. The honourable member for Clarence did not regard my electorate seat as a safe seat for the Country Party. He ran away; he did not want to contest **the seat** against me. I am standing in his seat following the redistribution. The honourable member thinks he has found a safe harbour a bit further south, though **it** is not nearly as safe as he thinks. That applies to many Country Party seats.

Mr Greiner: How is all this relevant to this debate?

Mr DAY: The Opposition raised these matters, not I. I am taking the opportunity to expose Opposition supporters for the humbugs they are. I **shall** refer specifically to the savage imposts that have been placed upon industry by the **federal** Government, to which the motion draws attention. The New South Wales Government has been under tremendous pressure following reductions in funds from the **federal** Government. Those cuts amount to **about** a third of the increases which the federal Government granted for its own services.

Mr Cameron: Why do you not say a few words about the new Parliament House in Canberra? That would be just as irrelevant.

Mr DAY: The honourable member for Northcott is more knowledgeable **than I** on that subject. He tried twice to win a seat in federal Parliament and failed on **both** occasions. I have not tried to gain a federal seat. Therefore, the honourable **member** would have more interest than I have in a new federal Parliament House. I **shall** deal now with the export facilities scheme announced by the federal **Minister for** Industry and Commerce, though not supposed to begin until next year. The **effects of** this proposal are already being felt. I wish to quote from an **article** written by the motoring editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* and published in **this morning's** edition. That article reveals that seventy-five jobs **will** be lost in Sydney **because** Ford Australia has cancelled orders for carburettors. That **surely** lends urgency to the motion. Let me quote the article in **full**:

Seventy-five jobs **will** be lost in Sydney in November and at least 150 more in Melbourne by the same time because Ford Australia has **cancelled** orders for carburettors.

The Sydney workers are employed by James N. Kirby Products Pty Ltd at Rockdale.

Ford will get its carburettors from Weber in Italy from November, claiming they are cheaper and better made. Kirby denies the claims.

The Rockdale company—formerly Bendix—supplied carburettors to GM-H until January last year, as it had done for 23 years. GM-H now gets its carburettors from France.

The cancellation of the Kirby carburettor contract by Ford means the end of carburettor manufacture in Australia. The company yesterday expressed concern to the Federal Government that manufacture of a component "critical to any defence program" had been lost to Australia.

Kirby joins a growing band of component suppliers being affected by local manufacturers' moves to change to overseas suppliers.

Australian Motor Industries has advised many of its Australian suppliers that their contracts are terminated and the parts they supplied are being obtained from Japan.

Bosch Australia Pty Ltd, which built Toyota Corollas, and Trico, which supplied windscreen wiper arms, are only two.

Borg-Warner Australia is still assessing Nissan Australia Pty Ltd's decision to cancel contracts for manual gearboxes for locally made Datsun cars.

The director of the Federation of Automotive Product Manufacturers, Mr Jim Smith, said yesterday: "We know very well that we are going to lose \$200 million in business through complementation alone by 1984 and that component industry workforce is going to fall by about 9,000."

He said the effects of contract losses would be felt by 150 companies.

Mr Smith said local parts makers were angry at transfer pricing by car manufacturers. (Transfer pricing is where the local subsidiary of a multinational buys parts from another subsidiary overseas at unrealistically low prices in order to reduce or avoid import duty or other taxes.)

"Some of the prices they are quoting for finished components from overseas don't even cover the cost of the raw materials," Mr Smith said.

Surely those comments, which were reported as recently as **this** morning, must cause every responsible member of **this** House the utmost concern. I mention **specifically the** Nissan project, which plans to use the cheap electricity available in Australia—in **this** instance electricity in Victoria—to produce low-cost aluminium that the company **will** manufacture into crude castings for shipment to Japan. The **company will** earn huge export credits in Australia and utilize them for the importation of complete transmissions. The Borg-Warner company is most concerned about this proposal. **It** is only the tip of the iceberg and a revelation of what is happening generally in the motor industry. Though the export plan that has been announced is not **to** take effect until the beginning of next year, already it is having its effect by the cancellation of **contracts**. It is outrageous that the national government should permit Australians to be used—or rather abused—in this way.

The **Albury** newspapers have expressed their concern about the matter. They reflect accurately the great **fear** of local people about the impact of these **plans on** that community. Every member of the local councils **and** of the **Albury** Regional Promotional Council has expressed and shown great concern about the matters I have brought to the attention of the House. The promotional **council** stated, "This is **an**

urgent and vital message to our business community". Albury is one of our national growth centres where Borg-Warner provides 1 100 jobs in its decentralized industry. Yet Country Party supporters turn their backs on the problem and assert that it has nothing to do with this House. Among other things, the Albury Regional Promotional Council stated:

The Cabinet decision on the I.A.C's recommendations for future assistance to the motor vehicle industry after 1984 is due in 4-6 weeks and may well have a detrimental effect on Borg Warner's future. A previous decision regarding complementation of vehicle components is having negative effects now and could mean that Borg Warner could close for lack of business by the time the 1984 policies start.

No responsible person could suggest that the future of those people is not the responsibility of honourable members of this House, or indeed my responsibility as Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation. The matter certainly causes me a great deal of alarm. If the decision to which I have referred is handed down within the next four to six weeks there will be little opportunity for this House or the Government of New South Wales to make clear its attitude to such irresponsible policies which, if implemented, would devastate the Albury-Wodonga growth centre. The Albury Regional Promotional Council sponsored a full page advertisement in yesterday's *Border Morning Mail*, which stated:

The ultimate closure of Borg-Warner's Albury-Wodonga operations would affect every household and business in the National Growth Centre.

Notwithstanding that warning, Opposition supporters assert that it is of no consequence, that the State Government should not interest itself in it, and it is wasting the time of the House and taking up question time by asking them to state clearly the Parliament's attitude to these matters. The advertisement by the promotional council alleges that the federal Government's policy would lead to a direct loss of 1 040 or more jobs, a secondary loss of another 2 610 jobs, and a potential population drift of 8 350 people. The Leader of the Country Party, with his hypocrisy and shedding of crocodile tears about the drift of populations from country centres to the cities, does not consider important the prospect of 5 000 people moving from one of the State's regional cities to seek work in metropolitan areas. On other occasions the Leader of the Country Party will speak hot and strong about this drift of population. That is not the case today. It does not matter today as he has other fish to fry. I know that he is most anxious to get out in the electorate to patch all the holes in his sinking ship. Nevertheless, he should have the decency at least to intimate that the Country Party is concerned about this matter and is willing to express that concern through the Parliament to the federal Parliament.

The motor vehicle component manufacturing industry in New South Wales is not located entirely in Albury. Important as Albury is in this field of manufacture, the industry extends throughout New South Wales and employs directly some 10 000 people. One ordinary manufacturer, National Springs of Sydney, has 280 employees. That company has stated to me that the viability of all its suppliers is linked to its own viability. The company carried out a survey of one federal electorate and it has supplied a list to me showing seventy suppliers to the company in that electorate. They will be affected most seriously if the component manufacturer National Springs is forced out of business. The multiplier effect will be evident throughout the community and could well destroy some of the tremendous advances the Government has made since coming to office in 1976.

*Mr Day*]

Some 1 000 people are employed on motor vehicle assembling in New South Wales. I have mentioned already that 10 000 persons are employed by fifty companies operating production units for the manufacture of motor vehicle components. At least another 10 000 people in New South Wales are dependent indirectly on the automotive industry. The position is made quite clear in the huge one-page advertisements placed in every newspaper by General Motors-Holden's, one of the biggest motor vehicle manufacturers in Australia, and indeed in the world, jointly with the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation. They preface their comments with the astounding words, "An Australian Industry destroyed. They make a compelling case that should make every intelligent and interested person concerned about the effects of the irresponsible actions of the federal Government.

The genuineness of the concern expressed by many people from a wide social and political spectrum is undoubted. Already, without the further reductions in tariffs proposed, some 6 000 jobs will be lost in the automotive and allied industries in New South Wales. However, the threat is not just to the motor industry; it extends to many manufacturing industries. One is the truck industry. Before I consider that matter I should like to refer to a statement made by Sir Brian Inglis, the managing director of the Ford Motor Company of Australia. He said that should the Government implement the Industries Assistance Commission's draft report, the company would begin to dismantle its facilities. That company has a factory in New South Wales. Members of the Opposition who do not take that statement seriously are exhibiting the lack of responsibility characteristic of their federal colleagues.

I now turn to an industry that manufactures work trucks and other mobile machines. Its main base is in New South Wales. That industry has been the subject of a number of Industries Assistance Commission inquiries and temporary assistance inquiries in recent years. The most recent inquiry was held early this year. The current IAC inquiry is to examine long-term assistance for the local production of battery electric internal combustion power and certain normally operated machines. At present, imported internal combustion powered machines are subject to a duty of 30 per cent. An import licensing fee and a 37.5 per cent tariff apply to imported battery electric trucks not exceeding 2 500 kilogrammes lifting capacity. The share of the total Australian market held by imported work trucks is more than 60 per cent.

When the tariff board held its inquiry in 1973 there were eighteen local manufacturers of work trucks. By 1978 only ten manufacturers were known to the commission. Representatives of eight companies gave evidence to that inquiry. The commission estimated then that Clark Equipment Australia Limited and Hyster (Australia) Pty Limited accounted for 95 per cent of local internal combustion powered truck manufacture and that Crown Controls Pty Limited was the only known manufacturer of battery powered trucks. [*Quorum formed.*] Let the record show that after the call for a quorum, not one member of the Liberal Party or the Country Party entered the House. Let it be noted also that, even after the ringing of the quorum bells, only five honourable members of the Opposition are in the House. That indicates the contempt of those parties for employment in New South Wales and their contempt for the prosperity of industry in this State, whether country or city based.

Before the call for a quorum I was expressing concern on behalf of the Government for the manufacturers of work trucks. I was about to state that Load-Arm Australia Pty Limited is the sole supplier of lifting forks. It manufactures a full range of lifting forks for original equipment markets. The industry is concentrated in the southern and northern parts of New South Wales and in Sydney's western suburbs. At present the New South Wales manufacturers of those items are Clark Equipment

(Australia) Limited at Asquith, Hyster (Australia) Pty Limited at Milperra, Crown Controls Pty Limited at **Smithfield**, Load-Arm Australia Pty Limited at **Kurnell**, and Manipulator Equipment Company Pty Limited at Blacktown. Assembly of those machines is carried on by Lansing Australia Pty Limited at Lidcombe, **Davies** Industrial Equipment Pty Limited at Miiiperra, and F. J. Hodgson Pty Limited at Balmain. In February this year some twenty material suppliers, eighteen of which are established in New South Wales, gave evidence to the temporary assistance inquiry into assistance for battery powered truck manufacture. Yet, again, the manufacturers of those important pieces of equipment will be subjected to an inquiry into whether their tariff protections should be reduced or abandoned.

The white goods industry will be affected too. Email Limited is the major manufacturer of white goods in New South Wales. It is decentralized in the city of Orange. That company was established after World War II with assistance from the federal Labor Government of the time. Indeed, federal Labor governments have been the only governments to make worthwhile contributions to decentralization. The whole of the white goods industry is being rationalized to achieve greater efficiency; but, uncertainties put at risk the future of the industry, and Email Limited in particular. The rationalization programme was structured in the expectation of certain assistance. How can the industry plan restructuring when, despite an undertaking it was given of a certain level of assistance, the federal Government questions once again the tariffs and other forms of help it gets" The futures of 1600 employees of Email at Orange are threatened. The Country Party has expressed no interest in the problem. It says that this matter should not be debated in this House, as it merely wastes the time of the House.

The inability of the steel and automotive industries to develop new quality products with modern technology will have a serious effect on the investment programmes of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in New South Wales. The long-term effect will be a gradual weakening of the economic soundness of the steel division of BHP. By the turn of this century only basic iron and steel will be produced in New South Wales. The downturn could occur much sooner. It certainly will occur sooner if the latest Industries Assistance Commission inquiry speeds the reduction of assistance being given to the industry. A similar downturn will occur in the clothing, textile, and footwear industries. In the past ten years countless inquiries into those industries have resulted in an announced assistance programme extending to 1989. In the light of that, what will happen to the announced assistance arrangement on which these industries base their planning? Important clothing, textile, and footwear industries have been established in many areas of New South Wales. These industries employ approximately 38 000 workers. About 3 300 of them are employed at Newcastle, Maitland and Cessnock. In this area of predominantly male workers, the industries are vitally important for the employment of female workers.

The Wollongong—Port Kembla area has 2 000 employees in the clothing, textile, and footwear industries. In my electorate of Casino, industries such as Sandra Leigh are planning activities based on the assistance programmes. The future of such industries is threatened. Despite the importance of these industries, the federal Minister for Industry and Commerce clearly informed me in Adelaide last week that these industries would not be exempt from the deliberations of the new and threatened inquiry. Also, he informed me that the IAC would not issue a draft report on the two inquiries to be held. They are an inquiry into approaches to general reductions in protection, and an inquiry into the effectiveness of all Commonwealth industry assistance programmes. Assistance programmes to abattoirs will be effected, as will the

manufacturing and primary industries of Australia. State Governments, employer and employee associations, and companies will have no opportunity to comment on the IAC philosophy before the federal Government makes its decisions.

I was greatly disturbed by a statement of Sir Phillip Lynch, the federal Minister for Industry and Commerce, to the effect that the federal Government is not in business to prop up people who cannot survive in a world of change. What sort of a statement is that from a federal Minister? Surely assistance to Australian industries comes within his responsibility. It is his duty to prop up industries to enable them to survive. These two inquiries highlight the absurd lengths to which the federal Government is willing to go to destroy competition, while maintaining that it is encouraging it. They are a few examples of the depth to which the federal Government has sunk, and are indicative of its philosophical approach to industry protection.

The federal Government has eliminated assistance to the Industrial Design Council and the Productivity Promotion Council and its productivity groups throughout Australia. If the federal Government wants Australian industry to become competitive, surely the \$240,000 or \$250,000 it has provided to the industrial design council is the minimum sum it should offer to assist industry to modernize and update industrial design. The modernization of industrial design is essential to an industry's competitiveness.

Mr Smith: What is the State Government doing about it?

Mr DAY: This Government is making a contribution. It has not abdicated its responsibilities to New South Wales. Industry assistance is a joint responsibility. The federal colleagues of the honourable member have abdicated their responsibility. The productivity council groups have done much to modernize Australian manufacturing design. The federal Government offered that body a once only grant of \$140,000. However, in the past year the council received only half that sum, **and** it was informed that next year it would get nothing. That is *the* federal Government's attitude to making Australian industry competitive. What a pitiful and insignificant **sum** of money to be allocated. The enthusiasm of those endeavouring to **make** industry competitive has been put at risk through the federal cut in funding.

Members of the Opposition are hypocritical when debating these matters. The Productivity Promotion Council and its productivity groups are voluntarily working together towards the goal of ensuring that Australian industry becomes more productive, efficient and conscious of costs. The federal Government's Budget withdrew the previous insignificant grant made to these bodies. It is extraordinary that the **federal** Government should be able to get away with such double dealing. It speaks of the importance of decentralization—as do the hypocritical Country Party members in this House. The Liberal Party members seldom speak of it, for they are not interested in decentralization, as everyone would know. They make a pretence of concern for decentralization. Certainly Country Party members are terrified at the prospect of industrial workers moving to their electorates, because they usually support the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Boyd: I wonder why.

Mr DAY: Country Party members know that their seats are at risk. The honourable member for Byron is at great risk from decentralization, because he does not do much work in his electorate, and that is why he does not encourage industry.

Mr Boyd: I shall give the Minister some figures in that regard.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DAY: Despite the efforts of the honourable member for Byron, the electorate of Byron has had an increase in industry and population.

Mr Boyd: The Minister is not really surprised, is he?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Byron seeks the call I shall allow him to contribute to the debate. In the meantime he should not interrupt.

Mr DAY: The honourable member for Byron has converted what **was** a safe seat—a blue ribbon Country Party seat—into a marginal seat. One would have to work hard to achieve that result, but the honourable member for Byron has managed it. The federal Government pays lip service to assisting industry. It set **up** a decentralization advisory board. That did not cost a fortune, because only a small number of people were employed by the board. Later the federal Government decided that it did not want to have anything to do with the advisory board or with decentralization. It disbanded the board. It allocated approximately \$10 million to assist with the establishment of new industries in country areas. As insignificant **as** that allocation was, it could have assisted the New South Wales Government to **carry out** its enthusiastic and generous decentralization policies, but what happened?

A wool combing plant set up at Wagga Wagga was given a federal Government grant of \$1 million out of a total grant of \$10 million for Australian industry. The company was certainly generously treated, but the federal member for Farrer and another federal Minister refused to attend the official opening of the plant because the Premier and Treasurer of New South Wales was asked to perform that ceremony. The New South Wales Government had done all the work and provided most of the assistance to establish the plant. The representatives of the federal Government got their neck in a knot and their names, which were on the original plaque, had to be taped over because these petty little people got in a huff over the matter. Even the miserable allocation of \$10,000 for the decentralization advisory board has been eliminated from the federal Budget. The federal Government has now withdrawn support for the Bathurst–Orange growth centre and reduced to an almost insignificant sum its contribution to the Albury–Wodonga growth centre. It has virtually pulled out of decentralization. The federal Government clearly intended to get out completely in a conspiratorial way from the one national growth centre at Albury–Wodonga. The matter was discussed in Liberal Party circles.

One Liberal Party member of the Legislative Council knew that the federal Government intended to hold an inquiry and to foist all financial responsibility for the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation on to the States and local government. Because of the resistance by the State Government and my public criticism of the conspiratorial nature of the inquiry and of the Commonwealth's intention to withdraw support for decentralization, the federal Government amended the terms of reference of the inquiry. It is hypocritical for honourable members opposite to talk about the need for decentralization when their colleagues in the national Parliament have discarded any pretence at being interested in it, even slightly. I condemn them utterly for their attitude. The subject of decentralization was raised at the industry meeting in Adelaide last Friday. I suggested to the appropriate federal Minister that the Commonwealth should allow rebates of telephone charges on the same basis as the New South Wales Government and the Victorian Government allow rebates of payroll tax to selected new industries in country areas.

Mr Greiner: Why does not the Minister tell us about the payroll tax surcharge, which is about seven times more than the rebates?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai wishes to participate in the debate, he should seek the call.

Mr DAY: If the honourable member would listen to what I am saying, he would profit immensely. I doubt that he has been out of the metropolitan area. When he gets to Hornsby he thinks he is in the bush.

Mr Cameron: Mr Speaker, as there are again only two Government supporters in the House, I invite your attention to the state of the House and ask you to—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that if he wishes to call a quorum, that is all he has to do. There is no point in his making supporting remarks. As a quorum was called for a short while ago, I am sure the Government is able to provide one.

Mr Cameron: It is not providing anything like one now.

Mr DAY: The Government has more supporters present than the miserable numbers on the Opposition benches.

Mr Cameron: It is not the responsibility of the Opposition to provide a quorum.

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

Mr DAY: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggests that members of the Liberal Party and Country Party do not have to be in the House at all. He is suggesting that is the responsibility of Government supporters only.

Mr Cameron: That is right.

Mr DAY: That remark reveals the farcical attitude of members of the Opposition. They are recreant to their responsibilities. A little while ago they were waxing strong in the House about how important this last day of the sittings is and about all the marvellous things that they wish to do. They have brought nothing up in the years they have been in Opposition.

Mr Maher: Where are the members of the Country Party?

Mr DAY: There is no one in cockies' corner at the moment. Their attitude has been expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. When an important debate is going on, affecting a great number of people throughout the State, they say they have no responsibility to be in the House and participate in the debate. I said in Adelaide, at the meeting to which I referred, that it is ridiculous to expect Australian industries to compete with the high technology and high volume industries of Japan, the United States of America and Europe or the low-cost labour countries in South-East Asia.

If the attitude of the federal Government is that we should not have an industry in Australia unless it can produce goods for sale at the same price as those produced in other countries, no Australian would be employed and able to buy cheap goods, the importation of which the federal Government has encouraged. Because Australia has a small domestic market and wages here are higher than wages in most South-East Asian countries, we have to pay a small penalty to have industries. But our country has plenty of natural resources, and we shall never be reduced to being the hewers of wood and drawers of water that implementation of the philosophy of the federal Government would entail. Though we must accept that we cannot compete fully, we must be as efficient as we can. If we do not accept that, we shall destroy our

industries and, with them, the fabric of modern Australian society. I do not agree that our attitude to industry should be based on whether we can import something cheaper than we can produce it ourselves.

The logical conclusion of the adoption of that attitude would be to import all our dairy product needs from New Zealand, our beef supplies from Argentina, and a host of agricultural products from the European Economic Community, which at the moment is devastating our export markets by selling goods cheaper than we can produce them. If we did these things, no one in this country would be in employment. It is utter stupidity for the federal Government and the Industries Assistance Commission to expect Australian industries to compete on an equal basis with *oversea* industries. Canberra seems to be full of boffins who would not be able to do a practical job if they were paid double their present fantastic salaries. No doubt we could import *boffins* cheaper than we can produce them ourselves, but nobody suggests we should do that.

We have rich natural resources and the capacity to produce high quality articles. We must have a federal government that is committed to maintaining manufacturing industries in Australia, if anyone in this land is to be able to buy imported products. The State Government will strenuously oppose any further reduction in manufacturing industries. We will not be reduced to the status of serfs at the beck and call of *oversea* industries. Not only our manufacturing industries are under threat. The second term of reference of the latest Commonwealth inquiry is a direct threat to our primary industries, for if this inquiry is to examine the cost effectiveness of assistance given to all industries—including agriculture, mining and forestry—its implications for Australia and for the welfare of the people of this State are great indeed. I make no apology for describing this matter as urgent. Its urgency has been amply demonstrated. I ask the House to support the motion so that the national Government will be clearly aware of how members of this House feel about proposals to wreck Australian industry and massively increase unemployment.

Mr GREINER (Ku-ring-gai) [11.59]: The Opposition is not opposed to a reasoned and reasonable discussion of the problems of industry structured in Australia. It is not opposed to a reasoned and reasonable discussion of the proper levels of protection of industry. It is certainly not opposed to a reasoned and reasonable discussion of employment levels and forward planning and investment decisions, some of the matters the motion speaks about. But the Opposition is opposed to a formal abuse of the true role of this House on the last day of this Parliament, a formal abuse which involves depriving all members of this House of the opportunity to ask questions during question time.

A complete and utter farce has been made of this morning's proceedings. We have heard the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation speak for an hour and a half on an issue about which this Government in New South Wales has done virtually nothing. It has been suggested to us that in some way that issue is of greater priority to this Parliament, to the administration of this Government, than issues such as the decline of the education system in New South Wales, the shemozzle that is public housing, and the lengthening of lists of people who require welfare housing. The motion is supposedly of greater priority than the provision of good quality health care in New South Wales. Those things are of lower priority, or of less urgency to this Government, than the long diatribe we have heard from the Minister. But his statement contained not one single initiative; not one single positive statement of what the Government proposes to do or how it relates to the problems mentioned. All we have had is yet another session of federal Government bashing without any attempt to relate it to what the State Government can or should

do. Indeed, if this motion and this charade we are going through today reveal the priorities of the Government, we would be only too ready to have the people of New South Wales judge which side of politics has the proper level of priorities. On this side of the House we have no doubt that the people of New South Wales do not expect their Parliament, on its last day, to be indulging in an exercise such as we are going through. The second paragraph of the motion is of considerable interest and states:

That this House immediately convey to the federal Government its great dismay that savage reduction in protection for Australian industry is now being seriously considered again.

The motion states that it "is now being seriously considered again" but I wonder if the economic geniuses on the Government side of the House know what the word again refers to. What was the only major reduction of protection in Australia in the past ten years, and which government introduced that 25 per cent across-the-board tariff cut that cost something like 250 000 jobs in three years? I wonder if the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation, or the honourable member for Burwood, might like to tell us which government presided over that? I challenge any of the members opposite to tell me which government presided over the 25 per cent cut in tariffs. We shall get no answer but we all know what it is. It was the Whitlam Labor Government, the only federal Labor government we have had in Australia in the past 30 years, that introduced the 25 per cent across-the-board tariff cut. What is the attitude of the State Government to that? Surely it is hypocrisy of the first order to be talking about how terrible it is to be considering again reductions in protection of industry when the only real reduction that ever happened in living memory in Australia was introduced, put through, forced through, by a federal Labor government. And that was the cause of the loss of a quarter of a million jobs throughout Australia.

Last night the Budget was delivered in this House. If this motion is a matter of such great priority, a matter which ought to take precedence over all other issues I have mentioned, surely there would have been time in the one hour it took to deliver the State Budget for something to be said on the issue. A lot was said about economic background by the Premier and Treasurer, things he regarded as relating to the structure of the State Budget, but the question of industry protection was not mentioned. When one looks through the Budget Speech, which is the major speech delivered in this House during the year, one does not find so much as a comma dealing with the content of this motion. Yet twelve hours later, it is regarded as one of the most important matters to be considered, perhaps more important than anything else could be. Do we really believe the Parliament ought to be considering it today, or should we be talking about the impact of the State Budget? What nonsense this is on the part of the Government; what hypocrisy.

When the Minister was speaking to the motion I listened carefully to hear what the State Government was going to do to reduce the impact of the federal action the Minister described at such length. I took copious notes of what the Minister said. Not one single initiative was projected; not one single positive step was outlined about what the State Government intended to do, though we were subjected to more than one hour of diatribe about economic nonsense. Not a single step is to be taken by the State Government to redress the problems the Minister said existed, and do exist in part. But what do we have? There is absolutely nothing in the Budget though it took the Premier and Treasurer an hour or more to deliver it. We have nothing suggested by the Minister in the hour or more he took to speak upon the motion. What sort of nonsense is this? If this is the most important State issue

we can discuss on the last day of this sitting of the State Parliament we might reasonably expect that the Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Industrial development and Minister for Decentralisation, in the total period of two or three hours they addressed this House, would have spoken of State Government initiatives to redress the impact of the feared reduction in protection for Australian industry. But we have nothing except the usual regurgitation of anti-federal Government nonsense such as this Government likes to go on with. In order to improve the background for the debate on the motion I shall read to the House the actual reference about which the Minister is concerned, and to which the motion is related. The reference comes from the federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and states:

Having regard to the Government's desire

- (a) To pursue policies to encourage the development of competitive Australian industries which rely less on government assistance.

If that is not a good desire the State Government shares, so be it. We on this side of the House have no problem about standing behind such a statement. We wish to pursue policies that will encourage the development of competitive **Australian** industries which rely less on government assistance. The reference continued:

- (b) To achieve a less complicated, lower and stable structure of protection.

The Opposition has no objection to ensuring that any changes are within the capacity of the community to absorb them. The federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs stated specifically that the Government wanted to ensure that "any changes are within the community's capacity to absorb . . ." so why do we have this talk of fire and brimstone by the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation? Surely there is no problem if the reference is to deal with changes that the community can absorb. The next and last desire of the reference is as follows:

- (d) That the benefits of any assistance reductions are available sufficiently early to contribute to the achievement of the Government's economic goals, in particular through lower prices and the increased availability of real resources . . .

Surely, the State Government is not opposed to lower prices. Certainly it should not be opposed to increased availability of real resources. Almost every statement that comes from that side of the House is concerned with the necessity for sufficient resources to be made available to the State Government. The reference goes on to say:

(2) Specify that in its report the Commission shall, in respect of each option:

- (a) Include advice on
  - (i) the likely short and medium term effects on prices, employment opportunities generally and in particular regions, and the structure of industry.

I should read that again because it makes nonsense of almost everything the Minister has said. The federal Government is saying to the Industries Assistance Commission that it must include advice on the likely short and medium-term effects on prices. I emphasize that. And it must include also advice on the likely short and **medium-term** effects on employment opportunities generally and in particular regions, and the structure of industry. It is nonsensical to suggest that the federal coalition parties are not interested in maintaining a healthy and effective white goods industry.

There is nothing in that reference to which any rational government of whatever political complexion could legitimately object. I cannot believe that even an economic illiterate, such as the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation, could oppose those goals. The motor vehicle industry has borne the brunt of the Minister's remarks. I should like to quote from the Shrapnel *Economic Outlook* dated July, 1981. It shows that in May total registrations of new motor vehicles were up 6.3 per cent on a year earlier, passenger vehicles up 5.3 per cent, and other vehicles up **10.1** per cent—that refers to numbers rather than dollars. For the year ended May total registrations reached 585 **000**. The report then makes the important point that imports of passenger vehicles in the year ended May exceeded the target **provisional** quota set by the Government. The report says that the Government has frozen the quota at 88 000 units until the share of local producers rises. Does the Minister object to that?

Mr Day: When are you coming on to Albury?

Mr GREINER: I shall deal with Albury shortly. Mr Shrapnel's report concludes by saying that local producers can look forward to a buoyant period. That was in July, only a month ago. Therefore, the gloomy and doom-laden stories that are now being visited on the House by the Minister are a load of nonsense. The Minister has set up a straw man and is attempting to knock him down in order to seek to demolish an argument that has not been advanced. The Minister's arguments were aimed at the federal Government. Consumers do not rate a guernsey in his argument. I shall come shortly to the interests of consumer groups. The dire forebodings of the Minister are misplaced. The federal Government does not have the intentions that are assumed by the Minister.

There is a case for selective phased reduction of protection in Australia. The federal Labor Opposition believes that there is such a case. If the Minister were so concerned about these matters he should have taken the same line as his counterpart in the South Australian Government, the Hon. D. C. Brown, Minister of Industrial Affairs and Minister of Public Works. He took steps to deal with the situation a great deal earlier than the Minister has done in this State. Mr Brown made public the South Australian Government's plans for the motor vehicle industry—a balanced programme that considered everybody's interest. That plan contained ideas governing content planning, market share and the speeding up of export facilities. The South Australian Minister took the trouble to prepare a detailed, sensible and positive plan.

That plan makes a contribution to the debate that should be ensuing in the community. It did not contain meaningless diatribe of the type we have heard from the Minister today. We do not require bluster on this issue. We do not require the Premier and Treasurer to tell us that the managing director of Nissan will not place any more **orders** until these things are cleared up. We do not need the kind of bullying we have had from the New South Wales Labor Government in the past. **It bullies** the building societies, the manufacturers, the gas companies and anybody who disagrees with Labor's views. We do not need to hear about its threats to Nissan or anybody else. We need action that will contribute to a reasonable resolution of these important, long-term problems. We require from the Government a reasoned, sensible analysis of what it intends to do to cope with the situation. We have not had that reasoned view from the Minister today, nor did we get it from the Premier and Treasurer yesterday. Neither spelt out a coherent set of priorities governing the State's industrial structures.

I wish briefly to mention the interests of the consumers—a section of the community unmentioned by the Minister. He said not a word about easing the impact of protection on the community; nothing about the interests of the users of white

goods, clothing and textiles. I should like to quote from an item in the Australian Automobile Association newsletter, dated June 1981, headed "Restructuring of the Automotive Industry in Consumers' Interests". Incidentally, I should have thought that, even though the Minister for Industrial Development and Minister for Decentralisation is not interested, the retiring Minister for Consumer Affairs would have been present in the Chamber to represent the consumers' interests. The passage I am about to read represents a balanced point of view of the kind the New South Wales Government should be putting to the House. The newsletter reads:

While the Australian Automobile Association wishes to see a restructuring of the local industry, account must be taken of its existing size and structure and of its significance to the economy, particularly as an employer. Restructuring must take place over a time period which will avoid undue disruption and must recognize, not only the impact on industry as a whole, but also the effect at the regional level and within the many sections of the industry. We support the IAC's contention that the issue of what rate of structural change would constitute undue disruption is largely subjective and many factors could be relevant. Before adopting a rigid time scale, the Commission should look closely at the restructuring that would occur within the manufacturing and component industries between now and 1985 . . .

That view represents a sensible and balanced approach. It does not state that there is no case for reducing protection, nor does it propose that the community should contribute \$1,000 million to ensure such a high level of protection. The Minister's view is unreasonable. We must examine the problems of regional employment and sectoral employment in the various industries. We need to reach a long-term, balanced and phased situation to protect the interests of industry and employees. However, we must not ignore the interests of the community—interests which the Liberal Party—Country Party supporters wish to promote.

I turn specifically to Albury and the Borg-Warner factory. Last night in this House the Premier and Treasurer imposed a tax on Borg-Warner of \$132,000 in the current year. Without blinking an eyelid, he ensured that Borg-Warner's costs in the current year would rise by that much. That experience will be repeated in all manufacturing industries in New South Wales. One wonders how the \$132,000 compares with the kind of grandstanding offered by the Government in compensation. It is not true to suggest that the Opposition is not concerned with the problems of decentralized industries or the problems of major employers such as Borg-Warner. The Opposition has consistently sought to maintain a programme of balanced decentralization, a spread of manufacturing industry in appropriate places throughout the State, and we believe that Albury is one such appropriate place.

The Minister went on to deal with Bathurst—Orange and Email. It should be pointed out that Email's most recent financial statement discloses a record profit. That does not suggest that Email is about to disappear. It is absurd to suggest that the Opposition has anything but concern for the maintenance of the white goods manufacturing industries in Australia. It is fair to say that the federal Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs had a significant influence on the restructuring processes in industry, as did the federal Minister for Industry and Commerce, the Right Hon. Sir Phillip Lynch.

I shall deal only briefly with decentralization policy for I am sure my colleague the Deputy Leader of the Country Party will deal with it in greater depth. Perhaps the Minister will tell honourable members more about the Country Industries Assistance

Fund. He misled the House about it not long ago. Last night during the presentation of the Budget honourable members learned that the allocation to the Country Industries Assistance Fund is to be \$25 million. I wonder whether the Minister will tell us how that sum compares with the allocation for the previous year.

Mr Day: It is more than the Liberal Party–Country Party Government gave.

Mr GREINER: Obviously the Minister is not going to tell us. Either he does not know or he does not want to tell us, for the fact is that this year the allocation is exactly the same as it was last year. In real terms the amount available for country industries assistance is falling. Though this Government claims it is committed to assisting country industries, it has not come up with any positive action. The Minister has already quoted from an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, which is apparently his bible, on the credibility of the campaign, the burning urgency of the matter and imminent loss of huge numbers of jobs in Australia. On 25th August, 1981, an article in that newspaper stated:

It is by no means the first time that the major **carmakers** have sought to influence Government policy by brandishing dire warnings of layoffs and shutdowns. More often than not this disreputable tactic—in which the company hides its own interests behind those of the allegedly threatened workers—has had the desired effect . . .

It hardly needs to be said that the companies' threats to close down their Australian plants in the event of a reduction in protection lack credibility. Both are involved in major re-investment programs, GM-H is about to open a \$300 million four-cylinder engine plant at Fisherman's Bend. And only last month Sir Brian Inglis said that Ford's \$300 million investment plant reaffirmed his company's "intention to remain a strong and viable part of the Australian economy."

That is perfectly correct. I agree with Sir Brian Inglis and the *Sydney Morning Herald* that there is no real credibility in the threats that have been made. The article continued:

Both companies have known for many years that the considerable protection their industry enjoys would be reviewed about now, with the new long-term arrangements applying from 1984. They have made their calculations accordingly.

How can that statement stand with this motion about uncertainty and doubt inhibiting forward planning investment decisions when the major automotive **manufacturers** are making multimillion dollar investment decisions, and **sticking** to them? It makes nonsense of persons talking about lack of certainty and lack of ability to plan ahead **in** making investment decisions. The article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* went on to say:

. . . employment within the industry has been declining for many years, in spite of the growing **cost** of protection. Even If the Government agrees to continue the present arrangements this trend is likely to continue, so that car buyers pay more and more to protect fewer and fewer jobs.

Surely a sensible Minister responsible for industrial development in this State would address himself to a long-term structural trend that will continue regardless of **decisions** made on **tariffs**. Even if no change is made, in the long term the trend **will** be for purchasers of **motor** vehicles to pay more and more to **protect** fewer and

fewer jobs. Instead of ranting and raving at the federal Government, the Minister should be taking some action about that structural trend. He should be planning assistance to industries and the employees in them.

Honourable members on this side of the House agree that there is a need for a national debate on protection, but it should be a sensible, quiet debate and not one held on the last day of Parliament and led by a Minister who does not understand the economics of the problem. That became obvious to anyone who listened to the last part of his speech. As the *Australian* of 25th August said, it is time for a national debate on the motor vehicle industry. An article in that issue of the *Australian* had this to say:

Both the major car companies and the Japanese newcomers have been investing heavily in manufacturing or assembly or a mixture of both.

Investment decisions have been made on the basis of knowledge of the long-term plans of both Labor and Liberal governments. The motor vehicle industry has been aware of the long-term situation and has planned accordingly. For the Minister to build an argument of straw and then try to blow it down with as much wind as possible shows that he is not genuine. Let me examine how genuine the Government is in its concern about huge additional unemployment. Last night the Government brought in a bill introducing a tax on employment—scarcely a brilliant idea if it is concerned about the massive increase in unemployment—that will make it more expensive for employers other than the small ones to employ more people.

Mr Egan: This State has the best employment record of any in Australia.

Mr GREINER: The honourable member for Cronulla, one of the junior economic whizz kids, says that the Wran Government has the best record of any government in Australia. In fact, the New South Wales Government has the worst record of any government in Australia with respect to payroll tax. New South Wales has the lowest level of exemption and the highest rate of payroll tax, yet the Minister claims he is concerned about the huge rise in unemployment. I should think it axiomatic that if the Government were concerned about huge additional unemployment it should make it cheaper to employ people, not more expensive. The Government has gone out of its way to make it more expensive to employ people. That was the major thrust of the Government's Budget.

It is hypocritical to express concern over additional unemployment and then to increase payroll tax as a method of raising additional revenue. A government's wages policy is relevant to maintaining employment and ensuring that young persons are able to get jobs, yet the Budget Speech contained nothing about wages. The State Government has made a variety of sweetheart deals. One such deal cost \$40 million. Now the Government is preparing to make a further series of sweetheart deals. This year the advance to the Treasurer has been increased by about 100 per cent, from \$47 million to more than \$90 million. What is the reason for that?

Mr Mallam: On a point of order. I submit that the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai is guilty of tedious repetition. I suggest, Mr Speaker, that he should be warned that the House is sick and tired of conduct of that type.

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

Mr GREINER: I thank the honourable member for Campbelltown for joining me on his last day in this Parliament. It is kind of him.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ku-ring-gai has exhausted his time.

Mr CATERSON (The Hills), Opposition Whip [12.29]: I move:

That the honourable member for Ku-ring-gai, Mr Greiner, be allowed to continue his speech for a further period of fifteen minutes.

Question put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 26

Mr Arblaster	Mrs Foot	Mr Osborne
Mr Barraclough	Mr Freudenstein	Mr Park
Mr Boyd	Mr Greiner	Mr Rozzoli
Mr Brewer	Mr Hatton	Mr Smith
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr Healey	Mr Toms
Mr Bruxner	Mr McDonald	Mr West
Mr Dowd	Mr Mason	<b>Tellers,</b>
Mr Duncan	Mr Moore	Mr Caterson
Mr Fisher	Mr Murray	Mr Taylor

Noes, 59

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

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion for extension of time negated.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—proposed.

Mr SMITH: Mr Speaker —

Mr FLAHERTY (**Granville**), Government Whip [12.39]: I move:

That the question be now put.

The House **divided**.

**Ayes, 59**

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

Noes, 27

Mr <b>Arblaster</b>	Mr <b>Freudenstein</b>	Mr <b>Rozzoli</b>
Mr Barraclough	Mr <b>Greiner</b>	Mr Schipp
Mr Boyd	Mr <b>Hatton</b>	Mr Smith
Mr Brewer	Mr Healey	Mr <b>Toms</b>
Mr J. H. Brown	Mr <b>McDonald</b>	Mr West
Mr <b>Bruxner</b>	Mr Mason	
Mr Dowd	Mr <b>Moore</b>	
Mr <b>Duncan</b>	Mr <b>Murray</b>	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr Fisher	Mr Osborne	Mr <b>Caterson</b>
<b>Mrs Foot</b>	Mr Park	Mr Taylor

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put.

Motion agreed to.

**BILL RETURNED**

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

Pay-roll Tax (Amendment) Bill

**CONSTITUTION (REFERENDUM) BILL**

In Committee

Consideration of Legislative Council's amendment.

*Schedule of the amendment referred to in Message of 26 August, 1981.*

Page 2, clause 3, lines 15 to 21, both inclusive.

Omit all words on these lines, insert—

3. The day appointed for the taking of the votes of the electors at the referendum is 19 September, 1981.

Motion (by Mr Walker) agreed to:

That the Committee agree to the Legislative Council's amendment.

#### Adoption of Report

Resolution reported, and report adopted on motion by Mr Walker.

### PRECEDENCE OF BUSINESS

#### Suspension of Standing Orders

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

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would preclude Government Business only being taken at this sitting.

*[Mr Speaker left the chair at 12.46 p.m. The House resumed at 2.15 p.m.]*

### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

#### Valedictions

Mr WALKER (Georges River), Attorney-General and Minister of Justice [2.15]: I move:

That this House at its rising this day do adjourn until Thursday, 3 September, 1981, at 10.30 a.m.

In moving this special adjournment, I express on behalf of the Premier and Treasurer good wishes to the fourteen of our colleagues who will be leaving this Parliament. *All* honourable members have appreciated their company over the years. Some of those retiring have been here for many years; others have been here but a short time. They have been good colleagues, and we have enjoyed serving in this Parliament with them. Government supporters have enjoyed in particular the **comradeship** of members of their party, and as a group we have enjoyed the many battles we have had with retiring honourable members of the Opposition.

On behalf of the Government I mention especially the Minister for Consumer Affairs, the Hon. S. D. Einfeld, and the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads, the Hon. H. F. Jensen, two ministerial colleagues who have served the Wran Government with distinction. They have been responsible for the great popularity that the Wran Government enjoys. Public opinion polls show that the Premier and Treasurer has a popularity rating that is extraordinary in Australian politics; and the Government's popularity rating is close to it. Though a collegiate effort achieved those ratings, two outstanding members of the Wran Ministry who have contributed to it are Syd Einfeld and Harry Jensen.

Other members retiring from the Government benches are the honourable member for Campbelltown, the honourable member for Blacktown and the honourable member for Broken Hill. The honourable member for Campbelltown and the honourable member for Blacktown have spent many years in this House. We will miss them very much indeed. They, too, have made a significant contribution on behalf of their constituents and the citizens of New South Wales. Retiring members from the Opposition benches are the honourable member for Davidson, the honourable member for Dubbo, the honourable member for Tenterfield, the honourable member for Young, the honourable member for Temora, the honourable member for Oxley, and the honourable member for Sturt. They will be leaving the ranks of this Parliament. The honourable member for Oxley and the honourable member for Sturt, who will be retiring because of redistributions in their boundaries, have been in this House only a short while. I am sure they look forward to regaining seats here in the future. The honourable member for Tenterfield has served with distinction for many years. Though I have clashed with him often, I have deeply appreciated his gentlemanly approach to New South Wales politics.

I make special comment about the honourable member for Davidson. When I was on the Opposition benches I considered him an excellent Minister. He was always considerate and administered his portfolio most capably. The House will be the poorer for his retirement. The same can be said of the honourable member for Young and the honourable member for Temora. The honourable member for Temora, the Country Party Whip, is one of the most co-operative members, and I have always valued his assistance. I wish him and his colleagues the very best for the future.

Head-on election collisions will result in two honourable members not being with us in the next Parliament. The first is the clash of the honourable member for Bathurst and the honourable member for Blue Mountains, who will contest the seat of Bathurst. A similar contest will occur in Castlereagh. I am sure all honourable members wish the losers of those battles the best for the future in their careers outside Parliament. Of course, it is the view of the Labor Party that Mick Clough and Jim Curran will be returned as the representatives of those electorates. Whoever the winners and losers of those two grand battles may be, they all will be recognized as fine contestants.

On a more political note, I direct my usual valedictory remarks to other honourable members who will not be here after the next election. Of course, I refer to the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Hornsby, the honourable member for Maitland, the honourable member for Bligh, the honourable member for Wagga Wagga, the honourable member for Pittwater, the honourable member for Upper Hunter and the honourable member for Orange—again fine contestants. The House can rest assured that they will be replaced by candidates of the highest calibre. If anything, the Government of New South Wales will be enhanced greatly after the coming elections. From the Government's point of view, the forthcoming elections will produce a most significant event, that is, the election of a woman member of the Labor Party, Janice Crosio, to represent the safe Labor seat of Fairfield. Her beauty as well as her ability and intellect will enhance the Government ranks.

I express my usual thanks to you, Mr Speaker, to the Clerks, the attendants and all servants of the Parliament who make our lives here so much easier than it might otherwise be. They give good service. I refer to all members of the staff, whether they be Hansard, dining-room staff, all others throughout the rest of Parliament and news media reporters. We appreciate their work, which is performed in unusual conditions, for Parliament sits only part of the year, but when it is sitting the staff are subject to tremendous tension and pressure.

It is with considerable regret that I bid farewell to some of our colleagues, but I look forward to a bright future with the Wran Government and its enhanced majority after the next elections.

Mr CAMERON (Northcott), Deputy Leader of the Opposition [2.24]: The Parliament rises today for an election after sitting for a mere eight days this session. The Opposition makes no complaint about that. It is ready for the election, and looks forward to the opportunity it will present for a return to the Treasury benches by the Liberal Party and the Country Party. The Government's handling of the House in the past eight days reminds me of the story of the Australian who was travelling by car in Ireland. He came to a railway crossing. One crossing gate was open and the other closed. The signal was neither up nor down. The crossing attendant was seated on a stool milking a cow. When queried, he explained, "I'm half expectin' a train". Similarly, the Government appears to be always half "expectin'" something or other to happen without being quite sure what. If it is the XPT it is waiting for, it will have a long wait. At the moment the Government has only two-sevenths of its "fast" train; one that will not effectively go round corners, and obliges half of its passengers to sit with their backs towards the direction in which they are travelling. Notwithstanding its massive cost, this so-called super-fast train will not get from point to point faster than a passenger coach on an adjacent highway.

Today the House says a sincere cheerio to a number of members from both sides of the House. I pay tribute to them, and in particular, to the honourable member for Dubbo, who, having previously been a Minister of the Crown, served this House courageously. Members could not fail to admire the energy that John Mason put into his role. He always displayed the utmost congeniality. He had the ability to bring people together, even in difficult matters. I put it on record that John Mason has been treated unfairly by those splendid members of the fourth estate, who in so many other respects command our admiration. Every member should put aside bipartisan drives and reactions and pay a warm tribute to the honourable member for Dubbo. We should wish him well in what undoubtedly will be a richly rewarding career that has opened up to him outside this House.

I pay tribute to the honourable member for Davidson also. I have been closely involved with him throughout my thirteen years as a member of Parliament. He had much experience during his term as a successful Minister for Health. He commanded respect and admiration wherever he went. I know that the House will sincerely regret his leaving to go into other activities within the community.

I pay a warm tribute to the Country Party Whip, Jim Taylor. He has an admirable background. He served in the 2nd AIF, 1940–1945, 55 Battery, 2/5th Field Regiment, as a gunner. He was a master exponent of the twenty-five pounder and could achieve great accuracy with that weapon over considerable distances. He was equally accurate in his parliamentary work. His predictions were nearly always correct. He was on target most of the time. Jim Taylor is a warm-hearted man. My wife joins with me in paying tribute to him. Mr and Mrs Taylor, my wife and I, together with a number of other members and their wives—a small group—had a delightful time when we travelled to Perth and back by the *Indian Pacific* train for the Constitutional Convention. The party consisted of the Taylors, the Camerons, the Maddisons and the Cowans. We then shared a memorable companionship from which grew a friendship that has endured ever since. The House pays a tribute to Jim Taylor and to his service to the Parliament.

The honourable member for Young also is most deserving of tribute. He was a successful Minister in the Coalition Government and displayed a sound and practical mind. His judgment could always be relied upon. He was popular with members on both sides of the House, and is highly regarded by all.

I pay tribute next to the honourable member for Tenterfield, who served as Deputy Leader of the Country Party from 1975 to 1980. He had an extensive war service with the 2nd AIF, initially from 1941 to 1955 with the 1st Armoured Brigade and later with the Royal Australian Air Force in the Operations Training Wing as a pilot officer. I admire his powerful rhetoric. He did not speak often in this House, but could always grip members with his power of oratory. My only regret is that he did not use that gift more often so that we might have been edified and uplifted by his remarks.

Fourteen members are about to leave our ranks. We regret their impending departure, but in particular we shall miss the honourable member for Waverley, the Minister for Consumer Affairs. He has been a jousting partner of mine for a long time. I have enjoyed that. He is a remarkable man, with a rich, warm personality and a wide range of talents and attributes. I remember him well in his special role as one of the honorary adjudicators at the City of Sydney Eisteddfod, which position, he occupied from 1947 to 1957. They were the initial years when a puny competitor—as well as others—took part in debating contests. The honourable member for Waverley was consistent in putting the view that sometimes young Jim Cameron's manner was all right, but his matter was always pathetic.

Nonetheless I did learn things from Syd Einfeld at that stage and I have learned a number of things from him since then. I do not disguise the fact that I am an implacable opponent of the political thought stream that he represents, while upholding him in every way that I could as an individual. He was the honourable member for Bondi from 1965 to January 1971, when he became the honourable member for Waverley. He had previously been the federal member for Phillip from 1961 to 1963, when he suffered one of the rare defeats of his life.

I shall now comment on his role, his thought stream, and not his qualities as an individual. I see him as a paternalist, and I believe it is imperative that we oppose paternalism. I see him as being committed to control thought streams and I believe it is imperative that we oppose those thought streams. There are three members on the front bench on the Government side who, in particular, represent the thought streams that I oppose. As the House adjudicates today on whether it should adjourn for the election, honourable members should think of the things that remain undone, some of the areas that we should be concerned about, including the role of this Parliament within the community.

Perhaps the premier State does not actually kill the goose that lays the golden eggs, but we certainly torment her mightily, nowhere more than in this continent's Mother Legislature—the Parliament of New South Wales. Nice words about the goose often accompany her harassment. The ways in which she is persecuted are artful and varied, but most effective. Sometimes, ironically, they have their funny side as well. Private enterprise, small and large, is the beneficent goose because it is the wellspring of our prosperity. The legions of the State, small and large, preside over her torment—all dutifully carried out in the cause of the so-called public interest. Though they stop short of actually wringing the poor old goose's neck, they do plague her to the point at which it is scarcely worth her while to lay.

*Mr Cameron*]

None is more skilled in the arts of harassment than a trio of veteran socialists who sit on **Labor's** front bench in the Legislative Assembly. They have been described as three of the craggy old peaks within a whole range of exhausted volcanoes on **Labor's** front bench. I refer to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports, the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, and the Minister for Consumer Affairs, who is about to depart the arena. Nothing would delight that old-time bricklayer the Deputy Premier, Jack Ferguson, more than to be able to put a darg on the number of eggs the goose could lay in a week. To parallel his approach to bread-baking hours, Pat Hills, the Minister for Industrial Relations, would put rigid limits on the hours during which eggs could be laid. The goose could be pretty sure that those nominated would be the hours least convenient to her.

But the well-meaning grand Pooh Bah of overgovernment is, of course, Syd Einfeld, the Minister for Consumer Affairs. He has a light touch with words, but his governmental hand is more leaden than any other's. The Minister for Consumer Affairs would be on hand to insist on date-stamping the eggs. As in his dealings with landlords and entrepreneurs generally, he would be eager to bring in some kind of price-fixing of eggs, at levels which would make it scarcely worth while for the goose to produce a single golden egg. He would have half his field force of seventy inspectors on hand to certify the eggs as to quality. If the goose needed to offer credit to purchasers of her eggs, she would find herself threatened by his proposed new credit control laws. And if the poor old goose gave any one of those golden eggs an extra brush with her feathers to put a special sheen on them, she would be hit with a writ for false advertising.

There is only one prayer coming out of the old goose's bill—deregulation. It is startling but true that the New South Wales Labor Government made 1 728 new regulations in its first three years in office. New South Wales now has 1 018 statutory committees plus an unknown number of ministerial committees. In all, 85 statutory bodies have been either created or significantly expanded since **Labor** took office in 1976. There are no fewer than 402 qangos not adequately accountable to Parliament. In the field of housing alone, there are no fewer than twenty-eight different departments, commissions and boards scattered over eleven different ministries. The ultimate limiting factor, however, is always people, and where they are put to work. The higher the ratio of those in the non-earning public sector to those in the embattled, earning private sector, the greater the taxation load entrepreneurs have to carry.

It is true enough that the bureaucracy—sometimes called the ad hocracy—is a convenient punching bag. Every community desperately needs its share of motivated and highly qualified public servants. But because of the luxurious freedom State administrations like Premier Wran's enjoy under present Commonwealth-State financial relationships, they have been allowing their public services to mushroom in complete disharmony with the restraint shown in this regard by Prime Minister Fraser. New South Wales alone has increased the number of its public servants by 40 000 since Premier Wran came to power. If one averages out the cost of each public servant at \$20,000 annually—and that may be conservative—that means an increased salary bill of \$800 million per annum. Admittedly, every extra public servant does mean another family guaranteed a pay packet. But it does nothing to increase the community's real wealth—only private sector earners do that. If a small businessman has too many sons and too little income, he makes the family no wealthier by giving an extra son a job on his own payroll. Let us give the goose a break—and aim at smaller government, fewer regulations and lower taxes.

In addition to the members I have mentioned, and the Minister for Consumer Affairs in particular, there are a number of others who leave the Parliament, of whom the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads is one. Everybody in the Parliament will willingly and happily say of Harry Jensen that he came to the Parliament as a man with the highest motivation and that he has observed the highest personal standards throughout his whole time in this Chamber. He has been an honest and effective Minister and he departs with the best wishes of all members.

Before I pass to other members I shall refer to the honourable member for **Campbelltown** who also leaves us. He and I have also been jousting partners of a kind over the years. There **was** a time when I felt that the honourable member for Campbelltown had but one issue, and one that I never fully understood: that was, the Desert Flame of Andamooka. I must confess that to this day the implications of the Desert Flame of Andamooka have escaped me. But I heard of the Desert Flame of Andamooka so many times in the days when the honourable member was in Opposition and was often on his feet, that since he has joined the serried ranks of honourable members on the backbenches of the Government side from whom we never hear a word, I remain as mystified by the Desert Flame of Andamooka as I was years ago.

The honourable member for Blacktown and the honourable member for Broken Hill will also leave this place. My best wishes go to them. The honourable member for **Sturt** and the honourable member for **Oxley** have joined us recently. Though we have not had the opportunity to become as well acquainted with them as with those who have been with us longer, I am confident that we shall see more of them. I admire the directness, forthrightness and power of expression displayed by the honourable member for Sturt. The community is indebted to him for his contribution in this place and when he was a high-ranking army officer. He also served the community well as the federal member for Riverina.

The Premier and Treasurer has something in common with one of my favourite English Prime Ministers, but regrettably he is not half as frank. Sir Alec Douglas-Home said:

There are two kinds of problems in my life: the political ones are insoluble and the economic ones are incomprehensible.

The Premier and Treasurer likewise appears to find the former ones insoluble. There can be no doubt that he finds the economic ones incomprehensible, but he is not nearly so willing to admit it. As Parliament examines its role and ponders whether it should rise today, honourable members should be focusing attention on the real priorities—the heart of the Opposition's case. We believe that the Government's economic priorities are wrong and that the Government should be reassessing them. We put the case powerfully by suggesting that at a time when scarce public capital is not available for hospitals, prisons, roads, schools and a whole range of other imperative needs in the community, some \$800 million of scarce public capital is being needlessly, wantonly and irresponsibly spent on commercial enterprises. That is a role that private enterprise is waiting in a queue to perform, without the expenditure of one public dollar. That could be outlayed entirely from the financial resources of private enterprise.

A sum of \$100 million is being put into a third coal loader at Newcastle. Again, private enterprise is queuing up to fund that project from its own resources. That would enable that amount of public capital to be spent on hospitals, schools, roads, harbours and dams—all projects for which capital is scarce. At least \$20 million

*Mr Cameron]*

is to be spent on an entertainment centre. That is a joint venture with private enterprise, but every dollar of that sum is capable of being found right now from the resources of private enterprise. The people of this State see public hospitals being closed down. One has only to think of that magnificent lady, Florence Nightingale, walking round the wards with her lamp. If she were operating in New South Wales, the flame in her lamp would be snuffed out by Government action. The wards she and her like exist to serve would be in danger of closure. We all know that Parramatta Hospital is threatened with extinction. That is happening at a time when that area is crying out for beds for orthopaedic, paediatric and other patients. At a time of need that hospital is being closed down and it is a great tragedy. Last night the Premier and Treasurer said:

The total recurrent and capital allocation for health in 1981–82 is \$940 million or 8 per cent more than last year.

That figure of 8 per cent more will not cover even the rate of inflation. This is happening at a time when hospitals are in a desperate plight. The Government's priorities are wrong. One recalls the Government's promise to bring in new mental health legislation. That promise has been made year after year during Labor's tenure. A significant part of community life is in disarray because of the absence of such legislation. The community has been given nothing but promises. It has been words, words and more words—but no action and no legislation. When shall we see the mental health legislation that was promised five years ago? It has still not been delivered. Let us take a philosophical view. Mark Twain, writing about health and physicians, noted that:

The only way to keep your health is to eat only what you don't want, to drink only what you don't like and do only what you druther not!

That may be so, but certainly the Opposition believes that health is a vitally important aspect of community life. Indeed, it is one of the prime issues in the community. The important matter is not abortion clinics, councillors of equal opportunity, anti-discrimination boards or women's refuges; it is the old-fashioned hospital that plays a great part in our community as a place in which sick people can be brought back to health. We have only to bear in mind the difficulties of the Mater Hospital to realize the plight of hospitals. I recently met a medical practitioner who has served the Royal North Shore Hospital and the Mater for a number of years. That doctor finds difficulty in getting patients into the Royal North Shore Hospital. He tells me that, if he is unable to get his patients into the Mater or the Royal North Shore, he will not know what to do with them. The Government intends to close down hospitals. It intends to convert the Mater into a geriatric institution.

I turn briefly to a matter that should be in the forefront of consideration in this Parliament as it debates whether it should adjourn. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice has given the date Thursday, 3rd September as the date when Parliament will resume. That statement, in common with so much of the Government's programme, is entirely mythical and illusory. There is no prospect of this Parliament after its rising today resuming on that date. Tomorrow, the Executive Council will meet and this Parliament will be dissolved, never to reassemble. Once again the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, as Leader of the House, presents us with a charade, a myth, an illusion, a piece of imagery and pretence. The reality is that the Opposition does not care a whit: we want an election as much as anybody else. We want an early election because of the opportunity it will give the Liberal Party–Country Party to resume its rightful place on the Government benches. Inexorably, we shall occupy those benches on Mr Speaker's right hand where the seats are more comfortable and the view so much better.

On the subject of education we learn that the actual expenditure for 1980-81 was \$1,510 million. In 1981-82 that figure will rise to \$1,650 million, an increase of only 9.3 per cent. Let us remember the impact of inflation on the community—despite the magnificent and world-admired efforts of the federal Government under the Right Hon. J. M. Fraser and the Liberal Party—Country Party in containing that figure. Therefore, the Government's figure for education will not be effective. Many wonderful people have said some memorable things on the subject of education. Some learned gentleman said that if a man's education is finished, he is finished. George Saville said:

Education is what remains when we have forgotten all that we have been taught.

John Ruskin's view was:

Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know; it means teaching them to behave as they do not behave.

I am intrigued by the proposition put by H. G. Wells—not a person I admire—when he said that human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe. That is somewhat of an overstatement, as it attributes to education the role the edurnianiacs apply to it, as if it is the panacea; all one has to do is educate a child and he steps into a highly paid profession within the community; education solves everything and education rules everything, which is absolute nonsense. I prefer the view of G. K. Chesterton—whom I admire—that no man who worships education has got the best out of education; without a gentle contempt for education no gentleman's education is complete. With that I agree.

My own view on education is summed up in a short story about a humble verger in England who for years carried on successfully and without complaint his undemanding job. Then to his discomfort the congregation discovered by accident that he had never learned to read or write. He was instantly dismissed and flung on to the unemployment scrapheap. For a long time he was out of work but ultimately he made good and became a millionaire. Admirers then said to him, "Just imagine how much more you would have achieved if you had been able to read and write as well." He replied, "If I had been able to read and write I would have still been a verger."

Mr Egan: What is wrong with being a verger?

Mr CAMERON: The honourable member for Cronulla would not know what a verger is. There are many matters that the Government is not attending to. The most important is in the field of industrial relations where there is abuse of union power. The Government has an obligation to stimulate the work ethic, which it is failing to honour. Many good unionists are crying out to work harder for better wages in reward for a job well done. Top union officials are deterring them and prohibiting them from achieving this aim. Many people still have the attitude, which the Government is doing nothing to combat, that work is the greatest thing in the world so one should save some of it for tomorrow. Frequently the Premier and Treasurer surveys the bleak industrial scene and tries to find some little light that will give him encouragement, or a statistic that holds out some hope. Each time the Premier and Treasurer finds a bright spot in the State's industrial scene it is like a policeman bending over a body in a back alley and saying cheerfully, "Two of his wounds are fatal, but the other one is not so bad."

Australia has too many people in the industrial scene like the well-known wharfie—the others are not all the same—on the Sydney docks who is known by all his mates as the judge, because he is always sitting on a case. Also I wish to pay tribute

valedictorily, as did the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, to a number of opponents who unwillingly will not be members of this House in the next Parliament.

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

Mr JENSEN (Munmorah), Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads [2.54]: Mr Speaker, the first person to whom I should like to express my appreciation is you; not only appreciation but also congratulations. I observed you follow previous Speakers when your first steps were rather timid and uncertain. In the course of the years during which you have occupied the Speaker's chair you have fulfilled the duties of your office with authority and in a manner that I and other honourable members admire and respect. I have been delighted to observe that the experiences you have undergone have resulted in your greater maturity and in greater certainty in your judgments. I thank you for **all** the courtesies you have extended to me. I express my appreciation to members of the Government, who gave me the opportunity to serve in the Ministry, who have worked with me in close co-operation over the period I have been a member of the Government, who had confidence in me, supported me, and made it possible for my errors to be fewer than they would otherwise have been.

In the sixteen years that I have been a member of this House, members of the Opposition have treated me with courtesy. At times when we have had differences of opinion we have found means of expressing those differences in a way that imposed a minimum of hurt upon our adversaries. It has been a great joy and pleasure for me to have had these experiences, which are part of the Parliament.

Were it not for the manner in which the Clerks of the Parliament fulfil their functions, its efficacy would be greatly reduced. As a consequence of their profession they are forced to listen to discussions in this Chamber. I am sure that frequently they wish that it were not their responsibility to do so. When asked, they give to members and Ministers counsel and assistance that is of the highest value. Their part in the conduct of the affairs of the Parliament cannot be too highly praised.

I express my sincere thanks to the attendants of the Parliament, who cheerfully go about their tasks. I pay tribute to their effectiveness. I am grateful to them for what they have done to make better my experience as a member and Minister. I pay tribute to the Parliament's telephonists. They are the voice of the Parliament to the world. The manner in which they conduct themselves in discharging their duties adds to the prestige of the Parliament and its members.

I express thanks to my personal staff who have been closely associated with me in the discharge of my duties. I refer to Irene Bailey, my private secretary, who for many years was personal secretary to Ministers of various governments and performs her task with admirable competence. I have never met a more devoted and delightful person than my assistant private secretary, Daphne Beard. I refer also to Joe Court, who was formerly press officer to Tom Lewis. Some of my colleagues looked at me rather askance when I decided to retain him as my press officer. One could not meet a more dedicated friend. I refer also to John George who performs liaison duties with the Department of Main Roads. He undertook his duties with great enthusiasm and skill. I am deeply indebted to him. George Burden and others on my personal staff have contributed greatly to the enjoyment and satisfaction that I have experienced during my years as a Minister.

I pay tribute to the high skills and great dedication of the senior officers of the Department of Local Government. That department has trained people who have subsequently worked throughout the public service. One of the difficulties in that

department arises from the fact that those trained by it are greatly sought after by other departments, resulting in a great turnover of its staff. Those who train them and lead them do a great job. Without their skills local government could not be as effective as it has been. The former Commissioner for Main Roads, Mr Brian Sexton, performed his duties superbly. I was deeply saddened by his death. Bruce Loder, who has succeeded the former commissioner, is applying himself with similar diligence and skill. It was not until I became associated directly with the Department of Main Roads that I was competent to form an assessment of its contribution to the advancement of New South Wales. I have high admiration for that department. I am sad that it is threatened by events occurring in other places. It is a great department and it has been a wonderful experience for me to fraternize with those responsible for its administration.

The dining-room staff at Parliament House prepare excellent food and present it in a way that is a delight to guests and hosts.

The Labor Party put its trust in me and raised me to positions of prominence that I could not otherwise have enjoyed as part of the experiences of my life. I express appreciation for the electors of Wyong who first took me into their trust when I ran for Parliament, and kept returning me to this House until the electorate was abolished and the electorate of Munmorah was created. Those people have, with continuing enthusiasm, supported my candidature. All of those experiences have been marvellous.

My justification for entering public life was a deep conviction that society needed reform, that the system of distribution of earnings and gains among those who contributed to its accumulation was inequitable and unfair and that injustices were to be seen at every hand. I carried a torch to correct those things. I regret that there have not been more successes stemming from my efforts and the efforts of my party. Society is more egalitarian than it was when I first became interested in politics. Much more needs to be done. I hope that those who follow me will have similar enthusiasm for the cause, and more success in correcting the manifest injustices that still exist in our society. I have every confidence that they will.

I am a little sad, also, that I shall no longer be observing some of the events of this Parliament, including the incredible double acts of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who come across the footlights of the stage of Parliament, one singing madrigals and performing *pas de deux* and minuets—and I refer, affectionately, of course, to Jim Cameron, who by the turn of the century will probably be dancing to three-quarter time—and the other, the Leader of the Opposition, Bruce McDonald, dancing the quickstep and other modern dances, some of which I am reluctant to mention but perhaps including the twist. They make an interesting duo.

I join with my colleagues in a prediction that the Wran Government will be returned; but that is a matter for the people. I am reminded of a story of a professor who had a reputation for correctly answering difficult questions. A number of students approached him with a live pigeon hidden behind their backs. They said to the professor, "Is the pigeon we are hiding behind our backs alive or dead?" Of course, if the professor said it was dead, they intended to show it to him alive; if he had said it was alive, they intended to wring its neck and show it to him dead. The professor's answer to the question was: "Ladies and gentlemen, the answer to that question lies in your hands". The greatness of this State in future years lies in the hands of all honourable members. Though in some respects I am sad to go, I am delighted to have

been here and to have shared all the experiences that have been mine. I pass on the message that the answer to the greatness that can be ours lies in the hands of the members of this Parliament. I wish you great success in your endeavours.

Mr MASON (Dubbo) [3.4]: I, too, wish to take the opportunity provided by this debate to express appreciation to those who have given me the privilege of serving in this Parliament in a number of capacities, both in Government and in Opposition. I commend to any member that there is much to be said for being in Opposition and then achieving government, rather than the reverse situation. I have had the experience of being elected to a party that was in government and then after some years being a member of the same party in Opposition. It is not such a pleasant experience. I wish my colleagues in the Opposition an opportunity to govern in the near future.

Members of Parliament owe a huge debt to many people. We owe much to those in the Parliament who make our daily lives more pleasant. I refer to the Clerks, the attendants and others involved in running the Parliament. I wish to record my sincere appreciation of their assistance under the administration of Mr Speaker. The Parliament is run effectively and in the interests of members. Again I express my appreciation to them.

A member, in his term of office, becomes particularly close to some people. Over the years my personal staff have served in a most sincere and dedicated manner. I have appreciated that service. In particular I bring to mind my former private secretary, Mrs Judy Ludvik, who was with me for many years and served me admirably. She served other Ministers including John Maddison and Harry Jago.

I join with the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads in acknowledging our heavy indebtedness to the public service of this State. From time to time it has been maligned but I wish to record that my experience of the public service of this State has left me with a deep appreciation of the skills and dedication of the vast majority of its officers. The people of New South Wales owe them much.

I enjoyed hearing of the humorous experiences related by a number of honourable members this afternoon. In the most recent issue of the *National Geographic* magazine appeared an article about the State of Iowa. That article stated that Iowa is the first State in which the presidential primaries are held. Therefore, when that peculiar system of electing an American president commences, Iowa attracts political commentators from all over the United States of America as well as other countries.

The article recorded an event that took place in Iowa in a small village with a population of about 4 600. There, the local radio station invented a new method of polling. In the middle of the town was a water tower. To gauge the feeling of the people at the last primary elections that radio station invited all the voters who wished to support President Carter to flush their toilets at a certain time. The level in the water tower decreased by one-tenth of a foot, which was calculated to be equivalent to 300 votes. The voters who intended to vote for Senator Kennedy were invited to do the same thing, and there was no appreciable drop in the level of water. Finally, the most significant vote cast by this peculiar method was by those voters who were uncommitted, and officials estimated from the drop in level of that water tower there had been about 600 flushes. The article commented that surely the flush-vote must be a world phenomenon. I am afraid there is sad commentary in the result obtained from that peculiar system, for it may express the opinion that some persons have for politicians; perhaps they put us in a category somehow associated with that system of voting.

My experience in this House has been there are three categories into which members fall: those who see their election to this House as the best job they are ever likely to get; those who seek to feather their own nests; and—I should hope that the majority fit into this category—those who seek to serve their country, State and electorate. Every member who loses the motivation I have mentioned in the third category does a disservice to himself and to the parliamentary institution. Our motivation should always be to serve our country, our constituents and colleagues. I hope every honourable member in this Parliament in the future will have those motivations and aspirations. The country will be better for having people like that as members of this House.

As I come to the end of my political career I have some regrets. For instance, I regret that, whatever might be the cause and no matter what party was in government, the Parliament has not been able to do enough for people in the community. I am concerned that, despite the endeavours of the many select committees of this House since I have been a member of the Parliament, honourable members have not grasped a full understanding of the problems of the Aboriginal people. Aborigines are put into a special category, in a special way. I regret that more has not been done for them, that we have not been able to understand them, to reach out to them and to make them true citizens of this State. I regret also that the Parliament has not been able to come to grips with the real sources of crime and corruption in the community. That problem should transcend the political scene, whether one is on the Treasury benches or in Opposition. It disturbs me and causes me great anguish that the forces of evil continue to operate and have been able to do so irrespective of the party in office.

In the time that I have been a member of the Parliament I cannot recall once having had a wide-ranging debate, beyond the political necessities of a bill, when the Parliament tried to resolve the problems of industrial relations. Surely that is one of the most important areas of concern for all members of Parliament. I regret that as I am coming to the end of my career I realize that not a great deal has been contributed to improve industrial relations. I ask honourable members on both sides of politics to realize the importance for the future of Australia of a good relationship between government, management and unions. This country is crying out for leadership and action. I believe the future of the Parliament will be sound only so long as each honourable member who takes his place in this House has an understanding of and dedication to the Westminster system to which we owe so much. Sir Winston Churchill was reported as having said, "Well, despite all of its faults, it works". The Westminster system does work, and it gives members of Parliament an opportunity to express their opinions and sometimes to rise above the political scene to do something for the State.

I hope that those members who return to this House after the forthcoming election will have a deep regard for the system, will want to make it work and to assist it so that, whether they be on the Opposition benches or Government supporters, they will want to be part of a system that works for the interests and the well-being of the people of New South Wales. Finally, it has been my great privilege to represent in this Parliament the electorate of Dubbo. In the years that I have been the parliamentary representative for the electorate I have had the privilege of seeing Dubbo grow from a municipality to a thriving city. In that time the Macquarie Valley has developed into one of the most fertile agricultural areas of the State. Over the years it has given me a tremendous amount of satisfaction to know that I have had support and encouragement from my electorate. I shall return to that electorate with the knowledge that I have done my best in the Parliament to represent

my constituents. One of my great satisfactions is knowing that I have been able to share in the development and growth in that electorate. I wish the Parliament well. May it continue to stand for democratic principles, integrity and concern. May those principles continue to be its hallmarks for many years.

Mr EINFELD (Waverley), Minister for Consumer Affairs [3.15]: I wish to express my happiness and pleasure at having been given an opportunity to represent in this Parliament the Australian Labor Party and the people of my electorate. I have been able to give effect to many of the things in which I have always believed. For the majority of the time that I was a member of the Parliament I sat on the Opposition benches. Frequently I told the House—even with the benign consent of the honourable member for Northcott, Mr Speaker, who for some time occupied your position—about the things that the Labor Party would do when it gained the Treasury benches. I am thrilled and happy that the Government has been able to accomplish many of the things about which I spoke as a member of the Opposition. I am confident that as time goes on the Government will do all of the other things about which I spoke—and many more—for the good and the betterment of the people.

Members of Parliament have a wonderful opportunity. We are a peculiar group. All honourable members start out immodestly and egotistically, by offering themselves for preselection for their respective parties. They advertise themselves as being the best person for the job. In literature and by word of mouth they tell people that they are the ones to whom the voters should give their support. I am grateful to the people of Bondi and Waverley for giving me their support regularly. In my own way I tried to do all I could to satisfy their ambitions, desires and wishes.

I would be wrong if I did not say that on this occasion I am sad as well as being happy. I should like to tell the tale about three men who for three years were shipwrecked on an island. Each morning they went down to the beach. One morning they saw a lamp, which one of them picked up. It resembled Aladdin's lamp, so he rubbed it. Out came a genie, who said to the three of them "I shall grant you each one wish". The first man was an American. He said, "I wish for \$5 million and five beautiful blondes, and I wish I was in Miami". The genie said, "That is no problem at all", and rubbed his hands together. The American arrived in Miami with \$5 million and five beautiful blondes. The second man was an Australian. He said to the genie, "I would like to be on the Gold Coast with \$5 million and five gorgeous brunettes". The genie said, "That is no problem", and rubbed his hands together. Immediately the Australian was on the Gold Coast with \$5 million and five gorgeous brunettes. The third man was an Irishman. He thought for a while and said, "You know, I am quite lonely. I would like to have my two friends back". I, too, shall feel lonely for a while.

Members of Parliament have a wonderful opportunity to stand in a free and unfettered place, to say what they think, and to espouse the principles in which they believe. That is a great privilege. In my quite long experience in this place, and in another place, I have realized that almost every member of Parliament of any political party entered the Parliament because he or she believed that he could do the best and wanted to do the best possible for Australia. Though we have different ways of wanting to do the best, and argue strongly at times about how it should be done, almost all members of Parliament want to do what is best for Australia and for the world. I believe they do it quite remarkably. For example, the honourable member for Northcott spoke earlier in this debate. Strangely enough, I have some regard for him. I know that every honourable member sympathises with me because I had to be his adjudicator in his early days when he was just as

verbose—though probably not as fluent—as he is now. He did not have any more matter than he does now. I know that honourable members will sympathize with me when I say that it was a difficult art to adjudicate on what he said, once one overcame the problem of adjudicating on how he said it.

The honourable member for Northcott does not believe there should be any protection for the individual. He believes in the freedom of society, provided it is freedom for the greedy and for those who have power. He spoke of the goose that laid the golden egg. I want the goose to lay the golden egg so that the golden egg might ensure that people will be employed and so earn wages. I want to make sure that everyone gets a share of the golden egg. That is the difference in my philosophy and that of the honourable member for Northcott. The honourable member for Northcott wants only the greedy to get the golden egg. He wants but a few to share in all the golden eggs. I want all the people to share all the golden eggs that rightfully belong to the whole community—not to a privileged few. That is where he and I differ ideologically. He has said that his side is right. However, honourable members would know that the Government belongs to the people; they are the ones who matter in this world. The people will continue to choose the Labor Party because they know that it is right for them and is not merely for the greedy few who want all the golden eggs.

It has been an interesting experience to be a member of Parliament. It is sad to say farewell to the close associates one has had over the years, and to all the members of Parliament, who are fine people of merit. Certainly nearly all of them are people of good motivation. I pay my respects to you, Mr Speaker. You have had close associations with me—and I with you. For some time we sat together on the Standing Orders Committee under the chairmanship of the honourable member for Northcott, who today raises points of order on matters that you and I fought for. He always voted against you, Mr Speaker, as you will remember so clearly. I have enjoyed your occupancy of the Chair. You have endeavoured to be fair and you have been fair. Your judgments have been sound. I thank the Clerks of the Parliament for their efforts in their onerous tasks. They run the Parliament, and it is just as well for honourable members that they do. They are wonderful people who give good advice—as do all the officers involved in the running of the Parliament.

In my public life I have been blessed with the services of a wonderful personal staff, including my private secretary, Greg Brown. He was with me when I was Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I am as proud of him as I am proud of members of my own family. I thank him for his loyal service to me. I pay tribute to all my staff. My assistant private secretary, Margo Denholm, and others have worked day and night for the sometimes revolutionary and often hurried things that I have desired. The officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs are white knights on white horses—all anxious to fight and work for the community. One can only be enriched by that sort of help and by having a co-operative, helpful wife, who is always most anxious to please—as is my wife. I am grateful for my experiences. I wish the Parliament well. I shall watch with anxiety and interest the future working of the Parliament. I want what everyone should want—the best for the people of Australia.

Mr MURRAY (Barwon), Deputy Leader of the Country Party [3.26]: On behalf of the Country Party I extend best wishes to those members who will be leaving this Parliament. They have certainly earned a tribute, as they have earned the right to be members of this Chamber. The Country Party is witnessing the passing of an era that has virtually covered the span of the life of the Parliament. When I was elected a member of this House, one of the first pieces of advice given to me was, "When you look round and see another person, you might think what a fool he is.

Do not forget that there are probably 20 000 people who would argue with you in an endeavour to prove that he is not". When a person ceases to be a member, he creates a gap in the party ranks and in the Parliament.

George Freudenstein, Jim Taylor and Tim Bruxner have each been members of this House for many years. John Sullivan and Peter King have only recently been elected as members of this House. They will all leave at the end of the Parliament. Over the years these men have had tremendous personal appeal within their electorates. They have worked hard in their electorates and in this Parliament, and have shown a loyalty to the Country Party, its members, the Parliament, and to the people who elected them. Their integrity is such that they leave this House with unblemished records. Their assistance and friendship to all members is appreciated—especially by me, as a relatively new member.

George Freudenstein is the second longest serving member of this House. The only other member who has served longer is the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy, the Hon. P. D. Hills. That is a wonderful record when one considers that George Freudenstein was elected to Parliament twenty-two and a half years ago when he won a seat that had been considered safe for the Labor Party. He made it a safe Country Party seat. All that I have said about hard work, honesty and integrity applies to him so well. George Freudenstein set up the present system of power generation and constructed the establishments in this State that now carry out that task.

Jim Taylor has been the Country Party Whip for a long time. He served twenty-one and a half years in this Parliament. He has been a soldier settler in former days and worked with the limited resources that were available. Jim Taylor carved a career for himself and brought to the Parliament a touch of commonsense. His departure will leave a gap. He has left his mark on the Parliament. Tim Bruxner is the second member of his family to be elected and serve in the New South Wales Parliament. His father served for forty-two years before him. Tim Bruxner has given nineteen years' service to the Parliament. They would be regarded as the father and son statesmen of the New South Wales Parliament. Tim Bruxner served as Deputy Leader of the Country Party and as a Minister in a former coalition government. He is a strong debater and has a tremendous sense of humour. He has endeared himself to all members of this House. However, I might add that he is a dreadful snooker and pool partner. The work of John Sullivan in this Parliament has been of short duration. Previously he served in the federal sphere of politics and in gaining election to Canberra was responsible for one of the greatest upsets in political history. He has shown what can be done by a member in a short time. My remarks apply equally to Peter King, the member for Oxley. The Parliament is the richer for these men having passed through its portals. This House shall miss them very much.

On behalf of the Country Party I extend best wishes to John Mason, the honourable member for Dubbo and former Leader of the Opposition. I extend best wishes also to Dick Healey, the honourable member for Davidson and a former Minister. John Mason was my first leader in Opposition and I served as a shadow minister under his leadership. Dick Healey is a former Minister of the Crown who served this State well. I extend best wishes to the two Ministers who will be retiring, Syd Einfeld and Harry Jensen. These two men have had a tremendous impact on politics. It is not often that a member of Parliament serves in both the federal and State spheres, as has Syd Einfeld.

I pay tribute to Harry Jensen for his sense of humour and for the kindness he has extended to many honourable members. Early in my career as an honourable member I made a speech. I remember receiving a note from him across the table.

The note read: "Congratulations on an excellent speech". That gives an idea of the calibre of the man. To the Clerks, attendants in the House and throughout the building, the library staff, dining-room staff, the cleaners and to all who serve members, I extend thanks. Members of the Country Party look forward to seeing them all again soon. Six Country Party seats were abolished in the redistribution of electoral boundaries. In the past, attempts have been made to wipe out the Country Party at elections. Those attempts have not succeeded. The attempts to do the same thing by way of a redistribution will not succeed. The Country Party will return with even stronger loyalty and solidarity than that exhibited by those honourable members who are retiring from the Parliament.

Mr MALLAM (Campbelltown) [3.32]: I am indebted to the people who have helped me throughout my parliamentary career. When I came to the city and was out of work Jack Lang took me under his wing and introduced me to that great reformist party, the Australian Labor Party. His loyalty to me, like my loyalty to him, was unquestioned. I sat in the House with your father, Mr Speaker. He was one of the great men of politics who showed kindness to people of all walks of life. I am proud to have served in the same House as both you and your father. It was an honour also for me to serve with Billy Sheahan, and a pleasure to have been a colleague of his son. I nursed Terry when he was a baby, and when he was a boy sometimes I used to chase him away so that his father and I could have a private chat.

Joe Cahill was a great leader of the Labor Party. I have been proud to serve here with his son as I was proud to serve with him. I knew Joe Cahill when he was a member of the Parliament and also when he was not a member for a time. It has been a privilege for me to have been associated with the people I have mentioned. I want to make reference also to the Bodkin family, a great Labor Party family. Frances Bodkin, Harley Johnson's daughter, worked on the *Century* newspaper without salary and also served as a political secretary, without payment. The position is different today when members have paid secretarial assistance.

It was Pat Hills who inspired me—when I was 61 years of age—to return to the Parliament. He is one of the most brilliant politicians I have met, though he is greatly underrated. I say that as one who has come in and out of the doors of this institution over a period of 54 years. It was my colleague Syd Einfeld who convinced my wife that I should run for election on a second occasion. He played a major part in my return to the House.

The honourable member for Northcott said that he has not heard from me recently about the Desert Flame of Andamooka. The reason is that I have been busy with electoral matters. My wife and I had to move with our family to Campbelltown. At one stage we lived in two houses. It had not occurred to me that the Labor Party would be back on the Treasury benches so soon. I pay tribute to all Ministers of the Government, so ably led by Premier Wran. During the Government's period in office the population of my electorate has almost trebled from 27 000 to 64 000. I have been doing the work of two or three Country Party members so I have not had much time to speak about the Desert Flame of **Andamooka**.

The *sub judice* rule was introduced in the Parliament so that the Speaker, **Sir Daniel Levy**, could protect the Lang Government on one occasion. It should never have been introduced. When the honourable member for Northcott was Speaker he applied that rule to me on one occasion because his own party did not want me to raise a particular matter. I pay special tribute to him because **the** next day he rang me and informed me that I could ask the question I had tried to ask earlier. I respected **him** for his courage in doing that.

**All** members of the House have unique qualities. On one occasion when **I** was attacked bitterly, Dick Healey went out of his way to see that I had the **opportunity** to visit government departments. I served with **Tim Bruxner's** father. He was one of the most able politicians ever to grace the House. **Tim** has been a worthy successor to his father. It is true that honourable members do not agree on all matters. I am a member of a reformist party. Opposition supporters want the **status quo**. The Minister for Consumer **Affairs** said earlier that the Opposition wants all the golden eggs, not just a share. The Parliament is a wonderful institution. I have the highest praise for those who reproduce the speeches of honourable members. I was amazed when I read my maiden speech in *Hansard*. I pay special tribute also to the gentlemen of the fourth estate. I remember when the railing was put at the front of the press gallery. A reporter—I think it was Cliff Carey—knocked over an inkwell and the ink splashed on Jack Lang. The news media staff are fearless. I have no **complaint** to make about them though I may have had some disputes in the past with the owners of newspapers.

All honourable members owe a debt to the public servants with whom they have contact. In the past few years in the **Campbelltown** electorate I have had cause **to** thank Ministers for their promptness in dealing with matters, despite the work load the Ministers are called upon to bear. To my colleagues also I owe a great debt. In an electorate to which 15 000 new people come each year numerous problems must be faced. I have the greatest admiration for the staff of all government departments, for their work and diligence in attending to problems in the **community** in which I serve.

I do not denigrate Opposition supporters. They do the best they can. Doubtless all members of the Parliament work hard in their electorates. I have worked with reformers such as J. T. Lang, Syd Einfeld, Harry Jensen, Billy Sheahan, and Joe **Cahill**, I trust that some day the people on the other side of the House **will** no longer want to retain the **status quo** but will become a little progressive. The State will face big problems in the future. We live in a world of uncertainty. When I became a member of the Parliament there was much certainty about interest rates, loans and what legislation should be enacted. Today, nothing is certain. By tomorrow morning interest rates may have risen even higher. The world is changing rapidly.

Members of the Opposition must begin to realize that they cannot get back to the **status quo**. I wish **all** the continuing members and the incoming members well in the difficult tasks that they will have to perform. I remember the late Colonel **Bruxner** standing where the Deputy Leader of the Country Party is sitting at this moment and telling the House about the early days of this Parliament and how simple life was before the introduction of the Motor Traffic Act. He spoke of how little there was to do in the Parliament in those days. The work that Ministers and backbenchers have to cope with today is overwhelming. In the days of which the late Colonel **Bruxner** was speaking, members would come to the House once a year for a few weeks and then return to their electorates. Life was not so complicated I regret that it will become even more complicated and more uncertain.

I express my thanks to all the people outside the House, especially in the electorate of **Campbelltown**, who gave me a second opportunity to come back into this Parliament, which is something that rarely happens. I thank my colleagues in the **Labor** Party who supported me in my attempt to **win** the seat. It is always a high point in the political life of a **Labor** man to beat a Liberal or conservative member **of** Parliament. I had that privilege at the age of sixty-one. I have been fortunate in many ways. The good Lord has been caring for me for a long time, and I say that remembering that I had a difficult life when I first came to the city.

I know that the young members of the Labor Party will be returning to the Government benches. I hope that the honourable member for Heffron achieves his ambition by becoming a Minister in the next Government and that other young members will do the same. The Labor Party under its present leadership is clearly successful and I hope to live long enough to see the Minister for Housing, Minister for Co-operative Societies and Assistant Minister for Transport become Premier. His father and I were mates. He comes from great fighting stock. The Labor Party has survived because of its fighting qualities. It must keep fighting for more reform. I wish all honourable members well. I have no regrets about leaving. I have been privileged and a lucky person to have sat in this Chamber.

Mr HEALEY (Davidson) [3.43]: I shall take a few minutes, not to reminisce about my twenty years in this Parliament or to go back over what might have been, but to place on record my thanks to a number of people with whom I have been associated while I have been here and to say some things that may be necessary in the circumstances. I have watched people come and go in this Parliament for various reasons, but have not equipped myself satisfactorily for this occasion of my own departure. Perhaps we all think that it will not happen to us, but in the long run it does. Like death, leaving the Parliament is inevitable for all of us. There are various ways one can leave the Parliament. One can resign; that is of one's own choosing. One can go by loss of one's electorate, which is someone else's choosing. One can depart because one is beaten in a preselection, as I was. There are one or two other ways that one can depart. There is always the ultimate one for those who do not make it to the next election. Perhaps one can spare a thought for those who will not quite make it after 19th September. Might I express the hope that some of my colleagues on the other side of the House may be joining me in retirement.

I am grateful for the opportunity that I have had to represent my electorate in this Parliament. In 1962 I became the member for Wakehurst, which took in the whole of the present electorates of Wakehurst and Davidson. In 1971 I became the member for Davidson. I am grateful to the electors for their confidence in me over that period. I express thanks to the staff of this Parliament through you, Mr Speaker. There is no doubt that honourable members are well attended by the officers of the Parliament. That remark extends not only to the attendants for the manner in which they look after honourable members but also to those who serve us in the dining room and to the attendants as they care for our personal needs. Perhaps we do not always give them the credit they deserve. Only yesterday, attendants were searching for me—wasting their time, in a sense, I suppose. But that is the measure of the work they do. They are always cheerful and go about their job in an efficient manner.

I thank the public servants of this State for the way in which they have served this State, this Government, previous governments, and me personally. They have always been courteous and helpful. They have always had advice to offer. I never found any public servant who acted in a political manner, either when I was in Government or when I was in Opposition. I have found them most helpful. To members of my ministerial staff who are still serving, I say thank you for your devotion to duty and to me. I thank the members of the Country Party and the Liberal Party for the assistance I have received over the years. I ask all honourable members, irrespective of party affiliation, to spare a thought for my former leader, Sir Robert Askin, who is so ill in hospital. He was a great Premier and he did a remarkable job. When I was Minister for Health and later Minister for Youth and Community Services, I received dedicated service from all members of the staff of those two departments, from the commissioners and heads of departments right

down to the most junior clerk or typist. I found them helpful, courteous, and of great assistance. If I was successful in any way as a Minister, it was largely due to the advice and help that I was given by them.

One person to whom I publicly pay respect is my wife, who for nineteen years has stood by me and been a great backstop and a tremendous help while I have been in this Parliament. I do not think any honourable member, until he sits and thinks about it, really understands the role that the wife of a Minister or wife of a member has to play. People outside the Parliament have no idea of what is expected of the wife of a member. It is with great love that I pay that tribute to my wife for the way she has helped me.

I go out of Parliament with no regrets. I have done the job that I had to do. I feel that I have completed all the things I had to do here. When I came to the Parliament in 1962 the electorate, situated in the Warringah shire on the outskirts of Sydney, was sparsely populated. It is now an important part of the great metropolis. From a collection of scattered villages, the region has become an extensive residential area. I have followed its development in the building of schools and roads and the provision of sewerage services. The services it should have had have been provided. The things that are wrong with it now are the result of its having turned the full circle. At the beginning it had too little of some things: it now has too much of them. By that I mean it now has too much traffic and there are many other problems to be dealt with as a result of the huge increase in population. Someone else will have the job of solving those problems.

I said that I have no regrets about leaving this Parliament in the sense that I have achieved what I set out to do. I came here as a brash young politician who was out to improve the world. I was told to sit in the corner for a couple of years, keep my ears and eyes open and not say much. That was sound advice. I am sad, if I may say so, at the way this Parliament is heading. I may be wrong. Other people will perhaps differ from me. Members of the Labor Party continually claim that they are out to improve the parliamentary system for the sake of democracy. I would not argue with their words if their actions were consistent with them. I have observed changes that have occurred in this Parliament over the past twenty years, and they worry me. There has been a loss of dignity in the House. It is my view that members of Parliament should be setting an example to the whole of the community. As people come into the Parliament and see how things have changed, they must be worried.

Standards of dress, behaviour and debate in this place have all been lowered and that is a pity. A tendency to score cheap, dubious political points has grown in a way that denigrates the importance of the parliamentary institution and the manner in which it contributes to the well-being of the citizens of New South Wales. I refer in particular to the manner in which the Budget was delivered last night, and the way in which question time was wiped out today. Why was the Government so unhappy, so afraid and so lacking in confidence that it did not permit questions to be asked today in this House? Was the Government afraid that the Opposition might have asked a question that may have made newspaper headlines about an issue that could cause it to lose the election? The Government's attitude is to be deplored. Though the same kind of thing may have taken place when the coalition parties were in office, the manner in which debate has been cut off and elected members have been denied their right to ask questions is deplorable. Whether the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice in his role as Leader of the House, thinks he is scoring points or causing the Opposition damage, I do not know. The fact is that he is causing damage to this Parliament, and that concerns me.

It has been said that, if two people keep agreeing, one of them will not be necessary, and that could be the case if the Opposition and the Government always agreed. If that always happened, Parliament certainly would not operate in the way in which it does. There is a need for an Opposition and a Government. Whether the Opposition represents the Labor Party, the Liberal Party or the Country Party, matters little. An Opposition provides an alternative point of view; it says the things that need to be said on behalf of the minority in the community. Often the voice of the minority cannot be heard unless a member of Parliament in this House speaks up on its behalf. For the welfare and future of this Parliament, I ask members to try to ensure that there is adequate debate, sufficient discussion and proper consideration of legislation brought into this House. We should not try to score cheap political points or play dubious tricks in Parliament.

Debate should not be cut short by the guillotine only because the Government wants to score points from the Opposition. When the coalition parties were in office, I deplored that practice and I have continued to criticize it. It does not make any difference which party is in office: if matters are fully discussed, the likelihood is that better legislation will result. For many years I have said I would like to see a committee system of examining legislation introduced in this Parliament. Under that system, legislation would be considered by committees before being introduced into the House. That system has operated well in Sweden and Israel and, to some extent, in Canberra. After many different views are given, legislation is presented that will work better and require less amendment than has been the case in recent years. What we are getting now is some form of instant decision-making, which is not beneficial to the community. Doubtless, some members on the other side of the House will agree with that.

I should like to thank Ministers and many backbenchers opposite for the courtesy and help they have given me. I thank the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice for the remarks he has made about me. I thank also the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party for his kind remarks. In the period of almost twenty years in which I have been in this place I have made some good friends. If I have not made a large number of friends, I can retire with the thought that I have made no enemies. I have always tried to forget the personality of a member. I have never attacked a member as a person but only as a supporter of the Government or the Opposition, or as a representative of a certain electorate. I have never attacked a member personally or said any thing that could be construed as a personal attack or one that would cause him any concern.

I am proud to have had the opportunity of serving in this Parliament for such a long time. I have no regrets at leaving this place. In the past three months I have been able to consider my position. Though I have been under pressure from sections of my electorate to run as an independent candidate for this Parliament, my wife and I have decided against it. Most members today have told some story to illustrate the points they have made. I am reminded of a bowling club in a small town—perhaps the size of Lightning Ridge. It was decided that a number of Aborigines should be asked to join the bowling club to make them feel more at home within the community. Half a dozen Aborigines were asked to join the bowling club, which they did. After twelve months the new members were getting along quite well so a member of the committee asked one man to take office in the club. When he replied, "What job do you have in mind?" the committeeman said, "We have given it careful consideration and we think the job you would fill best would be that of selector." The new member then said, "No fear, I have enough trouble in this bowling club just being an Aborigine." We all know how popular bowling club selectors are.

That is how I felt when I was asked to be an independent candidate. I have got into enough trouble just being a Liberal in this House. To come here as an independent Liberal would put me in the same position as that Aborigine: I would not be popular with anyone. I thank members of this House for the opportunity they have given me to say these few words. I look forward to my retirement from the Parliament. I do not intend to retire from public life, for I have a number of goals that will occupy me within the next six or seven years. No matter which party members belong to in this House, and no matter how long they have been here, I wish them all the best. I look forward to seeing the result of the election on 19th September.

Mr FREUDENSTEIN (Young) [3.56]: I shall occupy the House for but a short time. I thank the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice for his kind remarks about me and my long service in this House. It is unusual to hear praise from a member of an opposing party. Having had the privilege of serving twenty-two and a half years in this House, I am an equal fourth longest-serving member. I had hoped to be able to serve another three years. I have been polishing the seat and keeping it warm, but when the redistribution pulled it from under me I had to change my mind about the prospect of serving another term.

As I am approaching the age of sixty, I could not see myself travelling over 200 square miles of an electorate looking after a larger number of people and giving them the same service they had grown to expect from me in the past. I should like to thank those persons in my electorate who gave me the opportunity of representing them in this place for so long. I thank my colleagues, also, for their tolerance of me in the party room. In particular, I thank the Leader of the Country Party and a former leader of the Liberal Party, Sir Robert Askin, for the help they gave me here. I was the second-longest serving member of a cabinet in this Parliament. It might be said, as my one claim to fame, that I have served in more portfolios than any other member. If one were unkind, one could say that that was because I was inclined to make a mess of any portfolio I held. Others who are kinder might say that I was more adaptable. My electorate is in good shape although it will soon be scattered by the winds of distribution. That part of my constituency which will be part of the electorate of Goulburn will be well looked after by the honourable member for Goulburn; the northern part of the electorate of Young, which will be made part of the new electorate of Lachlan, will be in the good hands of Mr Ian Armstrong.

Portion of the Young constituency will be made part of the Burrinjuck electorate. I hope the people of that electorate change their minds and elect a non-socialist member. I am confident that John Harvey will do a good job for the electorate. I am a little concerned that I have not achieved all that I set out to do when I came to this place. One thing I failed to achieve was the sealing of the road from Young to Goulburn, which is my shortest route to Sydney. Now that I will be losing my free travel pass, I shall be using that road more often, but if it gets any worse I am afraid that my obituary will be written sooner than I would have expected. I wish to thank the staff of Parliament House for their courtesy and for the way in which they have attended to my needs during my tenure here. No establishment can be properly run without discipline, and that discipline comes from the Chair and the Clerks at the table. I leave this Chamber happy in the knowledge that I have achieved a good deal for my electorate. I leave this place with no ill will towards anybody in this Parliament. I hope that good will is reciprocated.

Mr BARRACLOUGH (Bligh) [4.3]: This has been for me both a happy and a sad day. It has been happy because it is my daughter's nineteenth birthday, and I had a most enjoyable luncheon with her in the parliamentary dining-room.

Today has also been sad for I attended the funeral of Mr and Mrs **Noice** and Mrs Swan, who were killed in the unfortunate tragedy last Monday. I know that the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy is a busy person, but I hope that he will institute a thorough investigation into the events that led to that terrible accident. I have heard reports that some materials fell off the same building on the previous Friday. The building has a bad record, and I hope that these matters will be fully investigated.

This is also a sad day because many good friends and colleagues are leaving this Chamber. I refer in particular to John Mason, Dick Healey, Tim Bruxner, James Taylor and George Freudenstein—all men who have served in this Parliament during the time I have been here, that is, since 1968. We have had a lot of fun together and have taken part in some interesting debates. I wish all those members a long retirement. I wish them and their families health and happiness in the future. I am sorry that Peter King and John Sullivan are leaving this place. I hope that they will have the chance to serve in this House in the future.

I am sorry to see a longtime political opponent, Syd Einfeld, departing from this place. He and I were candidates for this House back in 1965. I pay tribute to Syd Einfeld and Harry Jensen. Whenever I made representations to those Ministers, they and their staff attended to them with expedition. Only last Friday I made an urgent appeal, and although it did not come to anything, it was dealt with expeditiously. I shall miss Lew Johnstone. He and I have a common interest in the New South Wales 18-foot sailing league club. On some occasions we have had refreshments in that club, I am sorry to see Cliff Mallam retiring. He will probably become an honorary member of the Australian Jockey Club when he leaves this place. I have always treasured his friendship, and we have had many laughs together. I am sorry particularly about the retirement of Gordon Barnier. During his time as a member he has served his electorate and this Parliament well.

One reason why I came into the Chamber is that while I was having lunch one of my parliamentary colleagues said to me: "Get down into the Chamber quickly. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice just opened your campaign. He is saying nice things about you". When I came into the Chamber I heard the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice have the audacity to say that I would not be back. As a matter of fact, the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, with the assistance of the Premier and Treasurer, opened my campaign last year when he repealed the Summary Offences Act and substituted a new law. Those two members have been doing great things for me in my electorate. Any time between now and 19th September the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice can come with me to the back lanes of Darlinghurst, to Paddington or the streets of Surry Hills. I shall welcome him—and the people of those areas want to see him. For the information of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, the good ship Bligh sailed at **9.30** last night. We will fire our first salvo at **7.30 a.m.** tomorrow on Kings Cross railway station, and I should like the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice to be there.

I conclude on this note—and I shall be raising these matters when I resume my seat in this Parliament after the coming elections: I say to the new members on the Government benches that there has been too much ridiculing of honourable members who sit on this side of the House by Ministers and some Government supporters. This Parliament will succeed in its work only by having an effective government and **an** effective opposition. On one or two occasions I have been subject to ridicule, but I have a thick skin: it did not worry me. However, it worried my family, and that is not the name of the game. If this State and this democracy are to exist, there must

be an effective government and an effective opposition. If some honourable members continue to conduct themselves in the way they have been, New South Wales will end up like most South African States—with a government and no opposition, and that would be a sad thing. For the benefit of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, who opened my campaign last year, I repeat the words of the great, courageous and experienced General MacArthur—"I shall return."

Mr TAYLOR (Temora) [4.7]: I express my appreciation of the kind things that have been said about me by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Country Party. I wish to thank a number of people, but I shall not name them all. I thank members of this House for their company and co-operation and for the privilege of being able to work with them for the benefit of New South Wales. I thank the Clerks at the table. I count them among my best friends. I thank those persons who serve us—the attendants, the dining room staff and all other persons who work in every part of this, the mother Parliament of Australia.

I thank the people who put me here and those who have kept me here. It has been a privilege to serve them. If I have learned anything about being a member of Parliament, it is that we must regard ourselves as part of a team. If this Parliament is to mean anything in the future, its members must be part of a team. I have been part of the Country Party team and I am proud of that. I have been part of the Liberal Party-Country Party team both in government and in opposition, and I am proud of that. But I am proud mainly for being part of the New South Wales Parliament. If we forget teamwork, some of the things other honourable members have predicted will happen. The message I would like to leave with this House has already been mentioned by my deputy leader. He said he was told that, no matter what he may think of a person, either on his own side or on the opposite side of the House, he must remember that that person is here because the majority of people in a certain part of New South Wales put him here and supported him.

I was introduced to this Parliament by Mick Bruxner, later Sir Michael Bruxner, who was sworn as a member of this Parliament on the day I was born. I was forty years of age when I entered this Parliament. Sir Michael Bruxner was a great man, and he explained the workings of the Parliament to me as only he could. He said to me, "I will give you one piece of advice and it is that, no matter what we might think personally about the fellow sitting opposite or beside us, in some electorate the majority of people believe he is the man". If we disregard that advice, Parliament will be denigrated.

Some people, including several honourable members this afternoon, have expressed fears for the future. I have no fear for the future of this great State or the nation. Like some other honourable members, I have had the privilege of travelling in other countries. I have not travelled anywhere that has greater opportunities than Australia. I have not visited any place in which I would sooner live or of which I could be prouder. Provided they accept the system, though it may have weaknesses, parliamentarians, including the younger members of this Parliament, should take the opportunity that is available to make New South Wales the greatest State and part of the greatest nation on earth. That is the challenge I throw out to members and to those who come after them. During the time I have been a member of Parliament I have witnessed, in government and when in opposition, great and varied achievements. When I became a member of this House I was part of the Opposition. I have experienced the wonderful thrill of being in government, though not the privilege of being a Minister. Also, I have known the frustrations and disappointments of being a backbencher both in government and in opposition.

The privilege of being a member of Parliament afforded me great opportunities. As I said, I have observed the State develop in material ways. As bad as some things might be and as much as one might complain about them, one should not lose sight of the progress that has occurred. Twenty years ago when I first became the member for my electorate it had but a pitiful twenty miles of bitumen road. Now one may travel on many miles of bitumen roads in the electorate and continue on to Melbourne, Adelaide, Brisbane or Sydney, also along bitumen roads. They may not be as good as the highways in some other countries but certainly they are a big improvement on the roads of earlier years. All of our schools and hospitals are being developed. Of course, a great deal more must be done. One should not think that as a member of this House one can do everything that one would want to achieve. This great State and great nation of Australia demands more of us than that.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Government Whip, the honourable member for Granville, from who I have had every co-operation and assistance. I have appreciated his friendship. Unfortunately, we share a minor failing—we like to drive cars faster than the speed limit permits. I thank the Opposition Whip, the honourable member for The Hills, for his co-operation and help. I thank most sincerely the public servants of the various departments. I found them all to be people who acted as part of a team. Some of them have been attached to the offices of Ministers and others in departmental offices in country and city areas. None has told me anything that he should not have divulged. Most of them see their job as a way of working for the benefit of New South Wales. I express publicly my thanks and appreciation to the public service, the staff of the Parliament and to all honourable members.

Mr CATERSON (The Hills) [4.15]: I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the members of the Parliament who are leaving us today. I mention particularly my two Liberal Party colleagues, the honourable member for Dubbo and the honourable member for Davidson. From my five years' association with them I have nothing but the highest praise for them both, particularly for Mr Mason, the former Leader of the Opposition, with whom I worked closely as the Opposition Whip. He is a man of great ability. It is a pity that he is terminating his parliamentary career. Also, it has been a privilege to be associated with the Country Party members, Mr Bruxner, the honourable member for Tenterfield, Mr Freudenstein, the honourable member for Young, and Mr Taylor, the honourable member for Temora. I pay tribute to the energy of each of them. I thank the honourable member for Temora, the Country Party Whip, for his kind remarks about me. I have appreciated his help, chidings, corrections and philosophies on Parliament during the three years that we have been associated together as whips of the Opposition parties. I wish well the two short-term Country Party members who will be leaving the Parliament, the honourable member for Oxley and the honourable member for Sturt.

I thank the Minister for Consumer Affairs for the many courtesies he has extended to me, personally and through his officers. To the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads, may I say that recently it was a great privilege to thank him publicly three times on the one day in my electorate for his splendid contribution to the State. He has been a great help to me in my short time here. I lay claim to a personal relationship with the honourable member for Gampbelltown in that we share high regard for The Hills district. One of these days I might even entice him to live in the area. With his daughter and son-in-law living in The Hills we have two common conversation pieces—the Ifield family and The Hills. I wish Lou Johnson, the honourable member for Broken Hill, and Gordon Barnier, the honourable member for Blacktown, my electorate neighbour, well.

In the closing moments of the Forty-sixth Parliament I express my appreciation to you, Mr Speaker, for your courtesy to me as Opposition Whip. I have appreciated your help and advice during the three years that I have been in the position. Also, I thank the Chairman of Committees, the honourable member for Marrickville, for his help. I concur with the remarks of the honourable member for Temora in his tribute to the Government Whip, that if the whips did not work together, the Parliament would not function as smoothly as it does.

Mr J. A. CLOUGH (Eastwood) [4.19]: I join with previous speakers in expressing regret to the members who are leaving this Forty-sixth Parliament for one reason or another. It has been my pleasure to serve with many of them, both Government supporters and my colleagues of the Opposition parties. Generally speaking our relationships have been good. I should like to think that we have been able to appreciate each other's worth, weaknesses and strengths and be always tolerant and considerate of one another. The retiring Ministers have done an excellent job in giving effect to their beliefs and philosophies. We may agree on some issues and disagree on others but always they have extended to me every courtesy and assistance.

I wish I could say the same about the Minister for Education. For two months or so I have been endeavouring to obtain a reply from him on an important matter. The Karonga special school, located in my electorate, is attended by 173 children who have the worst of multiple handicaps. In accordance with government principles the staff is to be reduced. The Minister has not even deigned to reply to my representations for him to intervene to prevent a reduction in the staff level of that school.

I extend to all the other honourable members who are to retire best wishes for the future. I hope their retirements **will** be as they **wish** them to be. I pay special tribute to the former Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Dubbo. In doing so I do not reflect on the Leader of the Opposition. I **am** a loyal member of my party and once the party makes a decision, I abide by it. That is the way it must be, and is. The honourable member for Dubbo, despite what has been said about him in the media and elsewhere, has made a great contribution to his party and to the Parliament. The party improved under his leadership. However, for whatever reason, he was not acceptable to the media. These days, without that acceptance, a party leader has little chance of success.

I was interested in a remark of the retiring Minister for Local Government, who has been an excellent Minister. He stated that the **Labor** Party stands for a fairer distribution of community wealth. In the twenty years that I have been a member of this Parliament—and I have been in public life since leaving school—I regret to say that I have seen the **Labor** Party do little more for the people than any other political party. That is my experience, despite what one would expect from a party with its philosophies and policies. One would expect from it a better redistribution of wealth. The **Labor** Party must examine closely its policies and its aims.

When he spoke to Mike Carlton on radio today the Premier and Treasurer said that his party, irrespective of race, creed or colour, endeavours to eradicate discrimination. That may be the aim of the Premier and his party, but the implementing of the Government's philosophies is another matter. Recently I have given careful thought to this matter. During recent weeks I remained silent, as is my practice, on some issues that might have engendered sectarianism. I urge all honourable members, but especially those on the Government side, not to be lulled into believing the assertion of the Premier and Treasurer that the decision of the Government on the closure of the Mater Misericordiae Hospital was based on considerations of health

and not sectarianism. The matter is not so simple. I have reliable information that Lewisham is the next hospital to be affected, and after that will be St Lukes, the Waverley War Memorial Hospital and many others.

I am saddened that many good members on the Government benches do not recognize the trend. They do not understand that eventually they will become enmeshed in the common bondage and one day will awaken to find that things they thought could not occur have happened. I have a similar view about the fate of independent schools. In his Budget Speech the Premier and Treasurer said, in self-defence, that the independent schools are being sustained and the Government will continue to support them. My view is that if current trends are not halted, in the near future the independent schools will cease to exist. I give that warning on the eve of the conclusion of the Forty-sixth Parliament.

I join other honourable members in extending good wishes to retiring members. I hope I have the pleasure of meeting them again from time to time. I wish them and their families well. As the honourable member for Davidson said, I hope in future that the conduct of honourable members in this Parliament will improve on past performances. The Premier and Treasurer has set a poor example in implementing proper democratic parliamentary procedure. In my twenty years as a member of this House I cannot recall a worse example of parliamentary conduct than his. I hope that in the future the Premier and Treasurer will mend his ways.

Mr Walker: Probably I lead the Premier and Treasurer astray.

Mr J. A. CLOUGH: I agree that the Premier and Treasurer is not well assisted by the Leader of the House. The Premier and Treasurer is a man of acknowledged ability, but he is arrogant and lacking in many of the attributes that could enable the Parliament to work more democratically. I should welcome a change in that sort of behaviour. I wish all honourable members well and hope to see at least some of them when Parliament reassembles after the elections.

Motion agreed to.

## PRINTING COMMITTEE

### Second Report

Mr Jones, as Chairman, brought up the Second Report from the Printing Committee.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr Walker, at 4.29 p.m. until Thursday, 3rd September, 1981.

---

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

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

UN-DEDICATED CROWN LAND

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources—

(1) Of the nine areas of non-dedicated Crown land within the electorate of Gordon identified in the answer to Question No. 269, on page 1141 of the Session 1976–77–78, how many of those parcels remain without a dedicated purpose?

(2) Of those dedicated since that time, what was the date and nature of each dedication?

(3) Of those not dedicated when will a dedication be made and in each case for what purpose?

*Answer—*

(1) Five parcels of land, previously referred to as parcels (d), (f), (g), (h), and (i), remain without a dedicated purpose.

(2) Four parcels of land have been dedicated and the date and nature of each dedication is listed hereunder:

Parcel (a)—An area of 8 119 square metres at Barra Brui (Portion 833)—Reserved (R.90921) for Public Recreation, *Gazette* 30 September, 1977.

Parcel (b)—An area of 2.932 hectares at Barra Brui—added to Davidson State Recreation Area, *Gazette* 27 January, 1978.

Parcel (c)—An area of 3 367 square metres at East Killara—Reserved (R.91235) for Girl Guides, *Gazette* 1 September, 1978.

Parcel (e)—An area of about 786 square metres at West Lindfield—Appropriated by Land Commission of New South Wales, *Gazette* 8 February, 1980 and now disposed of as a residential homesite.

(3) The proposed purposes for the five non-dedicated parcels of land are listed hereunder—

Parcel (d)—An area of 3 hectares at Barra Brui—part or whole of this land will be required in association with reconstruction and realignment of Eastern Arterial Road. If there is any excess of land it is proposed to be added to Davidson State Recreation Area. Date of a final decision is indefinite.

Parcel (f)—An area of about 2.529 hectares at East Killara—possible addition to Davidson State Recreation Area. The date of a final decision is indefinite as it is associated with the proceeding rationalization of existing boundaries of the park.

Parcel (g)—An area of 1 568 square metres at East Lindfield (Portion 837)—possible addition to Davidson State Recreation Area. The date of a final decision is indefinite as it is associated with the proceeding rationalization of existing boundaries of the park.

Parcel (h)—An area of 1 555 square metres at East Lindfield—(Portion 837)—possible addition to Davidson State Recreation Area. The date of a final decision is indefinite as it is associated with the proceeding rationalization of existing boundaries of the park.

Parcel (i)—An area of 6 070 square metres at East Lindfield—the whole area is to be appropriated by the Electricity Commission of New South Wales for the Lindfield 132 kV Switching Station Site in approximately six months.

#### WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources—

- (1) What areas of any Government Departments, Government instrumentalities, Boards, Corporations and Statutory Authorities under his ministerial control or supervision act as self-insurers for Workers' Compensation?
- (2) For the last available accounting year for each such body, how much was paid out in Workers' Compensation claims?

*Answer—*

- (1) None.
- (2) Not applicable.

#### NAROOMA BYPASS

Mr HATTON asked the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads—

- (1) Has a date been set for commencement of a Princes Highway bypass through Narooma?
- (2) If so, what stage has the planning reached?
- (3) Have all affected property owners been notified?

*Answer—*

- (1) A date has not been set for commencement of the relocation of the Princes Highway through Narooma.
- (2) Planning for the bypass is in the preliminary stage only. It will be some considerable time before final plans are prepared and boundaries fixed.
- (3) On the southern side of the Wagonga River negotiations have been completed or are under way for all land known to be required, although some additional small acquisitions may be necessary for splays at intersections, depending on the boundaries fixed in the final design.

On the northern side of the river, the necessary surveys have not been completed, and until this is done, the fixing of the boundaries of the land required cannot proceed. Consequently, it has not been practicable to advise the owners of all properties affected on the northern side. However, the approximate boundaries of the planned route have been exhibited in Eurobodalla Shire Council's Interim Development Control Map published in July 1976.

BELLINGEN LOW LEVEL BRIDGE

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

- (1) Does the low level bridge between Bellingen and North Bellingen cause great inconvenience to industry and the people of the town whenever the Bellingen River rises?
- (2) **Has** any planning been done to replace this low level structure with a high level bridge?
- (3) Will he advise if funds will be made available for the construction?
- (4) When will funds be made available to allow the work to proceed?

*Answer—*

- (1) The Department of Main Roads has no information regarding inconvenience to local industry and residents at **times** of abnormal river levels. **This** bridge is located on a local road which is under the care and control of Bellingen Shire Council.
- (2) No planning for a replacement structure has **been undertaken** by the Department. The responsibility for initiating proposals, determining priorities and planning for a new bridge rests with Council.
- (3) Funds to assist towards the cost of construction of a new bridge would normally be made available to Council under the Bridge Subsidy Scheme, provided that the work is eligible for assistance under the Scheme.
- (4) Funds for eligible works are made available to Councils **only** after **all** plans, specifications and estimates of costs have been approved by the Department of Main Roads, and when Councils are able to meet their share of the costs of works.

NEWRY ISLAND ACCESS ROAD JUNCTION

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

- (1) Does the junction of Newry Island access road and the **Pacific** Highway cause problems to residents of Newry Island and highway traffic?
- (2) If so, has any planning been done to upgrade this intersection?
- (3) When will funds be made available for this work?
- (4) When will work commence?

*Answer—*

- (1) **This** junction has adequate sight distance and is widened and sealed on the western side. However, it appears that the junction is causing concern to some residents of Newry Island.

(2) **Yes.** Preliminary improvements to furnishings, including better delineation of the junction, will be carried out. Also, consideration **will** be given to additional bitumen surfacing to generally improve conditions.

(3) If possible, funds will be provided in the current financial year. However, the 1981–82 State Highways Construction Programme has not yet been finalized and no commitment can be entered into.

(4) If funds can be made available, every effort will be made to commence the work, which will take about two weeks to complete, during November, 1981.

The following question upon notice and answer was circulated in *Questions and Answers* to the date of dissolution.

#### SOLAR FILTER WINDSCREEN FILM

Mr MOORE asked the Minister for Transport—

(1) In what states are full windscreen and front door windows on motor vehicles permitted to be covered with a tinted solar filter film?

(2) Will he have the matter urgently re-examined if New South Wales differs from the majority?

*Answer —*

(1) None.

(2) In the interest of road safety, the Australian Transport Advisory Council has endorsed standards for glass opacity in windscreens in motor vehicles and New South Wales will not depart from this standard.

