

Bill was introduced, members of the Opposition said that it was toothless. Debate on amending legislation, which I understand is to be brought down shortly, will probably prove the truth of the statements we made at that time. Rubbish is dumped throughout the length and breadth of Victoria.

In some overseas cities, garbage is decomposed in the sewerage systems but siltage in sewerage plants has caused problems. In some places garbage is successfully disposed of by composting and incinerating plants. However, cities which incinerate rubbish face the problem that, although some material can be burnt, other material, such as tin and glass, cannot. There is also the problem of disposing of the ashes. One city in Germany has proved that ash from garbage disposal plants can be used as fertilizer, but the problem of how to dispose of broken glass and tins remains.

The Melbourne City Council and suburban councils are seeking to buy metropolitan land containing holes suitable for the dumping of garbage. Many people say that we live in an affluent society, although one might doubt it when one sees the squalor and poverty in which some people exist. In a so-called affluent society, the problems of disposal of waste are intensified. Many American practices have been adopted in Australia since the second world war. More prepared foodstuffs packed in bottles and cans are now used in Australia, and those packages are not easily destructible.

I realize that the Minister for Local Government is aware of the problems involved. I suggest that there should be a seminar, similar to the one recently held in Sydney, to discuss what areas are available for garbage disposal. I understand that some years ago the Department of Health started to survey available areas, but I do not know whether that investigation was completed. I was able briefly to examine the papers

presented at the Sydney conference on garbage disposal, and they were well worth while. Some expense would be involved in the holding of such a conference, but a small fee could be paid to those participating. Representatives of the Department of Health, municipal councillors, municipal engineers and town clerks should be given the opportunity to confer on the broad problem and attempt to ascertain future trends. It may be necessary to decide whether to fill the great hole at Yallourn, or to build destructors. Destructors cannot be built overnight and they are very costly. The metropolitan area may have to be zoned to permit the problems to be tackled on a broad basis.

I ask the Government to take heed of my remarks. I reiterate my congratulations to the three new members of the House who have spoken in this debate and I look forward with interest to the maiden speeches of other new members.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province).—I support the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. I congratulate those honorable members who have already spoken in this debate, particularly those who addressed the House for the first time, on the able way in which they made their points. Like other members, I wish to reaffirm the loyalty of the electors of the province I represent to our Sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II. I also wish to thank her representative in Victoria, Sir Rohan Delacombe, for his Speech. His Excellency and Lady Delacombe have endeared themselves to all sections of the community. Recently, they visited the shires of Daylesford and Glenlyon, Newstead, Newham and Woodend and Gisborne, all of which are within the Bendigo Province, and they must have been impressed by the warmth and sincerity of the welcome afforded them. We in turn were charmed and delighted with this gracious

couple, and on behalf of the electors in the Bendigo Province I wish them a long and happy stay in Victoria.

It is with great humility and some apprehension that I address the House to-night. I am fully aware that I was in the cradle when the most senior member of the House was elected. I am the youngest member of the House, but I bring with me the energy and enthusiasm of youth. I hope that, in time, I may gain the wisdom and experience of the more senior members of the Council. I have much to live up to in representing the Bendigo Province. My predecessors in the past 30 years were Sir John Lienhop and Mr. Harry Grigg. Mr. Grigg had a great personal following. He will be remembered not only for his service to his constituents but also for his activities in rural fire brigades. He was a particularly able competitor in their competitions, and was also an able administrator. He helped form the Country Fire Authority and was one of its first chairmen.

Honorable members may not be aware that this is the second time that a Frederick Sheppard Grimwade has sat in this House. My great grandfather was elected as a representative of the North Yarra Province in the Legislative Council in 1891, and he represented it over a period of fifteen years. About that time, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works was established to arrange the water supply for Melbourne, and it is to water that I wish to direct attention to-night—to its storage, distribution, and utilization. Recently, through the metropolitan and provincial press, all citizens of Victoria have been made aware of the need to restrict the use of water. To-night, the Minister for Local Government made a statement on Melbourne's future water supply. It is most important that all people should realize the need to conserve water now. It is unusual for this need to arise at this time of the year. Water restrictions are generally applied during a

The Hon. F. S. Grimwade.

long, dry summer, and it is now the early part of spring. One good point is that the city dweller is made aware of the drought conditions experienced by farmers in this dry season.

Water is a limited resource, even though it may be re-used. The problems relating to water and its utilization should be seriously considered. They can be approached in two ways. Attempts may be made to obtain more water, and to improve its utilization. To obtain more water may not be impossible, although it may seem to be so. The Government is actively encouraging the seeding of clouds to precipitate rain, and two aircraft are stationed at Horsham for this purpose. I am convinced that cloud seeding does produce more rain. In an article in the publication *Victoria's Resources*, Mr. Higgs, of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, wrote—

The results show convincingly that seeded clouds produce many times more rain than the unseeded ones.

Of course, if the right clouds are not available, seeding will not bring rain. Another way of obtaining more usable water is to desalinate sea water. This is technically possible and many countries have attempted it, but it is not yet economic for Australia to use this method. Storage of water is most important and, in this field, the Government has done a wonderful job. The Government has a ten-year plan providing for the construction of nine large storages. Three have been completed; work has commenced on three; and work is about to commence on the other three. Unfortunately, large sites for the economical construction of water storages are not now readily available. Water can best be stored where rain falls. Encouragement, perhaps by way of grants, should be given to the establishment of on-the-farm storages. I am thinking particularly of dams of some 200-acre-feet capacity. The Soil Conservation Authority has done a wonderfully good job in siting and planning

such dams, but its resources are limited; it needs more man power and money. More attention should be paid to this aspect of water storage.

In the Bendigo Province, water is distributed by the wonderful Coliban system. Large channels of great length supply water to Bendigo, Castlemaine, Harcourt and other towns in the area. Most of the main channels are concrete lined, and I understand that the loss of water in those sections is a mere 10 per cent. The branch channels are some 340 miles long; most of them are not concrete lined, and the percentage of water lost from them is much greater. The over-all loss of water through evaporation and seepage is about one-third of the quantity reticulated. The Water Commission is progressively lining these channels, but, in order to prevent further losses of water, it may be economic to accelerate the work.

When the water reaches the farmer, he makes effective use of only half of it. This aspect should be investigated, and perhaps spray irrigation, instead of flood irrigation, could be used, and the sowing of different species of crops or pasture may well improve the water utilization. The Government is aware of these problems, but I urge it continually to assess the situation in the light of new technical developments.

The Government should encourage the re-use of water used by industry and the city population. Up to a point, economics is possibly the only limitation to this practice. There is a river in the United States of America which acts as a channel for the supply of domestic water and as a drain for the effluent from sewage treatment works. I am told that this water passes through this cycle seven times with no apparent ill effects to the health of the inhabitants of the various towns. Therefore, I am pleased that the Government has called for a report on the use of the treated effluent from the Carrum sewage plant in industrial plants and

on its agricultural possibilities. Why should this water be piped into the sea if it can be used to advantage?

Since 1950, 33 water supply catchments have been proclaimed under the Soil Conservation and Land Utilization Act 1958. Following proclamation, the land use within the water supply catchment may be determined by the Soil Conservation Authority after consultation with the appropriate district committee. Eighteen catchments have been land-use determined, and not all the land within these proclaimed catchments is Crown land—a considerable portion is privately owned.

I am not concerned about the man who is despoiling our natural heritage by improper land use—his activities should be restricted. However, it is possible for a land-use determination to cause hardship to a farmer. There could be the genuine case of a farmer utilizing his land satisfactorily until the imposition of a land-use determination. A potato grower who had been growing potatoes for a number of years could be told that he was no longer allowed to undertake this production. A farmer might have planted a pine plantation and be prevented from harvesting it—even under supervision. A claim for compensation could be made; but there is no provision for compensation. This aspect should be examined.

These restrictions on land use are not marked on the title or in the rate-book. If the buyer is unaware of the determination, it is really a case of *caveat emptor*. A simpler method of protection would be to mark the title, not necessarily with the land-use determination, but with a warning that the land use had been determined and that advice should be sought from the Soil Conservation Authority. I commend the Government for its actions in these matters in the past, and I hope that in the near future answers will be found to the problems I have highlighted regarding water supply and use.