Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 22 August, 1979

---

**Petitions—Questions without Notice—Governor's Speech: Address in Reply (Fifth Day's Debate).**

---

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

Mr Speaker offered the Prayer.

---

**PETITIONS**

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

**Sunday Hotel Trading**

The Petition of the undersigned electors in the State of New South Wales, respectfully sheweth:

1. A referendum on Sunday trading in hotels was held in New South Wales in 1969 which showed that out of ninety-four electorates eighty-eight voted against any extension of Sunday trading.

2. Alcohol is a contributing factor in a large proportion of road accidents and deaths. Figures released in Western Australia show a 5.9 per cent increase in road deaths since Sunday trading.

3. The high incidence of alcoholism among our children and young people requires instant action during the International Year of the Child.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House: *will* take no steps to increase trading hours for alcoholic liquors without democratically ascertaining the will of the people by a referendum.

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

Petitions, lodged by Mr Mair and Mr Ramsay, received.
Trade Unions

The Petition of certain concerned citizens of New South Wales respectfully sheweth:

That they are dismayed by the present industrial anarchy which is forcing hardship on ordinary Australians, giving our country a bad name and undermining orderly government.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Premier and the Government take urgent action to curb the power of unions and put the control of the State back in the hands of our elected Government.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Schipp, received.

Marsden High School

The Petitioners of Marsden High School Parents and Citizens Association of New South Wales respectfully sheweth:

That as citizens of New South Wales and parents of state school children, we are most concerned that the quality of education available in our schools be of the highest standard.

We believe that this can only be achieved by overcoming our inadequate Library/Science accommodation at Marsden High School.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly, in Parliament assembled, should arrange for the construction of a Library/Science Block at Marsden High School.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr McIlwaine, received.

Sydney Taxi Industry

The Petition of the undersigned citizens of New South Wales who are members and drivers of the R.S.L. Ex-Servicemen's Cabs and Co-operative Members Limited respectfully sheweth:

That the issue of restricted district taxi licence plates by the Department of Motor Transport to ballotees of the taxi-cab drivers seniority list is unfair, arbitrary, bureaucratic and discriminatory in that ballotees under the present restricted policy of the department are only able to join, if they wish to do so, R.S.L. Ex-Servicemen's Cabs and Co-operative Members Limited in districts 1, 7 and 9 of the ten districts in the Sydney metropolitan transport area.

That the present policy is (1) an unfair restraint of trade and prevents R.S.L. Ex-Servicemen's Cabs and its members from providing a more efficient and fast service to the public in the other seven transport districts from which R.S.L. cabs are excluded, and (2) is not in the public interest nor in the interest of the R.S.L. Ex-servicemen's Cabs fleet throughout the Sydney metropolitan area.
Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House redress imbalances in the Sydney taxi industry so that any ballotee may join any radio co-operative he may wish to, and that retrospectivity should apply to 1974.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr K. J. Stewart, received.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ALUMINIUM SMELTER FOR NEWCASTLE

Mr MASON: Recently did the Premier announce that the French company Pechiney was to construct an aluminium smelter in Newcastle, and in so doing effectively block for many years a predominantly Australian-owned consortium which proposed to construct a much larger smelter? Had this Australian-owned group already secured a site in Newcastle, arranged a power supply contract with the Electricity Commission of New South Wales, and had well advanced arrangements for the marketing of its product? Had this group a major investment in the mining of the raw material at Gove? Is it true that the French group has yet to select a site and establish an Australian equity and has none of the other involvements in Australia that the Australian-owned company has? Why has the Premier slammed the door on the Australian proposal and shown such favouritism for an oversea owned and managed project?

Mr WRAN: The matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition poses a number of questions, the most curious of which involves the proposition that a wholly owned Australian consortium was overlooked by the Government in favour of Pechiney. Although it is true that the New South Wales Government has had a number of applications made to it for the establishment of aluminium smelters in this State, the fact is that there has not been one application made to the Government by a wholly owned Australian consortium. It would be preferable if the Leader of the Opposition would at least be accurate.

Mr Mason: I said predominantly Australian.

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

Mr WRAN: When he says predominantly Australian, let me say that it is news to me that the company Alusuisse from Switzerland has any Australian equity in it at all. In fact, it was a 50 per cent owner of the consortium that CSR Limited was endeavouring to put together in relation to its application for an aluminium smelter. Far from its not having any site, Pechiney has been granted the right to establish an aluminium smelter in the Hunter Valley. This is another inaccuracy of the Leader of the Opposition. If he is to drive away investment from New South Wales—something that the Liberals and the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, have been doing for the past several years—and also creating unemployment in this country, at least it would be better if the Leader of the Opposition were to be accurate.

The fact is that Pechiney has an option of three sites in the Hunter Valley and is able to take up an option on any one of them. Furthermore, it is a condition of the approval to Pechiney, which is the fifth biggest aluminium producer in the
world—well ahead of Alusuisse in that respect—that it must have a 50 per cent Australian equity in its operations. In addition to that, Pechiney agreed that it would offer at least 20 per cent to CSR, which at that time was part of a consortium with the Swiss-owned Alusuisse.

Now that the framework has been set correctly, let me correct one further inaccuracy on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. One would think that those briefing him from the Liberal Party headquarters, or wherever he gets his information, would at least read the Financial Review. The fact is that the capacity of the smelter to be built by Pechiney far exceeds the capacity of the smelter proposed by the Swiss consortium with CSR and a number of other Australian companies. Although unquestionably it was a difficult matter for the Government—these are matters of judgment—Cabinet made a decision after there had been extensive examination not only by the Electricity Commission and the Government's own expert authorities, but also after discussions in Canberra with those gentlemen of the same party to which the Leader of the Opposition belongs, who control the foreign investment review board. On balance it was considered that there was greater advantage not merely to New South Wales but to Australia, to our export trade and our balance of payments, if it went to Pechiney.

If I needed an advocate, I should not want the Leader of the Opposition advocating anything for me. By ventilating this matter in the Parliament he has probably done considerable harm to CSR, which was the principal Australian company in this consortium with the Swiss. Representatives of CSR were with me and the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Technology and Minister for Energy on Monday. They were having discussions with Pechiney and the Electricity Commission. The mischievous sort of complaint that the Leader of the Opposition brings up in this querulous and whining way—

[Interruption]

Mr WRAN: I am sorry you are so disappointed.

Mr Cameron: Schoolboy stuff.

Mr WRAN: The honourable member for Northcott organized a demonstration by the Festival of Light outside Parliament House yesterday, but could get only four people to attend. The Leader of the Opposition sits there smirking. The best he could do for his own party was to attack the Young Liberals as a bunch of radicals. God help Australia. Enough of this nonsense. Industrial development in New South Wales far exceeds that for the rest of Australia. The commitment of investment in New South Wales far exceeds any other State in Australia. The growth of employment in New South Wales far exceeds the growth in any other State in Australia. We will not have this humbug from the Opposition, particularly from the leader of a party whose federal Treasurer yesterday drove the unemployed further into the ground.

SUMMARY OFFENCES ACT

Mr WADE: My question without notice is directed to the Premier. Has his attention been drawn to claims that the repeal of the Summary Offences Act will result in a lack of care and attention to homeless persons and alcoholics? What action is the Government taking to ensure that these members of the community are looked after?

Mr WRAN: I am indebted to the honourable member for Newcastle for his question because there has been a deal of ill-informed and loose talk spread about by honourable members, particularly members of the Liberal Party and especially the
Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Gordon, in relation to the Summary Offences Act with reference to that portion of the new legislation that gets rid of the crimes of drunkenness and vagrancy. There is no room for penalizing people for these matters in our society, a society in which the federal Treasurer last night had the temerity to tell the public that all they can look forward to from the Fraser Government in the next twelve months is more unemployment. There is no room for putting people in gaol merely because they have no money or are drunk.

The position is that the Government has already committed $1.25 million to various institutions, such as the St Vincent de Paul Society, the Sydney City Mission, the Salvation Army and the Wesley Central Mission, for accommodation for alcoholics and homeless persons. This funding will provide 492 beds. The money will be not only by way of capital for the construction of buildings and the addition to existing buildings for accommodation in the city, the metropolitan area and thirty-five country towns; it will also provide those great institutions with assistance in running costs of the additions that will be constructed. This is in marked contrast to the attitude of the Fraser Government, which last night down-graded the whole of its welfare programme and left the handicapped, sick, poor, young and unemployed out on a limb.

Mr Arblaster: That is not true.

Mr WRAN: The honourable member for Mosman has been fairly silent now that it is winter. We hear more from him when it is summer and he is down on the nude bathing beaches. Further examples I might give are these. The St Vincent de Paul Society, which runs the Matthew Talbot Hostel will receive assistance in relation to a new development that will provide 126 beds. The Sydney City Mission will receive assistance—and this should please my colleagues opposite—for an institution known as the Opposition, which is a permanent building at Darlinghurst. The mission will receive also funds to lease new premises at Newtown. The Salvation Army will receive money for Foster House, which is in the inner city, for modification to existing premises. The Government is making a contribution to the Wesley Central Mission for the Edward Edgar Lodge at Darlinghurst, by way of a capital contribution towards a new centre. There will be assistance for other centres at Parramatta, Granville, Manly, Waverley, Kogarah-Sutherland, Newcastle and thirty-five country centres. Lest honourable members and the public think this is not necessary, may I say that the average age of the men who go to the Matthew Talbot Hostel in Darlinghurst because they have no money, are hungry, drunk or unwanted, is 38 years. That is a grave and serious reflection upon our society.

A considerable time ago the Attorney-General, who is in charge of the Summary Offences Repeal Act, and I had discussions with representatives of these worthy institutions. The Government is providing this money following a change in direction of caring for homeless people and alcoholics. No longer will these people be treated as criminals. They need help, not imprisonment. There is even greater concern over the increasing numbers of young people who need assistance. There will be even greater concern as this year wears on, and the effect of the cut throat policies of the federal Government, particularly on the young people, are felt.

CHARGES FOR ELECTRICITY

Mr SINGLETON: I address my question without notice to the Premier. What price per kilowatt hour did the French Pechiney group offer to pay for electricity? Was the price substantially higher than that offered by CSR Limited? Will the Premier give the Government's reasons for preferring a foreign company to an Australian company like CSR Limited? Can he assure this Parliament and the people of New
South Wales that there is no collusion between the Government and the Pechiney group, and that a claim of corruption circulating in the Swiss press and banking circles has no foundation?

Mr WRAN: The press would not print anything that the honourable member for Clarence wrote; he cannot read. I shall give the Opposition precisely the same information that the geniuses of commerce opposite gave to the public when the former Government entered into an electricity supply contract with Alcan Australia Limited when it established a smelter at Kurri Kurri—that is, precisely none. The simple situation is that industry is highly competitive. Already New South Wales has resisted importunings from Victoria and Queensland seeking to attract industry to those States. We are all Australians, but naturally we in New South Wales are endeavouring to attract as much industry to this State as we possibly can. Until Labor came to government in 1976, such was the lassitude, indifference and incompetence of the Liberal-Country party Government in this State that industry was being driven away. Labor is attracting it to the State.

I find it absolutely extraordinary that the honourable member for Clarence, who asked the question, or any other member of the Opposition would dare mention the word corruption in relation to what can only be regarded as a great commercial and investment coup for New South Wales. Let the honourable member take his charge of corruption to Pechiney and tell the French that they are corrupt. Let him tell the people and companies who are trying to invest in New South Wales, whose efforts will provide jobs for people who became unemployed through the actions of the party to which he belongs, that some form of corruption is associated with their coming here and investing their money.

It is the result of a barren attitude, an absolutely barren mind, that the only suggestion that any of the real estate agents, sharebrokers, developers or blown away industrial advisers for employers' associations who sit on the Opposition benches can come along with when something happens is that there must be something wrong. They are so used to putting their hands out themselves that they cannot accept the fact they have in this State a government that is doing its best in the interests of the people. I regard the question as insulting, not only to myself, but also to Pechiney and other potential investors in this State.

CENTRAL COAST HOSPITALS

Mr McGOWAN: My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Is the Minister aware of the effect that continued population growth is having on health care delivery in the central coast of New South Wales? Can he assure the House that the Government's hospital building programme on the central coast will be continued to completion so that my constituents might enjoy hospital buildings which match the dedication and efficiency of the nursing and administrative staffs?

Mr K. J. STEWART: I thank the honourable member for Gosford for his question. I certainly compliment him on his work and efforts on behalf of the people who elected him as their member. He has been a constant advocate for increased health and hospital facilities for Gosford and the Central Coast generally. Indeed, I am well aware of the population growth along the Central Coast of New South Wales, especially in Gosford, and the fact that over a number of years health and hospital facilities in that area have become scarce. The population has outstripped the services available. Because of the constant representations by the honourable member for Gosford I am
happy to advise him and the House that Gosford Hospital is undergoing a redevelopment programme. Also, the honourable member would be aware that the Kanwal Hospital is presently under construction. That will be a brand new hospital facility.

Stage 1 of the redevelopment of Gosford Hospital is nearing completion. It is expected to be operational by February 1980. Part of the redevelopment programme will comprise an extra 120 beds, an accident and emergency centre, six theatres, a plant room and a new kitchen. Of course, one of the great problems confronting the New South Wales Government at the moment is that the federal Government has placed an embargo on financing any new project or any new facility brought on line this financial year. Gosford Hospital and Kanwal Hospital are affected by that embargo. This Government is committed to the opening of the new services, whether they be in the Central Coast area, Westmead, Liverpool or Wagga Wagga because they are in areas that have no hospital facilities whatsoever or where there is a scarcity of hospital facilities. It was because of that fact that last week I was forced to create a saving of $20 million in existing services by the closure of 870 beds in the metropolitan area in order that that money might be diverted towards the opening of new units to be brought on line in this financial year.

I am pleased to inform the honourable member for Gosford and his colleagues on the Central Coast that the programme for the opening and bringing on line of Gosford Hospital and Kanwal Hospital will continue despite the destructionist efforts of the federal Government.

AUTOMATION

Mr MORRIS: I direct my question without notice to the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Technology and Minister for Energy. Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the vast increase in profits of banks and insurance companies over the past couple of years? Are these institutions protected by federal law from overseas competition? Have banks and insurance companies embarked upon a heavy programme of automation, which has eliminated thousands of jobs normally available to school leavers? In view of the pampered and privileged position of these institutions, will the Minister confer immediately with the boards of these institutions to see if they will, at this late hour, give consideration to employing some of the thousands of young people in this State who will come on to the labour market at the end of 1979?

[Interruption]

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

Mr HILLS: It is a fact that over the past five to ten years a tremendous amount of automation has occurred in the banking and insurance industries. Traditionally the banking industry in Australia has sought annually an additional 2 500 employees. Because of tremendous technological change the annual demand for additional employees has dropped to 600. The effects of this technological change were not felt at times of high employment. Only now, when there are not so many job opportunities available in commerce and industry for young people because of the turndown which this country is experiencing, has the effect been felt.

Technological changes, including word processing, will have a tremendous effect on employment opportunities for young people in the future, and it is necessary that this State and the Commonwealth face up to this important problem. Studies have recently been carried out into this matter. It is expected that in the next few years in France there will be a 30 per cent reduction in employment in the banking industry as a result of technological changes. Moreover, the Crawford committee has reported
that it is expected that technological changes will result in the elimination of 40 per cent of job opportunities in West Germany. It is obvious that the effect of technological change should be thoroughly investigated. Last week I informed the House that the Government was in the process of establishing within the Department of Industrial Relations and Technology a section to monitor industrial changes brought about as a result of technology. The information gained by that section will be made available to government departments and private industry with a view to seeing what can be done to overcome the effects of those changes.

The banking and insurance industries are different from those industries that need to automate their activities to enable them to compete effectively on overseas markets, that is, in terms of importing or exporting their commodities. The banking and insurance industries are contained within Australia. For that reason they do not need to automate to the same extent as industries involved in competition with other countries. They are merely competing with each other.

Mr Morris: There is not much competition either.

Mr WILLS: As the honourable member for Maitland suggests, the banking and insurance industries in this country do not engage in a great deal of competition. It is incumbent on the banking and insurance industries to make available to the many young people who will be leaving school in the near future as many jobs as possible. It is expected that approximately 200,000 young people will leave school or university at the end of this year. Private industry and government must do as much as possible to ensure that those young people have jobs available to them. I congratulate the honourable member for Maitland on his question. I sincerely hope that his colleagues, both in this House and at the federal level, will join with the Government in endeavouring to make jobs available to young people.

**DOG ACT**

Mr WILDE: I address my question without notice to the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads. Has he received many representations to amend the Dog Act? Did he organize the holding of a series of seminars to provide the widest opportunity for public participation and discussion on this legislation? In view of the Premier's recent announcement that Cabinet has approved the preparation of legislation to amend the Dog Act, will the Minister give the House an indication of the proposed amendments?

Mr JENSEN: I thank the honourable member for Parramatta for raising a matter of great public interest. It is a further indication of the honourable member's interest in community affairs. This problem extends beyond the concern of his constituents. Proposals to amend the Dog Act have been approved by Cabinet. Those proposals will give effect to the Government's decision to review the Dog Act to overcome shortcomings that have become apparent since the passing of the 1966 amending legislation. The proposed amendments will increase the penalties provided by that Act and bring them into line with present day values. Moreover, they will create a number of new offences designed for more effective control of dogs.

By the proposed amendments the fee for registration of a dog is to be as determined by a council up to a maximum of $10 a year. The fee for registration of a dog permanently incapable of reproduction is to be half of the fee fixed by the council up to a maximum of $5. The fee for concessional registration, such as for pensioners' dogs and guide dogs for blind persons, is to be $1. The concessional fee for owners of working dogs on rural properties is to be extended to cover owners who breed and train working dogs. All dogs in public places will be required to be
leashed and under the effective control of a competent person, subject to exceptions such as guide dogs, working dogs and dogs at exhibitions. Only councils or the police are to have power to prosecute for an offence. There will be no prospect of a person informing on, or proceeding against, a neighbour.

Councils will be empowered to set aside areas where dogs may enter or be taken without being leashed. That recognizes that some dogs need exercise more than could be obtained when they are leashed. Persons permitting dogs to foul footpaths and certain other places will be liable to a penalty of up to $100.

Dogs will be prohibited from certain places such as shops, shopping areas, public bathing reserves, and school grounds, and within 10 metres of children's playing apparatus in public places, playing areas and outdoor areas set aside by councils for the preparation or consumption of food. Guide dogs are to be exempted. Pound release fees are to be increased to $10 for the first release and $20 for second and subsequent releases within twelve months. Councils are to be permitted to fix pound maintenance charges by resolution. Furthermore, councils will be given authority to recover pound maintenance charges and any other reasonable expenses incurred in the disposal of an impounded dog when it is not claimed. Provision will also be made making it an offence for anyone without authority to release a dog after it has been seized.

As the Premier has stated, these measures are not Draconian. They are the result of considerable public discussion over a long period. The proposals establish a new and higher standard of conduct for dog owners. Only those dog owners who allow their dogs to cause inconvenience to other people will be adversely affected by the measure.

**FREIGHT RATES**

Mr BREWER: I ask the Minister for Transport why a levy of 30 per cent has been imposed on bales of greasy wool weighing more than 180 kilograms when the industry has agreed to handle bales of 204 kilograms. In the light of the fact that the new by-law may cause growers to send wool by road rather than by rail, will the Minister give consideration to an alteration to the by-law?

Mr COX: Doubtless the honourable member for Goulburn will be aware that no increases in wool freight charges have occurred for a number of years. The matter he has raised was also raised in another place. In view of the statement made by the honourable member today and the statement made in another place, I am having the matter investigated. When I receive some further advice I shall convey it to the House and to the honourable member.

**FEDERAL BUDGET**

Mr MALLAM: I direct a question without notice to the Premier. Does the Premier regard the recent Fraser federal budget as a contribution or a handicap to the financial and employment problems facing New South Wales and Australia?

Mr Cameron: On a point of order. The question clearly asks for an opinion. The honourable member for Campbelltown seeks an opinion from the Premier on whether the federal budget is a contribution or a handicap. The whole question turns on the opinion that is sought. I submit that the whole question should be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Did the honourable member for Campbelltown use the word opinion?
Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Northcott submitted in a point of order that the honourable member for Campbelltown had asked for an opinion. As I did not hear all the question I ask the honourable member to repeat it.

Mr MALLAM: I sought an opinion. The question was, will the Premier comment whether the Budget will be a contribution to employment problem?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Campbelltown should rephrase his question and later he may have an opportunity to ask it.

FILM "THE JOURNALIST"

Mr McDonald: Did the Premier provide through the New South Wales Film Corporation approximately $200,000 for the making of the film "The Journalist"? Was this a grant or a loan? What was the basis of the Government’s financial arrangements with Michael Thornhill, a director of the corporation and director of the film "The Journalist" in relation to that film? As the film has received consistently bad reviews in professional film magazines and as the distributors, Roadshow, have no definite plans to release it, will Mr Thornhill pick up the tab for his share of the loss in this extravagant exercise or will it be the taxpayers who have to foot the bill?

Mr Wran: I would not be certain how much was provided by the Film Corporation to the producers and makers of the film "The Journalist", of whom one was certainly Mr Michael Thornhill, a director of the Film Corporation. In due course I shall advise the honourable gentleman of the actual amount. It is equally correct that so far the film has not enjoyed any great success either at the hands of the critics or at the box office. The suggestion that Mr Thornhill by virtue of his being a member of the Film Corporation is disqualified from participating in any grants or assistance from the corporation is entirely a misconceived concept. Mr Thornhill is a member of the Film Corporation because he is one of Australia’s most distinguished film directors. There is ample evidence of various film commissions and corporations in other States—and indeed of the Australian Film Commission—actually making grants or providing loans or funds in order that a member of the Film Corporation is disqualified from participating in any grants or assistance from the corporation is entirely a misconceived concept. Mr Thornhill is a member of the Film Corporation because he is one of Australia’s most distinguished film directors. There is ample evidence of various film commissions and corporations in other States—and indeed of the Australian Film Commission—actually making grants or providing loans or funds in order that a member of the commission or corporation who is involved in the making of films can participate in their making. I know that the minds of Opposition members in this Parliament are not concerned with constructive positive matters such as that raised earlier by the honourable member for Maitland. There is a rumour that the honourable member is making a run for the leadership.

Mr Morris: Don’t be fooled by the new suit.

Mr Wran: We on this side of the House thought the honourable member looked even more distinguished than usual. Because we know their minds do not run in terms of positive and constructive things but rather down those narrow veins that find their way into the gutters, this question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was anticipated. We have taken out some details of similar occurrences in other film commissions and corporations and I now provide the House and the honourable gentleman with this information. Anthony Buckley, when he was a member of the Australian Film Commission, received funds from that commission for the production of "Caddie" and "The Irishman". Both those films were a success. That was the good fortune of Australia, the Australian Film Commission and Mr Buckley. As the late Sam Goldwyn said, only one film in seven will be a success. We all know that. It is pointless and irrelevant to look at the ultimate success or failure of a film. Mr Graham Burke, when he was a member of the Australian Film Commission,
received funds from that body for the films "Eliza Fraser", "High Rolling" and "The Last of the Knucklemen".

[Interruption]

Mr WRAN: I know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not go to films except of a certain kind. Generally speaking, all those films were successful. Pat Lovell, a member of the Australian Film Commission, has received funds for a development package.

I refer now to the position in Victoria, which I remind the House has had a Liberal government for some time. Honourable members opposite might take a leaf out of the Victorian Liberals' book as they just scraped home by the skin of their teeth at the last elections. The following people, members of the Victorian Film Corporation, received funds in the following manner: Natalie Miller for "In Search of Anna"; Fred Schepisi for "The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith"; Tim Burstall for "The Last of the Knucklemen"; and Nigel Dick, consultant to Crawford Productions, for "Young Ramsay" and "The Sullivans". Let us not think there was anything strange about the fact that the New South Wales Film Corporation made funds available and was involved in "The Journalist". Just let us think it strange that that is one of the few films in which our corporation has invested that have not been a success at the box office.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr MALLAM: I ask the Premier whether the Budget presented recently by the federal Treasurer will be a contribution to or a handicap on the financial and employment problems facing this State and Australia.

Mr Cameron: On a point of order. I submit that the question as rephrased asks for the same opinion as that sought in the original question. Therefore I submit that the question is out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I propose to allow the question. I believe the Premier will be in a position to give facts and figures in answering it.

Mr Morris: On a further point of order. Mr Speaker, I submit that the Premier has already answered the question, in the press this morning, when he said that the federal Budget is an election winner for the Fraser Government.

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

Mr WRAN: There will be no more election wins for the Fraser Government. It has run out of steam; it has painted itself into a corner. Last night's appalling effort was a last minute throw to endeavour to deceive the Australian public into believing that the federal Government had some sting in it. It is all over Australia that the knives are out for Mr Fraser, and I have no doubt that every one of the Liberal Party gentlemen opposite well knows that Mr Peacock has been shoved along at a rate of knots to get somebody presentable for them to put before the Australian public to blot out the disaster of the conservative Government in Canberra that has brought our country to the brink of lack of confidence and economic disaster that now we face.

As I said before, the real estate agents, stock and station agents, brokers, developers and the like who sit opposite are the people who are supposed to be able to run the country. The same sort of people are trying to run the country in Canberra. But what was the effect of the Budget that was presented to the federal Parliament last night? What admissions did the federal Treasurer make? The first admission—
and this is in reply to the responsible question asked by the honourable member for
Campbelltown; it will have an enormous effect on not only every citizen but, more
important, upon every business and industry in Australia—is that inflation will be
more than 10 per cent this financial year. In other words, we are back on the galloping
horse of inflation. The next matter that was conceded by the federal Treasurer—not
when he was asked but when he was delivering his Budget speech to the Parliament last
night—is that unemployment in Australia must increase. Indeed, he later admitted in
interviews that the number of unemployed in this nation in this financial year will
exceed 500,000. Yet the honourable member for Maitland has the temerity—and he
has a lot of temerity—to talk today about a Fraser election win.

[Interruption]

Mr WRAN: Although the honourable member who attempts to interject is a
hypocrite, at least he can read. What I said was that Mr Fraser had read the surveys
and was trying to gear himself up by persuading the pensioners and the taxpayers that
he was on their side by getting rid of the tax surcharge so that he would not have what
he considered to be those electoral lead weights in his saddlebags as he prepared for an
early election. That must be fairly obvious. He said that inflation and unemployment
will increase. Why would he wait any longer? And why would he wait for Mr
Peacock to cut his throat? There are more knives out in the federal Parliament than
there are in the State Opposition, and that is saying a lot.

Mr Cahill: There are more members in Canberra.

Mr WRAN: I am indebted to my colleague the honourable member for
Marrickville, for his remark. Perhaps he is right.

The federal Government’s sleight of hand is obvious. It has endeavoured to
play this confidence trick on the Australian people, saying that the tax surcharge would
be removed in December of this year, but knowing that when the totality of incomes
is measured, every wage-earner in the country will pay 18 per cent more income tax
in the current financial year. That statement is supported by the Australian Tax-
payers’ Association. The answer to the honourable member’s question must be self-
evident.

Additionally, there is the greatest confidence trick of all, the imposition of an
oil levy for the purpose of bringing the price of so-called Australian petrol to world
parity. The federal Government last night informed the Australian people through the
Treasurer that from that source alone $2,023 million will be gained. In the same
breath the federal Treasurer, the Hon. J. W. Howard, said that the price of petrol to
the ordinary consumer, to industry and to farmers, will rise this financial year another
5c a litre or 20c a gallon. When speaking of farmers, I add that there are not many
of them among the Opposition. In the past couple of weeks there has been one
dairyfarmer fewer than usual in their ranks,

Under the Fraser Government the price of petrol today is 100 per cent higher
than it was when the Liberal–Country parties came to office. Does the
honourable member’s question need more of an answer? The sooner Australia gets rid of Mr
Fraser and the Liberal–Country party Government in Canberra and restores sound
economic management under a Labor government formed by Bill Hayden, the better.
Inflation will be more than 10 per cent in the current financial year. The probability
is that unemployment will pass 500,000. In addition, the young people of our country
will be in a perilous position at the end of this year and the beginning of next. The
defederal Government has slashed funding for the so-called sweet pea scheme which
was designed to provide the creation of job opportunities for school leavers an a
contributory basis.
This federal Budget is really that of the Prime Minister, who has the Hon. J. W. Howard for his ventriloquist's dummy. The Prime Minister's Budget is riddled with hypocrisy and duplicity. Its few benefits, the removal of the tax surcharge and the restoration of indexation of pensions, will be heavily outweighed by other matters. It will not be long before there is a massive backlash against the Fraser Government. That Government has the lowest electoral rating of any federal government since World War II. Mr Fraser is a Prime Minister who is held in greater odium than any other Prime Minister in Australia since that war. There is no doubt that unless the Australian people remove this federal Government from office we shall face a tough situation in the years ahead.

**SOIL ANALYSES**

Mr Murray: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Agriculture. Is the Minister aware that staff reductions in the soil analytical section of the Biological and Chemical Research Institute at Rydalmere are having a disastrous effect on the capacity of that institute to process soil samples? Is the Minister aware that district agronomists have been instructed to reduce their soil samplings to urgent cases only? Will the Minister take immediate action to ensure that the Rydalmere institute is adequately staffed so that the testing time for soil samples is brought back to the same level of efficiency as that which existed prior to the cuts?

Mr Day: I am sure the honourable member for Barwon would not expect me to have at my fingertips details of staff levels at research stations and other services operated by the Department of Agriculture. I assure the House that no reduction has occurred in departmental staff ceilings. If there has been some reduction in the services rendered at Rydalmere, I undertake to examine that matter and give the House the figures in relation to the number of persons employed at that establishment and of any delays that might be occasioned by reduced staff levels.

**GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Fifth Day's Debate

Debate resumed (from 21st August, vide page 428) on motion by Mr Keane:

That the following Address in Reply to the Speech which His Excellency the Governor has addressed to both Houses of Parliament on opening this Session of the Parliament of New South Wales be now adopted by this House:

To His Excellency Sir Arthur Roden Cutler, upon whom has been conferred the decoration of the Victoria Cross, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Knight of the Most Venerable Order of St John of Jerusalem, Governor of the State of New South Wales and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

May it Please Your Excellency—

We, Her Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, in Parliament assembled, desire to express our thanks for Your Excellency’s Speech, and to affirm our sincere allegiance to Her Most Gracious Majesty.
2. We beg to assure Your Excellency that our earnest consideration will be given to the measures to be submitted to us, that we will faithfully carry out the important duties entrusted to us by the people of New South Wales, and that the necessary provision for the Public Services will be made in due course.

Mr OSBORNE (Bathurst) [3.6]: I join in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and those honourable members who have made their initial contributions in this House. I know well how easy it is for those who listen while a member makes his maiden speech. For the honourable member who has to deliver the speech it is a traumatic experience. As I have a responsibility on the Opposition benches for matters concerning land, I looked forward to speaking in this debate. Although I have examined the Governor's Speech a number of times, I cannot find one word about the Department of Lands. It is difficult to speak to government policy on land for the ensuing twelve months when in the Government's calculations the subject does not rate sufficiently to merit a paragraph, a line or even one word in the Governor's Speech.

I then looked for the next best thing on which to speak in this debate. I have a deep interest in decentralization, and so I turned to that matter. However, in the Governor's Speech only seven lines are devoted to decentralization, and one of them consists of one word. I then looked for something on rural industry and noted that the Government places the highest importance on the contribution of the rural sector to the prosperity of New South Wales. That assertion in the Governor's Speech does not tally with the Government's attitude to rural industry and land matters. His Excellency said that the Government has a great interest in the contribution of the rural sector to the economy. In my travels round my electorate I have spoken to farmers who have land in the vicinity of national parks. They are completely nonplussed at the Government's policy and question whether the Government wants them to remain on those properties. They have the impression that they are not wanted there. That feeling arises because the National Parks and Wildlife Service is selecting areas that it proposes to have dedicated as national parks. Some land has even been gazetted as being required for national parks. The rural industry does not disagree with that policy. Many persons on the land are conservationists in their own way—they have to be, in order to survive on the land, for otherwise they would go broke. Their great problem is in ascertaining from the department what is proposed. This morning, as a member of a deputation, I met the Minister for Planning and Environment and Vice-President of the Executive Council to discuss national parks. It was said that approximately 20 per cent of the land of one shire is involved in a proposed park but the shire was not consulted about the proposals, nor had it been able to find out the exact location of the proposed boundaries.

It has been a good year for primary producers. They needed it because they have accumulated debts. Predictions about rural industry are somewhat doubtful because at the moment conditions are unfavourable. Good rain is needed soon, for otherwise it will be a bad summer. No one will guarantee prices. Primary producers have to contend with seasons, variable prices, and strikes that affect getting their produce away. They now believe that they have to contend also with the New South Wales Government, which wants to fight them. The Department of Lands has made an attack on the capacity of farmers to produce. As from April this year the department announced by circular a new policy on the conversion of Crown land leases to permanent tenure. It has reserved 60 metres of land fronting streams. From one point of view that might seem reasonable, but it is disastrous to many farmers because the best country is the flats along the streams where lucerne is grown. The department says,
"We are not taking it from you. We are only reserving it. You have the right to use it." So has everyone else—including people on motor cycles who decide to have a **squiz** at what is going on down at the river, and when they get there start a trial around the lucerne paddock. The property owner cannot do a thing about it. It is yet another problem that the farming community faces.

A recent amendment of the Oyster Farms and Fisheries Act gave public access over waters on the beds of streams. That does not sound dramatic but is still an intrusion on the rights of those who are trying to work their properties. A man came to me and said that he had asked people who came up a certain river what they were doing. They said they were fishermen. They did not look like fishermen to him. When he went to this area later he found a small patch of cannabis growing. He had no authority over them. They did not have to tell him where they were going. If they wanted to start a fire, he had no way of stopping them. This is just another barb for primary producers, who already have a difficult job. It is good to think that everybody is free to use our waterways, but there must be some control. Like other honourable members, I swim in the Domain baths, which are close enough to being public waters. But when we go there, we know that we must observe rules and if we do something wrong, we shall be put out. The same principle should apply in the country. Not many people object to fishermen, but they want to know what is going on to enable them to protect their livelihood.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service is taking vast areas of land for conservation. There could be no objection to that if they restricted themselves to Crown land. But some of the areas being threatened are miles away. I know of people on properties who are surrounded by freehold land two or three miles from the site of a proposed park. When they have applied for conversion or a renewal of a lease, they have been told, "No, we will not agree to that. You may have the permissive occupancy," which is a weekly arrangement, "because we might need it for a national park". A permissive occupancy can be taken away at the stroke of a pen. In those circumstances people cannot be expected to plough the land, put superphosphate on it, and grow crops.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service is moving into many areas, including two in my electorate. The Department of Lands says to farmers, "Right, you want to convert your lease, but we cannot allow you to do so because we need that river front." The department is not providing the facilities wanted by the average person. A family man might wish to take his children away for a weekend fishing or camping. A landowner in the Oberon National Park area told me that eight people had asked him to allow them to camp by his river because they could not be accommodated in national parks, which seem to be set up for a coterie of people who consider themselves wildlife experts and want such areas to be available in case they wish to go up there to look for some rare insect or bug. A person who wants to take his children away for the weekend fishing, or perhaps to shoot a rabbit and the like, is not accommodated. We are setting aside national parks for some people and are taking river frontages from others.

If the Department of Lands really wants to accommodate people, it should send officers to some of the properties that have suitable river frontages and make a fair offer to the owners to buy them for the purpose of establishing recreation and camping sites. If such places were located strategically through the State, members of the public would be given what they wanted. Additionally, the livelihood of primary producers who might have spent thirty, forty or fifty years on one property would not continually be threatened. If they have, say, half freehold and half leasehold tenure and are told, "You will no longer have a lease", their future is put in jeopardy. I should like to see the Minister for Lands and Minister for Services look at the position, and instead of saying, "You may convert your lease, but an imaginary line will be drawn through it
and anyone may go on to the land on one side of that line", he should do the job thoroughly and select areas of land with a view to making them available for public purposes. If necessary he could provide some facilities on them. In doing that, he would be serving the public and taking the pressure off those who are trying to make a living on the land, but are being frustrated.

The honourable member for Barwon mentioned cuts in staff of the Department of Agriculture. I do not know whether there have been cuts, or how the lack of service to those in primary industry is explained. I know that at Bathurst even the rural youth movement has suffered by the loss of an extension officer and that anyone who wants to see an extension officer must travel to Orange to do so. The honourable member for Goulburn brought up the subject of wool freights—again another Government slug on primary production. It all adds up to a consideration of what the Government says as opposed to what it does. It is useless for the Government to say that it recognizes the importance of the contribution made to the economy by the rural industry if its actions belie that fact. The Government is making it increasingly difficult for people on the land, and particularly for those with leasehold property, to operate their properties and make a respectable living from them. And it goes beyond that. The Oberon council recently complained that their charges for water from the Oberon Dam used by people living in rural towns have been increased by 25 per cent. Last year the House debated a bill dealing with land valuation. That bill included provisions that increased from $40 to $200 the penalty for failing to do certain things, and increased another penalty from $20 to $200. All the time there is this build-up of costs, and of regulations and of taking away the equity of farmers and making it difficult for a lot of them, if they are in areas that are affected by some Government action, to carry on and be productive.

The average age of farmers is now estimated to be 57 years. People could be in the prime of life at that age, but that figure does not promise much of a future for young farmers coming on. Members of the Country Party have suggested a scheme of land settlement in an endeavour to get young people on to the land. I urge the Minister for Lands to give consideration to our suggestion, which was a sound one, and to implement it or something close to it. The suggested scheme is similar to the war service land settlement scheme that was implemented after World War II but with some variations in that it did not involve the Government in buying the land. The proposal was that young people who could prove that they were qualified to own and run a property efficiently, when they found a block of land that met their requirements, could approach a board that would be set up. The board would then inspect the land, check the qualifications of the applicant, ensure that the price was fair and that the transaction met all the conditions that are usually imposed. The applicant would then be granted long-term financial assistance, which is the key to the success of the scheme. Rural properties cannot be run on short-term finance. The applicants' borrowings would have to be at a subsidized rate of interest.

That scheme would attract young people on to the land. Many suitable young persons want to go on the land but are prevented from doing so by the high capital cost and the short term of available finance. The implementation of this scheme would solve many problems for persons who are at the end of their working life as farmers, for whom no superannuation scheme is provided and who must live on the proceeds of sale of their properties. If they have children, they cannot afford to give the property to their children for that would leave them with no equity to live on. A scheme such as I have suggested would enable a young person to buy a family property from his parents and allow them to retire, with good prospects of success for the young person who would be able to carry on the property. I hope the Minister will favourably consider the scheme proposed or one like it. There is great demand for such a scheme.

(Mr Osborne)
There are many fine young people with experience on the land, who have the necessary qualifications and are really keen to have properties of their own. If they could get assistance to take up a career on the land they would be good producers of wealth for this country.

Earlier I mentioned that only seven lines of the speech of His Excellency the Governor were devoted to decentralization, and I am afraid what was said was not terribly exciting. The first paragraph contains these words:

My Government has recently established Decentralization Advisory Councils to advise on the development of regional resources and investment opportunities.

What was not said was that when the decentralization advisory councils were set up the regional advisory councils, which had done a tremendous job, were disbanded and they have been replaced with a smaller unit. Irrespective of the quality of the personnel appointed to the decentralization advisory councils—and they include some good appointees—the new councils will not get off the ground for they are scattered over large areas with no communication and represent far too much of the arm of government. The regional advisory councils consisted of members elected by local government and they had earned the faith and respect of the people in their areas. The decentralization advisory councils consist of a few men in large areas who will not be able to do the sort of job that is envisaged. At the time that the bill setting up the decentralization advisory councils was being debated I said it was a tragedy. If the Minister wishes to retain the decentralization advisory councils, he should recreate the regional advisory councils, which would provide a means of research for the decentralization advisory councils and a channel for the flow of information from the Government to the department to the people and vice versa. The next paragraph of the Governor's Speech dealing with decentralization contains these words:

For the first time, the Government is proceeding progressively to establish "shop front" decentralized offices in the regional centres of the State.

I do not know whether that is all that is contemplated. Offices of the department have functioned well, whether they have been shopfront offices or any other type of office. Shopfront offices might be an interesting experiment but I do not believe they will suddenly create a greater demand for decentralization. The section of the Governor's Speech dealing with decentralization had nothing to say on the subject of growth centres. That is a pity, for growth centres represented the biggest step towards balanced development that was ever taken in this State. Many schemes have been tried with some degree of success, but since the establishment of New South Wales as a colony nothing has succeeded like the growth centres. They were an earnest of the Government's intention that had captured the imagination of the people in the city and in the country. Growth centres provide a prospect of benefit not so much for today—though our growth centres had made great progress—but in twenty or thirty years time they would provide an opportunity for young people outside of the metropolitan complex to live and seek careers and professions in a country environment.

I was bitterly disappointed when the Government announced a downturn in the Bathurst–Orange development programme. It was a tragedy. I hope the Government does not proceed with its stated intention. If the present experiment fails, no future government of any political persuasion would be brave enough to start another growth centre. The growth centre concept was working. People who came from other countries that have engaged in this type of development have been amazed at what was achieved. The subject of finance was used unfairly by the Government. Statements about financial difficulties were made that were embarrassing to the development
corporation. There was talk of a shortage of funds when there was no such shortage. In press statements I made about twelve months ago I warned of the danger and informed the Government when it changed the funding arrangements for the development corporations that it was on the wrong track and that it would shackle the corporations.

When the former Government set up the growth centre development corporations it made finance available to them on the basis of a period of ten years free of interest and capital repayments. That doubled the amount of money that the corporations had to start with. Anything that starts in a green paddock situation, as the corporations did, has no way of being profitable in the first few years. The corporations had to plan and acquire land. They then had to develop the land and lease, rent or sell it to get their capital back. That is a simple exercise in commerce or arithmetic and that was the basis of the ten-year rest period allowed for by the former Government.

This Government in its first budget reversed that policy. It took away the Government funding with the rest period and directed the corporations to go out and borrow on the open market at the current rate of interest compelling them to meet their capital and interest repayments immediately. That effectively halved the amount of money that the corporations had over a ten-year period and placed heavy burdens on them. That is why the corporations have heavy debts. They were structured to have debts. They could not have anything but debts in their early years. They had only loan money to work on and they had to meet their working expenses out of it. The shortage of funds that the Government talks about will not wash with country people. Whenever one picks up a newspaper one reads of Government projects. In July the Premier turned the first sod for the new Sydney entertainment centre. We read that this multi-purpose centre will cost the Government between $40 million and $50 million over the next twenty years.

It is a little worrying for country people when they read such articles. When one reads newspapers one finds the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative Societies is spending some millions of dollars on the Pyrmont housing scheme. Country people are not against this sort of scheme, but want their fair share. In a recent rural journal one finds the chairman of the Homebush abattoirs reported as stating that last year that abattoir lost $6 million yet announcing the reduction of charges and plans for expansion. But that is a city abattoir. Country people have not been able to get that type of funding for the Blayney works. One reads in newspapers that the Homebush brickworks has no shortage of funds available to modernize its undertaking and can get $2 million or $3 million.

We in the country wonder what is wrong, why the growth centre is being cut back on funding because of money shortages yet $40 million is found for an entertainment centre in Sydney. The entertainment centre is probably important, but surely not as important as the country developments I have mentioned. If there is a priority at all, growth centres must take precedence over things such as entertainment centres. Announcements of support were made a couple of years ago when Cabinet met in Bathurst. The article, appearing in the newspaper under the headline "Premier has confidence in growth centre's future" read:

The Premier, Mr Neville Wran, said yesterday he was sure any temporary disadvantages caused by the Bathurst–Orange growth centre project would be far outweighed by the great advantages it would bring to the region and its people.

Good: We all cheer. That is exactly what we thought. The former Minister for Decentralisation and Development, the Hon. Don Day, was reported under the heading "New city to go ahead to have said there was no suggestion of reducing the area of land

Mr Osborne]
required, and that acquisition on terms will mean a reduction in uncertainty and a clarification of the position for many landholders. That was in 1977. But suddenly there is this great shortage of funds, in spite of new entertainment centres being opened in Sydney, special provisions being made for housing and so on. We in the country wonder whether the priorities have changed dramatically and, if so, why.

Another point I wish to raise relates to the supply of natural gas to Lithgow, Bathurst, Orange and surrounding areas. This was to be a particular attraction for the growth centres. It appeared that for the first time that area was to be placed on equal terms with the metropolitan areas in energy supplies. This would have been great, but owing to certain things that happened with the change in the federal Government new plans were adopted and the proposed laterals were not proceeded with. In his Speech His Excellency mentioned that construction had commenced on a $55 million pipeline to extend natural gas supplies to Newcastle. That is good. We do not disagree with that, nor the extension to Wagga Wagga. But nowhere in the Speech was the Central West district mentioned.

In November 1976 when the Energy Authority Bill came before the Parliament and a clause was taken out in the Legislative Council the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Technology and Minister for Energy claimed he had been blocked in the upper House from putting through legislation that would allow laterals to be built to the Central West. But when this was denied the Minister said:

I will say this on behalf of the Government, that we will introduce a special bill for the purpose of ensuring that the Australian Gas Light Company honours its obligations to provide natural gas to these country towns.

Later he said:

After conferring with the Premier this evening, on behalf of the Government I announced that the Government will introduce that legislation next year.

That was 16th November, 1976, and though now we are nearing the end of 1979, we have not yet seen the introduction of legislation promised almost three years ago and recorded in Hansard. No complaint is made about supplying natural gas to Newcastle or Wagga Wagga, but as an integral part of fostering growth in the growth centres we need natural gas to be able to compete with the metropolitan areas. In Victoria when the problem arose about natural gas going to some areas and not others, the Victorian Government, in order to sustain its country brickworks, introduced a subsidy scheme. It subsidized country brickworks which were deprived of natural gas to the extent of half the difference in cost between natural gas and the alternative energy used. About twelve months ago the Victorian Government increased the subsidy to 100 per cent. It pays the subsidy in order to retain the brickworks, and maintain employment. This Government has been approached and asked to adopt a similar scheme but it is not prepared to do so.

Finally, I should like to say on behalf of some country people that the Heritage Council which is now operating in this State is acting over-zealously. The Sisters of Mercy in Bathurst have an old convent building which they cannot afford to renovate. It is a building that is not suitable for their purposes. They want to build a convent for their old sisters and yet they are told to seek an alternative use for this building. It is located only 25 feet from the cathedral. They ask: What do we put there? A casino, or what? The Heritage Council should be a little more realistic and considerate.
Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr JACKSON (Heathcote), Minister for Youth and Community Services [3.36]: I am prompted to enter into this debate by an episode that took place in this House last night. Before coming to that matter, I want to say how proud I am to be a Minister of the Government that was responsible for the facts related to the public by His Excellency in his Speech on the opening of this session of Parliament. I pay tribute to the honourable member for Woronora, who is a seasoned member of this House, for moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and to the member for Willoughby for the excellent manner in which he delivered his maiden speech in seconding that resolution.

Last night in this House the member for Gordon sought, through an avenue available to him per medium of the Address-in-Reply debate, to embark on a scurrilous, vicious, unfounded attack upon myself. In my twenty-four years in this Parliament I have been christened, according to the press, with the name "Buckets" and probably I have been regarded as a tough member when in opposition. But not once have I risen in this House and said anything that I was not willing to repeat in Macquarie Street or outside the protection of parliamentary privilege. The member who made the accusations last night is the shadow minister for youth and community services. At question time he has been conspicuous by his not asking questions about the administration of my portfolio. In fact, the Opposition has been conspicuous by its not asking questions about the administration of my portfolio.

Mr Robb: Members opposite are not interested.

Mr JACKSON: Of course they are not interested; the Government is well aware of that. Opposition interests do not include human interests. One would expect that from reactionary parties.

Mr Moore: Your speeches are as valueless as your cheques.

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

Mr JACKSON: No wonder the honourable member for Gordon sits on the front bench: his colleagues will not allow him to sit behind them. He is renowned for his homosexual tendencies. No wonder his colleagues are concerned about him and watch him closely. Last night in this House the honourable member for Gordon made a vitriolic attack upon me.

Mr Moore: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I take the strongest exception to the Minister's remarks.

Mr JACKSON: It is a known fact that the honourable member for Gordon had to get married again because of rumours in his electorate and various other things. Earlier today a lady telephoned me—in fact I have been fully occupied this morning getting similar telephone calls about the honourable member's conduct in the boy scout movement.

Mr Moore: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, I seek your protection. I ask that the Minister withdraw his statement that I was a homosexual and that I have homosexual tendencies.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gordon takes offence at the expression that he is a homosexual or that he has homosexual tendencies. I ask the Minister to withdraw that remark.

Mr JACKSON: I did not say that the honourable member was a homosexual; I said he was renowned for his homosexual tendencies, and I affirm that statement.
Mr Moore: On a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! If the remark is offensive to the honourable member it is necessary for the Minister to withdraw it. I ask the Minister to withdraw his statement that the honourable member for Gordon is renowned for his homosexual tendencies.

Mr JACKSON: I withdraw that remark but I assure the honourable member for Gordon that I will always make sure that I am behind him when we march.

[Interuption]

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

Mr JACKSON: When someone makes an unfair, vitriolic attack upon another person, it is interesting to look at the qualifications, the standing, the history and the credibility of the person making the attack. I shall deal, one by one, with the matters raised by the honourable member for Gordon. I am fortified in my attitude to this debate by the number of telephone calls I have received this morning from residents of the honourable member's electorate. If my standing in the community were such as that of the honourable member for Gordon, I should want to go and hide myself in some part of darkest Africa. I propose to relate some of the information given to me over the telephone this morning.

Last night the honourable member for Gordon made some irresponsible and unfounded statements. Moreover, he was not content to confine his statements to this House. He issued a press statement and then rushed into Parliament and made allegations about me. In fact, he read about fifteen minutes of a speech. However, not one newspaper saw fit to publish any of the honourable member's statements: they are aware of the depths to which the honourable member has sunk. The honourable member for Gordon has only one claim to fame: that is, the speed at which he travels back from the snowfields in his Range Rover. He races back with his boy friends from the snowfields and then boasts about completing the journey in so many hours and so many minutes.

When he is apprehended by the police—and he has established some sort of a record for apprehensions by the police—he always says: "I am the son of Sir John Moore, President of the Conciliation and Arbitration commission. I am a member of Parliament. I am the member for Gordon." It is common knowledge that he is referred to by the police as the hoodlum from Gordon. In his contribution to this debate the honourable member for Gordon said:

Members of the House will be aware that a number of years ago quite serious charges alleging the passing of bad cheques were laid against a member of this House who is now a member of Cabinet.

I agree that certain charges were laid against me. However, a month before those charges were laid I was warned that I was about to be set up by one of the greatest crooks in the State—the former Commissioner of Police, Mr Hanson, aided and abetted by the Premier of the day.

That warning was given to me by an honourable member who sits on the Opposition side of the House. He told me: "Watch yourself. They are out to get you because you are saying some nasty things about crooked policemen." Although on that
occasion attempts were made to put me through the wringer, I ran the gauntlet and appeared before the court. I came out as clean as a whistle. The honourable member for Gordon said also:

It was reported on 28th June in the Sydney Morning Herald that the Attorney-General had quashed charges against a club manager who had allegedly stolen $19,000 from his club and attempted to defraud it of $10,000.

The club involved was the Helensburgh Workers' Club which was notoriously the institution milked to buy out the bad cheques of the Minister for Youth and Community Services.

I shall dispose of that allegation by reading from statutory declarations from a number of the management and executive members of the committee of that club during the past twenty years. I shall refer also to a letter a man who occupied the position of assistant manager at the Helensburgh Workman's Club Limited from 1964 to December 1973. That person has written stating that I had been personally known to him as a local resident for thirty years during the period he was manager of that club and that from time to time he had cashed cheques for me which had always been honoured by the bank. He states further that during the period he worked there I never owed money to the club.

A statutory declaration by Mr R. S. Marshall states that he was employed by the Helensburgh Workman's Club Limited from 1952 until 1976. The declaration continues in this way:

I was originally employed as a bar steward and later became assistant manager, holding that position until 1965 when I was appointed secretary-manager. I held that position until 1976. I have known Mr R. F. Jackson, M.L.A., for the past thirty-one years. During my time as assistant manager and secretary-manager of the Helensburgh Workman's Club, Mr Jackson, like most other club members, has from time to time availed himself of a service provided by the club, that is, the cashing of cheques due to the lack of normal banking facilities. At no time have the cheques failed to be honoured and never at any stage during my long association with the club was Mr Jackson in any way in debt to the club.

Another statutory declaration, sworn by Mr G. Barron, secretary-manager of the Helensburgh Workman's Club Limited since February 1978, is in similar terms. I have never been an official of the Helensburgh Workman's Club Limited. I have never attended an annual meeting of the club and I have never been indebted to it. I have never presented to that club a cheque that has been dishonoured. The statements made in that respect by the honourable member for Gordon are as unsubstantiated as the other matters he raised in his speech—and I shall deal with them, one by one.

The honourable member for Gordon said in another part of his speech:

I believe there is a need for an independent investigation into the connection between the dropping of those charges and the involvement of the Minister for Youth and Community Services.

I shall put the honourable member's mind at rest: I was never involved in any way with charges laid against the secretary-manager of the Helensburgh Workman's Club Limited. Moreover, I have never been involved in any representations about that matter, nor did I raise a finger in connection with those charges. The honourable member for Gordon also said:

On 16th January, 1977, at the Hotel Florida, Terrigal, the scene of much infamous and riotous conduct by Australian Labor Party figures at their national conference, at a Department of Youth and Community Services
conference the Minister announced that he was buying the beer. The drinking
continued into the early hours of the morning and I understand that the bill
footed by the taxpayers, for alcohol alone, was over $500.

I shall waste no time in dealing with that allegation. A conference was held at the Florida Hotel at Terrigal in 1977—on 16th and 17th June, 1977, not on 16th January, as stated by the honourable member for Gordon. One has only to look at the honourable member's history to realize what he is all about. One has only to know about the lady who will not allow her boy to attend a meeting of the boy scouts whenever he is present. The first residential care conference of my department was held at the Florida Hotel, Terrigal, on 16th and 17th June, 1977. That conference, for the first time, brought together officers of the residential care division. A total of 122 officers, representing 1,400 personnel in my department, attended the conference. The officers ranged from superintendents through to youth workers. The majority of those officers, who are located at centres throughout the State, would, in other circumstances, have little or no opportunity to have contact with senior officers of the department.

That was something the Opposition had never done—bring officers together so that each would know what others were doing. Some officers arrived on Wednesday evening and did not go home until Saturday morning. An evaluation done by Mr R. L. Walsh, superintendent of Kamballa, Parramatta, was that the conference had proved most fruitful and helpful in the development of staff at his unit and doubtless would be reflected in the care of children entrusted to Kamballa. When the Opposition was in office and had the responsibility to look after children it clad them in blue and khaki calico clothing and fed them on low-grade meat. Also, it had them doing the goose step all around the place. It is no wonder that I have been invited by one of our wards to give her away at her wedding in January next. I shall show members opposite her letter in which she intimates what a breath of fresh air it was for her and her brothers when the Labor Government assumed office and gave them some care, understanding, love and affection. The former Minister for Agriculture was more concerned about fur-lined rugs for cows and so far as he and his colleagues were concerned human beings, particularly if they were disadvantaged, could rot in the wilderness.

The public servants who went to the conference at Terrigal were entitled to $25 a day sustenance allowance. The department saw an opportunity to save money and, after talking to representatives of the 122 delegates, did a deal with the Hotel Florida at Terrigal which agreed to give the delegates two nights' accommodation with all meals, including dinner on the final evening when I addressed them, for $47.50 a head. This resulted in a saving of about $1,500. The delegates subscribed $1 each for liquid refreshments, for wine on the table at dinner. I thought that was rather unfair as the department was saving $1,500 on the deal. These officers were dedicated people who could have claimed $25 a day but did not do so. I addressed the conference. At the request of senior officers of the department I agreed that the department should buy the liquor for the dinner, bearing in mind that the cost of the dinner was included in the $47.50. I made an announcement, but not in the terms the honourable member for Gordon used last night—his informant is advising him badly. I did not say, "I am buying the drink." That is a blatant lie. The honourable member knows what that means. He is conversant with telling lies. I made the announcement that, at the request of senior officers, the department would provide the liquor for the dinner. That is what we did.

Later in the evening the liquor provided by the department ceased to flow and everyone, including myself, bought their own liquor. That puts the lie to that vicious, scurrilous and unfounded allegation of the honourable member for Gordon. He is a great bloke at making statements here but he would not accept my challenge to
make his allegations outside. He said next, to provide a more recent example, that I
had hosted a luncheon for a number of journalists and senior staff from my depart-
ment at a restaurant called the Don Qixote in Albion Place, Sydney. He said that
that was on 23rd February. He was right. Terrific! Congratulations! He has one
point out of 500 so far. He said it was this year and he was right about that, too.
He said it commenced about 12.30 p.m. and finished more than six hours later. He
failed again there; it did not finish then. Was the honourable member for Gordon aware
of who was at the dinner? Was he aware that sitting next to me was the former
honourable member for Pittwater, Mr Bruce Webster, who demanded the opportunity
to speak. He was so delighted about the public relations that we were creating that he
eulogized me and the department and more or less condemned his own people.

Is there anything unusual about a Minister hosting a press conference? Of
course not. It has been traditional over the years for Ministers to authorize luncheons
or dinners to recognize people who give support and understanding to their depart-
ments. The honourable member for Gordon has failed to find out anything about my
department; he has failed to ask questions; and he has failed to talk about pre-school
kindergartens. Last night he got down into the lowest ebb of the gutter. That luncheon
was approved by me. I must have left long before the six hours were up because I was
in Gosford at 6 o'clock, opening a Lions Club convention. My driver and I do not
travel as fast as that honourable member does. We do not have a Range Rover with
fishing lines and ski gear all over it. We obey the law. That is why we do not get
pulled up as he does. Senior officers of my department were invited to that luncheon
to meet the press and express appreciation for the co-operation received from them.

Let us look at what will happen in the school holidays that are about to start.
Thousands of dollars worth of advertising has appeared in the Daily Mirror, the
Sydney Morning Herald, the Daily Telegraph and local papers telling people where
local child care centres will be located. This has not cost the department anything.
What a wonderful job the media did in the disastrous bushfires that occurred in the
Blue Mountains two years ago and also in the Granville rail disaster in telling people
where they could go to receive assistance. Every time the Government has called upon
the news media to support it and to provide publicity the press has rallied to the
cause immediately and without equivocation. Of course, the media did not do that
when the Opposition held office—probably because they did nothing. One would get eye
strain trying to find anything that the former Government did. It came as a breath of
fresh air to the community that at last a government was doing something, and this
occurred when Labor came to power.

I arranged that luncheon. I will arrange another luncheon and I will not tell
the honourable member for Gordon nor other members of the Opposition who follow
him like mongrel dogs. I will approve a luncheon in accordance with the laws of the
land under my authority as Minister and I shall certainly not invite the Opposition.
Honourable members opposite are laughing and supporting the honourable member for
Gordon but I have not yet finished dealing with him. I hope I have time to do so.
My expenses would probably be as low as those of anyone, especially any Minister
from the former Government which held office for eleven years.

I shall spend a few moments talking about qualifications of the honourable
member who cast these smears. He joined the public service after being an abject
failure at the university. He was up and down like a lift or a yo yo as far as his
university career was concerned. If he had not had influence he would have been thrown
out of the university. He could not do the course so he used influence. He used to arrive
at the university wearing a pair of white overalls with the word "chastity" emblazoned
in 12-inch letters across his back. He drove his old jeep with bullet holes in it to prove
that he supported wars but did not serve in them.
He joined the public service as a junior clerk but his job was that of an industrial spy—to file reports on strikes, which he fed to the federal Ministers for Labour. At the time he worked for the Commonwealth public service, in 1969 and 1970, conscription was a big issue. Balloting of 21-year-olds for service in Vietnam was taking place. He was much involved in that. I have had it from a reliable source that he worked overtime to conduct the ballots. There is a strong suspicion that he was actually involved in fiddling the ballots so that certain members of the Liberal Party gained exemption.

Mr Moore: On a point of order. I find monstrous the remarks of the Minister alleging I had anything to do with ballots for national service, including an allegation that I fiddled ballots. I ask that you, Mr Speaker, direct the Minister to withdraw them.

Mr SPEAKER: In light of the way that the debate commenced, with charges being made by the honourable member for Gordon, now that the Minister is making counter charges it is difficult for the Chair to deny the Minister an opportunity. The honourable member for Gordon should not allow his dignity to intrude; he should demonstrate to the Chair how his character has been impugned or how his position as a member of this House has been affected.

Mr Moore: It is not a question of dignity. I was not at any stage involved in any ballots for national service, or in any section of the legal department of the Department of Labour and National Service. The remarks are offensive to me.

Mr SPEAKER: The honourable member for Gordon will have an opportunity to make a personal explanation. He has already taken the opportunity to deny the remarks.

Mr JACKSON: The honourable member was certainly one of the key figures. As a result of a conversation I had this morning with a prominent member of the Liberal Party I know that the honourable member was the contact man. The honourable member mentioned the bookmaking fraternity. Unfortunately this morning time did not permit of my further dealing with the matter, although I have plenty of statutory declarations that I could relate to the House. As to my standing with the bookmaking fraternity, I seldom go to Wentworth Park. I am a patron of the New South Wales Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association of some sixteen years’ standing. When the Government of which Sir Eric Willis was a member first came to office, one of the first things he did as Minister for Education and as a follower of dog racing was to try to stand over those administering that sport to have them dispose of me as their patron and to elect him to that position. He said it would be nice for him and Mrs Willis, as she then was, if that were to happen as the political party to which he belonged was the only one that would help them. I give full credit to the board. According to the minutes the matter was discussed and the former Minister for Education, that great powerful man at that time, but now much deflated, was told that while ever Rex Jackson lives he will be their patron. I admire them for their gumption and for their rejection of those who are not born to rule at all. For that reason they have finished up on the Opposition benches.

Mr Quinn: Tell us more about the honourable member for Gordon.

Mr JACKSON: I shall tell the House more about him. I have a ton of information. It would take me hours to relate it to the House. When he was 16 years of age he said that he was destined to be Prime Minister. He was likened to Andrew Jones. I have a publication that states:

Remember Andrew Jones? Well, he's been reincarnated and is alive and well and sitting in the N.S.W. Parliament. The reincarnation of Jones, otherwise known as Tim Moore is profiled by Mark Robbins.
He was described in this article as Princess *Paspullum* of Pymble. Some of the pertinent points mentioned in the article are worth listening to. It states:

Mr Moore has also distributed a great deal of literature on various other subjects—(marijuana, *homosexual* law-reform)—to the clergy, church groups, schools, etc., in *Ashfield* and Drummoyne and it becomes quite obvious that he is working quite hard to establish himself as a "defender of the faith" . . .

Born in 1949, he waited an appropriate 16 years before insisting that he'd become Prime Minister of Australia . . . His social acquaintances of the time tell of an overwhelming aversion to study and extra-curricular activities such as late night rampages astride a Harley Davidson motor-cycle (silk dressing gown *aflow*, army-bayonet slung through belt).

It was around this time that he became "almost famous" for his Neutral Bay apartment, furnished, says one psychology student of the time, in "*Mid-Modern* Paranoia". Tim apparently slept in a bed beneath the table in one corner of the room. His bed was protectively bordered by wardrobes and dressers and, for that added touch of security, his army bayonet lay nearby. The rest of the large room was practically bare.

The comments go on and on. They reflect on the honourable member's credibility and give a background to the man. Is it any wonder that he makes these unfounded statements or that he does not apply himself to the task of being an effective Opposition member with his shadow portfolio? Is it any wonder that he does not ask questions about the home help service, or that he does not use his undoubted influence over the Prime Minister and ask him why he reduced the subsidies for that service from a $2-for-$1 basis to a $-for-$ basis? It is no wonder that there has been a reduction in the Commonwealth contribution to pre-school education when this Parliament has shadow ministers of the standard of the honourable member. If ever there was a shadow on the Opposition benches it is the honourable member for Gordon. We hope that the Opposition will realize what a disgraceful and incompetent shadow *minister* he is and replace him with one of substance.

*[Personal Explanation]*

Mr Moore: I wish to make a personal explanation.

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

Mr Moore: The Minister quoted extensively from an article in a publication called *Challenge*, a publication of which I am aware and to the editors of which I have written concerning my legal remedies against them. The article, which is the fabrication on which the Minister relies, cannot state correctly even my year of birth.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gordon when making a personal explanation must show how the matter referred to by the Minister for Youth and Community Services impugned his character. He must not debate the matter.

Mr Moore: I was merely pointing out that the article from which the Minister quoted cannot get correct even my date of birth, let alone the rest of the matters contained in it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is that the motion be agreed to.
Mr MADDISON (Ku-ring-gai) [4.6]: The House has heard from the Minister for Youth and Community Services a most pathetic response to the honourable member for Gordon in which he attempted without a great deal of success to besmirch the honourable member's character. The Minister trotted out in this House a catalogue of trivia in an attempt to denigrate the honourable member's character. The attempt was an abysmal failure. The Minister tried to cloud the allegations made yesterday in this Chamber by the honourable member for Gordon by attempting to brush them aside in a frivolous fashion and turn the attack on the honourable member for Gordon. Not one fact—if it be fact—brought out by the Minister could be said in any way to impugn the character of the honourable member for Gordon.

Mr Mulock: The honourable member and the honourable member for Lane Cove put the honourable member for Gordon up to it.

Mr MADDISON: There was no putting the honourable member for Gordon up to anything. He is the master of his own behaviour and conduct and makes his own determinations.

Mr Haigh: Why do you associate yourself with him?

Mr MADDISON: I shall continue to associate myself with the honourable member for Gordon as long as he and I are members together in this House. I had difficulty in understanding the relevance of the remarks made by the Minister for Youth and Community Services in this Address-in-Reply debate. I come back to the issues involved in this debate. I offer my congratulations to the honourable member for Willoughby, who, when making his maiden speech in this House, seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. I offer my congratulations also to the other honourable members who have delivered their maiden speeches in this debate. I hope that all of them will gain as much satisfaction from their stay in the House, whether it be short or long, as I have, in serving not only the people of the electorates they represent but also the wider electorate that we all represent.

The Government proclaims, through His Excellency's Speech, that it has adopted a positive approach to prison problems since the report of the Royal commission. The Speech goes on to assert, “Industrial and prisoner unrest has declined.” What an unfortunate statement that is in the light of what has happened in the past fortnight. Until now I have remained silent publicly on the action taken by the Government pursuant to the recommendations made by the Royal commission and more particularly in regard to Katingal. I have been content to watch the ineptitude and stupidity of the Premier and the Minister for Corrective Services in their haste to close Katingal. The aftermath of that closure was predictable, as the alternatives recommended by the Royal commission were not available to contain dangerous prisoners. The Premier—and I put the blame on him—stands condemned for his headstrong action in the face of the strong stand taken by the prison officers at the time of the announcement of Katingal's closure. I looked thoroughly at the report of the Royal commission and nowhere is there to be found any suggestion that Katingal should have been closed immediately. Recommendation 249 at page 393 states:

The present use of Katingal should cease.

Earlier recommendations 66 and 67 on page 383 say:

The dispersal system should be adopted as opposed to the system of concentration; dangerous prisoners should be contained in specified dispersal prisons.
The report continues:

A special unit should be maintained at each dispersal prison to hold dangerous prisoners who cannot temporarily or permanently be restrained. Implicit in these recommendations was recognition that some special accommodation was necessary within the prison system to contain dangerous prisoners. Implicit also was the need for the Government to provide a suitable alternative before closing Katingal. The failure to do so is an indictment of the Minister and the Premier. Yesterday in response to the urgency motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier referred to the fact that a dispersal unit is about to be opened at Goulburn. He added that consideration would be given to providing other similar units if the need for them can be clearly demonstrated.

A concept advocated by the Royal commission was the dispersal of dangerous prisoners at a number of prisons, not their concentration in one place. Clearly, the Government is not giving effect to the Royal commissioner's recommendation and is now about to concentrate intractable prisoners at Goulburn. From reports that I have received, the unit at Goulburn is no different in concept from the circle at Parramatta, which has been severely criticized. The change is that instead of a circle there will be a rectangle with a supervisory catwalk above it that will be manned by prison officers. If that is the situation—and I am told that it is—the Government has been engaged in what is merely cosmetic geometry; it has changed the circle into a rectangle.

It is not good enough for the Premier to say that, if subsequently there is a need for other security units to be built in other prisons, they will be built. It could be too late. All that has happened is that the concentration of dangerous prisoners will be at Goulburn rather than at Sydney, and that is not in line with the diversification that the Royal commissioner recommended. The arrangements that are being made to establish a unit at Goulburn pose the same problems of security in moving prisoners from the Sydney metropolis as applied when Grafton gaol was used to house this type of prisoner. There were then a number of incidents that posed threats to the community as a result of the transportation of prisoners from Sydney to Grafton. Those threats will be repeated when the proposal to incarcerate dangerous prisoners at Goulburn gaol is put into effect. The approach of the Government to this problem, which is acknowledged to be difficult, does not comply with the Royal commissioner's recommendation, nor does it offer proper security to the community, to prison officers or to prisoners themselves.

Though I cannot and do not condone industrial action within the prison system, it was industrial action provoked by the employer, the State Government which, up to yesterday, ignored the views of its employees. The prison officers after all have to make the system work on the job. They are the people who are exposed to the risks. Private employers are constantly being exhorted by the Government that there is a need to take their employees into their confidence, and to take heed of their views. It is said that only then can confrontation and unrest be avoided or mitigated. Last week in this House the Minister said that consultation between management and employees was fundamental. I agree with that principle, but the Government does not practise what it preaches. It must hold itself responsible for prison unrest that has developed over recent weeks.

Despite the reasons advanced by the Royal commission based on English and American experience that dispersal of dangerous prisoners among a number of prisons is to be preferred to concentration in a specialist prison, I have yet to be convinced that this is the option that should be taken in New South Wales. I say that for three reasons. First, this relatively small group of dangerous prisoners should be under one administrative regime on the spot, with specially selected staff, and close to specialist
services of all kinds. Second, the placement of this group in several specially structured units in a number of prisons, if that ever happens, does not readily permit of supervision of standard regimes throughout the system and is wasteful of scarce manpower resources and specialist services. Third, the obvious need for constant monitoring of entry to and discharge from this type of regime, often urgently and at short notice, can be handled more effectively at one institution rather than at several. Be that as it may, unless Katingal is reopened at least for long enough to allow the special units to be constructed in the prisons selected—and I ponder whether that will ever happen—there will be continuing incidents, the blame for which will be laid quite properly at the door of the Minister and the Premier. Even then, the problems will not abate, for the reasons I have advanced in favour of concentration rather than dispersal of this type of prisoner.

The director of the Australian Institute of Criminology, Mr William Clifford, is on record calling for an interstate accreditation council to examine conditions applying in prisons across the nation. This institute has sought to establish and set up standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners in Australia along the lines first started in 1929 by the International Penal and Penitentiary Commission. Standard minimum rules were adopted by the United Nations in 1957. Recently the Australian institute published a set of minimum rules that were seen to be appropriate for Australian conditions. Mr Clifford said in the institute's newsletter of September 1978:

These (the rules) may not meet the desires of extremists on both sides of the argument as to the exact conditions which should be applied. But they do provide a basis on which the layman can feel satisfied that human rights are being respected and that a prisoner is not actually being punished in prison, that is, in addition to the deprivation of liberty.

He continued:

In order to keep the public informed and to provide administrators with a guide, there is now a need for an interstate accreditation council, to make regular inspections of prison buildings and to provide reports for administrators and the public. Such a council should be composed of the representatives of authorities concerned as well as independent persons. The chairman needs to be someone who can command respect in this field.

In the same article Mr Clifford said that we will continue to experience trouble in prisons and that a national monitoring body as to standards would be desirable and would carry greater authority and respect than any local State monitoring body. This concept has my support. In my view it would not take away any autonomy or ultimate responsibility from State administrations in charge of prison systems.

I understand that this matter has been discussed at several meetings of responsible Ministers throughout Australia and has not found favour with the Minister for Corrective Services of this State. I suggest that he should think again because no one person or administration has a monopoly of ideas or can resolve the stresses and strains, both within and without the prison systems, many in conflict one with the other, which will for a long time in the future bedevil governments and their administration. I call on the Minister for Corrective Services to support the establishment of a national accreditation council to examine and monitor prison conditions.

Mr Haigh: That proposition has been rejected by every State in Australia.

Mr MADDISON: If they continue to reject it, trouble will continue for a long time.
Mr Haigh: You claim to be an expert on these matters. Tell us about the fires and riots that occurred at Bathurst gaol. Tell us about incidents at Grafton and Maitland gaols. Tell us about what happened at Long Bay Penitentiary.

Mr Maddison: I do not propose to go back into history. The record of the Askin Government in the field of corrective services will stand extremely close examination and deserves praise on many counts. If the Minister for Corrective Services is really smug as he appears to be about what is happening within the corrective services field, he will have a rude shock in the near future. The Minister ought to sit back and think, and not be so smug as he appears to be this afternoon. The Minister for Corrective Services in this State should support the establishment of a national accreditation council to examine and monitor prison conditions. If that had been established fifteen years ago this State would have been far better off than it is at the moment. The Minister would be in less trouble if it had not been ignored.

In the remainder of my time I want to concentrate on matters affecting the administration of justice and the law, the Government's past performance and its future intentions. Of major importance is how the citizen stands, and will stand, under the current Labor administration, in the pursuit and protection of his rights.

Over the years the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice has shown himself to be a man of double standards—a chameleon who changes his colour, both philosophically and sometimes physically, under stress. He is a pragmatist moved by political considerations of the moment, often having no regard to the effects of his actions, short term or long term. He is committed on paper at least, as is the Premier, to freedom of information legislation in this State which would allow citizens to have access to information in government records. Both these gentlemen have spoken frequently on the need for open government, yet nowhere does one see in His Excellency's Speech any reference to any initiative even to consider such a proposal. Moreover, on the last day of the previous session of this Parliament we saw the introduction, virtually without notice to the Parliament and the citizens, of the now infamous Evidence (Amendment) Act. This legislation closed the door on the courts' right to examine communications, written or oral, between Ministers and senior public servants, and for which the Attorney-General claims Crown privilege. His certificate is made absolute. It is now possible for the Government to hide any communication of a nature sensitive to its political survival but which is relevant in any court case in assisting a litigant to pursue or defend his rights. No court will now be able to examine those communications to determine the rightfulness or wrongfulness of the Attorney-General's determination as to where the public interest lies, whether in protecting government or assisting a litigant.

Clearly, the commitment to freedom of information legislation and the passage of the Evidence (Amendment) Act are quite incompatible. The inevitable conclusion is that this Act was introduced for some special purpose which the Government has not yet disclosed. The Opposition parties are firmly committed to repeal that Act on return to government. Citizens' rights have been seriously eroded as a result of the passage of that legislation.

When in Opposition the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice criticized the failure of the Government at that time to legislate for a public administration tribunal as recommended by the New South Wales Law Reform Commission. While in government our response was that as soon as sufficient time had elapsed for the Ombudsman's jurisdiction and procedures to be established we would set up such a tribunal. Prior to the 1970 election, and again prior to the 1978 election, the Premier promised to establish such a tribunal. His Excellency's Speech makes no mention of
positive action to give effect to those election promises. Such a tribunal would provide an avenue for citizens dissatisfied with a decision of a government, or its administration, to have that decision reviewed.

Professor Wilenski, in his interim report reviewing New South Wales government administration, entitled "Directions for Change" said:

A Public Administration Tribunal would provide a high level judicial review of specified decisions by Ministers and Senior officials for which there is now no adequate review mechanism.

He based this view on the ground that at the moment, broadly, the decision makers are responsible for reviewing the adequacy of their own performance. Clearly, this is a most unsatisfactory review of a government decision adverse to a citizen. The Ombudsman has discharged his responsibilities with great distinction and diligence and will continue to do so despite the difficulties that the Minister for Youth and Community Services has raised. That confrontation is a matter of history. The establishment of a public administration tribunal in no way denies the relevance and importance of the Ombudsman continuing to function in accordance with his charter.

The independence of the judiciary and the independence of the legal profession are essential ingredients in safeguarding the rights of citizens. We must have judges and magistrates fearless of government so that their judgments are given regardless of the consequences so far as government and its agencies are concerned. We must have a legal profession which responds to the needs of citizens fearlessly, conscientiously and skilfully. We must have judges, magistrates and lawyers who are respected for their integrity. We must therefore be sensitive to any statements which issue from, or actions taken by, government, which tend to destroy the public's confidence in those who take part in the process of administering the law and justice.

It is becoming more and more clear that the current Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is insensitive to the principles I have just enumerated. First, he should abandon the practice, which he has already followed on several occasions, of "promoting" judges from a lower court to the Supreme Court. I am not to be interpreted as saying that the Attorney-General, for any improper or inappropriate reasons in any case, elevated judges in this way. All I am saying is that the practice might appear to be a reward for being a conforming judge. If the practice is to become regular, the community might think that the independence of the judiciary is impaired. Second, the Attorney-General should also exercise restraint in his recent utterances criticizing the judiciary, and should ponder a long time before he tampers with judicial independence through legislation. The first of such utterances came in the debate on the Evidence (Amendment) Bill when he said, "No longer can one rely on the Australian courts to treat with delicacy claims for Crown privilege."

In the public debate that should have preceded this legislation but in fact took place after the bill had passed through all stages of the Parliament, a number of caustic comments were made by various qualified people and organizations as to the Evidence (Amendment) Act itself and the Attorney-General's comments. Mr Simon Isaacs, Q.C., previously a judge of the Supreme Court, said in an article he wrote in the Sydney Morning Herald of 12th June, 1979:

No Attorney-General in our history has ever before vented such disgraceful and unwarranted criticism of the judiciary and it is to be sincerely hoped that none ever will in the future.
He wrote also:

When the judiciary is denuded of its judicial functions by this type of legislation democracy is being replaced by a police state of despotism because it puts the Attorney-General and Government officials above the law.

Mr Justice Samuels, judge of the Court of Appeal, in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 1st May, 1979, is reported as saying:

The new Act meant that in proceedings by citizens against the Government or a Government instrumentality or in proceedings between two citizens the Attorney-General could withhold evidence of critical importance in the doing of justice.

No doubt any holder of that office, whatever his party, would exercise his powers with fairness and discretion—but the pressures towards secrecy are immense in any bureaucracy whatever its political complexion.

Professor Henry Whitmore of the University of New South Wales, in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 9th May, 1979, reportedly said:

The Act is a major setback to the causes of democratic government and fairness in the judicial system.

Mr Brian Donovan, secretary of the Criminal Law Committee, Law Graduates Association, in the *National Times* of 19th May, 1979, is reported to have said:

The manner in which the bill was passed was an affront to any supporter of the democratic process. Worse still is its content.

A representative of the Council for Civil Liberties, in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 2nd June, 1979, is reported as saying:

The Council said it seemed to be the intention of the amendment—so far as Government business at senior level was concerned—to make the Bench an agent of the Attorney-General.

The second recent utterance of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice that was critical of judges came in a speech by him on 27th June last at a meeting organized by an organization called Citizens for Democracy. He was reported on ABC radio news bulletins on 28th June, and again in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 29th June, 1979, as saying, on the radio:

As a politician I haven’t got a lot of faith in judges to solve problems of human rights; history shows that they don’t do it except for a few exceptions and most of the decisions are changed by their brethren very quickly.

And in the *Sydney Morning Herald* the Attorney-General is quoted as follows:

He said that historically judges had a very poor record about looking after human rights. They had been more concerned about looking after property rights. He was looking at it in the totality of the history of the judge made law. “You can’t rely on them because they haven’t developed laws about human rights.”

He was asked, “Well, why don’t you appoint some decent judges that will do this sort of thing?”

“What I then pointed out was as soon as you appoint a judge he becomes a different class of person.”

Of radical people he knew who had been appointed judges only two had stayed radical.

*Mr Maddison*
Here we see an example of a generalized attack on the judiciary, so that all judges of the State stand condemned, in the eyes of the Attorney-General, for their failure to subscribe to his principles of justice. We know that he is a radical from the left of the political spectrum. Those in politics who do not come within the bounds of his political philosophy know what to expect, but it is outrageous for an Attorney-General to criticize the judiciary as a whole for not conforming to his political precepts. Have any judges whom he has appointed to the courts of New South Wales been excluded from his criticism?

The Attorney-General is a glutton for arrogating power to his office, and I predict that legislation which he masterminded in the future will feed his ego as it has in the past. Unfortunately for the State of New South Wales, by acting in this way he alienates people and institutions at the expense of the best interests of the citizens of the State and their institutions. In the time available I cannot list and give precise details of all the examples of recent legislation. However, I instance his amendment to the control of the Corporate Affairs Commission, his control of the Legal Services Commission and his attempt to gain complete power over whether juries should decide serious corporate crime trials. His biggest blunder was in relation to the power given to the Attorney-General by the Evidence (Amendment) Act.

The Attorney-General was singularly unsuccessful in having governments round Australia establish in Sydney the National Companies and Securities Commission. And why? The other governments did not trust him, as a socialist, to be even-handed in dealing with the law relating to companies and securities. As a result we have a compromise which satisfies no one. The administrative functions of the new commission are to be in Melbourne and the headquarters of the council of Ministers will be in Sydney. The real action and responsibility will be in Melbourne in the administrative supervision and investigating functions of corporations and the securities industry. Sydney and New South Wales will be disadvantaged as a result of that decision. If the Attorney-General had not been so stubborn and not played politics the way he did, there was some prospect that the commission would be established in Sydney, with all the importance that that commission would gain from being located where the real capital market is and where securities are traded.

The Governor's Address informs us that the first two bills relating to uniform securities and company law and takeovers will be introduced after the lapse of some months, since all Attorneys-General except the New South Wales Attorney-General had agreed to the introduction of the enabling legislation to set up the commission. It seems strange that after years of pontification by our Attorney-General as to the need for a national commission he is the one who has been dragging the chain. Not long after the present Attorney-General had assumed office, in an interview with a reporter of the Bulletin he stressed the importance of his having a good relationship with the legal profession. In that interview he said that in the past such a relationship had been strained. I do not know to which Attorney-General he referred, but certainly my relations with the Bar and the Law Society were good, as were those of my predecessor, Sir Kenneth McCaw.

In the three years since the Bulletin interview it would seem that his relations with the legal profession have soured markedly. He fell foul of the Bar, the Law Society and the Association of Labor Lawyers over the proposed abolition of juries in the area of corporate crime and proceedings taken under the Evidence (Amendment) Act and the Legal Services Commission Act. These strained relations seem to offer forebodings of the Attorney-General's attitude when decisions have to be made on the ultimate recommendations of the New South Wales Law Reform Commission on the restructuring of the profession. If the independence of the profession is to be
preserved, it will need a stronger advocate and friend in the office of Attorney-General. At the present rate at which the Law Reform Commission is proceeding with examining the legal profession, perhaps the present Attorney-General will no longer be in that office when the ultimate recommendations come forward from the commission. Unfortunately, the Law Reform Commission has been devoting itself entirely to examining the legal profession. It has done no proper work on law reform in this State.

I have not had time to advert to the consequences flowing from the repeal of the Summary Offences Act. That action will affect all citizens of the State. Suffice it to say that a slow time fuse is burning which will lead finally to an explosion of public opinion that the Government will regret. Clearly this is the present situation. An advertisement inserted this week in the Daily Telegraph by the Police Association indicates the problems that it sees in making that legislation work. All in all, the divisive policies of the Attorney-General have led and will continue to lead to a diminution of the rights of citizens.

Mr BOOTH (Wallsend) Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism [4,36]: I congratulate the honourable member for Woronora, and particularly the honourable member for Willoughby who made his maiden speech in this debate on the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. Although I was not present in the Chamber, I have read the Hansard reports of both speeches and I take this opportunity of congratulating those members, both of whom will make their mark in the Parliament of New South Wales.

I propose to speak specifically about tourism in New South Wales. The previous Liberal–Country party Government in New South Wales gave no recognition to the importance of tourism to the State's economy and the employment that it generates. Tourism is now moving into a dramatic and challenging period of change and growth. In February this year the Government underlined this fact by calling a special conference on the future of tourism in New South Wales and establishing a tourist action steering committee to ensure that appropriate measures stemming from the conference were taken speedily and effectively.

The New South Wales Department of Tourism is responsible for implementing the Government's tourism policy, which aims at fostering the growth of tourism by exploiting, on a co-operative basis with the private sector and other tourism authorities, those markets and products offering greatest potential for long-term growth. Between April 1978 and March 1979 more than 20.43 million trips of one night or more away from home were taken in New South Wales by Australian and overseas residents. These trips resulted in an estimated 90 million visitor nights. Most of the trips—74.3 per cent—originated from within the State itself, 23.6 per cent from interstate and only 2.1 per cent from overseas. Although overseas visitors generated a small proportion only of all trips, they were important as they accounted for 8.2 per cent of the 90 million visitor nights recorded in that period, and were responsible for about 20 per cent of expenditure.

In regional terms Sydney and its environs attract about 41 per cent of expenditure, while the coastal and inland areas share the rest in roughly equal proportions. Sydney attracted about a third of trips and about 29 per cent of nights spent in the State. The coastal parts of the State attracted about 37 per cent of trips and 36 per cent of nights, while inland areas received 33 per cent of trips and 35 per cent of nights. These statistics show how tourism demand and supply is widely distributed throughout the State compared with other industries. Despite a severe recession in the latter part of the 1970's, tourism demand at the domestic and international level
continued to grow at up to three times the rate of economic growth measured in gross domestic product terms. Domestic tourism in the 1980's is expected to continue to grow, but at a reduced rate because of fuel cost-supply problems.

International tourism to Australia and New South Wales is showing signs of acceleration since the introduction of cheaper international air fares from Europe and the United Kingdom, North America and New Zealand. From July 1978 to June 1979 more than 700,000 overseas tourists visited Australia, a 22 per cent increase on the previous year. The period since the introduction of cheaper fares, and particularly the State Government's promotion activities in New Zealand, has seen the number of tourists coming to Australia and New South Wales increase by 31.2 per cent. This figure represents an additional 70,200 visitors, of which the State gained approximately 70 per cent. If this volume of increase can be sustained in the future, it will mean the creation of more than 1,000 new jobs in New South Wales alone. All the signs indicate continued high growth rates from overseas. New South Wales can capitalize on this growth if it is able to provide the resources necessary to take the action needed by way of development and promotion in the 1980's.

Let me turn briefly to the extent of the State's tourist plant that is available to attract and service the massive market that I have outlined. New South Wales offers virtually every feature of the Australian landscape, climate and way of life to make it the most versatile and popular tourist destination in Australia. The State offers over 200 tourist information centres located in major towns; 862 major tourist attractions ranging from national parks to Old Sydney Town; countless minor ones, such as amusement parks; 343 major tourist caravan and camping parks; 92 quality farm holiday centres; 325 festivals and events; and 1,120 hotels and motels with facilities providing over 76,000 bed spaces a night.

Based on a recent assessment made by the Bureau of Industry Economics, it is estimated that tourist expenditure in New South Wales for 1977–78 probably amounted to $1,050 million, of which about $150 million was earned from overseas visitors. In 1973–74, according to the bureau, tourism probably employed 45,000 persons full-time in New South Wales. A further 12,699 persons were employed part-time in the State's accommodation industry. To give an indication of the impact of tourism on employment, the bureau estimates that a 5 per cent increase in tourist expenditure to the State would generate 2,231 new jobs. Despite the favourable tourism position enjoyed by the State and the significant growth opportunities available in the 1980's, the tourist industry faces a number of problems. Their solution could lead to these future benefits: increased competition from other States and overseas destinations; seasonal under-utilization of tourist plant and equipment in the State's major destination regions; inadequate tourist information material to service the existing market; increased cost of fuel affecting motor car transport, which is the main mode of travel for domestic tourists; and lack of appreciation by the community of the value of tourism and the need for a more active welcome to be given to visitors.

The Government is concerned that the tourist industry continues to play its part as a contributor to the economic and social welfare of the State in the 1980's. Appropriate strategies have already been developed and implemented to attack some of the problems mentioned. It is therefore appropriate to review what the Government, through the New South Wales Department of Tourism, has done in the past year. In 1978–79 the department's programmes were directed at establishing a base for maintaining the State's existing market share of tourism and promoting greater utilization of tourist plant. The department produced and distributed some 730,000 tourist guides covering twelve regions of the State in addition to producing a new State tour planning
map to replace regional maps, a travel manual for use by the travel industry, new posters, service publications and advertising of the services provided by the department's travel centres and resorts.

The programmes directed at underutilization took the form of a major co-operative campaign in New Zealand during February and March this year, a pilot campaign to test the concept of promoting early summer holidays to the Sydney market, and a major campaign for off-season travel directed to Victorian motorists. Industry co-operation has been the hallmark of the department's strategy in the past financial year, and a strong base has been established. Although it is too early to provide conclusive information, short-term results are encouraging. For example, the department's major promotion in New Zealand has achieved a 50 per cent increase in awareness of the State's holiday attractions and has already resulted in substantially increased holiday traffic to the State. Both the New Zealand and Victorian promotions are being closely monitored. On the whole, tourism levels throughout the State improved compared with the previous financial year. Accommodation occupancies have improved, particularly in Sydney, where a shortage of international-class hotel accommodation is looming. The department's own operations showed increased business activity. Although other factors were operating as well, it is believed that the department's programmes in no small way made a contribution to the general climate.

A new structure and management system has also been developed and approved for the Department of Tourism. This is now being implemented. It involves the creation of separate divisions for marketing and development, policy and planning, and administration. As part of the reorganization the department closed its government travel centre in Adelaide, and replaced it with a travel services manager in Adelaide to promote New South Wales more actively with the South Australian travel trade. Another officer of the department was sent on secondment to New Zealand with the Australian Tourist Commission to assist that body with its work and to make recommendations on the establishment of a New South Wales office in our largest overseas market. Because of market changes resulting from the lower international air fares and because of a growing demand overseas for more information on New South Wales, the Government has also posted tourist representatives to London and Los Angeles. This overseas representation is expected to enhance further the capacity of New South Wales to attract a majority of all overseas visitors to Australia, with consequent benefits to our economy and employment.

The tourism action steering committee, set up as a result of the February conference on tourism, has been reviewing the tourist potential of the State, and it is expected to report to the Government next month. A major achievement of the committee so far has been a study of the tourist and accommodation needs of Sydney. That has identified the possibility of a serious shortfall of hotel accommodation in Sydney within three years.

The New South Wales Government welcomes last night's decision by the federal Government to introduce a depreciation allowance for the tourist industry of 2.5 per cent on new buildings and extensions of buildings. That has been sought by the industry for a long time. This Government had recognized the importance of and need for such a measure, and the Premier had lent his support in approaching the Prime Minister on the issue. In addition to the need for action at a federal level, the State Government believes that taxation incentives are necessary to provide a stimulus for urgently-needed hotel accommodation in Sydney. At the Government's tourist conference in February the Premier offered tax concessions for new hotels and motels or extensions to existing properties which would involve an addition to 100 rooms or
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more. Since then close consultation has taken place between the New South Wales Premier's Department and interested developers involved in a number of proposals to ensure that badly-needed hotel facilities are provided.

Despite the fact that Sydney's hotels are enjoying buoyant demand, there has been little investment in response to this demand. In the past ten years the city of Sydney has had an addition of only 1 153 hotel rooms. The Government is hopeful that the incentives it has offered will stimulate interest in providing additional accommodation.

This Government welcomes the federal initiative, even though I believe that a depreciation rate of 5 per cent would be more realistic. Nevertheless, the move will have a positive effect on the general investment climate in the accommodation sector of the tourist industry. It seems likely it will act as a further impetus to groups negotiating with the State Government on accommodation proposals. The Department of Tourism has also paid attention to the need to ensure that overseas visitors travel more extensively throughout New South Wales beyond Sydney. At present, only about 30 per cent of overseas visitors to Sydney travel elsewhere in the State. The potential for many more to do so is great, and the Department of Tourism and the New South Wales travel industry are making strenuous efforts to encourage a wider dispersal of visitors throughout the State. To further this aim, in June the department organized a seminar on dispersal of international visitors. As a result, it has been decided to produce a special promotion booklet based on the use of concession air and rail fares.

The tourist industry development fund is also playing an important part in promoting tourism in New South Wales. Development assistance is directed towards encouraging the establishment of unique tourist attractions, tourist information centres, amenities and low-cost accommodation for the tourist in those areas of the State where a need exists. The fund was established on 1st December, 1976, and to date a total of approximately $5.2 million has been committed — $4.65 million for development works and approximately $550,000 for promotion activities. About $4.4 million has already been paid out to assist in the development of information centres, attractions and low-cost accommodation. These figures demonstrate the Government's genuine desire to provide the tourist industry in this State with the impetus and encouragement it needs, to enable New South Wales to continue to compete with other States and oversea countries in what is a highly competitive industry.

Since the expansion of the fund's guidelines to cover low-cost accommodation, I have approved payment of $348,000 towards the provision of such facilities, including the establishment of a youth hostel at Narrandera and construction of family cabins and caravan parks in areas of the State where a need for them exists. Future expansion in this area will include the extension of facilities at the Sydney Youth Hostel to provide additional accommodation for overseas and interstate visitors to Sydney. Other major projects assisted during the past twelve months include the Timbertown project at Wauchope and the El Caballo Blanco dancing horses project at Narellan, both of which are attracting an increasing number of visitors and are contributing significantly to the local economy.

Since the Government acquired a 75 per cent interest in Old Sydney Town in December 1976 the project has received significant assistance from the tourist industry development fund. This financial assistance has enabled the project to complete a number of outstanding capital works improvements including the stone gaol, school house and additional picnic and playground areas for the public. All of the capital improvements have been designed to enhance visitor appeal. Old Sydney Town has
a major impact on the economy of the Central Coast through the employment of more than 100 local residents, and the purchase of local goods and services for capital development works and for normal operations.

During the past financial year $180,000 was distributed to the twenty-nine eligible tourist associations and to the council of tourist associations, to assist in servicing the needs of tourists throughout the State. To be eligible to receive a subsidy, an association needs to cover the boundaries of at least two local government areas. Also, it must operate a tourist information centre and employ a full-time tourist officer. Last year the Government also provided $27,000 in direct financial assistance to the Sydney visitors’ bureau, and co-operated in two promotion campaigns to attract tourists to Sydney. In addition to these major activities, the Department of Tourism organized a major conference on tourism research, directed the activities of an interdepartmental committee examining sites for a major resort on the North Coast, and contributed towards the cost of monitoring domestic tourism. This is providing valuable information on market trends for planning and monitoring purposes.

The total cost of Government activities covering tourism in 1978–79 was $6,198,543. An amount of $622,000 went towards advertising and publicity; $1,680,000 went to development, promotion and tourist association assistance; and $3,896,543 went towards administration. The department’s operations returned direct revenue of $2,139,209. The activities planned by the department for the next year will extend and complement those that have already swung into operation. The first priority will be completion of the department’s restructuring. In regard to tourism product development, an additional $700,000 has been committed from the tourist industry development fund for projects. An amount of $87,300 has been committed for two low-cost accommodation projects. Funds totalling $89,298 have been committed to develop four tourist information centres.

The promotion programmes planned for 1979–80 will concentrate upon increasing utilization levels of the off-peak, maintaining market share and increasing our share of the growing oversea market. The programmes that are subject to the availability of funds include: extensive advertising, publicity and information servicing of the existing market; promotion to create public awareness of tourism to encourage greater community involvement in welcoming visitors and improving visitor satisfaction; advertising and publicity campaigns in intrastate and interstate motorist markets; and oversea promotion in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Europe and North America.

In the area of sales and industry relations, the department will continue to develop closer ties through co-operative programmes and the provision of servicing facilities for travel agents at the Government travel centres. It will continue to obtain and interpret market information through the domestic tourist monitor and other studies. A report on domestic travel to and within the State will be prepared. The appointment in the Department of Tourism of a personnel and training officer will improve its capacity to assist the tourist industry to develop training of staff, a vital component if we are to develop successfully and benefit from tourism in the 1980’s. The annual tourist conference to be held at Wagga Wagga next month will examine tourism in the 1980’s and implications for New South Wales and its regions. Further initiatives await the presentation to the Premier next month of a report from the action steering committee on tourism.

May I say in conclusion that the Government believes that tourism offers significant potential for further development in the State in the 1980’s. The development of this potential depends upon: identifying the problems and opportunities facing
us; identifying the appropriate strategies we must adopt; and developing closer ties on the one hand between the Government and the private sector and, on the other hand, between other government administrations that have an impact on tourism. The Government, through the New South Wales Department of Tourism, is moving towards greater co-ordination and involvement at all these levels so that the benefits of tourism can be fully realized in the next decade.

Mr BREWER (Goulburn) [4.55]: I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Also, I pay my respects to members who have contributed to the debate for the first time in making their maiden speeches.

I ask the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative Societies to convey to his colleague the Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism my pleasure at following in this debate a Minister of the Crown who has been constructive and forward-thinking in his approach to the handling of his portfolio.

Mr Einfeld: The honourable member is not following a Minister like that; he is actually facing one.

Mr BREWER: It is said that self-praise is no recommendation. I offer to the Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism the sympathy of the constituents of Goulburn in respect of the sad loss of his late wife. On several occasions we in the electorate had the pleasure of a visit from Mrs Booth. We always found her a lovely person. The people of Goulburn took to her immediately. I should like the Minister to know how sorry all my constituents are over his sad loss.

As I said before, it is like a breath of fresh air to follow in a debate in this Chamber a Minister who did not devote the time available to him to deprecating the federal Government, in slandering Opposition members and in carrying on in a manner like that for which his leader, the Premier, is noted. It is sickening to sit in this Chamber and listen to the Premier castigating the federal Government mostly with half-truths and untruths. His viciousness and disregard for the facts are staggering. It is a pity that people outside this Parliament are not able to see what really goes on in here.

As I said before, it is a great pleasure to follow a Minister who has paid due respect to the Commonwealth Government for the contribution it has made towards tourism in New South Wales. There is no doubt that tourism will be a big employer of labour. A major contributing factor to the upsurge of tourism not only in this State but also throughout Australia is the Commonwealth Government's contribution by keeping the inflation rate at one of the lowest levels in the world. This is a most important factor.

About two or three years ago when I was in Europe and the United Kingdom I found it almost impossible for an Australian to be able to finance his ordinary travel needs. This was because of the ravages there of inflation. Recently, when I was in South Africa I found an upsurge there in tourism because it had been able to maintain a reasonable rate of inflation compared with that in the rest of the world. The Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism was absolutely spot on when he said there is a glorious future for tourism in New South Wales and Australia. That glorious future is attributable to the restraint of the Fraser Government, as it has often been bitterly referred to in this Chamber, particularly by the Premier, in keeping the inflation rate at a reasonable level.
Anything that upsets the balance of inflation in Australia will not be the doing of the State Government or the federal Government so much as that of the oil nations. It will probably not even be the doing of the oil nations so much as the fact that the world is starting to run out of fossil fuel. The press has not complained bitterly about the federal budget which made a great contribution to tourism. No more positive way than tourism exists to create employment across the board in this nation. In that way roads, railways and other services may be used to advantage to employ people. The low rate of inflation in Australia is the reason why tourism is expanding. I compliment the Minister for Sport and Recreation and Minister for Tourism on putting forward positive and constructive debate and not denigrating the Opposition or the Commonwealth Government. He was constructive also as far as his own department is concerned. I pay respect to the Minister for the work he did at my invitation in connection with the Goulburn Police and Citizens Boys Club. It is a magnificent success which caters for many young people in the community.

In the near future I shall be seeking the assistance of the Minister for the establishment of a sporting complex in Goulburn. The complex will be of help to many young people in the community as a basketball court will be a feature of it. It is a forward thinking scheme developed by the community. In the not too distant future I shall be seeking help from the Minister to look for funds from the Government to establish that sporting complex. The soundness of the proposal and the willingness of the Minister to listen to it could greatly help many people in Goulburn.

I shall refer to a matter that has become of real concern in the electorates of Goulburn, South Coast and Monaro and also to the whole of the southeast region—the possibility of the failure of the Goulburn College of Advanced Education. With the worthwhile support of the Country Party following its decentralization policy and its leader at that time, Sir Charles Cutler who was Minister for Education, I had a great deal to do with the establishment of that college. It is a magnificent institution and has been responsible for employment involving at least 160 families, providing an annual income to the community of $5 million. In June of this year it was realized that problems would exist so far as preservice teacher training is concerned. Goulburn College of Advanced Education is a single purpose college and was developed as a preteacher training institution. As such it is likely to suffer in the reduction or downturn of preservice teacher training unless special consideration is given to it.

Some of the actions that have been taken by the community, the college and me merit mention. I shall refer to some of the communications I have had from the Minister who, if he does what he says, will not see the college founder and become a waste of the State's resources, which will be the result should it become idle. If that happens it will also be a tragic loss to post secondary education facilities in the southeast region. The Minister has said that the allocation of scholarships to the Goulburn College of Advanced Education in the next three years will be substantially below the number of students required to retain the college in a viable way. Since its opening, principals of the college have staffed it with professional people who are able to deal with almost any subject that contributes to community betterment.

Last year the Goulburn College of Advanced Education had the sixth highest enrolment of the nineteen teacher training institutions in New South Wales. It provided eight diploma courses in teacher education and liberal studies and in addition numerous courses for the community of the southeast region both on and off campus were provided. Dr Birrell, the principal, is retiring soon. He and his staff have been most active in developing the college as a truly regional college for the southeast region. It was feared at one time that the Canberra College of Advanced Education would provide competition for the Goulburn college but that has not happened. In Canberra
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circles there is much more reference to the activities of the Goulburn college than there is reference to Canberra in the Goulburn community. In fact no reference is made to Canberra because of the energy and the studies that the Goulburn College of Advanced Education is able to provide.

The representatives of the Government talk about decentralization. If Government supporters are genuinely concerned with decentralization I point out that the portfolio of the Minister for Education could make a great contribution to decentralization in the southeast region of New South Wales. Not only does the Goulburn College of Advanced Education provide jobs for 160 people and bring in $5 million a year to the local community, but also it provides education opportunities. It has been doing that as far as teacher training and the liberal arts are concerned, but in the future because the staff is there to handle the proposition, the college could be most important to the southeast region in other education fields.

The Minister for Education has a responsibility to that college and to decentralization. The college can survive in only two ways. First, it can survive with massive Government support. Second, the college can survive by a diversion of the majority of teacher training scholarships away from the metropolitan area to the Goulburn college in order to maintain the numerical strength of the intake and to keep the college viable while it develops in other fields. For at least ten to fifteen years it will be essential for the main thrust of the college to be pre-teacher education.

It is the responsibility of the Minister and of the Government to allocate to the Goulburn college the scholarship positions even if it means taking some of those positions from other colleges that are more able, because of population density, to branch out into other fields. The Minister has suggested that the Goulburn college should develop other spheres of education. I point out to this Parliament that the college has been doing this ever since its inception, though this Government has never accepted that fact, just as it has not accepted the college's capabilities in that regard.

A great deal of work on nurses' training has been done by the Goulburn College of Advanced Education. In fact, the chairman of the Nurses Education Board made a recommendation that the Goulburn college should be the recipient of the course in nurses' education that is to be provided by the colleges of advanced education. I impress upon this Parliament and upon the Minister the need, not only in the interests of the economic stability of the community of Goulburn but also in the interests of education, to decentralize tertiary education that can be provided by the Goulburn College of Advanced Education. If the Minister does not in the next three years, and for longer than that, provide the scholarship positions that are essential to keep the Goulburn college viable—it is a corporate body—it will fail and become part of the technical and further education system and will lose its advantage in tertiary education in the south east region. Immediately it cannot get the required intake of trainee teachers, the people who have assembled such wonderful opportunities in training courses will start to disperse and the college, as an institution, will be lost—not because of the loss of the buildings or loss of income to the community of Goulburn but because of the quality of the lecturers at the Goulburn college at present, in all sorts of studies in the liberal and performing arts and, in fact, in almost every subject that can be imagined.

I urge the Minister to make the necessary reductions in other colleges that can be self-sustaining and provide the basic requirement of the intake of pre-teacher trainees to keep the Goulburn college viable. It has been said that Goulburn will have to relinquish teacher-training as its principal role. If that happen?, within the next five or ten years the college will fail and become a white elephant on the hill.
I wish to refer now to a matter that affects my constituency and the people and the families who live in it—that is, the problems facing the prison system in New South Wales. It made me sick yesterday to hear the outburst of the person who is the responsible head of the prison system in this State, Dr Tony Vinson. He appeared to be concerned only about himself and the prisoners. I agree that there is a need for concern about the inmates of our prisons, but much concern is wrongly placed. The Premier referred to Katingal as an electronic zoo. Is it not far better to have the sort of people who were incarcerated in Katingal in an electronic zoo where they cannot harm warders or other prisoners? The Premier closed Katingal—and it was the Premier who closed that institution—because he overreacted to the recommendations in the report of the Royal commissioner, Mr Justice Nagle. I feel that I am close to the prison officers in my community. They are highly responsible people and they have been part of the community ever since the early days when the Goulburn reformatory existed. The Premier overreacted because he accepted the advice of the way out left-wing supporters of this Government.

The Royal commission into prisons was forced upon this State by certain honourable members in this Chamber. We all know them; I shall not name them. They were not concerned about the community; their concern was for a socialist state, and the way out radical attitudes that have proved to be disastrous in every country where they have been accepted. Those people and the Premier must take direct responsibility for the death of the prison officer who was murdered recently and all of the tragedy that has occurred since Katingal was closed. A forecast of what would happen with the closure of Katingal was made by most of the intelligent and knowledgeable prison officers. I remember a statement being made at a meeting that I attended at the Goulburn prison. It was said that the closure of Katingal would throw back into the gaols throughout New South Wales an element of violent prisoners, corruption and insurrection, which would not only be harmful to the system but also would damage the unfortunate prisoner of a younger and less hardened nature. If Dr Vinson is worried about prisoners, his principal concern should be the great harm that has been done by rapists and murderers who belong inside Katingal. It was dastardly to disperse them throughout the prison community among prisoners who might otherwise have developed into good citizens. The right place for dangerous prisoners is in the electronic zoo, not where they can murder and rape within our prison system.

I shall not give up in this Parliament or in my constituency until a more sensible approach is taken by this Government on the prison system. I am concerned for law-abiding people and those who want to make good. The attitude of the Premier—the Minister is not worth mentioning—and the do-gooders in this State has brought about a tragic set of circumstances in our prison system that will take a long time to correct. The sooner this Government takes notice of responsible and worthwhile officers of Her Majesty's prisons in New South Wales, the sooner the situation will be corrected.

I shall refer also to some of the inquiries that are proceeding at Goulburn into alleged bashings. It would appear that the Royal Commission into New South Wales Prisons listened to the sort of people who in the past month have been giving evidence in Goulburn. Hardly any of the prisoners who accused prison officers of various misdemeanours have been able to state their cases consistently and accurately on separate occasions. The falsification of evidence proven at the magistrate's court in Goulburn gives the lie to most of the findings in the report of the Royal commission. It will be noted that the House did not debate that report. I would welcome the opportunity to debate it, as I know some of the persons involved, particularly Allan Penning. One reason why the prisoners concerned in the interrogations now proceeding are anxious to get rid of men like Mr Penning is because they are good prison officers and disciplinarians who will not tolerate the sort of happenings that have taken place in the State's prisons in recent months.
The report and evidence given in the recent court cases in Goulburn put paid to any recommendations made in the report of the Royal commission. The sooner the Government and those responsible give consideration to the safety of law-abiding citizens and the possibility of recovering the younger, less incorrigible prisoners within the system, the sooner prison officers will be able to carry out their jobs. The whole episode has been a tragic incident. Dr Vinson is worried about himself and what is likely to happen to some of the prisoners because of the actions of the few who will be incarcerated in Katingal if that establishment is re-opened. He should think of the tremendous harm that will be done to prisoners and prison officers if the present position is not rectified.

The Governor's Speech made little reference to matters of tremendous value. Particularly I refer to the likelihood of a reduction in the availability of fossil fuels. I remind the Government of its statement on the proposed electrification of the main southern line from Campbelltown to Goulburn. That would make a tremendous contribution to saving fuel costs in the State, despite the capital cost of developing the rail system. I wish to refer also to the Government's policy on national parks. The proclamation of a national park in the Cookbundoon Ranges would increase the bushfire hazard in the Goulburn district. Approximately 30 per cent of that park will come from private land. The most important thing to be considered when acquiring land for this national park is the management of the park and the prevention and control of bushfires. It is a tragedy that the Government and the do-gooders have banned the aerial baiting with 1080 poison in national parks. The Government is being run by trendies, way-outs and persons who display no acceptance of community responsibility.

Mr BRERETOW (Heffron) [5.25]: I congratulate the honourable member for Woronora, the mover of the motion being debated by the House. I congratulate also the honourable member for Willoughby and the honourable member for Miranda who so ably made their maiden speeches during the course of the debate. In the short time since the last election both honourable members have made their marks upon the parliamentary Labor Party and this Parliament. They have wonderful futures and I am sure will remain members of this House for many years and have the honour to represent the constituents who were sound enough in their political thinking to elect them as their representatives.

I shall deal shortly with that part of the Governor's Speech which referred to housing. I was delighted to hear that the Government will release 2,000 Crown land home blocks in this financial year and that a further 2,000 home sites are to be released through the Land Commission. I was pleased to learn also of the establishment of a home purchase advisory service to provide the public with general information on all aspects of home purchase. I was appalled at the reality of the drastic cutbacks in federal funding dealt with in the same section of the Governor's Speech. Honourable members on this side of the House would be aware that the most pressing problem facing many persons in the Sydney region, apart from unemployment, is the lack of security in housing. Statisticians say that the average Sydney family takes some eleven and a half years to save a deposit for a three-bedroom home. That might well be the dream of every Australian, but it is clear that dream is well beyond the reach of the average Australian. Because many people are unable to purchase their own home, New South Wales is faced with the tremendous rental crisis in the market-place.

The shortage of rental housing has been caused by the inability of people to purchase their own home and has contributed largely to the enormous increase in rents that has occurred in the market-place over the past twelve years. A few weeks ago the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative
Societies said he saw the prospects of persons on the rental market gaining accommodation as being particularly grim. He said further that it was almost impossible for such persons to gain accommodation unless they were prepared to pay exorbitant rents. The situation has developed where the rental market has been totally uncatered for by private developers. Building programmes for rental accommodation have been neglected largely because potential investors see much more to be gained from putting investment capital into building societies or high dividend investments, rather than into housing where they have not received good returns.

It is time that the federal Government embarked upon a course of massive incentives to entice developers to get back into the rental market-place. All honourable members would be aware that the market is extremely tight; the Minister has said so, and so have newspaper reports. The latest figures available from the Real Estate Institute of Australia show that at the end of May in Sydney the vacancy rate for rental accommodation was 2.2 per cent, the lowest rate for any capital city in Australia. It is generally accepted that a vacancy rate which falls below 3 per cent is serious. The great demand and lack of supply has contributed to the spiralling increase in rents of between $15 and $25 a week for persons in my electorate and surrounding electorates. In the past year these factors have contributed also to the tremendous competition faced by most people living in the Sydney region and seeking this type of accommodation.

I am delighted with the efforts of the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative Societies in establishing a directorate of housing earlier this year. That is an indication of the Minister's seriousness in treating the housing problem as a total problem and not just a matter for the Housing Commission. The previous Liberal-Country party Government regarded the housing ministry as having the prime function of being a post-box between members of Parliament and the Housing Commission. The establishment of the directorate of housing will contribute greatly towards providing the Minister with research facilities with independent expert advice and the opportunity to create programmes across a broad reach of housing needs.

I am delighted also with the commitment of the Minister to pursue new initiatives for private rental housing. As I said before, until we can meet the shortage of supply—and that will require some initiatives—we shall not offer any long-term relief for people in need of reasonably priced accommodation. The realities are that of all residences in Australia about 68 per cent are privately owned and occupied, some 27 per cent are privately rented and the remainder are publicly let. Recently the position in regard to building commencements has changed. About 89 per cent of buildings commenced will be privately used and the remainder will be for public use. Virtually none of the 89 per cent will be for rental accommodation.

Since the Fraser Government was elected to power we have seen savage and drastic cutbacks in funds for public housing. From a total outlay for housing in the federal Budget in 1974-75 of some 3.9 per cent of the total budget, last year housing received only 1.3 per cent. We have seen the programme of the New South Wales Housing Commission slashed dramatically since 1974, when the Whitlam federal Labor Government was in office, from 6,000 houses commenced by the Housing Commission of New South Wales to a mere 1,100 in 1979. We have seen the federal Government's grant for housing for this State cut back from more than $132 million in the year before last to $103-odd million last year, and this year to $75 million. It is for this reason that the Government has felt compelled to defer the abolition of death duties for twelve months, because it realizes that it must fill the gap caused by the retreat of the federal Government from financing the construction of welfare housing.
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A terrible plight confronts large numbers of people, and I wonder whether other members are aware of the magnitude of it. I represent a working-class electorate where many people are of limited means and, indeed, suffer grave housing hardship. In my electorate I come into contact with a number of the agencies that provide accommodation for people in desperate need of adequate housing. When one speaks to any of the people associated with the provision of accommodation refuges or welfare housing one is soon made aware that they see an escalating trend towards desperation. In a 9-month period the Camperdown Family Centre, which is run by the Anglican Church, had to turn away some 300 requests for accommodation. Those requests came mostly from families. The centre, which is the only one providing family welfare units in the Sydney metropolitan area, had insufficient room for those people. The other refuges and centres cannot accept all members of a family, a situation that is absolutely appalling to members on this side of the House. Many people who sought help at that centre came there after being evicted from other premises and they could not raise the bond required to permit them to rent a flat. A family now needs $400 or $500 as a bond and advance rent for privately rented premises.

This afternoon the Premier referred to the fact that the average age of a person seeking accommodation at the Matthew Talbot Hostel in Sydney is now 38 years. That the situation is extremely desperate becomes evident when one learns that only 6 years ago the average age of a person seeking accommodation at that hostel was not 38 years but 58 years. All cheap hotel accommodation in the inner city area is absolutely packed at present. C.B. Residential Homes in the city have 210 rooms for rent at $22 a week. Every one of those rooms is full every night of the week. The people running that centre say that there was a time when the demand for accommodation was quiet in winter. However, it is not quiet any more; the rooms are full the year round. This is because people on the scrap heap are desperately looking for assistance. Community groups recognize the magnitude of this problem and have made numerous applications to the Government for assistance to provide community information and welfare services for people with housing and tenancy problems.

Whereas previously some welfare bodies were able to take in people from the street, they now put a time limit of one week on their emergency accommodation. One finds that women's refuges, originally set up to provide temporary accommodation for battered wives, are under increasing pressure to house women, usually single parents and homeless children, not because of domestic violence but because of the difficult rent position. Some of the refuges have had to make an arbitrary rule that they will take only women who are battered. What I have been saying applies also to the provision of emergency accommodation for young people. At Bondi in the electorate of the honourable member for Waverley a community youth support group has helped to find accommodation for young people who descend on the beach in the summer. In winter there was never any problem. In this last winter that body has been dealing with some fifteen to twenty homeless teenagers every week, some of whom have been sleeping on the beach. So the problem runs right across the community spectrum.

We hear a lot from the Opposition benches about dole bludgers and people who are ripping off the Department of Social Security. Let me point out that the dole has not been increased for these young people over the past four years; it is still $36 a week. That is one significant reason why these people sleep on the beach. There is a need to inject funds into programmes that will put a roof over the head of people in desperate plight. The Housing Commission has provision for out-of-turn priority. Over the past twelve months a lot of pressure has been put on the Housing Commission by people in desperate housing circumstances. Last year the committee heard 299 applications and approved 63 of them. This year it has considered 648 requests and approved only 49 per cent of them.
Mr Petersen: Did the honourable member say 49 per cent?

Mr BRERETON: Forty-nine per cent of the people who were desperate enough to apply for out-of-turn priority for accommodation were successful in getting it. Let me point out the criteria for having an application dealt with by the committee. First, it is not just a matter of walking in with an application. Unless a person can show that he is totally unable to satisfy his housing needs on the private market his application will not be dealt with. Second, that person has to have a court order directing that the premises he was occupying be vacated—in other words, he is virtually on the street. Unless those criteria can be satisfied the application is not even considered. In spite of that, last year only 49 per cent of the people who met that criteria were able to be housed as emergency cases by the Housing Commission.

Mr Petersen: Malcolm Fraser would not understand that.

Mr BRERETON: Of course, he would not understand that.

[Interuption]

Mr BRERETON: If the Opposition will permit me to continue, let me point out that things will not be improved by last night’s federal Budget. An analysis today by such people as the Taxpayers Association of Australia showed that in spite of the abolition of the 2½ per cent surcharge, the percentage of tax will actually increase by 50.99 per cent this year. That is for people earning $4,500 a year. It will increase by 27.38 per cent for people earning $5,000 a year. Of course, at the higher end of the scale one finds that the increase in taxation as a result of this budget is lower. It is 18.46 per cent for people earning $5,500 and 13.7 per cent for people earning $6,000. It can be seen that the people at the bottom end of the scale, about whom I have been talking and who are facing a desperate housing plight, will be socked harder than anybody else as a result of the federal Budget announced in Canberra last night.

One must ask oneself, what has the federal Government been doing to assist these people? This Government has asked itself this question. It has come up with the answer—absolutely nothing. It has seen federal funds for housing cut by an effective 40 per cent this year, following a cut of 25 per cent in real terms last year. It has seen a need to raise $30 million by deferral of the abolition of death duties in order to maintain the building programmes of the Housing Commission. What has become of the initiatives suggested to the federal Government by the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Housing and Minister for Co-operative Societies? There was a suggestion that there should be short-term incentives to increase production of rental housing. This was to be an incentive to attract accommodation providers back into the market. The federal Government has been considering that proposal for some considerable time but it has not yet made a decision on it. Yet, such a concession would have enabled proprietors of rental housing to claim a benefit that is available to many other small businessmen and would provide a badly-needed investment incentive. Surely if such a scheme were implemented many of these people would come back into the market-place. That is what our Minister has been saying, but the message has been falling on deaf ears in the federal Government.

What about trading stock valuation tax concessions, which were introduced in 1977 to provide relief from the impact of inflation on stock values? They do not apply to the housing industry. Has the federal Government given favourable consideration to the Minister’s proposals? Once again the answer is, absolutely not. Of course this is to be expected from the federal Government. If one looks across the range of its attitudes, as have been demonstrated in recent months, whether it be Ningana, the question dealt with by the honourable member for Balmain last night, or any other area, its performance has been lamentable.
Ningana is a classic example of the lack of co-operation of the federal Government. Our Minister for Housing has been trying to arrange for this place to be made available for emergency housing. The federal Government has not co-operated. Ningana contains fifty-three units that have been empty for the past three years—while people are wandering the streets homeless. The federal Government's problems there could have been resolved at the drop of a hat. Instead, all we have had from the federal Government has been procrastination. It has said that such things as the cooking facilities at Ningana are not up to standard, but they are much better than the cooking facilities for young people on Bondi beach. In my electorate there is the scandal associated with the housing units reserved by the Commonwealth Government for its service personnel. Seventy-two units there were kept vacant for a lengthy period because the federal Government did not have any service personnel to put in them. The units remained vacant while other people were on the streets, searching desperately for accommodation. What of the backbench members of the federal Parliamentary Liberal Party? How have they performed on this matter of government housing? Five federal Liberal members of parliament are on record saying that they do not want Housing Commission homes built in their electorates because they do not want Labor voters in their areas.

Mr Petersen: Who were they?

Mr BRERETON: They included two Liberal Party members from New South Wales, Mr Alan Cadman, federal member for Mitchell and Mr Philip Ruddock, federal member for Dundas. They were joined in their attitude by their interstate colleagues, Mr Viner from the federal electorate of Stirling in Western Australia, Mr Hyde from the federal electorate of Moore in Western Australia and Mr Kevin Cairns from the federal electorate of Lilley in Queensland. These marvellous, compassionate men would not want Housing Commission accommodation built in their electorates because they do not want Labor voters there. While I am talking about the Liberal Party and their fellow travellers, let me spare a thought for the Lord Mayor of Sydney, Alderman Meers, who went on record as saying——

Mr Petersen: He is not a Liberal, is he?

Mr BRERETON: It will be interesting to see whether he seeks Liberal Party preselection. The Lord Mayor announced a scheme to house some 2,000 people in reconditioned premises. Me said that basically it was not a project for low-income earners. In other words, it would be for people from the upper end of the market. He would cause large sums of public funds to be devoted to providing housing in an area for people well above the income bracket of the needy citizens about whom I have been speaking.

I now deal with a matter concerning the constituents of my electorate—the vexed question of the proposed expansion of Mascot airport. There is not a more vexing question for the people of my electorate. They have been studying with great interest the interim reports that have come forward from the MANS committee. One of the earlier reports included a statement that if a wide-space eastern parallel runway were built at Kingsford Smith airport some 340 existing residences would need to be demolished. That number has been transformed into 420 dwellings housing 1,350 persons. As well 100 factories would be affected but the report neglected to mention them. Those factories offer employment opportunities for 1,100 persons. Also affected were 18 shops and 3 hotels employing another 140 people and the 28 hectares of parklands that had been set aside to compensate for the loss of foreshore as a result of the development of Botany Bay. So much for the gobbledygook in that report. No wonder there is alarm over the federal Government's intentions. It is
believed that it intends to expand Mascot airport on the parallel configuration. That would mean enormous hardship for at least 16,900 people. By the MANS committee's admission that number of people would be adversely affected by noise pollution for the very first time.

The residents of the suburbs of Rozelle, Lilyfield, Glebe, Camperdown, Stanmore, Newtown, Erskineville, Sydenham, Alexandria, Mascot and Botany reside directly under the proposed flight path and would be particularly affected by additional noise nuisance. So, 16,900 people would be subjected to the noise from aircraft coming in to land and from airliners flying directly over their cottages. Those people are not now adversely affected but they would be if the airport were expanded according to the proposed configuration.

I shall compare that position with what would occur if a second airport were built in a perimeter area of Sydney. I rely on the MANS committee for these figures. If, for instance, the second airport were built at Kemps Creek only 830 people would be affected by noise. If it were built at Bringelly 730 persons would be affected by noise. If the second airport were built at Nelson, 3,300 people would be affected. In other words, if those three new airports were constructed the total number of people affected by the noise of aircraft movements would still be about one-fourth of the number of people who would suffer should Mascot be extended in accordance with the wide space eastern parallel option.

I do not wish to alarm honourable members or the people who live in the area I have referred to but I point out that more than noise nuisance is involved in this issue. Safety goes hand in hand with the noise problem. Many residents of this area live amidst a concentration of heavy industrial, toxic and chemical industries. Petrol refineries and similar industries are located there. The prospect of a DC.10 crashing while entering or leaving Mascot airport, should it be extended, is grim indeed. It would make the sad occurrence of a few months ago near Chicago airport look absolutely minor in comparison. In the Chicago crash the plane was flying over a caravan park. In Sydney a plane would be coming in to land over one of the most densely populated areas of the city. It would take off over Kurnell and the Botany petro-chemical complex and the ICI complex. There is also the new oil refinery at Matraville to be considered. All those essential facilities would have aircraft flying above them.

Even if Mascot were to be extended as proposed it would be an inefficient airport by comparison with many of those overseas. Most of the international airports constructed in recent years are much larger than what would exist at Mascot if it were extended. Sydney's airport would then occupy 880 hectares compared with Montreal's 32,000 hectares and the Charles De Gaulle airport near Paris occupying 3,000 hectares. Dallas airport has 7,000 hectares and even Tullamarine airport near Melbourne, which was built only a few years ago, takes up 2,200 hectares. Houston airport in the United States of America spreads over 3,240 hectares. The Mascot complex would be minute by comparison with the airports I have mentioned.

On other occasions I have spoken about plans that have been already put into action by government and semigovernment authorities to provide for the projected expansion of Mascot airport. Honourable members know of the purchase of the old ACI property at the railway end of King Street, Mascot, at a price of $1.1 million. Qantas claims to have acquired it for use as a car park. Commonwealth Wool Stores are negotiating to purchase property for the relocation of their existing stores, which are situated on a 32-acre site at Hale Street, Botany.
It is essential that the federal Government make urgent provision for a second airport site for Sydney. It should not be the responsibility of the State Government to nominate the site. The federal Government has to plan the airport and it will be responsible for the resumption of land, construction of the airport and its administration. That is why the federal Government should be responsible for choosing the site for the airport. The New South Wales Government should not relieve the federal Government of that responsibility.

Mr Caterson: Put the blame on the federal Government.

Mr BRERETON: The New South Wales Government has the definite responsibility of protecting the 16,900 people who live in proximity to Mascot. The State Government should be saying not where the airport should be located but where it should not be located, especially that an enlarged airport must not be located at Mascot.

The interjection of the honourable member for The Hills reminds me of a statement made in 1973 by a former Premier of New South Wales, Sir Robert Askin, when it was urged that a second airport for Sydney be built at Galston. He said that the New South Wales Government would effectively block the siting of a second airport at Galston. That was reported on the front page of the Sydney Morning Herald on 8th September, 1973. The State Government has a responsibility to the people living near Mascot airport. That was how Sir Robert Askin perceived his responsibility in 1973. I remind honourable members that 16,900 people were not living in the environs of Galston directly under the proposed flight path. I thank the House for having this opportunity to say these few words during the debate on the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor’s Speech on the opening of Parliament. I commend the motion to the House.

[Mr Speaker left the chair at 5.55 p.m. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

Mr J. A. CLOUGH (Eastwood) [7.30]: I join in offering congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech by His Excellency the Governor, especially the seconder, the honourable member for Willoughby, on delivering his maiden speech. I trust that he appreciates and enjoys the honour and privilege of membership of this Parliament. Because of the limited opportunities that members have to speak about needs in their electorates, I wish to take this opportunity to draw attention to a few pressing requirements in my own electorate. As a result of the quadruplication of the northern railway line, new paving, lighting and shelter are required at Eastwood railway station. Also, a public address system is needed to inform patrons of traffic movements. The consolidation of buildings at Eastwood primary school is most desirable and worthy of the highest priority. Conditions in the science block and laboratories at Epping high school are so bad that members of the science staff are threatening to refuse to teach in the third and final term, which commences on 10th September, if no improvement has been effected by then. Things are so bad that between forty-nine and sixty-six periods cannot be conducted in a laboratory. Years 7, 11 and 12 are the worst affected.

Another matter I wish to raise concerns the City of Parramatta plan prescribed earlier this year. The zoning in the plan permits high rise residential development in Carlingford Road, Kent Street and Victoria Street, Epping. Residents of Epping are strongly opposed to this. I vigorously support their protest and shortly I shall lodge with the Minister for Planning and Environment thousands of letters I have received opposing the high rise and demanding re-zoning for single residential purposes only. Similar objections have been received by me from local residents opposing recommendations by the Local Government Boundaries Commission for an interchange of
parts of my electorate between the municipalities of Parramatta and Ryde and the shire of Hornsby. To date I have not heard from or met anyone who favours the recommendations. I also am strongly opposed to them. I ask the Government to examine these matters seriously so that the wishes of a vast majority of my constituents may prevail.

I refer now to the Governor's Speech. Without the slightest intention of discourtesy to His Excellency, for whom I have the highest personal regard, I feel it is quite wrong that he should be required by this shameless Government to enjoin himself in implied condemnation of the Commonwealth Government's financial dispositions to this State. I express this concern because I have learned at firsthand in conversation with some of my constituents that this Government's allegations of unfair financial treatment by the Commonwealth Government "must be true because the Governor said so". I am alarmed that people in my electorate believe that what the Governor says in his Speech represents his own personal opinions.

Throughout the Governor's Speech the Government shuffled in persistent platitudes and self-contradictions. Consistently it said on the one hand "We are being pauperized by the wicked Commonwealth Government", while on the other hand it claimed achievement, progress and prosperity for the future. It cannot have it both ways. In regard to housing, the Government announced in a tear-jerking summation action to maintain construction of Housing Commission homes by deferring for one year the planned abolition of death duties. As well as breaking an election promise, this deferment is unnecessary, for an examination shows that there has been no diminution of funds available to the Government. For example, its special deposits accounts are still healthy. Its cash balances at 31st March, 1979—the latest available to the Opposition—were $588,788,891 or $105.4 million more than they were at 30th June, 1978. Its term deposits at 31st March, 1979, were $668,600,000 or $189.1 million more than at 30th June, 1978.

Mr R. J. Brown: Good management.

Mr J. A. CLOUGH: On the one hand the Government says it has no money; on the other hand it claims its finances are healthy. Although it claims to have effected good management, the Government continually cries and whines and condemns the wicked federal Government: "If only it would give us more money". Thank goodness the New South Wales Government is not getting any more money than it is. It would be absolutely profligate if it did. The increase in term deposits of $189 million if invested at current market rates would produce virtually the amount involved in the death duties deferment. Once again, this Government is interested only in words, but the truth of the matter is that it is both incompetent and dishonest in its claims and accusations.

The Government's announcements in regard to transport are singularly succinct, as well they may be, having regard to the continually escalating transport deficit and the contributions made to it from Consolidated Revenue, despite the Premier's boast that Labor, on assumption to office, would contain rates and finally overcome the Public Transport Commission's financial malaise. Unless this windy leader of the Government soon transfers to new pastures he will find himself enmeshed in the bonds of his own perfidy and vanity. Nevertheless, it is to be hoped that proposals to extend the electrification of the Gosford–Newcastle line and the line to Waterfall will be proceeded with in the interests of the much neglected users of public transport.

Every cloud has a silver lining and there is one area of activity on which I am pleased to compliment the Government. That is its financial assistance to non-government welfare organizations, particularly as announced today by the Premier in question time. I rebut the Premier's allegations that the former Liberal–Country party coalition
Government was inert and unhelpful in this area. The ball game has changed dramatically since the advent of the Whitlam Government. Before that time the non-government welfare organizations did not have the same demands made upon them as they do now. As a former active member of the St Vincent de Paul Society I know that calls on the society for the usual type of assistance had abated considerably, to the extent that the society turned its attention to dealing with other worthy activities such as providing homes for the aged and the needy. The growth in unemployment triggered off by the profligate Whitlam Government resulted in a rapid increase in the demands on the society for day-to-day welfare assistance.

The Fraser Government has been establishing new financial arrangements as an extension of federalism under which, instead of giving direct grants to non-government welfare organizations such as the St Vincent de Paul Society, it increased considerably its untied financial assistance grants to the State Government, thus permitting it to allocate its own priorities to a greater degree. To its credit, the State Government has directed some of these funds from untied grants to non-government welfare organizations. It cannot be claimed or charged that the former Liberal—Country party coalition Government in this State was not interested or helpful. Though at the time that Government was in office the federal Government was making more indirect grants, the same demands were not made upon non-government welfare organizations as have occurred since the Whitlam Government caused the spiral in unemployment that the coalition federal Government has not been able to arrest.

I shall now deal with health care, an important field in which the record of the Wran Government calls for close scrutiny, particularly in view of its irresponsible behaviour and utterances over the past few months. In that time quite wrongly the Government has berated continually the Commonwealth Government for its shortcomings. Since entering into the field of payment for medical services the community has had the false impression that health care is now a Commonwealth matter. That is not the case. The State has the major role to play in the provision of health services and in the construction and operation of hospitals. The people of New South Wales are concerned at the escalating cost of health services since every dollar spent on those services must be raised by some form of taxation. Social security and welfare now account for the biggest proportion of the federal budget outlay, amounting to 27.8 per cent on the 1978–79 estimates. Between 1970–71 and 1976–77 the operating expenditure in public hospitals in New South Wales has increased by a massive 277 per cent, from $212 million to $798 million. In the same seven year period salaries and wages, which in New South Wales account for more than 75 per cent of all costs, have escalated by 292 per cent. Also in the same period the daily average of hospital patients increased by 8.8 per cent and staff increased by 26.6 per cent. Radiology and pathology staff increased by 50 per cent, medical staff by 50 per cent and administrative and clerical staff by 30 per cent.

In February this year the chairman of the Health Commission of New South Wales, Dr Roderick McEwin, was reported as saying that the health of New South Wales people was not improving, despite the huge increases in health service funds. He pointed out that mortality rates were increasing for the five major causes of death—coronary artery disease, cancer, cerebrovascular disease, accidents and the fifth category lumped together bronchitis, emphysema and asthma. Recently that was confirmed by the report of a survey conducted by the Bureau of Statistics which showed that 47.1 per cent of the population had a chronic or recurring illness, almost one in five of the persons interviewed in the survey had been to the doctor during the two weeks before the interview, almost one in ten Australians suffers from heart disease and within any 48-hour period more than half of the nation's adults took some form of medication—and it was not all Dr Toohey's.
A recent federal Government review of medical manpower supply, headed by Dr Sydney Sax, showed that by 1981 Australia would have one doctor for every 543 persons. That ratio has occurred ten years earlier than was anticipated in the expansion of medical planning report adopted by successive governments, Labor and Liberal–Country party, as the planning basis for the intake of students into medical schools. In February this year in an address to the Australian Physiotherapy Association in Canberra, Senator Peter Baume asserted that Australia, like Cuba and Costa Rica, averaged about 4 beds per 4 000 people. However, while the latter two countries spent $21 a head annually on health services, Australia was spending approximately $450 per head.

The provision and utilization of medical services in relation to hospital beds further reflected the indulgence of Australians in hospital care. Annual utilization in Australia approximates 1600 bed-days per thousand of population per annum. Some States provide levels of care with far lower rates of hospital use. Comparable rates in other countries are 1 207 in the United States of America, 900 in Scotland and 1100 in England and Wales. Australia has 6.5 acute beds per 1 000 of population, the United States of America 4.4, Scotland 5.8 and England and Wales 4.1. It seems to be stating the obvious to say that New South Wales has too many hospital beds and many of them are in the wrong areas.

The 1977 annual report of the Health Commission virtually admitted this. They are the latest available statistics that I have been able to gather. The report said that in the inner metropolitan area there are approximately 1000 general hospital beds too many and in the Western Suburbs about 1000 too few. Studies carried out by the Health Commission indicate that certain inner metropolitan hospitals should be closed. These include Sydney Hospital, Balmain District Hospital, Manickville Hospital and either Crown Street Hospital or King George V. Last Friday the Minister for Health made certain announcements in this connection. If I have time I shall refer to them later.

It is generally accepted that in order to be economic hospitals should have at least 50 per cent occupancy. Sydney Hospital has been operating at about 79 per cent of capacity, Balmain Hospital at 67 per cent, Marrickville at 61 per cent and Crown Street Hospital at 64 per cent. A widespread belief is that many patients are in hospital because it is the most convenient answer to a problem that may be as much social, domestic or financial as it is medical. A review of the uniform hospital charges established on 1st October, 1976, has resulted in an increase in daily hospital rates of from $40 to $50 for shared accommodation and from $60 to $75 for private accommodation. The average cost of hospital beds in Australia is now $150 a day. Six years ago the cost was $41 a day. In 1976, when the present bed charges of $40 and $60 were introduced, the average cost was about $120 a day.

In all of these financial constraints the question arises as to whether growth control in health services is a matter principally for the Commonwealth or the State. I believe it is a responsibility of the State. It seems to me that, contrary to accepted procedures at present, the States should be able to exercise arbitrary control over moneys raised by the federal Government. This has recently come to light with what I regard as the unjustified criticism made by the New South Wales Government about funds for community health. It seems to me to be completely within the scope of the State Government to pick up any shortfall simply by sorting out its spending priorities.

I shall now refer to the Minister's recent statement. Last Friday the Minister for Health made an announcement which, I am sure, all honourable members will have read in the Sydney Morning Herald. The Minister attacked the Commonwealth and talked about a reduction in funds available from the Commonwealth. He went on to
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say, "Despite this we are making splendid progress and health services in New South Wales are in order." Of course, we are all aware that they need attention in the directions to which I referred—that is, too many hospital beds or too few patients and a wrong distribution of finance and services. In regard to the Minister's press release—and also I join with that his address on Friday last to senior hospital representatives, unions and professional associations covering hospital employees and hospital affiliated organizations on hospital rationalization in the 1979–1980 Budget—he made known his reasons for cutbacks in hospitals.

The Opposition supports the principle of rationalization. It has to be done because there are too many beds in the wrong places. The Health Commission of New South Wales says certain hospitals could be closed to no disadvantage, and it has in mind some of those I have mentioned. What I disagree with is the method by which the Minister proposes to carry out these savings. His across the board approach was wrong and he will finally discover he has not achieved much. Had he tackled the situation by dealing with those two or three hospitals and leaving alone some of the others mentioned he would have done a better service to the Government, the taxpayers and all in need of hospital care.

The Government says it has no money, but it has commenced to spend no less than $56 million on the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital at Camperdown. The Government is going to spend $18 million to establish a hospital at Mount Druitt and $17 million to update the Nepean Hospital. An amount of $9.9 million has already been spent to establish a 120 bed hospital at Campbelltown. With the establishment of the large hospital at Westmead there is no call for the construction of a hospital at Mount Druitt. It is an unwarranted expense. There are already hospitals in the Blacktown and Westmead areas and with the upgrading of the Nepean Hospital they will adequately meet the needs of the region. It is the view of many authorities that the Western Suburbs Hospital could also be closed without dislocating the health and hospital care of the community. The former repatriation general hospital at Concord has now been turned into a combined repatriation and public hospital. It is my belief that that hospital and the kewisham Hospital could service that area. I believe that in addition to Marrickville and Balmain hospitals, and one or two others, the Western Suburbs Hospital also could be closed without seriously affecting the health care and hospital services offered. This would result in a huge saving to the Government and taxpayers. In the address by the Minister for Health to the senior hospital representatives, unions and professional associations covering hospital employees and others, he said:

My purpose in asking all of you to attend this meeting is to inform you of decisions taken by the New South Wales Government as a result of a $28 million reduction in the 1979–80 budget for New South Wales public hospitals, under the terms of the Commonwealth/State Hospitals Cost Sharing Agreement, as announced by the Federal Treasurer in his May Mini-Budget—though the severity of the cutbacks, as announced, have been subsequently modified somewhat under pressure.

If the Wran Government had the intestinal fortitude to be honest and say, "We have a problem and there has to be cutbacks" I think it would have the support of the Opposition and all thinking people. But, the Government merely whines and cries all the time and blames the federal Government. The New South Wales Government will spend any amount of money allocated by the federal Government. It will grab the lollies and eat them up like a monster. It has been shown that the federal Government cannot continue to carry this burden. In creating a situation that the State has to grasp the nettle, it is forcing the State to do what it should have done voluntarily instead of
whining and crying, as it has done, about nothing. When the Minister said there will be a $28 million reduction he glossed over it and he gilded the lily. We know that this involves a dollar for dollar arrangement and that $28 million really means $14 million. The other $14 million is what the State should put in on the matching basis. The New South Wales Government not only blames the federal Government for this problem but also it doubles the fault in the process. In another part of his address last week to these hospital people the Minister said:

In many respects, the current rationalization programme will have the effect of re-allocating beds within the metropolitan area, to reflect shifts in population, so as to achieve a more equitable distribution of hospital beds and services.

That is the whole crux of the situation. This Government has been neglecting its duty. It should have grasped the nettle long ago and proceeded with its business. The Minister for Health said also:

In the main, the programme will affect the large teaching hospitals. That is obvious. They are the more costly. They can be trimmed without disruption to the service to the people. The Minister goes on to refer to the excess number of specialist units and said there were six radiotherapy departments, five cardiothoracic departments, nine renal units and nine neurology-neurosurgery units. We know there is an excess of these costly technological services. They should be rationalized. We should support that approach. But, the federal Government should not be blamed for everything. This State Government is a sovereign Government with its own responsibilities. Because hospitals are the concern of the State in a major way and not primarily the concern of the Commonwealth, the Wran Government should know what is happening.

The Minister for Health said a number of things about country hospitals being seriously affected. Of course some will be affected. What the Government must do is ensure that aged persons in country hospitals are not disadvantaged. The Government should set about establishing suitable nursing homes where the cost is not so great. If it costs $150 a day to keep a patient in a country district hospital, the same treatment could be given for $30 or $40 a day in a nursing home. If the Government acts responsibly in this area it will receive the approbation and support of the Opposition. But, while it continues to assert that the federal Government is the bete noire, it will get no support from me or the Opposition—or indeed from anybody else.

Mr KNOTT (Wollondilly) [8,0]: I support the honourable member for Woronora, the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech. I congratulate the honourable member for Willoughby and the honourable member for Miranda on their maiden speeches. Mr Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence in allowing me the opportunity of expressing my views and concerns in this Parliament. In the brief ten months since the landslide victory of the New South Wales Labor Party, and since the so-called invincible Liberal seat of Wollondilly changed hands and I was given the honour of becoming a member of this Government, I have learnt that if a State member of Parliament is to represent properly a rural area like Wollondilly, he must do a 7-day-a-week job. He cannot afford the luxury of living in Sydney and representing a country seat as so many Country Party members, including the leader of that party, attempt to do.

During my election campaign Mr Michael Baume, the next ex-federal member for Macarthur, who will be replaced by the Labor candidate, my good friend Jim Groves, deplored the fact that Wollondilly would be represented by a 57-year-old invalid pensioner who could not effectively represent his constituents. I believe that I have given lie to his claims. In the past ten months the Premier has visited my
electorate twice. Next month he will visit Jamberoo. The Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports has also paid a visit to Wollondilly. The Minister for Decentralisation and the Minister for Mineral Resources and Development have visited my electorate on two occasions.

The Minister for Education has also been my guest. The Minister for Youth and Community Services accepted my invitation to visit my electorate. The Minister for Corrective Services has also been to the area. The Minister for Sport and Recreation has been my guest and will return to the district in October. The Minister for Health has also visited my electorate and the Minister for Agriculture has addressed a meeting of dairy farmers at Moss Vale. The Minister for Lands has made a visit to my electorate. The Minister for Planning and Environment has visited my area and has promised to return in the near future. I am indebted to him for playing a prominent part in my election.

In the short time I have been in office I have obtained a record number of State grants for the area. I will continue to battle for my constituents as long as I hold this office. While I am here, they will certainly be aware that they have a member of Parliament. Under the previous Liberal–Country party Government the Wollondilly electorate was sadly neglected. High schools at Picton, Kiama, Bomaderry, Bowral and many other parts of my electorate have brought to my attention the results of past neglect and they have asked for my assistance. I have made representations on their behalf to my colleague the Minister for Education. I am sure he will make every effort to rectify those wrongs, despite the fact that heavy federal cutbacks in education will make his job longer and more arduous.

Local government, roads, highways and railways in my electorate show the effects of the disastrous Liberal–Country party administration. With the Fraser Government's avowed policies of drastic financial cutbacks in the public sector, huge unemployment and with inflation estimated to increase to double figures—it is now over 10 per cent a year—the task is enormous. With the return of a federal Labor government next year and with this popular New South Wales Government firmly entrenched, firm steps will be taken to set right the mess caused by the Fraser Government and previous State and federal Liberal party maladministrations.

I have previously pledged to listen to, talk about and represent the claims of the 15,000 people who voted against me, whether I agree with their views or not. I am well aware of the small margin of my win and I realize that my duty is to represent all 33,000 electors in my electorate. This I will continue to do. My office is open to all. The so-called reversal of policy by Mr Fraser and the promise of twice-yearly indexation of wages are confidence tricks. They perpetuate his policy of making the worker pay, while the profits of the combines and multinationals continue to soar. Real wages have decreased drastically over the past three and a half years and the Fraser indexation proposals will ensure that they continue to do so. Workers will continue to resist the Prime Minister's attacks on their living conditions.

The Huntley colliery miners, who are now on strike, have seen their real wages and bonus conditions eroded by inflation. Their claims are fully justified and I wholly endorse them. I will use every endeavour to see they obtain wage justice. I have said previously in this House that I am indebted to them for my election to this place. I shall not betray their trust.

I have also been elected to the Parliamentary Select Committee upon Aborigines. That committee consists of members of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and the Country Party. It is inquiring into land rights of Aborigines in New South Wales, the protection of sacred sites and the socio-economic deprivation of Aborigines in
welfare, education, health and housing in this State. It is public knowledge that I have had great reservations about nine white people being appointed to recommend what is best for Aboriginal people in this State. I felt—and I still feel—that a committee of Aboriginal people would be better suited to advise the Premier and the Parliament what the Aboriginal people need in respect of land rights, sacred sites and in the fields of health, housing, education and welfare. However, at the request of the Premier and some Aborigines, I decided to take my place on the committee, although I do not feel that the Aboriginal people will be dealt the full justice they deserve.

The immediate need is to obtain at least in New South Wales, legal recognition that Aborigines have land rights and that they have a need to immediately obtain some form of protection for sacred sites, burial grounds and their culture. Tomorrow might be too late. To highlight the deprivation and degradation of the Aboriginal race, I considered that this committee, with all its failings, might be able to ensure some small degree of justice for the Aboriginal people. I publicly acclaim my shame of my own race for the injustices it has meted out and the genocide it has committed on a beautiful race of people, with culture and traditions far superior to our own. Over a period of fewer than 200 years these peaceful people were almost exterminated by disease, and raped. They were demoralized and almost annihilated in a greedy grab for land and wealth that was rightly theirs.

For 40,000 years or more the Aboriginal people lived and communed with the environment until the arrival of so-called white civilization, some 200 years ago. During that period, the natural environment changed little, the fauna and rain forests remained intact and pollution was unknown. During our brief occupation, the environment has changed drastically; rain forests have been almost completely destroyed and pollution has become a way of life.

In the greedy hunt for profits, mining companies, international monopolies and foreign interests are excavating and exporting the mineral wealth with an unholy haste, leaving to future generations devastation and holes in the ground in order that a comparatively few in the western world may live in luxury and propagate a wasteful and selfish society. With the exception of a few Aborigines on the Bass Strait islands, the entire Aboriginal race in Tasmania has been exterminated. Only a handful of Aborigines remain in Victoria, where the early squatters even poisoned the waterholes.

In New South Wales the number of persons of full Aboriginal descent could be counted on the fingers of both hands. Tribes have completely disappeared from all over the State, leaving no descendants. In the Newcastle area, in the Kangaroo Valley and in other areas, not one Aboriginal descendant of the original Australians can be traced. Those that were left along the coastline and in the interior were herded on to the poorest land that was not required by the invading whites, their natural food and game destroyed, their culture totally derided and their women raped. These people were infected with tuberculosis, venereal diseases and other white men's diseases. They were supplied with cheap liquor, and that led to alcoholism among them. They were left to die in tin shanties and other substandard dwellings. They were given meagre hand-outs to salve the public conscience. Whenever the little land left to them was required, once again they were herded off to a place of lesser value. A typical example of their treatment is the grabbing by the Shoalhaven shire council of their land at Orient Point near Nowra and the erection of public toilets on their burial grounds. This was done despite the protests of the local Aborigines. Another example is the proposed bulldozing of their miserable dwellings at Brown's Flat, which is a traditional tribal camping ground. The major portion of it was seized for a sporting complex consisting of a polo field, a soccer field and a caravan park.

Mr Knott]
Again, attempts were made to destroy—by the Japanese woodchipping industry and the country sawmillers—the sacred sites on Mumbulla mountain, near Bega. Racist statements have been made by the sawmillers and the Minister concerned that Ted Thomas, an elder of the Huin tribe, was only "black under the fingernails", and that no notice can be taken of "someone who just knocks two sticks together". Despite this, an independent report by the National Parks and Wildlife Service has shown beyond doubt that both Mumbulla and Goolga, or Dromedary mountain as we know it, are sacred to the Huin Aborigines as they contain sacred sites and ceremonial grounds. The vested interests seek to destroy them in their bid for profits and cardboard cartons. Ted Thomas, Jack Campbell and Percy Mumbulla, all tribal elders, have consistently worked for the rights of their people on the South Coast. They have been aided in their efforts by the Rev. Father Terry Fox, a Catholic priest. This dedicated man is respected not only by the Aborigines but also by the trade unions, the Labor Party and the working class of the whole South Coast. Despite this—and it is to their shame—Father Fox receives no aid, financial or otherwise, from the hierarchy of his church. Here is a true Christian deserted by Christians.

In Queensland, the State with the worst record in Australia for denial of basic rights to the Aboriginal people, we witnessed in the fifties and sixties the shameful treatment of tribal people after discoveries of bauxite at Weipa and Gove. Aboriginal land was seized and given to foreign-owned enterprises. The Aborigines were degraded and their culture was destroyed. They were pushed aside to make way for the white invasion. With the advent of white civilization came the inevitable rape, prostitution, drunkenness and despair, aided and abetted by that northern fascist and cohort of the oversea mining interests, Joh Bjelke Petersen. The pattern is being repeated in the Northern Territory. The Fraser Government has bullied, cajoled and threatened the Aboriginal people, forcing them to accept uranium mining on their lands. Promises have already been broken and the Ranger uranium shares are to be sold to foreign mining interests. Once again the Aborigines will be forced off their land. Promises will be broken and tribal Aborigines will be degraded. As usual, they will be the losers.

The setting up of a parliamentary select committee in New South Wales did not come about because of a benevolent government but because the Aborigines are fighting back. Leaders have emerged among them and their constant agitation for recognition of Aboriginal rights and the bringing into the open of the shameful and shabby treatment we have meted out to them, such as substandard housing and poor medical and welfare conditions, has forced the Government to act. The emancipation of any underprivileged sections in our society, including the Aborigines, can occur and only will come about by the united struggle of these people.

Before the coming of white man tribal Aborigines proved that a true socialist society can exist in harmony with the environment for the benefit of all its members. We have a lot to learn from their culture. It always amazes me that the feature of Aboriginal life which is most condemned by the whites is their willingness to share what they own with their relations and their fellow man. For this they are condemned as no hoppers and bludgers and held up to scorn and ridicule. This is supposed to be a great fault. It is hypocritical that people who claim to be basically Christian in belief should condemn the Aboriginal community for putting into practice the Christian ideals of "Help your fellow man," "Give up your goods to feed the poor," and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Our society is not Christian; it follows the capitalistic concepts of "Hang you, Jack; I'm all right" and "Charge what the market will bear".

I hope that the minimum that will emerge from this Parliamentary Select Committee upon Aborigines is the recognition by this Parliament, first, that Aborigines in this State do have land rights and that action will be taken to ensure this; second,
that the need to preserve their sacred sites and culture is immediate; and third, that this State Government will take action to rectify their socio-economic deprivations in the fields of health, housing, education and welfare, which are a national disgrace. This parliamentary committee is unique in that it has established an Aboriginal task force to contact and liaize with the Aboriginal people and in taking submissions and evidence from Aborigines. Nevertheless, having cognizance of the performance of past inquiries into Aboriginal welfare, coupled with the fact that it is run by whites, I cannot blame some of the Aboriginal leaders for being sceptical that it may well be another whitewash. Past performances and broken promises are the only guide they have to go on. They will, I am sure, co-operate and await the results. I hope sincerely that their fears will be unfounded.

As they are an underprivileged minority, their real hope lies in uniting their struggle with that of the trade unions and the working class as a whole. This has been illustrated by the assistance they are receiving on the South Coast from the South Coast Trades and Labor Council. While recognizing the justice of their claims, the South Coast Trades and Labor Council does not attempt to tell the Aborigines what they want. Rather, it gives them support when requested to do so. This enlightened Labor council takes the same attitude to the question of environmental protection. It gives its support and muscle to these issues only after being requested by meetings of resident action groups to do so. This is why on the South Coast so much success has been achieved in regard to the protection of headlands and conservation areas and the stopping of sandmining projects, which have been against community interests. Uranium mining has been a predominant issue on the South Coast and within my electorate. Apart from the sell-out of Aboriginal rights, it is inconceivable that any government could be irresponsible enough to support the mining of this substance until the problems of the disposal of atomic wastes are solved and that events like those at Harrisburg in the United States of America can be guaranteed never to recur.

Until this guarantee is given uranium should stay in the ground. To suggest that we should be committing future generations to annihilation, cancer, leukaemia, sterilization and all the other by-products of radiation, in order that a few investors and multinational organizations can reap a harvest is sheer lunacy. Fraser and Anthony are so intent on acting in the interests of the wealthy that they are willing to risk the proliferation of nuclear weapons, atomic substances being in the hands of political maniacs and the extermination of future generations. I make my stand known on this issue because I believe that every politician should stand up and be counted on it. The survival of the human race depends on this approach. Public resistance to uranium mining until such assurances are given will grow daily. Let us hope that even now it is not too late.

The economic ills of the western world are brought about by capitalism. The greed of the multinational organizations and the exploiters is evident in their efforts to extract greater profits at the expense of their workers who, in the main, are the market for their goods. As the workers’ ability to buy is reduced, in turn the capitalists shrink their own market. In the final analysis the arms race and expensive conflicts such as the Vietnam war as well as the space race have to be paid for by the worker. The collapse of the system has been inevitable. It has been hastened by the Arab nations taking control of the Middle East petroleum fields. The shieks swiftly learned from the Americans that under capitalism the price of a commodity is what the market will bear. The oil companies intend to be the winners, so they adjust their prices accordingly. Malcolm Fraser and Doug Anthony immediately adjusted our oil prices to world parity, giving millions of dollars a year in additional profits to the oil companies. As well, the federal Government has gained an annual bonanza of more than $2,000 million.
It is a stated policy of mad Mal that spending in the public sector has to be curtailed. Everyone is well aware of the need for sewerage, water schemes, bridgeworks, roadworks, of the shortage of housing, and of the requirements for hospitals, education and all other facets of our society. Unemployment is at record high levels. Although abundant essential work is waiting to be done and the work force is available to perform it, we spend millions of dollars on social service to keep people unemployed. This man is so sick that in his endeavour to destroy any semblance of public ownership he is willing to sell the Ranger interests to oversea monopolies. He is contemplating the sale of Trans-Australia Airlines, one of the most successful public ownership enterprises in the country. He is determined to cause as much havoc as he can before he is defeated in the next federal elections. As is always the case, the Labor Party will be left the task of repairing the damage. History is proving that 11th November, 1975, was a major disaster in Australian history. Malcolm Fraser is an embarrassment to the Liberal Party, but with an election coming up next year it cannot afford to get rid of him. Meanwhile the Australian people have to pay the price.

The Liberal Party has been the focus of scandal after scandal, with the Victorian land deals, the family trusts and the Queensland Government dealings. Heads of government such as the former federal Treasurer, Phillip Lynch, Ian Sinclair and Joh Bjelke-Petersen have been involved. The people of the federal electorate of Macarthur still remember Michael Baume and the Patrick Partners affair. While the worker's taxation is taken out of his pay in advance, large companies and the wealthy employ dubious taxation experts to create taxation dodges to evade their responsibilities, which cost the federal Government millions of dollars a year. This amount has to be met by the workers. The final answer surely must be known when the majority of Australian people realize that the natural wealth and products of the toil of the workers belong to the Australian people, not to multinational monopolies and a few wealthy families. Only then will the problems of the capitalist economy be solved.

I thank the Premier and all the Government Ministers for their help in the ten months I have been in this Parliament. They have all been most courteous and have made their time and their staff available to me whenever I have requested their assistance. I personally thank every member on this side of the House for their comradeship and willingness to oblige. I am proud to be one of the sixty-three members on the Government side of the House. I am grateful to you, Mr Speaker, for your advice and help and the opportunity to speak on this debate.

Mr BOYD (Byron) [8.22]: The Address-in-Reply debate is probably the most important debate in this Parliament. The House has heard a most provocative speech by the honourable member for Wollondilly, his second in this House, and one must question his sincerity. If he were sincere, in conformity with his concept that we ought to give this country back to the people who originally owned it, he would return to the country from which he sprung. If he subscribes to the principles enunciated by those who govern Russia he would do well to go there. I do not intend to debate something about which the honourable member feels deeply and I find abhorrent, other than to inform him that this country had communism for some 40000 years before it had white settlement. The practice of Aborigines of each putting into the pool according to his ability and each taking out according to his needs is pure communism. This country languished under that system. There was no development until it proceeded under that dreadful free enterprise system for which the honourable member obviously has so much hate. In fewer than 200 years the city of Sydney, with its get up and go principle that if one has the ability to go out and earn a quid then one should do so, and stop whingeing, has developed into a city equal to any in the world. The Aborigines are not a second-rate people, as the honourable member for Cessnock
They are the words of Mr Bill Hayden, the federal Treasurer when he delivered his speech as Treasurer in 1975. I am sure that Government supporters would have applauded those words at the time and would have said that there was no doubt about Bill Hayden, that this country had seen no finer a Treasurer. After three years of a federal Labor Government in office in Canberra what made Bill Hayden, whom
some people on the Government benches would consider to be the Treasurer of the
greatest Government Australia has seen, say things like that? One reason he made those
statements was that inflation was running at 17 per cent. He said those things as the
inflation running at that high level was caused by the Labor Government in Canberra.
In 1975 unemployment had reached 278,000. It was recognized that inflation was one
of the things which caused that high level of unemployment. The federal Treasurer of
that time was man enough to accept some responsibility for unemployment.

Mr Cavalier: What is the unemployment figure now?

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

Mr BOYD: If the honourable member for Fuller listens, he might learn some-
thing. He has been talking to too many cons. In 1973 tax collection went up by 34.3
per cent. In the next year it rose by 40.5 per cent. People have been squealing that taxa-
tion is too high, but increases occurred when Labor was in office in Canberra and
everybody had to pay the increased tax. In this exotic situation the debit balance
crept up to $3,585 million. A few years before that it was down to about $10 million.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Cronulla will have the
opportunity to seek the call later in the debate. I ask him not to interject but to wait
until he gets the call.

Mr BOYD: The debit balance increased by 45.9 per cent as former Treasurers
were trying to spend their way out of problems. That is the very thing that Government
supporters have been recommending. It just did not work. The spending went up
300 per cent in the ten years from 1965 to 1975. It went from $5,000 million in
1965–66 to $22,000 million in 1975–76. That is an incredible increase. Apparently
Government supporters do not learn from their mistakes. Do they not have enough
intelligence to learn from experience? They have made the mistakes before. Why do
honourable members have to sit here and listen to them say that the same mistakes
should be made again? I want to go back to my major concern of welfare housing——

Mr Petersen: Why not tell the federal Government that?

Mr BOYD: The honourable member for Illawarra is so busy running to
Queensland and setting arrested that he does not know what is going on in his own
State. Why does he not stay at home, learn a few things and do something for the
people of New South Wales? Welfare housing in New South Wales is a typical example
of what has happened as a result of running away from reality, a pedantic exercise in
something that is academic and does not work. I know that two and two makes four
because I employ people. When I look across at the Government benches I see many
honourable members who would not have employed a single person in their lives.
It is a new experience for them to have somebody working for them, to have to pay
them and make sure that enough managerial ability is available to keep paying them
from week to week. It is necessary to make sure that when employees are paid the
cheque does not bounce. So many people on the Government benches have not had that
experience.

Let me look at the end product of the former policies I have spoken about.
I want to be objective, and outline a few basic facts so that honourable mem-
bors can appreciate the problems generated by an academic approach to how
the nation should be run. About 100,000 people live permanently in caravan parks in
New South Wales. That is abhorrent to me. As at 30th June, 1978, 28,697 applicants
were waiting for Housing Commission accommodation. Dealing with families, one
multiplies the number of applicants by four and finds that 100,000 people are waiting for welfare housing assistance in New South Wales. It has been suggested that it might be reasonable to look at the Wran Government's policy on welfare housing as the Labor Government is the only government that cares about such matters. If they care, why do they not perform?

I shall go through the facts objectively. In 1975–76 the number of welfare houses built in New South Wales was 7,068. Total expenditure was $189 million. Of that sum $94 million came from Commonwealth Government loans. In 1976–77 3,428 homes were built in New South Wales, when total expenditure was $145 million. That was in the first year of Labor Party government. At that time the honourable member for Merrylands was Minister for Housing. He lasted for only 12 months in the portfolio. An amount of $86 million was supplied from Commonwealth Government loans. By 1977–78 there was a new Minister for Housing, the honourable member for Penrith. In that year 2,682 homes were built from a total expenditure of $134 million, of which $89 million was from Commonwealth Government loans. The predictions of the present Minister for Housing are that he hopes to build about 1,100 homes in 1978–79. I look forward to the report of the Housing Commission of New South Wales with a great deal of interest because all the facts will be shown in that document and one will be able to test the Minister's performance. It is progressively getting worse.

Let me refer to the constant Commonwealth Government loan factor. In 1975–76 an amount of $94 million was provided by the Commonwealth Government in loan finance. The State provided $95 million from its own resources. It outmatched the Commonwealth Government's contribution. In 1976–77 an amount of $86 million was produced by the Commonwealth Government. In the first year in office of the Wran Government that Government produced a miserable $59 million. That is how much the Wran Government cares for the welfare of the people of New South Wales. Its supporters weep and make a pretence of caring but they have not done their research properly. In 1976–77 an amount of $59 million was produced by the State for welfare housing. That is not the end of the story. In 1977–78 the Commonwealth produced $89 million which, I agree, was not enough. But, the State produced a miserable $45 million.

Government supporters jump on the soapbox but do not perform at all. One looks at the obvious scaling-down of the State funds and wonders why results are not being achieved. I shall tell honourable members why. It is because of the gross unit cost. I shall refer to the total amount of money spent divided by the number of houses built. In 1975–76 the gross unit cost was $26,742 to build a Housing Commission unit. By 1976–77 the amount needed had crept up to $42,425. In 1977–78 the cost had reached the alarming figure of $50,165.

Mr Gordon: Housing is getting better all the time.

Mr BOYD: The Minister for Conservation and Minister for Water Resources says that housing is getting better all the time. If the Government is building palaces for some people, that is marvellous but what about the 100,000 people living in caravan parks? Have they been written off? Are some people lucky and some not? If that is Government policy, at least it is established. Government supporters may say it is all right, but I say that it is not.

Mr Gordon: Some people like to live in caravan parks.

Mr BOYD: If that is the Government's policy, then at least we should know it.
Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister for Conservation and Minister for Water Resources to refrain from interjecting.

Mr BOYD: Welfare housing presents a major problem. When I return to my electorate I interview people who have been waiting for seven years for Housing Commission accommodation. I deal with such people constantly. They come to me with real problems. I weep tears of blood for them. They are decent, honest people, caught up in circumstances to which the Government has subscribed. The Government demonstrates its hypocrisy by paying lip service to certain ideals but not carrying them into effect.

In the current situation I admit I am most unhappy about the federal contribution to welfare housing, but let us examine it. In the federal Budget papers that came out yesterday recurrent grants were $1.8 million; an advance was made to the New South Wales Government of $52.5 million, and pensioner housing grants were provided at $12.1 million. From other grants, which were not spelled out expressly but are known to total $70 million for the whole of Australia, it is assumed that this State will receive $23 million. These figures give a total of $89.4 million. I should like to think that figure was $100 million. If the State Government were to contribute the same figure as was provided in 1975–76, we should have a total of $184.4 million to assist in providing welfare housing. On previous experience, that would permit the building of some 6,500 homes. That would not be a bad contribution, and certainly it would be a better result than we have now.

The State Government has announced that it will be able to build only 1,100 homes because the Commonwealth Government will not do what the State Government wants it to do. But if the State Government, as the friend of the worker, of the Aboriginal and of the bloke who has no hope at all, receives $89.4 million and builds on it, it should be able to find at least $95 million this year to match the federal grant. Thus $184.4 million would be available to get on with the provision of welfare housing.

Of course, there would have to be some allocation of funds to building societies. Many of the building societies are doing fairly well from other sources of finance, although not as well as they could do if they enjoyed federal financing. I recognize that. I am fair about it. If I have any quarrel with the federal Budget, it is about welfare housing.

How can the State Government find additional funds to assist welfare housing? Let me offer a couple of ideas for examination. General revenue funds in 1975–76 were $946 million; in 1978–79 $1,464 million; and this year, according to the federal Budget papers, $1,667 million. That is an increase of $203 million in the last year alone. That is not a bad increase. Surely the State Government could look at that increase and allocate some portion towards welfare housing. Surely the State Government could chisel off a little of that increase, face up to its responsibilities and make some contribution for welfare housing. I hope that Government has the charity, the sincerity and the consistency to do that. When I look at the total increase for this year, although it is not as much as I should like to see, as a resident of New South Wales I realize it is nevertheless an increase. Some of that additional money should be used for welfare housing.

Dealing with other advantages of this State, I remind the House first that we have a poker machine tax. This year the State Government will enjoy a bonanza of $100 million from that tax. From that tax, which no other State imposes, as the Treasurer knows, the Government is to contribute $1.5 million to welfare housing—and that is all. It could be generous and say, “We will devote the bulk of that money to
the welfare housing sector and to the housing of the aged in our community." Yet the State allocates only $1.5 million for those purposes. That is an example of handing down crumbs from the rich man's table and apparently is not the type of thing that anyone with communist inclinations feels strongly about.

There is to be a new betting game called lotto. The State Government will allow about $12 million from lotto to go to a couple of extremely big blokes in industry. Did the honourable member for Cessnock, for example, ask in the Caucus, "Is there any reason why we should not give $12 million to two big newspaper men so that they will do the right thing by us."? Is he sincere?

I am a member of the Country Party. I believe that two and two makes four. I am a realist. I do not ask for help. I have been willing all my life to follow my beliefs. If the honourable member for Cessnock wishes it, I shall review them at some time for his information—for the information of that great communist over there, the man who has subscribed to communist principles, and is willing to give away $12 million from lotto to two of the bigger businessmen in this country, all for the sake of good public relations. But something will be left over from what is received from lotto. The State Government should think in terms of allocating some of that for welfare housing.

There is also the Totalization Agency Board's betting system. In a newspaper recently I read that following the sudden resignation of the Commissioner of Police, and the appointment of a fair dinkum and sincere man as Acting Commissioner, revenue from the TAB is likely to increase by $20 million. That was the report in the press, and I am only repeating what I read. There is no doubt that the increase will be of that order, because the Government had the good sense to instal a decent and solid citizen as Acting Commissioner of Police. Suddenly starting-price betting operations dried up and $20 million is coming to the Government. The honourable member might say that the press does not know what it is talking about. If there is a correction of that figure, perhaps the Treasurer can inform me.

From probate the State Government will collect $30 million. As one who will be susceptible to payment of probate I have no quarrel about its collection if the Government uses it to look after welfare housing. Take it from my estate but do not let the Government be hypocritical about it. The people in need of homes should be shown decency, and given dignity and respect.

As to the Land Commission, in 1976–77, in a great exercise in which members of the Government had a yen to be involved, the Government spent $26.3 million. With what benefit? A total commitment of approximately $50 million has already been made to the Land Commission. That money could well be directed to welfare housing.

I suggest to the Government that it look seriously at its priorities, get them right and then do something about the matter. I do not have time to deal with the South Australian Land Commission but if the Government examines that commission's activities, it will see how much money it has lost. In 1973–74 the head office of the Premier's Department was run on a miserable $1.8 million. That was in the days of that supposedly dreadful man, Bob Askin, when the entire Budget was $1,543 million. In 1978–79, the current Premier needed $28.7 million to run the head office of his department, out of a total Budget of $3,500 million.

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

Motion (by Mr Singleton) negatived:

That the honourable member for Byron, Mr Boyd, be allowed to continue his speech for a further period of fifteen minutes.
Mr JONES (Waratah) [8,52]: I join with the honourable member for Woronora and the rest of my colleagues on this side of the House in supporting the motion for the acceptance of the Address in Reply to the Speech by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Arthur Roden Cutler, V.C., Governor of New South Wales. I take the opportunity to congratulate the honourable member for Willoughby and the honourable member for Miranda on their maiden speeches.

I should like to answer a few remarks that were made in this House last Thursday, 16th August, by the honourable member for South Coast, and to inform the House of the position with regard to the comments that were made by that member. I should like to inform the House also that I went to his room earlier tonight and told him that I would be making my comments now. I hope he has the decency to treat his fellow man in the same way that he would like to be treated himself.

I have represented the electorate of Waratah since 1965 and never have I seen or heard so much tripe or hogwash in the time that was taken by the member for South Coast in making his comments. I have a good wife who has been a tower of strength to me. I have a married son with three grandchildren and I have another young son and a daughter still going to school. My family is a very good one and they have been most helpful in my work as member for Waratah. I should like to put on record that I feel this way about them. People can be very cruel, and I make reference to this matter because of my children. I am sick and tired of gutless wonders such as the honourable member for South Coast, who go off, as he did last week, spraying accusations without any foundation. The Premier has made a statement that if the honourable member for South Coast brings out the evidence, he will open up an inquiry. Now let him put up or shut up. Quite frankly, I am happy for that inquiry to take place.

I should also like to mention the matter that was put on the notice paper by the honourable member for South Coast. He picks up the threads where he can. He is fed by Bob Bottom. I have here an article that was printed in Playboy with respect to Bob Bottom. On page 62 it states:

I had been convicted of carnal knowledge. Rather embarrassingly, I then had to go on air and explain what I had previously described to the Premier as a personal family matter whose public airing I regarded as a gross invasion of privacy. The truth is that the charge involved a relationship with my wife before we were married. We have been together since our early teens and were married when I was 17 and she was 16.

I do not like raising these things, but he is the one who is feeding the ears of the member for South Coast. I wonder whether it is Bob Bottom's brother, Wayne Bottom, who is in the public relations section of the Police Department, who is feeding information to Bob Bottom. If that is what is taking place, something should be done to stop the leaks, if there are leaks within the Police Department.

I have copped a lot of sideswipe in my time over the past three or four years and I have always turned my cheek and looked the other way rather than stand up and fight, because I am a member of a political party and so far as I am concerned the party is more important than the person. But what the member for South Coast is doing is rehashing tripe that has been circulating for years. As I said, I am fed up to the ears on this particular aspect because I love my children and I do not want to see them hurt. I have done nothing that I am ashamed of and so far as I am concerned people like the honourable member for South Coast should make inquiries and make sure their allegations are well founded before coming in here and opening their big traps.
I could say this. How would Mr John Hatton like me to say that when he was a councillor on the Shoalhaven shire council, he did some dirty deals? That would be saying much the same about him as he has been saying about me. I do not believe he has, but to say it is to allege it. I believe that he did not do any dirty deals, but the fact is that to drop that sort of comment is to do no more than he has done to a lot of people, me included.

Last year at about this time I was in Hull. I was talking to the manager of White Fishing Industries. While I was sitting there talking to him at his desk there was a telephone call, and—you would not know—the manager said, “Yes? Hullo? Oh, yes. It is for you.” It was only the media ringing about a matter that had been raised here. On that occasion whoever wanted to raise the matter waited until I was outside Australia, just as the honourable member for South Coast waited until I left the House before he made his comments. That is indicative of the type of person who raises such matters.

What is the role of a member of Parliament in the community? It is to represent the people who elect him. That is what I have been doing. I am positive that other members in this House do likewise. If people come to my office or knock on the door of my home, or ring me, it is my job as a member of Parliament to do what I can to assist those people in whatever problem they may be confronted with. I would be a bad member if I did not do so.

I am concerned about the report that was put out by the Crime Investigation Unit. In this day and age one does not know what life is all about until one reads the reports that are printed in the press. People can doctor tapes and photographs and do a lot of bugging by means of instruments that are now available. One does not know what to do about this pattern that is emerging in our society.

A question about Robert Stanislaus Finlay was asked originally by the honourable member for Wakehurst, Mr Viney. When he left the House the honourable member for Byron put the question on the Questions and Answers paper. On 29th November, 1978, the question was answered by the Attorney-General in these terms:

(1) The Crown Prosecutor to whom these cases were assigned for the purpose of finding a bill sought further investigation of the matters, and will, I am advised, be in a position to make a determination in the near future.

(2) The statement, if made, is correct.

The honourable member for South Coast has seen that the question on the Questions and Answers paper has been answered. I assume that Bob Bottom has had his ear and said, “We have to keep it going. The case is not before the court. Keep it up. There is a lot of dirt in there. See what is going on, what is causing it.”

I shall skip all that the member for South Coast said about other people in his speech and mention only what concerns me. He said:

My questions concerning the trials of Rodney Stanislaus Finlay, John Finlay and Peter James Francis of Belmont, Newcastle, were aimed at discovering whether there was an attempt to interfere with the course of justice and an attempt at cover-up, and whether the member for Waratah was involved. Perhaps we will never know.

Mr Jones}
I can put his mind at rest quite easily. All I can say is that I was not. I will take an oath on the Bible and on my children’s lives that I have never approached the Attorney-General or an officer of the Attorney-General’s Department or the Police Department to make any representations for these particular people. I repeat myself and say that I never made an approach.

I know Rodney Stanislaus Finlay and I know his son, Rodney John. I played first-grade football with Northern Suburbs in the Newcastle area and coached the under-16 junior football team for a number of years. In the years that Rodney Stanislaus Finlay played junior football with Northern Suburbs, he ran with the team. I can throw out my chest with pride and say that I coached Brian Carlson. I saw in that boy at an early age the promise of what he turned out to be. I spoke to my cousins, other relatives and friends and indicated to them that one day he would finish up playing for Australia, and he did. I played in the same team with another big name in rugby league who is now dead. He was, and still is, well thought of in the rugby league world — the late Herb Narvo. I coached his son, Frank Narvo. If need be, I could call to mind many other people whom I coached.

If I am to be accused of being a part of a deal of talking to these men, people had better look elsewhere because I will not turn my back on anyone. Rodney Stanislaus Finlay trained with the team I have previously mentioned. I had conversations with him later. His son was playing with Northern Newcastle just prior to going up for trial. Rodney John Finlay played with Norths Juniors. Rodney senior’s wife came from Wickham. His parents are well respected in the Newcastle area. His father is dead but his mother is still alive — both wonderful people. She lives now in my electorate. If they were to come and see me and ask me to do something, I would take it as far as I could. I would not do the things that the member for South Coast tries to infer.

The headlines of an article in the Newcastle Morning Herald on Saturday morning last stated, "Crime inquiry pledge". I have read to the House the statement that the member for South Coast made in this Chamber on Thursday last. I shall read now what the Newcastle Morning Herald said about it:

Perhaps we will never know whether the Labor Member for the Newcastle seat of Waratah, Mr Jones, was involved in a cover-up in a horse-doping case.

The Wagga Wagga Daily Advertiser of 17th August carried a front page headline in these terms:

Organised Crime — Bombshell Speech In Parliament

If this is what the member for South Coast wants, let him get in and name everybody.

The Illawarra Mercury headline of 17th August said:

Crime Flourished Under Askin, Hatton Claims.

Let me tell the House what the article said about me:

In the same speech Mr Hatton asked whether State Labor member, Mr Sam Jones (Waratah), was involved in any attempt to interfere in a horse-doping trial.

Have we got to put up with this garbage? The Newcastle Sun last night carried the headline, "Debate is OK By Me — Jones". A reporter telephoned me yesterday in my room at Parliament House and asked me for a comment. I intimated that I was quite happy for an inquiry to take place, as was suggested by the Premier. I also told him that I had coached Finlay, and told him what I have told this House tonight about Brian Carlson and Frank Narvo. I am positive that these two gentlemen who
are friends of mine will still be friends of mine. I am raising this issue to indicate that the member for South Coast, as far as I am concerned, is a gutless wonder, as I said before. The article in the Newcastle Sun went on:

Mr Jones said today he had a long association with Mr Rodney Stanislaus Finlay, of Jordan St, Charlestown, who was sentenced to three years’ jail last month after being convicted of conspiracy involving the doping of race horses.

I did not say that. The article continues:

Mr Jones said he used to coach Mr Finlay in the Northern Suburbs rugby league under-16 team more than 30 years ago and knew his mother and father.

I did say that but I elaborated with respect to the people to whom I have just referred. If the Bob Bottoms are allowed to get the ear of the member for South Coast to enable him to go on like he did in here, spraying like he did without any evidence whatever, this place is being denigrated by this type of person. I apologize for naming Bob Bottom in this context as I did. I do not think he is entitled to that, but do not forget that what he did was a crime. Is this Bob Bottom going to go round and charge people for spitting in the street: or if he sees someone throw litter around, will he report that as a crime?

They are trying to foment the hysteria of McCarthyism and a Watergate-type scene. This country does not want that type of activity. The preceding speaker in this debate mentioned starting price betting and said that Totalizator Agency Board turnover had increased by $20 million. Starting price betting is a crime for which persons are brought before the courts. Recent press reports have shown that this is occurring. It should not be forgotten that what Mr Bottom did was also a crime. The matters to which I have referred were minor. It is not necessary to use Mafia-type, Watergate or McCarthyism expressions about them. Honourable members of this House should not make deliberate and regular accusations as have been made by the member for South Coast. He made a lot of noise about the Department of Motor Transport, but no heavy clouds have emerged from the rumpus created by that inquiry. Some minor misdemeanours might have been involved but not to the extent alleged by the member for South Coast. If he produces the evidence that the Premier has requested, the Premier should ensure that the information is genuine, straightforward and has not been doctored or prepared to support and prop up the member for South Coast.

In his Speech the Governor referred to a $55 million pipeline to extend the natural gas supply from Sydney to Newcastle and into other areas. I support this proposal but am a little concerned that Caltex Oil (Aust) Pty Limited did not take the opportunity to construct its pipeline in conjunction with the natural gas pipeline in order to bring oil fuels to Newcastle, as it had proposed. I ask the Minister for Mineral Resources and Development to note a new proposal that may be the forerunner to the future transport in the State. The Government's pipeline authority should consider the possibility of pipelines being used for the transportation of coal. This form of transportation is being used in the United States of America. The introduction of such a scheme in New South Wales might obviate the need for a further coal loader at Newcastle. Admittedly it could be described as a deadly weapon that could strike an enormous blow to the railway system. However, in a modern world one must use the most economic means available. Experiments are being conducted with pipeline systems for the transportation of coal and one day that will become a reality. In the past the Minister has shown that he has the capacity to keep up to date with modern
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techniques. He might consider this possibility. The construction of a third coal loader at Newcastle could cost up to $200 million. That would be an enormous outlay for the Government. The alternative of constructing a pipeline merits consideration.

I congratulate the Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports on the deepening of the Newcastle harbour. That work is essential to bring modern transport ships to Newcastle. The Minister has established a committee which has prepared a further report on the future of Newcastle harbour and the possibility of a second entrance to Newcastle harbour. That indicates that the department is examining all aspects of the future needs of Newcastle. While this continues, Newcastle and the Hunter Valley with its coal resources will assist New South Wales to maintain its position as the number one State in the Commonwealth.

The federal Government has made drastic cuts in the funding of the Health Commission of New South Wales. A task force set up by the Minister for Health has been considering the problems involved and the cutbacks necessary in the number of beds in hospitals in the State. That frightens people. In my electorate the Minister faces enormous problems. I hope the Minister will not take drastic action affecting the Waratah electorate until the Government considers carefully the effects of its decisions on constituents. The staff at a number of hospitals, not only in my electorate but also in adjoining electorates, are worried about some aspects.

It is refreshing to note that the Government intends to do something about electrification of the railway line from Gosford to Newcastle. A programme has been arranged and the Minister has announced the estimated cost. In 1965 when I became a member of this House the estimated cost was $14 million. It has now escalated to almost $200 million, the figure announced by the Minister. That shows how inflation has caught up with the public transport system.

Next I shall refer briefly to the Totalizator Agency Board. I know that the responsible Minister is looking at the future of that board. I hope he will be able to allocate some of its revenue to the racecourse development fund. I am hopeful that additional moneys for that fund will be made available in future from unclaimed bets held by the Treasury. In Victoria money from that source goes to the racecourse development fund. I suggest that that is a possible source of funds for racecourse development in this State.

I wish to refer also to the necessity for a compulsory third party property damage insurance scheme for motor vehicles. On two occasions I have been involved in accidents when I was not at fault and in each case I have had difficulty in recovering the cost of repairs from the other person involved because he had no insurance cover. One of the other drivers concerned was unemployed and was driving on a learner permit. The Minister for Transport should consider the introduction of a compulsory third party property damage insurance scheme for motor vehicles. Many people have suffered loss when the other person involved in the accident, who was in the wrong, was not willing or able to pay for the damage done.

Mr BARRACLOUGH (Bligh) [9.21]: In speaking in this debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor I take this opportunity of congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion, particularly the honourable member for Willoughby who was making his maiden speech, and the honourable member for Miranda for his contribution. Both these honourable gentlemen follow energetic and popular former members in Messrs McGinty and N. D. Walker, both of whom set a high standard of electoral representation and whose presence in this Chamber is greatly missed. We all remember both those gentlemen for their great sense of humour.
Last week the confidence and authority of prison officers had been eroded to the stage where these loyal public servants, who are doing one of the toughest and most unrewarding jobs in this State, were forced to take drastic industrial action. During three years of office this Government has not demonstrated to those officers and the public that it is in earnest about offering protection and support to prison officers. The Government clearly had a policy that supported the prisoners of this State and set many of them against the officers. The Government, supported by every member of this Parliament, has a duty to support prison officers who daily face the fear of violence and death from prisoners.

Katingal has become the symbol of authority in the New South Wales prison system. Senior prison officers continually declared that Katingal could have taken some prisoners immediately if a couple of days' work had been done on it. The decision to open Katingal was stopped because of the stubborn, pigheaded refusal by the Premier to admit that he had made a terrible blunder. In the words of the Reverend Korrex, speaking at the funeral last Thursday of the prison officer Mr John Mewburn, the decision to close Katingal was "hasty and ill conceived". As long as eighteen months ago members of the Opposition said the decision had all the hallmarks of political expediency. It was wholly the making of this Government and its leader the Premier. To have closed Katingal virtually overnight after receiving the Nagle report, without any alternative provision being made for intractables held in the prison system was nothing less than an act of political vandalism. It has already cost the life of one prison officer. It has threatened the health and welfare of other prison officers. It has incited some prisoners to believe that the Government supported them rather than its own public servants. It has led to the destruction of property of the public. It has led directly to the impasse the community sees today.

Yesterday the Government realized the terrible psychological damage it was causing and, by announcing the temporary opening of Katingal, admitted it had made an error of judgment. Katingal should never have been closed before something better than the animal shelters the Government built at Goulburn were ready to take violent criminals. Present Government policy threatens the present and future security of the whole prison system. The Opposition condemns the failure of the Government to provide adequate facilities to contain the State's most dangerous criminals. The public must be told what went wrong with the Government's prison policies.

On 29th January, 1978, honourable members were told in this Chamber by the Premier: "The Labor Government will accommodate one hundred maximum security prisoners at Silverwater." It has not been done. Another prison promise was broken. There is no proper provision for maximum security prisoners; they must be moved from prison to prison and this enhances their chances of escape. On 25th January, 1978, in this Chamber the Premier said that there was a plan for prison building, renovating and refurnishing. The Minister for Corrective Services tells us that Goulburn is the answer. The prison officers tell us that the Minister's cages are inhuman and would set back the reform of the prison system by a century. Parklea is another generation away. Bathurst is miles behind the plans announced for its reconstruction and little has really happened there. What assurance can the Premier give to a concerned community that has seen such vicious men simply walk out of their confinement and in the case of two men have their escape remain unnoticed for one whole day? What is the Government doing to stop the flood of escapes and the horrifying reports of prison rapes and violence?

This State faces a crisis in its prison system. Members of the community are aghast at the alignment of the Government with those who peddle a soft line, prisoner-oriented administration. Trusted public servants—the prison officers and police—are affronted and believe the Government does not stand behind them. This Mr Barraclough]
position cannot go on. Except for the announcement by the Premier of the temporary opening of Katingal, nothing is being done to improve the New South Wales prison system. Let us look at the Government's record. On 4th April, 1978, in this House, the Premier, making a ministerial statement about the Royal commission into prisons, said:

The one area that no Minister can absolve himself from is that of policy determination.

Clearly the Government has not faced up to that declaration. Its prison policy is in disarray. One has only to look at today's Sun newspaper, to which I shall refer later. The position is one of the Government's own making. It derives from the Government's stubborn refusal to acknowledge the need for a prison as secure as Katingal for the handful of men who should be there. A prison officer has lost his life. Others live in fear. The police force is being compromised and the public lack protection when the police force is left to man our prisons. The Government forced trusted and loyal public servants to go on strike. The Premier has still not given a clear assurance that the prison officers of this State have the full support of the Government. This Parliament should consider some of the Premier's ministerial statements about the Nagle report. Let me quote from what he said on 4th April, 1978:

The findings of the Royal commission are a clear and complete vindication of the Labor Party's attitude to prisons.

That is a joke. The Premier said also at that time:

We are determined to start implementing solutions to the problems identified in the report and we are determined to finish that implementation.

He went on to say:

The important thing for the Government is in its determination to look to the future . . . to ensure that adequate status is granted to prison officers and to boost morale within the prison services. The Government is fixed in its determination to do as much as it can and do it quickly. Katingal shall cease within one month.

There was nothing in the recommendations of Mr Justice Nagle about Katingal ceasing within one month. Therefore, the Premier's decision was made with obscene haste. He went on, on that occasion, to say:

There is a need for prisons for those who cannot abide by the accepted modes of society.

Let us look at recommendations 242 to 251 in the Nagle report under the heading “The Department and Future Planning”. The report recommended a detailed 10-year plan—there is none; a new maximum security gaol to accommodate 200 to 300 prisoners—there is none; the redevelopment of Bathurst gaol—that is behind schedule; work to be carried out on all old gaols in New South Wales—that has not been done. Finally, the Premier said that the one area that no Minister can absolve himself from is that of policy determination. I refer to that again and will continue to do so. There were further words on this subject from the Premier on 25th January, 1978, when he said:

For the first time stability . . . has been restored to the prison system in New South Wales.

Tell that to the prison officers in the gaols throughout New South Wales. The Premier went on to say:

An air of reality and discipline has been restored.
On the very day that was said the Daily Mirror described the prison administration as a laughing stock. It described the Minister for Corrective Services as bumble-footed, accident-prone and naive. In September 1978 the Daily Mirror called on the Premier to dismiss his Minister for Corrective Services. The Opposition called for the re-opening of Katingal until a new high security prison was built. On 25th January, 1978, in this Parliament the Premier regaled us with statistics about the Department of Corrective Services yet the 1978 report has not even been released so that the Opposition has no way of knowing what has happened statistically in that department since 1st July, 1978. Is not that a disgrace? In January 1978 the Premier said:

The Labor government will accommodate 100 maximum security prisoners at Silverwater.

The Government has considered a plan for prison rebuilding, renovation and refurbishing.

This statement is constantly made. In an attack upon the Opposition the Premier said:

It is a slur... to suggest that the interests of prison officers were not properly protected.

Prison officers clearly showed last Friday, by the industrial action they took, that the Government has not properly protected their interests. I was present last Friday at the funeral of the late Mr Mewburn and so was the Minister for Corrective Services. The Reverend Arthur Horrex gave great comfort to Mrs Mewburn and her five daughters—five daughters who are left without a father. The reverend gentleman said that Mr Mewburn's death was a strong indictment of major recent decisions which must now appear hasty and ill-conceived. He said further that the Government's decision-making process had all the hallmarks of political expediency and the desire to appease the radical humanist pressure groups. The Government has forced back into an already overpopulated, understaffed, harassed, frustrated prison system, criminal offenders of the most violent and intractable type. Mr Mewburn's death appears as an indictment of these pressure groups and their politics, for they have maintained an extremely emotive and, at times, seemingly irresponsible campaign. The rights of prisoners appear to have precedence over the rights of prison officers. Officers have to work in constant fear of insecurity with the ever-present threat of physical assault, violence and even death shadowing them.

What is the public reaction? The public reaction is confused and anxious and has no confidence that there is a prison policy under this Government. The public has no confidence that the industrial position will not flare again. The public has no confidence that the Government has any solutions. It is entitled to this view following the endless promises from the Government that have not been kept. In February of this year two of the State's most dangerous prisoners, Arthur Joseph Loveday and Roy Anthony Pollitt, each serving a 16-year sentence, attempted to escape from Parramatta gaol after being released from their cells. Loveday punched an unarmed officer, shots were fired, and we were told that a full report was made. In March, John Laurence Stout escaped from Long Bay gaol. He was serving a term of life imprisonment for the murder of a night security officer at the Warringah Mall at Brookvale. He did not really escape as he was on day leave when he absconded.

I am pleased that the Minister for Health is sitting at the table. He would be aware that in April, Cribb and Munday, described in this Parliament by the Premier as men with a proven track record of animal behaviour, walked out of Morisset hospital, where they should never have been, and terrorized the people of Sydney and Bondi. There was no debate in this House—the Premier would not allow it. Munday was not due for release until the year 2001. Cribb had a record of fifty felonies. Earlier this month a prisoner armed with a hammer is alleged to have killed a prison
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officer after being transferred from Parramatta, Cooma and Maitland gaols. Prison officer Mewburn is dead yet the Government still has no known policy on maximum security prisons. The Minister for Corrective Services is reported in the Sun tonight as having said this clearly. Let me remind the Premier and his supporters of some of the press reports about our prison system. In April 1978 a Katingal prisoner wrote to the Daily Telegraph setting out his case for the retention of Katingal. The prisoner wrote:

Most of the people shooting their mouths off haven't a clue about the real conditions in Katingal and haven't enough integrity to look for verification.

He referred to a small minority group pressuring the entire community into doing things their way to suit their purposes. In April 1978 a Catholic priest, a chaplain at Long Bay gaol for nine years, opposed the closing of Katingal. He said:

You have to have some place for these outlandish people.

That was said by Father Bill Meacham. In June 1978 the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Peter Coleman, called for the re-opening of Katingal until a satisfactory alternative had been found. He said:

We say that Katingal should be re-opened until such time as there are other facilities.

This followed a Maitland gaol disturbance where six prisoners smashed benches, showers and lavatories. Four prisoners were armed with iron bars, pieces of timber and lumps of concrete. In April 1979 the Sunday Telegraph said:

The public of New South Wales won't stand for another reign of terror like this week's.

The Daily Mirror spoke of more criminals on the loose and said:

This surely must be the last straw. The public would be pardoned for thinking there are now more felons on the run in Sydney than there are safely under lock and key. It is time our penal authorities got back to basics. Our gaol system fails to do its job. The whole fabric of society is threatened.

Let us look at last week's press report in the Sydney Morning Herald where it was said:

The rapid closure of Katingal . . . was a mistake.

The report said further that the Government acted too quickly and without sufficient reflection. On 16th August last the Daily Telegraph said:

The Wran Government still has not come to terms with the crisis in our prisons. Sub judice . . . cannot stop us pointing out once again the dangerous inadequacies of the New South Wales prison system.

Of the Katingal block it said:

For the time it was in use we actually had in this State a prison which could contain those criminals considered so dangerous they had to be put somewhere. The Wran Government has a blind spot where prisons are concerned. We believe Katingal should be re-opened. We believe a prison as tough and secure as Katingal is necessary.

Mr Justice Nagle did not specify that Katingal should close immediately. He did not specify that it should close within one month. The recommendations referred to are concerned with a detailed plan for the next ten years, a new maximum security gaol, the redevelopment of Bathurst gaol and, of course, the improvement of old gaols. Therefore the Premier must answer to this Parliament, to the public and to all in the prison system for the delay and dereliction of duty in his handling of maximum security prisons. The Opposition now passes judgment on the Government of New South Wales.
which closed Katingal on the recommendation of the Nagle Royal commission, which the Premier himself described in the House as a complete vindication of the Labor Party's attitude to prisons.

It is a matter of grave public concern that for eighteen months the Labor Party's attitude to prisons has resulted in wasted taxpayers' money—that is, money spent on the building of Katingal. The Government's policy has jeopardized the security of prison officers by exposing them to injury—or even death—from dangerous prisoners. Only last week this situation culminated in the tragic death of a prison officer. The Premier has vilified any suggestion that a maximum security unit was needed for intractable prisoners. He has adopted that attitude to gain political mileage by caving in to a minority of softliners who are more concerned with the welfare of prisoners than that of the public and prison officers. The Premier is responsible for the massive strikes by prison officers. He is responsible also for exposing the public to risk by deploying police officers—against their will—in a task that they should not be asked to perform. One afternoon newspaper has referred to the Premier's prison policy as being a "straw in the wind". If the public gave full expression to its sentiments on this issue, there would be no doubt that it is fed up with piecemeal promises. The community is fed up with softline prisoner-oriented administration.

The existence of the problems in our prisons constitutes yet another massive failure by the Wran Government to honour an election promise.

In this House in January 1978 the Premier argued that stability has been restored to the prison system in New South Wales. He acknowledged that there was a hard core of intractable prisoners who would use every opportunity and weakness to test the prison system. He said, "You only need a grain of commonsense to know this". Yet that grain of commonsense has escaped this Government in everything it has done in relation to unpredictable and dangerous criminals.

The Premier promised this House that "the Labor Government will accommodate 100 maximum security prisoners at Silverwater". It has not done this. There is no provision for maximum security prisoners and that is why the prison system is in a state of unprecedented crisis. On that occasion the Premier said that the Government had a plan for prison building, renovation and refurbishing. Yet nothing has happened at Silverwater; Parklea gaol is another generation away; the plan for Bathurst is behind schedule and Goulburn gaol is operating amidst allegations of improper security.

The Premier remains the bedfellow of small pressure groups, whose emotive and irresponsible campaign in the cause of prisoner rights has led to the exposure of prison officers and the public to constant fear and insecurity in overpopulated and understaffed prisons. The Government's policies have exposed prison officers to physical assault and the prospect of violent death. The Premier accused the previous administration of "caring little about prison officers, whom they neither consulted nor understood".

This Parliament should hear from the Premier as to which prison officers he has consulted and his understanding of their plight. The Premier said of the former Liberal-Country party Government, "most of its schemes ended up being fiascos". The current predicament in prisons in New South Wales has passed beyond the stage of fiascos.

The Premier's statement to the House on 4th April is the most appropriate epitaph to this Government's attitude towards the control of dangerous criminals. On that occasion he said, "The one area that no Minister can absolve himself from is that of policy determination." The responsibility for policy determination in corrective services must be sheeted home to the de-facto Minister—the Premier—who is frightened
and ashamed to allow the Minister for Corrective Services to speak on behalf of the Government. The Premier has admitted that the responsible Minister is "all the Government has got". This Government's policy was to close Katingal without making any provision for the containment of dangerous criminals.

For eighteen months the Government's policy has been to ignore the media, the public and the Opposition's demands to open Katingal. The Government must now answer for the emotional, dangerous and tragic position in which the prison system of New South Wales is now placed. The present situation is the Government's own making. The Government has stubbornly refused to acknowledge the need for a prison as secure as Katingal to hold the handful of men who should be there. One prison officer has lost his life and others live in fear. The police force has been compromised. The public lack protection not only from prisoners but also from the situation where the police force was left to fill an administrative vacuum created by a totally irresponsible government which shows that on this matter it has no public conscience. Today's edition of the Sun newspaper contains an article dealing with the reopening of Katingal in these terms:

Mr Haigh said reopening Katingal—even for a short time with a limited number of prisoners—made him, the Government and the Commission unhappy.

It will hopefully be in use for only three weeks.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must indicate the newspaper from which he is reading and its date of publication.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: I was reading from today's issue of the Sun newspaper. It is obvious that the Government will continue to ignore the media, the Opposition and the public call to provide New South Wales with the best prison system in Australia. I shall now refer to a few matters affecting my electorate. I wish to speak first on behalf of the residents of Kings Cross, Elizabeth Bay, Potts Point and Darlinghurst, where the Attorney-General's—and the Premier's—new street offence laws have caused anxiety and distress to many residents, particularly elderly and retired people and pensioners. Vandalism, loutish behaviour, bad language and noise nuisance have increased greatly in those areas. Many residents are frightened to go out at night.

Honourable members can well imagine the reaction of those people to the press advertisement by the Police Association of New South Wales last Monday to the effect that the police can no longer guarantee the public safety from harassment, and that it is almost impossible for police to prove common street offences. The final frightening part of the advertisement was, "Police could eventually lose control of the streets." Are people supposed to put up with the situation that existed in Sydney in the 1930's when razor slasher gangs roamed the streets, or some blackboard jungle type of situation? As the Attorney-General and the Premier claim responsibility for the new summary offences law, they should accept responsibility for the present situation. Let them change the law to give the police back authority on the streets of Sydney and my electorate in particular. If that does not happen, we shall witness conditions similar to those existing in New York and San Francisco.

I shall now deal with the Eastern Suburbs railway. After twenty-four years—that is, between 1921 and 1965—of refusal by Labor Government to complete the Eastern Suburbs railway, the project was finally opened on 23rd June this year. In 1967 the Askin Government decided to recommence construction of the railway. If Labor had remained in office in New South Wales, the Eastern Suburbs railway would have never been commenced. The Minister for Transport conducted an inquiry into the possible abandonment of the Eastern Suburbs railway.
Although fifty-eight persons gave evidence before the board of review that
decided that issue, only two members of Parliament appeared — and they were both
members of the Liberal Party — the Hon. W. C. Wentworth, M.P., and myself. Not
one of the five Labor members representing Eastern Suburbs electorates — and they
include the Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Rousing and Minister for
Co-operative Societies and the Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Tech-
nology and Minister for Energy, took the trouble to appear before the board to
support the completion of the Eastern Suburbs railway. I have received many good
reports about the service from Bondi Junction to the city. I congratulate the Minister
for Transport on his determination to complete the Eastern Suburbs railway despite
the opposition he must have encountered from his Cabinet and the Caucus.

I propose now to reiterate some complaints I have received about noise nuisance,
disturbances and other matters. I have put details of these matters before the Premier.
I am hopeful that those problems will be dealt with quickly. Finally, I wish to refer
to some matters to which the honourable member for Waratah referred. It is sad that
the honourable member for Waratah devoted most of his speech to the scurrilous
attack by the honourable member for South Coast upon him and some other members
of this Chamber as well as some former members of the previous Government, including
Sir Robert Askin and the former member for Miranda, the highly respected Mr Tim
Walker. The honourable member for South Coast made his attacks in this debate
last Thursday. Since then there have been two days on which he could have come
into this House and provided some concrete evidence for his vicious, wicked allegations.
I assure the honourable member for Waratah, the honourable member for Balmain
and other people that in my view it is an appalling situation that the honourable
member for South Coast who spends most of his time with Government members,
made those attacks in what Sir Robert Askin referred to as a coward's castle. If the
honourable member for South Coast wants to make further allegations about members
of this House he should make them outside the Parliament.

Mr EGAN (Cronulla) [9.50]: I join with other honourable members in
congratulating the honourable member for Woronora on his excellent contribution
in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Also I congratulate
the honourable member for Willoughby and the honourable member for Miranda on
their fine contributions while making their maiden speeches. I was particularly pleased
to listen to the speech of the member for Miranda. For many years I have been
privileged to be a friend and political colleague of his. I assure the House that he
is held in enormously high regard in the Sutherland shire not only by the Australian
Labor Party, which on three occasions has selected him as its candidate for the
seat of Miranda, but also by the community generally. There is no doubt that in
the short time he has been a member of this Parliament he has shown himself to be
an able, diligent and determined advocate on behalf of his constituents.

We have just heard from the honourable member for Bligh a re-run of all
the hoary old arguments on prisons used by the Opposition prior to the last elections.
It is amazing that any member of the Opposition should have the hide to speak about
prisons after the devastating indictment in the Nagle report of the Liberal-Country
party's administration of the prisons of New South Wales. That report clearly showed
the prevalence of bashings and brutality during the term of the previous Government.

It was interesting to note that the honourable member for Bligh said absolutely
nothing about the burning of Bathurst gaol, the riots at Bathurst and Goulburn gaols
and the fact that for a number of years Liberal Party Ministers in this Parliament
consistently misled the House on the question of prison administration. It was only
after consistent pressure from members of the Opposition that at the very last minute the former Government was forced to establish a Royal commission into the prison system. That Government established it only to save its neck and to take the sting out of prisons as an election issue.

Having criticized the honourable member for Bligh on that matter, I wish to support some of the comments he made tonight. I join with him in deploring the contribution made to this debate by the honourable member for South Coast. The privilege that attaches to comments by members of this Parliament should certainly not be abused; it should be exercised with great care by every member of this Parliament. It is not good enough for any member of this Parliament to make all sorts of allegations in the House about members, past and present, without making any attempt to adduce evidence. The honourable member for South Coast should realize that every member of this Parliament, and indeed every person in public office, is an easy and convenient target for malevolent, malicious mudslinging. All one has to do is commence a rumour and within a few months that rumour spreads throughout the community. I should have thought it to be the duty of members of this Parliament to ensure that no credence is given to allegations without some substantiating evidence.

The honourable member for Byron criticized the Whitlam Government for the deficits in its three budgets. It is time that Opposition members, particularly members of the Country Party, cut themselves loose from pre-Keynesian economic ignorance. Deficit budgeting can be of great value in times when an economy is operating under capacity and there is underutilization of manpower and materials. Deficit budgets enable a government to give some stimulus to an otherwise slack economy. Members of the Country Party consistently return to the theme that the former Whitlam Government was in some way spendthrift and profligate. They always point to the deficits of the Whitlam Government budgets. I remind the House that during the period of the Whitlam Government the highest deficit was $3,519 million, in 1975–76. By comparison, in 1977–78 the Fraser Government had a budget deficit of $3,929 million. If Country Party members are to continue with the sort of criticism the House heard tonight from the honourable member for Byron they should direct some criticism of it to their own colleagues.

Mr West: Tell the House about the deficit spending of the Premier.

Mr EGAN: I shall tell the House of the deficit spending of both the Whitlam and the Fraser governments. I remind the honourable member for Orange that he is lucky to hold his seat in this Parliament. He was re-elected with a majority of about 800 votes. If he persists with the inane contributions for which he is renowned in this Parliament, after the next elections Mr Borrie Gartrell will be the new member for Orange. In its three years in office, the Whitlam Government’s deficits amounted to $6,388 million. The first three budgets of the Fraser Government had a combined deficit of $10,345 million. Although members of the Country Party have difficulty in absorbing mathematical concepts, simple addition is an easy task and I am sure that even they could add up the figures. If they were to do so they would see that the total deficit during the Fraser era was $4,000 million more than the total deficit during the Whitlam era. If Opposition members wish to criticize the former Whitlam Government they should be directing criticism also towards the Fraser Government.

Yesterday the honourable member for Young accused the Australian Labor Party of being a high-tax party. That criticism looks silly, considering the federal Budget last night that provided an additional 16.4 per cent in total taxation revenue. When one breaks up the figures one sees that this year the Fraser Government, which
makes some play on its income tax policies, will receive an additional $2,324 million from personal income tax, representing an increase of 18.2 per cent. The honourable member for Young should recall the various imposts by the former Liberal–Country party Government in New South Wales. Obviously he has forgotten, or wants to forget, that his Government increased stamp duty on cheques, cars and hire purchase agreements and that on two occasions it increased poker machine taxation.

Obviously the honourable member for Young wants to forget that his Government increased liquor licence fees by 5 per cent, that it increased pay-roll tax to 5 per cent and doubled racing tax. He has obviously forgotten that his Government imposed a petrol tax which at first amounted to 10 per cent of the retail price but was later increased to 15 per cent. He conveniently forgets that his Government imposed a tax on cigarettes at 6c a packet. He overlooks the regular and massive increases in public transport fares. I am pleased to say that despite the fact that there has recently been an increase in public transport fares in New South Wales of the order of 17 per cent, fares on our trains and buses are still lower than they were when the Wran Government came to office more than three years ago.

This Government has an excellent record in the area of taxation. One of its first measures was to defer stamp duties payments for first-home buyers. The Government has substantially increased pay-roll tax exemptions and has reduced poker machine taxes to clubs which run welfare, youth and sporting activities and other activities of benefit to the community. The subject of death duties is one which has not received a great deal of attention from members of the Opposition during the debate. They are somewhat embarrassed by the fact that in the short three years that the Wran Government has been in office it has abolished death duties between spouses and increased the exemption on rural properties to $300,000. It has also introduced a one-third reduction in duties. I have not heard any explanation from members of the Opposition why in their eleven years in government they were not able to go at least some of the way to making some of these concessions.

Though the federal Government has the record of being the greatest taxing government in our history it also has a record of being one of the greatest axing governments in our history. Despite massive increases in federal Government total taxation revenue this year considerable cuts have been made in areas of spending such as housing, urban and regional development and community health. One of the first experiences confronting a new member of the Parliament is the queue of desperate people looking for decent housing. Honourable members should recognize that poverty cannot be eliminated and the full benefits derived from improved health and education while so many people in the community are wretchedly ill housed or impoverished by the cost of housing.

More than 270,000 families live in caravan parks. Throughout Australia there are 100,000 families on Housing Commission waiting lists, with 40,000 of them in New South Wales. I am proud to be a member of a political party which, in 1946, instigated the Commonwealth–State housing agreement, the first major commitment by governments in Australia to provide decent housing for all citizens. Unfortunately, during the fifties and the sixties the commitment of the federal Government to public housing diminished to the extent that by 1972–73, in the last budget of the McMahon Government, only $169 million was made available for welfare housing. In 1973–74 the Whitlam Government considerably increased the allocation for welfare housing and embarked on a new Commonwealth–State housing agreement. By 1975–76 the allocation by the Whitlam Labor Government for welfare housing had reached more than $360 million.

Mr Egan]
It is a matter of great regret that despite his election promises, Prime Minister Fraser has chosen housing as one of the main areas for giving vent to his meanness. This year the Commonwealth's contribution to welfare housing has been slashed to only $260 million. Keep in mind that that compares with a figure of more than $360 million four years ago. This year New South Wales will receive only $75.5 million for its public housing programme.

It should be realized that from the time that the Whitlam Government left office the consumer price index has increased by 49.6 per cent. If the amount that the Whitlam Government had made available in 1975–76 were to be sustained—in other words, if the federal Government were to make available to New South Wales this year the same amount in real terms as was made available to this State in 1975–76, we should be talking about $184.6 million. Instead we see that this year New South Wales has to make do with $75.5 million for its public housing programme.

For the past few years the building industry in this country has been in dire straits. Members of the present federal Government, and particularly Prime Minister Fraser, like to parade themselves as friends of business and of industry. Quite frankly, I should not like to be a businessman involved in the housing industry. In four years we saw the number of people working on dwelling construction jobs decline from 88 900 at the end of June 1974 to only 55 500 at the end of June 1978.

Last night in Canberra the Budget was presented. Even on official Treasury forecasts it provides for subdued economic growth, higher inflation and a possible rise in unemployment. In fact, the Treasury acknowledges that this year it allows for a growth rate of only 3 per cent and that that growth rate will not help reduce unemployment. In the rather bland way that Treasury has of stating its case, it says that some increase in unemployment is not out of the question and that a large fall in the immediate future would seem to be unlikely. We also heard the federal Treasurer, the Hon. J. W. Howard, say this:

The priority given by the Government to the attack upon inflation has been vindicated by the steady improvement in Australia's economic health over the past three and a half years.

Let us examine that improvement in Australia's economic health.

In May 1976 247 000 people were unemployed, yet in May 1979 396 600 people were out of work, an increase of 150 000 people in three years. Is that the steady improvement in Australia's economic health to which the federal Treasurer refers? Heaven only knows how big a pat on the back federal Government supporters would give themselves if unemployment had increased by 300 000, if they consider an increase in unemployment of 150 000 is an economic improvement. If the increase were greater than that, perhaps supporters of the federal Government would be nominating the Hon. J. W. Howard for the Nobel prize in economics.

As I mentioned, in the past three years 33 000 people have gone out of the housing industry. That means that the capacity of the industry is weakening. As the industry becomes depressed people tend to leave it and, when they leave it, they tend never to return.

It is worth noting that the report of the Indicative Planning Council for the Housing Industry estimated the industry's capacity in 1976–77 as 150 000 dwellings, yet its estimation of the industry's capacity in 1979–80 is only 135 000 dwellings. That bears out the point that I just made, that as the demand for housing has declined in recent years and as work in the industry has declined, the number of people employed
in the industry has shrunk, more and more firms have gone out of business, and when the time comes when housing demand picks up—if it ever does under the Fraser Government—clearly the industry will not be in a position to meet that demand. It is alarming that despite the fact that the Indicative Planning Council recommends that the desirable level of home constructions for 1979–80 is 162,000 dwellings, in 1978 only 113,000 dwellings were commenced throughout Australia. Clearly the housing industry is in desperate straits and the present federal Government shows no willingness or capacity to do anything to encourage its recovery.

I am glad that in his Speech the Governor referred to the fact that this year the State Government would make available for housing an extra $30 million to augment the pitifully mean and inadequate amount that the Commonwealth Government will grant to New South Wales. One of the excuses that the federal Government has used for its cutback in housing has been that there have been substantial increases in the State’s general purpose grants. That is true: it is a fact that in recent years there have been substantial increases in untied grants from the Commonwealth. However, it should be kept in mind that the reason for those increases is simply the so-called Whitlam guarantee, which unfortunately will expire next year. If we are to get the whole picture of the Commonwealth Government’s parsimonious financial treatment of New South Wales we should look not only at general purpose grants but also at general purposes capital funds and specific purpose, both capital and recurrent, payments. If we total them we will see the true situation. In 1975–76 New South Wales received $2,767 million in these payments from the Commonwealth. In the current financial year it will receive $3,706 million. That is a substantial increase in money terms, but when one looks at the inflation rate in the same period and adjusts the amount that was received in 1975–76 to current prices, one sees that to hold even New South Wales would need to receive this year $4,139 million. In other words, this year the State is losing $433 million in real terms compared with what it received four years ago.

I have done some calculations which, when one applies the rate of inflation to the payments to the States for the years 1976–77 to 1979–80, show that in 1976–77 New South Wales lost $167 million; the next year we lost $237 million; the next year $321 million; and this year $433 million. When those figures are added together it will be seen that the total loss to New South Wales because of the primitive economic prejudices of the Prime Minister is $1,158 million. But if the loss each year is converted to current prices, the total loss in terms of current prices is $1,282 million. So much for Fraser federalism.

It is also worth keeping in mind that, in the same period that the Commonwealth Government’s payments to New South Wales increased by only 33 per cent, its own receipts increased by 58 per cent and its expenditure increased by 43 per cent. In the same period inflation increased by 49.6 per cent. It is clearly seen that the whole thrust of the federal Government’s economic policies is to make the State governments bear the main brunt of its financial stringency.

I am pleased to congratulate the Government on the measures that have been announced in the Governor’s Speech and I look forward to speaking on a number of the bills that have been foreshadowed.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr West.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr K. J. Stewart, at 10.15 p.m.