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:

Sexual Offences Against Women

The humble petition of the undersigned members of organizations listed below and citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That current laws relating to sexual offences against women are discriminatory against all women, and in particular against married women; and that current laws relating to sexual offences are ineffective and inadequate to protect married and unmarried women; and that we believe that both married and unmarried women should be effectively and adequately protected by law against sexual abuse.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray:

That laws relating to sexual offences against women must be redefined to include all forms of sexual abuse against married and unmarried women, including all forms of coercion—physical, psychological, exploitative, extortionary and authority-based, and including sexual harassment in any form, particularly at work and in educational institutions.

That evidence laws applicable generally to assault crimes must be acknowledged as applicable to sexual offences and the rules relating to corroboration in assault crimes must be made applicable to sexual offences.

That laws must be reformed so that accused persons are not entitled to abuse the criminal justice system; and furthermore laws must be revised to give greater protection to the victim and to minimize her distress.

And your Petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition, lodged by Mrs Foot, received.
Pre-school Funding

The Petition of concerned parents of pre-school age children and members of the community in the Murray region of New South Wales respectfully sheweth:

The Petitioners believe that pre-school education should be available to all three and four-year-old children in the community and they believe that the present system of Government funding to pre-school kindergartens leads to excessively high fees being charged for attendance and as such prevents some children, where parents are unable to afford the high fees, from attending the pre-school kindergartens.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House revise its system of funding to community-based pre-school kindergarten centres so that one hundred per cent of approved staff salaries is paid to all community-based pre-school kindergarten centres through your Department of Youth and Community Services.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Mair, received.

Pinball Centres

The Petition of the residents and ratepayers of Berowra respectfully sheweth:

Now hear the Petitioners' concern regarding the establishment of pinball recreation centres or the like in the area seriously endangering the total well-being of our youth. Furthermore, these establishments would seriously erode the benefits to be gained from a community centre incorporating youth meeting places, nearing completion in the vicinity.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House consider framing stricter regulations or licensing procedures for such establishments.

Additionally we query the principle whereby local council's refusal of the application to operate a pinball parlour, as a result of intense objection by residents, could be reversed on appeal to the Local Government Appeals Tribunal.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Pickard, received.

Waitara Public School

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

(1) That a resource teacher be appointed to Waitara Public School as a matter of urgency. The statistical evidence to support this request has been collated and is soon to be forwarded.

(2) That the replacement of the toilet and washshed facilities of the infants' department at Waitara Public School be undertaken as a matter of urgency.

(3) That there should be a substantial increase in the annual library allowance.
(4) That Waitara Public School, because of its outdated buildings and inadequate facilities, should be placed on the current list for the redevelopment plan.

(5) That Waitara Public School be considered as a suitable venue for building of a multipurpose room to be used for arts and crafts.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will do all in its power to satisfy these requests.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Pickard, received.

Barrenjoey Sand Mining

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

(1) That the proposed mining of sand and gravel in Broken Bay could do irreparable harm to our beaches and have adverse effects on an area, which is one of Sydney's finest tourist attractions.

(2) That the present state of knowledge of sand resources, and sand movement off our coast is very limited.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that:

The Parliament protect the unique environment of the Barrenjoey peninsula and prevent the issue of mining leases for sand and gravel and marine aggregates in the offshore areas near the Barrenjoey peninsula.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Smith, received.

"The Moonies"

The Petition of the persons whose signatures appear hereon and on other copies of this petition respectfully sheweth:

(1) That it appears from reports from overseas and in Australia that the operations of the organization known as the Holy Spirit Association for the Unification of World Christianity (commonly called "The Moonics") are so detrimental to society in general and to some individuals in particular as to be undesirable in New South Wales.

(2) That it appears that the said organization has become active and is constructing a training centre in New South Wales.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will cause a public inquiry to be made into the activities of the organization in order to ascertain:

(a) Whether such activities or any of them are
   (i) in breach of any law of New South Wales; or
   (ii) detrimental to the people of New South Wales or any of them.
(b) Whether the organization is active in New South Wales.
(c) Whether any action by legislation or otherwise should be undertaken to prevent the activities of the organization or any of them in New South Wales.
(d) Whether action should be instituted to prevent further construction of the training centre pending the outcome of the inquiry.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Akister, received.

Aborigines

This petition of citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth that:

(1) Australia's Aboriginal people suffer through dispossession of their land and discrimination on all social, cultural and humane fronts an impoverishment so extreme as to cause them to rank as having one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world, the highest prison population per capita, the highest unemployment, the worst lack of housing, lack of medical facilities, highest degree of both governmental and social discrimination in this land.

(2) This Government was elected on its policy to rectify the Aboriginal situation, to grant land rights, protect sacred sites and end the inequalities.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that this Government acts immediately to implement its policy and grants land rights to Aborigines and to freeze from market or negotiation all Crown lands and Aboriginal areas until an adequate land base is established with full Aboriginal concurrence.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Hatton, received.

Local Government Amalgamations

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

Grave concern at the intention of the Government to force amalgamations by legislation.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will call upon the Government to desist from that action and to approach future amalgamations on the basis of genuine consultation with the citizens, communities and councils of the areas concerned.

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

Petitions, lodged by Mr Akister, Mr Barraclough, Mr Crabtree, Mr Mair, Mr Mason, Mr Moore, Mr Rozzoli and Mr Taylor, received.

Traffic Signals for North Ryde

The Petition of the undersigned residents of Sydney respectfully sheweth:

That there is an urgent need for the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Badajoz Road and Twin Road in North Ryde, Sydney. This junction is adjacent to the East Ryde Primary School.

High speed traffic along both roads makes this junction particularly dangerous to children that cross these roads at this point.

The junction is also a hazard to motorists that use both roads because of the heavy volume of traffic in each direction.
Your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable House will encourage the Minister concerned to act promptly to remedy this problem.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Cavalier, received.

**Balmain Land Use**

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

We request that the land currently used by the Australian National Line at Morts Dock, Balmain, be immediately made available for combination development of open space for public use and low cost housing such as Housing Commission one level units, hostel and nursing home, accommodation for the aged, pensioners, single parent groups and low income earners.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House consider this Petition.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Degen, received.

**Hospital Beds**

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

We protest most vehemently about the reduction in health care facilities, particularly the reduction of a number of beds at hospitals in the Inner Metropolitan region.

We refer especially to the Balmain Hospital, the Children's Hospital and the nightly closure of casualty at Rachel Forster in Redfern, Lewisham Hospital and Marrickville Hospital.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will take no action to reduce the existing arrangements available at Balmain Hospital, the Children's Hospital, Rachel Forster in Redfern, Lewisham Hospital and Marrickville Hospital.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Degen, received.

**Violet and Bruce Roberts**

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

1. Violet Roberts and her son Bruce Roberts were convicted of the murder of her husband and his father, Eric Roberts, on 15th March, 1976, at Newcastle Supreme Court.

2. Violet was sentenced to life imprisonment and Bruce, who was then 17 years old, to 15 years imprisonment with a 6-year non-parole period.

3. They are currently serving these sentences and have been in custody since their arrest on 13th December, 1975.
(4) The killing was the direct result of the constant violence and abuse suffered by Violet and Bruce and the other five children for over twenty years at the hands of Eric, an alcoholic who was brutal when drunk.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable Wouse arrange for the immediate release from gaol of Violet Roberts and Bruce Roberts.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Petersen, received.

Blue Mountains Water

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

(1) The principle of adding fluoride compounds to a public water supply for the avowed purpose of reducing tooth decay is contrary to the findings of world famous scientists.

(2) There are alternative methods which can be used by those desiring fluorides, such as tablets or drops, without subjecting a whole population to the dangers of compulsory mass medication. Tablets or drops provide the only means of ensuring an accurate and consistent dosage. Experience has shown that this cannot be guaranteed by fluoridating a public water supply.

(3) No body of persons should have the right to force others to take a drug or medicine against their will. We believe this to be a negation of a moral right which we should all enjoy.

(4) There is a risk of damage to mains and machinery. Many cities in the United States have discarded fluoridation for this reason alone.

(5) The fluoridation of public water supply is a wasteful method of administering a medicine, as less than one per cent is used for drinking purposes by those it is alleged will benefit.

(6) The expenditure of large sums of money on fluoridation can only lead to an unnecessary increase in rates.

(7) Fluorides at any concentration are dangerous cumulative poisons and there is no safe level.

Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable Wouse ensure the provision of a water supply free from additives.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr R. 9. Clough, received.

Traffic Signals for Mayfield

The Petition of Mayfield East public school parents and citizens of Mayfield respectfully sheweth:

That traffic lights are urgently needed at the intersection of Crebert and Ingall Streets, Mayfield, to safeguard children walking to and home from school.
Your Petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House urgently consider installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Crebert and Ingall Sheets, Mayfield.

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

Petition, lodged by Mr Jones, received.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO DRUG TRAFFICKING

Ministerial Statement

Mr WALKER: I wish to make a ministerial statement. I have this day received a letter from the honourable member for Broken Hill. In that letter he advises as follows:

On the last sitting day of the Legislative Assembly the House dealt with a motion calling for the expulsion of the honourable member for Balmain. The motion was partially based on a statement by His Honour Mr Justice Woodward that:

I have no hesitation in finding that Degen actually accompanied Poolman to Manila and that in giving his evidence before me upon this topic he deliberately lied and prevaricated.

I wish to inform you that I accompanied Mr Poolman, who was a casual acquaintance of mine, to Manila on the date in question. This, together with evidence produced by the honourable member, should satisfy the Crown Solicitor that the honourable member has no case to answer arising out of Justice Woodward's report. I would like to assist the Crown Solicitor in his investigation and I will make myself available at his request.

I have already advised the Parliament that I have referred the further report of the Royal Commission into Drug Trafficking to the Crown Solicitor for advice. *inter alia*, on whether the honourable member for Balmain has committed any criminal offence. I then forwarded to the Crown Solicitor certain documents tendered by the honourable member for Balmain. The letter from the honourable member for Broken Hill has also been forwarded to the Crown Solicitor, whose advice I now await.

Mr MASON: For a number of reasons the Opposition is deeply concerned about the information that the Attorney-General has placed before the House. Its principal concern is why the honourable member for Broken Hill waited as long as he did to reveal the information. Why did he not place the information before the Royal commission when he had the opportunity? Honourable members have not heard the full text of the letter written by the honourable member for Broken Hill. It may contain some reference to the reason for the delay. It is significant that, as in the defence of the honourable member for Balmain before this House, the quotation from the letter does not state that Mr Poolman did not also accompany them to Manila. How are we to know whether Mr Poolman was not a member of the party? Why was that not denied by the honourable member for Balmain or the honourable member for Broken Hill? Surely, if the information is to have any significance, it ought to have related to that gentleman, who attracted so much attention at the Royal commission. The information placed before the House by the Attorney-General——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr MASON: I address a question without notice to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports representing the Premier. Is the Government aware of public concern about the inroads of crime, corruption and other organized illegal activities into New South Wales society? Has the Government taken notice of claims that limitations were imposed on the terms of reference of the Woodward Royal commission severely restricting its power to investigate and to follow up important leads into organized crime? In view of the undoubted presence of organized crime in our community, will the Premier heed the call of the Opposition, the Australian Labor Party administrative committee and Mr Justice Woodward, and take immediate action to establish a State crime commission? Alternatively, will he approach the federal Government and other State governments to pursue the suggestion of an interstate crime commission? If not, will he tell the House what action his Government proposes to stamp out organized crime?

Mr FERGUSON: I was unaware that the terms of reference of the Royal commission presided over by Mr Justice Woodward were limited in their scope.

Mr Mason: The Deputy Premier has not read the report.

Mr FERGUSON: I have read it. It has been selling like a best-seller. I feel that the terms of reference were wide, for everyone has been reading it and drawing certain conclusions. Mr Justice Woodward made nine recommendations which I outlined to the House last week. The Government proposes to take certain action on them. If the Leader of the Opposition were to ask me what the Government is doing about the eighty-nine recommendations contained in the first report of the Royal commission, I would furnish that information to the House. As to the suggestion of the honourable member for the establishment of a crime commission, I may say that New South Wales has one of the best commissioners of police this State has ever known.

[Interuption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: Mr Lees' integrity cannot be challenged by anyone in our community. The Leader of the Opposition is really indicating that he lacks confidence in the commissioner as a responsible leader of the police force and in his being able to tackle what the honourable member refers to as organized crime. Mr Justice Nagle did not recommend the establishment of a crimes commission, nor did Mr Justice Woodward. Cabinet has considered the establishment of a crimes commission and also the general question of administration. The matter has been referred to the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice for report and advice to Cabinet on the legal aspects.

I shall not accept any attack by the Leader of the Opposition or any member of the Opposition on the dedication of the Commissioner of Police as the officer responsible for and in charge of the police force and responsible also for the prevention of crime. The commissioner is doing a wonderful job. I reject any implication by the Leader of the Opposition that he is not.

NEW SOUTH WALES COUNCIL ON THE AGEING

Mr MAHER: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Youth and Community Services. Has his attention been drawn to recent news media publicity attributed to the New South Wales Council on the Ageing condemning the Government
for failing to provide that council with sufficient funds? If the Minister is aware of this publicity, are the statements correct? If not, what is the true position about State funding to the Council on the Ageing?

[Interruption]

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

Mr JACKSON: I am aware of the recent media publicity in which the New South Wales Council on the Ageing has been highly critical of me, my department and the New South Wales Government for failing to provide a sum of money to the council. That money had been withdrawn by direction of the Commonwealth Government. I deplore the vicious attack that has been levelled by the New South Wales Council on the Ageing. It is tragic. Such an organization could, if its members accepted their responsibility, do a tremendous job to provide information and services to aged people.

It is interesting to note the funding of the council by our predecessors. In 1968–69 the New South Wales Council on the Ageing received a State grant of $4,000. The following year it received $4,000; the year after it received $5,000; and the year after that it received another $5,000. In 1972–73 it received $6,200. By 1975–76 the sum had progressively increased to $10,000. Immediately after being elected to office the Labor Government increased the amount to $17,500; the following year it increased it to $30,000; the year after it was $60,000; and in the financial year recently concluded the Government increased the amount to $98,500.

Mr Smith: What did the Government do with the boy scouts?

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

Mr JACKSON: One would have thought that a member of the Opposition would have been too ashamed to interject in such a stupid way. I shall excuse him because he has been in this House for only a few months. He does not know what it is all about. He has a lot to learn about politics. I shall excuse him for being so stupid.

In its first two years in office the Government provided more money for the New South Wales Council on the Ageing than was provided in the eleven years of the former Liberal–Country party Government’s term. In its four years in office the Government has increased from $10,000 to $98,500 its allocation to the council. Despite that increase, the council has said that unless the State Government allocates a further $38,000 the council will have to cease its activities. I shall tell the House why the New South Wales Council on the Ageing is so concerned about the $38,000. The attack that it has made on the State Government should have been directed towards the federal Government. For many years the Australian Council on the Ageing has allocated funds to the State branches. I am amazed that the federal Government should direct the Australian Council on the Ageing not to provide any of its funds for the State council.

Last financial year the Australian Council on the Ageing provided $32,588 for the New South Wales council. That is the amount the State council is now seeking because this year the federal Government has directed that no federal funds should go to the State bodies. Instead of attacking the New South Wales Government, the representatives of the State council should devote their time to an attack upon the federal Government for the cavalier way in which it has directed the Australian council to withdraw funding from State bodies. One wonders what that organization is about.
I am pleased that the honourable member for Drummoyne has asked me a question on this matter. For some years he played a most important role as an executive member of the State council. I attended the last annual meeting of the State council and heard the results of the election for the executive of the council. I was able to ascertain also the work done in the previous twelve months by the executive members of the council. It was a strange council. The Liberal member for the federal electorate of St George, Mr M. J. Neil, was a member of the council but attended one meeting only in twelve months and treated the council with the utmost contempt. He had the audacity to nominate for re-election to the council.

Mr Dowd: He was elected.

Mr JACKSON: He was re-elected. That is one reason—

Mr Dowd: Is the Minister against democracy?

Mr JACKSON: I am not against democracy. The honourable member for Drummoyne attended every meeting of that council.

Mr Dowd: He might have been out with the caravans.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr JACKSON: It is sad that the honourable member for Lane Cove laughs and makes a big joke about this matter. Out in the community is a large army of aged persons who suffer the degradation of poverty. The honourable member for Lane Cove could not care less about those persons. If he cared about them he would demand that the Fraser Government should amend its direction and again fund the New South Wales Council on the Ageing. However, the honourable member for Lane Cove could not care less. He jokes and laughs and tries to make fun of what I am saying. In twelve months Mr Neil attended one meeting of the council. He nominated for re-election only because he thought it might help his candidature in the federal election. The honourable member for Lane Cove should put his money where his mouth is. The former Liberal-Country party Government of which he was a member should have provided more assistance for the New South Wales Council on the Ageing.

Mr Dowd: I was not a member of the House at that time.

Mr JACKSON: Though the honourable member for Lane Cove might not have been a member of the House at that time, he was an influential member of the Liberal Party and he was a candidate for pre-selection. He was part of the driving force behind that great Askin government.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to ignore the interjections and come back to the question.

Mr JACKSON: The honourable member for Lane Cove was one of those who pulled the strings behind the scenes. The honourable member for Drummoyne was a wonderful asset to the New South Wales Council on the Ageing. He attended every meeting of the council and gave hours of his valuable time in assisting the council. He was recognized by the secretary of the council as being one of its most competent and dedicated members.

The members of the council voted the honourable member for Drummoyne off the council and put Mr Maurice Neil back on it. The Leader of the Opposition laughs. He is the member who constantly complains to the Premier about Ministers visiting
his electorate without informing him. I have always informed him when I have visited
his electorate, but he went to my electorate the other day and told deliberate lies
when at a pre-school at Bundeena. I shall challenge him about that a little later.
His definition of democracy is one-sided. It is a sad situation when an important
council plays politics in the way that the Australian Council on the Ageing is doing. I
hope that council will reconsider its position and set its priorities right. It should appre-
ciate that this Government has done far more for the council in one year than Liberal-
Country party governments did for it in eleven years. The council will then be able to
lay the blame for its present problems at the feet of the body responsible for them,
namely the federal Fraser Government, which could not care less about aged people or
any other underprivileged people. Its concerns are the cartels and its own selfish inter-
est, not the people who are suffering because of its administration.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Urgency

Mr PUNCH (Gloucester), Leader of the Country Party [2.42]: I move:

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

That the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice be removed
from office immediately because of his abuse of the position, and
particularly his use of the position in a grossly political manner.

This matter is urgent because the acquittal last week of the Right Hon. I. M. Sinclair
of all charges against him is proof that the entire Finnane inquiry and subsequent
legal action by the New South Wales Government on the recommendation of the
Attorney-General and Minister of Justice represented the greatest travesty of justice
ever perpetrated in the history of the New South Wales Parliament. It is vital that
action be taken immediately to see that a similar occurrence can never recur. It is
urgent because the principal law officer of the State instigated legal action in the
face of the recommendation of the Corporate Affairs Commission, following its
investigations, that no action be taken against Mr Sinclair. These investigations had
revealed that he had committed no wrongdoing, and this was conclusively proved again
in the court last week. Copies of reports of these investigations as well as the legal
advice tendered to the Attorney-General on the whole Sinclair inquiry, committal and
trial, should be tabled in this House.

Mr Einfeld: On a point of order. Those reports and the nature of them have
nothing whatever to do with the urgency or otherwise of the situation. The Leader of
the Country Party is moving urgency on the basis that the Attorney-General should
resign or be removed from office. I submit that at this stage he is confined to showing
that the matter is urgent.

Mr SPEAKER: There is merit in the point of order taken by the Minister for
Consumer Affairs. The motion to which the Leader of the Country Party is speaking
is that it is a matter of urgent necessity that the House should, in effect, put aside all
business of the House in order to deal with the substantive motion that it would be
asked to consider if urgency were granted. The Leader of the Country Party should
defer to a later stage, if urgency is granted, his arguments for the substantive motion.
He should address himself now to the motion that it is a matter of urgent necessity
that this matter should be discussed forthwith.
Mr PUNCH: I shall endeavour to do so, Mr Speaker. The matter is urgent because of the sudden removal, without notice, of Deputy Commissioner Pettit and an Assistant Commissioner, Mr Greenwood, of the Corporate Affairs Commission because they had earlier cleared Mr Sinclair. Their replacement was an active member of the Australian Labor Party who is a close personal friend of the Attorney-General. This matter is urgent because the Attorney-General would not accept the verdict of the Corporate Affairs Commission, but insisted on pursuing a blind, politically biased vendetta until May 1978 when he was able to find a witness who would give him the so-called "new evidence" he needed to reinstate his attempted persecution. It is urgent because the Attorney-General, as the principal law officer in Australia's first State, attempted to abuse our most sacred institution—the law—and its centuries of tradition, by forcing an accused person to prove his innocence, not causing the prosecution to prove his guilt.

The matter is urgent because the cost to the people of this State for all the inquiries, committal and trial proceedings that were brought about by actions precipitated by the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice are estimated to be more than $1 million. It is urgent because, in that pursuit, by tabling the report and repeatedly giving stories to the media, the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice publicized the allegations in an immoral way so as to ensure that the accused would be virtually convicted before he went to trial. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is responsible for so many leaks to the media that he makes the Dambusters look like amateurs.

Mr Einfeld: On a point of order. Mr Speaker, apparently the Leader of the Country Party believes that if he commences every paragraph with the words "It is urgent", that makes the matter urgent. That does not accord with the usual procedure. It is the duty of the Leader of the Country Party to marshal his arguments so that the House will be convinced that the motion must be dealt with urgently today and, as you have said Mr Speaker, in place of any other business before the Parliament. The Leader of the Country Party seems to be confusing the words "It is urgent" with urgency. This is wrong. From time to time your predecessors, as well as you yourself, have ruled that the words "It is urgent" have no cogency and no relationship to the argument and do not prove it.

Mr Punch: On the point of order. Mr Speaker, I am trying to give instances to establish that the motion I am pursuing is urgent.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The point at which the Minister for Consumer Affairs took a point of order was when the Leader of the Country Party was referring to the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice making the Dambusters look like amateurs. I cannot see that that remark is relevant to the motion before the Chair and I ask the Leader of the Country Party to return to that motion.

Mr PUNCH: The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice told the House that the Finnane report was under a security guard until after it had been tabled. That was untrue: the federal Leader of the Opposition was given a copy of the report before copies were available to Mr Sinclair, the Prime Minister and me as leader of the National Country Party in New South Wales, and before it was tabled in this House.

Mr Einfeld: What has that to do with urgency?

Mr PUNCH: The Minister should listen. The tabling of the report without recommendations brought forth from the Bar Council of New South Wales a condemnation of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice. That forced the Premier
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to intervene and recall Mr Finnane from holidays, as honourable members will recall. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice approved the Premier's action and proceeded to report.

It is urgent because in October 1979 the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice misled this House when he said that he had not been in possession of a copy of a letter before it had appeared in the Bulletin. That letter was a further leak designed to embarrass Mr Sinclair. A little later Mr Finnane told the court that he had sent a copy of the letter to the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice more than two months before it had appeared in the Bulletin.

The matter is urgent because from the day of his swearing in to this State's most important legal office, when he informed the media that he intended to call for the files on all former Ministers, the record of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice has been one of repeated denigration of the office of a Minister of the Crown. He has proved continually that he is incapable of accepting and unwilling to accept the responsibility that goes with the high ministerial office he has accepted. It is urgent because last week at the instigation of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, police were involved in dawn raids on the homes of the mayor of Marrickville and other people involved in the criminal activities of Labor Party branches. That this was done with the full knowledge of the media indicates that the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice had in mind motives other than justice in relation to these arrests.

Today's newspapers report that next week the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is to deliver a paper at a United Nations conference in Venezuela on the abuse of power in the criminal justice system. The Minister's record makes him an appropriate person to deliver such a paper. The panic reaction of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, supported by the Premier, in introducing the Evidence Act was done as a cover-up for people with whom the Premier had been in touch. It was an Act designed to put the State above all other people in the presentation of evidence. This matter is urgent because of his actions.

Mr Einfield: On a point of order. The Leader of the Country Party is arguing why the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice should vacate his position because of some supposed, imaginary, improper conduct. Mr Speaker, I submit that the Leader of the Country Party is entitled to put is why the matter is urgent, and I ask you to confine him to that issue. Although the Leader of the Country Party is fluent in his argument, he referred to the Attorney-General's going overseas in order to do certain things, which has nothing to do with the motion. I submit that you should direct the Leader of the Country Party to confine his argument to why the matter is urgent.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Country Party is unable to present his case for urgency without placing before the House some of the reasons why he believes the matter is urgent. I rule that he is in order.

Mr PUNCH: The matter is urgent because of the Attorney-General's most recent abuse of his office concerning his announcement of an attempt to bribe him. It is a matter of concern that although the Attorney-General learnt of that matter in May, he adopted a strange code of secrecy. Not even the Premier and Treasurer or other Ministers were told of the matter until it was announced in the news media the day before Parliament met after the recess. One would think that—at least—such a serious matter would have been referred immediately to the Premier and to the police.
The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice is morally bound to refer to both the Premier and the police any knowledge of an attempt to blackmail him. The matter is urgent because the investigation ordered by him, about him, to which he has appointed an officer of his own department to report on him, to him, is totally immoral and improper. The Premier or the Acting Premier should have stood the Attorney-General down immediately until a full and independent inquiry was held into all aspects of the alleged attempts to bribe him. Because they have failed to do that, I commend the motion.

Mr FERGUSON (Merrylands), Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports [2.51]; I have listened with considerable interest to the terms of the motion and the argument put forward by the Leader of the Country Party who, as usual, was strong on rhetoric but weak on facts. The Leader of the Country Party, who apparently professes to know so much about the law, waxed eloquent. He said that last week the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice had ordered dawn raids in various parts of Sydney on some members of the Australian Labor Party. That was the first point he tried to make. He should know that the Attorney-General is not in charge of the police force. I must admit that I, like all members of this House—indeed like many citizens of this State—followed with great interest the trial of his political colleague in what was known as the Sinclair case. I have no comment to make about that trial except to say that it took the jury seven hours to reach its verdict.

The Leader of the Country Party referred to—as he put it—how the Attorney-General had conducted that case. Unlike the Leader of the Country Party, I shall state a few facts. The conduct of that matter was in accordance with time-honoured procedures in all prosecutions of indictable offences. At every step of the way, advice was sought from independent Crown law officers, and on every occasion that advice was followed. I shall deal now with the decision to prosecute. The Finnane report was forwarded to the following law officers for their comment and advice: the Crown Solicitor, who briefed Mr J. T. Hiatt, Q.C., Mr B. T. Sully, Q.C., and Mr C. J. Bannon, Q.C., Crown Prosecutor; the Solicitor General, Mr G. T. A. Sullivan, Q.C., and the Crown Advocate, Mr R. M. Court, Q.C. The independence and integrity of those officers is surely beyond question. Each of those distinguished legal officers recommended prosecution on twelve charges. The Leader of the Country Party laughs when I speak of the integrity of those legal officers.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The matter was then placed in the hands of the Solicitor for Public Prosecutions and the Clerk of the Peace, who also concurred in the recommendation. The matter was brought to the attention of the police, and the police laid the informations. Let us deal with the preliminary hearing. The twelve charges were duly heard before the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr Briese. He found a case to answer on nine charges and committed Sinclair for trial in the District Court. Is his integrity questioned? The Crown was then bound to proceed with the trial. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Peace began to make arrangements. However, in accordance with the usual procedures, Sinclair's lawyers submitted a no bill application to the Attorney-General. And, also in accordance with practice and procedure, that application was duly considered by Mr Hiatt, Q.C., Mr Sully, Q.C., Mr Court, Q.C. and Mr Sullivan, Q.C. All those learned gentlemen advised that all charges should proceed to trial, and that is what occurred at the District Court.
When the Crown case had been completed Sinclair's lawyers submitted to His Honour Judge Staunton, Chief Judge of the District Court, that there was no case to answer. Like the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate and the Crown law officers before him, His Honour Judge Staunton also held there was a case to answer. The Chief Judge rejected the submission of Mr Sinclair's barrister that the case should be taken away from the jury. Given those facts, there can be no suggestion that the case was dealt with improperly or not in accordance with the rule of law. All this talk of abuse of power is an unfair attack on the Chief Judge of District Court, the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, and the Crown law officers, all of whom took the view that Sinclair had a case to answer. Let us have no more of this hypocritical wailing and gnashing of teeth by members of the Opposition for one of their federal colleagues. All the legal advice to the Crown Solicitor concerning the case was that there was a case to answer.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FERGUSON: The Leader of the Country Party should come here with facts, not rhetoric. I have given the House the facts and they refute completely any argument of the sort put forward by the Leader of the Country Party. The Government rejects the motion of urgency.

[Interruption]

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Question of urgency put.

The House divided.

Ayes, 29

Mr Arblaster
Mr Barraclough
Mr Boyd
Mr Brewer
Mr J. H. Brown
Mr Bruxner
Mr Cameron
Mr J. A. Clough
Mr Dowd
Mr Duncan

Mr Fisher
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Mr McDonald
Mr Mason
Mr Moore
Mr Morris
Mr Murray
Mr Osborne

Mr Park
Mr Pickard
Mr Punch
Mr Schipp
Mr Singleton
Mr Smith
Mr Wotton
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Mr Caterson
Mr Taylor

Noes, 60

Mr Akister
Mr Anderson
Mr Bannon
Mr Barnier
Mr Bedford
Mr Booth
Mr Brereton
Mr Britt
Mr R. J. Brown
Mr Cahill
Mr Cavalier
Mr Cleary
Mr R. J. Clough
Mr Cox

Mr Crabtree
Mr Curran
Mr Day
Mr Degen
Mr Durick
Mr Egan
Mr Einfeld
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Mr Hatton
Mr Hills

Mr Hunter
Mr Jackson
Mr Jensen
Mr Johnson
Mr Johnstone
Mr Jones
Mr Keane
Mr Knott
Mr McCarthy
Mr McGowan
Mr McClwaine
Mr Maher
Mr Mair
Mr Mallam
Mr Mulock Mr O'Connell Mr O'Neill Mr Petersen Mr Quinn Mr Ramsay Mr Robb Mr Rogan Mr Ryan Mr Sheahan Mr A. G. Stewart Mr K. J. Stewart Mr Walker Mr Webster

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion of urgency negatived.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

(Resumed)

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO DRUG TRAFFICKING

Mr DOWD: My question without notice is addressed to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports. In addition to the nine recommendations in the further report of the Royal Commission into Drug Trafficking, did Mr Justice Woodward make numerous complaints about restrictions placed on him by the narrow terms of reference? Did Mr Justice Woodward, in recommendation 1, state that the evidence before him should form a basis for a further inquiry? Did he seek wider terms of reference? If so, why was this refused? Will the Government now set up a further Royal commission to examine particularly the protection of criminals by senior officials of the Australian Labor Party and their colleagues?

Mr FERGUSON: The honourable member for Lane Cove has asked me a series of questions. I shall consider them and give him an answer tomorrow.

F4 FREEWAY

Mr WILDE: I address a question without notice to the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads. Will the Minister advise me of the progress that the Department of Main Roads is making with the construction of the F4 Freeway in the vicinity of Mays Hill? Will the Minister assure honourable members that the reduced level of road funding by the federal Government will not delay this important project? Will the Minister ensure that the freeway is completed as soon as possible in order to avoid disruption to the area in general, as well as to the pupils, staff and parents of children attending Parramatta West public school, which is represented today in the gallery of the House by the children of class 6T? Will the Minister advise also what provision has been made for pedestrian access across the freeway in the vicinity of the school?

Mr Cameron: On a point of order. The question grossly exceeds the standard normally accepted for the length of questions. The question gives more information than it seeks and should be ruled out of order.

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

Mr JENSEN: One can understand the abhorrence of the Opposition to being exposed by a Government supporter who asks a question that is meaningful to his constituents and wants to do something to help the development of the State and protect children. The Opposition, whose duty it is to bring these matters before the Parliament, is incessantly trying to bring down the status of the Parliament. Destruction is
the forte of the Opposition. When the honourable member for Parramatta asked the question members of the Opposition could not contain themselves at the expose and a point of order was taken. The question asked by the honourable member for Parramatta is a good one. I congratulate him on lifting the Parliament out of the depths to which it has been driven by the Opposition since the Parliament resumed.

The Opposition has not been constructive in its attitude or in questions asked. The Western Freeway, in the vicinity of Parramatta West public school, forms part of the Government's major works programme to provide relief to the heavily trafficked Parramatta Road from Concord to Parramatta and beyond. The work being undertaken between Parramatta and Mays Hill is well advanced. That work is due for completion in December 1981, at a cost of approximately $10 million. The Government would be happy to accelerate the work but for the niggardly attitude of the Commonwealth Government which this year, in real terms, has given New South Wales less money than was the case five years ago, despite the fact that the Commonwealth Government has collected from the motorists of New South Wales $1,400 million in petrol tax and has given them back only a miserly $196 million. Despite the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, the State Government will persist with the completion of that work. I am delighted to inform the honourable member for Parramatta that a pedestrian bridge will be built so that children might traverse the road safely in order to get to school. The Government will proceed to the completion of the work as quickly as possible. I hope that in future some members of the Opposition will emulate the honourable member for Parramatta and ask constructive questions.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS' INCOMES

Mr SINGLETON: I direct a question without notice to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. Has the Minister requested certain personal income information from New South Wales doctors? Was he threatened to prosecute doctors who refuse to fill out the questionnaire? Was the Minister reconsidered the questionnaire? What is the present situation?

Mr EINFELD: The answer to the first two questions is no. The Prices Commission has issued a questionnaire to doctors. I have seen reports about a statement by the president and acting medical secretary of the New South Wales branch of the Australian Medical Association, advising its members not to respond to the questionnaire of the Prices Commission. That questionnaire was designed to elicit information on various matters relevant to the inquiry, including income, work rate, numbers of patients, level of fees, and the numbers of staff employed. It was originally designed as part of a Prices Commission inquiry, which began in September last year, into whether fees set by Mr Justice Ludeke of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission should form the basis of fees charged by New South Wales doctors.

In February this year the Prices Commission distributed a detailed questionnaire to a random selection of 3,000 doctors throughout New South Wales. That questionnaire was not pursued, because in the Supreme Court the State branch of the Australian Medical Association challenged the validity of the questionnaire. On 3rd July Mr Justice Lee dismissed the challenge and allowed the questionnaire to be sent out, with the exception of two questions. He said those questions were about social and moral matters, whereas the law allowed the Prices Commission to ask questions about economic aspects only. Incidentally, Mr Justice Lee dismissed the association's claim that the Prices Commission had shown bias against the association during the hearings of the inquiry.
On 6th August, following Mr Justice Lee's ruling, a revised questionnaire was sent out to doctors. The deadline for return of questionnaires is 22nd August. The chairman of the Prices Commission and the two commissioners have taken extreme care, in co-operation with the Privacy Committee, to preserve the confidentiality of the information contained in the questionnaires. The Privacy Committee will receive all responses to the questionnaire and withhold all means of identifying respondents. It will give to the Prices Commission responses identified by number only and will destroy material when the Prices Commission has finished its inquiry.

I was astounded to read in the press that officers of the Australian Medical Association in New South Wales were defying the law. That is inexcusable. However, it is not surprising. The association challenged the questionnaire of the Prices Commission in the Supreme Court. Mr Justice Lee made a finding that two of the questions ought not to be asked of doctors. One would have expected officers of the Australian Medical Association to accept that situation. At hearings before the Prices Commission the AMA continually challenged the law, the competence of lay witnesses to give evidence, and the relevance of the law of evidence—upon which it based some of its own submissions—and accused the Prices Commission of favouring lay witnesses. Finally, it walked out of the hearings.

I must emphasize that the federal body of the Australian Medical Association, though obviously not pleased with the inquiry, co-operated throughout because it understood, and understands now, that there are good reasons for requesting the information. Most questions are based on the Australian Medical Association's own evidence. The New South Wales branch of the association had made assertions about access to medical care, the average length of consultations, and the incidence of bad debts. None of this information can be tested without a questionnaire. Indeed the federal body of the AMA said that the AMA often complained that doctors' gross income figures had been misused and misquoted. Obviously, the questionnaire was the only way to solve the problem. The AMA said that the Prices Commission would need to consider in some statistical form the net incomes of medical practitioners, hours worked, numbers of patients seen, the costs of practices, et cetera.

The association wants it both ways. It wants to be a unique group in the community and to preserve what it calls a special relationship between doctors and patients—but it wants that special relationship to apply not only to medical matters but also to financial matters. Fortunately, its own members are not as anti-social as the association. I understand that the Privacy Committee has received hundreds of replies to the questionnaire. Even in the last few days the Prices Commission has received hundreds of telephone calls from doctors who state that they will send in replies to the questionnaire.

The Government is not seeking a confrontation with doctors, who are ill-served by those seen to be occupying positions as executives in the head office of the Australian Medical Association. I must make it clear, as I did publicly—which is apparently what the honourable member is referring to—that section 13 of the Prices Regulation Act provides that information must be given to the Prices Commission when requested. Under section 59 the penalty for non-compliance is a fine of $5,000 or twelve months' imprisonment, or both.

All I can say to doctors generally, and indeed to the honourable member, is that citizens in New South Wales are expected to conform to the law, and must do so. They must answer questions legally asked of them. Mr Justice Lee found the questions in the questionnaire to be legal. Those to whom the questionnaire has been sent were chosen at random. The confidentiality of their replies has been respected because the Privacy Committee will ensure that the procedures I have outlined are complied
with. I repeat that the penalty is a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for twelve months, or both, if a person does not answer a questionnaire sent to him by the Prices Commission. Following 22nd August, when I see how many replies have been received by the Privacy Committee and forwarded to the Prices Commission, and when I receive the report of the Prices Commission I shall ask the Crown Solicitor and the Attorney-General to advise me on what further action the Government should take.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH: ADDRESS IN REPLY

Second Day's Debate

Debate resumed (from 13th August vide page 168) on motion by Mr Curran:

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 BANNON (Rockdale) [3.19]: I congratulate the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, the honourable member for Castlereagh, and the seconder of the motion, the honourable member for Manly. I address my remarks more specifically to the honourable member for Castlereagh who, when he moved the motion last week, delivered his maiden speech in the House. As I listened to him my mind went back to the by-election for Castlereagh who, when he moved the motion last week, delivered his maiden speech in the House. As I listened to him my mind went back to the by-election for Castlereagh and the reception that other helpers of the honourable member and I received in the work that we did in that campaign, including door-knocking and the other usual chores that must be done. I suspect that the members of the Opposition who did similar work in the nrrca also received the same reaction to the approaches they made to the electors—an expression of the high esteem in which the honourable member for Castlereagh is held in his electorate. There was never a doubt in the minds of the members of the Government that he would be successful. My colleagues and I congratulate him on his fine effort in the by-election.
The honourable member for Castlereagh, in the opening remarks in this debate, spoke highly of the former member for Castlereagh, the Hon. J. B. Renshaw. Because of a special affinity I have with the former member, as a room-mate and being involved in many of his activities, I place on record my personal tribute to his work in the years that he served in this Parliament. I wish him well. I know that he will capably represent this State in England as Agent General for New South Wales.

I pay a sincere tribute also to His Excellency the Governor for the service that he has given to the State. I understand that by the time he retires he will have given close to fifteen years of dedicated full-time service. I wish His Excellency and Lady Cutler an enjoyable retirement. I recall sitting in the other place when the Governor delivered his opening Speech. As he walked out of the Chamber it flashed through my mind, as I am sure it went through the minds of other honourable members, that it was the end of a proud era in this State's history, for His Excellency had announced his intention to retire from office. He has been a wonderful asset to the State. I am sure every honourable member has experienced the warmth and vitality—[Quorum formed.]

I have no quarrel with the Opposition's right to call a quorum, but doubtless Government supporters noted that the Opposition timed its call while I was paying tribute to His Excellency the Governor for his record service to this State. That is typical of the attitude the Opposition has adopted in the past few weeks. Although some days have passed since the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply was debated I wish to make a reference or two to the attack that the Opposition made on the Speech delivered by His Excellency at the opening of Parliament. It is shameful that the Leader of the Opposition involved himself in this despicable attack. It is even more shameful that the Prime Minister became involved. It had nothing to do with the Prime Minister except that it cut him to the quick to hear in the Speech a completely justified attack on this nation's prevailing economic conditions.

It was not the first time Governor's Speeches have contained criticism of the activities of federal governments. Apparently the Opposition has forgotten such an attack that was made in 1974, in the days of the Askin Government, when in the preamble to the Speech the Governor criticized conditions in New South Wales. In putting the programme of the Government into the proper context reference was made to attempts by the federal Government to restrain activity by monetary measures. His Excellency said:

This has had a heavy impact on State authorities in the financing of capital works.

That was clearly an attack on the policies of the federal Government of that day as they affected New South Wales. In the same Speech His Excellency went on to say:

Losses of production due, directly and indirectly, to industrial disputes have reached serious proportions.

That was a criticism of the trade union movement. In 1975—and even in those days unemployment was high—a further attack was made on the federal Government for its announcement that grants for a special programme of unemployment relief throughout New South Wales would be phased out by the end of that year. The Governor said:

The Government is concerned that, unless there is an improvement in the economic environment in which private investment decisions are made, the present high level of unemployment will persist.

Mr Bannon]
That was another attack upon the Labor Government in Canberra at the time. The Governor's Speech continued:

There seems little prospect of any lasting improvement in either business confidence or employment unless inflation and steeply rising wages in particular can be brought under control . . .

The prospects will depend largely on the ability of the Commonwealth Government to restore business confidence and create a climate where a reasonable return from new investment in real terms can be predicted with some certainty.

They are attacks of the sort that the Opposition when in government chose to launch through the vehicle of the Governor's Speech on the opening of Parliament. Now the Opposition criticizes the fact that the Governor referred to the economy and mentioned the federal Government. Some other matters must be straightened out before I finish dealing with the Governor's Speech. The Speech is presented to the Governor some time before he delivers it. He looks at it and has the opportunity of discussing its contents with the Premier to ensure that it is in a satisfactory form. No government would present to the Governor a speech that it knew would not be acceptable and that he would not be willing to present to Parliament. The only honourable member who graces the Opposition benches at present may not be aware that the Governor's Speech is approved by the Executive Council. Let us have no more stupid and ridiculous remarks from the Opposition slighting the Governor when he is near the end of his memorable term of office. His Speech was approved by the Executive Council and ratified before presentation. It must be clear that it met with his approval and that he was happy to present it.

In the short time now left to me I wish to point to the effect that the recent Premiers' conference and the meeting of the Loan Council held in Canberra had on the finances of New South Wales. In the lead up to the final decisions that were taken we were all subjected to the usual hoo-ha from the Commonwealth Government. It will be noted that the Australian Financial Review of 27th June, 1980, contained this statement attributed to the federal Treasurer:

The economy overheated, Howard tells the State Premiers.

In other words, the federal Treasurer was warning the States that they should not expect too much from the Premiers' conference. In this federal election year the media has put forward a view to be gobbled up by the public at large. For example, the Sydney Morning Herald of 30th June, 1980, contained this report:

The Government's Budget strategy, which required that payments to the States from the Federal Budget be at least held in real terms, emerged unscathed. And yet nearly all of the Premiers went home professing to be satisfied. Even the ones who did grumble, like N.S.W.'s Deputy Premier, Mr Ferguson, expressed their dissatisfaction in muted tones.

I do not recall the Deputy Premier expressing anything but the gravest dissatisfaction about the possibilities for the future. His view will be borne out tonight when the federal Treasurer presents his Budget and announces a 7 per cent increase in funding for the arms build-up of our defence forces. What the Deputy Premier said on 28th June might not be far from the mark. He said that at the Premiers' conference Prime Minister Fraser kept on lecturing the Premiers about the red peril. A headline at the time reads: "PM 'Hell Bent on Khaki Election'."

I shall refer now to a couple of matters that vitally affect the people of New South Wales. The allocations for roads, housing and health were drastically affected by what transpired in Canberra a couple of months ago. To highlight my point I shall give
the background based on Commonwealth figures. Statement No. 4 of the federal budget speech of 1979–80 shows that the Commonwealth Government estimated an increase of 16.4 per cent in taxation income in the financial year 1979–80. That result was achieved.

When I inquired about the estimated increase in the yield from income tax in this financial year I was unable to obtain the figures. As the federal Budget was not to be brought down until tonight I believed that I would have to make my speech without that information. However, thanks to Mr Laurie Oakes, the world already knows what is in that Budget. It is expected that during the current financial year federal taxation revenue will rise by 16.2 per cent and spending by 13.2 per cent.

The basic outcome of the Premiers' conference in Canberra a couple of months ago is that the grants to the States have merely kept pace with inflation. Some have not even done that. Thanks to the policies of the federal Government the increase to New South Wales of 10.8 per cent will just keep pace with inflation. There was an increase of a mere 5 per cent in general purpose grants and the increase for specific purpose payments was 9.4 per cent. Loan approvals, largely for semi-government borrowings, remained static at the figure for the previous year. Allocations for New South Wales reveal an average rise of 8.5 per cent. They do not even match the inflation rate. The federal Government is requiring the State to maintain its work programmes at last year's levels. However, the programmes for roads, health and housing will have to be cut back over the next five years if the effects of inflation upon the finances of New South Wales are taken into account.

Consider the effect on roadworks in New South Wales. Today the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Roads answered a question asked of him by the honourable member for Parramatta about the construction of a freeway. The Minister replied that in the current financial year the federal Government has allocated to New South Wales in the order of $196.4 million out of the motor vehicle taxation that it will collect. Over the past twelve months the federal Government has raised from New South Wales motorists alone no less than $1,400 million from petrol tax. In this year the federal Government will collect at least $2,500 million in petrol tax from the motorists of Australia. As I have said, this financial year New South Wales will receive a mere $196.4 million out of that mammoth sum.

Compare that allocation with the amount distributed to the State over the past few years. Five years ago New South Wales received $274 million. Worse is to come when one considers the allocation for roadworks. A 5-year programme has been determined from now until the financial year 1984–85. This year the 11 per cent increase merely kept pace with inflation. Next year the increase in funding will be 9 per cent; the year after that it will be 7 per cent; and for each of the next two years the increase will be 6 per cent. I do not know what the federal Government takes us for. About six years ago inflation was said to be running at a mammoth level. It was said then that three years hence inflation would be reduced to about 4 per cent or 5 per cent. The federal Government would have us believe that over the next five years inflation will be reduced to 6 per cent. If that were so, the grants to New South Wales would match the inflationary trend. In other words, the State would be able to continue to build roads commensurate with the needs of two years ago. In five years time New South Wales will be constructing roads at the same rate as it would have been expected to build them two years ago, but that approach does not take into account the enormous increase in the number of vehicles using the State's roads.

Somehow New South Wales must find the shortfall, which according to figures I have received could be in the order of $4 million next year, $13 million the year after that, $26 million in 1983–84 and a huge $41 million in 1984–85. If that...
situation were allowed to continue, the State’s roads would be choked by that time. The full blame would have to be levelled at the federal Government for its niggardly attitude to grants to this State for roadworks.

The federal Treasurer said that the decision on funding for 1980–81 reflected the importance his Government places on continued assistance for roadworks. If so, I am concerned about what he might say in a couple of years time when New South Wales will have a shortfall of $4 million in funding for essential road construction. This year the federal Government will increase its rate of spending to 13.2 per cent, though taxation revenue to the Commonwealth has increased by 16.2 per cent. The States are expected to maintain their spending at the rate that existed before the beginning of this financial year. The federal Government has adopted its attitude in spite of the advice it has received from its own authorities. The Bureau of Transport Economics had said that New South Wales had a warranted road construction programme of $1,390 million or 38 per cent of the warranted road construction of all the States. It said further that New South Wales with its high warranted needs would receive only 32.4 per cent of the total allocations to the States. That is a clear indication of the parsimonious attitude of the federal Government towards New South Wales. Recently I received a copy of the latest issue of the NRMA journal Open Road, which is not considered to be anything but a rather conservative publication. In its editorial it said:

Motorists will be appalled at the grossly inadequate level of Commonwealth road grants for the next five years, announced at the recent Premiers’ Conference.

Though the community has become more aware that an efficient road system will reduce transport costs, inflation, deaths, injuries, pollution and congestion, the Government remains stubborn.

And having turned every car into a Government money-producing machine, through high fuel taxes, the Commonwealth has the revenue to allow the States to get on with the job.

The Commonwealth grants to the States total $628 million in 1980–81. This is an increase of 11 per cent over 1979–80, matching the general inflation rate.

In NSW, the vital categories of urban and rural arterial roads don’t even get the 11 per cent rise.

I had intended to speak about the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to community health and housing. In the limited time remaining I commend to honourable members a book that deals with a totally different subject. The Opposition has been remarkably quiet during the terribly traumatic days that affected the workers of General Motors-Holden’s Pty Limited. Finally that company has been compelled by the power of big business to come to some form of agreement about the closure of the Pagewood plant. I recommend that Opposition members educate themselves by reading On A Clear Day You Can See General Motors written by John Z. DeLorean. Mr DeLorean should know something about the Generals Motors Corporation and its activities. At the time he resigned from that organization he held a position in which he was paid up to $650,000 a year. That was one of the highest-paid executive positions in the United States of America. I commend to Opposition members a reading of the following passage on page 224:

After watching the corporation over a long period of time, I have slowly reached the conclusion that, in reality, General Motors’ competitors in America exist by reason of GM’s sufferance. GM has the potential to
eliminate Ford, Chrysler and American Motors any time it desires. **This** could be done in a short time, as little as one year, by simply lowering prices or not raising them to the point where GM forced the competition out of business.

If that day comes, heaven help the motoring industry throughout the world.

Mr ARBLASTER (Mosman) [3.49]: I join with other honourable members who have contributed to the debate in congratulating the honourable member for Castlereagh on moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and the honourable member for Manly who seconded the motion. I congratulate the honourable member for Castlereagh also on his maiden speech in this House. It is a privilege to move such a motion in this House and to present the Address in Reply to His Excellency. I should add a tribute to a great Australian. Sir Roden Cutler has served the State and its citizens for a record term. Sir Roden and Lady Cutler have carried out their arduous duties with great dignity and have given leadership to the State. All honourable members would agree that His Excellency and Lady Cutler have earned the admiration and respect of all citizens.

In his Speech His Excellency said that he has had the honour of holding the office of Her Majesty's representative for longer than any other governor. It is the citizens of this State who have been honoured in having Sir Roden Cutler as their Governor for such a long period. I wish him well in his retirement and a great deal of happiness and health and time to indulge in the pursuits he has not had time to enjoy over the past few years. In them I wish him fair winds, good sailing and plenty of good bites on the line. The Speech of His Excellency covered the subject of transport very briefly. One passage dealing with that matter said:

The State Rail Authority, the Urban Transit Authority and the Railway Workshops Board were established on 1st July, 1980. These new management structures will promote the efficiency, economy and public accountability of the State's transport system.

These bodies had better start promoting the economy of the public transport system. All honourable members will recall the famous statement of the Premier in 1976 when he said, "Unless I get hold of the public transport deficit within three years, I will have failed". Clearly the Premier has failed. All honourable members know that the real annual deficit—not the phoney, bookkeeping deficit—is approaching $500 million. Turning to the matter of public accountability. I say that the new management structure is simply another cover-up for the Government. Its only aim is to place yet another barrier between the Minister for Transport and the day-to-day administration of the public transport system. Honourable members know what happened last year when some trains were running late, and others were cancelled, when more and more strikes were occurring and a great deal of comment on these things appeared in the news media. The Minister said: "This is not my fault; I have nothing to do with it. It is the fault of the commission." That was another abrogation of responsibility by the Minister. In effect he was saying: "I am not responsible for the situation. It is the commission's responsibility. It is the commission's fault." The new division of authority will achieve nothing except to put more barriers between the administration and the Government, to keep the administration and the Government at arm's length. It is another sham approach to the administration of our transport system.

Let me turn now to the Government's appointments to the two highest paid public service jobs in this State. What happened? The Government advertised worldwide in the first instance for a chief executive officer and a managing director, but not one applicant was considered suitable for either job. The Government advertised again, and still received no applications from persons considered suitable for the jobs.
What happened? The Government told the general manager of the bus division of the Public Transport Commission, "You will apply for the job of senior executive of our Urban Transit Authority." So he got the job and now we have in the Urban Transit Authority the man who was running the bus division of the Public Transport Commission. He now has a greatly increased salary and more staff. What happened with the State Rail Authority? No one applied to become the State's highest paid public servant. When no suitable applicant offered himself for the job what happened? The Government selected Mr David Hill from the Premier's mafia squad.

Mr Robb: A good choice.

Mr ARBLASTER: I shall come back to that interjection in a moment. The Government selected Mr David Hill to become the senior man in the State Rail Authority. Mr Hill may be a good economist; I would not know. He has been very good at looking up hollow logs and finding cash, but he has had no experience at all in the management of people, in the administration of transport or the operation of a railway system, and no experience at all in industrial relations. The advertisement sought applications from persons whose first qualification was experience and success in the field of industrial relations. Mr Hill does not know how to spell it, but he was appointed. Now let me remind honourable members of what the Minister for Transport said when he was the Opposition spokesman on transport at the time of the appointment of Mr Philip Shirley as chief commissioner of the Public Transport Commission. At that time he said:

A real weakness in the Government's new Public Transport Commission was that the Chief Commissioner designate, Mr Philip Shirley, did not have experience in running a transport system. He said Mr Shirley's role as a member of the British Railways Board was to slash rural lines, and that was his main experience in transport. In a strong attack on Mr Shirley's appointment he said problems would arise for him with the technicalities of running an everyday transport system.

Has Mr Hill had the experience necessary for the job? He has not. The Minister continued:

I do not think you can pluck a man out of the air and say that he will solve all the transport problems. I wish him well, and that he makes a tremendous impact. But I am yet to be convinced that his experience was not relatively short.

What was Mr Shirley's experience compared with Mr Hill's? Mr Shirley had been deputy chairman of the Cunard Steamship Company.

Mr Crabtree: Is that good for railways?

Mr ARBLASTER: Let me continue. From 1962 to 1967 he was a member, and from 1964 to 1967 vice chairman, of the British Railways Board. He was a member of the British Transport Commission in 1961 and 1962; executive chairman, Batchelors Foods, 1958 to 1961; and chief accountant, Unilever, 1952 to 1958. The Minister for Police and Minister for Services seems to think that that was not enough. That is the experience with which we must compare Mr Hill's record. What is Mr Hill's experience? By comparison he has not had any. The honourable member for Miranda said he was a good man and a good choice. Let us examine his first actions in the field of industrial relations. When acting commissioner he took some guests on a tour of the North Coast and used the commissioner's coach. Many people are asking whether that tour was for business or pleasure. To find the answer one would have to ask employees in the railway service.
When the train stopped at Byron Bay, to put it nicely a conflict of interest occurred. However, the place where that conflict of interest occurred was not, as reported in one newspaper, in a motel but at a joint called *Poppa Bear's*, which was closed in the following week. This conflict of interest concerned the man that the Government has appointed to improve industrial relations in our railway system and the morale of the railway workers. When will the charade stop? What has been done to improve industrial relations in the public transport system? Honourable members will remember that about eighteen months ago Mr Pat Johnson was appointed to be the Minister's *Henry Kissinger*, to go out and solve all the problems. But what happened? There were even more strikes, industrial trouble and delayed trains. What did the Government do? It promoted Mr Johnson to be a member of the State Rail Authority, even though he had made a mess of his previous position. The Government then had to find someone else to handle industrial relations.

So the Government said it would set up an industrial relations tribunal and give it sole responsibility for staff levels and for technological change. I should have thought that the Government itself would have accepted responsibility for staff levels and for making changes for the benefit of commuters, following technological advances. Under the cover-up Wran Government the State is moving farther away from its responsibilities. It is trying to get out of the kitchen where the heat is on. The Government does not want to account for its actions.

This Government has had four years in which to show what it could do with public transport, but the position has grown worse, with unreliable services—when there are any services. Trains are late or services are cancelled. By its lack of action the *Government* causes emotional stress in commuters' families. The Government *could not* give a damn about commuters from Gosford, the Blue Mountains and the western suburb?, and it does not give a thought to the effect that poor public transport has in causing workers to lose their jobs. I shall give credit to the honourable member for Gosford for his remarks in the local press when he made mention of the inadequate rail system. The honourable member said:

> Cabinet needs to realise the human suffering which arises from an incompetent railway service.

> Many commuters live in fear of losing their jobs because of unpunctuality through no fault of their own.

> Strains and tensions are placed on families because of disruption, financial loss and physical pressures generated by an inadequate rail system.

The honourable member for Gosford had the courage to speak publicly about the problem. What does the honourable member for the Blue Mountains have to say about it? He packs up his office and goes off electioneering by opening another office in Bathurst, which seat he does not yet hold, and I shall lay money on the fact that he will never represent that electorate. What about the honourable member for Nepean, the honourable member for Mount Druitt, and other Government supporters? What about the Minister for Transport? Coal trains will be travelling where there was to be none.

I shall give the House an example of what is happening. The night before the last urban transport strike the Leader of the Opposition and I were in Gosford. At 10 p.m. it was announced that no urban trains, or fewer urban trains, would run the next day, but no announcement was made about interurban trains. At 11.15 p.m. I rang three local railway stations. I was told by staff at the first station that the trains would run but only in 4-carriage sets and that there would be fewer trains. I was told by staff at the second station, "We will not know until 2 a.m. Give us a ring then. We think it could be as usual, but we do not know." The staff at the third railway station I rang told me, "Mate, there won't be any trains tomorrow." I then
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rang Sydney. I was informed, "We do not know for certain yet. We do not know what effect it will have on the interurban services." Most commuters at Gosford have to get up at 4 a.m. or 5 a.m. to catch their usual trains. What was the point of advising those of them that inquired to ring again at 2 a.m.?

Local organizations on the Central Coast have their own emergency transport services, and have become efficient in running them because they have had plenty of practice. They have six chartered buses on stand-by to transport people to Sydney. Those organizations did not know whether trains would be running. As it turned out, the trains ran. The 7.10 a.m. train from Gosford was half-empty. It was certainly not over-crowded, as it usually is. The reason was that at midnight people said to themselves, "We do not know whether we shall be able to get to work tomorrow by train. We shall take a sickie or stay at home using flexi-time." Those who did not stay at home went by car. From 5 o'clock next morning cars were streaming past our motel on their way to Sydney.

In this House the Premier and Treasurer and the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports have often referred to the ability to run a pie stall. Go to Gosford and ask about the administration of the State's rail services, or go to the Blue Mountains and ask commuters whether they think they will get home on time, and you will soon be told where to put the pie. The commuters now know that the Government itself is incapable of running anything, even a pie stall. The Labor Party claimed that it would manage public transport better than a Liberal–Country party government because it could control the unions. Government supporters seem unable to get into their thick heads that top-class rolling stock, the most modern carriages in the world, and the best permanent way, are useless unless trains run, and run on time. People would prefer to have Cobb & Co run the service. Horse transport used to arrive at Springwood and at places north of Gosford on time, even though it had to contend with a punt in crossing Hawkesbury River. Commuters want punctual and reliable transport. They do not want the tensions to which unreliable transport subjects them and their families, to say nothing of the possibility of losing their jobs. The cover-up and maladministration within the transport system is occurring at the top level. It starts at government administrative policy level.

I refer now to a statement made last week in the Land under the heading, "Huge rail profits from grain." What is the true story? Who is misleading whom? What are the facts? One had a spokesman for the Minister this week saying that a leaked document was genuine, and that the Public Transport Commission was having its first crack at trying to isolate various areas of cost and expenditure. But what does the chairman of the State Rail Authority, Poppa Bear's visitor, say? He said that the figures were incorrect. Whom does one believe? The head of the authority says one thing and the Minister says another. That has been going on for four years.

Last November the Minister for Transport said that the bulk freight section of the State Rail Authority was making a profit of $7 million. What the Minister did not say was that the transportation of wheat and coal yielded a profit of close to $70 million. The loss on all the other freight was about $224 million, which was nearly half the total deficit of the Public Transport Commission of New South Wales. The Minister for Transport and the Minister for Industrial Relations, and Minister for Energy continually disagree about these matters, which is just one indication of the Government's cover-up of these issues.

I shall deal now with some of the other troubles in the public transport system. In January, in the hottest part of the summer, as a result of a shortage of spare parts the air-conditioning in only thirteen of the thirty air-conditioned interurban railway
carriages was operating efficiently. The air-conditioning in the other carriages remained out of order for three weeks. People travelling in those carriages must have felt as though they were in a mobile sauna.

Mr Crabtree: When the former Government was in office there were no air-conditioned carriages.

Mr ARBLASTER: All the interurban carriages now in use were ordered by the former government. That Government also ordered 80 per cent of the double-deck railway carriages now in use in this State. The Government failed to order more of those carriages until March of this year. The Government should realize that train passengers are laughing at signs in railway carriages asking people to excuse eleven years of neglect of the transport system. Graffiti on those signs shows clearly that the people are blaming this Government for the present unsatisfactory situation.

The Government has made a number of stupid statements about how it proposed to improve the public transport system. It boasted that it would introduce a computerized booking service for country and interstate train passengers. After the Opposition asked the Government why nothing had been done about introducing the service, the Minister for Transport said that it would be too difficult to implement and nothing would be done about it. The Minister took that attitude although transport experts from France had offered the Public Transport Commission assistance in terms of programming and some necessary computer software. Although many Australian transport organizations, including Ansett, Trans-Australia Airlines and Qantas operate a computerized booking service, the Government said that it was impossible to introduce a similar service for interstate and country passengers.

Doubtless the Minister would have had complaints about double bookings, and even triple bookings on country trains. Many people, who have been told by a railway official that a particular train has been booked out and they cannot be allotted a seat, have observed that train leaving with a number of carriages almost empty. That is one result of the Government's failing to introduce a computerized booking service. The Government has failed to take steps to effect a better utilization of railway carriages and staff, which would result in great savings in maintenance costs. The Government made great play about protecting from hoodlums passengers on late night trains. It said that those trains would be patrolled by railway police. Complaints are still being made about passengers being molested on late night trains. In 1976 the Government announced that it would abolish the toll over the Sydney Harbour Bridge in respect of vehicles carrying more than a driver and two passengers. That is another of the Government's broken promises. His Excellency the Governor said that the Government would increase coal production, and that new coal mines were being established at Birds Rock, near Lithgow, and at Mount Arthur South in the Hunter Valley. I should like to know how the Government proposes to move the coal produced at the Clarence colliery, near Lithgow, which will go into production this year.

Mr Crabtree: The coal will not go to Botany Bay.

Mr ARBLASTER: At present colliery proprietors are paying between $2 and $3 a ton as demurrage charges on coal—and that is dead money. The Minister has said that what he termed dirty coal trains will not be travelling on the Illawarra line. The same statement was made in the Earlwood by-election campaign by the Minister for Transport and the Premier. We have since been told that thirty-two coal trains a day will travel over that railway line. The Minister for Transport knows as well as I do that soon, on an average, one 24-ton coal truck will travel through the Wollongong area every 10 seconds. Although the coal mine at Clarence will soon go into production, the Government has not said how the coal from that mine will be moved.
How does the Government propose to move the coal that will soon be produced at the giant Mount Arthur North mine in the Hunter Valley? How will it transport that coal to the port for shipment overseas? Either the Government does not know or—in its usual arrogant fashion—it has decided not to tell people how that coal will be moved. The Government will probably keep people in the dark until it announces that so many coal trucks a day will be passing through a particular area. Obviously it will try to pass the buck. This Government is expert at two-timing and covering up. One has only to refer to the double standards of the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, who was quick off the mark when it came to taking action over Mr Ian Sinclair. The Attorney-General and Minister of Justice failed to tell the Premier or his Cabinet colleagues that an attempt had been made to blackmail him. This cover-up—crooked Government looks after bashers, and some councils will have to face the consequences of its actions. The Government engages in half-truths and misleading statements—and the people have woken up to it.

Mr CLEARY (Coogee) [4.18]: I congratulate the honourable member for Castlereagh who moved the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech, and the honourable member for Manly, who seconded that motion. The honourable member for Rockdale spoke about supporting the honourable member for Castlereagh in the by-election campaign. The honourable member for Castlereagh is an outstanding member. I recall spending a couple of days at Coonamble during that by-election campaign.

Mr Fisher: It was the first time the honourable member had ever been there.

Mr CLEARY: No, it was the third time I had visited that town, and I enjoyed my stay there. The calibre of the honourable member for Castlereagh was shown in the result of that by-election. I join other members in extending my congratulations to His Excellency the Governor. I shall not enter into the controversy mentioned by some Opposition members about the contents of the Governor's Speech. I merely wish the Governor and his good lady a happy and long retirement. Sir Roden Cutler has been an outstanding Governor. The honourable member for Mosman spoke about the Governor enjoying fishing. I know that he is a supporter of the University of Sydney rugby team. On many occasions the Governor enjoys watching a rugby match at Milner field, in the Eastwood electorate.

I propose to deal with a part of the Governor's Speech which related to the environment, and I shall deal particularly with an issue that concerns my electorate, and has been fairly well publicized in the local press and metropolitan newspapers. I refer to the proposed development of Glebe Gully. I find it necessary to devote most of my contribution to this debate to this issue because of a report in the Bondi Spectator on 24th July, under the heading of "Local Groups Outraged", and below a statement by the Minister for Planning and Environment about Glebe Gully. The report about the outrage of local groups has a subheading entitled "Infuriated" under which the following passage appears:

The State Government is not the only target of the resident groups. Randwick Council has also infuriated them by failing to provide any leadership and support on the issue. Had they done so, the Gully would have already been won.

The article continues:

Like Michael Cleary, MP for Coogee, they have consistently ignored lengthy petitions and a public rally attended by well over 1 000 people.
A little farther on, the article states:

Michael Cleary says there is no support for the preservation of Glebe Gully and has no doubt told this to the Minister, Mr Bedford.

A correction appeared in the following issue of the Bondi Spectator, which was published on Thursday, 31st July. That so-called correction was outrageous for it did not give the facts. It made defamatory and libellous remarks about me, and was a complete fabrication. Where the earlier edition reported that, "Michael Cleary says there is no support for the preservation of Glebe Gully and has no doubt told this to the Minister, Mr Bedford", in the subsequent edition the words "residents claim" had been inserted. The so-called correction made the passage read as follows:

Michael Cleary says there is no support for the preservation of Glebe Gully and, residents claim, has no doubt told this to the Minister, Mr Bedford.

I made my maiden speech in this House following my election on 20th July, 1974, at a by-election and after consideration of the result by the Court of Disputed Returns. In that speech I drew attention to the environment at Glebe Gully. Additionally, I spoke of development in the Randwick municipality. A few months later I found myself involved in controversy engendered by the issue of development at Glebe Gully. I asked the Minister for Planning and Environment, Sir John Fuller, to receive a deputation from myself and residents of Randwick on the controversy about the Randwick planning scheme and the concern of Randwick residents for the area which contained the gully. I was denied that privilege. Subsequently, I found that a political opponent of mine at that time had been granted the privilege. As a result, questions were asked in another place. Eventually I saw Sir John Fuller about the matter. That was when I started to become actively involved with the controversy. I have had to detail this history of my association with Glebe Gully because of remarks that were printed in the local newspapers.

When in 1976 the Labor Party came to Government I asked a number of questions about the Glebe Gully. I directed them to the Minister for Corrective Services who, at that time, represented in the House the Minister for Planning and Environment, the Hon D. P. Landa. A few weeks later the Minister for Corrective Services visited the Coogee electorate and stood with me and a number of people from resident action groups at Glebe Gully to view the situation. The main complaint was about the exhibited planning scheme and its relation to high rise development in that area. Subsequently, that Minister for Corrective Services, acting on behalf of the Minister for Planning and Environment, spoke on the matter in this House. In further support of the statement of my actions on the gully issue, I wish to refer to a few notations from my diary. From it I know that on 16th October, 1976, at 6.30 p.m. I was at the office of the Hon. D. P. Landa. On 22nd October, 1976, at 11.30 a.m. I was again with the Hon. D. P. Landa. On 8th December, 1976, at 11.00 a.m. I was at my office with the Hon. D. P. Landa and from there we went to the Glebe Gully. Fourteen different entries concern occasions on which I met the Hon. D. P. Landa between 16th October, 1976, and 9th June, 1980. On that date, the last time I led a deputation on this matter, I saw the present Minister for Planning and Environment.

Honourable members should hear a little of the history concerning the Glebe Gully. When the Randwick planning scheme was exhibited in 1971 the Glebe Gully area was zoned for various intensities of residential development. This zoning would have permitted high rise development. Six-storey and seven-storey buildings could have been built on the periphery of the Glebe Gully, leading to a possible population increase of 1,300 people. In 1976 a development proposal was submitted to Randwick council.
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At that time the council's business was conducted by an administrator. No aldermen were available to react favourably or unfavourably to the development proposal. When I heard of the proposal I spoke strongly against it, and asked questions on the subject in this House. The Minister for Corrective Services, who at that time represented in this House the Minister for Planning and Environment, the Hon. D. P. Landa, and the responsible Minister himself came to my electorate and heard objections. As a result a freeze was placed on that sort of development.

The Minister for Planning and Environment looked once more at the objections and in 1978, when the proposed scheme was gazetted, in conformity with the wishes of the objectors, and on my representation, he said he would protect the area known as the Glebe Gully by putting a building line around it which would prevent any development. He was referring to the bottom section of the gully where the creek is and where the supposed rain forest is to be found. He changed not only the Randwick planning scheme as exhibited, but also the zoning on the periphery of the gully to 2 (b1) and 2 (b2), which provides for two-storey home units and town houses. He also reduced the plot ratio from 0.8 to 0.6. That decision was subsequently gazetted.

Nothing further was heard from anyone on the matter until a firm by the name of Toga Limited submitted a development application in conformity with the zoning, seeking to construct a maximum of 212 units on the newly zoned land. I had no knowledge of that company. I had never met, or spoken with, any representative of it. When the proposal was made all hell broke loose. Out they came from the woodwork. By that stage local government was in the hands of aldermen, and aldermen have ears. Their ears were pounded. Unfortunately those aldermen were new and quite green. They would not bite the bullet; they would not make a stand. They procrastinated. They stood at public meetings and told people what they wanted to hear, instead of telling them the facts. Then those aldermen came to me and, behind the backs of their electors, said, "You are quite right, but we have to compromise somehow. The developer is justified in making the application, because the zoning is appropriate".

The people said they wanted the land for open space. I have tried to get the people as much open space as possible. The council did not want to pay for it. The objectors said, "Because the land was given to the Church of England for nothing, the Minister should step in and give it back to the people for nothing". What would be the situation if it had been their own home, for which they had been given land rights, and the Government subsequently wanted to take it back; would they be satisfied if they got nothing for that? I made investigations and tried to find out why these people, all of a sudden, were rallying as they did. When I speak of these people I refer really to a tight-knit section of the community. Some of those who were objecting to 2-storey building being permitted on one side of St Mark's Road, the gully side, were sitting on land zoned as 2 (c1) which permitted 3-storey development. I could not work that out. I suggested to one of my friends, an alderman, that he should move in council that, in view of the opposition of those people to any sort of development, their land should be submitted to the Minister for re-zoning as residential A land. But that did not occur; so I was unable to ascertain whether their attitude was sincere. One person connected with planning and environment, then a councillor at Randwick, said that perhaps it was a political issue rather than a matter of sincerity.

As I mentioned, there was a problem with the building line, which was the aspect that was taken to court. Investigations carried out on my behalf disclosed that possibly the developer could have developed the total land without applying for subdivision. Unfortunately, one section of the area that he purchased had on it six dwellings that he wished to sell separately. He applied for the subdivision of these six
properties, which had huge backyards, but found that because of the inclusion of the word "development" relating to the protected section of the gully he could not obtain a linen plan and thus could not finalize the sales of the homes. The problem with the gully has continued. As I mentioned, the number of units was reduced to 212. Again some members of the community were unhappy with that proposal. The land was offered for sale but no one was willing to buy it. Some wanted the land for nothing and to have it as open space.

Taking into account the zoning of the land, in 1979 the Planning and Environment Commission estimated the value of the total land at $3.3 million and the land below the building line at approximately $1.5 million. Some may contend that if the land could not be developed its value was nil. I remind them that whether it could be developed or not, the land was owned. Further deputations were held with the former Minister for Planning and Environment. Rallies were held about the land. I recall in 1978 attending an open rally about the gully area at which I endeavoured to explain the position. I said that I would do everything in my power to assist. At that stage the Minister had offered $350,000 to the council if it would make up the difference for the purchase price and buy the land. The council did not accept that offer, on the basis that it did not have the money. Further, I calculated that if council were to buy it, each ratepayer in the Randwick municipality would be required to pay an extra $30 or $40 by way of council rates. Again there was a stalemate with no solution.

Once more I went to the former Minister for Planning and Environment to endeavour to reach a compromise. I arranged for a meeting to take place at the Rockdale office of the Department of Planning and Environment, at which the developers were present. The Randwick council refused to attend. Nevertheless the meeting proceeded and after considerable haggling and effort the developers agreed to reduce from 212 to 94 the number of units to be built on the land. The developers agreed also to dedicate free of charge to the Randwick council 1.4 hectares of land, valued at $1.5 million, in the middle section of the Glebe Gully. Again the proposal was not accepted. The former Minister for Planning and Environment called a further meeting, presided over by a chairman, at the council chambers. Persons interested in this matter discussed it for three days but could not arrive at a solution to the problem. One group at the meeting wanted nothing; another group wanted all; yet another group did not want to pay any money; and a final group did not wish to compromise. Once more the Minister was consulted.

The problem of Glebe Gully started in 1971 and has continued ever since. Recently the Minister for Planning and Environment received deputations on the matter, including one from me and the executive of my Labor council. I was present at a meeting with Labor aldermen and candidates for the office of alderman where again the history of Glebe Gully was discussed. It became apparent that irrespective of how long the agony of repeated discussions continued some type of development would take place in the Glebe Gully area. We adopted the attitude that it would be preferable to have minimum development with maximum open space. As I said earlier, in 1971, 1973 and 1974, 1,300 people would have been accommodated in the area, had the former administrator approved the plan. Now the proposal is for 94 units with an average of three people in each unit, making a total of about 270 people.
Although those objecting to the proposal refer to it as high rise development, I classify it as low density housing consisting of two-storey units or townhouses. The proposed plot ratio density is 0.6. To give honourable members an idea of the significance of that density, a density of approximately 0.8 would represent 263 per cent of the land that could be built on. In other words, the buildings would be well apart, with ample air space. They would be constructed on the top section only of the gully, I have mentioned that there are already on the land houses and a grammar school. The proposal therefore was not something new to the area. Further, the council was to be given free of charge 1.4 hectares of land. I appreciate that I have given the House a long story but I consider that this matter should be explained fully in order to uphold the integrity of the Government. This whole matter has to be put in its full perspective and all the details given.

Mr Fisher: The Ministers have been most inconsistent, with one approving and one disapproving.

Mr CLEARY: Both Ministers approved.

Mr DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLEARY: I should like to clear up the matter raised by the honourable member for Upper Hunter. The former Minister for Planning and Environment agreed to 94 units and the dedication of 1.4 hectares of land. When the present Minister for Planning and Environment took office a further rehashing of the matter took place. The Minister considered a compromise. He gave all the parties concerned a good hearing. I have mentioned that the local Labor Party council, the Labor aldermen and candidates, and various action groups have seen the Minister. The Minister said that as the problem had continued for so long it should be resolved. As a result, we told the Minister that 80 units would be acceptable, with a dedication of land to the Randwick council. Further, a building application plan should be made available so that all concerned would know the types of townhouses and units proposed. I appreciated that the Minister required some negotiating power if the developer would not accept the proposal. One was faced with the prospect of court cases. The compromise decided upon by the Minister was that agreed to by the former Minister for Planning and Environment, namely 94 units, the dedication of 1.4 hectares of land and a plot ratio density of 0.6. Again this compromise was refused. This was the commencement of what I describe as the silly season, with some people contending that the area is a rain forest and that a rare species of lizard is found in the area. I say to those who found the lizard to be satisfied with the knowledge that it will have 1.4 hectares of land over which to roam. I wish to read to the House the contents of a letter from the National Parks and Wildlife Service addressed to the town clerk of the Randwick council. It is in these terms:

Re: Glebe Gully, Randwick


Our investigations have revealed that this area is not compatible with the criteria required for national park or nature reserve status. The gully contains some remnant native plant species but . . . over half the plants present are introduced weeds. It is interesting to note that such species as lilli pilly and woody pear still remain. The ability of the native species present to survive in the face of the weed invasion is questionable.
People with knowledge of rain forests and wildlife have visited the area and dispute some of the arguments put forward by people who are supposedly civic minded and responsible. I have with me a photostat copy of a handbill that was distributed in parts of my electorate. Parts of the document could be criminally libellous. It states:

Introducing Messrs Bedford, Labor Minister for Planning and Environment, Vidor, Stillone and Giblin, Toga Developers, these men have done a deal to destroy Randwick Glebe Gully. Of course they don't live in Randwick, they don't care about the lack of public open space in this populous suburb. Show them what you think about corrupt politicians and developers taking your open space to make a buck, to express your views on their actions.

The private address and private phone number of the Minister is given and the private addresses and private phone numbers of the other three gentlemen are listed. The document is not authorized by anyone. There is no stamp on it showing who printed the document. These are the so-called civic-minded, responsible people who have suddenly got some sections of the media to listen to them about a matter that has been going on for ten years. I know half the people who are involved now. They were not involved in the past. Those people have come into the area only in the past two years. They have been putting forward a case about the destruction of rain forest in Glebe Gully. Not one of them has approached me to ask me about my views on the matter or to ascertain what I have done to preserve Glebe Gully.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service says that there is an overabundance of introduced weeds in this precious gully. The public has been given $1.5 million worth of land. That has been given to the council without cost, for the lizards, the birds, the trees and the plants to exist in peace and harmony, with not one stone being turned and without any development at all. These people are getting more than they started with, yet they had the audacity to print what I quoted earlier. The local paper proprietors decided to print the article without checking the facts. If an issue has to be taken hold of, I will fight as hard as anyone else, for anything in which I believe. I have already shown that I fought hard on this matter. Two Ministers who have had responsibility for the planning and environment portfolio and a Minister acting on behalf of a Minister in the upper House have done everything in their power to reach a solution satisfactory to all concerned but, unfortunately, this little group will not let go.

People have telephoned me about Glebe Gully. Two old ladies rang me about it. When I told them what the Minister proposed, that is, ninety-four units plus the dedication, they asked how long that had been on. I told them it had been on for a month. They said, "Thank you very much". Many people have instilled in their minds high rise buildings and that the gully will be built on. Since 1976 it was never going to be built on. The people have no worries. The statement published in the local paper was a low form of journalism. It is not journalism at all; no journalists were sent out to check the facts. I shall read from a letter to the editor of the Bondi Spectator from the Minister for Planning and Environment:

In your article beaded "Local groups outraged" (24/7/80) you make the point that "the saga of Glebe Gully has gone on for so long that some people are tired". That is indeed true.

The prolonged nature of the haggling over the future of the area is one reason why the Government drew up the interim development order which overcomes the earlier conflicting planning provisions and permits the construction of 34 units on half the site to proceed.

That action, I believe, represented a practical and reasonable solution to a development problem which has caused a great deal of concern to the Government, Randwick Council and residents.
It is a compromise solution.

Your article claims that Mr Cleary said there was no support for the preservation of Glebe Gully.

He has at no time made such a statement to me.

Mr Cleary has been involved in negotiations over the future of the Gully since he was elected to the Legislative Assembly.

Indeed, without the efforts of Mr Cleary and others, no part of the Gully would have been preserved.

Now, in the terms of the compromise put to the Government and the developers half the site—more than 1.4 hectares of the most environmentally sensitive parts of the Gully—has been dedicated as public reserve.

The compromise has also ensured that the density of development is greatly reduced when compared with the original plans for more than 200 units to be built.

In the current plan, the blocks containing the 94 units will be no greater than three storeys high, including a parking level.

The compromise solution was put forward as a genuine attempt to meet residents' concerns and comply with the original intent of the Randwick Planning Scheme, which zoned the area for medium density development.

I have pursued that aspect sufficiently. I should like also to draw attention to health care for the aged in my electorate. As time has gone I shall not pursue the matter at length. I wish to refer to the Benevolent Society and the Eastern Suburbs Hospital. I support this organization so long as care for the aged is not selective and is open to all those who reside in the eastern suburbs.

Mr FISHER (Upper Hunter) [4,48]: I take this opportunity to join with other honourable members in congratulating the honourable member for Castlereagh on his speech in which he moved the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. I congratulate also the seconder of the motion, the honourable member for Manly. I listened attentively to the honourable member for Castlereagh. Obviously his speech was written for him by the Premier's massive publicity staff. Most of his speech was addressed to the fact that the honourable member for Castlereagh won a so-called Country Party seat. I do not know who was responsible for writing that; though it might be good writing, it is short on logic. The seat has been held by the Labor Party for almost ninety years, apart from a short period in the early thirties, I fail to see how the honourable member for Castlereagh can maintain that it is a Country Party seat. As most honourable members are aware, the seat boundaries have been changed radically and it is no longer Castlereagh but Burrendong, so honourable members should not expect to see the honourable member for Castlereagh in the House for too long.

I take the opportunity also to pay tribute to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Roden Cutler, and to wish him and Lady Cutler the very best in their retirement. I am sure that most honourable members, particularly those from country areas, recognize the untiring efforts of the Governor in travelling throughout New South Wales. He has been an outstanding soldier and diplomat and carries with him the mark of one of the greatest Governors to serve the State. He is the strongest rebuff to the many socialists who wish to see the demise of the vice-regal system and its replacement by a republican system. I deplore the fact that not only do socialists generally promote such a scheme but also that the Government has seen fit to use the Governor
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to denigrate actions of the federal Government. I do not think that in the history of New South Wales any other Governor has had such words put into his mouth. The Government deliberately distorted the speech for its own ends.

Before I address myself to the main point I wish to raise in the Address in Reply I shall first cover a point raised by the honourable member for Coogee. I was most interested to hear what the honourable member for Coogee, who represents the people in the Glebe Gully area, had to say about the rezoning of land in that area. It is an issue of concern. Many people in the community are concerned that changes made by successive Ministers for Planning and Environment are initiated apparently by approaches to them from developers and that, where those approaches are considerate, the Minister concerned has appeared to be willing to change the zoning of areas. It is not surprising that Randwick residents are concerned about the future of their area. The honourable member for Coogee admitted that he did not know anything about Toga Limited. Only recently Messrs Vidor, Stillone and Giblin, principals of Toga, approached the Minister for Planning and Environment. Somehow, they persuaded the Minister to change the zoning of the Glebe Gully area, which only a few years earlier a previous Minister had carefully zoned to exclude any development whatsoever. That is the history of this Government. It has done that in Glebe Gully; how much further is the Minister willing to go in changing the zoning of many important areas, particularly in Sydney?

Quite recently the Minister gave approval for a development in the Warringah shire. That enabled Anka Developments to build a drive-in theatre there, despite Warringah council’s strong disapproval of any development on the basis that there were already several drive-in theatres and shopping centres in the area. The Minister for Planning and Environment was willing to override the council and allow that development.

A well-known personality was able to obtain a change in zoning of his property in Rosemont Avenue, Woollahra, to permit it to be used as an embassy or consulate—much to the concern of the Opposition and the community. The Minister overruled the council and allowed that rezoning. One begins to wonder at the extent of access such people have to a Minister when a building, bought two or three years ago for $150,000 is rezoned and sold for more than $800,000. It is not surprising that the people in Randwick are beginning to wonder what the Government is all about.

I do not propose to spend any further time on matters dealt with by the honourable member for Coogee. I do wish to deal with a number of matters raised by His Excellency in his Speech. His Excellency, naturally enough, dealt with a considerable number of developments in the electorate of Upper Hunter. Many of them relate to the huge resources of coal in the region. It is significant that in his Address the Governor outlined a development programme entailing some $6,000 million over the next five years. Most of this development is possible because coal will be used to fire power stations, which will ultimately provide power to three major aluminium developments, the projected cost of which will be $1,500 million for New South Wales. Of course, those power stations will require vast quantities of water. Thus we have three interdependent developments, the aluminium smelters, coal mines, and the power-stations to provide electricity for them. In addition, dams will be required to provide water for the power stations as well as, to some extent, the coalmines.

A matter of utmost concern to many people in the region is that all of those developments will place great pressures on the environment. In a short time those pressures will be quite acute. I stress the need for the Government to ensure that the interests of all sectors in the Hunter region are observed and the need to protect against the potential, deleterious effects that industrialization will bring to the region.

Mr Fisher]
For many years the Upper Hunter district has been renowned for its beef cattle, dairying, cereal growing, many horse studs, and wine industry. I stress that the developments to take place must in no way jeopardize those industries, which have been established over many years. Perhaps the most significant of the industrial developments in the region, that of coalmines, has made it the major coal-producing electorate of the State.

Quite early in his Speech His Excellency mentioned joint ventures for the development of coal production at Mount Arthur North and Mount Arthur South in the Hunter Valley. Mount Arthur North is expected to be the largest coalmine in Australia. I have even heard it referred to in world terms. It will certainly dwarf the developments of Utah in Queensland, as well as other mining areas. Most of the coal from Mount Arthur North will fuel the Bayswater powerstation. In addition, eight further mines are at the committal stage, two are in their final stages of a feasibility study and six are in the preliminary studies stage. Those sixteen mines are in addition to seventeen mines currently operating in the area. I point out that most of those mines will be open-cut. Though the open-cut mine is generally regarded as safer and more agreeable for those involved in mining work, it also greatly increases the potential for atmospheric, noise and water pollution. On the other hand I stress that the open-cut mine has the ability to recover 95 per cent of available resources as opposed to, in many cases, a recoverable rate of less than 50 per cent gained from underground mines.

Most of the coal that is won from Ravensworth and Swamp Creek mines is used as fuel for Liddell power station. Ultimately some of it will be used in the Bayswater power station. Power stations emit large quantities of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, carcinogenic hydrocarbons, traces of lead, cadmium, and radio-active by-products of uranium and thorium. These are toxic substances which are potentially hazardous to humans as well as to plant and animal life. Therefore it is essential to minimize emissions by careful control by those engaged in the coal industry and by the State Pollution Control Commission. In North America such emissions from coal-fueled power stations are believed to be the cause of a phenomenon known as acid rain.

Acid rain occurs when power station emissions containing large quantities of sulphur rise in the atmosphere and, through temperature inversion, are held in a layer above the power station. With the development of Eraring power station, which is as large as Bayswater and larger than Liddell, and the operation of Munnorah and Vales Point power stations—making five major power stations in that region—there will be a possibility of large quantities of particulates and gaseous forms of sulphur dioxide being held in the atmosphere and a fall of rain causing the phenomenon known as acid rain, which falls as a strong solution of sulphuric acid. A recent statement by Dr Bridgeman of the University of Newcastle drew attention to this possibility. The State Pollution Control Commission must be aware of it and should ensure that no action is taken that will bring about that adverse effect.

Perhaps it is fortunate that coal generally found in the Hunter region has a lower sulphur content than that found in the United States of America and Canada. Nevertheless, the greatest caution should be exercised by the State Pollution Control Commission. Eraring power station will produce 2 640 megawatts and will need 6 million tonnes of coal a year, some of which will be mined by the open-cut method in the Lake Macquarie area. The open-cut method of mining is of considerable concern to many residents of the area. Bayswater power station, which is under construction, will require 3 million tonnes of coal a year by 1986 and 6 million tonnes by 1989.
The high stacks that are usually associated with power stations are generally taken to be adequate to disseminate sulphur dioxide and fluoride emissions. It is significant that some of the fluoride from Liddell is alleged to have been traced to the vineyards of the lower Hunter regions of Pokolbin and Cessnock. I shall deal a little later in my remarks with a recent publication by the State Pollution Control Commission which causes me great concern. The publication deals with pollution control in the Hunter Valley, with particular reference to aluminium smelters. The commission admits that it has little or no knowledge of the meteorology of the area and consequently concentration of emissions from power stations will cause concern. Liddell power station uses electrostatic precipitators to remove particulates and ash from the smoke plumes, I understand that this may need to be modified. It is significant that the Electricity Commission acknowledges that that method of trapping ash is inferior to the fabric bag filter which is used on aluminium smelters and power stations.

In addition to the amount of coal that is required and will be required for power stations and energy production in this State, huge quantities are required for export. I take this opportunity to draw attention to the need for the development of a third coal loader in the Newcastle-Hunter region. Great disruption is being caused in the outer and southern areas of the Sydney metropolitan district by the Government's refusal to build a coal loader at Botany Bay. Huge quantities of coal must be hauled by train through the outer suburbs of Sydney, causing a great deal more disruption and concern to the residents than would a coal loader at Botany Bay. As well, it adds enormously to the cost of the coal at the point of export. The Government has procrastinated for some time over the development of a third coal loader. At present there is a dispute between many of the trade unions involved on whether the loader should be built and operated by a government instrumentality or by private enterprise. This State's second major coal loader is operated by Port Waratah Coal Services in Newcastle. It was built and is operated by private enterprise. Without it the export of coal from the Hunter region would be impossible.

I have spoken of the pollution from power stations in the Hunter region which is causing concern to many residents. I should mention also pollution that will occur from mines. It was dealt with in the State Pollution Control Commission special report which was released only a couple of weeks ago. I found the report to be deficient. It was premature in its ready acceptance that these developments may take place, despite its admission that its knowledge is insufficient. Naturally, open-cut coal mines create a great deal of dust, though it can be controlled by watering. They also generate large amounts of noise pollution by blasting and other activities. Perhaps of more importance than that is potential water pollution, particularly of ground water and underground streams. Ground water is important to towns like Singleton, Muswellbrook and Denman which rely on it for their water supply. It provides considerable quantities of water to coalmines and, of course, for irrigation. With the development of coalmines comes the risk of contamination of underground water by water percolating down through overburden and increasing the salinity and acidity of river systems. Without the most careful disposal techniques and regeneration of mined areas, there would be indefinite leaching of overburden and soil from disposal areas. Inevitably there will be contaminated water runoff from coal stockpiles and the haulage roads when water is used to minimize air pollution.

The building of aluminium smelters is perhaps the most controversial issue in the Hunter region. The Government has given tentative approval for the construction of two more smelters in the area and the expansion of the existing Alcan smelter at Kurri Kurri. As the member for the area, I certainly do not discourage the promised development. I shall, however, do a great deal to counter the disinvestment and the
loss of jobs in other industries elsewhere in the State and the nation. Perhaps the

greatest single example of the bungling of the State Government is the closing of the

Pagewood Ford works.

Mr Whelan: Ford? It is General Motors-Holden's at Pagewood.

Mr Fisher: Yes, General Motors-Holden's. I must admit that that lapse was

because a second-hand Ford car dealer, the Minister for Industrial Development and

Minister for Decentralisation, is at the table. I thought it strange that the Government

would send someone over to Detroit who was used to handling rust buckets and would

not know much about General Motors vehicles. I had a slight mental aberration.

Despite modern technology, I wonder whether there is too much development too

quickly in the small Hunter Valley area. Perhaps that is the reason for the concern

expressed by most of the people in that area. It is significant that Alcan's Kurri Kurri

smelter provides jobs for about 500 people. The expansion of that plant will result in

the employment there of 800 people by 1982. The proposed Alumax-BHP-Mitsui

smelter at Lochinvar or Locksley, which is near Kurri Kurri, will create a further

2,000 jobs in the construction period and between 900 and 1,000 permanent jobs.

In addition, the Pechiney-CSR smelter at Tomago will create 1,500 jobs in the con-

struction phase and 800 permanent positions. This is a total of 4,000 jobs when under

construction and 2,600 on completion—the latter being twice the number of jobs

lost at the closure of General Motors-Holden's Pagewood plant. These are valued jobs

for skilled tradesmen, and the $1.5 billion capital investment will create other jobs in

supporting service industries. The Hunter Development Board has established that at the

peak of development in 1983 up to 15,000 new jobs will be created, but there will be a

shortage of 2,780 skilled tradesmen in the area.

The Minister for Education said that the number of apprentices at Muswell-

brook is increasing. However, the secretary of the Newcastle Trades Hall Council has

said that no serious attempts were being made to train people in the region to fill

skilled jobs, and the companies would have to seek skilled migrant labour from overseas.

For example, when the Liddell power station attempted to recruit forty more appren-
tices to train for the operation of Bayswater power station, only twenty-two of about

eighty applicants were able to pass the basic mathematics test at year 10 level.

I propose to deal with the construction of aluminium smelters at an appropriate

stage by moving a private member's motion. The many owners of vineyards and their

1,500 to 2,000 employees are concerned about the damage that will result from the

construction of three aluminium smelters close to the vineyards. This subject should be
dealt with at much greater length by the House. As I mentioned earlier, the State

Pollution Control Commission admits in its report that it has insufficient knowledge and

that there are unknown aspects of the meteorology of the valley. The possible emerg-
ence of additives and the synergistic effects of sulphur dioxide, combined with other
pollutants, may require the use of scrubbers, et cetera. It says also that the meteoro-
logical and other scientific knowledge of fluoride emission is inadequate.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: Order! The honourable member has exhausted his
time.

Mr Whelan (Ashfield) [5.18]: I am delighted to speak in the debate following
the Governor's Speech. I join with members on the Government side in congratulat-
ing in unambiguous terms the honourable member for Castlereagh on his maiden
speech. It was a major contribution to this Parliament. I am sure that he will represent
the constituents of Castlereagh, and the new seat of Burrendong after the next State
election, as well as did his predecessor, the Hon. J. B. Renshaw. Similar remarks
apply to the honourable member for Manly, who I am sure will represent that electorate
for many years.
The Governor outlined eleven instances in which the federal Government has failed the State Government and the citizens of New South Wales, including unemployment, the closure of the General Motors-Holden's Pagewood plant, capital works cutbacks, housing, roads, and the harsh treatment meted out to the disabled in the federal Government's health cutbacks. I have named only a few of the savage federal Government cutbacks that have beset the people of this State. The third paragraph of the Governor's Speech is quite telling. He said:

The economic policies of the Federal Government, which have produced the highest level of unemployment in Australia for more than forty years, continue to impede my Government in its efforts to carry out the task entrusted to it by the people of New South Wales.

I share that concern because as we enter the 1980's we face rising unemployment, with little hope that the federal Government will relieve the plight of the young or the old or people in the rural sector who are unemployed and desperately in need of employment. Yet, on the day after the Governor's Speech the Prime Minister said on a Sydney radio programme:

The Government made a disgraceful use of a Governor's position.

He said also:

I doubt that the speech would have taken the form it did had the Premier, Mr Wran, been fit enough to lead the party. Yesterday's speech was a pretty disgraceful one and I think people can see through that. I don't know of any other occasion in Australia's history when a State Government has done that.

Those comments are typical of the magniloquence of the Prime Minister. He was a member of federal Parliament in 1974 when this State had a Liberal-Country party Government. At that time the same Governor said:

My Ministers are deeply concerned, however, at the difficulties they now face in seeking to discharge their responsibilities to the electors of this State. This is due not only to the Commonwealth Government's failure to return adequate funds to the State, but also to its requirement that such funds as it does return, and even revenue raised by the State Government itself, be expended in the direction of Commonwealth priorities and in furtherance of its policies to an ever-increasing extent. The result of this is that the development of basic services for which my Government is responsible, and implementation of its own policies which have been endorsed by the electors of this State, are seriously curtailed because of lack of funds.

It is time the Prime Minister considered seriously the positions held by the Governor and the Governor-General. I need not remind honourable members of this House of the Prime Minister's view of the position of the Governor-General in 1975. It is cant—hypocrisy—for the Prime Minister to suggest that the State Government is using other than the most advantageous means of improving the lot of the unemployed by objecting vehemently to the closure of General Motors-Holden's Pagewood plant and attacking the federal Government for its savage cutbacks in capital funds for housing.

The Prime Minister did not allude to the accuracy of the claim and gave no indication that he would correct the financial imbalance that has beset the State. He has never said that he is willing to come to grips with the problems that confront the States. When the Acting Premier and the Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Assistant Treasurer went to Canberra the Liberal and Labor States combined to reject once and for all the concept of federalism dreamed up by the
federal Government in 1975, which has never been realized. All of the States decided
to discard that furphy, raised by the federal Liberal-Country party Government.
In the next federal budget no redress is to be given to the financial plight and needs
of this State. Again New South Wales will be prejudiced and subjected to gross
financial discrimination. The cutbacks in funding for housing and roadworks are most
savage and portray the approach of the negative, totally inactive, policy-bankrupt
Federal Government.

Mr Caterson: This State has never been better off.

Mr WHELAN: The honourable member for The Hills might not be a bad
councillor, but he is out of touch with the federal sphere. Every year is critical for
road building and replacement and the provision of safety features. Since 1976 this
State has suffered because the federal Government has neglected its responsibility and
purposely reduced Commonwealth grants to the State. The Department of Main
Roads is languishing as a result of the financial disaster that besets it because of the
inadequacy of funds for expansion, safety or repair programmes. The cutback in
funding for the State's roadworks programme is one of the most serious that has
taken place. Its effect will be felt by the nation for the next two or three generations.
Notwithstanding any windfalls from oil parity, no national government would be
able to rectify the problems that now beset the State.

My concern is shared by many others in the community. In his report of
November 1978 the Commissioner for Main Roads spoke with concern of the difficulty
in maintaining the asset. The road network of the State is a national asset, as well as
being a State one. Communication is essential. Communities and the livelihood of
individuals are affected by neglect of the State's roads. The State Government must
object most strenuously to ensure that it receives sufficient financial assistance to
complete adequate roadworks in the State. In his report the commissioner said:

I wish . . . to advance a sobering thought relating to the increasing
difficulty of maintaining the asset of our older roads and bridges. Obviously,
with the passage of time, considerably more lengths of road throughout the
State will reach the stage of requiring either major reconstruction or an
everincreasing investment in maintenance costs—and many more bridges will
require either replacement or much more money spent than at present on
keeping them safe and serviceable. With continuing inflation having a drastic
and detrimental impact on the real value of the finance available for road
and bridge works, it is imperative that increased funds be found to maintain
the asset which has been established for the community over past years.

He then made a plea which indicated a critical reduction in the relative value of
funds allocated for road construction. That plea was made without specific reference
to the Federal Government. The Federal Government is continuing to allocate to the
States grants of the same value as those that it made in the past three or four years.
For the past four years the federal grants to the States have been of the order of
$224 million. No increase has been made, even taking into account the consumer
price index. The consumer price index and road construction costs are two distinct
financial criteria. Since 1974 the consumer price index has increased by 83 per cent,
but road construction costs have increased by almost 110 per cent. Notwithstanding
the increase in the cost of material and other factors connected with road construction,
the Federal Government has not made available additional funds for the State. Conse-
sequently, less money has been available, fewer roads have been constructed, fewer
repairs carried out and fewer bridges constructed.
The Commonwealth Government has failed lamentably to give the State any proportion of increased revenue from fuel taxes. In 1950 the States were given 60 per cent of the fuel tax. The amount returned to the States is now limited to 50 per cent of the fuel tax revenue. The increasing rate of inflation has led to a critical shortage of funds for roadworks. Funding for the Department of Main Roads has decreased 18 per cent, or $58 million. In 1976–77 Commonwealth grants were $17.6 million. During that year the rate of inflation was 12 per cent. The blame rests squarely with the federal Government for reducing from 60 per cent to 50 per cent the ratio of fuel tax revenue returned to the States.

I commend to honourable members a reading of the reports of the Commissioner for Main Roads for 1978 and 1979. I assume that in 1980 the commissioner will make the same harrowing plea that unless substantial funds are made available for roadworks in the rural, urban and local sectors, State governments and local councils will face a deleterious situation created by a breakdown in communications and will be called upon to meet a billion dollar bill to try to improve the State's road system. The distressing need for adequate funds and for real value grants cannot be overemphasized. The welfare of the community cannot best be served by narrow, poorly surfaced, incorrectly located, inadequately aligned, or otherwise substandard and outdated roads and bridges. That applies particularly in country areas. Surely that is not all that can be aspired to in 1980. It will cost the community dearly in transport costs and in unnecessary accidents.

Surely every honourable member is concerned about the number of road accidents and wants them reduced, with a consequent reduction of personal suffering and frightful injuries. I note that the honourable member for The Hills is listening intently. I assume he was at a recent deputation of people from his electorate—it included my brother John—asking the Government to install traffic signals to enable children to cross a particular road in safety. I know the honourable member is taking this matter up.

Mr Caterson: That electorate has a good member.

Mr WHELAN: He should really direct his efforts to the federal Government and ask it to increase funding to the State for road purposes. If the federal Government were to do that, the children of Baulkham Hills would be able to cross that road under the protection of traffic signals as would school children in Croydon Park in my electorate be able to cross the roads near their schools. These children have been promised traffic signals at Georges River Road and Milton Street and at Frederick Street and the Hume Highway. They will get them because they too have a good member. But traffic signals will not be provided at countless places on the roads of this State. Nor will those roads be properly lit. As a result, tragically, they will continue to be a potential cause of loss of life of children and adults. The blame for this situation lies fairly and squarely on the federal Government for its cutbacks in road funding. If additional funds were available to the New South Wales Government it could implement road safety programmes that include road rebuilding, the realignment of roads and the installation of traffic signals as well as the removal of old wooden bridges in country areas and the construction of new bridges in outlying suburbs of Sydney. These are all areas where money is needed and I say that the community will suffer great loss in the future because New South Wales has been severely prejudiced by the federal Government cutback in funding.

I have reminded honourable members that the Commissioner for Main Roads has said there has been a savage cutback in funding for roadworks and we have been prejudicially affected. The July issue of the Local Government Gazette, the official organ of the Local Government and Shires Association of this State, calls upon the
federal Government to grant to local councils and to the State Government increased funding to enable local councils to get on with the job of repairing roads. I understand that all honourable members have received a submission from the National Roads and Motorists Association on this topic. The association forwarded a copy to me, pleasing with me to contact the Premier and outline what the NRMA wants for roads. In essence it is that additional funds be made available for the States and for local government for roadbuilding.

The press reported the Premier at the Premiers' conference pleading with the Commonwealth to increase funding for roads. So far I have referred to the Commissioner for Main Roads, the Local Government and Shires Association, the NRMA, the Government and the Premier. Where has the Government failed? It has not failed at all. As I have said, the failure rests with the federal Government, which has not allocated one cent of the additional moneys it has been acquiring from its world oil parity pricing policy or its excessive fuel taxes. As well it is now compelling the State to impose excessive registration charges.

In the past couple of months I have read two interesting but conflicting views, one expressed by the Minister for Consumer Affairs, representing the Government, and the other by the honourable member for Oxley. The Minister for Consumer Affairs said that the Government would not increase registration fees until the federal Government gave the State a fair share of the crude oil levy cake. On the other hand, the honourable member for Oxley said the first thing the Opposition parties would do when returned to government would be to increase registration charges.

Mr Caterson: He was wrongly reported. He said so.

Mr Whelan: That is what he said. He should have gone to Canberra, talked to his Country Party colleagues in the federal Government and asked them to give to this State a fair share of the fuel taxes. So far he has sold out the people of New South Wales on behalf of his Country Party colleagues. The federal Minister for Transport, the Hon. R. J. D. Hunt, when addressing a Country Party meeting claimed he was well acquainted with local government. He claimed he understood the problems of local councils, especially in relation to roads, and he intended to give them a brand new deal. He has already reneged on that promise. He said he would give local government all the benefits of his twelve years of experience as a councillor on the Boomi Shire council. I am sure the 2 500 people who live in the Boomi Shire must be dissatisfied that their federal representative, their former local councillor, has turned his back on them. He said there would be more money for urban local roads and rural roads, but the first time he had an opportunity of doing something constructive for country councils when his Government had the money, he reneged on his promise.

As I have said, the federal Government has failed to allocate a fair share of available funds to the State, despite needs and the increased number of cars and heavy vehicles on the roads. In fact the Commonwealth has reduced road grants in real terms from $247 million in 1974–75 to $196 million in 1980–81. So, over six years this State has gone back $51 million in road grants. Though in 1980–81 the Commonwealth will receive $1,400 million from New South Wales motorists by way of fuel taxes, it will return a paltry $196 million or 14 per cent to this State. But I do not wish to deal only with fuel taxes. The inadequacy of the grant becomes apparent when one considers figures released by the Commonwealth Bureau of Transport Economics. The bureau reports that New South Wales has 38 per cent of the nation's warranted road needs, but the Commonwealth gives this State only 32 per cent in grants. If one equates the grant to motor vehicle registrations, one finds that in 1974–75 the figure was $113 a vehicle and in 1980–81 it will be $73—a reduction of about $40 in six years.
The situation becomes even more alarming when one considers the 5-year programme starting this year that the federal Government has now concocted. The increase in road grants to the States, leaving aside inflation, is to be 11 per cent this financial year, but when one takes out inflation there will be no real gain. In 1981–82 the increase in grants will be only 9 per cent, in 1982–83, 7 per cent, and at the end of the grants in 1984–85 it will be 6 per cent. These figures are the Commonwealth's estimate of inflation for the next five years. The most significant thing about these inflationary figures is that the Commonwealth is not willing to adjust its formula according to the inflation rate. The Commonwealth has given the States a hopeless, hollow promise that they will be given adequate money for local roads and other State roads. Regrettably the Government has had to increase registration charges. Though these cutbacks in federal funding have occurred and the motorist has been hit savagely, the level of funding by the State Government for roads has increased over the past six years by 40 per cent. The Government will continue to set aside considerable funds for roads out of its limited resources, it is quite clear that it will not be able to do anything of a major nature until the Commonwealth accepts its true share of responsibility.

The level of funding provided for New South Wales, at $196.4 million, is unsatisfactory. Not only does the New South Wales Government believe it to be unsatisfactory; so do all the State governments of Australia. They have all decried the federal Government for its failure to reward the States with proper funds. The federal Minister for Transport said he will undertake to review the provisions of the Australian Transport Advisory Council report and amend the Act, perhaps in June 1981.

In 1980–81 New South Wales will spend almost $500 million on main roads, of which the federal Government will provide a measly 31 per cent. In 1974–75 the federal Government's contribution was 45 per cent. Strange as it may seem, notwithstanding the inflationary spiral, the reduction to 31 per cent represents a decline of 14 per cent over a 6-year period.

The federal Government claims it is maintaining total road grants in real terms, but in fact since 1974–75 it has reduced them by almost 20 per cent. In the federal Government's new proposal the grant for national highways represents 48 per cent of the total federal grant for roads, but in New South Wales these roads represent only about 4 per cent of the total classified road system. Federal Government assistance for roadworks is in the order of $70,000 a kilometre for national highways. Compare that sum with a mere $780 a kilometre for rural arterial roads. I cannot understand why members of the Country Party have not been screaming in this House about that matter and looking after the interests of their constituents who have been far more seriously prejudiced than the people of the urban areas.

Since the federal Government assumed responsibility for funding national highways in 1974–75, there has been a systematic and progressive cut-back in grants for arterial roadworks, particularly in the urban areas of Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong, mainly because of the refusal of the federal Government to inject more funds into this project. For 1980–81 the grant for arterial roads is $59 million or about half in real terms of the grant received in 1974–75. This reduction has ignored the fact that warranted road needs in this State are increasing at a little less than 6 per cent a year. It is clear that only the federal Government has the capacity to lift the level of funding for roads. Neither the New South Wales Government nor any other State government has the capacity to do so.
The federal Government has attempted to transfer its responsibility for the funding of roads back to the States, but that move as part of the so-called federalism was rejected by the State Premiers. New South Wales is not in a position to accept additional financial responsibility. In contrast, the Commonwealth Government has been able to expand its revenue, particularly from the poor unfortunate motorist. This year the federal Government will raise $2,500 million from the crude oil levy, in addition to $1,000 million it will raise from fuel excise. Thus, $3,500 million raised from fuel taxes will be used by the federal Government to help it balance its budget. Parliamentary reporter Laurie Oakes claims that in this financial year the federal Government will have a deficit of $1.5 million. I pose the question that if it had not been for the crude oil levy, and the discovery about a decade ago of an oilfield by BHP and Esso Australia Limited off the coastline of Victoria, this nation would be bankrupt. Instead, it has been kept financially afloat. It is beyond comprehension that the federal Government should impose such high taxes on motorists, but return only $1 in $7 to improve travelling conditions on roads and to assist in the reduction of motoring costs when the road needs are so great.

In 1980-81 the $196 million to be collected from the federal Government represents only 14 per cent of the $1,400 million that the federal Government will collect in fuel tax from the motorists of New South Wales. Solutions to the problems I have mentioned must be found. The current level of federal road funding to New South Wales does not fulfil the community's road needs. This State is unable to compensate for the federal Government's declining role in road financing. Only the federal Government has the capacity to finance the high cost of roadworks. The federal Government has a moral responsibility to allocate the States with adequate funds for roads. The only way the road needs of Australians can be met is for the federal Government to change its policy and share its funding responsibilities with State governments and local government. For many years local government has been promised a fair deal.

In 1979 at the Premiers' conference much was said about the need for special funds to be set aside to finance the infrastructure of major developmental projects coming on stream. The federal Government made some magnificent gestures including a claim that it would help with the funding of roads in 1980-81 and with the development of the Hunter Valley as referred to by His Excellency in his Speech, and many other areas in the State. The federal Government has allocated more than $6 million to enable this State to get on with the almost $10,000 million worth of proposed development that was outlined in the Governor's Speech.

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

[Mr Deputy-Speaker left the chair at 5.48 p.m. The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.]

Mr BARRACLOUGH (Bligh) [7.30]: I join other honourable members in congratulating the honourable member for Castlereagh upon his election to this House. The honourable member made an excellent maiden speech in this debate. I wish him well, and I hope that during his time here he makes a number of friends on both sides of the Chamber. I join other honourable members in expressing my regret at hearing His Excellency the Governor announce his impending retirement. Sir Roden Cutler served this nation with great courage, as a result of which he lost a leg and won the Victoria Cross, our highest military award. During the twelve years I have been a member of this Parliament I have had a great deal to do with the Governor, and I take this opportunity of wishing him and Lady Cutler and their family a long and happy retirement. I hope he lives for many years. I take the opportunity of congratulating also Mr Ian Sinclair and his family upon the jury's verdict that he was innocent on all counts in the proceedings taken against him.
Earlier this year the Attorney-General and Minister of Justice and some of his colleagues conducted what I regarded as a kangaroo court attack upon Ian Sinclair. All the members involved in that attack should hang their heads in shame. I hope that some of them write to Mr Sinclair and apologize for that attack, which was made upon a man who has served this nation as a parliamentarian with great honour and distinction. The citizens of New South Wales will be interested to learn the cost of those court proceedings, the inquiry that preceded them, and the fee paid to Mr Finnane who conducted that inquiry. Incidentally, I understand that Mr Finnane is a member of the Australian Labor Party. The attacks mounted upon Mr Sinclair certainly brought no credit to the Government.

A number of my colleagues on this side of the House have referred to the Governor's Speech. As Opposition spokesman on sport, recreational and cultural activities, I was interested in the Government's programme in those areas. The Governor, in his Speech, said that financial grants to sport will be continued. I find it hard to believe that the Government will honour that promise. The Minister for Sport and Recreation, Minister for Tourism and Assistant Treasurer must worry when he reads the statistics dealing with financial assistance to sport. The Government has adopted a policy of extending gambling activities throughout this State. New South Wales is now known as the premier gambling State of Australia. Lotto, the latest gambling game, is the subject of a great number of newspaper advertisements that tell people about the millions of dollars they can win. That type of advertisement has had a serious effect on the revenue from soccer pools. When I was the responsible Minister, the former Government led by Premier Lewis, introduced soccer pools to assist sporting organizations throughout New South Wales.

Opposition members are greatly concerned that, in the financial years 1979–80 and 1980–81, grants to sport and recreation from soccer pools have been reduced from $8.4 million to $2.1 million. Lotto has brought in between $16 million and $24 million while revenue from soccer pools, which totalled $8.4 million in 1978–79, has been reduced to $2.1 million a year. I wonder whether the Government was being honest with the Governor when it included in his Speech a statement that financial grants to sport and recreation would be continued. Although those grants will be continued, they will be $6.3 million less than last year.

I shall deal now with some persons the Government has ignored. I refer to women in sport. With changing social values, more emphasis on leisure time, a greater number of work, family, and social problems such as the abuse of analgesics and increased alcoholism, the importance of encouraging women to become involved in sport is obvious. With the establishment of the New South Wales women's co-ordinating unit within the Premier's Department, the Anti-Discrimination Board, and with numerous seminars on women in sport, it can be taken for granted that before the next State election the Liberal and Country parties will include in their policies some of the recommendations made to the Government.

Though people may vary in their interests in high-performance sport or merely in leisure activity there is agreement about the general social ideal of ensuring that all people, regardless of age, sex, class, race or ability, have equal opportunities to pursue the interest of their own choosing to a desired level of participation. To the women of this State that does not mean identical opportunity; it means equal and appropriate opportunity. When dealing with participation in sport, it should be acknowledged that men have a much higher rate of participation and more expressed interest in sport. However, the participation rates of women, particularly at the local level, have increased remarkably in recent years.
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I shall now examine some figures on the degree of participation by women in some sporting activities. Netball has 230,000 registered players, and lawn bowls caters for a comparable number of participants. Other sports, such as volleyball, squash and basketball, are able to demonstrate a similar rapid growth rate. Women are now participating in a far greater variety of sports. Those sports include power lifting, marathon running, sailing, martial arts, horse riding and even soccer. Australian representative women’s soccer teams make tours overseas. In recent years we have seen a marked improvement in women’s sporting achievements in speed events and endurance tests. Notwithstanding the increase in women’s participation and their better performance in sport, the same cannot be said about the situation at the administrative and coaching level.

Though governments—at all levels—do not take the responsibility for the management of sporting organizations, they are interested in equity and they must recognize that women are far from equally represented in the decision-making process. It is important that women have the right to produce the changes that will allow for that equality of opportunity in sport. It is important also that the Department of Sport and Recreation initiate further research into the social, psychological and physiological needs of women in all areas of sport. The department must support the concept of regional sports councils as a mechanism for achieving a more equitable allocation of community resources for women’s sports. The Opposition recommends that women be represented proportionally on such councils.

The Opposition will review the State allocation of funds with a view to achieving a just distribution of available resources to women’s sports and recreational activities. We will appoint a woman representative on the State sport grants committee and we will take immediate steps to see that any new recreational facilities make provision for child minding centres. The Liberal–Country party will give women a better deal in sport and recreational facilities. In education the Opposition will ensure that boys and girls have equal course options, are encouraged to learn basic skills and, so far as possible, share sporting facilities. The Opposition will ensure that the Department of Education regulations are amended to make specific reference to the need to ensure equality of boys and girls in physical education and choice of sports, with specialist teachers in physical education to be appointed as resource teachers at all primary schools. We will encourage business houses to bear in mind the benefits of sports sponsorship of women’s events. It must be remembered, especially, that the hand that signs the cheques also rocks the cradle. It is amazing that business houses have not given greater support to women’s sports and have not taken the opportunity of encouraging women’s sporting and recreational organizations who have presented their cases for sponsorship from business houses.

When I commenced my address I referred to the extent of gambling in New South Wales. A recent report reveals that business houses, small businesses and individuals have suffered more bankruptcies in the past two years than ever before. One needs only to listen to people like Mr John Walton of Walton’s Stores, and Mick Grace of Grace Bros., to learn that sales in retail stores have fallen considerably within the past year or two. They seem to have fallen since the introduction of lotto. In New South Wales we have lotteries, on-course betting, off-course betting, and poker machines. I am not critical of poker machines and I give credit to the Labor Party for their introduction. Money from poker machines has provided New South Wales with some of the best clubs in Australia. Soccer pools were introduced and I have already spoken of that. The recent introduction of lotto, however, has had a serious effect on the lives of average Australians. The Government must be concerned for the fall in retail sales and for the number of people facing bankruptcy.
I congratulate the honourable member for Mosman on his excellent speech in this House, in which he exposed this Government's failures within the transport field. The honourable member also referred to starting-price bookmaking. My advice is that starting-price bookmaking is roaring ahead. Mr Beck—Raider Beck, as the Government called him—has been taken off the job. In my mind there is no doubt that starting-price bookmaking in this State, under this Government, has taken a great deal of money from off-course and on-course betting. I am sure that the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy must share my concern that we have become the premier gambling State of Australia. Gambling brings tremendous pressures to bear upon women in our society who have to manage a family budget. A budget for Australia is being brought before the federal Parliament tonight and that will be an excellent one. But it is the women of New South Wales who have to balance a family budget daily and weekly. Because of the extension of gambling in New South Wales tremendous hardship is being caused to the citizens of this State.

The honourable member for Coogee and the honourable member for Upper Hunter referred to the Glebe Gully at Randwick. I did not intend to refer to the gully but I feel constrained to reply to the remarks by the honourable member for Coogee. There is a belief, held with a great deal of persistence in many sections of our community, that the New South Wales Government, with its Ministry of Planning and Environment, lacks significant regard for the preservation of the Randwick rain forest gully. That is completely true. Sufficient reports of the importance of that gully have been received. The honourable member for Coogee did not make one reference in his address to the number of high rise units already built, surrounding that gully. I was rather saddened to hear the honourable member for Coogee make an attack upon those people of all walks of life and from all political parties who have fought for its preservation. One of the stronger critics of this Government's action concerning the Glebe Gully has been the Labor candidate in the forthcoming elections for Randwick council.

The Glebe Gully at Randwick is an area that still could be preserved, still could be purchased by government authorities and retained for the use of future generations. It is a fallacy for the Government to argue that it does not have funds sufficient to purchase the gully because it has funds available to purchase other areas of land. Recently, millions were spent on resuming an area in Balmain to the great advantage of the people of that area. The Government has been heard to say that it wants to preserve open space areas in the western suburbs. No doubt the Government could have taken some action. It has been my advice that those seeking to preserve the Glebe Gully sent a telegram on one occasion to the Premier of this State but that telegram was never acknowledged.

Mr Maher: The Premier has been ill and in hospital for some time.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: The honourable member should not have interjected. That telegram was sent to the Premier last year and at that time the Premier was not in hospital. The demand for the preservation of the Glebe Gully at Randwick will continue. Those concerned for its preservation will remember, certainly, that the Government of this State, through its Ministry of Planning and Environment, through the Minister for Planning and Environment, Mr Bedford, and the honourable member for Coogee, rejected out of hand the reasonable request that the subject land should be rezoned and kept for all times as an open space area, for all the people—not just for the people of Randwick but for all the people of this State.

Mr Speaker, you and I came into this Chamber in 1968. One of the undertakings I gave, when coming here, was to fight for the preservation of Paddington. Paddington was preserved. What did the Government of the day do? The Minister
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for Roads at that time, Mr Morton, set up an inquiry, under the distinguished late Mr Walter Bunning, into the preservation of Paddington. Paddington was preserved. Why cannot the present Government take similar action with the Glebe Gully? I thought the honourable member for Coogee gave a good resume of what had taken place about the gully, and efforts made to preserve it, but why should not there be an inquiry? The honourable member for Coogee did not mention that there had been court actions. The matter was taken to the Supreme Court and, in the Court of Appeal, Hutley, J.A., Samuels, J.A., and Mahoney, J.A. on 26th February, 1980, in a unanimous decision, stated that development should not take place in this area. The honourable member for Coogee made no mention of that.

In a democracy such as ours the Government must make decisions. Sometimes those decisions are right, sometimes those decisions are wrong. But, when there is a court action and when this Government takes steps to over-ride the judgement of that court, a great deal is wrong and democracy is under attack. Parliament did not sit between 4th April and 12th August, 1980. Four and a half months passed in which the Opposition of the State of New South Wales had no chance to attack the Government. Today we have heard the Leader of the Opposition say that the Attorney-General knew, in May, that he was being accused of something he said he had not done. Yet, not a word was said. It was in May that I learned his ministerial car had been stolen. Within the Randwick district people live who come from all walks of life, people who support the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and perhaps the Australian Democrats, and others who have no political beliefs at all. A judgment was given in the Court of Appeal concerning the preservation of land within that same district but what was the attitude of this Government? The Government tore up that court decision.

I have always regarded the Minister for Planning and Environment as a most able Minister. When he was Minister for Education he was always available to receive me as the member for Bligh when I had a problem that concerned his Education portfolio. I am surprised that he has made a decision in favour of developers which will have the effect of destroying the last remaining rain forest in the eastern suburbs. Bligh and Vaucluse are the only electorates between Woolloomooloo and Botany Bay held by Opposition members. I have not heard the honourable members who represent the electorates of Waverley, Phillip, Maroubra or Heffron assert that the Glebe Gully must be preserved. The honourable member for Coogee was the only member in the area I have mentioned to do so. It is all very well for the honourable member for Drummoyne to laugh. As a lawyer he should not agree to the proposal. On two occasions a court, whose judgments the Government has torn up, supported those citizens who wished to preserve the Glebe Gully. I remind the honourable member for Drummoyne that in 1979–80 the Government received $267 million from gambling. It can afford to spend the million or two necessary to save that gully.

Although some 1 000 people made representations to the Minister for Planning and Environment, the Minister for Education and the honourable member for Coogee seeking preservation of the Glebe Gully, a decision has been made. I consider strongly that it was a political decision. I remind the House of the record. In September 1978 people concerned to preserve Glebe Gully were aware of rumours that the former Minister for Planning and Environment would ignore the citizens of Randwick and the decision of their elected council by removing from the Randwick planning scheme with respect to the gully clause 66, which he had previously included, and suspend clause 73. Both these clauses greatly limit development. The former Minister for Planning and Environment ignored the resolutions of the local Australian Labor Party branches, of which the honourable member for Coogee is a member. By way of interjection the honourable member for Drummoyne said that the Premier and Treasurer was sick. I remind him that in September 1979 the Glebe Gully preservation group
sent an urgent telegram to the Premier seeking a denial of the **rumours** to which I have 
referred. The telegram was not acknowledged. All honourable members know that the 
Premier and Treasurer has a large staff and the least that could have been done was 
to acknowledge the telegram.

On Monday, 22nd October, 1979, the **Randwick** council received a letter from the 
Planning and Environment Commission issuing an interim development order for 
the lands owned by the developers, which confirmed that all the **rumours** to which I 
referred were based on fact. Although the honourable member for **Yaralla** may say 
that they were merely **rumours**, the decision of 22nd October confirmed that they 
were based on fact. The former Minister for Planning and Environment said also that there 
would be no need to advertise the zoning change or the suspension of the planning 
clauses. As the former Minister was allowing 50 per cent more development than 
permitted by the local council, the **people** had a right to comment about the zoning 
changes. One can understand the concern of the **citizens** of **Randwick**.

The story of the **Glebe Gully** has been sad. I appreciate that the honourable 
member for **Coogee** is in a most embarrassing position. I am sure that the honourable 
member has read a letter by Professor Frank Talbot, who was appointed by the 
Government as the professor for environmental studies at the Macquarie University. 
If the Government intends to appoint a committee to inquire into this matter I suggest 
that it should appoint to it that well respected environmentalist as the chairman, and 
Milo Dunphy, O.B.E. On 12th August Professor Talbot said in his letter:

> Present legislation and also the new Environment and Assessment Act 
> passed by this Government and coming into force in the next few weeks, 
> demands that developments which cause **significant** environmental impact, 
> or which may have generated significant public controversy must be preceded 
> by a comprehensive environmental impact statement.

I regret to say that an environment impact statement has not been made. It is a most 
sorry story for the Government. The citizens of **Randwick** will express their grave 
concern at the next elections. Professor Talbot concluded his letter by saying:

> Surely if this Government is serious about its own legislation these 
> things should have been done and seen to be done.

For many years I have had a good working relationship with the Minister for 
Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy. As a result of the recent redistribution 
I shall take over from him Woolloomooloo, **Surry Hills** and East **Redfern**. I am most 
concerned about the large volume of traffic that passes daily through those areas. 
The Government has done nothing to contain the traffic flow that divides **Surry Hills**, 
**Redfern** and Woolloomooloo. The Southern Cross expressway, Cleveland Street and 
Crown Street continually carry a large volume of traffic. Many people are in fear for 
their lives when crossing Crown Street. In its four and a half years in office the Govern-
ment has done nothing to divert traffic from the area. The Woollahra council is 
endeavouring to protect Paddington, the area in which I reside, by diverting traffic 
around it. I support that council’s efforts. Unfortunately nothing has been done to 
protect the people in **Surry Hills**, **Woolloomooloo** and **Redfern** from the speeding 
traffic that passes continually through these areas.

The Government’s programme that was presented by His Excellency the 
Governor is **not** one to which the people of New South Wales can **look** forward. 
It consists of many promises. New South Wales is winding down. Recently I heard 
the Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Energy say on the Australian 
Broadcasting Commission programme **"City Extra"** that he had warned the Premier
and Treasurer about General Motors-Holden's Pty Limited. Nevertheless the Government had the audacity in the Speech delivered by His Excellency to blame the federal Government for this happening. I heard the Minister say on that programme that he had worked at GMH, had a lot of friends there, and that he knew months before it was announced that there was to be a change at Pagewood. Yet nothing was done to try to preserve that great industry for New South Wales. It is all very well for the Government to attack the federal government. One becomes a little weary of that. Although the Minister knew in advance, there may have been some reason why he did not inform the Premier.

Mr Hills: I told the Premier.

Mr BARRACLOUGH: The Premier may not have taken any notice of the Minister. I am saddened that a great industry will be lost to New South Wales. During most of the twelve years that I have been a member of this House progressive programmes have been introduced. When the Government came into office in 1976 it was full of enthusiasm. For the first year or so it went well, as did the Whitlam Government when it first came to office. That is changing now; it is a different ball game. The people of New South Wales are seeing that all the promises are not being honoured. One hears frequently criticism about the State's rail services. The honourable member for Mosman highlighted the shortcomings of the rail transport system. The Government has disregarded the wishes of the people and withdrawn most of the bus services from the Kings Cross area. The Government has in effect said that the honourable member for Bligh is a member of the Liberal Party and it does not worry about him. I receive complaints continually from those who live in Kings Cross. I regret that I have had to stop writing to several Ministers as I never receive an acknowledgment of my communications. It is a sad thing for democracy when one has to deal with departmental heads rather than with Ministers. The Minister for Transport knows well that bus services in the eastern suburbs are not running well. The Kings Cross area has a lot of elderly people as residents and they depend on buses as they are not able to walk to their nearest railway station. The 311 and 316 bus services can be described only as a disgrace. I ask the Minister to heed to my plea on behalf of these people.

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

Mr KEANE (Woronora) [8.0]: I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in the Address-in-Reply debate. I offer my sincere congratulations to the honourable member for Castlereagh. He is an adornment to the House and doubtless will continue to be a member well into the next century. I congratulate also the honourable member for Manly for his first-rate contribution to the debate. I wish to touch upon a matter that I consider vitally affects the future not only of my constituents of the electorate of Woronora but every citizen of New South Wales and, for that matter, every citizen of Australia. The subject is war and peace.

In his Speech the Governor referred to the achievements of the Wran Labor administration since the last Budget session. He referred also to the future plans and legislation of the Government, to be introduced in the coming session. I applaud the past achievements of the Government and I look forward with keen anticipation to the fulfilment of Labor policies during the year ahead. However, all these projected plans of our Government can be fulfilled only within a climate of peace and prosperity, not in an atmosphere of cold war rhetoric and warmongering hysteria. Unless we, the elected representatives of the people, speak up and speak out against the war psychosis of the Prime Minister, this insidious poison will lead to the fatalistic acceptance of what will be world war III. A nuclear holocaust will turn this beautiful planet Earth into a smoking radio-active ruin and there will be no future in which the Wran Government plans may be implemented—indeed there will be no future for any of us.
The manner in which the Prime Minister and his puppet Ministers are deliberately, in a cold and calculated manner, attempting to mould public opinion to accept the unacceptable, is quite horrifying to observe. What Prime Minister Fraser and the Liberal–Country party coalition Government are deliberately attempting to do is to persuade the Australian people that a nuclear war between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is inevitable. Prime Minister Fraser has adopted in toto the Chinese communist line that nuclear war is inevitable. Yet, a short time ago it was Prime Minister Fraser and before him, Prime Minister Menzies, warning in sombre tones that the Chinese communists were poised to launch a downward thrust against Australia. Now, all that is forgotten. The Chinese communists are on our side and apparently it is the Russians who are about to launch their forces against the Australian continent. Small wonder that the Minister for Foreign Affairs spends most of his time frantically trying to explain the Fraser Government's foreign policy to puzzled heads of Governments, confused and bewildered by the erratic twists and turns engendered by the Prime Minister's Russian paranoia.

This deliberate creation by the Prime Minister and his ministerial minions of an atmosphere that will permit the diversion of scarce human and material resources into non-productive war goods, is a desperate attempt to infect the Australian people with his own obsessive fantasies. As the Australian Financial Review of 5th August stated:

The Federal Government has entered upon a substantial expansion of defence spending—even though there is no evidence of an external threat to Australia.

Over the next five years the Fraser Government proposes to spend $18,000 million on armaments. Ironically, much of it will be spent on imported equipment which will not provide work for Australians. The share of national resources devoted to armaments will jump to about 3.4 per cent of gross domestic product. Yet, when the Government's last white paper on defence was released it stated:

Our assessment of the international situation has not revealed any present likelihood of our being called upon to provide any direct military assistance to our allies or other defence associates.

In October 1978, the Minister for Defence said his Government had taken a conscious decision and cutting back on proposed defence spending would benefit the nation through curbing inflation, boosting recovery and engendering international confidence. Inflation continues its upwards spiral, with unemployment keeping pace. Thousands of unemployed people are hounded and hunted in an attempt to deny them the dole. Recipients of vital social welfare benefits are ruthlessly and callously denied their entitlements. It seems that while Prime Minister Fraser and Treasurer Howard claim there is no federal money for health, education, housing and other pressing social needs, there is no shortage of money when it comes to filling the gaping mouths of the militarists.

An editorial in the Australian Financial Review of 8th August blasted the Fraser Government for the lack of logic underlying its irrational decisions related to defence spending. The Australian Financial Review reminded us that the thrust of the Government's official advice has been, and still is, that nothing has changed as far as the danger of direct assault on this nation is concerned. I shall quote again from the editorial of the Australian Financial Review:

We have embarked upon a rearmament programme which has no apparent justification... in an ultimate act of folly we appear to be contemplating action to strengthen military links with the People's Republic of
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China. This emphasis on defence, to the exclusion of national trade policies, manufacturing policy, and foreign policy, is astonishingly dangerous for the future of Australia . . . The coming session of Parliament must make it a top priority to probe and question the real logic underlying the Government's extraordinary attitudes towards defence.

Though the Fraser Government is willing to provide billions of dollars in the pursuit of military buildups designed to kill and maim the youth of other countries, the youth of Australia suffer the brunt of disastrous and inept domestic policies. Statistics show that at least 61 per cent of unemployed Australians are in the 15–24 year age bracket, and one in five unemployed are in the 15–19 year age group. This phenomenally high percentage of youth unemployed means an enormous loss of income to the community, estimated to total $1,640 million.

Business circles estimate that more than $400 million a year is lost in retail sales through unemployed youth's lost purchasing power. Thus, though the Prime Minister is preparing the youth of this country for cannon fodder, youth unemployment is at an all time high, and business activity is floundering in the morass created by Prime Minister Fraser's illogical, inept politics. This deliberate Fraser policy of guns before butter is all part of the brainwashing process designed to soften up the Australian people to accept the inevitability of a nuclear holocaust. Prime Minister Fraser and his Government aim to create a climate of frustration and hopelessness that will make us easy victims for the war manipulators. It is a deliberate attempt by the Fraser Government to transform the normal, decent Australian, into a mirror-image of himself—a man filled with fear and hatred. It is necessary to create a climate of hatred before one can contemplate the killing of another human being. It is not natural in human society for people wantonly to destroy others—society has enacted laws to deal with those who do.

Day-to-day human relationships are not based on destroying those with whom one disagrees. Human contacts are based on conciliation and understanding. The average family unit operates in that manner. Our entire industrial system is based on the concept of conciliation and negotiation. At every level in human society people agree to disagree without resorting to murdering one another. Why should international relations not be on the same basis? Surely similar rules should apply to the solving of international disputes. Day-to-day experiences of life teach us that only by discussion, negotiation and conciliation can human society survive and flourish.

Contrary to the Fraser policy of blood, sweat and tears, the Australian Labor Party is deeply committed to world peace, the maintenance of detente, and mutual disarmament. The Australian Labor Party strongly believes that international disputes must be settled, not by war, but in the forum of the United Nations. It is Australian Labor Party policy to utilize the nation's resources to provide productive and satisfying employment for all citizens, young and old alike, and enrich the cultural life of the Australian people.

A recent branch meeting of the Australian Labor Party carried a resolution deploring the mounting war hysteria created by the Fraser Government. The resolution expressed the need to oppose the apparent growing public acceptance of the inevitability of nuclear war. As the resolution so rightly stated, in a nuclear holocaust all life on our planet would be destroyed. The branch called upon all Labor Party members, particularly the leaders, and parliamentarians to make the struggle for world peace their main priority. I applaud the initiative of the Australian Labor Party members in this regard and wholeheartedly support the policy of the Australian Labor Party in its concern for world peace, the preservation and continuation of detente, and the elimination of war.
Recently I and two of my colleagues, the member for East Hills, and the member for Earlwood, were discussing the urgent need to do all within our power to counter the Fraser Government's militaristic policies designed to drag the Australian people into a war of annihilation. We are convinced that there is no viable alternative in this thermo-nuclear age of intercontinental missiles to the peaceful co-existence of nations. We therefore decided to contact our colleagues in the other Australian State Parliaments and seek their views on this vital matter. Resulting from these discussions an organization titled Australian Parliamentarians for Peace and Justice has been formed. Its objective is to promote the cause of peace, detente, and mutual disarmament. We consider that State parliamentarians, as well as federal members of Parliament, have a right and a duty to raise matters of national importance and to play a positive role in matters of social concern to our constituents. The response from State members of Parliament in all areas has been most positive and encouraging, and proves that parliamentarians are vitally concerned with peace.

Unfortunately, there appears to be a well orchestrated, cleverly directed and skilfully executed drive by certain elements in military and political circles to convince the Australian people that nuclear war can be made respectable; that casualties, though running into hundreds of millions, would be bearable. Even today the Secretary for Defence of the United States of America asserts that that country has not ruled out the possibility that it would strike first with nuclear weapons. This horrifying scenario is being assiduously peddled by some people in positions of great power, which tends to lend credence to the terrifying proposals.

It is shocking that such people should so abuse their positions of power and trust. What they are proposing flies in the face of all reality. Why do they persist in peddling this pernicious poison? The only answer seems to be that these merchants of death and destruction are floating these horrific pieces of misinformation in an attempt to create an acceptable climate that would permit such nightmares to become a reality.

The careful preparation of public opinion to accept fatalistically the certainty of their own destruction is necessary before further preparation for thermo-nuclear war can be made. The ordinary people, left to themselves, will never accept that thermo-nuclear war is an acceptable method of solving international problems. It is necessary that they be misinformed and misled by subtle propaganda so that they become confused, despondent and resigned to something they know is horrifying but over which they feel they have no control.

No sane person who has seen photographs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were flattened by what are now puny atomic bombs compared with the nuclear missiles of today would wish to suffer the same fate as the hapless human guinea pigs of those two martyred cities. It is far beyond all human logic to believe that any problem between nations is so great that it can be solved only by destroying all living beings that inhabit this earth. Even to consider the use of weapons that will condemn millions upon millions of innocent children to be scorched and blasted to instant death, or for others to endure later an agonizing, lingering death from radioactive fallout, is beyond all comprehension.

To overcome the natural abhorrence of sane and sensible people to the prospect of not only themselves but also their children and their grandchildren being destroyed, there must be created a huge smokescreen of lies, half-lies, rumours and misinformation to hide the yawning credibility gap that separates fact from fiction. Only when people are deliberately misinformed, deceived and misled will there be any possibility of accepting that they should be wiped from the face of the earth because of disputes between other human beings.
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As parliamentarians, as elected representatives of the people, we have an awesome responsibility to do everything within our power to dispel this smokescreen of lies, and inform the people in clear and unambiguous terms what the real consequences of thermo-nuclear war would be. We must never tire in our endeavours to convince the people of Australia that thermo-nuclear war will mean the end of all life on this planet earth. We cannot, and we must not, let a handful of power-crazy generals and politicians decide our fate. The peoples’ will must prevail against such madness. We, as elected representatives of the people, must emphasize that true defence of this country will not be achieved by spending billions of dollars on armaments; it can be achieved only by providing decent houses, living conditions, health services and, above all, jobs for all.

The world is spending $1,000 million every day on weapons of destruction; $40 million dollars an hour is wasted on unproductive military hardware. Of the world's total output of goods and services, 6 per cent is used for military purposes. Yet, in the world are 570 million people near starvation; 1,000 million people who have no homes, 1,500 million people who lack medical care, 200 million children who do not attend schools, and 800 million people who can neither read nor write. At the same time, 25 per cent of the world's scientific manpower is engaged in military purposes and 400,000 engineers and scientists are engaged on military production. Of the financial resources devoted to research and development since World War II 40 per cent have been in the military field; the majority of the equipment produced has no practical civilian use.

It is estimated that throughout the world approximately 22 million people are involved in armed forces and approximately 60 million people are involved in either a direct or indirect way. It is no wonder that the Secretary General of the United Nations has stated that disarmament must be a vital part not only of our efforts to establish a better system of international peace and security but also of our attempts to restructure the economy and social order of the world. The United Nations has called for a 10 per cent limit on arms expenditure. In 1978 a special United Nations session on disarmament took place, with encouraging results.

As one among many other renowned and respected bodies, the World Council of Churches is vitally concerned about the increasing threat of war. In February of this year the executive committee of that body met and adopted a document titled Threats to Peace. The executive committee issued a call to its member churches and appealed to all people of good will, including leaders, to become active in the struggle for world peace. The document stated:

The churches must speak out against the tendency to resume the perilous tactics of brinkmanship. Claims by any nation to become the strongest at any cost, should be deplored. Peace requires willingness on the part of differing political and social systems to co-exist and co-operate with each other.

The executive committee called upon the member churches:

To intensify their engagement in efforts for peace and to collaborate with others working for peace in mobilizing public opinion and promoting education and action for peace. To follow up urgently recommendations under the programme for disarmament and against militarism and the arms race and to initiate and encourage innovative measures for peaceful resolutions of conflict. To continue and promote detente and to resume negotiations on arms limitations including SALT.
This conference of churchmen held at Melbourne consisted of delegates from more than eighty countries and they called for a worldwide cessation of the research, testing and production of nuclear weapons and urged the early destruction of all nuclear weapons. This call should be heeded and acted upon by the governments of the world. It is a call made by men of God acting in accordance with the highest of Christian ideals and the commandment "Thou shalt not kill". Apart from the threat that nuclear war poses to all human beings, there is the equally grave threat caused by the economic wastage of the world's finite resources when they are diverted to the manufacture of weapons of war. In the United States of America alone, the richest country in the world, the military budget totals $160,000 million a year. It is expected to rise to $235,000 million a year by 1985. Reports from the United Nations agencies state that many nations have stockpiled sufficient nuclear explosives to destroy every person on earth fifteen times over. Yet an estimated 12 million people, of whom 6 million are children, live on the edge of starvation.

No longer can the world afford to consume wastefully dwindling material resources to manufacture and stockpile weapons of mass destruction while the population of the third world is rapidly expanding. It is estimated that by the year 2000 the population of the world will increase from the present 4,413 million to 6,196 million, or half as many again. Of those, 90 per cent will be in the poor, materially underdeveloped countries. If we were to imagine the world as a global village consisting of 100 persons 58 of them would be Asian, 13 African, 10 Latin American, 9 European, 5 Russian and 5 North American. Of the world's population, 70 per cent live in materially poor third world countries, containing only 10 per cent of the world's material wealth. On the other hand, the world's richest countries with only 30 per cent of its population possess 90 per cent of the material wealth. At the same time, in the third world countries 20 per cent of the people are seriously malnourished, 30 per cent lack pure drinking water or health care, 40 per cent are without work and of those over the age of 15, 50 per cent are illiterate.

If the world is to avoid a nuclear catastrophe it is essential that resources now wasted on useless stockpiles of more and still more weapons of death should be used instead to raise the living standard of the third world countries. As citizens of one of the richest countries in the world, we cannot continue to ignore the pleas of the millions of poor living on the edge of starvation all round us. Our only defence is to build up security and good will between our neighbours by using our enormous material resources, not to manufacture weapons of death, but to assist in feeding, clothing and housing those so desperately in need of our assistance.

On the basis of self-interest alone, apart from the needs of humanity and Christianity, the Fraser plan to greatly increase military spending must be opposed. Instead, the Prime Minister should use his influence with President Carter to convince him that the SALT II treaty should be ratified, and that negotiations on the SALT III treaty should begin immediately. Prime Minister Fraser should take the initiative in promoting peace by saying to the leaders of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that the size of the NATO and Warsaw armies should be gradually but consistently decreased to permit international tensions to diminish. He should demand that all countries with nuclear weapons sign a solemn assurance that they will never be the first to use such weapons in warfare. The peoples of the world cannot afford to return to the era of the cold war of the 1950's with its inflexible foreign policy.

In January of this year Pope John Paul in Saint Peter's Basilica spoke for world peace to a huge crowd, saying that scientists had told him that it needed only 200 of the world's estimated 50,000 nuclear bombs to destroy all the major cities of the earth. We, as parliamentarians elected to represent our people, have a solemn
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responsibility and a sacred duty to ensure that the sacrifices of the peoples of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were not in vain. From their terrible experiences we must learn the lesson that the world can survive only in peace, otherwise it will not survive at all. Our children deserve to inherit this world. We have a duty to ensure that they do.

Mr Murray (Barwon), Deputy Leader of the Country Party [8.30]: In rising to speak on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I congratulate the honourable member for Castlereagh on moving the motion and the honourable member for Manly on seconding it. I cannot agree with the comment made by the honourable member for Woronora at the commencement of his speech that the honourable member for Castlereagh will be here in the next century. Far from being here in the next century, I believe he will be lucky to be here at the next election. I congratulate His Excellency the Governor on his fourteen-year term of office. It has been fourteen years of dignified service in which he has travelled the State from one end to the other and has done everything possible to uphold the dignity of his office. Now he has made it clear that he is to retire. To me it was incredible and quite improper that when he opened Parliament at the beginning of this session the Government used him politically by getting him to make the Speech that he did. It worries me that that might set an example for what future Governors may have to do. It concerns me as to who His Excellency's successor might be.

Agriculture in this State faces a wonderful future. The honourable member for Woronora spoke about the problems of nuclear energy and warfare. It is within this State's capacity to divert those problems, for it is able to feed many of the starving millions of whom the honourable member spoke. People engaged in agriculture in this State and the Government can do much to remove one of the causes of war—empty stomachs.

Mr Roy Watts, Director-General of Agriculture, has recently retired. He has given excellent service to agriculture. For a number of years I have been associated with him and we have had some interesting debates. I have not always agreed with him, but one could discuss a matter with him and at the end of the discussion there would be no personality clashes. I congratulate Mr George Knowles, who has taken over from Mr Watts. He is a new broom in agriculture, having come from the Soil Conservation Service. However, I mourn the loss of a number of senior men from the Department of Agriculture.

I hope that the decision that has been made by the Government, as a result of which a number of senior men will move out of agricultural and into other activities, will be of benefit in the long term. Agriculture needs experienced men who have been through the mill and have learnt the basis of agriculture. It causes me a great deal of concern that these senior men are leaving the Department of Agriculture. I do not subscribe to the theory that because you are old you are good, but I do subscribe to the theory that experience plays a tremendous part in agricultural ability. Agriculture must be serviced because its production creates much of the wealth that the towns and cities of this State will depend upon for many years to come.

Over the past few months the new Minister for Agriculture has travelled consistently throughout the State promoting extension services. I thoroughly agree with this theme, but the main problem is that he does not have the staff for the promotion of his programme. A couple of years ago there were huge cutbacks in the staff of the Department of Agriculture and its extension services. Extension services and research met the full thrust of the Government's reduction in staff. Yet today the Minister is promoting an excellent programme without having the extra staff necessary to implement ideas to benefit growers. The Department of Agriculture cannot function without extension. Extension cannot function without staff, and neither can research.
The Minister must make positive moves to convince the Public Service Board and the Government that the staffing ranges within the department in these two functions must be extensively upgraded. When an extension programme is implemented, one must then be able to educate the primary producer in its use.

For many years past agricultural colleges have operated throughout the State, catering for the adult farmer and the young farmer. Agricultural colleges such as Farrer, Yanco and Hurlstone High have done a wonderful job. The Orange Agricultural College is gaining a high reputation throughout Australia as a college of management. It is turning out graduates capable of moving into the top fields of agricultural management. This is the first time in history that Australia has turned out managers who can operate a farming enterprise with all its complexities. The Orange Agricultural College is turning out men who will be able to go into the top positions of agricultural management on a farm. This is the most important part of its activities. Universities educate people to gain agricultural science degrees and other degrees, but the men from Orange will be able to go straight on to a farm. This is important in today's rapidly changing agricultural scene.

Agricultural education must provide for a transition from school to the tertiary education sector and then to the farm. Unfortunately, the idea is developing within this State and within this country that all agricultural education must come under the wing of some other higher education body and that for it to operate it must have the benefit of, may I say, the eggheads in education. It is necessary that these institutions have autonomy and be allowed to develop their own courses. They must be given sufficient finance to implement their courses. At the same time they must be able to look to the future and be able to amend and adjust courses to meet changing needs. I strongly hope that the Minister for Education will not bow to the pressures that are being exerted upon him to down-grade all these colleges and to change the system of their control.

Recently there has been much talk about the Department of Agriculture, the Grain Elevators Board and other grower marketing boards throughout the State. Through extension and education the farmers have been taught how to produce. Having produced, the farmers must be able to sell their products. Recently the board system has been subject to some criticism. A couple of months ago I mentioned the great need for accountability to the growers by marketing boards. These boards are controlled by grower majorities and the growers pay the costs of the boards. Because of that, they are responsible to and accountable to the growers. The various boards act as boards of directors under part-time chairmen. They must employ top staff to carry out the necessary work under a director-type arrangement. The boards' members virtually must act as company directors. In doing so it is their responsibility to be accountable to the growers—in this instance, the shareholders. It is essential that the boards have annual general meetings. The Auditor-General should report on these boards' activities in much more detail. The boards should present to the growers a written report of their activities and answer any questions asked of them. The boards should not be directed to take certain action by growers who attend the annual general meetings. Some people have said that the 3-year elections for the members of boards are ample means of achieving accountability. I do not agree that this is the only accountability that is necessary.

As the board members are responsible to the growers for their actions, the growers should have the right to elect new boards after three years. I do not believe that growers should have the right to direct the boards at the annual general meetings. Many of the boards have taken responsible action. The Australian Wheat Board made a Mr Murray]
generous contribution to stockowners when it gave them a $2 a tonne concession for wheat purchased for drought feed. The Government claimed responsibility for that concession but did not contribute a cent towards it.

The Minister has proposed the introduction of departmental control of the boards that would make them answerable to the bureaucracy rather than to the growers who back them. That is just not on. Boards cannot abrogate their responsibilities. Any such action that might be taken by the Minister could well sound the death-knell for an excellent organization. I urge the Minister strongly to reconsider any such proposal. He has indicated already that he might introduce controls. If he did so, it would be a complete disaster. The Premier seems to delight in the system of inquiry that was mentioned many times in the Governor's Speech. It was said that the intention was to set up Royal commissions and inquiries. The chairman of the inquiry into the Grain Elevators Board, Mr Carmichael, has been moving round the State talking to growers. Though in some respects he has done an excellent job, unfortunately he is announcing the results of his inquiry before the members of the committee have been able to determine fully the likely results. The lack of consistency in what has been said has caused a degree of concern.

About twelve months ago I suggested that the Grain Elevators Board should implement an internal inquiry system by employing a firm such as W. D. Scott and Company. That would have been far better than the present system. Time will tell the effectiveness of the inquiry into the Grain Elevators Board. The election of members to that board is now thirteen months overdue. Why has the Government continued to procrastinate? Is it contemplating taking over that board, which is funded completely by growers, and making it another government instrumentality? I hope not.

Over the years the Grain Elevators Board has done a fairly good job. The State has had three good wheat seasons when the wheat crop has been taken into storage by the end of January. This year the drought has proved to be a tremendous leveller. The drought continues throughout a large part of the State and is developing rapidly into the worst drought since 1965. This year in the prime wheat growing area of northwestern New South Wales, from Moree north to Boggabilla and west to Walgett, the total rainfall has been between 50 and 75 millimetres. That area will not produce any wheat this year. In fact, the area has not been sown to wheat. Unless it rains within the next few weeks there is little prospect of any wheat being produced north of Dubbo. That will have disastrous effects on the economy of the State.

When one considers that the line of no wheat has extended from about 20 miles west of Narrabri, north of Coonamble and west to Nyngan, one realizes that a tremendous area of the State will be totally non-productive. That will place an enormous demand upon the resources of the State. One fall of rain does not overcome a drought. Many persons fail to realize that the State has an enormous drought area where it is difficult for the stock to pick up feed. The far west of the State has had one rainfall this year, but since then has experienced searing winds and, unless follow-up rain falls within the next few weeks, that rainfall will be of no benefit. The State has had only temporary relief from the drought.

I acknowledge the Minister's concern about the need for the movement of stock from the north of Queensland back to New South Wales and the requirement that such stock not be sold for eight weeks. Lengthy discussions were held on that matter and, fortunately, the Minister recognized that anomaly and has removed the statutory requirement that stock not be sold for eight weeks after returning to this State. It is interesting to contemplate where stock returning to the State from the north might be taken. The Coonamble and Nyngan areas, which are the only parts of the State
north of Dubbo with any supply of feed, are grossly overstocked. Hay producers cannot provide sufficient fodder for the stock. The need to find fodder for stock in the coming spring must be considered carefully by the Department of Agriculture.

Problems have been experienced in negotiating loans for carry-on purposes and for restocking. Carry-on loans up to a maximum of $10,000 and restocking loans up to a maximum of $20,000 are available through the Rural Bank of New South Wales. Severe restrictions are placed upon the loans and are tightly concertinaed into the relationship of growers who have too much money and those who have insufficient funds. The lack of scope between the two types of growers prevents the Rural Bank from taking adequate measures to assist many producers. Far too many growers have insufficient money and those with too much money are proportionately too few. Unless the Government recognizes and accepts that fact, many producers will go to the wall, especially those in the western area of the State who are now entering their third year of drought. Not many persons in business or in primary industry could carry on for that long.

In the near future the Rural Assistance Board will be deluged with applications for assistance from growers in the Northwest and the Western Division of the State. Unless funding is made available from the State and federal governments further desperate situations will develop, particularly in the western area of the State. Over the past few years good repayments have been made to the board. That money should be recirculated into the system. If necessary, loans falling due should be carried over for an extended term. Those funds must be paid.

Another matter of concern at this time of drought in this State is reduced funding for works of water conservation for agriculture. I was pleased today that the Minister for Lands, Minister for Forests and Minister for Water Resources received a deputation about the Split Rock Dam. I thank the Minister for his consideration in making $2 million available to commence that dam, with the proviso that the Commonwealth Government make the same amount available on a $-for-$ basis. But I am thinking not only of that dam; I am thinking of Windamere Dam and Cudal Dam and of requirements for water in the south. All these needs can be met only if government funding for water resources is rapidly increased. The honourable member for Woronora spoke about problems that would be caused by warfare. Australia can feed the world if it has the water. This State could feed South East Asia if it had the water. The productive capacity of the State is largely untouched. Insufficient money is being spent on agricultural dams. Recently the Minister for Agriculture while travelling through the northwest of the State said that Split Rock Dam would be built shortly. He was recorded as having said that during interviews at Tamworth and Narrabri.

The Minister said also that the railway to Walgett would be reopened. Railways are another important factor in the success of agriculture in this State. Railways are the cheapest and most efficient form of transport. Yet lines are still being closed in country areas in New South Wales. At the end of the last session I spoke in this House about the problems being caused in Walgett by the closure of the railway. The Minister for Transport is still refusing to meet deputations or to speak to the people concerned. The result is that they are moving interstate. This is happening not only in the north of the State but also in the south. People are being forced away from New South Wales. This is incredible when this State has so much to offer. People from the northwestern area have been making representations direct to the Premier of Queensland, seeking to be serviced by the Queensland rail and business systems, and they are being received by the Premier of Queensland. If people from this State are being forced to move interstate to obtain the required services to run their businesses
and to live in the dry inland areas of the State, we have a government in this State that is completely insensitive to the needs of the people. The problems of Walgett could be solved simply by the running of a mixed train three times a week. Yet the people cannot even get to the Minister for Transport to put their point of view.

The abattoir industry of this State is facing tremendous problems as a result of procrastination by the Government. When the honourable member for Casino was Minister for Agriculture he set up a Cabinet subcommittee to examine the abattoir industry. Subsequently the Regen committee was established to go into the whole abattoir problem. About four weeks ago the Minister for Agriculture said that a report would be available in about three weeks' time, but so far we have heard nothing of it. The problems of the abattoir industry will not just fade away. This State has suffered a reduction in its cattle herds from 33 million to about 26 million that has automatically reduced the throughput of abattoirs. There has been a tremendous increase of costs in the abattoir system. A loss of $3 million was suffered at Homebush. Yet the Government is still procrastinating and is not coming up with answers to the problems. It is not solving the problems of the unemployed in the abattoir industry. It is not taking the action necessary to assist the abattoir industry to meet the changes of today's world.

I turn now to the dairy industry. The former Minister for Agriculture made it clear that when the Dairy Industry Authority was abolished and the Dairy Industry Marketing Authority came into existence, Mr Butler would continue as chairman of the Dairy Industry Marketing Authority; in other words, there would be continuity of management. This has not happened. There has been a political appointment to the management of the new authority. The industry is now paying two chairmen and will continue to do so for the next twelve months. It is costing the dairy producers and consumers $40,000 a year for these two chairmen when a perfectly good man was available to do the job. Mr Butler was a top man. He is now in limbo. He is another example of the loss of top men from agriculture in this State, men that we can ill-afford to lose.

Another serious problem that could be solved by co-operation between the department, landholders and the producers of this State is wild pigs. I have spoken about this on numerous occasions. The whole livestock industry is under grave threat from wild pigs that are now coming into the coastal area. With refuse being thrown overboard from shipping moving up and down the coast there is always the prospect of its reaching coastal feral pigs, with the consequent risk of foot and mouth disease or some other exotic disease being picked up and transported by these animals. Three years ago the Government introduced a commendable scheme for the control of feral pigs. It is now in its last year and it appears that it will not be continued. The livestock industry of this State cannot afford to have that scheme concluded at the end of this year. I seek the co-operation of the Minister in ensuring that funding for the control of feral pigs is continued for a number of years to come. The picture is not all gloomy. The prices that producers are receiving at the moment are some of the best ever. Our future in agriculture is guaranteed.

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

Mr PETERSEN (Illawarra) [9.0]: I open my contribution to the Address-in-Reply debate by congratulating the honourable member for Castlereagh and the honourable member for Manly on their contributions. Honourable members cannot but be proud of these two Labor intellectuals whose competence and energy are obvious
and who are recognized for their superb abilities to represent the country and city in this House. I have chosen to speak particularly on the subject of prisons. Between 1970 and 1976 I constantly advocated a public inquiry or Royal commission into the New South Wales prison system. It was a source of considerable gratification to me to hear His Excellency say:

The Government is resolutely implementing the recommendations of the Royal Commission into New South Wales Prisons.

Their successful implementation involves changes in public attitudes to crime prevention, detention and rehabilitation, and my Government recognizes that this can only be achieved by community co-operation.

What disturbs me in the current situation of New South Wales prisons is that a definite attempt is being made to destroy any possibility of community co-operation in obtaining a prison system that is as humane as we can make it. The report of Mr Justice Nagle was tabled in this Parliament on 4th April, 1978. With the notable exception of troglodytes such as the honourable member for Clarence—whose response to the Nagle report was to abuse me as a dirty commo—every decent person who has studied even a summary of the Nagle report was disgusted at the revelations in the report, revelations that atrocities of violence had been perpetrated that can be described only as gross betrayals of the human condition by the authorities concerned. Just as an aside, let me say how nauseated I am at the hypocrisy displayed by members of the Liberal–Country party in this Chamber who now publicly deplore the bashing of the Hon. P. J. Baldwin by an unknown assailant, but who did everything possible to prevent the truth from coming out that the administration of the New South Wales prison system was based on violence; a system that saw Grafton gaol as the ultimate hell, with a regime of torture that would have done credit to a Nazi concentration camp or a Stalinist labour camp. This was the regime where violence was the norm at all levels; where, if any attempt was made by prisoners to be treated as human beings, discipline was maintained by such atrocities as the bashing of 200 prisoners at Bathurst gaol on 20th October, 1970. [Quorum refused (Mr Caterson).]

As one Bathurst prison officer said in evidence, prisoners had to conform or be broken. This involved not only a single bashing, but constant and repetitive bashings of horror equal to those sustained by the Hon. P. J. Baldwin. I am not saying this simply to rehash old atrocity stories. Nevertheless, it is true that I was subjected to a campaign of vilification by the Minister of Justice, then the Hon. J. C. Maddison, when I brought the facts before this House. My informants were called liars, and I was described as a person whose sole objective was to denigrate authority. Predictably, the Leader of the Opposition has been weeping crocodile tears about the violence against the Hon. P. J. Baldwin. Also, the Leader of the Country Party has been stating his unequivocal support for law and order. Yet these are the same people who, for the whole eleven years they were in government from 1965 to 1976, tolerated—positively encouraged—illegal violence against the prisoners immured in the gaols of New South Wales. It was the system under which they operated and the system that they wanted to operate—a system of illegal violence and hypocrisy, symbolized by the fact that the bashers of Grafton were granted a special environmental allowance. That allowance was not paid to the prison officers who had to endure the heat of Broken Hill or the cold of Cooma. On page 43 of his report Mr Justice Nagle said:

It is wrong to say that one purpose for which offenders are sent to prison is to rehabilitate them or cure them. They are sent to prison by the Courts on behalf of society for the simple purpose of imprisonment.
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While in prison the offender (should be) treated humanely in a manner befitting his human dignity and that the least possible harm should be done, so that so far as is possible, he emerges from prison no worse, mentally or physically, than when he entered it.

It says something for the ethical standards of our capitalist society that such an essentially small "liberal" concept should raise considerable hostility—a hostility that was concealed when the Nagle report was released, but is now becoming more and more obvious. The major reason that prompted me to speak in this debate on the subject of prisons is that too many people who are still tied up in the prison system want a return to the old days when discipline was maintained by methods described by Mr Justice Nagle in these words concerning Superintendent Penning of Grafton gaol:

He used his baton and his fists on many occasions when there was no violence or provocation by the prisoners.

I note that last month the N.S.W. Police Association and the Leader of the Opposition called for tougher gaol rules. Every now and then the demand is raised that Katingal should be reopened in order to protect lives and property. One has had the provocation of the prison officers at Malabar going on strike because an ex-prisoner, employed as a research officer by the Bureau of Crime Statistics, dared to go to the gaol as part of his duties. I might mention that he is now in Britain studying to be a criminologist. I wonder whether the prison officers are frightened of what he did in the past or of what he might do in the future. The final straw was the despicable pair of articles that appeared in the Sun on 14th and 15th July, 1980, written by a journalist called Richard Cunningham. Quoting an anonymous prison officer named Mike, it reported:

Okay I can't deny prisoners were bashed in the past—but there's been nothing like it since the Royal Commission came down. You can't say boo to a prisoner since the Nagle report came out.

The anonymous prison officer said:

Discipline is a farce. The authorities seem to be taking the attitude that just being in jail is imprisonment enough. Let's make it easy for the crims while they're there.

In fact Mr Justice Nagle repeated the aphorism that a person is sent to prison as punishment, not for punishment. Loss of liberty is itself a severe punishment; and its deterrent effect is not made more so by having a more severe regime. An inmate should lose only those rights made necessary by loss of liberty. The sending of a person to prison should be a last resort. Prison sentences should be as short as possible and prisoners should be housed in the lowest appropriate security.

It is most instructive to summarize the main recommendations of the Nagle Royal commission and to indicate the action taken on these recommendations. The Government has established the Prisons Commission consisting of three full-time and two part-time members, as recommended by Mr Justice Nagle. The recommendation that gaol superintendents and other commission or executive officers should be highly trained personnel, and that prison officers should be better paid and better trained has been adopted also in principle and is well on the way to being carried out. Existing prison rules have been withdrawn and rewritten. The Corrective Services Advisory Council has statutory recognition and is listened to. The cumbersome classification system has been scrapped and replaced by a division of prisoners into three classifications as recommended, first, those whose escape would create danger; second, those who would escape if they could; and third, those who would not if they could.
Probably the most controversial statement made in the Royal commission report was that the escape rate at that time was acceptable. If total security were required, costs would be trebled. I am glad to say that the present commissioner, Dr Vinson, has wholeheartedly endorsed this principle, which I support without reservation. Mr Justice Nagle's proposals were far from libertarian. He drew attention in some detail to the fact that security of gaols is based upon outdated lock and key techniques. He recommended training of staff in riot control and formation of special security squads in prisons, the use of electronic aids and perimeter security programmes. In this respect his recommendations have been more or less carried out.

On prisoner education Mr Justice Nagle expressed total dissatisfaction with the system, which employed teachers as general dogs-bodies. He pointed out the necessity for remedial teaching, particularly for such people as the illiterates, and he was suitably scathing about the ridiculous practice of not employing qualified prisoners in the gaol teaching service. It must be said that these recommendations have been carried out in part only. Unfortunately, as yet there is no real concerted programme. Nevertheless, a review of education services is working in some places. I note that at Goulburn gaol it is working particularly well.

There were long and detailed recommendations on health services, and recommendations such as complete overhaul by an outside medical expert. Mr Justice Nagle stressed the necessity for medical, dental or optical treatment to be determined by medical people, and this applied particularly to the treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts. I shall deal with this later, but suffice it for me to say that I do not believe that any real improvement will take place until such time as the Corrective Services Commission administers its own health programme, rather than work through the Health Commission of New South Wales.

Mr Justice Nagle suggested complete overhaul of the visiting rules and regulations and their considerable expansion, including legal visits and weekend leave. To a large extent his recommendations have been carried out. There has been considerable amelioration of the situation in this respect. His Honour recommended scrapping of prison regulations regarding prisoners' letters, and said that incoming letters should be examined for contraband, with prisoners having rights to pay for newspapers and books and for the use of telephones. He condemned the standard of food, clothing and eating facilities, sport, hobby facilities, and a lack of attention to the rights of non-English speaking prisoners and Aborigines. In all of these spheres it can be said honestly that progress is being made. His recommendations on prison discipline were essentially conservative, not what a radical would propose. However, he did propose withdrawal of infamous regulation 23 (f), which provided for the prosecution of a prisoner making a false statement, and this has been done.

Unfortunately, the report recommended also retention of the existing visiting justice system detested by all prisoners. He recommended the appointment of a prison ombudsman and rejected the prison officers' submission that there should be no appeal to the District Court from visiting justices' decisions. Here I must admit to some reservations. I am less than satisfied with the reported decision that it is intended to build a court inside Parklea prison. I hope this does not happen because justice must be freely done, out in the open. On prisoners' rights and grievances he was fairly cautious. He said prisoners should have the right to vote in the electorate from which they came and the right to sue. These recommendations have not yet been implemented. He wanted prison grievances committees and committees of public visitors to be more than just cosmetic operations. I congratulate the newly appointed superintendent at Bathurst gaol, who is committed to a policy of participation. He has taken real steps to involve the community in the administration of the gaol.

Mr Petersen]
His most important recommendation for prisoners concerned release on parole. He rejected the concept that release on parole is a privilege, and recommended that any prisoner with less than a 4-year sentence should be released at the end of the non-parole period, unless it is proved that his release would endanger the public. The practice of parole boards making a decision to grant parole should apply only to those sentenced to more than four years' gaol, with rights of appeal to the District Courts and prisoners being given detailed reasons for parole board decisions. Remission of sentence should come off the non-parole period.

It is impossible to overstate the importance of the recommendations made by Mr Justice Nagle. They are a clear example of his concept that prison is the last—not the first—resort. It was significant that he suggested the gradual easing of prisoners into the community on their release, with more work release and periodic detention programmes, and with unpaid fines being enforced through garnishees and execution orders in preference to imprisonment. It is to the great credit of the Government that it is doing its best to implement most of the principles which Mr Justice Nagle recommends.

Mr Justice Nagle's report has a special chapter on women prisoners. He drew attention to the administrative schemozzle at Mulawa with inedible food, boredom and stupidity in administration, particularly exemplified by the application of the rule requiring women to give up their babies after they were one year old even in the case of a woman due to be released in a month. I think we can credit the Government with the opening of the new Sheila Parker institution which separates minor offenders from the major offenders.

A significant feature of Mulawa women's prison was what amounted to control by the use of drugs. Mr Justice Nagle pointed out that in 1976–77 expenditure on medical services at Mulawa was $2,123 a head compared with $73 a head for 300 prisoners at Cessnock and $149 a head for 360 prisoners at Goulburn. It is an indication of the Government's sincerity that a dramatic reduction has taken place in the amount of prescribed drugs used in the women's prison.

What I have said already is a brief summary of what I consider to be the most important items in a comprehensive report. It was an honest attempt by a conservative member of the judiciary to bring justice into the present system—and I use the term conservative in the best sense of the word. In other words, it is the report of a person who is interested in conserving human values, even if it is not the report that I would have written.

The Nagle report contained 252 recommendations. As at 1st May the Government had adopted 183 of those recommendations, 64 were still under consideration and 5 had not been adopted. I must say that four of those five recommendations strike me as being relatively unimportant administrative matters, but the fifth, which concerns the question of employing a prison ombudsman, should be reconsidered. Of the 64 matters still under consideration, the electoral office still has to do something about the rights of prisoners to vote, and the Attorney-General has to do something about reciprocity between Australian States and the right of prisoners to sue.

Without delving into too much detail of the rest of the recommendations still under consideration, I suggest that there are four major areas in which reform is still necessary. The most important of those areas covers the provision of a suitable and adequate replacement for the dreadful observation section at the Malabar complex—the gaol within a gaol—described as Dickensian in the Nagle report and used to accommodate both difficult prisoners and those with psychiatric problems. The problem is complicated by the fact that accommodation for about forty psychotics at Morisset, which is administered by the Health Commission, is woefully inadequate and insecure.
In fact we have three problems. The first is the problem of the difficult prisoners—the recalcitrants who used to be sent to Grafton, to be illegally bashed into submission and later to Katingal. Modern penological thinking is that there is an answer to this problem—that is to establish a special care unit of the kind that has been so successful under the leadership of Mr Ken Murray at Barlinnie, near Glasgow, in Scotland. In that unit, where difficult prisoners and trained prison officers relate to one another as human beings, the process seems to work. I understand that the commission is considering the use of the observation section at Malabar for these prisoners. Using the precedent at Barlinnie, this could work, even if the accommodation itself is something less than wholly satisfactory. After all, Barlinnie itself was established in an antiquated gaol.

The problem of recalcitrant prisoners overlaps with the problem of prisoners who are in a stage of crisis of one kind or another. I understand that a special care unit for men and women in a crisis situation will be opened by the end of the year. I have been told that two highly motivated officers, Superintendent John Horton and Mr David Schwartz a psychologist, who have been overseas for study will be in charge of the new unit. Unfortunately, this question of a Barlinnie-type unit and a special care unit overlaps with another difficult problem—that is what to do with the psychotics at Morriset. It would be a total disaster if these psychotic patients were to be unloaded on the special care unit or the Barlinnie-type institution.

It is this problem of what to do with psychotic prisoners that appears to have given rise to the proposal to build a special medical and psychiatric care unit, comprising a modern hospital, at Malabar. The proposal had its genesis in the escape from Morriset of two dangerous psychotics who subsequently committed a series of violent offences. As one would expect, the press had a field day in publicizing their atrocities.

In its publicity the press were partly right: it is wrong and impossible to confine such people in traditional mental institutions. There is certainly a great need to put such people in secure institutions, and I would agree that a secure institution with individual cells should be built at Long Bay to accommodate the forty or so people involved. But what I would not like to see is this proposition expanded so that a larger hospital is built. Perhaps it could be argued that there is a need for a hospital at Long Bay. It would be an unnecessary duplication of the facilities at the Eastern Suburbs Hospital to have gynaecological or surgical facilities there.

A pregnant female prisoner, a prisoner with cancer or a broken leg or appendicitis, will still have to be sent to Prince Henry Hospital which has secure wards. Why not send all prisoners requiring hospitalization to Prince Henry Hospital, where wards are being closed down? If there is to be a 40-bed medical surgical ward for prisoners, why not accommodate them at Prince Henry Hospital, instead of spending between $12 million and $20 million on a new hospital? I understand that prison officers are concerned that a large hospital of this size will present real problems regarding hostages, facilities for escape and difficulties in bringing out-patients to this new secured hospital.

What really concerns me about the whole proposal is the clear implication that psychiatric treatment will be seen as a means of controlling prisoners. We will be back to the situation that existed at the old observation section, which Mr Justice Nagle so rightly criticized, where psychotics, prisoners in crisis and recalcitrants will be all mixed up together. We will then have another observation section but this time in a modern setting. What has to be done is to separate the problem of the psychotics from those of psychiatric services. One is a custodial problem, the other a medical problem, and the two have to be separated.
Certainly the proposed new hospital will do nothing towards providing an improved medical service and it will create severe custodial problems for no good reason. What is needed is something like the small facility that exists at Yatala prison in South Australia, which I have visited. That small facility, accommodating some thirty to forty people, is run by psychiatric nurses. Any decisions regarding prisoners are made by the medical officer in charge. It is not used as the threat of an ultimate hell, as Grafton and the old observation section were used, and it appears to work well.

There is some talk about the need for another observation section where psychiatric assessments can be made. I suggest that it should be a very small separate institution well away from the gaol, but not a 136-bed hospital. While I am on the subject of medical facilities, it might be noted that the medical facilities for women in gaol are still poor. I know that in the near future it is proposed to commence work on a new hospital at Mulawa, and I urge the Government not to delay in this matter.

The second major problem is the necessity for detailed planning for adequate industry within the gaol system. The fact remains that the great majority of prisoners in New South Wales gaols have nothing to do. The Government is to be commended for increasing the prisoners’ allowance for a sweeper to $6.50 a week, but it would be far better if prisoners were earning proper wages in properly organized industries. The annual report of the list of gaol industries is small: beef cattle breeding at Mannus; viticulture, a cabinet shop and a metal shop at Cessnock; a sign shop at Berrima; fourteen inmates in a light engineering facility at Silverwater—which actually makes a profit—and the Parramatta linen service. It is worth noting that when Mr Ken Murray from Barlinnie visited New South Wales recently, he praised the service as the best of its kind he had seen.

I am aware that the recommendations of Mr Justice Nagle have been endorsed in principle, but concerned officers and former prisoners alike who have spoken to me on this subject expressed the view that, in some areas, the position is now worse than it was before the Nagle Report, particularly at Long Bay, and that this could lead to terrible consequences if the frustration caused by boredom at useless make-work produces a riot situation. In the proposed Parklea gaol there will be five large industrial sheds. We ought to make up our minds what we will put in them before we open the gaol. The third major problem is the need for a special prison ombudsman as recommended by Mr Justice Nagle in recommendations 170 to 174. These recommendations have been rejected, in my opinion, on the ground that the present ombudsman is adequate, but that is not the case. As one who receives a number of letters from prisoners I must confess to a feeling of frustration when I receive them. In effect, in forwarding such letters to the Minister one is appealing from Caesar to Caesar. On the other hand, the problem is often handed over to non-official organizations, like the Council for Civil Liberties, a voluntary organization of dedicated people that does a magnificent job but whose facilities are extremely limited because it is precisely a voluntary organization.

Where serious allegations are made, as in the case of alleged bashings at Goulburn gaol by Superintendent Penning, we have had the most unsatisfactory method of a Public Service Board inquiry dealing with a major problem. It has turned into an expensive and tedious mini-Royal commission which will satisfy nobody, whatever the final result. The fourth area is one that concerns prisoners more than anything else, the problem of parole. I note that Mr Justice Nagle’s recommendations in this respect are still being considered. No greater single cause of unrest and dissatisfaction exists. Prisoners have no guidelines at all. They simply regard parole in the same way that we regard lottery tickets—just as the luck of the draw. How is a prisoner supposed to modify his behaviour to fit him for parole if he does not know why parole is, or is
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not, granted? Discontent will continue to fester unless parole hearings are public, unless parolees have the right to be represented and unless the Parole Board gives reasons for its decision in each case. I would strongly urge the Government to cut the Gordian knot and implement these most necessary reforms, thereby reducing the tension that non-implementation of these reforms causes.

In dealing with this subject, of necessity I have dealt mainly with problems that require attention rather than giving praise to the Government for what it has done. But two initiatives, in my view, deserve particular commendation. First is the Yawarra Training Centre at Kurri Kurri which accommodates up to 40 young prisoners under 21 years of age who are at risk from rape or assault. It has been operating for about eight months and is working well. The second initiative, working well against all expectations, is the accommodation for dangerous prisoners at Goulburn gaol which at present holds three prisoners but has held up to eight. This accommodation has been criticized for its unsound design. Those criticisms are still true, but the poor accommodation is more than compensated for by the motivation of the officers administering the unit. As Ken Murray demonstrated at Barlinnie, it is people that matter, much more than buildings.

Prisons in New South Wales are a great deal more humane than they were. In Dr Tony Vinson we have a Commissioner of Corrective Services who is far and away the best officer ever to occupy that position. The Wran Labor Government is a reformist Government which, by implementing the terms of the Nagle Report, has shown evidence for the first time among all New South Wales governments of trying to escape from the convict tradition established in 1788. Two major difficulties, I consider, are encountered by the Government in implementing its policies. The first is that within the prison system there are still too many who hearken to the old days when discipline was maintained by the boot and the baton. The second is that the ruling class and its media outlets fear that a humane prison system would be insufficiently protective of its property interests. The particular form that the concern of the ruling class takes is an over-emphasis on the problem of escapes from prisons. As Mr Justice Nagle said:

The number of escapes, notwithstanding the very few that have resulted in violent and ensuing tragedy, is not unreasonable and it is a risk that the community should accept. At much greater risk to itself, society is prepared to accept the motor vehicle with all its attendant advantages and tragedies.

Here I might refer to a heading in the Daily Telegraph published yesterday. The article was headed "Killer Escapes", as though the prisoner who had escaped was some sort of mad dog, different from the rest of humanity. A contradiction arose in the Nagle Report in that His Honour recommended construction of a new maximum security gaol in the metropolitan area to accommodate between 200 and 300 prisoners, and recommended also the redevelopment of Bathurst gaol as a maximum security institution. If new gaols must be built, I am glad that the Government decided to build one at Parklea where relatives can visit prisoners, instead of bowing to the pressures of local residents who were more concerned with property values than with the human needs of the persons immured in our prison system. Also, I cannot praise too highly the Government's decision to close the monstrous electronic zoo, Katingal maximum security centre.

Although I agree that the old prison cells at places like Long Bay should go, it disturbs me to find so much emphasis on the provision of new prison cells rather than the development of alternative forms of imprisonment. Particularly do I deplore the insistent calls from rural chambers of commerce in declining towns to have prisons established in their centres to provide other industry. I can foresee a situation where
prisoners are kept in maximum security institutions simply because they are there, rather than being accommodated in minimum security establishments, which would be much more humane and far more likely to return a prisoner to the general community no worse than when he left.

In the brief time left to me I wish to deal with what I consider to be the major achievement of the Nagle report, the considerable reduction of violence in New South Wales prisons since 1978. Here, parenthetically, I wish to deal with the case of the prison escapee Raymond John Denning. I have heard and seen the radio and television broadcasts he made. I have read his statement. A large part of what he said rings true. I have no doubt that before 1978 he was repeatedly bashed at Parramatta and Grafton gaols. I do not know whether it is true that he was bashed at Grafton gaol in September 1978. Neither do I know whether he was guilty of assaulting prison officer Faber on 14th September, 1974, the crime for which he was sentenced to life imprisonment. However, it is obvious to me that his allegation that he was bashed to obtain a concocted confession to secure his conviction was true. To be blunt, he has suffered too much for a reputedly civilized society to be convinced that justice was done, and I believe that his case should be reopened and the charge heard once more, whether he is recaptured or not.

What is significant about the Denning case is that since 1978 his case is the only one in which I have heard of alleged joint bashings of the sort that were commonplace before the Nagle Report. I have heard stories of kicks and the odd so-called lick with the baton, and I do not know whether they are true, but deliberately and officially inspired violence to maintain prison discipline apparently does not happen now. That is an enormous improvement on what happened in the past. The rule of law does apply—the hated justices still visit the gaols, but since a prisoner can appeal to the District Court there is much more regard for rules of evidence. That is a situation to the Benefit of both prisoners and prison officers alike. The spokesman of the Opposition on prisons said that the recent Goulburn gaol escapes highlighted the need for greater security. I would like to suggest there is only one way in which there can be absolute security, that is the way of the Stalinist labour camps so well described by Maria Joffe in *One Long Night*, or in the methods used by the military juntas of Chile and Indonesia.

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

Mr SMITH (Pittwater) [9.30]: As I rise in this debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech by His Excellency Sir Arthur Roden Cutler, first I should like to congratulate the honourable member for Castlereagh upon his maiden speech in the House in which he proposed the adoption of the Address in Reply. I trust he will have an enjoyable time in this House and make many friends during whatever period he is a member. Second, I should like to express the appreciation of the people of Pittwater for the wonderful service that has been given to this State by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Arthur Roden Cutler, during his period as Governor of New South Wales. His service to the people of this State is of record length. Certainly I do not think any Governor has stood taller in the eyes of the people than Sir Arthur Roden Cutler, in stature and in demeanour. I trust he has a most happy retirement and, as I understand he will move to the Manly-Warringah area, I am sure he will enjoy living there.

I protest about the contents of His Excellency's Speech. As the Government knew that it was His Excellency's last Speech to this House prior to his retiring, it should have prepared not a highly political speech but one with greater sensitivity, more appropriate to his pending retirement. Some parts of the Speech do not
At one part of his Speech, His Excellency said that the restrictive policies of the federal Government had manifestly failed to curb inflation. I much prefer to accept the figures of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development than the Government's opinions. On 18th June the Sun newspaper referred to the figures of the OECD, which showed that Australia's inflation rate for the previous twelve months was 10.5 per cent. Countries with comparable societies to ours were New Zealand, with an inflation rate of 18.4 per cent, Britain with 22.5 per cent, Italy with 23.7 per cent, and the United States of America with 15.7 per cent. These figures make it patently clear that the federal Government has curbed inflation and that its policies are improving the economic state of Australia, particularly New South Wales. The State Labor Government seeks to claim all the credit for getting New South Wales going. I contend that in spite of the State Government's efforts, New South Wales is moving. His Excellency said also:

The revival of the Hunter Valley, recently one of the most depressed regions in Australia, with the highest unemployment level, is a major policy objective. In this task the Government will give equal priority to the need for the development and the protection of the environment. One would not gain the impression from speaking to the people in the Hunter Valley that the Government was giving priority to these matters. The citizens of the Hunter Valley have at no stage been properly consulted to ascertain their views on development of the area. They have not been given an opportunity to contribute to the area's total planning. Further, there is little local autonomy with development plans and the control of their own quality of life. I do not disagree that the Hunter Valley presents one of the most attractive industrial development areas in the western world. The ready availability of cheap coal and energy sources makes the area most attractive to industry and important to the Hunter region, New South Wales and, indeed, to all Australia. Nevertheless, any development programme in the area must take into account the wishes and aspirations of the people of that area. The Government must show credibility and make to account to the people who will be affected by any major developments in the area.

The proposals to increase considerably aluminium smelting activities are of major concern to those in the agricultural community, especially the vignerons and those who chose to live in a country environment. It is clear from His Excellency's Speech that that Government's plans will proceed notwithstanding that much of the work necessary to determine whether environmental damage has been caused has not been carried out. Because of cheap electricity, aluminium smelters are considered an attractive proposition in the Hunter region. The increased demand for electricity will require a greatly accelerated rate of construction of power stations and the operations of power stations in that area. Air pollution is one of the matters of particular concern. Vignerons are most concerned about the escape of fluorides. Modern technology in the aluminium industry has resulted in a vast improvement on the earlier smelters. That improvement may be seen in one of the two pot lines at the Kurri Kurri smelter. The new smelters do not pose as great a threat as the old pot lines at Kurri Kurri. Nevertheless the community does not have absolute figures and more work needs to be done. The real problem is air pollution caused by power generation. On a recent visit to the Hunter Valley at 9 o'clock in the morning, I observed that the Kurri Kurri area was covered in smog, I believe emanating from the power station at Liddell.

New South Wales is blessed with low sulphur coals. Great concern has been expressed overseas about the volumes of sulphur dioxide emitted by power stations into the air. Because of Australia's low sulphur coals little concern has been shown about sulphur dioxide emissions. When Liddell and Bayswater power stations are operating at their final design size, each year some 140 000 tonnes, or 2 184 000
cubic metres, of sulphur dioxide will be emitted into the air. If one adds the emission from Eraring, Vales Point and Munmorah power stations, each year a total of 325 000 tonnes, or 5 070 000 cubic metres of sulphur dioxide will be emitted each year in the Hunter Valley. This represents 14 000 cubic metres each day.

A further problem is to maintain water quality. I raised this matter during the debate on the Glennies Creek Dam Bill. The first stage of the Bayswater power station will result in more water being put into the air than flows in the Hunter River in its driest year. With the completion of the second stage of that power station double that amount of water will be put into the air. According to the environmental impact statement prepared for the Glennies Creek Dam proposal, most of the water was to come from Glenbawn Dam. As I stated during the previous debate to which I referred, Glenbawn Dam has the sweetest water that enters the Hunter River. It has total soluble salts of 200 parts per million, which makes it the only water entering the Hunter River that is completely acceptable for agriculture. I submit that it is worth repeating some of the other figures relating to the water that flows into the Hunter River particularly from Glennies Creek, which water will replace that used from Glenbawn Dam.

The water in Glennies Creek has total dissolved salts of 400 milligrams a litre. Sautwater Creek has 1 796; Ponds Creek, 3 607; Sadlers Creek, 2 793; Whites Creek, 3 370; Maidwater Creek, 3 065; Gardiners Creek, 1957; McMahons Creek, 8 460; Bayswater Creek, 2 899; and Lake Liddell, 777. The significance of the figures is that, with total soluble salts above 200 milligrams a litre, the growth of plants is restricted. More than 500 milligrams a litre is considered not satisfactory for agriculture. That is a point that the Government has not taken into account properly. For those who have not read it, in the Sydney Morning Herald of 8th July, 1980, an article in "Discovery" titled The Changing World of Salinity revealed that salinity problems exist in the Hunter Valley. I shall refer to another proposal that the Government brought to light in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. The Speech reads:

Two joint ventures are being developed for the production of export coal at Birds Rock near Lithgow.

The reason I mention this is that the Premier, in campaigning at Lithgow prior to the 1976 election, said that the profits from the Birds Rock mine would finance the electrification of the railway line west of Lithgow. Birds Rock mine is an area which I pegged in 1967 and explored for my former employer. Out of that area Coalex selected the Clarence Colliery, an area of 12 square miles, as being the best area available in the total exploration area of 500 square miles. There were 120 million tonnes of reserves in the one seam. The Katoomba seam varied in thickness from 9 feet to 14 feet. The results of Coalex were supervised by the Electricity Commission of New South Wales which was interested in the area. The commission selected the next best area, known as the Newnes Plateau area. What was left over, apart from Wolgan, which was already pegged by Coalex for a coking coal seam, was taken by the Government.

Despite the Government's objection to multinationals and foreign investment, the Government sold that off to the Japanese in a joint venture with Taiheiyo. Taiheiyo was to put up the capital and, out of the profits, take back the capital before anything came to the people of New South Wales. By comparison, in the deal that Coalex did with BP (Australia), BP (Australia) put up all the capital and no repayment was necessary. That was a far better deal for the people of Australia than the one entered into by the Government. The area involved is three times the size of the Clarence colliery. It holds 60 million to 70 million tonnes, spread over three seams, all of which is high in ash and badly split. As a mining engineer, I would say it is very marginal.
The Katoomba seam was 10 feet at one end with splits in the north and only the bottom 6 to 7 feet has any possibility. With an estimated 15 per cent to 20 per cent ash, it will run at about 10,900 Btus a pound, as received. The Lithgow seam deteriorates towards the east and has 24 per cent ash. The possibility is about 17 per cent. The Wolgan seam is only about 4 feet and comprises 30 per cent ash. This is what the Premier and Treasurer will make profits from, in order to pay for the electrification of the railway line west of Lithgow. That is just not on. The credibility of the Government on that project is at zero. It makes me wonder about the rest of the proposals in the Governor's Speech. The Speech reads:

The Government is progressing steadily with its programme of port development.

I would like to have about three hours to speak on that topic. I shall read from the Australian of 9th August, 1980:

NSW coal companies have told Japanese steel, cement and electric power officials that they are “having difficulties” honouring existing contracts, the sources said.

The NSW disruption, which could involve as much as 46 per cent of normal exports, results from limited loading capacity.

This goes right back to the stage where I was in charge of the team promoting the Botany Bay coal loader which was to be built and would have been built, had not Labor won the 1976 election. The reason it has not built the coal loader is purely political. It is not an environmental reason. That has been clearly established on many occasions. Now the Government proposes to take the coal out of Port Kembla, if and when the coal loader is built. It is being built, but time is the essence of the contract. Also, it will be necessary to take the coal down the railway line and undoubtedly people living in thirty residential suburbs will be kept awake by trains thundering through from Tempe to Wollongong, in an endeavour to carry down that line the vast quantity of coal needed. Two years ago when Coalex made an attempt to shift coal at the maximum rate the best rate that could be achieved was 3 million tonnes a year. The company was forced to use road as well as rail to load the ships.

This State has always lagged behind with loading facilities for coal. As a consequence, income has been lost. Had the Botany Bay coal loader been approved it would have been in operation today. There were contracts, conditional on the coal loader being built, which would today be bringing $200 million in income. The Government, faced with not being able to build housing and called upon to provide this and that, would have welcomed that $200 million into its coffers. It could have done much for society.

The most recent survey of world energy trends is by Professor Carroll Wilson of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who worked with experts from the United States of America, Japan, the United Kingdom, Western Europe and China, as well as with environmentalists dealing with world energy trends. It is an authoritative work. It has been published and well documented in the press. It shows that over the next twenty years the annual world requirements for coal will grow from 900 million tonnes in coal equivalent to 3.9 billion tonnes in coal equivalent. That is a 400 per cent growth. Before those figures were quoted the Joint Coal Board did estimates of the highs and lows of expected exports from New South Wales. To 1985 the high figure was 55 million tonnes. The low figure was 34 million tonnes. The Maritime Services Board figure was 39 million tonnes.

Mr Smith]
I shall now refer to planning for ports. The figures I shall mention are taken direct from the New South Wales coal loading exports strategy study. The present capacity of New South Wales is 5.7 million tonnes from the Carrington Basin, 9.3 million tonnes from the Steelworks Channel, 2.5 million tonnes from Balmain, 1 million tonnes from Bails Head and 7 million tonnes from Port Kembla—a total of 25.5 million tonnes. The only capacity being built now, or committed to be built, is a planned extension to 4.5 million tonnes to Balmain and 14 million tonnes to Port Kembla—an additional 9 million tonnes. That means that New South Wales will be lucky to meet the 34 million tonnes—the low figure of the Joint Coal Board.

I have already read from the Australian that New South Wales is already losing sales of coal because of lack of port facilities. In addition, the world coal study indicates a need for large ships. The Australian Financial Review of 7th August, states: "Elsewhere, the report highlights the need for large ships". Queensland can now load 150,000 tonnes from Hay Point; even when Newcastle harbour is finally deepened, the maximum it will be able to load is 110,000 tonnes. That places New South Wales at a serious disadvantage in world trade. Queensland and South Africa have a capacity to load ships of 200,000 tonnes carrying capacity. Thus once again New South Wales will miss out on the market potential.

In the time left to me I wish to raise some matters of concern to the people of Pittwater. One matter is the sandmining proposal of Consolidated Gold Fields Australia Limited. A considerable number of public meetings have been held on that matter. Statements have been made by experts, and by the Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports about a need for ten years of study to ascertain what environment damage will occur should that sand be mined. Previously I have stated publicly that over the past fifty years the rate of natural erosion from Palm Beach, as assessed from aerial photographs, is half a metre a year. That calculates out at a loss of 6,000 cubic metres of sand a year from the Broken Bay system. The proposal of Consolidated Gold Fields Australia Limited is to take 500,000 cubic metres of sand each year from that area. The potential for increased erosion is enormous.

The Deputy Premier, Minister for Public Works and Minister for Ports spoke of a need for ten years of study. I know he bases that statement on the sound advice of experts from his own department. Why then is a public inquiry proceeding? Why waste taxpayers' money when experts have declared already the need for a ten-year study before any mining is carried out? The Government should immediately reject that proposal. It should continue with the study of sand movement along the New South Wales coast. A major problem of erosion exists along the Sydney coastline. Beach nourishment programmes are needed to protect public and private property along that beachfront. Later, I propose to move a private member's motion to that effect.

The Governor's Speech does not mention examination or rectification of transport problems in the Warringah area. The Government should proceed now with the Warringah Expressway. As an immediate project, it should improve the bus system in that area. As a long-term project, it should consider constructing a railway, possibly from Dee Why into the city, to enable persons from that area to get to the city without having to cross the Sydney Harbour Bridge. In 1941, when I was eleven I used to travel to Avallon Beach by bus. It then took an hour and a half. It still takes an hour and a half. Very little has changed in that transport system since 1941. Nowadays there are more single-deck buses; whereas in those days, they were mostly double-deck buses. Of course, the introduction of express buses is a distinct improvement.
It is time the bus services were examined and restructured. I should like the Government to run the buses in the same way as it runs the trains. Major stations could be built at Mona Vale, Narrabeen, Dee Why and Brookvale and buses would stop only at those major stations. They could be like Greyhound bus depots with coffee places, news stands and public facilities. They could be serviced by radio-controlled feeder buses of minibus size. With such a system passengers could be delivered almost to their doors and they would have a service that they have never had before. It is little wonder that there are so many problems with young persons. Sometimes they cannot get home at night because of transport difficulties. The residents of Manly-Warringah have been neglected for years and I doubt that this Government will do anything to alter that position.

The Governor’s Speech does not say that the second section of the Sandy Hollow railway line from Ulan to Maryvale is to be completed. That is a major decision that should be taken by this Government. The line should be completed. It is essential for the wheat industry to enable hard wheats to be separated from soft wheats and to eliminate industrial problems such as those experienced at Darling Harbour or White Bay wheat terminal because all of the wheat is channelled through one small area. Having shipped coal out of Balmain for years I can understand the problems encountered by wheat shippers. An additional problem is the proposed increase in the handling capacity of the Balmain coal loader to 4.5 million tonnes. This will create a bad bottle-neck under Victoria Road.

I feel sorry for the people of Balmain. They have been sold down the river by their local member and by the Government’s decision on the coal loader. Had the coal loader been built at Botany Bay the Balmain installation would have been closed and the environment would have been better than it is today. The specious arguments against the building of the coal loader at Botany Bay are contained in several of the reports. They make interesting reading.

I have received a number of representations on fares from persons outside my electorate. Residents of Artarmon used to travel to Chatswood and return for 20c. With the increase introduced by the Government the fare is 60c. They point out to the Government and to the Parliament that they have suffered not a 17 per cent increase but a 200 per cent increase in the cost of their transport. This Government’s policy on the transport of bulk materials such as coal and wheat has cost New South Wales a considerable amount of money. Every member of the Government ought to read the report published by George Webb entitled ”Some Economic Considerations of the Port Kembla Coal Loader and Coal Transport” in which he stated that the Government’s decision to locate the coal loader in Port Kembla cost the people of New South Wales $528 million. He left out of account the earnings that would have accrued to New South Wales had the coal loader been built at Botany Bay. I conclude my remarks by once again wishing the Governor a happy retirement and thanking him for his service to this State.

Debate adjourned on motion by Mr Mair.

House adjourned, on motion by Mr Haigh, at 10.1 p.m.