Mr. JONES (Melbourne).—I understand my swearing of the oath last week to be a pledge of commitment to all proper constitutional usages—that constitutional changes to lawful sovereignty will only be made according to the rules. For example, there will be no change to an Australian republic except by referendum or by a reference of power by the six sovereign States. I have a deep respect for the British Parliamentary tradition as it has evolved over the centuries and would strongly oppose any break of our traditional link with Great Britain and the Commonwealth. But I should like to see the proclamation of an Australian republic, a step which would probably be of greater psychological significance than of political significance.

This would probably involve no more drastic situation than that the Governor-General's function would become that of a president. Sir Paul Hasluck would go to bed at Yarralumla as Governor-General and wake up on the following day as the President of the Commonwealth. All that would be needed is a change of note paper. Commonwealth Presidents or State Governors could be chosen by a qualified majority in the legislatures, and such men as Sir Macfarlane Burnet, Dr. H. C. Coombs, Sir Paul Hasluck and Lord Casey could in fact find their way to the chief symbolic position in this nation.

The proclamation of a republic might help Australians to acquire some "shock of recognition" of national identity, which is a question that has not really been resolved. As an Australian nationalist and a Victorian nationalist, I am a nationalist in the sense that Mazzini saw Italian nationalism as an intermediate stage between provincialism and internationalism.

I regard myself as being fortunate to represent the electorate of Melbourne. Melbourne is a seat of great complexity and of enormous interest and challenge. During the term in which I am able to serve in this Parliament there are many major changes I should like to see brought about in my electorate. Obviously, the first and most important change relates to poverty. Belatedly the Federal Government has indicated some intention to undertake an inquiry into poverty. Professor Henderson's survey showed that something like 10 per cent of the Australian community lived in a condition of poverty and I understand that that proportion is slightly higher in the electorate I represent. Some people want to eliminate poverty in Melbourne by eliminating the poor, but I do not see this as a remedy.

Secondly, a major remedy to the problem would be to secure the $130 million which it is believed is needed to raise the standard of the schools in the inner-metropolitan area to what might be regarded as an acceptable standard. Clearly, $130 million would represent a substantial proportion of the amount set aside for this purpose by the Premier and Treasurer in his Budget. I do not believe this problem can be settled overnight, but it is a matter of great urgency.

Thirdly, I should like to fight in my electorate the extension of freeways, which represent a great challenge and threat to Melbourne as a community of mixed usage. This, of course, means reversing priorities in our public transport and this is an area where recently, and again belatedly, there has been recognition of the problem even by Ministers on the other side of the Chamber. We must reverse the current trend, and stress that there must be less emphasis on the absolute supremacy of the privately-owned motor vehicle and greater stress laid on public transport. This is the only course that will save Melbourne from becoming another city like Los Angeles, which has been described as a reasonable man's vision of hell. It is not a vision I should like to see converted into an Australian context. Districts such as Carlton, North Melbourne and Parkville will clearly suffer as a re-

sult of the introduction of further freeways, and the areas of Collingwood, Fitzroy in the electorate represented by my Leader are similarly threatened. I do not wish to see the domination of the City of Melbourne by the motor car and I commend the Government for initiating moves which will improve the condition of public transport.

Fourthly, I wish to have the abattoirs and cattle yards removed from Kensington, where 80 acres of wonderful land are being used for these purposes—in fact, it is the most fertilized land in Australia! This land could be devoted to a higher public use than it is at present. A practical measure of decentralization will be to get the abattoirs and cattle yards out to the provincial areas beyond the city where they are wanted, and away from the City of Melbourne where they are not wanted. If the Government wishes to appoint a Ministry of Decentralization this would not be a bad project upon which to start.

My fifth point concerns the democratization of the Melbourne City Council, that cosy collection of clubland cronies. Keith Dunstan, writing in the *Bulletin*, remarked that he thought the Melbourne City Council was worth an "A" classification by the National Trust because it is one of the few eighteenth century institutions, or perhaps early nineteenth century, to survive in our society. The boundaries of the City of Melbourne have not been changed since August, 1939—a week before the second world war commenced. Half of the members of the Melbourne City Council are elected by 71 per cent of the voters and the remaining half are elected by the other 29 per cent. The small ward of Hoddle has 1,673 voters and, of course, is a Civic Group stronghold that elects three councillors. The Labor stronghold of Hopetoun ward has approximately 7,000 voters and on a *per capita* basis Hopetoun ward should return twelve councillors. But that point would be strongly argued within the Melbourne City Council where representation is not by head but by interest. Such a consideration left this Parliament in the 1860s and one would think that the Melbourne City Council, the most important local government body in Victoria, ought to be prepared to face the challenges of this democratic age.

I certainly hope to work and fight in this Parliament for the democratization of the Melbourne City Council, and against the "lucky dip" type of method by which the Lord Mayor is chosen. Sometimes one might select a major piece out of the lucky dip, but often it is a dud. If in this concrete and steel era the City of Melbourne becomes depopulated, the only human institution that will remain in it will be the Melbourne City Council! All it needs is a sufficient complement of steel and concrete and members will continue to be elected to that body.

The sixth point I wish to make is that I should like to end the dream of "Melbourne unlimited". That may be a strange statement for a member for Melbourne to make but one of the more disastrous aspects of the Bolte era was this dream of "Melbourne unlimited". It was always rather quaint that it should be a member from a rural electorate who proclaimed the idea of "Melbourne unlimited". Such a concept has meant the complete reversal of any constructive programme towards decentralization. I was pleased to note the reference to decentralization in His Excellency's Speech, but this is rather late in practical terms of Government policy. In 1955 Melbourne's population was 65 per cent of that of the State of Victoria; in 1972 it is 71 per cent. It is argued that by 1985 the population will be 3·5 million and that by the year 2000 it may be as many as 5 million. If this is the case, Melbourne will indeed be a concrete jungle of freeways and parking lots and, as I said, the Melbourne City Council. One wants to see, and I say it again, Melbourne survive as an area of mixed usage.

As a fisherman, you, Mr. Speaker, will be aware of the unfortunate predicament of the crayfish in that as it gets bigger it reaches the point that it begins to strangle first the alimentary canal and then its nervous system. I believe this happens to cities; when a city gets too big it strangles the core and takes the life out of it. I do not want to see the doctrine of "Melbourne unlimited".

The seventh point I wish to make about my electorate is that I should like to do something to promote the beauty and amenity of Melbourne and, in particular, to eliminate the eyesores at the western end of the electorate.

In general terms, one needs to recognize that the economic, social and political problems of the 70s are really quite different in scale and type from those of the past decades. From my personal point of view, it is quite an extraordinarily interesting period in which to have been elected to a legislature. The year 1972 will obviously be a watershed year which will be marked in Victoria by the retirement of Sir Henry Bolte and in the Commonwealth sphere by the defeat of the Liberal-Country Party Government at the forthcoming elections. The Liberal Party has held office for a long time, for the most part by enjoying strong leadership. With the withdrawal of the strong leadership of Sir Robert Menzies and the disappearance of Mr. Holt, the Federal Liberal Party has faced a leadership vacuum followed by a conflict between the progressive and regressive wings of the Liberal Party, a conflict which I believe will lead to its ultimate disintegration.

The Liberal Party in itself is a paternalistic party which has relied so much on the leadership image, whereas the Labor Party in this sense has always tried to be fraternal. The Liberal Party has relied very heavily on the idea of instinct and tradition, whilst the Labor Party has frankly recognized the nature of the class society around it. In a sense, the Liberal Party has always been strong on the need for a sense of hierarchy from the lordly G.C.M.G.s, down to the humble M.B.E.s and E.D.s, to say nothing of the Knights Bachelor and the D.S.O.s.

On the other hand, the Australian Labor Party has always tried to be a classless party and, if it were the Government, I believe it would be a classless Government. Members of the Labor Party believe in equality for all citizens and in particular in the liberation of one section of the community which has never had its place in the sun—the female voters of the State. I should like to put myself very firmly in the vanguard of women's liberation, if not first in this place certainly in the community at large.

The Liberal Party has been frankly and honestly committed to the ideology of privilege, and there has been a frank recognition of the *élitist* nature of privilege in education. To be fair to the Minister of Education, this is more apparent in the determination of the Federal Liberal Party than in the operations of the Education Department under the administration of the Minister. The view of the Federal Liberal Party has been a minority "booted and spurred to ride, with millions bridled and saddled to be ridden"—to quote from Macaulay.

The Labor Party has always been a party of ideas and several of them have been accepted in the Budget today — a very late conversion. Perhaps some of the traditions to which the Liberal Party has been committed are disappearing. The Labor Party has been a party of ideology, and because people in that party feel very strongly about conflicting ideas, this very often leads to differences of opinion. Whenever a number of people really believe in change but are uncertain in many ways about how those ideas should be implemented and about a scale of

priorities, then naturally this occurs, but there is no mystery about the mystique of the Liberal Party; it is a success party, it believes in success and believes in hanging on to office.

Newsweek remarked that the Prime Minister's idea is that a short-term consideration is what happens in the next ten minutes, and a long-term consideration is what will happen in the next twenty minutes.

In office, the important thing to the Liberal Party has been hanging on. The curious thing is that although the Liberal Party has been in office collectively in both the Federal and State spheres for a much longer period than has the Labor Party, it would be short-sighted to deny that the great bulk of the ideas that have come to be accepted year after year — I am not talking about the recent past, but of two decades — have predominantly been ideas from the left-hand side of the Chamber, where the Labor Party has predominated.

In the 1950s, the Liberal Party mirrored with uncanny accuracy the shortsightedness, selfishness, snobbishness and fear of the unknown of a significant section of the Australian community. In the 1960s, the Liberal Party survived because of Sir Robert Menzies, who was unquestionably the greatest party leader in Australian history, followed very closely by Sir Henry Bolte as a party leader. I stress the word "party". Also, the Liberal Party was kept in office by the role of the Democratic Labor Party, the significance of which party we on the Opposition side of the House cannot deny, and also by the resultant schisms within the Australian Labor Party, schisms which I am glad to say have finished in this State.

Some of the great election issues of the past, in both the Federal and State spheres, even from this side of the House, now seem to be completely — and are indeed completely — irrelevant. As I say, there was a leadership vacuum in Canberra after Sir Robert Menzies retired and following the death of Mr. Holt, a vacuum which was filled by a leader brought down from the upper House. In Canberra, for the past twelve months, there has been something approaching Government by somnambulism.

I am sorry that I was not in this Chamber during the period of Sir Henry Bolte, because I should have liked to observe him.

Mr. BORTHWICK.—He would have given you curry!

Mr. JONES.—I am sure Sir Henry would not have interjected during a maiden speech. We will watch with some interest to see the effect of the power vacuum in the State Liberal Party as the seventeen-year Bolte era fades into memory. I shall be interested to watch the Premier trying to run according to reason a party which is not strictly constructed according to reason. At least it is comforting to know that the honorable gentleman has not yet exhausted that volcano, the Chief Secretary and, in a sense, the Minister for Social Welfare to continue in the grand old Bolte–Rylah tradition of "knock them down and tell them nothing". Of course, we all know that Sir Henry Bolte was enormously popular with the electorate and that in fact the Liberal Party vote was frequently higher than 35 per cent. This is not said in any party or factional way, but as an observer with, I hope, some historical sense.

My working life has been divided between education and the law. On the question of law I am very grateful to see some of the suggestions that have been included in His Excellency's Speech. I am particularly pleased about the suggestion that an ombudsman may be introduced. The scheme in that has been Labor Party policy for six years. I am also delighted to see that there is to be provision for compensation for victims of criminal

attacks. One hopes that a more generous scheme than that which operates in New South Wales will be introduced. The scheme in that State has generally been regarded as being too limited in scope. I hear honorable members opposite nodding assent.

I should like to see a much more thorough-going reform of the criminal law than has been attempted in recent years, and, most important, I should like to see an improvement in the granting of legal assistance to people with limited means. The legal aid scheme has worked very well, but it is still true that it is difficult for people with limited means and with very limited experience or sophistication to have anything like equal access to the courts. I believe this is something that the parties have to look at, perhaps by means of the Parliamentary committee system, to see what improvement can be made.

I wish to devote some time to the subject of education, particularly education in the post-industrial era. Conventional education in most school systems until now has placed great emphasis on hygiene, order, team spirit, working under direction for goals set by other people and the transmission of values of what in Australia has mostly been a conservative and property-loving society. Again this is not said in any critical sense.

Schools themselves are mostly organized on "industrial" lines in which children are raw material to be processed by "workers" in a centrally located factory, or school, managed on bureaucratic lines, and subject to disciplines and uniforms, with intense competition among the pupils, a high rejection rate in terms of the ultimate goals set—indeed it is a higher-quality control system than that of General Motors-Holden's Pty. Ltd. at Dandenong—and a heavy time-bias because of the complete domination of the learning process by the clock.

When lives are job centred, such an education is inevitable and reasonably appropriate. Leisure time is merely a period of recuperation between bouts of work and many people are disinterested or disinclined in the prospect of enlarging their range of experience—hence the desire to "kill time" and the general reliance on sedative forms of leisure occupation, such as television, drinking and smoking. I do not put this in a critical, puritanical spirit; I put it as a matter of observation. Education for a post-industrial society in which lives will be increasingly leisure centred would require a considerable shift of emphasis in school planning.

A reduction in working hours will raise problems in the field of education. It will mean changes in school planning when there is a 35-hour week. I do not say that will be introduced within the next three years, but I do not think anyone would doubt that it will come about before the end of the decade, not because of an enormous political change, but because of increasing sophistication in manufacture which will make unskilled and semi-skilled workers redundant and because people will be retiring earlier and living longer. Another factor is that as women master the control of their reproductive cycle, more and more women will enter the work force and compete in it. There will then have to be more "rationing" of work to avoid retrenchments and unemployment which no one wishes to see.

The basic problem of education in the post-industrial society is to help people to take a greater control of their own lives, to make a greater use of their own talents, and to convince them that time is finite and the only irreplaceable commodity. At present many people have a low regard for themselves and their individual significance, and they take the view that leisure is only a passive respite between "earning time", which they see as having a cash value, and "leisure time", which they see as the preparation for earning time.

The absolute barriers between work and leisure will need to be broken down. When thinking of education in the future, there is one problem we need to face. It is that education should be seen not as an obstacle race in which few finish the course or, as it has been described by Ivan Illich, as an "inverted funnel" from which most people fall out — indeed, the system could not really work, unless the bulk of the people did fall out. But there should be a great range of options in which students can, in effect, plug in or plug out.

Schools are not particularly effective instruments for instruction. On this subject, I am a convert to the views of Ivan Illich who, as some honorable members will remember, lectured in Australia this year. He made the point that most of what we learn is learnt outside school. He talks about talking which we all do so fluently.

Mr. WILCOX.—You do not have any problem.

Mr. JONES.—The same cannot be said of some back-benchers in the Liberal Party. But compared with talking, writing which we learn at school generally we do so badly. There is also walking, and physical co-ordination, sports and swimming, driving, cooking and using tools, social relationships — meaning sex and marriage — basic philosophy, by which I mean secular or religious commitment, and elementary reasoning. These are all learnt outside the schools' education system and they are the things which tend to be the major components of the way in which we live.

But school is an excellent sorting machine. It classifies people and sets them apart. Just as cattle and sheep are branded, so school leaves its brand or caste mark for life and few succeed in washing or shaking it off.

If a person attends a poor school and he lives in a poverty stricken social environment, the school system will do little to overcome his disadvantages. If one is disadvantaged, school will tend to extend those differences through life. Cultural poverty seems to be inherited and is extraordinarily difficult to shake off.

It is an irony that as we approach the goals of a satisfactory class—pupil ratio in conventionally equipped class-rooms, a goal which has been pursued by all parties for some time—these goals may recede, turn into a mirage and prove irrelevant to the education needs in the post-industrial society.

I have already indicated that I am a Republican. I am also a Socialist, but a Christian Socialist influenced by Methodism rather than Marxism, I certainly regard myself as a wowser on such issues as gambling, liquor, and drug dependence generally, including the officially sponsored drugs of addiction. But out of my Christian concern I have, I hope, developed some kind of sense of community and a sense of common human interest which rises above party interests, even in this place.

One would not want to exaggerate, but one sees the tendency for some people to think of society as being equivalent to the market. I should like to see society at large having more sense of community so that the economic factor is not at the centre of things but is only secondary. We should all like to see a gentler, milder and more compassionate world in which we recognize each other's frailties, a world with less stress on competition and more on co-operation. We all share the space ship Earth, and in the next three hazardous decades we might have to wipe the slate clean and revise some of the dogmas of the past.

There are two groups of words which always stick in my mind and with which I should like to close. The first is Immanuel Kant's great idea of the categorical imperative, a consideration which has not often

been argued in this Chamber. Expressed simply, Immanuel Kant's idea was that the categorical imperative was a command by the conscience to act as if the maxim of one's action would become by one's will a universal law of nature. It was, in other words, that a man should always act as if he were virtually legislating for the whole world so that he would take the actions of any individual in a community and multiply the actions of that individual—in the case of the present population of the world—3 billion times and ask what sort of a world it would be if everybody acted in the same way. If one is a polluter, one would have a polluted world. If a man acts resolutely and rejects pollution and violence, and expects what he is doing to be multiplied 3 billion times, he is acting along the ideas of the categorical imperative. He would be acting as if he were a legislator for the whole world. Therefore, legislation against violence and cruelty in society has to begin with the individual.

The second point is to recognize the frailty of the human situation and that we are all weak. We all have grave weaknesses and we are inter-dependent on each other. One of the most penetrating things ever written by anybody was a few sentences written by Pascal, the great French thinker.

Mr. WHITING.—What page?

Mr. JONES.—No. 264 of the *Pensées*, with which I am sure the honorable member for Mildura is familiar—

> Man is but a reed, the weakest in nature; but he is a thinking reed.

I see the Attorney-General smiling—

> It does not take the whole Universe in arms to crush him. A vapour, or a drop of water is enough to kill him. But if the Universe were to crush him, man would still be nobler than his killer. For he knows that he is dying, and that the Universe has the advantage over him; the Universe knows nothing of this.

The office of a member of Parliament is a high calling I hope one day to be worthy of it.

On the motion of Mr. TRETHEWEY (Bendigo), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until next day.

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 5) on the motion of Mr. Meagher (Chief Secretary) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—The Government has been stewing for four months over this relatively small measure. Although small, it is nevertheless important to legislation governing co-operative housing societies. The Bill will make six amendments to the principal Act. Two relate to the bankruptcy of a member of a co-operative society; two facilitate the management of older societies; and two affect the future operations of societies.

One amendment to the principal Act will enable the Official Receiver in Bankruptcy to be registered as the owner of a bankrupt member's shares so that he can act on his behalf. The second principal amendment will enable the registrar to authorize a society to hold its conventional meetings every two months with only three directors present instead of five. The third amendment will enable the board of directors of a society to meet quarterly instead of every two months.

The fourth amendment will enable the Treasurer to guarantee a larger aggregate liability; the maximum is raised from $200 million to $220 million. The fifth amendment will enable the Treasurer to indemnify societies to a maximum of $3 million instead of $2 million. This is the area in which societies provide finance to their members above the 80 per cent of the value of a property as provided under the legislation, and up to 95 per cent. The