Mr. LIND (Dandenong).—I ask the Treasurer whether it is a fact that Tour Finance Limited, of 83 William Street, Melbourne, has had its money lender's licence revoked because of serious offences, and whether it is at present operating for a front company, or any other companies, inasmuch as it is taking assignment of loans for other companies. The company is said to be charging exorbitant rates of interest. It is said that, the other companies not having any money to lend, Tour Finance Limited is making money available at what are still exorbitant but lower rates of interest than the other companies then charge. I ask the Treasurer to investigate this matter and inform the House of the actual position.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I have exhausted all other means, correspondence and the like, of having a serious situation at the Plenty Primary School remedied, so that I must now raise this matter in the House. On the 22nd July, 1970, I wrote to the Minister of Education about the fire hazard at this weatherboard school in a rural bush area. I was given an assurance that remedial action would be taken and that the seized-up windows would be fixed so that they could be opened. I was informed by the Minister in August, 1970, that renovations had been approved in 1967, but it appears that they were overlooked.

I wrote to the Minister again in April of this year, as reasonable time had been given for the windows to be fixed to allow pupils to get out through them in the case of fire. The Minister said that the work would be undertaken as a matter of urgency. On an inspection of the school this week, I found that no action had been taken. The fire-danger period is approaching. The school came through one summer fire-danger period with its windows in this condition, but I cannot accept the responsibility of allowing another summer period to pass without the windows being fixed. Therefore, I ask that the matter be attended to urgently.

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—I am not aware of what is alleged by the honorable member for Dandenong, but I shall certainly have it investigated. I cannot promise that I will inform the House of the result of the investigation, but I will certainly inform the honorable member. The matter raised by the honorable member for Gippsland East was raised early today by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to Orbost. Apparently, there has been some confusion but, whatever promise I made about Orbost, I now make about Genoa.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—Three matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education were raised during this debate, one by the honorable member for Morwell, one by the honorable member for Geelong North and one by the honorable member for Greensborough. I shall direct the attention of the Minister of Education to these matters and ensure that replies are provided to the honorable members.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.18 *p.m., until Tuesday, October 12.*

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, October 12, 1971.

The PRESIDENT **(the Hon. R. W. Garrett)** took the chair at 4.53 p.m., and read the prayer.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES (INDEMNITIES) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS. (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government), was read a first time.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION.

PAISLEY BRIQUETTE DEPOT.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

Has any final decision been made by the State Electricity Commission on the future use of the Paisley briquette depot; if so, what are the proposals?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer is—

No final decision has been made by the commission, but it is currently giving consideration to the future use of the depot area. The commission's own requirements are being determined, and it is envisaged that part of the area will be required for a zone sub-station and a further part as a storage area for contractor's plant and equipment during the construction of the proposed new power station project at Newport.

A request from the Education Department for the reservation of 15 acres as a school site has been agreed to by the commission, but the location of the site has yet to be finalized.

Before deciding on the course of action to be taken with the remaining 105 acres in the depot area, the commission is awaiting advice from the Housing Commission whether it is interested in development of the site.

The State Electricity Commission will take up the matter of rezoning of the depot area with the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the City of Altona when more definite advice can be given regarding prospective use of the area.

CHAR.

MORWELL PLANT: PRODUCTION: EXPORTS.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) What amount of char has been produced at the Morwell plant since it began operations?

(*b*) How much char has been exported, and to what countries?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer is—

Australian Char Pty. Ltd., the company which operates the char plant at Morwell, is a private company engaged in a competitive business and, while the State Electricity Commission has a small shareholding in the company, it would not be appropriate for the commission to disclose information concerning the company's operations and marketing. I would suggest that the honorable member contact the company concerned for the information he desires.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

COLLINGWOOD EDUCATION CENTRE.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province) asked the Minister of Public Works—

(*a*) At what stage are the plans for the complete Collingwood education centre (primary, secondary, adult open classrooms, etc.) at Vere and Cromwell Streets, Collingwood?

(*b*) Why have final plans been delayed so long?

(*c*) Is it envisaged that there will be any change in the plans as exhibited in a special showing at the Public Works Department while the Minister was overseas; if so, why?

(*d*) When will tenders be called?

(*e*) Is it planned to build the centre in its entirety, or only in part?

(*f*) What are the target dates for completion of the various stages?

(*g*) When will tenders be let?

(*h*) When is it anticipated that construction work will start?

(*i*) Is finance to be made available progressively over the next three years to complete the centre; if so, what is the appropriation for—(i) stage 1; and (ii) subsequent stages?

(*j*) What are the Education Department's plans for interim accommodation for the Collingwood High School for the years 1972, 1973 and 1974, if necessary, with regard to site, buildings, amenities and toilet blocks, respectively?

(*k*) What transport will be provided at Government expense?

(*l*) What alternative accommodation will be provided for Cromwell Street Primary School No. 2462 as construction of the centre progresses, taking into account the large number of extra children due for enrolment?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—The answers are—

(*a*) The feasibility study of the total development of the centre has been completed and discussions are taking place with the Education Department.

(*b*) For the first time an endeavour has been made to obtain community involvement in a centre planned to provide educational facilities for primary, secondary and adult education. The opinions of educationalists, sociologist, local municipalities, parents and experts in educational planning were obtained to aid in the preparation of the scheme which is unique in Australia.

Such an involvement has been and will continue to be time consuming, but it is considered necessary if the total concept is to be planned as efficiently as the local community would desire.

(*c*) At this time it is envisaged that the scheme will be essentially the same as that exhibited.

(*d*) It is at present intended, subject to any unavoidable delay, that tenders will be invited in the second half of 1972.

(*e*) The buildings will be built by stages. It was intended that the first stage to be constructed would be the secondary school. However, I am now pleased to announce that the Minister of Education has now reviewed the programme, and authorized the construction of stages 1 and 2 concurrently. This will provide accommodation for 1,000 high school students and 1,000 primary school students.

The following stages will be constructed in accordance with programmes to be determined once stages 1 and 2 are committed:—

(*f*), (*g*) and (*h*) Subject to the completion of contract documents, being finalized on time, it is expected that the contract for stages 1 and 2 would be let towards the end of 1972 and construction work commence shortly thereafter. Occupation of these two stages should be effected by the third term of 1974.

I am unable at this time to give any time table for stages 3, 4 and 5.

(*i*) Finance will be available for stages 1 and 2 as soon as the contract is let and the contract amount known.

(*j*) Temporary arrangements are to be made for the accommodation of the high school.

(*k*) Transport is not deemed necessary.

(*l*) The Cromwell Street Primary School will remain in occupation until such time as stage 2, that is the primary school, is completed. However, if numbers dictate, senior classes may need to be housed at other schools in the vicinity.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

MELBOURNE–DIMBOOLA SERVICE: MURTOA–HOPETOUN SERVICE.

The Hon. B. P. DUNN (North-Western Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

Since the implementation by the Victorian Railways Commissioners of a revised timetable affecting passenger rail services between Melbourne and Dimboola and between Murtoa and Hopetoun—(i) what number of passengers have arrived at and departed from each station between Melbourne and Dimboola; (ii) what number of passengers have arrived at and departed from each station serviced by the rail motor running between Murtoa and Hopetoun; and (iii) what were the corresponding figures for passenger loadings at each station referred to in (i) and (ii) during the same period last year?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—As the answer is statistical and detailed, I seek leave of the House for its incorporation in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave was granted, and the answer was as follows:—

(i) The information sought is only available from 7th July, 1971, and in respect of stations Dimboola to Ararat inclusive. Special tallies were arranged at those stations in respect of the 6.45 a.m. Dimboola–Melbourne and 4.55 p.m. Melbourne–Dimboola trains, following their schedules being altered to accord with the new Portland line time-table.

On that basis, the number of passengers other than employees travelling on duty, and so on, joining and alighting from those trains at the stations mentioned to 25th September were as follows:—

	Joining	Alighting
Dimboola	166	244
Horsham	628	901
Murtoa	234	460
Stawell	500	764
Great Western	64	11
Ararat	2,149	2,505

(ii) and (iii) The information is set out in the following statement in respect of the Hopetoun line rail motor.

However, details for 1970 in respect of the trains between Melbourne and Dimboola are not available.

—	1971		1970	
	Joining	Alighting	Joining	Alighting
Hopetoun ..	171	174	208	130
Rosebery ..	10	5	4	11
Beulah	41	61	75	104
Galaquil ..	4	7	3	5
Brim	54	17	46	47
Lah	2	Nil	4	4
Warracknabeal ..	297	364	349	396
Sheephills ..	7	8	6	16
Minyip	64	60	120	103
Coromby ..	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil
Murtoa	628	588	633	634

LANDS DEPARTMENT.

MURRAY GOULBURN CO-OPERATIVE COMPANY LIMITED: LAND AT SIMPSON.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

Will the Government make land at Simpson available to Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited to erect a store and depot; if not, why?

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The answer is—

The Government has been most anxious to ensure that the best and most appropriate shopping facilities are available to the citizens of Simpson and the district generally. The most promising proposal to date has come from three of the four dairying companies which operate in the area and which propose to form a consortium to finance the development of modern shopping facilities. Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited has been invited to join that consortium but to date has not seen fit to be associated with the proposal. The Rural Finance and Settlement Commission has asked Murray Goulburn to reconsider its decision. On the question of the establishment of a milk depot, the Government is not anxious to encourage this project as it believes that in the present circumstances it is more important to give priority to the establishment of the best possible shopping facilities. In addition, the establishment of additional milk handling facilities at Simpson is difficult to justify in view of the Commonwealth Government's and the dairy industry's attitude which opposes expansion for dairying in Victoria, and which for the present has caused a cessation of new land being made available for dairying in the Simpson area.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITIES COMMISSION.

NURSING HOMES: COMMONWEALTH GRANTS.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

In view of the press announcement by the Acting Premier of 16th September, 1971, that the Government was accepting the Commonwealth Government's offer of a dollar for each dollar of State grants for nursing homes—(i) has the Government made a formal acceptance to the Commonwealth; if not, when will it do so; and (ii) will this Commonwealth finance be additional to the Hospitals and Charities Commission's present loan grants?

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The answer is—

(i) and (ii) The position in this matter is that on 16th September, 1971, the Acting Premier wrote to the Prime Minister informing him of the Government's desire

that Victoria should participate in the Commonwealth proposals incorporated in the States Grants (Nursing Homes) Act 1969 and suggesting that this arrangement should be effective from the beginning of the current financial year. The Commonwealth's concurrence in this matter is awaited.

The legislation provides that subject to certain approvals and determinations by the Commonwealth Minister for Health the Commonwealth will recoup to the State one-half of its expenditure on approved capital projects after that expenditure has been incurred.

Details of the financial arrangements involved in attracting the Commonwealth assistance available have yet to be determined.

HOUSING COMMISSION.

RICHMOND REDEVELOPMENT.

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL (Melbourne Province) asked the Minister of Public Works—

Is it the intention of the Housing Commission to notify owners of shops in the Berry Street area of Church Street, Richmond, that it will be acquiring their premises within one month; if so, has the Richmond City Council been notified of the commission's intention?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—The answer supplied to me by the Minister of Housing is, "No".

SOUTH MELBOURNE REDEVELOPMENT.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province) asked the Minister of Public Works—

What is the present situation with the Housing Commission regarding the area in South Melbourne bounded by Pickles and Dorcas streets and City and Nelson roads?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—The Minister of Housing has supplied the following answer:—

The commission has passed its first resolution recommending that the area be dealt with as a reclamation area and is at present awaiting advice from the City of South Melbourne of a date at which council would be prepared to consult with the commission as required by the provisions of the Housing Act.

HORSE-RACING.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD: RACECOURSES DEVELOPMENT FUND: COUNTRY RACING CLUBS.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister of Public Works—

(*a*) What amounts, stated as percentages of the turnover tax, have been received by each country racing club from the Totalizator Agency Board for each of the past five racing seasons?

(*b*) What payments have been made to each country racing club from the Racecourses Development Fund, including payments (if any) made to racing clubs confined to Saturday dates, for each of the past five racing seasons?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—The answers are—

(*a*) Details of payments to country racing clubs are published by the Totalizator Agency Board in its annual reports. I will arrange to forward copies of the annual reports for the past five years to the honorable member.

(*b*) Payments made to country racing clubs from the Racecourses Development Fund are set out in the attached tables. The fund was established on 1st July, 1968, but first payments were not made until the financial year 1969-70.

I would mention that this information will also be included in the first report of the Racecourses Licences Board which is expected to be available for distribution next week.

I will ensure that the honorable member receives a copy of this report.

I seek leave of the House to have the tables attached to the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without being read.

Leave was granted, and the tables were as follows:—

RACECOURSES DEVELOPMENT FUND.

EXPENDITURE ON COUNTRY RACING CLUBS.

1969-70 Racing Season.

—	Refinancing	Approved works	Minor works	Total
	$	$	$	$
Apsley	..	..	..	..
Ararat	3,500.00	3,037.50	1,200.00	7,737.50
Avoca	..	..	..	..
Bacchus Marsh	..	..	14,041.00	14,041.00
Bairnsdale	..	..	3,990.00	3,990.00
Ballarat	..	..	..	..
Benalla	..	5,810.50	..	5,810.50
Bendigo	..	8,012.10	..	8,012.10
Burrumbeet	..	..	1,997.47	1,997.47
Camperdown	..	..	2,767.84	2,767.84
Casterton	..	..	7,659.73	7,659.73
Chiltern	..	..	1,800.00	1,800.00
Cobden	..	..	2,073.00	2,073.00
Colac	..	..	..	..
Coleraine	..	..	3,500.00	3,500.00
Cranbourne	..	..	..	..
Donald	..	..	3,892.00	3,892.00
Echuca	..	3,774.00	1,220.00	4,994.00
Edenhope	..	..	..	..
Elmore	..	..	2,342.30	2,342.30
Geelong	5,000.00	9,245.00	..	14,925.00
Great Western	..	..	2,300.00	2,300.00
Hamilton	..	..	..	..
Hanging Rock	..	..	..	..
Horsham	..	..	7,389.00	7,389.00
Kaniva	..	..	..	..
Kerang	..	..	..	..
Kilmore	..	5,856.00	..	5,856.00
Kyneton	..	9,400.00	..	9,400.00
Manangatang	..	..	..	..
Mildura	..	4,220.00	..	4,220.00
Moe	..	13,200.00	..	13,200.00
Mornington	..	..	..	..
Mortlake	..	..	..	..
Murtoa	..	6,359.00	..	6,359.00
Nhill	..	3,568.00	..	3,568.00
Pakenham	..	..	..	..
Penshurst	..	..	7,000.00	7,000.00
St. Arnaud	..	..	9,057.44	9,057.44
Sale	..	6,664.00	..	6,664.00
Seymour	10,000.00	5,060.00	..	15,060.00
Stawell	..	..	..	..
Stony Creek	..	..	6,130.00	6,130.00
Swan Hill	12,000.00	..	..	12,000.00
Tatura	..	7,633.00	..	7,633.00
Terang	..	..	..	..
Towong	..	3,761.72	3,873.76	7,635.48
Traralgon	..	..	..	..
Wangaratta	..	4,000.00	3,250.00	7,250.00
Warracknabeal	..	..	6,562.00	6,562.00
Warrnambool	5,000.00	20,000.00	..	25,000.00
Werribee	10,000.00	8,600.00	4,560.00	23,160.00
Wodonga	..	..	..	..
Wycheproof	..	..	1,465.00	1,465.00
Woodend	..	..	..	..

RACECOURSES DEVELOPMENT FUND.

EXPENDITURE ON COUNTRY RACING CLUBS.

1970-71 Racing Season.

—	Refinancing	Approved works	Minor works	Total
	$	$	$	$
Apsley	..	..	2,000.00	2,000.00
Ararat	3,722.00	3,314.73	2,214.23	9,250.96
Avoca	..	8,953.00	1,497.22	10,450.22
Bacchus Marsh	..	..	376.80	376.80
Bairnsdale	..	..	3,569.00	3,569.00
Ballarat	10,000.00	..	..	10,000.00
Benalla	10,472.00	5,816.50	..	16,288.50
Bendigo	..	47,800.30	9,482.60	57,282.90
Burrumbeet	..	..	..	..
Camperdown	5,686.00	7,971.88	1,698.44	15,356.32
Casterton	..	489.56	5,222.20	5,711.76
Chiltern	..	..	9,420.00	9,420.00
Cobden	..	..	..	..
Colac	..	49,502.63	..	49,502.63
Coleraine	..	6,400.94	..	6,400.94
Cranbourne	20,000.00	1,920.00	..	21,920.00
Donald	..	..	6,167.82	6,167.82
Echuca	..	4,780.10	4,392.00	9,172.10
Edenhope	..	..	1,621.00	1,621.00
Elmore	..	..	..	..
Geelong	5,000.00	5,050.00	1,300.00	11,350.00
Great Western	..	..	..	..
Hamilton	14,057.00	17,763.04	8,921.13	40,741.17
Hanging Rock	..	..	809.90	809.90
Horsham	..	8,930.00	2,297.74	11,227.74
Kaniva	..	..	2,613.00	2,613.00
Kerang	..	..	2,966.22	2,966.22
Kilmore	11,200.00	8,296.00	..	19,496.00
Kyneton	..	23,817.00	..	23,817.00
Manangatang	..	..	1,400.00	1,400.00
Mildura	..	9,837.98	6,375.80	16,213.78
Moe	..	13,200.00	..	13,200.00
Mornington	10,000.00	..	..	10,000.00
Mortlake	..	6,928.00	1,220.00	8,148.00
Murtoa	..	11,833.00	2,033.00	13,866.00
Nhill	..	3,569.00	6,290.43	98,59.43
Pakenham	9,000.00	..	..	9,000.00
Penshurst	..	17,819.00	..	17,819.00
St. Arnaud	..	..	4,613.86	4,613.86
Sale	..	11,945.00	..	11,945.00
Seymour	11,000.00	5,883.00	1,961.58	18,844.58
Stawell	..	4,443.52	11,884.84	16,328.36
Stony Creek	..	1,659.00	750.35	2,409.35
Swan Hill	6,161.00	1,040.00	..	7,201.00
Tatura	..	24,113.64	2,790.00	26,903.64
Terang	..	12,812.00	..	12,812.00
Towong	..	8,789.95	1,872.04	10,661.99
Traralgon	..	14,960.00	..	14,960.00
Wangaratta	..	4,000.00	4,000.00	8,000.00
Warracknabeal	..	..	7,433.03	7,433.03
Warrnambool	4,789.00	14,894.71	..	19,683.71
Werribee	10,000.00	13,600.00	4,200.00	27,800.00
Wodonga	..	8,549.00	3,791.00	12,340.00
Wycheproof	..	..	1,800.00	1,800.00
Woodend	..	..	3,893.20	3,893.20

PUBLIC WORKS AND STATE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES BILL.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to make provision for and with respect to the protection of witnesses before the Public Works Committee and the State Development Committee, to amend the Public Works Committee Act 1958 and the State Development Committee Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

INFORMATION STORAGES BILL.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL (Monash Province), by leave, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to make provision with respect to the storage and distribution of personal information.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

STOCK DISEASES (COMPOSITE LICENCES) BILL.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to enable the issue of composite licences for the purposes of section 15 of the Stock Diseases Act 1968.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS. (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works Act 1958. A major purpose of the Bill is to effect an increase in the board's borrowing powers, but the opportunity has also been taken to deal with some other matters which have been awaiting attention, both with respect to events which will occur this month and in the future.

Clause 2 proposes to amend section 7 of the principal Act which provides for the board to convene a conference every five years to make recommendations to the Minister as to the representation on the board of the various councils in the board's area. Such a conference is to be held Thursday next and, in accordance with the present provisions of the Act, each council currently having representation on the board will appoint not more than two members of the council as delegates to the conference. There are, however, four councils—Croydon, Healesville, Lilydale and Sherbrooke—the municipal districts of which are now, wholly or partly, in the extended metropolitan areas as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act, but which are not represented on the board and technically they have no entitlement to representation at the forthcoming conference.

It is only fair that these councils should have representation at a conference which will make recommendations on a matter vitally affecting their ratepayers, and the amendment now proposed will permit each such council to send one delegate if it so desires. The amendment will apply equally for the future to any council which is not represented on the board but whose municipal district or any part thereof has been added to the metropolitan area for town planning purposes, or to the metropolis for water supply purposes. I regret that this measure has reached the House at such a late stage. The Government's desire is that, whether or not this legislation is enacted, councils which are affected should be given the right to be heard at any conference.

Clause 3 will empower the board to fix minimum amounts to be paid for any water rate and any sewerage

rate in respect of any rateable property not having a dwelling thereon. Currently the Act fixes a minimum of $10 in each case, but the board advises that the actual cost of providing facilities is now calculated to be $15.84 for water and $26.03 for sewerage. These amounts, it should be noted, do not include the cost of operating the services, but merely cover the cost of financing the capital funds required to provide the services. The Government considers that the board should have flexibility in fixing minimum rates more in line with actual costs as they vary from time to time and should itself accept the responsibility of doing so.

The amendment now proposed will accordingly confer on the board the power to fix from time to time minimum amounts to be paid for water and sewerage rates on any property not having a dwelling thereon. The position concerning properties with dwellings remains unchanged. In these cases no minimum rate is payable, and the properties are simply assessed at the normal rate in the dollar fixed by the board.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—It would be better to put a hut on a vacant allotment.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—A dwelling. Clause 4 will increase the board's borrowing powers from the present amount of $500 million to $750 million. The borrowing powers were last increased in 1968, and the unexercised power which remained when this measure was introduced to another place about six weeks ago was about $6 million which would finance the board's capital works programme for a matter of weeks only. The works financed by the 1968 authorization and the works programme for the next three years may be summarized as follows:—

Increase of $100,000,000 in 1968		Proposed increase of $250,000,000	
Estimate	Actual expenditure	Capital works	Estimated expenditure for next three years
$	$		$
15,980,000	12,418,300	Large and reticulation water mains ..	14,780,000
39,395,000	45,562,400	Water supply amplification projects ..	55,830,000
4,145,000	2,762,600	Other water supply works	2,542,000
36,800,000	33,543,700	Main and reticulation sewers	36,500,000
32,450,000	41,981,300	Amplification of sewerage system ..	111,225,000
..	600,000	Eastern region sewerage scheme (extended metropolis)	15,432,000
3,280,000	3,762,900	Other sewerage works	3,221,000
1,400,000	1,595,000	Board of Works farm, Werribee ..	1,626,000
9,000,000	7,047,800	Main drains and river improvements ..	8,600,000
8,700,000	10,766,000	Plant, motor vehicles, water meters, buildings and sundries	10,122,000
151,150,000	159,950,000		259,878,000

I point out to honorable members that the present situation is that, apart from a small amount, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has no unexpended capital funds on which to draw. The heavy expenditure proposed on amplification of the water supply and sewerage systems is a consequence of the rapid expansion of metropolitan Melbourne. The programme will be subject to annual review having regard to the availability of labour, materials and finance.

Clause 5 will extend for a further period of five years the present arrangement under which the board makes annual payments to certain shires in whose districts the board has acquired a high proportion of

land. The Act requires these payments to be expended on road and street works. The shires concerned are Broadford, Corio, Healesville, Lillydale, Upper Yarra, Werribee, Whittlesea, Sherbrooke and Berwick. The total amount payable annually is $57,689.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—To what are present payments related?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Originally the arrangement stemmed from the loss of rate revenue because of undue acquisitions in proportion to the size of income of the shires. The acquisitions were for the board's purposes, although none of the municipalities affected were within the board's area. Although none of the municipalities received services, they lost substantial revenue. Now the position has changed, and many of the shires are within the extended metropolis; nevertheless, their revenue and expenditure structure to a large degree has been built around the receipt of this income which totals $57,689.

Clause 6 deals with the power of the board to take land compulsorily with the consent of the Governor in Council. This power relates to works under the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works Act and not to the acquisition of land under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1961. Section 232 of the board's Act requires the board, before taking land compulsorily, to obtain the consent of the Governor in Council and to publish in the *Government Gazette* and once in not less than two daily metropolitan newspapers a notice describing the works and stating where a plan or description of the works can be inspected. After obtaining consent of the Governor in Council and publishing notices, the board must serve notices to treat on all parties interested in the land in accordance with the requirements of the Lands Compensation Act. The requirement for publication of notices appears in the board's original Act of 1890. It may then have had some value but it now serves no useful purpose and it is unlikely that persons affected would see these notices. The real safeguard is in the requirement to serve a notice to treat. There is no corresponding requirement in legislation such as the Town and Country Planning Act, the Country Roads Act and the State Electricity Commission Act. Accordingly it is proposed to amend section 232 by repealing the requirement for publication of notices of compulsory acquisition in the *Government Gazette* and metropolitan dailies.

Where, however, acquisitions proposed by the board relate to routes for roads, sewerage or water lines or other major projects, it is proposed nevertheless to require the board to give advance publicity to the location, as a prerequisite to any consent to acquisition. This will be achieved as a simple matter of administrative policy. In other words, unless the board has given a general indication by a map or plan rather than a specific one in respect of each individual property, the Government does not intend to consent to any acquisition. Thus there will be adequate control to ensure that the public will be notified by advanced publication of the intention of the scheme and the location of the project. The publication of individual notices did not achieve this purpose. I suggest that this procedure will be simpler and cheaper as well as being more effective in its purpose of drawing major schemes to the attention of the public.

The amendments are quite unrelated, but some of them are urgent, and I seek the co-operation of the other parties in dealing with this measure as expeditiously as possible; at the same time, if members find that their research cannot be done in time, I shall agree to an extension of the period of adjournment of the debate. I commend the Bill to the House. I hope the debate will not be adjourned beyond tomorrow. I regret that the House is being given such short notice.

On the motion of the Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 19.

STOCK DISEASES (COMPOSITE LICENCES) BILL.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Stock Diseases Act 1968 made provision for the licensing of the collection of food refuse for feeding to stock, and for the separate licensing of premises used for the collection, storage and feeding to stock of food refuse. It further provided that all food refuse collected should be treated by boiling before feeding to stock.

These provisions were made to enable the strict policing of swill feeding of pigs in Victoria. Between the years 1938 and 1954, in the United Kingdom, 40 per cent of primary outbreaks of foot and mouth disease occurred in swill fed pigs, a further 9 per cent resulted from stock gaining access to uncooked food refuse, and another 7 per cent was believed to have originated in swill fed pigs.

The feeding of uncooked food refuse had always been prohibited under the stock diseases regulations but earlier regulations were difficult to implement as there was no means of determining the names of persons collecting food refuse, the location of premises where food refuse was fed to stock, and no means of controlling new operators who might decide to enter this field.

The regulations under the Stock Diseases Act 1968 fixed an annual fee of $20 for each of the two licences concerned, but representations have been received from primary producer organizations and some members of Parliament requesting that the fees be reduced to $10 per annum. This proposal was not acceptable, but the Government considers an alternative proposal for a combined licence at no extra fee would meet the objections to the present system.

The purpose of the Bill now before the House is to permit composite licences to be issued, each year, to persons requiring a licence to collect food refuse and to use premises for feeding food refuse to stock. The effect of the proposed amendment will be that persons requiring both licences will be required to pay only the single licence fee of $20. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 19.

CHIROPODISTS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 7) on the motion of the Hon. V. O. Dickie (Minister for State Development) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province).—Far be it from us to tamper with the tootsies of the populace. That is rather a dangerous practice to engage in at any time. Our feet carry us. They are an important part of our anatomy and they deserve a little respect, but it is amazing how little we give them. Possibly, honorable members will give that statement a lot of thought, now or in the future, particularly if gout, or an ingrown toenail, or a bunion develops and a visit to a chiropodist is necessary.

It seems that the Government, in its consideration for the profession, will give certain members who have been practising chiropodists an extra year in which to register. It is amazing, considering the extent of the publicity given—the matter has been highlighted in the press—that some people in this profession do not even know that they have to register. That state of affairs is hard to visualize, but it exists. The Labor Party supports the Bill.

The Hon. R. W. MAY (Gippsland Province).—The history of the Bill has been well covered. It amends the Chiropodists Act which was passed by Parliament comparatively recently. The Act provided that people who had been practising as chiropodists could, within twelve months of the commencement of the Act, apply for registration. Mr. Elliot commented on the fact that some of these people had not applied for registration, and the Minister for State Development pointed out in his second-reading explanatory speech that 34 applications were submitted after the expiry of the time allowed. The Bill will extend by twelve months the time during which these people can apply for registration. It is interesting to note that anyone who comes into the profession now has to undertake three years' training. Therefore, those people who have been practising as chiropodists and are entitled to apply for registration would be well advised to do so in the ensuing twelve months. The Country Party gives the Bill its blessing.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Substitution of "two years" for "twelve months").

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—I merely indicate that I have been given an interesting figure which should be included in the report of the debate on this Bill. At the moment, 756 chiropodists are registered in Victoria.

The clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 15) on the motion of the Hon. G. L. Chandler (Minister of Agriculture) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province).—The Bill refers to certain areas of land which are not part of the reservations of the agricultural colleges at Longerenong and Dookie, but which have been under the control of the Lands Department, have been leased, and have become the subject of Crown grants. The first purpose of the Bill is to make provision for the transfer of any mortgage or any other encumbrance attached to the land.

It is historically interesting that, in 1884, the Agricultural Colleges Act constituted the Council of Agricultural Education and provided for the reservation of areas of Crown land throughout the State as an endowment to produce revenue for the establishment and maintenance of agricultural colleges. The areas of land set aside for this purpose amounted to some 142,000 acres. An Act of 1944 ended the administration of the council and the land came under the control of the Minister of Lands. There are still areas of land in Victoria controlled in this way which are leased and which, in many cases, have become the subject of Crown grants. Now it is desired that provision should be made automatically to transfer any encumbrance on the land when it is transferred, and the Labor Party does not oppose this provision.

The second amendment to the Act relates to the stock trading accounts of the agricultural colleges and will enable them to be operated in a simpler and more efficient way than at present. In particular, the Bill eliminates the need to keep special accounts for veterinary costs and transport costs for trading stock, although an exception for stock purchased for rations or from special funds for research purposes will remain. The operation of the accounts of the colleges will be a little more practical as the result of the passage of this measure. I understand that the provisions of the Bill are considered

highly desirable by those who conduct the colleges, and the Labor Party is pleased to support it.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province).—The Country Party can add very little to this debate. Clause 2 of the Bill provides that any encumbrances on land are automatically transferred with the land when it becomes the subject of a Crown grant. It was probably taken for granted that these encumbrances would be transferred with the land, but frequently lawyers find technicalities which leave room for doubt. The Bill will make it certain that the encumbrances are automatically transferred with the land.

As the Minister and Mr. Kent have pointed out, at present a rather cumbersome system operates for trading in stock by the agricultural colleges. The colleges have power to purchase stock and other requirements, but certain aspects of the working arrangements for these purchases and so on are not debited to the stock trading account. The Bill will enable that to be done and there will be more conformity with usual practice in all aspects of trading in stock. Consequently a lot of red tape and administrative work will be cut out and there will be more flexibility in the working of the two major agricultural colleges in this State. The Country Party has pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Templestowe Province).—Nobody could help but approve the provisions of the Bill, particularly clause 3, which makes it possible for agricultural colleges to practise what they are increasingly preaching, that farmers should be good businessmen which is one of the most important lessons in agricultural education.

I utter a word of criticism. To some degree I deplore the extent to which the agricultural colleges are laying emphasis upon the need for their undergraduates to be good businessmen. The path to prosperity in primary production is littered with the corpses of good businessmen. It is an eloquent testament to the application with which one should approach this contention——

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Do not pick on me.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—I am certain that I would not include Mr. Elliot in the corpses about which I am thinking. I believe emphasis should be put on the making of undergraduates into good farmers, rather than making them into good businessmen. Almost always when one meets students, particularly those at private agricultural colleges but also, to some extent, those at the State agricultural colleges, one finds that they mouth the platitudes they are taught about being good businessmen. It may be true that they need to be good businessmen but very few seem to adopt an analytical or critical approach to this problem.

Professor Gruen of Monash University is one of our foremost agricultural economists, but all his students say that transferable quotas are needed to solve the problems of the agricultural industry today. Again there is this platitudinous approach by students of agricultural economics when what is really needed is a cure for the ills of primary production and not a transfer of quotas. Some students must be studying these themes and adopting a critical approach, and I hope they are. If they are, they are receiving practically no recognition, and no publicity is given to anything that they may have to say. Their comments are not printed. In my opinion the contention of Professor Gruen should be approached with caution.

Another aspect of teaching at agricultural colleges of which I am a little critical is the importance placed on the need to keep records. For whom do farmers keep records?

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—For the Taxation Department.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGTON.—I agree that it is necessary to keep records, but I do not agree that

farmers should spend the amount of time on them that agricultural educationists advocate. Some people take the view that the only way to be successful at farming is to come in at night so tired that it is impossible to put a pen to paper to complete this onerous task.

One of the important reasons given for a farmer to keep records is that he can present to a lending institution the best possible case for obtaining a loan. In my opinion the best possible case for obtaining a loan for primary production is undoubtedly the worst possible case that can be produced. If a farmer can convince a lending institution by presenting the worst possible case that he ought to have a loan, then the farmer is likely to be successful. Otherwise, he can be in all sorts of trouble. Another reason why farmers are urged consistently to keep extensive records is to enable agricultural advisers, of whom there were many before the drought, to come on to a property, analyse the records and tell the primary producer what he should be doing. Many primary producers in rural Victoria rue the day that they kept careful records and that their agricultural economic advisers were able to tell them what they should be doing. In many instances this advice has meant disaster. I hope I have not been over-critical, because I recognize the value of all of these things. However, I am critical of the over-emphasis placed on them.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province).—I feel obliged to contribute to the debate because of Mr. Houghton's contribution concerning the keeping of records. The point made by Mr. Houghton is worth noting, but he went too far in his condemnation of this aspect. Records that are properly kept can be of assistance to farmers. The University of New England has published a record book and if primary producers follow the advice contained therein and have the figures processed by a computer, they can obtain considerable assistance. For example, average figures can be obtained for farms in similar areas, such as basalt country, granite country or the black loam of the Yarra Valley. By having his figures processed by a computer, a farmer can be advised of the mistakes he is making, particularly concerning certain overheads.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—All of my records are processed by a computer.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—I cannot understand why Mr. Houghton went into orbit about farmers keeping records. His comments were a slap in the face to many people who are trying to make an honest living off the land. The honorable member referred to Professor Gruen of Monash University. I have listened to Professor Gruen speaking on many occasions and he is worth listening to. However, I agree that Professor Gruen, Mr. Donath and other experts in Australia at times assert that they can find a panacea for all agricultural ills through their study of agricultural economics. I read 25 country newspapers a week and I have come to the conclusion that, in the same way as solicitors can give varying opinions on a topic, a farmer can obtain differing advice on the problem that confronts him at the moment.

There is no substitute for practical experience, as I have learnt to my cost. I have contact with a young farmer who has learnt farming techniques the hard way. He has been a share farmer in wheat and other cereal crops, worked with cattle, built fences, and been a jackaroo. He is not good at keeping records, but by simplifying his records and following the advice contained in the book published by the University of New England, which costs $3.50, he has produced oustanding results. However, if it had not been for the hard work he did and the local knowledge he obtained his efforts would have been to no avail. The perfect combination is that of a theoretical knowledge and practical experience used judicially. If a person has some practical experience in any subject

and adds some solid theoretical training to this experience, he is probably a much better man in his profession or calling.

There is a greater need now than ever before for more training at agricultural colleges. Some honorable members may regard that as a stupid opinion on the basis that in view of the exodus of people from the land there is no need for more agricultural college training. I believe conditions in primary production will improve much quicker than many people think. Primary industry must move away from the horse-and-buggy thinking. When a farmer undertakes some pioneering work he is frequently called an idiot, but when his experiments are successful everybody in the area immediately follows him. This applies a good deal today when farmers are facing many problems. I thought the provocative statements made by Mr. Houghton should be answered by a member from this side of the House.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province).—I agree with some of the comments of the previous two speakers, and I disagree with others. I agree with Mr. Elliot on the need for more agricultural colleges. One has only to look at the Scandinavian experience, and in particular Denmark and Holland, to realize that the number of agricultural colleges per head of population in those countries is larger than it is in Victoria. There are 27 colleges in Holland and by contrast there is a paucity of colleges in Victoria.

I agree with Mr. Elliot and Mr. Houghton that practical experience is most important in farming. However, I disagree with Mr. Houghton in his comments about the keeping of records. Apparently he relies too much on the accountant to whom he sends his financial figures or the computer into which he feeds other material. I suggest that a student at an agricultural college who could not work out a cost-benefit analysis to enable him to make a decision on how to spend money on a farm would not know what he intended to do on his farm in the future. Cost-benefit analysis is so important to farming that it ought to be a major subject at an agricultural college. It is very easy to say that a farmer keeps records and never uses them, but I believe it is vital that a farmer should keep records and his records should fall into two categories. He should keep non-financial records and financial records and the non-financial records are just as important as the financial records.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—The non-financial records eventually are translated into finance.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE.—That is so. They are used to determine whether the spending of money should cease, whether more money should be spent, whether a move should be made from sheep to cattle or from cattle to wheat.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—I do not think a farmer would want to grow wheat.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE.—I am speaking about the keeping of records to be used by the farmer, and I am suggesting that these records are of considerable assistance to the practical farmer. I should be happy to speak at great length on this subject to inform honorable members who are interested in the financial and other records I keep and the way in which I use them to my benefit.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province).—In view of the direction in which this debate is moving, I believe I can make a contribution to it by examining the suggestion that a course of business management should be included in the education of a farmer. I very much doubt whether that is so and I offer a suggested course for farmers, but without guaranteeing success.

The first requirement is probably a short course in philosophy, which would enable a farmer to appreciate everyone's point of view. It would also assist the farmer to put up with

the various misfortunes which he has to suffer. The second subject taught to the farmer could be necromancy, which would be of assistance to him if he wanted to conduct a witch hunt to determine what is wrong with the industry. My third suggestion is a course in public relations so that he can introduce a satisfactory planning scheme to persuade the Government to come to his rescue when he is in trouble. Another suggestion is some form of prophecy or fortune telling so that he can make a satisfactory decision on the products to grow. I know of no other way to make a correct choice. Perhaps if this course received sufficient support from the Government it could be included in the curriculum at agricultural colleges. I suggest that details on all the problems facing farmers could be fed into a computer and the best computer would be one into which one fed all the problems and from which they never emerged.

Let us consider this fallacy of record-keeping, with due respect to those who keep records, and what might be expected from them. As I see it, the problem is that we have a public philosophy towards cruelty to animals which is in contrast to the economic requirements of a farmer endeavouring to carry on his farm. This is a fairly serious matter. A large number of farmers object strongly in principle and in practice because it does not suit their particular style to run a farm in the way in which economists suggest it should be run. When one considers the way in which a farmer is supposed to run a flock of sheep—I forget what the record is for one man, but I think it is 18,000—whether it is 5,000, 6,000 or even down to 3,000 sheep, it is still necessary for the farmer to allow for a number of those animals dying through misuse, flies and lambing problems, and to accept the resulting monetary loss. This may be all right on paper, but it is difficult for a man who has some concern for the welfare of animals. In the production of meat from intensive farms such as piggeries and poultry farms, the problem arises whether man is justified in treating animals in this way. I think I am on the side of the animals at times.

Society requires that, for his farm to be economically viable, a farmer must behave in this manner and for this and other reasons I have some doubt whether the keeping of records is of much assistance because a farmer will retreat from the horror of his paddocks and consult his records to gain some crumbs of comfort. I do not like that sort of farming.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Transfer of encumbrance from purchase lease to Crown grant).

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The remarks during the second-reading debate had little relevance to the measure. Mr. Bradbury asked how much was involved in the charges which are levied for wool packs, veterinary services and so on. For the past twelve months, at Dookie Agricultural College, the cost of contract services, veterinary services, stock medicines, stock registrations, wool packs and so on, amounted to $4,000 whilst at Longerenong the cost was $2,100.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—At least they kept records.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—The colleges do keep records. During the period 1966–67 to 1970–71 the amount transferred to the Treasury from the stock and trading account of Dookie college was $135,000, and of Longerenong $34,000. When it is realized that it costs approximately $2,204 a year to keep a student at an agricultural college and that a student pays approximately $540, the annual losses at Dookie approximate $380,000 and at Longerenong $204,000.

One could talk at length on the comments of honorable members on philosophy and the keeping of records. I believe that Dookie and Longerenong agricultural colleges provide a balanced education between what has been suggested today and the development of a practical farmer with regard to theory, farm management and book-keeping. No one can suggest that any one of those facets has been over-emphasized. I should like to think that the advisory council which examines these matters from time to time and decides upon the syllabus knows what it is doing and makes sensible recommendations. I do not agree that the keeping of records is emphasized to excess at Dookie or Longerenong. Their compilation on a sensible basis is part of being a successful farmer because nobody can be a successful farmer unless he is accurate in his records and possesses a good knowledge of farm management.

For some time now a demand has existed for more knowledge of farm management and the keeping of records. The younger breed of farmers today are more skilled, scientific and knowledgeable in every facet of their activities. They require a scientific knowledge of agricultural diseases and things of that nature. I well remember accompanying a member of Parliament some time ago on an inspection of farms in New South Wales when it became evident that the man who had high educational qualifications had the worst possible farm. Therefore, a person can be unbalanced by a wonderful education and, unless he applies that education in a practical way, he will fall by the wayside.

The State can be proud of the agricultural colleges at Dookie and Longerenong, together with the new college at Glenormiston, the horticultural college at Burnley and the establishment at Werribee. There have been transformations in agricultural education. Following the second world war, service personnel undertook rehabilitation courses at these colleges. Prior to 1955, the colleges were experiencing financial difficulties and the State could not be proud of them. Progressively over the years with the availability of finance, the colleges have reached a standard of which the State can be proud.

From time to time, a complete survey will be made of the syllabus and other facilities of the colleges. I shall bring to the attention of the appropriate officers of the department the comments of honorable members during the second-reading debate and at some time in the near or distant future I shall express the department's point of view on those comments.

The clause was agreed to, as was the remaining clause.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

LATROBE VALLEY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from August 31) on the motion of the Hon. V. O. Dickie (Minister for State Development) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province).—This Bill will place the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board on the same footing as other water and sewerage authorities in regard to the investment of surplus funds in the short-term money market. Although the Labor Party supports the measure, I find it hard to understand why a local government authority should have to look beyond the financial institutions of the State Government to invest its funds. When adequate facilities exist to invest money with the State Savings Bank of Victoria and in Commonwealth Government securities, I know of no reason for including in the Bill the right to invest funds with any bank or authorized dealer in the short-term money market.

The other simple provision eliminates the necessity for the board to prepare a revenue account, a statement of receipts and payments, and a balance-sheet. In future, the two statements will be replaced by one statement of revenue and expenditure. This should simplify the administration of the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board, which has many complex problems to face. The Labor Party supports the Bill.

The Hon. R. W. MAY (Gippsland Province).—Members of the Country Party are very much in favour of this measure. We realize the wonderful work carried out by the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board and the services it has rendered to the area over the years, firstly under the chairmanship of the late Mr. J. B. Mulvany, and later under the present chairman, Mr. J. A. F. Oram. In the past, the board has been somewhat restricted in the avenues available to it for the investment of surplus funds. The Bill contains machinery provisions which will enable the board to invest any surplus funds in certain approved securities, which are set out in clause 2. Members of the Country Party hope the board will invest its money with the State Savings Bank of Victoria so that it may be usefully and gainfully employed instead of lying idle and not earning interest. Anyone with a keen business sense would prefer any surplus funds at least to be earning interest for the board.

As has been said, the Bill provides for the simplification of the board's accounts. In future, instead of a statement of receipts and payments and a balance-sheet, the board will be required to prepare one statement of revenue and expenditure which will clearly show its financial position. Members of the Country Party consider that this is a sensible approach; it will save paper and needless bookkeeping. In the long run, it can only benefit the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board, and we therefore support the measure.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

The sitting was suspended at 6.20 *p.m. until* 8.3 *p.m.*

MOONEE PONDS (QUEENS PARK) LAND BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 28) on the motion of the Hon. G. L. Chandler (Minister of Agriculture) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province).—The purpose of this Bill is to authorize the municipality of the City of Essendon to lease portion of Queens Park reserve at Moonee Ponds to the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club. An area of the park bounded by Mount Alexander Road, Kellaway Avenue, Pascoe Vale Road and the Strand is currently occupied by the bowling club. The land was permanently reserved in 1964 for public park and recreational purposes, and the City of Essendon had control of the reserve as a committee of management. The land was originally reserved in 1884 for ornamental plantation purposes.

It was stated by the Minister of Agriculture that the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club has occupied a portion of the reserved land for approximately 80 years by agreement with the municipality as committee of management. The area of the site presently occupied by the club is approximately 1 acre 30 perches. The club house on the site is of such age that the club proposes to proceed with a rebuilding programme. To carry out this programme, it will be necessary for the club to raise finance by way of loan. Consequently, it is vitally necessary that the club should obtain security of tenure of the site in question.

Clause 3 provides that the City of Essendon may grant to the bowling club, but to no other sporting organization, a lease of the relevant part of the reserve. Other sporting organizations may think that they can use this

legislation as a criterion to justify their asking for legislative action to be taken to enable them to lease sections of Queens Park, but clause 3 contains sufficient safeguard against encroachment of this type. The Opposition does not oppose the Bill.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province). — The Country Party gives its blessing to this small measure which, as Mr. Eddy stated, will allow the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club to obtain by way of lease for a term not exceeding 21 years a portion of Queens Park reserve at Moonee Ponds in order to enable the club to erect certain buildings upon it. The area of the park in question has been used by the bowling club for many years. Queens Park reserve is a beautiful park which was originally set aside for ornamental plantation purposes. It embraced an area of gardens, trees and so forth, and in the centre was an artificial lake or pond.

This Bill recalls to my mind my younger days when I used to swim in the old baths at Essendon. The drainage from the baths kept the pond in the gardens filled with water. One day when I was playing with my friends in the swimming pool we succeeded in lifting the plug at the bottom of the pool with the result that two members of our party were swept into the pond in Queens Park. When the two lads came up for air in Queens Park, they were as much relieved as the rest of us to find that they had successfully negotiated their underwater trip.

Areas that are set aside as parklands in various municipalities are greatly appreciated by the public. Queens Park reserve illustrates the forethought of the early citizens of the City of Essendon in planning something for the future. Although the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club seeks greater security of tenure of the site to enable it to undertake a rebuilding programme, I agree with Mr. Eddy that this should not be taken as a criterion for any other organization to seek similar concessions. Areas of this type should not be excluded from the general public. Queens Park reserve should be kept for all time and not be whittled away by further encroachments.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—It was my privilege to assist the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club in its negotiations with the Minister of Lands, Mr. Borthwick, concerning the lease for a period of 21 years of an area in Queens Park reserve. Honorable members, particularly those with municipal experience, will know that reserved land of this type can be leased by councils for only seven years. A short-term lease offers no collateral for organizations which wish to borrow money. With the co-operation of the Minister, the seven-year lease will be extended to a 21-year lease so that the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club will be able to use the lease as collateral. The Essendon City Council is making available to the club for rebuilding purposes an amount of $40,000, and the club has raised by debentures amongst its members a further $40,000. The club proposes to replace its existing club house. Mr. Bill Mahoney, the secretary of the club, asked me this morning to let him know when the Bill had been passed and proclaimed, because the club wishes to advertise the tenders without delay.

Like Mr. Swinburne, I can speak of Queens Park reserve with nostalgia. Some years ago, when Queens Park was surrounded by a high fence, it was referred to as the "chicken run". Along with many other young men, I used to visit the park on Sunday afternoons hunting "chickens"; today they are called "birds".

The small reservation was originally reserved for ornamental plantation purposes in 1884. As Mr. Eddy stated, it was reserved in 1964 as a site for public park and public recreation. Two organizations are currently using the park. I refer to the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club, which was opened on 11th October, 1891,

and the Trugo Club, which operates for the benefit of pensioners and which has been functioning there for some few years.

I should like to pay a tribute to the councillors and the Town Clerk of the City of Essendon, the curator, the engineer and officers of the council for the magnificent way in which they keep the park. I have the privilege of living opposite the park which is a real picture when it is laid out with floral displays as at present. The lawns and magnificent shrubs, which are neatly trimmed, are now coming into their best, and the trees are beautiful.

The Moonee Ponds Bowling Club has a good club house at present, but if it is to compete successfully with other clubs today—there are nineteen bowling clubs in Doutta Galla Province—it must have the best possible facilities. Consequently, the club is launching a rebuilding programme. The club was originally built without a liquor licence, but it now has a licence. I am a past president of the Ascot Vale Bowling Club, which is a dry club, and I think I can speak with some knowledge. Municipalities make certain facilities, financial grants, and amenities available for younger sportsmen. In my club, more than 50 per cent of the male members are retired, are nearing retirement or are pensioners. During the day, the club provides facilities for people who have finished their working lives and have little to do. At the club, they play cards, have a roll of bowls, have a talk, and then go home.

Much hard work is involved in raising finance to run a dry club, but the members of my club feel that it should remain dry. Some municipalities see their way clear to make facilities available to older as well as younger people at their sporting grounds, but more could be done for some bowling clubs which are not supported by the proceeds of a bar and whose existence is threatened. I often quote the story that some clubs depend on beer and some on women, because the associates of a club do bring in a lot of money. If my club must make a choice, it will stick to the women.

I do not know whether all honorable members realize it, but there are 507 bowling clubs in Victoria. Mr. Fry would be well aware of that, as president of the Parliamentary Bowling Club, of which I have the honour to be vice-president. The Parliamentary Bowling Club cannot obtain registration because it does not have four rinks. If the Premier and Treasurer could see his way clear to provide an additional rink, the club probably would seek registration.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—The Bill does not deal with that matter, does it?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—No, Mr. President, it does not. There are more than 44,000 bowlers, and, of a Saturday, 11,000 men play pennant bowls. No other registered sport in Victoria can produce figures comparable with those. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. I am certain that everyone in the Moonee Ponds club will be grateful to the Minister of Lands, the Honorable W. A. Borthwick, for the way in which he has handled this matter. The Government has given sympathetic consideration to the needs of other clubs—I do not want to refer to the Carlton Football Club—and now it has extended similar consideration to the Moonee Ponds Bowling Club. I wish the club well in its future development.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Interpretation of "Corporation").

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I thank honorable members for their comments on this Bill and I join with

them in paying tribute to the Royal Victorian Bowls Association and to its associated clubs. I agree entirely with what Mr. Tripovich has said. Bowling clubs, not only in Victoria but throughout Australia, provide a fine community service, particularly to elderly people. This service and the friendship, co-operation and recreation provided at the later period of life are greatly appreciated. What is more, a person belonging to the bowling fraternity who visits any other State or many other countries has entrée to clubs there, which is a fine thing in itself.

I am mindful of the charitable work done by the bowling clubs. As president of a hospital board, I know that the clubs have a charity day every year and that they assist local charities and hospitals. This all adds up to a tremendous amount of community service.

Over the next few months, the Department of Agriculture may be able to do something further for bowling clubs in relation to research and the use of the agricultural extension services. Clubs already obtain advice from the department about problems concerning their greens. The matter is being considered now by the department and the Royal Victorian Bowls Association, and there should be some important result. At present, it is difficult to obtain sufficient capital to get the programme under way but there are moves in that direction. The result could be to make the greens of bowling clubs, golf courses, and so on, even better than they are now. Even now, the greens in this State would have no superiors in the world; they are outstanding.

The clause was agreed to, as were the remaining clause and the schedule.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

COMMONWEALTH PLACES (ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 15) on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister for Local Government) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY (Doutta Galla Province).—In the spring sessional period of Parliament last year, a Bill which became the Commonwealth Places (Administration of Laws) Act 1970 was debated. At that time it was clearly stated that the Government's intention embodied in the Bill was to overcome difficulties arising from a decision of the High Court in the case of *Worthing* v. *Rowell and Ors.* which did not result in a perfect solution to certain problems. That Act was to remain in force only until 31st December, 1971. It was passed by Parliament because the law in respect of Commonwealth places was in question.

Following an industrial accident, a workers compensation case was brought by an employee of a sub-contractor who was injured while working in a Commonwealth place in New South Wales. The High Court upheld an appeal on behalf of the sub-contractor whose counsel relied on section 52 of the Commonwealth Constitution to avoid responsibility under the State law for persons employed in Commonwealth places. I consider that, in the case which resulted in the principal Act being passed, the High Court expressed a political opinion on the Constitution. In other words, it interpreted the Constitution in a way which was never intended by its originators.

The Bill extends the operation of the principal Act until 31st December, 1974. I know of no reason why State laws, particularly State industrial safety regulations, should not be operative in Commonwealth places. Members of the legal profession are not certain whether the Act, even with this amendment, will cover the circumstances of the New South Wales case. However, I repeat that

it was never intended that the Constitution should operate as it has been held to do. There are some dangers associated with the Constitution when the Commonwealth can hide behind one of its sections and deny justice to employees who are injured in industrial accidents. The Opposition does not oppose the Bill.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province).—This Bill has been so well explained by both the Minister and Mr. Eddy that it is unnecessary for me to make any further comments. There is a constant inter-relationship of the respective State and Commonwealth laws and this small measure will clarify that relationship in one respect. The Country Party accepts the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

STAMPS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 29) on the motion of the Hon. Murray Byrne (Minister of Public Works) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—In accordance with the new procedures connected with the introduction of the Budget, this is a Budget Bill which provides for an increase in the stamp duties which the Government expects over a period of six months to bring in $9·6 million and over a full year approximately $14.8 million. For the rest of this financial year stamp duty on various items is expected to increase as follows:—On cheques, $700,000; transfers of marketable securities, $1 million; transfers of land, $2·5 million; mortgages, $200,000; leases, $100,000; insurance licences, $2·4 million; instalment purchase agreements and credit and rental business, $800,000; and certificates of registration or transfer of registration of motor vehicles, $1·9 million.

Every dollar of that money will be reflected in increased costs. Unfortunately, stamp duty is associated with indirect taxation because it adds to the cost structure. The short history of these increases was that initially the Treasurer received $10·3 million last year from receipt duty on sarlaries and wages, but unfortunately this was found to be unconstitutional and had to cease. That revenue had to be replaced. The honorable gentleman showed no concern for hitting the cost structure, but apparently he had no alternative and consequently stamp duty on cheques rose by 20 per cent; on transfer of marketable securities, by 50 per cent; on transfer of land duties, by 25 per cent; on mortgages by 20 per cent; and on leases, by 20 per cent, until it came down to the poor old motorist who got a kick in the teeth because the fee for the transfer of a certificate of registration of a motor vehicle goes up by 50 per cent.

These imposts add to costs. The Government has always been fond of saying how much it has granted for education and hospitalization and how these facilities have been increased. When this Government came to office in 1955, the sum of $12·6 million was received from probate duty. Today probate duty revenue is $51 million. In 1955, land tax brought in $5·2 million. Today the estimated revenue is $29 million. In 1955, the Government received £79,702 12s 3d from the Totalizator Agency Board; today the figure has increased to $16·2 million. The 1955 total figure for stamp tax was $11·2 million, and under this Bill, it is proposed that $87·75 million will be collected. By imposing these extraneous charges, the Government has certainly contributed to the inflationary problems confronting Victoria.

Clause 2 provides an increase from 5 cents to 6 cents or 20 per cent on bills of exchange payable on demand. Clause 3 relates to the transfer of marketable securities. Smaller exchanges less than $100 in value are increased by 40 per cent and those

over $100 in value are increased from 40 cents to 60 cents, which is a rise of 60 per cent. Clause 4 relates to the transfer of land of any real property or estate or interest therein. Previously, the rate for amounts between $100 and $7,000 was $1.25 per hundred and above that amount, $1.5 per hundred. It is now proposed to subdivide the amounts into various ranges, the smallest of which has been increased by 20 per cent and the largest by 100 per cent. In my province, in the case of a worker disposing of his modest small single-fronted cottage in Ascot Vale, Moonee Ponds or the older established areas—not the properties of 50-ft. frontages in Higinbotham Province or South-Eastern Province—and purchasing another home for $11,500, it would cost $612 in stamp duty and $70 in solicitor's fees. The account would show, "$100, say $70".

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That is a generous way of doing it.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—That is so. Whenever I hear criticism of workers' wages and their effect on inflation I point to the solicitor's fees on the sale of the property of "$85, say $50". I hope the Minister of Public Works or Mr. Hider will not take offence at my remarks. The agent's commission for selling this home is $415. No selling is required because people are looking for these homes. Then the Government says, "We want $204 in stamp duty". Transfer fees are also involved and before long the cost is up to $680. The buyer will want the title inspected to see that there is no impediment to it. In those circumstances the cost is "$100, say $70". I like to put these arguments when workers' wages are criticized. Under the statutory rules, a solicitor or an accountant can charge $10 for writing a letter.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—That is included in the charges of the transactions.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Honorable members can rush in and defend this, but I like to defend the engineers and others. I think of working men's wages when I go to get my car fixed.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—You must pay more then.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The charges are $5 to $6 an hour, but the man doing the job does not get paid $40 a day. Indirect taxation is bad taxation. The taxation in this Bill is bad and the Government must consider taxation measures which do not increase the cost structure.

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—Have you an alternative?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Yes, I have examined the Henry George and single tax and other systems. I have studied them all. Many of these systems merit further consideration. I do not believe in indirect taxation because it acts on the cost structure and becomes a cost load for industry. Anything that affects the cost of production, whether it be stamp tax or any other indirect loading, means that a percentage is added for profit in the first exchange, a further impost is added for the next exchange and then when the article finishes at the third exchange, the cost is twice as much.

This Budget measure replaces the receipts tax. I have no objection to the Premier having a holiday in Queensland. I have seen the nice home he bought in Maroochydore where he normally prepares his Budget. However, simply to say that there will be an average of 25 per cent increase on indirect taxation is not really correct.

I conclude by again appealing to the Liberal Party, which claims to be a national political party, to have its conventions at State and Federal levels and to have a good look at the question of taxation. Indirect taxes are not good taxes. The only fair tax is an income tax or a tax on profits. Other fringe taxes associated with the collection of revenue may assist in the distribution of wealth in the country.

Social services provide the second and third distribution of wealth and they avoid loading the cost structure. I ask the Liberal Party to examine this tax and get its committees working to produce some form of agreement between State and Federal Governments so that the people who are responsible for the real production do not have to carry an excess tax load. The taxes which are applied to cheques, mortgages, leases or transfers of marketable securities, mean that the consumer must pay in the end. Taxes of this type, which represent a cost load on the final article, increase the average cost of production to the point where it may become serious for Australia's international trade in the difficult years ahead. This is a serious matter, which warrants more than a 25 per cent over-all increase in indirect tax to meet the State's commitment. Nevertheless, the Opposition supports this Budget measure.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province).—This Bill increases various stamp duties in Victoria. I have a great deal of sympathy with the Treasurer of this State in his efforts to bridge the gap between receipts and expenditure. Some indication of the balance between the two may be gauged from the fact that in the Estimates of Receipts and Payments of the Consolidated Fund for the year ending 30th June, 1972, only five pages relate to receipts and 283 pages deal with expenditure. One of the reasons for the fact that there are only five pages of receipts is that the State's sources of revenue are so limited.

Honorable members have discussed in this House the inequalities of the Commonwealth-State financial arrangements and the difficulties that confront the State Treasurer in attempting to raise money. Considerable changes have occurred during the current year, the most significant on the balance-sheet of the State being the introduction of a State payroll tax, which was debated last week. Fundamentally, when everything was weighed and considered, and receipts and expenditure fully discussed, a gap of some $14·5 million existed between what was to come in and what was to be paid out. Of course that gap had to be bridged.

There is a limit to the amount of loan funds that can be used in Victoria. It can perhaps be said that the State has already borrowed too much. Therefore, the Government proposes to increase certain stamp duties. Mr. Tripovich rightly said that this would lead to a rise in costs and intensify inflation. Many people will be affected by it, and many will grumble. It is remarkable that as a result of measures of this type very few people seem to change their votes, which must provide some comfort for the Government. Increases in stamp duties fall upon the whole community, whether in the metropolitan area or in the country. It has been the policy of the Country Party to endeavour to assist decentralization in the State by financial means. Members of our party have searched in vain through the Budget for any incentive towards country development, the moving of industries to the country, or the creation of a healthier economic climate in rural districts. If I had been framing the measure, in the unlikely event of my being Treasurer of the State, I would have seriously examined the stamp duties to determine whether assistance could be provided by this means for country development and decentralization. I venture to suggest some such assistance could have been provided.

Recently, the House encountered some difficulty in deciding what was a suitable distance from Melbourne beyond which to grant to industries and businesses exemptions from payroll tax. I do not know whether Ballarat would be included in an arc, which could be bent, and which radiated 75 miles from Melbourne.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—It does.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—The increase in stamp duties on the transfer of land presumably over

the six months' period in this financial year will yield $2·5 million. Would it not be practicable for the Government to exempt payment on transfers of land beyond that distance? In view of what is generally acknowledged as the parlous condition of rural affairs in Victoria, it would be a practicable suggestion. A similar exemption could be applied to mortgages. It would not be difficult to determine which land would be affected by such a provision. I am not asking the stamps duties office to do anything that is difficult. A suitable distance could be selected to provide relief to country districts, and residents of provincial cities from the payment of stamp duties on transfers of land and on mortgages.

One of the main impositions under this measure relates to the transfer of registration of motor vehicles. Again it would be practicable to determine that an exemption should be granted outside a certain radius from Melbourne. This is important, because it is generally agreed that in country districts where public transport is virtually non-existent the people must use motor cars. During a recent debate in this House, it was rightly suggested that public transport should be supported as a means of travelling in the metropolitan area because motor cars are choking the whole transport system. Of course, this is not common only to Melbourne. In London consideration is being given to imposing a ban on either trucks or cars entering certain areas at specific times of the day or night in order to reduce the congestion. Other cities of the world are considering banning certain forms of transport in order to reduce traffic congestion.

Therefore, if this extra tax is imposed on metropolitan motor cars as an extra registration or transfer fee, the money could usefully be diverted to public transport, which can be used in the metropolitan area by many people going to and from work and about their daily business. On this principle, I should like the Stamps Bill to be amended, and it should be used as a definite lever to promote decentralization of the State and to assist the country. Unfortunately, the Government does not seem to agree with my suggestion, although, in due course, this Government, or some other régime which replaces it, may give serious consideration to it.

Finally, how far can the Government go in increasing these impositions year by year? A gap of $14·5 million must be filled this year and apparently the Government is fortunate that it has not been larger. Of course, the gap could prove to be greater than the Treasurer expected. Year by year the revenue derived from these taxes is failing to increase as fast as the expenditure is rising. Ultimately a crisis will be reached in which it will be impossible for the Treasurer to jack up the individual items any further. At that time some of Mr. Tripovich's suggestions may perhaps be reviewed.

I regret that it is necessary for the Treasurer of Victoria to impose this form of taxation which can only add to the inflationary spiral that is affecting Australia. The controls introduced by the Commonwealth Government in an attempt to check inflation are completely negatived by the need of the States to impose taxes which increase inflation. The two different financial policies, adopted by the Commonwealth on the one hand and the State on the other, just do not pull together.

As this measure is part of the Treasurer's plan for the current financial year, members of the Country Party support the Bill with extreme reluctance. I, for one, will be happy when stamp duty in Victoria is shaped in a different manner.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Bills of exchange and promissory notes).

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—Honorable members will not have much argument against many of the matters raised by Mr. Tripovich and Mr. Clarke. The basis of their arguments is that the Bill is a taxing measure, which is a reasonable ground for opposing it. However, the main reason for their opposition to the measure is that it represents an indirect taxation. As Mr. Tripovich forcefully pointed out, most indirect taxation is usually unfair taxation. It is unjust taxation because it is levied on people irrespective of their ability to pay. I entirely agree with those sentiments.

Mr. Tripovich and Mr. Clarke did not elaborate on the fact that Victoria and the other States have used this form of taxation because the right of levying income tax, which is the fairest form of taxation, has been largely taken away from the States, despite the fact that under the Constitution the States have the bread and butter responsibilities of the community for education, health, housing and local government. The States are in an impossible position when control of income tax vests in the central Government, and yet the real responsibilities vest in the State Governments. This applies to every State irrespective of whether a Liberal Government, a Country Party Government or a Labor Government is in office. Unfortunately, they have been forced more and more into the field of indirect taxation, so what we are doing is not unusual.

The South Australian Premier and Treasurer, Mr. Dunstan, brought in an interesting Budget. In almost every regard it is identical with the Budget which was introduced by the Treasurer of this State, but in some cases he increased the incidence of indirect taxation. Stamp duty on cheques was increased to 6 per cent; and that is the position in every State of the Commonwealth. In South Australia the duty on cars is slightly above the rate in Victoria, as are the taxes on receipts for conveyances of land and mortgages. I understand that the same position obtains in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. E. KENT.—That Government does not support the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—It is a State Government, which has the same responsibilities as any other State Government.

Mr. Clarke has asked where this is going to end, and I should like to place my view on record: It will not end until the States have income taxing powers. If it is a question of raising money for schools or for hospital accommodation or for greater social welfare benefits, I favour increased indirect charges.

Mr. Tripovich made a case in relation to land, and in that connection I point out that most of the increases relate to higher rates; so when one considers increased taxes for transfers, one will note that the increased rates apply to the transfer of areas of land of higher values. I should think that the average working man's home would be valued at about $15,000. That is the lower level; and when one looks at a mortgage of say, $8,000, which is about the average figure, the increase is not significant. Above that amount the increase is substantial. To that extent some concession has been made to the man who can least afford to pay the tax. Although Mr. Dunstan, in introducing his Budget, said that people on low incomes would not be affected, his rates are above those in Victoria. I do not agree with Mr. Dunstan, but I cannot see any other sources of revenue for the State.

Mr. Clarke referred to decentralization and to assistance that could be given to it through budgetary bills. I think the honorable member endeavoured to relate this to an incentive which could be given through this measure. I concede that if a Federal or a State Government is to

give a real incentive to decentralization, it will be in the field of taxation; but it is hard to argue, for instance, that a concession of $7 on the transfer of land would achieve what it is desired to achieve, namely, a real spur to decentralization. I do not think this Bill is the right vehicle for that. I do not think that the lessening of tax on the transfer of a block of land would offer a real incentive, although it may be of some value.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—I thank the Minister for his reply. The point I was making was that at its Federal conference the Liberal Party is represented by seven delegates from each State, but they do not seem to be able to determine what the Commonwealth Government ought or ought not to do. In one of its early Federal budgets in the early 1950s, sales tax was increased by $120 million, and income tax was reduced.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—That is the Federal Government.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—That is so. I think something should be done in connection with the stamps tax. It interferes with our cost structure, it affects costs of production and it affects the price of goods to consumers. When one is considering international trade, that is a factor which must be taken into account.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province).—I relate my remarks to clause 2 of this measure, and I remind honorable members of the safety that a cheque affords in the payment of wages, particularly when large sums of money are involved.

There have been an increasing number of pay-roll robberies. They have involved big pay-roll deposits which are held overnight and also individuals who have taken a cheque to the bank to obtain cash for a pay-roll. Although the Minister has said that all States have agreed that charges should be increased, the Government should consider whether some encouragement could be given to people and to firms to use cheques.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—This stamp duty has been agreed upon all over Australia.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—Yes, but I deplore it. I should like to see the Government encourage payment —particularly of wages—of big pay-rolls by cheque.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 3.

Clause 4 (Conveyance etc., of real property).

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province).—I should like to ask the Minister a question concerning transfers of land and the time limits which are involved. Many people buy land on a contract which extends over a period of years. I have spoken to several solicitors in my province, and they have expressed the view that they would like to have a period of three months in which to clear up many of these transactions. Can the Minister assure me that the Bill will not be proclaimed for another three months, so far as it relates to land?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—I cannot give such an assurance, but I advise the honorable member to inform the solicitors to whom he has been speaking to lodge their contracts and have them stamped immediately.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province).—I thank the Minister for his advice. I raised the matter because it takes some time for documents to be prepared and clients to be consulted, and it is a matter of concern to many solicitors.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province).—The Minister said that the concession on the transfer of a piece of land in a country district would amount to only $7.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—Do you think that would mean a real incentive?

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—I inform the Minister that I am not referring only to house blocks. I am referring to the transfer of farms and properties of that type. If the increase in stamp duty for half the year is $2·5 million, I presume that over a full year it will be $5 million, which is a substantial amount. The Government has an opportunity of providing an incentive by exempting land in country districts. The concession would be much greater than $7; in fact it would amount to hundreds of dollars even for small farms —and there are very many of them in Victoria.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 5 to 9.

Clause 10 (Credit or rental business).

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER (Monash Province).—I am concerned about sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph (*b*) of sub-clause (1) of clause 10 of this measure which provides that rentals paid in connection with a credit transaction before the commencement of the Act will be subject to the higher rate of duty. This means that if I had entered into a leasing arrangement prior to the commencement of the Act, and I had arranged my affairs on the basis that I would have to pay 1·5 per cent stamp duty, I would later find that I had to pay stamp duty at the rate of 1·8 per cent; in other words, if I had looked to the future and made my plans I would find that I would have to pay a higher rate of duty than I had expected. This is retrospective legislation, and I think, as a general principle, fiscal legislation should not be retrospective. I agree that in circumstances which involve tax evasion or avoidance it is necessary to introduce a measure of retrospectivity. However, I do not agree that any tax which affects a contract of three to five years' duration should be retrospective. The Government should not be able to impose an increased tax on a transaction which has been entered into in the past; the leasing of a motor car is a typical example. A person may be paying $120 a month and have to pay 1½ per cent more duty. Certainly, the amount of the increase is not great so it is a question of principle only. I understand that the State will collect only about $100,000 in a full year from this source. That sum will not have a great practical effect.

It is unfortunate that this provision is included in the Bill. As it is a financial matter, it is not for this House to amend the Bill. The principle was accepted and incorporated in the Stamps Act of 1966 when specific exemptions were made for arrangements entered into before the commencement of that Act in 1967. That was a proper way to approach the problem and perhaps the same approach could have been adopted in this Bill. This point is highlighted by the fact that loan and discount transactions are exempted, the reason being that, generally, duty is paid on a loan transaction at 1/8th per cent a month, whereas on a leasing or credit rental arrangement the payment is 1½ per cent on each monthly payment, spread over the whole period.

As loan transactions are exempted, if a person borrowed money at interest in excess of 10 per cent three months ago, he would not be affected. However, if he entered into a five-year car leasing contract, he would be. I ask the Government to examine this matter. It is unfortunate if we are to have retrospective fiscal legislation; this is something which should be avoided.

Perhaps the Budget has been cast in a way which requires that $100,000 be raised in this manner, but I believe it could cause hardship to people who have arranged their affairs according to the circumstances which existed some months ago, without anticipating this type of legislation. These people will now suffer some minor penalties. Perhaps, in certain

circumstances, finance companies will not be able to pass on the extra costs because their documents are not drawn to allow that to be done. However, my concern is not with who pays but that arrangements previously entered into are being varied by legislation. I ask that the Treasurer consider this and, if hardships are found to exist, that some remedial action be taken.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—Mr. Hider has raised an interesting point, but, of course, it could be argued both ways. I agree that it would be bad if it could be proved that there were retrospective taxing provisions in the Bill. Paragraph (*a*) of sub-clause (1) of clause 10 increases the rates on credit and rental business. The provisions to which Mr. Hider refers are those of paragraph (*b*) of sub-clause (1) which provide—

> The provisions of sub-section (1) of section 131AC of the Principal Act in force immediately prior to the commencement of paragraph (*a*) of this sub-section shall continue to apply after the said commencement with respect to—
>
> (i) loans made by a registered person before the said commencement;
>
> (ii) amounts expended by a registered person before the said commencement in discount transaction;
>
> (iii) amounts debited by a registered person before the said commencement for the sale of goods or the provision of services pursuant to a credit arrangement; and
>
> (iv) the amount received by a registered person before the said commencement in respect of rental business for or in relation to the use of goods other than books—
>
> in all respects as if paragraph (*a*) of this sub-section had not been passed.

These provisions were deliberately included in the Bill to prevent any retrospectivity. In the circumstances set out, the old rates will apply. I do not have to read the section to come to this conclusion, but what Mr. Hider points out is that, in the case of rental goods, future payments will attract stamp duty and increased rates. Mr. Hider then argued that a person or a finance company—the finance companies have raised this point because they may not be able to pass on the increased rates——

The Hon. C. A. M. HIDER.—In most cases, the finance companies can pass on the increased costs.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—They cannot do so unless it is specifically provided in their contracts. If it is not written into the contracts, they cannot pass it on. Mr. Hider would then go on to say that if a man had entered into a contract for a period of time, that contract should not be interfered with by subsequent legislation. That point could be argued both ways. It could be argued that a man who entered into a lease should not have to pay for increases in rates and taxes. It could be argued that contracts for rental business or leasing business were entered into for periods of many years and that the contracts should be exempted from all future taxes.

Mr. Hider made a rather telling point that the Act which came into operation in 1967 provided an exemption for finance companies in respect of contracts which they had already entered into. The Treasury could argue that, prior to the operation of that Act, the State had never levied this tax and it was reasonable that finance companies or persons who had entered into agreements before the operation of the Act should have immunity. The Bill now takes away that immunity which they have enjoyed for several years.

I am trying to look at this matter impartially. Mr. Hider has argued strongly that there could be hardships. Of course, this House does not have the power to amend the Bill but the matter will be referred to the Treasurer. I understand that finance companies have already made representations and the Treasurer has said that, if there are hardships, he will examine them in the light of what happens after the Act begins to operate.

The clause was agreed to, as were the remaining clauses.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill proposes to introduce daylight saving of one hour for four months next summer, from the end of October to the end of February. Daylight saving is a regular practice in many parts of the world, and is generally regarded as a convenient way of making best use of the longer hours of daylight in the warmer months. Naturally, therefore, an extra hour of sunlight will benefit most those who prefer outdoor activities of many kinds, whether active or passive. It gives more time for recreation and for the arts of leisure which flourish in natural light and warmth.

Obviously, it will benefit some groups in the community more than others—people engaged in long fixed hours of employment, the young people, and all those who cannot look forward to any form of recreation until after ordinary working hours. On hot days it will mean that more of the day's work will be performed earlier under somewhat cooler conditions. There may also be some road safety bonus, in that more travel will occur in daylight.

It will bring advantages to those enterprises which cater or provide for outdoor activity, and correspondingly will hamper or restrict to some extent those enterprises which operate chiefly after dark—drive-in theatres being one example. In some rural industries, daylight saving would require some adjustments—in the hours for receiving grain into storages during the harvest, for example.

Generally speaking, the principal benefits of daylight saving will be felt in the urban areas of the State, in the provincial cities and country towns, and in the metropolis, especially among young people. But there will be groups who can see no personal advantage in the proposal, and others who will expect some positive disadvantages. At present, all indications are of strong public support for daylight saving, but minority views are not to be lightly disregarded. For this reason, daylight saving under this Bill will be restricted to one summer only, so that the proposal can be reviewed, by Victoria along with the other States, in the light of that experience, and a decision made whether it ought to be made permanent each summer.

Last year, the Government decided that it would introduce summer daylight saving, provided that all four States in the eastern time zone agreed, in the interests of uniformity. After discussions, however, Queensland indicated that it was not agreeable to the proposal, and it therefore lapsed for last summer. This year, the Governments of Victoria and New South Wales agreed to introduce daylight saving this summer, along with Tasmania, which has had it since 1967, even if Queensland still felt unable to accept it. I understand Queensland has now decided to go along with the other States.

Accordingly, a conference of responsible Ministers from all States and the Commonwealth was convened in Melbourne on 16th July and the proposal was fully canvassed. The conference agreed in general principle that the States and Territories in the eastern time zone—Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory—should adopt daylight saving for a trial period commencing at two o'clock in the morning of Sunday, 31st October, 1971, and ceasing at two o'clock in the morning of Sunday, 27th February, 1972, these times and days being chosen as being those least likely to

cause disruption in the everyday affairs of the community. The States of South Australia and Western Australia, which were present at the conference without commitment, have since announced that they will also follow suit.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Western Australia is not going on with it; there has been some trouble there.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—I do not know the exact position in Western Australia.

It was further agreed that consultations by Ministers would take place after February, 1972, to assess the over-all effect of daylight saving on the community and the desirability of its continuance in subsequent years. The Bill now before the House provides for the introduction of daylight saving into Victoria for the trial period agreed upon by conference.

The Bill defines the term "standard time" to determine the datum from which the advance of time by one hour is to be made. Summer time is defined. In effect it means the period during which time will be in advance of standard time in accordance with this Bill. It provides further that any specific or stipulated time at which or during which any act, matter or thing is required permitted or forbidden by any Act, regulation, by-law, rule, proclamation, Order in Council or other instrument shall, during the relevant period, be summer time unless the contrary is expressed, provided or stipulated.

The provisions of section 80 of the Supreme Court Act declaring the mean time of the 150th meridian of longitude east of Greenwich to be standard time throughout Victoria are saved and standard time is retained for the purposes of astronomy, meteorology or navigation or the construction of any document mentioning or referring to a point of time in connection with any of those purposes. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. H. A. THOMAS (Melbourne West Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 19.

PUBLIC WORKS AND STATE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES BILL.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains provisions relating to the protection of witnesses appearing before the Public Works Committee and the State Development Committee. I suppose every honorable member jealously guards the principle of Parliamentary privilege. The right of a member of the House at any time to make statements honestly in the furtherance of his duty is essential to ensure that honorable members are able to speak frankly at all times without fear of the laws of slander and libel being invoked against them.

It has always been thought that the same privilege of Parliament attached to Parliamentary committees and witnesses appearing before them. Generally speaking, that is true. In the past some members tended to have an indefinite understanding of what constitutes a Parliamentary committee. The committees which existed under The Constitution Act and which were recently transferred to the Parliamentary Committees Act include the Committee of Public Accounts of the Legislative Assembly and the joint House Committee, the Library Committee, the Statute Law Revision Committee, the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the Printing Committee and any private Bill committee. Parliamentary privilege clearly applies to those committees. It also applies to the Meat Industry Committee and applied to the Drainage Committee which went out of existence recently.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The Road Safety Committee.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Yes, it applies to the Road Safety Committee. Grave doubts have, however, arisen whether it applies to the Public Works Committee and the State Development Committee. The distinction appears to be quite clear. All committees other than the Public Works Committee and the State Development Committee report directly to Parliament and they enjoy the privileges of Parliament. The Public Works Committee and the State Development Committee report to the Governor in Council and it appears probable that the privilege which was thought to exist for what were loosely called Parliamentary committees, but which in these two cases are more properly called statutory committees, does not exist in their cases.

The matter came to a head recently when it appeared that a witness who had given evidence before the State Development Committee was likely to face a libel action. Investigations were made and the Crown Solicitor advised that it was probable that Parliamentary privilege did not apply. The members of the two committees concerned took the initiative and instituted action to protect witnesses appearing before them, and I commend them for that action because I am sure they have acted properly.

Quite clearly the same privilege which exists for proceedings of this House should apply to these committees if witnesses are to be absolutely frank in the information that they supply to these committees. It would not be in the interests of this Parliament, or of its committees, or in the long-term interests of the State if a witness before these committees had to watch his words for fear that he might subsequently become liable for damages. The Bill seeks to rectify that situation.

Honorable members will note that the measure does not extend to giving privilege to members of the committees. The Crown Solicitor has advised that members of Parliamentary committees or of statutory committees are in fact privileged provided that they do not act with malice. That seems to be a fair situation. One would not expect a member of a committee to act maliciously in questioning a witness, or, if malice were shown, that there should be a great deal of justification for special privilege. Nevertheless, further investigations are being made by Parliamentary Counsel to determine whether there is a need for additional protection. If further protection is needed a Bill will be submitted at a later date.

One other aspect needs to be drawn to the attention of the House. It is that on the advice of Parliamentary Counsel this Bill has retrospective operation to 1st January, 1971. I know that honorable members are always inclined to scrutinize closely any retrospectivity in legislation, but clearly it is justified in this Bill. In fact, it could be argued, and if any honorable member cares to move I shall be receptive, that the Bill should be retrospective indefinitely because it seeks to restore a position which honorable members had believed to exist at all times.

The Bill is sponsored by the two committees I have mentioned and for that reason I have no departmental notes for honorable members. I have explained the Bill in accordance with the information supplied to me by members of the committees and I agree with the action they have taken. I compliment them upon their perspicacity in promptly drawing the attention of the Government to the need for this legislation and I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 19.

HIRE-PURCHASE (FORM) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 28) on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Hunt (Minister for Local Government) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province).—Members of the Labor Party oppose the Bill because it is the final nail in the coffin, so to speak, of those people who are unfortunate enough to have to buy goods on hire-purchase. The Stamps (Hire-Purchase Agreements) Act of 1956 imposed a tax on the sale of goods by hire-purchase. That Act specifically stated that the tax was to be paid by the person selling the goods. At the time the Premier and Treasurer said that anybody who tried to pass the tax on to the consumer would be guilty of an offence and liable to a severe fine. Since then by one means and another the Government has gradually altered the position whereby the person who was selling the goods on hire-purchase had to pay the tax and was unable to pass it on, to the position where under this Bill it is provided that words to the effect that this tax shall now be paid by the consumer shall be written into hire-purchase agreements.

I know that the Minister for Local Government will disagree with me in that regard and say that the shopkeeper can decide whether he will pay the tax. The only way of ensuring that the tax was not passed on to the consumer would have been for the Government to accept a private member's Bill introduced by Mr. Galbally to fix interest rates on hire-purchase agreements.

In the Budget speech in which the Premier and Treasurer said that the tax would be imposed the honorable gentleman also said that the consumer would not have to pay it. However, the House is witnessing the final episode in this drama tonight in this Bill which provides for the amount of stamp duty to be added to the amount that a person who buys goods on hire-purchase has to pay. A person who purchases goods for cash does not have to pay the duty. There is a difference between a cash buyer and a person who buys on hire-purchase. The person who buys on hire-purchase is amongst the poorer section of the community and it does not surprise me that the Government has seen fit to tax the poor.

Members of the Labor Party oppose the Bill. The principle of the amount of the stamp duty being added to the amount owing under the hire-purchase agreement was contained in a Bill which was passed by Parliament last year and implemented this year. It deleted from the Stamps Act the provision which applied a penalty to any person who passed this tax on to the consumer. For the information of honorable members, I point out that section 131D of the Stamps Act, which was deleted last year, reads—

> (1) A vendor or other person shall not add the amount of any duty or any part of the duty payable by the vendor as aforesaid to any amount payable by the purchaser of any goods (whether under the agreement or otherwise) or otherwise demand or recover or seek to recover any such amount from the purchaser.
>
> (2) In the case of a contravention of the provisions of this sub-section—
>
> (*a*) the court by which the offender is convicted shall in addition to imposing a penalty order the defendant to refund to the purchaser any such amount which has been paid by the purchaser; or
>
> (*b*) the purchaser may recover any such amount from the person to whom he paid it in a court of petty sessions as a civil debt recoverable summarily for money paid.

Therefore, the Government never intended—at least that is what it said—that the purchaser should have to pay this tax. The principle of this measure has already been agreed to by Parliament and it is only a matter of form to add a few words to the back of a hire-purchase agreement. However, I make my final protest on behalf of those who can ill-afford to pay this tax, namely the consumers.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY (North-Eastern Province).—This Bill appears to be minor but any measure affecting hire-purchase is important. In effect, the Bill provides for the addition to a hire-purchase agreement of the amount that is being levied

for stamp duty. The hire-purchase company has a responsibility to set out on the agreement form the details of individual amounts which make up the total sum to be paid by the purchaser. As Mr. Walton has said, originally it was intended that stamp duty should not be passed on by the vendor to the purchaser. Regretfully, in practice, undoubtedly the vendor has been able to get around this and pass on the charge to the purchaser.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—By increased interest rates.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY.—That is so; these increases have amounted to more than the actual stamp duty. Hire-purchase has brought about many social problems in our community. Some years ago, the Country Party endeavoured to amend the hire-purchase legislation to prevent extortionate charges and interest rates being imposed on purchasers of goods on hire-purchase. In many instances, no deposit was paid on the goods. Frequently, I have said that we mislead ourselves into thinking that we are an educated people. Many unfortunate persons in the community can still be likened to small children. I believe sincerely that if a person is able to purchase goods without deposit by making weekly or fortnightly payments, he never places the same value on the goods. The Country Party attempted to amend the legislation to provide that a deposit of at least 30 per cent of the purchase price of the goods should be paid so that the purchaser would have some equity in the goods.

Whether this Bill, which contains minor amendments, will have any effect on interest rates is doubtful because in the past vendors have been able to pass on this charge in some other way, and I doubt whether the purchaser will ever receive the benefit. Although the companies have got around the legislative provision in other ways, the only method by which Parliament can right the wrong, if it can be called that, is to provide that the stamp duty shall be itemized on the hire-purchase agreement form so that the purchaser will know exactly how much stamp duty is being charged by the State.

Now that the Treasurer has decided to scrap the proposed accommodation tax, undoubtedly the honorable gentleman will be looking for other ways of obtaining further revenue. It will be a simple matter for the Government to increase stamp duty on hire-purchase agreements and thus obtain additional revenue. Reluctantly, the Country Party supports the Bill.

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. R. W. Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	.. ..	25
Noes	.. ..	8
Majority for the motion		17

AYES.

Mr. Bradbury	Mr. Hunt
Mr. Byrne	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Campbell	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Dickie	Mr. Mansell
Mr. Dunn	Mr. May
Mr. Gleeson	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Granter	Mr. Nicol
Mr. Grimwade	Mr. Storey
Mr. Gross	Mr. Swinburne
Mr. Hamilton	Mr. Ward.
Mr. Hauser	*Tellers:*
Mr. Hider	Mr. Clarke
Mr. Houghton	Mr. Fry.

NOES.

Mr. Eddy	Mr. Walton.
Mr. Elliot	
Mr. O'Connell	*Tellers:*
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Kent
Mr. Tripovich	Mr. Knight.

PAIR.

Mr. Chandler	Mr. Galbally.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6531 s. 3).

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—If the Bill had done what Mr. Walton suggested it did, namely, increase fees or charges payable by a hirer, there would have been something more in his argument. I think Mr. Bradbury put the case in proper perspective. The honorable member will pardon me, I am sure, if I repeat some of his arguments. I agree with him fully that the provision which formerly prevented stamp duty charged to a vendor from being passed on to a hirer was ineffective and that it was overcome by charging higher interest. Mr. Bradbury is obviously correct. He also pointed out that this was rectified not by this Bill but by an Act of the Parliament last year which abolished the requirement that no stamp duty be passed on. I think he was correct, too, in believing that the mere passing on of stamp duty might be somewhat preferable to an increase in rates of interest which could be higher.

Mr. Bradbury was clearly correct again when he pointed out that all this Bill does is to ensure that a hirer has on the document which he receives a clear statement of the stamp duty charged against him. That is the clear principle of this Bill. The principle is that a hirer should have full details of the amounts being charged to him, that he should know exactly for what he is paying. Until this Bill is passed the hirer will not in fact have those full details. The Government believes, as members of the Country Party clearly believe, that the hirer should have the benefit of full details of everything charged to him. In fact that is all the Bill does; it ensures that a vendor must advise a purchaser exactly what he is paying for and that he must have it in the table to the document which forms the hiring agreement. That then is the purpose of the Bill—a purpose which is designed to draw clearly to the attention of the purchaser precisely what he is paying for.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON (Melbourne North Province).—Of course, it does not do any such thing. All it does is to make provision on the back of the form that the stamp duty can be added if the vendor so desires. It does not place an obligation on him to include the stamp duty.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—No.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Am I incorrect?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Yes.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—As I understood it, the vendor had the choice of placing the amount of the stamp duty on the back of the form or he could continue to include it in his interest. When this legislation was first enacted members of the Opposition informed the House what would happen. However, either way it does not matter—the hirer will pay. I do not see that it matters very much whether or not it is laid out on the back of the form. The point is that the hirer will pay. The original intention of the Act was that he did not have to pay and should not have to pay. This Bill goes even further than I thought it did in view of the Minister's admission that the stamp duty must be shown on the back of the form.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—If it is charged it must be shown.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—If it is not charged, the Minister has already said that it must be included in the interest charges.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS.—It might be.

The Hon. J. M. WALTON.—Members of our party have known all along that this additional amount would be finally passed on to the consumer. It was the original intention of Parliament that it should not be passed on. The Premier said that it should not be and that there should be a penalty against persons who tried to do so. That legislation failed.

Honorable members should not be considering legislation which passes this charge on to the consumer; they should be considering measures to strengthen the legislation to ensure that it will not be passed on to the consumer. Parliament should fix the interest rate in such a manner that the vendor could not pass it on to the consumer. This charge will be permanently put on his bill so that he will have to pay this 2 per cent or 1 per cent tax. The poor person is forced by his station in life to buy goods on hire-purchase. Why should he have to pay this charge, when the wealthy person who can afford to pay cash does not have to pay it? The Government stands condemned.

The clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING SOCIETIES (INDEMNITIES) BILL.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Although this Bill seeks to amend the principal Act in a very simple manner, the effect has an important bearing on the future operations of co-operative housing societies in this State. Section 66 of the Co-operative Housing Societies Act provides that the Treasurer of Victoria may indemnify a society against any loss that may be attributable to the fact that the society advanced to a member an amount which exceeded 80 per cent of the value of the property offered as security for the advance.

Currently, sub-section (1) of section 77 of the Act fixes at $1·6 million the aggregate liability which the Treasurer may incur under indemnities. At the 30th June last, there were 2,998 indemnities in existence and the Treasurer's aggregate liability in respect of such indemnities stood at $1,599,848. This means, of course, that unless the existing limit is uplifted, societies will be unable to grant any further advances exceeding 80 per cent of the valuation of the security. This small Bill seeks to increase to $2 million the aggregate liability which the Treasurer may incur under indemnities.

It is interesting to note that, since co-operative housing came into operation in Victoria 26 years ago, over $350 million has been provided for societies, either from institutional sources or from the Home Builders Account under the Commonwealth–State Housing Agreement. That money has provided advances which have enabled a remarkable number of people—more than 73,000 families—in Victoria to acquire their own homes.

Approximately 10 per cent of those advances have been indemnified and, to date, the Treasurer has been required to satisfy only two claims under indemnities, the amount involved being in the vicinity of $1,600, which is also remarkable. All members will agree that co-operative housing has performed a very useful service in this State. It has enabled many persons who could not otherwise have done so to own their own homes. I certainly commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 19.

LOTTERIES GAMING AND BETTING (PRE-POST BETTING) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development), was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

FLOODING ALONG GOULBURN RIVER —NUMURKAH PRIMARY SCHOOL: DAMAGE BY POSSUMS.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—On behalf of the Leader of the House, by leave, I move—

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until tomorrow, at Three o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province).—I raise a matter which is causing concern to farmers who live between the Goulburn weir and Lake Eildon. I refer in particular to the serious flooding which has been occurring in this area in the past ten days or so. Honorable members might recall that towards the end of last month and the beginning of this month a lot of rain fell. This has been reflected in the fact that the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission had to release water from Lake Eildon in very large quantities and at a very fast rate. The rate achieved was approximately 17,000 cusecs, or cubic feet per second. The normal summer flow of the Goulburn River is some 5,000 cusecs, so it can be seen that a considerable quantity of water was coming down the Goulburn River.

Farmers were warned by the Water Commission that there would be moderate flooding, but in fact there has been serious and drastic flooding in some areas. It was described to me by several landowners as the worst flooding they had experienced in nineteen years. A considerable amount of damage has been done by this water. A number of crops have been lost. One landowner told me that he had 120 acres of oats which even now are still under water. This crop is a complete write-off because it will turn black and not grow any further. Some crops of barley, wheat and other summer crops have been spoilt completely.

One of the farmers in the area has even now some 30 acres of vineyard under water and this will probably not recover. Of course, other problems arise in terms of rubbish, silt, thistle seeds, Bathurst burr and Patterson's Curse. All this is deposited now on land that was being saved for crops or was being prepared for crops of various kinds. The State Rivers and Water Supply Commission is ponding the water at Lake Eildon primarily for irrigation. I think all honorable members appreciate the wonderful job the commission does. However, it also uses the Goulburn River as one of its channels and it does not help the landowners along the river to be flooded out.

It has been reported to me that a regulation or administrative direction has been issued that no water is to be released from Lake Eildon until 1st October. Of course, the prime objective is to retain as much water as possible in the lake for irrigation purposes. If this is so, it is rather stupid because it does not take into account what snow might be about and what expectation there could be of more water flowing into Lake Eildon. This year, the situation has been most peculiar in that even now there is approximately 3 feet of snow on Mount Buller. Thus there will be a problem in controlling the water flowing down the Goulburn River.

Landowners have suggested to me that if this water had been released a week earlier at a slower rate less damage would have occurred. Perhaps there is merit in this suggestion and it calls for an investigation to determine whether a regulation or administrative direction has been given to prevent the release of water earlier, even though there might be expectations of further water entering Lake Eildon.

I am concerned to ensure that this situation will not occur again. Certainly there was a minor flood last

year, but this year there is a flood of major proportions between the Goulburn weir and Eildon weir. Landowners are considering applying for compensation. I do not know whether they have a case, but it is another matter which could be investigated.

I have spoken to the Minister on this matter and the honorable gentleman has given me a preliminary letter, but I should like to suggest that a full investigation be made to satisfy the landowners that in fact the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission did all that was possible to prevent serious damage occurring by the release of this water.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province).—I desire to raise a matter of Government administration which concerns three departments—the Education Department, the Public Works Department and, to a lesser extent, the Chief Secretary's Department. The problem is somewhat unusual in that the primary school at Numurkah in my electorate has been invaded by possums. It is a serious matter for the school because, having recently inspected the situation, I feel there is no doubt that the possums are causing a great deal of damage in fouling the walls and ceilings of the school; in fact, in one corridor in the newer section of this school where the ceiling consists of canite sheet, which must be attractive to possums, the animals have already eaten several large holes. I raise this matter as one of urgency and urge the Minister of Public Works to give it immediate consideration.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—Representing the Minister of Water Supply in this Chamber, I know that the matter raised by Mr. Grimwade has been taken up with the Minister. However, Mr. Grimwade has brought forward one or two suggestions and I assure him that they will be placed before the Minister tomorrow.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—I assure Mr. McDonald that the disabilities under which the students are at present working at the Numurkah Primary School because of the invasion of possums are fully appreciated and first thing tomorrow I shall see that an inspector is sent to the school to investigate the problem.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.20 *p.m.*

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, October 12, 1971.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. Vernon Christie)** took the chair at 4.3 p.m., and read the prayer.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—It is with regret that I announce that the Minister of Health is ill and cannot be here today. The Minister of Labour and Industry has been delayed on matters of State but will get here as soon as he can.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated:—

COMMONWEALTH LAWS.

PERSONS IMPRISONED FOR OFFENCES: SENTENCES.

(Question No. 179)

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

1. How many persons are held in Victorian gaols or other penal institutions for offences against Commonwealth laws?

2. How many of those persons are serving minimum-maximum sentences?

3. How many of those persons have served a term of imprisonment in excess of the minimum sentence imposed by the court?

4. For what reasons, other than for breaches of prison regulations, the minimum terms have been extended?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—The answers are—

1. Thirty-two.
2. Ten.
3. Two.

4. The reasons are unknown, being under the exclusive control of the Commonwealth Attorney-General.

APPRENTICES.

TRAVEL SUBSIDIES: ACCOMMODATION CHARGES: LOG BOOKS.

(Question No. 238)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister of Labour and Industry—

1. How many apprentices have received travel subsidies during the past twelve months where they need to travel lengthy distances to attend day release classes?

2. What amount has been expended in payment of these subsidies in that period?

3. If he will ascertain and inform the House—(*a*) what amount country apprentices attending block release classes are charged per week for accommodation at the Young Men's Christian Association; and (*b*) what was the charge for accommodation when the rates of subsidy for such apprentices was fixed?

4. What is the present amount paid in subsidy to country apprentices attending block release classes?

5. If he will ascertain and inform the House what amount per week is paid to apprentices attending block release classes in similar circumstances in other States?

6. By what authority the present details of information to be entered in apprentices log books were compiled?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The answers are—

1. None.

2. Nil.

3. (*a*) $16.50.

(*b*) At accommodation arranged by the Apprenticeship Commission—Commonwealth hostels $9.85 per week. Arrangements for the accommodation of apprentices were not made with Young Men's Christian Association until 1967; however, the association advises that its charge for accommodation at the time when the rates of subsidy were fixed was $12.60 per week.

4.

Year of apprenticeship	*Amount*
1st	$9 per week.
2nd	$8 per week.
3rd	$6 per week.
4th or subsequent year	$3 per week.

Apprentices are also provided with second-class return rail vouchers or alternatively, to the extent to which rail travel is not reasonably practicable, are reimbursed the cost of the most economic other means of public transport available to them.

5. (*a*) Tasmania—same as Victoria.

(*b*) Queensland—

Stage I. $9.00 per week.
Stage II. $8.00 per week.
Stage III. $6.00 per week.

(*c*) South Australia—No Government subsidy; apprentices are reimbursed accommodation expenses up to $10 per week by employers on production of an appropriate receipt.

Apprentices in each of these States are provided with transport on the same basis as those in Victoria.

The other States have not yet supplied the relevant information; as soon as it is received, I will furnish the information to the honorable member by letter.

6. In certain trades log books have been introduced on an experimental basis by authority of this commission after consultation with the appropriate trade committees. If their use proves to be successful, consideration will be given to prescribing their use by regulations under the Apprenticeship Act.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION.

CONTRACT LABOUR FORCE: CONTINUITY OF EMPLOYMENT.

(Question No. 261)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power—

Whether, in view of the completion of the Yallourn West power station resulting in many hundreds of workmen facing unemployment if the State Electricity Commission does not continue with its programme in the Latrobe Valley, he will take steps to ensure continuity of work for the contract labour force?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The answer is—

On present knowledge the next base load generating plant to follow the Yallourn West power station, which will be completed in 1973, is planned to be based on brown coal fuel, either on one of the existing open cuts at Yallourn or Morwell or a completely new open-cut development at Loy Yang. A decision on the new development will need to be taken in about twelve months or so as construction would need to commence in the mid-1970s so that the first unit would be available by 1979 or 1980.

Economic necessity has forced the electricity supply industry throughout the world to introduce larger sizes of units into the generating systems with the result that there are longer periods between the installation of each unit and power station construction work is no longer continuous.

Because of escalating salaries and wages the State Electricity Commission is faced with rapidly-rising costs, particularly in the labour intensive brown coal stations of the

Latrobe Valley. The effects can be offset only by using larger units, reducing manning levels and reducing fuel costs.

With the introduction of larger unit sizes it is no longer necessary to bring a unit into service each year, as was the case at Hazelwood, and consequently there will be fewer men employed on the construction of new works for the commission. Construction work on major projects, whether they be power stations, dams or highways, by its very nature requires a fluctuating and temporary work force, both in respect of the total number engaged and the trade skills needed. This factor has been recognized and taken into account in rates of pay and site allowances for construction workers.

The State Electricity Commission cannot undertake to provide continuity of work for construction forces in the Latrobe Valley. However, the Government is fully aware of the problem and is continuing its endeavours to encourage the development of new industries in the area to provide alternative sources of employment.

Coal Dredge at Hernes Oak: Synchronization of Power Stations: East Field Coal Reserves.

(Question No. 329)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power—

1. Whether the State Electricity Commission proposes to build a coal dredge in the Hernes Oak area in the near future; if so, whether the construction site is on commission-owned land near the southern end of Bourke Street, Hernes Oak and, in that event, what right the commission has to carry out industrial work on land zoned residential?

2. Whether problems are envisaged with the synchronization of the Yallourn West power station and the Newport power station?

3. Whether the commission is presently investigating the opening of the east field coal reserves; if so, what bearing this investigation has in relation to the problems of synchronization referred to above?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The answers are—

1. The State Electricity Commission has on order a new coal and overburden dredger for Yallourn open cut and the erection of this dredger is expected to commence early in 1973.

The preferred site for erection of this machine is at the southern end of Bourke Street, Hernes Oak, on land which is owned by the commission. This land forms part of an area, east of the main Yallourn entry road from the Princes Highway, needed by 1975 for extension of the Yallourn open cut. The commission is currently negotiating the purchase of the few properties not owned by it in this area. As soon as these remaining properties have been purchased steps will be taken to have the area incorporated in the Yallourn works area pursuant to section 28 of the State Electricity Commission Act 1958 and to have the area rezoned for State Electricity Commission purposes.

The Commission believes that it is permitted to carry out the erection of the machine within a residential area under the exemption clause of the Latrobe Valley sub-regional planning scheme 1949 and will be approaching the Morwell Shire Council to determine the matter.

2. I am not sure whether the honorable member is referring to the electrical synchronization of these stations or the synchronization of construction work. In neither respect is any problem envisaged.

3. The commission is not presently carrying out any detailed investigation concerning the opening up of the east field coal reserves at Yallourn. Investigations aready done indicate that the east field should not need to be developed until the coal under the Yallourn township has been won. As set out in evidence given to the recent Public Works Committee hearing on the Yallourn coal reserves inquiry the date of commencement of any development of the east field is dependent on the future demand for Yallourn coal and on the present planning is unlikely to be before 1995.

Development of the east field would not bear any relation to the synchronization of the power stations mentioned in part 2 of the question.

SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT.

Cases of Hardship: Co-ordination with Housing Commission.

(Question No. 287)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

What measures are taken by the Social Welfare Department to co-ordinate its activities with those of the Housing Commission in relation to cases of hardship?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—The answer is—

In result of my personal discussion with my colleague, the Honorable the Minister of Housing, for the purpose, followed by arrangements between the Director-General of Social Welfare and the Director of Housing, liaison has been established at officer level for co-ordination of the respective activities in such cases.

CHARITABLE AND WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS: GRANTS.

(Question No. 314)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister for Social Welfare—

1. What stage has been reached in the transfer to the Social Welfare Department of administration of the capital and maintenance grants, formerly issued to charitable and welfare organizations under the jurisdiction of the Hospitals and Charities Commission?

2. Under which division or section of the department the above-mentioned activities will be conducted?

3. On what basis capital and maintenance grants will be allocated to individual charitable and welfare organizations?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—The answers are—

1. Departmental and commission representatives have conferred to determine which particular organizations will be affected by the transfer, and such organizations are presently being advised regarding the new procedures and rates which will apply in relation to maintenance payments. $90,000 has been provided to the department for the purpose of capital grants, and additional staff for the administrative work in this area has been cleared, but not yet appointed.

2. Central administration.

3. The basis on which capital grants will be allocated has not yet been determined.

With regard to maintenance grants, the present system of boarding-out rates paid by the department and grants paid by the commission will be abolished. Instead, the department alone will make payments for wards at rates up to $20 each per week, and in certain categories half-rates will also be paid in respect of non-wards.

I will arrange for the honorable member for Deer Park to be supplied with a statement explaining the new system in detail.

HOSPITAL AND CHARITIES COMMISSION.

PRIVATE HOSPITALS AND NURSING HOMES: FEES.

(Question No. 334)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Minister of Health—

1. How many registered private hospitals and nursing homes, respectively, are in existence in Victoria?

2. What fees are charged in—(*a*) private hospitals; and (*b*) private nursing homes?

3. Which private hospitals are used by the Hospitals and Charities Commission for the placing of patients who are entitled to supplementary nursing home benefits?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—The answers are—

1. There are 319 private hospitals registered under the provisions of the Health Act with the Hospitals and Charities Commission in Victoria. The term "nursing home" is one used by the Commonwealth Health Department for health benefit purposes and State registration does not use the term, but I have before me proposals to use the term "nursing home" in our Health Act.

Of the 319 hospitals—

95 are acute hospitals,

224 are for long-term patients and in general are registered for health benefits as "nursing homes".

2. The Government has no control over fees charged by these hospitals. However, I am informed that fees charged are as follows:—

(*a*) Acute hospitals—from $23 per day (3 or 4-bed ward) to $35-$40 per day (single bed ward with own facilities);

(*b*) long-term hospitals—from $65 to $90 per week.

3. Patients subsidized by the Hospitals and Charities Commission are at present accommodated in the following private hospitals:—

Abelene (Elsternwick)
Abberfield (Elsternwick))
Alice Berry (Emerald)
Anna House (Moonee Ponds)
Argyll (Glen Iris)
Ashleigh Lodge (Brighton)
Bambra House (Caulfield))
Blairgowrie (Camberwell)
Boronia (Boronia)
Cambrai (St. Kilda)
Colaba (Elsternwick)
Coogee (Boronia)
Deloraine (Greensborough)
Dewhurst (Canterbury)
Duretta (Windsor)
Eleanor (Heidelberg)
Elizabeth House (Heidelberg)
Ericstane (Surrey Hills)
Footscray (Footscray)
Frankston (Frankston)
Glenlyn (Glenroy)
Greenways (Northcote)
Heatherleigh (Hawthorn)
Ivanhoe (Ivanhoe)
Joycedale (Ivanhoe)
Kalamaria (Camberwell)
Kalimna House (East Malvern)
Karinyah (Camberwell)
Keith House (Armadale)
Kinkora Court (Hawthorn)
Kulki (Moreland)
Lancewood (Kew)
Le Chateau (Healesville)
Lendoris (Coburg North)
Lewisham (Windsor)
Manvantara (Ringwood))
Merlynston (Coburg North)

Mon Repos (Essendon)
Moruya (Wantirna South)
Myola (Malvern East)
Orana (East Brunswick)
Perpetua (Carlton North)
Rowena (Ivanhoe)
St. Helen's (Windsor)
St. Helier's (Camberwell)
St. James (Elsternwick)
St. Kilda (St.Kilda)
St. Linus (Merlynston)
St. Mary's (Ivanhoe)
St. Omer (Camberwell)
St. Peter's (Armadale)
St. Ronan's (Armadale)
St. Winifred's (Malvern East)
Sackville (Kew)
Sherwood (Caulfield)
Springfield (Boronia)
Stanleigh (Caulfield)
Stanhope (Camberwell)
Valley View (Glen Iris)
Vaucluse (Coburg North)
Wattle Glen (Wattle Glen)
Wahroonga (Sandringham)
Wilglen (Brighton)
Wyuna (Northcote)

POLICE DEPARTMENT.

MOTOR BOATING SQUAD.

(Question No. 347)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What is the description, size and type of boats in use by the police Motor Boating Squad?

2. Which of these boats have inboard or outboard motors?

3. When each of these boats was purchased and what was the cost?

4. Whether these boats are equipped for search and sea rescue work under all conditions?

5. How often the Victoria Police Force has been obliged to hire private craft or boats from other Government or semi-Government departments, trusts, boards, or instrumentalities, to carry out their duties?

6. What was the cost of hire in these cases?

7. Whether it is intended to purchase more suitable craft for the purpose of carrying out these duties; if so, what type of craft will be purchased, when, and what is the estimated cost in each case?

8. Whether the boats now in use are suitable for the tasks undertaken by them?

9. What was the cost of administration and maintenance of the squad for the year 1970?

10. What amount of revenue from activities of the squad was raised in 1970?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answers are—

1, 2 and 3.

Description	Date of purchase	Cost
1 x 32′ wooden hulled "Bartender" cabin cruiser powered by 2 inboard shaft drive 216 h.p. diesel motors	September, 1967 ..	$35,000
1 x 23′ wooden hulled "Bartender" cabin cruiser powered by 1 inboard shaft drive 250 h.p. petrol motor	December, 1968 ..	$11,623.32 (including $946 for trailer)
1 x 23′ wooden hulled "Bartender" cabin cruiser powered by 1 inboard shaft drive 250 h.p. petrol motor	April, 1970 ..	$11,987.90 (including $1,142.90 for trailer)
1 x 19′ wooden hulled "Bartender" open boat powered by 1 inboard–outboard 165 h.p. petrol motor	September, 1968 ..	$5,373.10 (including $622.60 for trailer)
1 x 19′ wooden hulled "Bartender" open boat powered by 1 inboard–outboard 120 h.p. petrol motor	November, 1969 ..	$6,540.89 (including $890.89 for trailer)
1 x 14′ De Havilland aluminium open boat powered by one 120 h.p. outboard petrol motor	April, 1968 ..	$1,000.60 (including $193.75 for trailer)
1 x 15′ De Havilland aluminium open boat powered by one 150 h.p. outboard petrol motor	January, 1970 ..	$2,067.00 (including $372 for trailer)
1 x 21′ Savage fibreglass cruiser powered by one 215 h.p. inboard–outboard petrol motor	June, 1971 ..	$7,278.00 (including $500 for trailer)

4. The 32-ft. craft is the only one fitted for sea search and rescue operations under all conditions. The remainder of the fleet can be and are used in search and rescue operations in certain conditions.

5 and 6. In the last five years, the only occasion when boats have been hired was when two private boats with operators were hired for two days at a cost of $200 to assist in a search operation at Lake Eildon.

In addition in three other instances the department has contributed a total of $50 towards the cost of petrol and oil consumed when private boats have been used to assist police during searches.

7. This matter is receiving consideration by the Government.

8. All craft are suitable for enforcing the provisions of the Motor Boating Act and regulations.

In regard to search and rescue operations, the answer to part 4 of the question applies.

9. $77,978.

10. For the financial year 1970-71, $14,051 was paid into the Tourist Fund in fines for breaches of the Motor Boating Act or regulations detected by members of the police Motor Boating Squad.

STATE HIGHWAYS.

LIGHTING COSTS.

(Question No. 339)

Mr. BROAD (Swan Hill) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Local Government—

1. When the Country Roads (Amendment) Act 1971 making provision for the costs of the lighting of State highways to be shared by the Country Roads Board, the State Electricity Commission, and the respective municipality, will come into operation?

2. What conditions must be complied with by municipalities for inclusion in the cost-sharing proposals?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answers supplied by the Minister for Local Government are—

I and 2. The cost-sharing provisions of the Country Roads (Amendment) Act 1971 will not operate in a particular case until the Street Lighting Committee approves the lighting installation concerned for cost-sharing purposes. The Street Lighting Committee has determined the minimum standard to which an installation must comply before the cost-sharing provisions apply. The minimum standard determined is that recommended in the Standards Association of Australia street lighting code, CA 19 part 1—1964, traffic routes.

The Country Roads Board, which is responsible for requesting the Street Lighting Committee to approve particular street lighting installations, will advise all municipal councils next week of the committee's minimum standard and invite councils to submit details of existing installations and proposed new installations which the councils desire to be subject to cost sharing. Those installations which are, in the opinion of the board, of a standard not lower than the standard determined by the Street Lighting Committee, will be submitted by the board to the committee for approval for cost-sharing purposes.

The procedural and costing details for proposals to improve existing installations to the minimum standard determined by the committee have not yet been finalized.

CHILD CRUELTY.

INCIDENCE: ACTION TAKEN.

(Question No. 346)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many cases of child cruelty were reported to the Chief Secretary's Department during the period 31st October, 1970, to 1st October, 1971?

2. What action was taken in each case?

3. Whether any further consideration has been given to making it compulsory for cases of child cruelty to be reported?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answers are—

1. Twenty-six.

2.

Number of cases	Persons involved	Result of police inquiries
10	10	Charges preferred
5	7	Referred for psychiatric treatment
7	7	No offence disclosed
4	4	Unsubstantiated or malicious complaint
Totals 26	28	

Persons charged were as follows :—

Persons charged		Nature of offence or offences
Male	Female	
..	1	Charged with murder, but presented for trial on charge of manslaughter
2	..	Grevious bodily harm
1	..	Grevious bodily harm, actual bodily harm, assault by kicking and resist arrest
1	..	Assault with weapon
2	..	Assault
1	..	Ill-treat child
*1	..	Attempted murder, attempted rape and indecent assault
..	1	Neglect to provide medical aid, etc.
Totals 8	2	

* Charged in New South Wales.

Arising out of the 26 complaints received, protection applications were made in respect of 16 children as follows :—

Number of children	Grounds on which application made
5	Unfit guardianship
3	Ill-treated
4	Ill-treated or exposed to risk
3	Exposed to risk
1	No visible means of support
Total 16	

Of these, thirteen children were admitted to the care of the Social Welfare Department, and three were placed on probation.

3. No.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

STAFF EMPLOYED: VACANCIES: TERMINATIONS: RECRUITMENT.

(Question No. 353)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister of Transport—

1. How many persons are employed by the Victorian Railways Commissioners as—(*a*) drivers; (*b*) guards; (*c*) station staff; and (*d*) other employees?

2. How many vacancies exist in each of the above categories?

3. How many in each category—(*a*) resigned or left; and (*b*) were dismissed in 1970 and to 1st October, 1971?

4. How many were recruited in each category in 1970 and to 1st October, 1971?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answers supplied on behalf of the Minister of Transport are—

—	Drivers	Guards	Station staff	Other employees
1. Number employed	934	854	3,623	20,375
2. Vacancies existing	Nil	24	154	75
3. (*a*) Resigned or left—1970	36	63	882	5,361
—to 1st October, 1971	33	37	802	2,987
(*b*) Dismissed—1970	Nil	Nil	75	212
—to 1st October, 1971	1	1	66	164
4. Number recruited—1970	Nil*	Nil*	977	4,721
—to 1st October, 1971	Nil*	Nil*	1,061	3,143

* Drivers and guards are not recruited as such. Employees in other grades become eligible by training and experience for promotion to these positions.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

FAILURES.

(Question No. 356)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Attorney-General—

Whether he has any knowledge of the possible imminent collapse of further insurance companies; if so, which companies; if not, whether he will investigate a statement by the Victorian Automobile Chamber of Commerce which indicated further failures of insurance companies?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—The answer is—

I have no such knowledge. As the honorable member will be aware, the matter of licensing of insurance companies generally is governed by Commonwealth legislation. However, provision is made in the Victorian motor car and workers compensation legislation for authorizing insurance companies to undertake insurance business for the purposes of that legislation, which is administered by the Chief Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

LOCUST PLAGUE: PREVENTIVE ACTION.

(Question No. 358)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Lands, for the Minister of Agriculture—

1. What is the precise amount and type of aid Victoria is sending to New South Wales to control locust outbreaks in that State?

2. What plans have been made against the possible penetration of locusts into Victoria?

3. What areas in Victoria are in danger from such penetration?

4. What type of insecticide is being used against the locusts and whether the insecticide is considered not to be harmful to other flora and fauna?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The answers supplied by the Minister of Agriculture are—

1. The Government has sent eight officers, including two entomologists, to New South Wales to take part in survey and control operations in those parts of the Riverina where dense egg beds of the plague locust pose the greatest threat to Victoria. A helicopter to assist in the survey at Victorian expense will arrive at Griffith early next week then proceed to Deniliquin as its operational centre. New South Wales already has a helicopter in operation.

This assistance will enable greater destruction of locusts in their breeding grounds and reduce the risk of swarms reaching Victoria. It will also permit a better assessment of when and where any swarms surviving the New South Wales campaign are likely to enter Victoria.

2. A decision on whether a separate Victorian campaign is necessary should be possible by late October, and such a campaign would commence about mid-November. Many factors may prevent the locusts reaching Victoria, but the Government is proceeding on the basis that a campaign will probably be necessary and plans are in an advanced stage of formulation.

The action taken against the locusts would be aerial spraying of swarms in open country with a non-persistent insecticide at rates of application so low that it would be harmless to men and animals. Precautions would be taken to avoid damage to apiaries, and all use of insecticides would be approved by the Pesticides Review Committee.

I have asked the Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales to permit Victorian planes to operate on the far side of the River Murray against swarms approaching the border as has been done in past campaigns. However, some migrating swarms could reach Victoria without warning and action within Victoria would then be needed.

A Bill is before the Legislative Council to up-date the provisions of the Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act so that plagues of this nature can be attacked expeditiously.

3. The densest egg beds are in the Hay–Hillston–Griffith area and around Deniliquin, while less dense but still dangerous beds extend westwards to Balranald and a considerable distance eastwards.

If the resultant swarms follow the pattern of past outbreaks by moving generally in a south-south-easterly direction, they could penetrate Victoria anywhere from Swan Hill eastwards with a major concentration between Echuca and Yarrawonga. They are not likely to penetrate beyond the Great Dividing Range.

However, there is no certainty that swarms will not appear in other places, and control campaigns must be organized on a highly mobile basis to deal with them promptly on being reported.

4. New South Wales is using lindane for ground spraying of locusts in the hopper stage in dry, open country and maldison and fenitrothion in other ground spraying where lindane is unsuitable. In aerial spraying against the winged stage, New South Wales proposes to use maldison and fenitrothion, and Victoria has the approval of the Pesticides Review Committee to use maldison.

Under the conditions of use, it is considered that these insecticides are not harmful to other flora or fauna. Lindane in the form of BHC was used in aerial spraying in Victoria during campaigns extending from 1946 to 1955 without any ill effects to man or the environment being reported or observed. New South Wales has used lindane for locust control over the last twenty years with the same absence of side effects. Properly used, the safety, effectiveness and economy of lindane make it the best material available for ground spraying.

Maldison has certain advantages for aerial spraying, and is expected to be the only material used in Victoria if the present outbreak reaches the State.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

MARYBOROUGH TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

(Question No. 359)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Education—

1. When it is proposed to carry out works at Maryborough Technical School to convert the old chemistry rooms to art rooms?

2. Whether he is aware that these works were promised twelve months ago when the new wing at the school was completed?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1. A specification of the requirements for conversion of the chemistry room to an art and crafts area is currently with the Public Works Department for a cost estimate and preparation of essential planning and documentation. It cannot be definitely stated at this date when work will commence.

2. Representations were made approximately twelve months ago for this work to be undertaken. Planning of requirements was deferred pending completion of the new trades wing.

SCHOOL RESIDENCE AT WATCHEM: EXPENDITURE ON TEACHER HOUSING.

(Question No. 371)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Education—

1. Whether a representative of the Teacher Housing Authority has inspected the school residence at Watchem; if so, when a decision will be made concerning the future of this residence?

2. When priorities are expected to be drawn up for replacement of condemned residences and whether Watchem is to be given a high priority?

3. Whether the authority has finalized its financial arrangements; if so, what amount of money is proposed to be spent on teacher housing including renovations this financial year?

4. When the authority proposes to commence rebuilding, renovation, building and purchase, of residences?

5. What amount was spent by the Education Department in the past three years on teacher housing?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1. Yes. A decision has been made to replace the residence.

2. The replacement of this residence is included in the current year's programme.

3. No, but it is expected that funds to the order of $650,000 for new works and $500,000 for maintenance will be made available.

4. A number of purchases are currently being negotiated, and a building programme will be initiated for those areas where a suitable purchase cannot be made.

Maintenance works have continued to proceed at an expenditure rate equivalent to the previous year.

5.

Year	Maintenance of residences	Provision of residences and capital improvements to existing ones
	$	$
1968–69 ..	517,760	613,999
1969–70 ..	376,411	699,980
1970–71 ..	466,233	626,443

These figures relate to houses occupied by district inspectors, teachers, caretakers and a few temporary tenanted to outsiders.

Separate figures for expenditure on teachers' residences only are not available but it is estimated that 85 per cent of expenditure related to such houses.

CONFINEMENT LEAVE FOR PRIMARY TEACHERS IN GREENSBOROUGH ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 375)

Mr. FELL (Geensborough) asked the Minister of Education—

How many primary teachers have been on confinement leave this year and last year, respectively, in each inspectorate in the electoral district of Greensborough?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answer is—

The information is not readily available in the form required by the question and we have to circularize all schools in the electorate. The honorable member will be advised by letter as soon as all details come to hand.

PRIMARY SCHOOL No. 4845.

(Question No. 382)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of primary school 4845, what plans the Education Department has for site works and playground improvement?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answer is—

A tender for over $17,000 has been let and work commenced on 8th October, 1971, to carry out site works in the vicinity of the newer class-rooms and to repair existing asphalt areas at the school.

SPENSLEY STREET, CLIFTON HILL, PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 383)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether plans have been drawn up for a new primary school in Spensley Street, Clifton Hill; if so—(*a*) whether the plans have been approved; (*b*) what is the estimated cost of the structure; (*c*) what facilities will be provided, specifying the number of class-rooms; (*d*) when tenders will be called for construction; (*e*) what is the estimated date of commencement of construction; (*f*) when it is expected that the structure will be completed; and (*g*) whether any provision has been made for expansion of the existing school site in the immediate future?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answer is—

The Public Works Department is in the process of preparing plans for the new Clifton Hill Primary School.

(*a*) A preliminary scheme and estimate has been approved.

(*b*) It is not our practice to reveal estimates prior to the invitation of tenders.

(*c*) The building will contain four large teaching areas equivalent to sixteen class-rooms. A library, a general purpose room, an art/craft room and a canteen will be included.

(*d*) It is not anticipated that we will be in a position to proceed with tenders during the 1971–72 financial year.

(*e*) and (*f*) Not known.

(*g*) Yes.

LOWER YARRA CROSSING.

DESIGN: CONSTRUCTION: SUPERVISION: FINANCING.

(Question No. 361)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Premier—

If he will lay on the table of the Library all files, documents and memoranda, in the possession of all Government departments and semi-Government departments, relating to the design, construction supervision and financing of the Lower Yarra Crossing?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—The answer is—

No. The total number and volume of such files held by departments, instrumentalities, and the Lower Yarra Crossing Authority is enormous. Furthermore, many of these files are in current use. The Government could not justify the work and disruption involved in granting such a dragnet request.

The Minister for Local Government is, however, prepared to arrange for an officer of the Lower Yarra Crossing Authority to consult with the honorable member and to supply him with information necessary for his purposes. The honorable member should after such consultation be in a better position to specify any particular files or documents which he desires to be produced in the Library.

DECENTRALIZATION.

FREIGHT CONCESSIONS FOR APPROVED INDUSTRIES.

(Question No. 362)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister for State Development—

Further to his answer to question No. 304 asked in this House on 30th September, 1971, if the Minister will ascertain and inform the House where the industries concerned are located, and in respect of each industry what percentage of assistance is given as a freight concession?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The answer supplied by the Minister for State Development is—

(1) *Locations*—

Kyneton	Maryborough
Ballarat	Sale
Bendigo	Euroa
Shepparton	Stawell
Castlemaine	Yea
Creswick	Ararat
Wonthaggi	Horsham
Portland	Benalla
Hamilton	Wangaratta
Moe	Tongala
Swan Hill	Tatura
Clunes	Warrnambool.
Kilmore	

(2) To obtain the percentage degree of assistance for each company involves a considerable amount of research. This information will be provided by letter to the honorable member as soon as possible.

ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIES.

(Question No. 372)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister for State Development—

1. How many industries assisted by the Department of State Development have

established themselves in country areas, indicating the type of industry, and the locality in each case?

2. What degree of assistance was given to each industry?

3. Which industries so assisted were established in other areas before going to their present locality?

4. What was their previous locality?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The Minister for State Development has supplied the following answers:—

1. The information sought is reasonably provided in *Hansard*, as follows:—

1969–70: Pages 755–8, dated 13th October, 1970.

NOTE.—There were no additions during 1970 beyond those cited.

1971: Page 720, dated 29th September, 1971.

2. Please also see *Hansard*, as above. The provision of more detailed information is resented by the industrialists concerned, and is therefore treated as confidential.

3 and 4. This information is not tabulated. However, with the exception of Kodol Chamois at Maryborough, and Green Bros. and Miller at Hamilton, both of whom moved their entire operations from Melbourne, the industries formed from outside represent in many cases an annexe or a subsidiary operation.

INDUSTRIES ESTABLISHED IN FIVE CHOSEN AREAS.

(Question No. 373)

Mr. AMOS (Morwell) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister for State Development—

1. If the Minister will ascertain and inform the House which industries have established themselves in one or more of the five chosen areas for special assistance, since the inception of that concept, indicating the type of industry, the location, and the number of employees, in each case?

2. How many of the above-mentioned established themselves in those areas as a direct result of the initiative taken by the development committees concerned or by the Department of State Development?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The answers supplied by the Minister for State Development are—

1.

Name	Operation	Location
1969—		
Ballarat Fibreglass Pty. Ltd.	Fibreglass production	Ballarat
River Farm Products	Packaging	Bendigo
Sarah Coventry	Jewellery	Wodonga
V.D.L. Spesonda	Furniture	Ballarat
A. V. Wehl Industries Ltd.	Particle board	Ballarat
Watersun Pty. Ltd.	Swimsuits	Moe
1970—		
Australian Char Pty. Ltd.	Char	Morwell
Diamond Cut Lingerie Pty. Ltd.	Clothing	Morwell
Dowling Mfrs. Ltd.	Laminators	Ballarat
Gippsland Furniture Mfrs.	Furniture	Moe
Glenlee Caravans Pty. Ltd.	Caravans	Traralgon
Haute Coutre Pty. Ltd.	Clothing	Portland
Kaolin (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.	Kaolin	Ballarat
E. B. Mawson & Sons Pty. Ltd.	Engineering	Bendigo
Moe Disposals	Canvas goods	Moe
Pipeweld Ltd.	Engineering	Traralgon
Portland Export Company	Packaging	Portland
1971—		
Fernando Bosco (Aust) Pty. Ltd.	Concrete poles	Bendigo
K. & K. Fasteners	Engineering	Ballarat
H. K. Porter (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.	Engineering	Ballarat
Godfrey Hirst Fabrics Pty. Ltd.	Textiles	Bendigo

Statistics concerning the work force employed in specific industries are not maintained.

2. As the promotion officers on the committees are also members of the staff of the Division of Industrial Development, it is not practicable accurately to assess where the initiative rests.

COUNTRY FIRE AUTHORITY.

FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT.

(Question No. 363)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many fully equipped units for fire fighting have been provided by the Country Fire Authority for country areas in Victoria during the past two years?

2. How many of these were new units?

3. Whether the subsidy to landowners to enable them to purchase fire-fighting equipment as a supplement to Country Fire Authority equipment will be continued?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answers are —

1 and 2. During the past two financial years, a total of 180 of these units were provided by the Country Fire Authority. All were new units.

3. Approval has been given to the provision of funds for the continuation of the subsidy for the current financial year.

MINES DEPARTMENT.

MOONLIGHT SANDS MINE, STAWELL.

(Question No. 364)

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas) asked the Minister of Mines—

1. When Western Mining Corporation Ltd. lodged an application for the lease of the mine at Stawell known as "Moonlight Sands"?

2. What action is being taken on the application?

3. Whether an application from the Stawell Town Council would be considered, so that they may develop the area; if so, whether he will arrange for officers of the Mines Department to visit Stawell to discuss the council interest in the area?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—The answers are—

1. Western Mining Corporation Ltd. lodged an application for a gold-mining lease over an area at Stawell—which area includes the "Moonlight Sands"—in December, 1968. This application was renewed in June, 1970.

2. Pendency of the lease application by Western Mining Corporation Ltd. expires in December, 1971. A decision as to whether a lease will be granted to the applicant company is expected to be reached on or before that date.

3. Proposals for the reclamation of the subject area have been submitted by the Stawell Town Council through the Stawell Reclamation Committee and these are currently being considered by the department.

To progress action in this matter, arrangements have been made for officers of the department to visit Stawell and confer with council representatives. This visit is scheduled for 26th October, 1971.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

FREEWAY F6.

(Question No. 365)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Local Government—

1. Whether a decision has been made to plan the F6 freeway as an eight-lane freeway; if so—(*a*) when such a decision was made; (*b*) how the decision was arrived at; and (*c*) who made the decision?

2. Why the decision has been made which allows public display of plans in respect of that section of F6 north of the Maroondah aqueduct but does not include plans for that section of the freeway in the electoral district of Reservoir, south of the aqueduct?

3. Whether the original width of the freeway was planned as a four-lane freeway; if so, why?

4. When responsibility for planning of F6 was accepted by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works?

5. Whether any persons have applied for compensation for loss of value to their property because of close proximity to a freeway in other cases of freeway construction; if so, where and to what extent loss of value was claimed?

6. What consultation or correspondence has taken place between the board and the municipal councils concerned in respect of the proposed change in route of the F6 freeway, prior to the recently announced change?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answers supplied by the Minister for Local Government are—

1. The Metropolitan Transportation Committee recommend four-lane construction by 1985. In common with the Country Roads Board most freeway reservations are planned to enable ultimate construction of eight lanes.

2. Plans north of Maroondah aqueduct are on display in connection with the exhibition of the planning scheme amendment. The section north of the aqueduct only has been amended as a major deviation from the existing reservation is required. Early public notification appeared to be desirable so that all alternatives could be examined and certainty established for the people affected. A feasibility study has yet to be carried out for up-grading of the section of F6 south of the aqueduct, to the freeway standard recommended by the metropolitan transportation study.

3. The original route was planned as a four-lane arterial road, the accepted requirement prior to the metropolitan transportation study.

4. The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has had responsibility for town planning including reservations for road purposes since the approval of the first interim development order in March, 1955.

5. There have been a small number of such claims, but it would take time to extract full details from files. No payments have been made.

6. There has been no consultation to date. The purpose of an amending planning scheme is to enable consultation on the widest basis, including the municipal council, to occur.

POULTRY INDUSTRY.

CONTROL.

(Question No. 366)

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas) asked the Minister of Lands, for the Minister of Agriculture—

Whether the Government has refused to co-operate with other Australian States to control the production of poultry; if so, why?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Agriculture is—

The Government has carefully considered and rejected the principles, accepted by all States other than Victoria and Tasmania, of controlling egg production by a system of licensing and quotas.

The Government believes that the quota system would close the industry to new methods and ideas and protect the inefficient producer.

RENTAL INVESTIGATION BUREAU.

CASES INVESTIGATED: PROPERTIES PLACED UNDER RENT CONTROL.

(Question No. 367)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Attorney-General—

1. How many cases were investigated by the Rental Investigation Bureau during the period 1st October, 1970, to 1st October, 1971?

2. Where the properties concerned were located?

3. Arising from these investigations, how many properties were placed under rent control by order of the Attorney-General, and what happened in respect of the remainder of the cases investigated?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—The answers are—

1. 768 cases.

2. (*a*) *Metropolitan area*—

Location	*Number of properties*
Abbotsford	5
Albert Park	11
Alphington	4
Altona	2
Armadale	6
Ascot Vale	3
Ashburton	2
Avondale Heights	3
Balaclava	3
Balwyn	3
Bayswater	1
Bentleigh	4
Blackburn	2
Black Rock	2
Boronia	5
Box Hill	4
Brighton	4
Brunswick	28
Bundoora	1
Burnley	1
Burwood	7
Camberwell	10
Cambellfield	1
Canterbury	2
Carlton	50
Carnegie	21
Carrum	2
Caulfield	17
Chelsea	1
Cheltenham	2
Clayton	1
Clifton Hill	1

Location	*Number of properties*
Coburg	10
Collingwood	3
Croydon	2
Dandenong	4
Deepdene	1
Diamond Creek	1
East Melbourne	2
Edithvale	5
Elsternwick	8
Eltham	1
Elwood	18
Emerald	1
Epping	1
Essendon	5
Fairfield	3
Ferntree Gully	3
Fitzroy	24
Flemington	5
Footscray	16
Forest Hill	1
Frankston	4
Gardiner	2
Glen Iris	4
Glenhuntly	4
Glenroy	1
Greensborough	1
Hampton	2
Hawthorn	23
Heartherton	1
Heathmont	3
Heidelberg	5
Highett	1
Kensington	2
Kew	7
Kilsyth	1
Kooyong	2
Lalor	2
Malvern	15
Melbourne	2
Mentone	1
Middle Park	6
Mitcham	2
Mont Albert	1
Moonee Ponds	17
Moorabbin	2
Mooroolbark	4
Mordialloc	1
Mt. Waverley	2
Murrumbeena	3
Newport	1
Noble Park	11
Northcote	7
North Melbourne	16
Nunawading	1
Oakleigh	7
Oak Park	1
Ormond	1
Parkdale	5
Parkville	27
Pascoe Vale	7
Port Melbourne	9
Prahran	10
Preston	11
Regent	2
Reservoir	5
Richmond	18
St. Albans	7
St. Kilda	53
Seaford	4
Seddon	3
South Melbourne	9
South Yarra	16
Spotswood	1
Springvale	3
Sunshine	3
Surrey Hills	4
Syndal	1
Templestowe	1
Thomastown	2
Thornbury	3
Toorak	3
Tullamarine	1
Vermont	1
West Melbourne	5
Williamstown	6
Windsor	12
Yarraville	3

(*b*) *Other areas*—

Location	*Number of properties*
Barwon Heads	2
Belgrave	3
Bell Park	1
Bendigo	1
Birregurra	1
Broadford	1
Bulla	1
Casterton	1
Echuca	1
Geelong	7
Healesville	3
Lilydale	2
Monbulk	1
Mt. Evelyn	2
Olinda	1
Panton Hill	1
Pearcedale	2
Rutherglen	1
Swan Hill	1
Tecoma	2
The Basin	1
Traralgon	2
Tresco	1
Wandin	1
Warrandyte	1
Werribee	2
Woodend	1

3. (*a*) In 26 cases declarations were made by Order of the Governor in Council pursuant to section 44 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1958. There were seven other cases where such a declaration has been given consideration. Consideration of five of these cases has not yet been completed and in relation to the two remaining cases it has been decided not to recommend declaration to the Governor in Council.

(*b*) In 380 cases the rent was reduced by negotiations between the Rental Investigation Bureau and the landlords or their agents or solicitors.

(c) In 150 cases the tenant had either vacated the premises or withdrawn the complaint before the bureau's investigation had reached finality.

(d) In 164 cases the facts did not justify a recommendation by the bureau of declaration pursuant to section 44 of the Act.

(e) In 41 cases the bureau's investigations have not been finalized.

FAIR RENTS BOARD.

CASES HEARD: RENTS ADJUSTED: DELAYS IN HEARINGS.

(Question No. 368)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Attorney-General—

1. How many cases were heard by the Fair Rents Board during the period 1st October, 1970, to 1st October, 1971?

2. How many cases resulted from applications for—(a) reduction in rent by the tenant; and (b) increase in rent by the owner?

3. In how many cases the rent was—(a) reduced; (b) increased; and (c) unaltered?

4. What is the delay (if any) in hearing cases by the board?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—The answers are—

1. 355.

2. (a) 15.
   (b) 340.

3. (a) 15.
   (b) 305.
   (c) 35.

4. The average period between receipt of an application and hearing is three weeks.

ALCOHOLICS AND DRUG-DEPENDENT PERSONS ACT.

ASSESSMENT CENTRES.

(Question No. 369)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Minister of Health—

How many assessment centres have been established in Victoria under the Alcoholics and Drug-dependent Persons Act 1968 and where these centres are situated?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—The answer is—

None. The Alcoholics and Drug-dependent Persons Act 1968 has not yet been brought into operation. The first assessment centre will be established on the site of the former Pleasant View Psychiatric Hospital at Wood Street, Preston.

PUBLIC SERVICE.

SOCIAL WORKERS: VACANCIES: RECRUITMENT.

(Question No. 370)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Premier—

1. How many professionally qualified social workers were employed in the public service as at 1st October, 1971, indicating in which departments, and on what salary classifications these officers were placed?

2. What vacancies for professionally qualified social workers remained unfilled as at 1st October, 1971.

3. What action (if any) has been taken to increase recruitment of Melbourne social studies graduates to the Public Service, in particular to the Social Welfare Department, and whether this action has been successful?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—The answers are—

1. Employed as at 1st October, 1971—167.

Department	Salary classification	Number
	$ $	
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	7,367– 7,791	1
	6,945– 7,156	6
	4,520– 6,795	5
		12
Health	4,520– 6,795	1
		1
Mental Hygiene ..	8,155– 8,573	1
	7,367– 7,791	8
	6,945– 7,156	10
	4,520– 6,795	30
		49
Social Welfare ..	–10,581	1
	8,910– 9,304	5
	8,155– 8,573	6
	7,896– 8,361	2
	7,367– 7,791	11
	7,050– 7,527	1
	6,945– 7,156	9
	4,520– 6,795	70
		105

2. Vacancies as at 1st October, 1971—25.

Department	Salary classification	Number
	$ $	
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	7,367– 7,791	1
Health	4,520– 6,795	1
Mental Hygiene ..	6,945– 7,156	2
	4,520– 6,795	9
		11
Social Welfare ..	7,367– 7,791	1
	6,945– 7,156	1
	4,520– 6,795	10
		12

3. The department has circulated extensive material through the various universities and the cadetship scheme of recruitment is now showing significant results, fifteen graduates under the scheme having been appointed in 1971. It is anticipated that up to twenty cadetships will be awarded in 1972.

ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC AUTHORITY.

INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS: MUNICIPAL LIABILITY.

(Question No. 374)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Chief Secretary—

Whether remarks were made recently on Radio 3AW by a member of the Road Safety and Traffic Authority to the effect that he would make municipal councils pay for the installation of traffic lights; if so, whether this statement represents the policy and directives of the Government?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answer is—

As far as I am aware no member of the authority has made any such remarks. In any event, they certainly would not express either the policy of the authority or that of the Government.

HISTORIC BUILDINGS.

PRESERVATION.

(Question No. 376)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Local Government—

Whether the Government has been requested by the National Trust of Australia (Victoria), or any other body, to implement legislation designed to assist in the preservation designed to assist in the preservation of historic buildings; if so—(*a*) when such a request was made; and (*b*) whether a decision has been made on the request and, in that event, what decision and what stage has been reached in drafting legislation?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

(*a*) Yes; a request was submitted by the National Trust in 1969 for comprehensive legislation of a far-reaching nature.

(*b*) The trust's proposals would involve going beyond normal town planning controls and require the formulating of new procedures and the provision of considerable further funds to meet compensation costs.

The request cannot be met in full at this stage, but will be met in part by an amendment to be submitted to the Town and Country Planning Act this session widening powers to protect buildings, works and areas of special architectural historic, scientific, conservation or aesthetic interest or significance.

MENTAL HEALTH AUTHORITY.

PSYCHIATRIC UNIT FOR GEELONG.

(Question No. 377)

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong) asked the Minister of Health—

What progress has been made with plans to set up a psychiatric unit in Geelong?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—The answer is—

The Mental Health Authority has completed negotiations with the committee of management of the Geelong Base Hospital for the use of an area adjacent to that hospital on which a 70-bed psychiatric centre will be built in due course. In the meantime premises within the hospital grounds have been made available to the authority and Treasury clearances have been obtained to staff an out-patient clinic and provide community follow-up services. This new service should commence early in 1972.

SHIRE OF SOUTH BARWON.

GRANTS FOR BELMONT WELFARE SERVICES.

(Question No. 378)

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong) asked the Minister of Health—

When grants for the erection of the Belmont Elderly Citizens Club and the Belmont Kindergarten will be provided to the Shire of South Barwon?

Mr. ROSSITER (Minister of Health).—The answer is—

Payment of grants for both the elderly citizens' club and the kindergarten will be made available, by progress payments if required while work is being carried out or after it is completed (as the case may be) in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Commission of Public Health.

Plans and specifications for the kindergarten have been approved but, as yet, a number of documents in respect of the proposed new elderly citizens' club rooms, as referred to in a letter to the Shire of South Barwon dated 11th May, 1971, must be submitted to the Commission of Public Health so that that body may consider the approval of plans and specifications for the latter.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

CHANGEOVER TO METRIC SYSTEM.

(Question No. 380)

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Local Government—

Whether, as conversion to the metric system has commenced and various activities are being worked to a plan, the Minister will make available to the House the plans for change over to this system?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The Minister for Local Government has supplied the following answer:—

The plans for the change over to the metric system are as follows:—

1. The Metric Conversion Board has been appointed under the Commonwealth Metric Conversion Act 1970, and the general Commonwealth plans are set out in a brochure issued by that board.

2. Following a meeting of State Ministers with the Federal Minister for Education and Science in April, 1970, inter-departmental committees were set up in each State to deal with metric conversion matters not calling for action at Ministerial level.

The inter-departmental committee in Victoria is composed of representatives of each Government department with an interest in metric conversion, together with representatives of all other similar authorities. It meets regularly to deal with matters of preparation for metric conversion and its chairman (the Superintendent of Weights and Measures) is now engaged more than half his time on matters connected with the States Committee for Metric Conversion.

3. The chairman of each of the States' inter-departmental committees are constituted as a "States' Committee for Metric Conversion" which is a channel of communication with the Metric Conversion Board.

4. One of the first activities of the inter-departmental committee has been to arrange for a survey to be made of all Victorian legislation in order to evaluate the magnitude of the legislative task concerned. Almost all of the replies have been received and are awaiting processing.

5. Progress in respect of the survey of necessary amending legislation and in other fields is awaiting clarification of the position with respect to finance. All Australian State Governments have made representations at high levels for financial assistance from the Commonwealth to cover the costs of metric conversion to be incurred by State Governments. Finality has not been reached so far.

6. The Government is aware of the need to take prompt action if the Metric Conversion Board's timetable is to be observed. For example, in the fields of primary education, weighing instruments and packaged goods, the change is to be effective in 1972, but the Government feels that it should not commit itself to any expenditure, other than of an investigatory type such as is being incurred at inter-departmental committee meetings, before an understanding is reached with the Federal Government concerning its contribution.

WORKERS COMPENSATION.

ENTITLEMENT FOR AIRCRAFT EMPLOYEES.

(Question No. 381)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Chief Secretary—

If he will ascertain and inform the House—

1. What is the current entitlement in respect of workers compensation of employees of the Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation Pty. Ltd., Lorimer-street, Port Melbourne, and the Government Aircraft Factory, Fishermen's Bend, respectively, for—(*a*) weekly compensation for total

incapacity arising from injury to single employees and employees with dependants, respectively; and (*b*) lump sum compensation to such employees for the following specified injuries:—(i) loss of one eye; (ii) loss of both hands; (iii) loss of leg above the knee; (iv) total loss of right hand; (v) total loss of the thumb of right hand; (vi) facial disfigurement; and (vii) total loss of hearing?

2. What rates, applicable to the above-mentioned categories, apply to an employee residing in Victoria but working in firms operating in South Australia and New South Wales, respectively?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answers are—

1. The Government Aircraft Factory is a Commonwealth body and consequently any entitlement in respect of workers compensation is dealt with in Commonwealth legislation, details of which I have already made available to the honorable member.

I am advised that the current entitlement of employees of the Commonwealth Aircraft Corporation, Lorimer Street, Port Melbourne, is as follows:—

(*a*) Weekly compensation for total incapacity—

Single employees—
adult $26
minor $24

Employees with dependants—
adult $41 maximum
minor $34 maximum.

(*b*) lump sum compensation for—

	$
(i) loss of one eye ..	3,287
(ii) loss of both hands ..	11,834
(iii) loss of leg above the knee	6,180
(iv) total loss of right hand	5,917
(v) total loss of right thumb	2,630
(vi) facial disfigurement ..	Nil
(vii) total loss of hearing ..	5,260

2. The rate would depend upon the particular contract of service applying. If the Victorian Act is applicable, the rates would be as set out above.

EDUCATION.

STATE EXPENDITURE: SCHOOL ENROLMENTS.

(Question No. 384)

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of the 1970-71 financial year—

1. What was the State expenditure on State primary and secondary education, and registered schools, respectively?

2. How many—(*a*) primary pupils; and (*b*) secondary pupils, attended State schools and what was the education cost per pupil respectively?

3. What items of expenditure are included in estimating cost per pupil?

4. What were the capital costs of State primary schools and State secondary schools respectively?

5. What was the expenditure on registered schools in respect of—(*a*) per capita grants; (*b*) scholarships; (*c*) subsidy on interest on building loans; (*d*) transportation; and (*e*) grants in respect of teachers' colleges, respectively?

6. How many pupils attended registered —(*a*) primary schools; and (*b*) secondary schools, and what is the estimated cost of teaching these pupils at the per capita cost of teaching State primary and secondary school pupils, respectively?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

It will take some considerable time to collate the required information. The honorable member will be advised by letter as soon as possible.

MOTORISTS.

DRIVERS LICENSED: PROBATIONARY LICENCES: TRAFFIC OFFENDERS.

(Question No. 385)

Mr. WILKES (Northcote) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. What was the number of licensed drivers in Victoria at 30th September, 1971?

2. What number of probationary licences were on issue at 30th June, 1971?

3. How many traffic offenders were convicted in the year 1970 and to 30th September, 1971?

4. How many probationary drivers were traffic offenders in the year 1970 and to 30th September, 1971?

5. How many probationary driver licences were cancelled in the year 1970 and to 30th September, 1971?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answers are—

1. As at 31st July, 1971—1,570,812, which is the latest figure available.

2. Separate figures in respect of probationary drivers' licences are not kept, but it is estimated that, as at 30th June, 1971, 220,000 such licences were on issue.

3. Statistics in respect of convictions are not kept. However, for the information of the honorable member, during the year 1970,

352,023 traffic offences were detected. In respect of 1971, to and including 30th September, approximately 284,334 such offences have been detected.

4. The information requested is not readily available as statistics of this nature are not kept.

5. 1970—10,454.

1971 (to 30th September, 1971—7,298).

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

PROPOSED ACCOMMODATION TAX.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Can the Premier inform the House whether the Government has indicated that it intends to abandon its proposal to impose an accommodation tax on certain sections of the community, and if so can the honorable gentleman give the reasons for abandoning this proposal?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—I do so with the greatest of pleasure. It has been announced that the proposal to impose an accommodation tax, for Budget purposes, has been abandoned.

Mr. HOLDING.—We were right.

Sir HENRY BOLTE.—The announcement should please all honorable members. The tax is to be abandoned only for Budget purposes. It is expected that a similar tax would be imposed in due course to assist the tourist industry. With that object in mind I have asked the Minister for State Development to call an early conference of the people interested in the tourist industry to assess the amount that they believe they require in a given year adequately to handle tourism and tourists. I still suggest that other States, such as New South Wales and Queensland, would readily cooperate in having a uniform tax to cover tourism, every dollar of it going to promote tourism. Although the accommodation tax for Budget purposes has been shelved, an accommodation tax for tourist promotion is still a distinct possibility.

BUDGET EXPENDITURE.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—As the proposed accommodation tax was to be worth approximately $2 million this year to the State, can the Premier indicate to the House whether he proposes to cut back the Budget expenditure by this amount, or from where he proposes to get this sum of money?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—This is a proper question, and if it had been incorporated in the first question I should have been delighted to answer it. The Budget figures were arrived at in June, and in them provision was made for the raising of $2 million this financial year from an accommodation tax. I shall immediately examine the figures in the Budget, and if it is still necessary to raise that $2 million, it will be done in one form or another in this financial year. If the figures have improved to that degree, no other tax will be substituted.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—In the light of the Treasurer's answer, does this mean that the Government intends to introduce a supplementary Budget to provide for the inconsistencies that existed in the original document?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasure).—It is not uncommon in any year to have a taxing measure. If it is necessary to do that this financial year, it will be done. But in no way would the action taken resemble or even indicate a "mini" or some other sort of Budget.

EMERGENCY HOUSING.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East). In view of the obvious implications facing his department, is the Minister for Social Welfare concerned at the absence of emergency housing in Victoria; if so, what discussions has he had on this matter with the Minister of Housing or the Premier?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—Lines of communication have been set up with the

Housing Commission to deal with difficult situations where children of families are likely to be brought into our care and protection. So far, it is only on an experimental basis and very little has been derived from it. The lines of communication are there, achievements so far are heartening, and it is hoped to continue with this experiment so that a continuing relationship can be formed with the Housing Commission to our mutual benefit.

TRIAL OF DOCTOR HEATH.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—As the trial of Dr. Heath has been fixed for hearing early in November, can the Chief Secretary inform me whether it is a fact that a police sergeant who was to be an important witness at this trial has been given leave of absence to travel overseas? Does this mean that there is a possibility of this trial being delayed? Finally, is it normal police practice, on an occasion like this, to allow an important police witness to absent himself from Australia?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! Two Ministers are involved in this question.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I can answer part of the question. This trial was originally set down for hearing earlier. It was deferred at the request—by the demands, really—of the defence until a later date. The police officer concerned is entitled to long service leave and he made inquiries and was granted a clearance through the Law Department on the assumption that the trial would, by now, have been completed. As the trial has been delayed so will the police officer's long service leave be delayed because he must be present for the trial.

FOURTH UNIVERSITY.

Mr. TRETHEWEY (Bendigo).—Has the Minister of Education received a report relating to the proposed fourth university; if so, what is the recommended location for the university?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I have not yet received a report from the fourth university committee but I expect that I will receive it in the very near future. I believe that the claims of Bendigo have been forcefully placed before the committee by representatives of that area.

SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCILS.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—Is the Minister of Education aware that certain school principals are refusing to accept nomination forms from students wishing to stand for election to the advisory councils of their high schools? Is the honorable gentleman also aware that the regulations regarding such advisory councils do not allow for discrimination on the basis of age, and will the honorable gentleman take steps to correct the position?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I will be happy to discuss the matter with the principals' association. I believe it is more appropriate for pupils to exercise their organizing ability and to develop a sense of responsibility by being members of student representative councils and prefect bodies.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—In view of the statement by the Chief Secretary, as reported in today's press, drawing attention to the possibility of Federal legislation relating to insurance companies being enacted soon, does the Chief Secretary have any information concerning the time factor, because a promise was made twelve months ago?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The only information I have from the Federal Treasurer is that he is having legislation drafted which he hopes to present to the Federal Parliament this session. I agree that this reply

was given twelve months ago. The State Government has followed up the matter with a further letter asking the Federal Treasurer for more definite information, and the same reply has been given, namely, that the Federal Minister hopes to present legislation to the Federal Parliament this session.

MILLEWA WATER SCHEME.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura).—Is the Minister of Water Supply aware of a shortage of funds to commence stage 3 of the Millewa domestic and stock pipeline system; if so, what action has the honorable gentleman taken; if no action has been taken, will the honorable gentleman give the matter his urgent consideration?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—I am aware that there is a shortage of funds to start stage 3 of the Millewa scheme, but advice has been received from the Minister for National Development that the Commonwealth Government will make a contribution to this scheme next financial year. The estimated cost of the scheme is $2 million, and the Government is hopeful that the Commonwealth Government will meet the larger part of this expenditure. No specific amount has been mentioned in the advice from the Federal Minister, but I hope that the money will be made available and the scheme completed in 1972-73.

ABANDONMENT OF TRAMS IN BALLARAT AND SEBASTOPOL.

Mr. STEPHEN (Ballaarat South).—My question concerns the recent abandonment of the tram service in the cities of Ballarat and Sebastopol, and the councils' financial reimbursement by the State Electricity Commission. Will the Minister for Fuel and Power investigate the possibility of the State Electricity Commission reducing the period for the financial reimbursement of these councils for roadway reconstruction from eight years to five years? Alternatively, will the Minister request the commission to consider subsidizing the interest on money borrowed by these councils for this purpose?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—To my knowledge, eight years was originally fixed for the reinstatement of the roads in Ballarat after the abandonment of the tramways as being the period during which the councils would be able to undertake the construction of these works. I am sure the State Electricity Commission will be agreeable to shortening that period if the councils are capable of carrying out the necessary work in the shorter time. I suggest that the honorable member should recommend that the councils confer with officers of the State Electricity Commission with a view to achieving this result.

SHOP TRADING HOURS.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Did the Minister of Labour and Industry consult the employee organizations on the Government's proposals to increase shop trading hours? If so, were the submissions of the employee organizations consistent with the proposed actions of the Government?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The representatives of the trade union movement and some of the employee organizations have from time to time discussed shop trading hours with me. The views expressed by them have not been entirely in line with the action that the Government intends to take. In fact, the unions strenuously indicated that all they wanted was a five-day week from Monday to Friday. The Government rejects that point of view entirely, and the Government's position is, therefore, not in line with the views expressed by the trade unions.

ROAD SAFETY.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—Has the Chief Secretary considered the road safety aspects of the submissions made by the Traffic Control

Equipment Manufacturers Association of Australia to Sir James Darling regarding the committee's investigation into road accidents in Australia on three aspects—collapsible guide posts at roadsides, the erection of signs suitable to be read at the speeds adopted on our roads, and reflective coloured pavement markings?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—These three matters are at present under consideration by the Road Safety and Traffic Authority, as are all matters affecting road safety. I will ask the authority to submit a report as soon as possible.

MELBOURNE CITY COUNCIL.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Did the Chief Secretary request the Melbourne City Council to initiate action to develop an over-all Melbourne development scheme; if so, when was the request made, for what reason, and what action has since been taken?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—Under a previous metamorphosis, in January this year I asked the Melbourne City Council to consider the formulation of an over-all plan for development of the central city area on a three-dimensional basis. I suggested that this might be best achieved by the appointment of a city planning department and the development of future plans indicating how the central city might be developed in the future. The purpose of the suggestion was that as so much redevelopment is going on in the city, it is time that developers, traffic managers, and everyone else connected with the development of the city, should have some over-all plan for approval by the council.

I understand that, since then, the council has adopted the suggestion in principle. It has decided to engage consultants to draw up such a plan—first of all, I think, to prepare a feasibility study and to increase the personnel and facilities of the city planning department. In other words, I believe the adoption of the proposal is substantially under way and that before long we shall see the results in the form of some over-all plan for the central city area.

DOWD'S MORASS.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Has the Chief Secretary received a report from the Fisheries and Wildlife Branch on the future of Dowd's Morass, which was featured in the *Sun News-Pictorial* last Friday? If so, will the honorable gentleman make a copy of the report available to me?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—What I have received, at my request, from the branch is a statement of the history of Dowd's Morass. As the honorable member probably knows, it consists of some 2,000 acres of swamp and morass land of which the Government has already purchased some 1,000 acres or more and turned it into a game reserve. What concerns us is the future of the remaining 1,000 or more acres which is still held by private enterprise. All I have at present is a history of the negotiations up to date to purchase this additional 1,000 acres. The Government has approved the purchase in principle, but no purchase price has been arrived at; indeed, at present the owners are not willing to sell. If this report is of any use to the honorable member, I shall be glad to make it available to him.

NATIONAL FILM AND TELEVISION SCHOOL.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—I direct a question to the Chief Secretary. In view of the significance of the report of the appointment of Professor Toeplitz to La Trobe University, will the Minister make representations to the interim council of the proposed National Film and Television School and the Federal Minister for the arts to ensure that the National Film and Television School will be established at La Trobe University?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Is this a matter for the Chief Secretary?

Mr. FORDHAM.—The Chief Secretary is reported in the newspapers to have made a statement to this effect.

The SPEAKER.—The Minister from whom an answer is sought must be responsible for the department concerned. The question might be asked of the Minister of Education.

Mr. FORDHAM.—I seek your guidance, Mr. Speaker, and that of the Chief Secretary. It was reported in the press that the Chief Secretary made a statement. I assumed he made it as Chief Secretary, but, if the honorable gentleman made it as Acting Premier, perhaps the question could be directed to the Premier.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The fact is that I have not made any statement on the subject.

POVERTY.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—Is the Minister for Social Welfare aware that a former member of this House advised the Government that it should make war on poverty and suggested that it should commence immediately? Has the Government any plans to relieve the increasing incidence of poverty within the community, and when does it expect to put these plans into operation?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—The Government is continually waging war on poverty through all sections of its administration, but more particularly through its broadminded policies.

VEHICLES TURNING RIGHT.

Mr. GINIFER (Deer Park).—Has the attention of the Chief Secretary been drawn to the growing tendency for young drivers, perhaps in late model cars, at intersections controlled by traffic lights, to make the right-hand turn quickly across on-coming traffic instead of waiting for the traffic to clear? Will the Chief Secretary have inquiries made into this practice and perhaps make a statement pointing out the dangers entailed therein?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I do not agree that this practice is confined to young drivers; in fact, I have seen middle-aged and elderly drivers do the same thing at right-hand turns at intersections which are controlled by lights. I invite the honorable member for Deer Park to indicate where this is happening. I shall then take action to see that police patrols are present. I agree with his suggestion that a statement should be made at an appropriate time to warn the public of this dangerous practice.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Has the Chief Secretary read the views which have been expressed by the Chief Commissioner of Police on capital punishment, and has he acquainted himself with the reasons advanced by that officer; in addition, does the honorable gentleman support those views and, if so, will he also support them at Cabinet meetings?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I have read the Chief Commissioner's views; in fact, I was present when they were expressed by him. As I understood him, what he said was that he was opposed to capital punishment if he had to take any part in it. It was a personal view and it reflected his personal abhorrence of the actual act. At the moment, I am not prepared to express my personal views on the matter. I believe this is a matter of policy with the Parliament and that at the present time I should not make my own views known.

ALLAMBIE RECEPTION CENTRE.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Will the Minister for Social Welfare inform the House what action his department has taken to relieve congestion at Allambie Reception Centre and whether or not he has been successful in providing beds which are not on the floor for 47 of the children there?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—To answer this question, it is necessary for me to explain exactly what the Allambie Reception Centre is. It is an emergency reception centre at which children stay, on the average, for approximately three months. They are children who come into our care and protection without warning. If I can give the House some idea of the situation, and if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will listen——

Mr. WILKES.—Tell me something worth listening to, and I shall.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—The number of children at Allambie fluctuates. During the past ten months it has been as low as approximately 190. That was at the end of the financial year, just a few months ago. Last week, it was as high as 285; and, currently, the children at Allambie number between 260 and 270. The number changes from hour to hour.

Approximately 40 children now sleep on beds which have no legs. They do not sleep on the floor. In an emergency, it is necessary to make such provision. We are taking action to ensure that eventually children will not have to sleep on beds without legs.

Mr. WILKES.—They are on the floor.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Beds are on the floor, too.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! As I have said before, there is no question time if the period allotted to it is taken up by interjections. I invite the Minister to give his answer and to ignore interjections completely.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Members of the Opposition will contend that children are sleeping on the ceiling. I am endeavouring to explain that we have under examination a number of methods by which we hope to speed up the transit of children through Allambie. The Government hopes to reduce the time that children spend at Allambie from three months to a month or six weeks. The Government has approached a number of agencies with a view to arranging emergency foster care. That is one avenue by which children can be taken out of emergency care at Allambie.

The Government has also endeavoured to improve the foster care and adoption section so that those few children who are eligible for adoption can be more quickly adopted. The Government devised a scheme for the next five years, which it is currently discussing with Treasury, to provide more family group homes where groups of four children can go into these more permanent situations more quickly through the emergency care at Allambie. However, since I have been a Minister the Government has placed 34 children in rented accommodation at the Lady Dugan Home, which has been rented from the Red Cross Society, and another 36 children have been placed in nine family group homes during the past ten months.

The difficulties cannot be overcome easily. Probably three or four more homes like Allambie could be provided and still there would be pressure from certain sections of the community to fill them almost immediately.

Mr. FELL.—Why does the Government not take action?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! The Chair must be severe with interjections during question time. If supplementary questions continue to be asked through interjection they will ruin the time for questions without notice.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—There is no admission of failure, or any suggestion of it. On the contrary, the department's regional development will result in more preventive action, and it will be possible to speed up the throughput currently being developed for Allambie. Whilst difficult situations may develop from time to time within the next twelve or eighteen months — crisis situations are

largely seasonal and most occur at this time of the year—in the long term the department will be able to cope adequately.

TEACHERS OF ENGLISH.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—Can the Minister of Education inform the House whether the recruitment of teachers from the United States of America has had any effect on the shortage of English teachers in the Education Department?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—Emphasis on the recruitment of teachers from the United States of America was placed on attracting teachers of mathematics, science and physical education. However, a number of these teachers do teach English and have majored in English at American universities; so to some degree they have reduced the shortage of English teachers, but their greatest contribution has been in the fields of mathematics and science.

SCHOOL COMPOSITE FEES.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I ask the Miniter of Education: At any stage has the Government considered the proposition that composite fees in schools should be made compulsory? If so, what was the result of these deliberations?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The composite fee has been paid in this State for 40 or 50 years, but it has always been in the nature of a voluntary payment by parents, or pupils, to the school. It is the department's view that at this time it should be retained in this form.

SCHOOL ADVISORY COUNCILS.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—In view of the obvious need to encourage young people to take an active interest in community affairs, can the Minister of Education give the House his reasons why he will not allow students to serve as one of the seventeen members of a school advisory council?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—Firstly, school principals generally do not favour such a move. Secondly, I have never received a request from any school advisory council asking that this be done. Thirdly, in the most progressive and enlightened schools considerable scope is given for pupils' initiative and organizing ability by the creation of house councils, student councils, student representative councils and prefect bodies, as well as sporting teams, where opportunity for showing leadership is frequently given.

STATUTE LAW REVISION COMMITTEE.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—By leave, I move—

That Mr. Manson be appointed a member of the Statute Law Revision Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

COMPANIES BILL.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In substance, this Bill will be familiar to, I think, every member of this House. It is the third time that it has been introduced into the Parliament and, whilst it has been amended in many ways, most of the amendments go to improving the drafting, revising the expression of the principles, and meeting detailed objections that have been raised by various organizations.

This Bill is a large and extensive revision of the uniform companies Act. When the uniform companies legislation was first proposed to the Parliaments of Australia it was well understood by all the Attorneys that companies legislation, more than any other, requires to be constantly updated to meet changing conditions of business and new practices which would require regulation.

As the Jenkins committee said in its report in relation to the English legislation of 1948—

> We cannot however accept the view that the 1948 Act has left no room for further improvements of substance in the law as it now stands. It is not a field of legislation in which finality is to be expected.

The process of reviewing the uniform companies legislation was commenced by the Company Officers Committee of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General very shortly after the legislation was passed. Its members carefully noted and analysed any complaints that were made and brought to one another's attention problems that appeared in the operation of the Act. They constantly reported their work to the standing committee and it was soon apparent to the Ministers that a general revision of the legislation was required. I pay a tribute to the work of the members of the Company Officers Committee. They meet many times each year and, apart from the work of reviewing legislative proposals, they are constantly engaged in an effort to rationalize administrative procedures and to inform one another of developments in the different jurisdictions.

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has devoted more than half of its time to the business of companies and securities legislation since its inception. This work shows no sign of decreasing and indeed, in my view co-operation in the field of companies and securities industry would be an ample justification for the standing committee if it had no other tasks. In fact, it has been involved in a very wide range of topics and the fruits of its regular meetings are to my mind the best example of co-operative federalism that exists in Australia today.

I hope that this House will substantially endorse the legislation now before it, which results from the labours of the standing committee and the Eggleston committee. At the time that the general review was undertaken, or shortly after it commenced, there had been published the work of the Jenkins committee in the United Kingdom. A lot of work had also been undertaken in Canada, and business had continued to expand and grow more sophisticated. There were many company failures which highlighted, in one way or another, deficiencies in the legislation. The question of take-over of Australian companies by foreign companies and the establishment of substantial shareholdings in public companies became matters of national as well as commercial interest and concern.

It was decided at a meeting of the Standing Committee of Commonwealth and State Attorneys-General held in Brisbane in 1967 that, before such a large and important measure was presented to the Parliament, the whole question should be investigated by an expert committee. As honorable members know, that committee consisted of Mr. Justice Eggleston, Mr. John Rodd and Mr. Philip Cox. Mr. Justice Eggleston needs no introduction to any member of this House. His work at the bar as an equity and industrial lawyer is still fresh in the minds of all who know anything of these fields. Mr. John Rodd is a leading Melbourne solicitor with a large commercial and corporation practice. He is a director of Conzinc Riotinto of Australia Ltd. and other companies. Mr. Philip Cox is a distinguished chartered accountant from Sydney, and is, I believe, the current chairman of the New South Wales division of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia.

The greater and the most important part of the Bill gives effect to the recommendations made by these gentlemen in the first four reports that they made under their charter to investigate and report on the extent of the protection afforded to the investing public by the existing provisions of the uniform companies Act and to recommend what additional provisions, if any, are reasonably necessary to increase that protection. It has been suggested in some quarters that the recommendations of the Eggleston committee

impose an unreasonable standard of care on directors, that the recommendations require too much detail to be supplied in the accounts of companies and that the legislation is unduly complex and burdensome.

I would suggest that these suggestions can easily be rebutted by reference to the clear, closely-reasoned reports of the Eggleston committee and by considering the qualifications of the men who constitute that committee. They are all experienced practical men of the law and business with very close connections with the day to day running of businesses large and small. They are not theorists; their approach has consistently been to limit the new legislation to what is clearly required to increase the protection to the public. They have reached their conclusions only after receiving the submissions of persons and organizations familiar with the working and administration of companies which responded to advertisements published by the committee. It is well known that all proposals to improve the protection of the public have since the first Companies Act in the nineteenth century been opposed by sections of the community that will be affected by the proposals. I do not impute any sinister motives to any who oppose this or any other measure, but I do suggest that the opposition to this type of legislation is too often an automatic reflex reaction to any proposal no matter how reasonable and how necessary the proposal may be.

Since the Bill was first published, many submissions have been received by me and by my colleagues on the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. Every submission has been carefully considered by the officers, by the Eggleston committee and by the standing committee. Many improvements in the legislation have been made as a result of these submissions. Unfortunately, there is one major difference between the Bill that I present to the House and the Bill before the New South Wales Parliament. My colleague, the Honorable K. M. McCaw, the New South Wales Attorney-General, has accepted basic suggestions that relate to the provisions which determine whether a person has an interest in a share or not for the purposes of determining whether that person has a substantial shareholding, whether the proposed acquisition of shares amounts to a take-over and of determining what is the extent of a director's interest in shares of his company. I am unable to accept that the New South Wales provisions are an improvement, and I prefer to follow the pattern of the Queensland legislation which has been passed and of the ordinance that has been passed for the Australian Capital Territory. This is an unfortunate divergence, but I am confident that when the legislation has been in operation for a short time these differences will be resolved.

I am afraid that the business and commercial community are tending to forget the advantages that have flowed from the achievement of substantial uniformity of company law in 1961. I have been surprised to find that organizations in the various States have continued to press for substantial variations from the pattern of legislation agreed to by the standing committee after their point of view has been considered by all States and even after the legislation has been adopted in some jurisdictions. In most cases the variations are of little over-all significance, but they would destroy the uniform basis of the legislation and lead to confusion and duplication of effort by many companies.

I do not believe uniformity requires a Parliament to deny in any way its supreme power to determine what the law shall be, but I suggest that, in areas which affect businesses which necessarily operate across State borders, unnecessary distinctions and differences in laws should be avoided, and that differences in

principle should be allowed only where the Parliament considers the matter of fundamental importance.

Against that background I propose now to give a short statement of the many proposals contained in the Bill. Most of what I will say has already been said on more than one occasion, but it may be of assistance to honorable members to have these matters stated on the Parliamentary record again.

The Bill is divided into seven Parts: Part I.—Preliminary matters; Part II.—Substantial shareholdings; Part III.—Duties and liabilities of officers and disclosures of directors' shareholding; Part IV.—Accounts and audit; Part V.—Special investigations; Part VI.—Take-overs; Part VII.—Miscellaneous provisions.

Part I. contains amendments to the formal and interpretation provisions of the Companies Act 1961 which are of general importance to the new provisions contained in the Bill.

Part II. deals with substantial shareholdings. It gives effect to part of the second report of the Eggleston committee—C. No. 1 of 1969—on disclosure of substantial shareholdings and take-overs. Part III. deals with the duties and liabilities of officers and the disclosure of directors' shareholdings in accordance with the recommendations of the Eggleston committee in its fourth interim report, C. No. 4 of 1970.

Part IV. deals with the vast topic of accounts and audit in accordance with the recommendations contained in the first report of the Eggleston committee, No. C.3 of 1969.

Part V. re-enacts all of the provisions relating to special investigations into companies and into the ownership of shares and is generally in accordance with the Eggleston committee's third report on special investigations, C. No. 2 of 1969.

Part VI. regulates take-overs and gives effect to the second Eggleston report previously referred to.

Part VII. deals with a variety of matters that have not been the subject of reports by the Eggleston committee.

I will now deal with the principal provisions of the Bill in some detail.

SUBSTANTIAL SHAREHOLDINGS.—The reasons for requiring disclosure of substantial shareholdings in the case of companies listed on any stock exchange are set out in paragraph 4 of the Eggleston committee's report on this topic and in the view of the Government these reasons are compelling. Paragraph 4 states, *inter alia*—

> Legislation such as that referred to above is, in our opinion, justified by the consideration that in the case of companies whose shares are traded on stock exchanges, shareholders are entitled to know whether there are in existence substantial holdings of shares which might enable a single individual or corporation or a small group, to control the destinies of the company, and if such a situation does exist, to know who are the persons on whose exercise of voting power the future of the company may depend.

Disclosure of substantial shareholdings is now required in the United States of America and the United Kingdom and it is hoped that the new Division 3A of the Bill proposed to be inserted in the Companies Act 1961 will ensure that the acquisition or existence of substantial holdings, which is fixed for the purpose of the legislation at 10 per cent of the voting shares in a company, is disclosed to managements and other shareholders.

The provisions are expressed to apply to all persons whether resident in the State or in Australia or elsewhere and to apply to acts done or omitted to be done outside the State as well as within. To be effective it is necessary to require all holdings, whether direct or indirect, to be disclosed and the provisions are necessarily somewhat complex. It is believed that the provisions will be effective because of the extensive powers given to the court under the proposed section 69N where there has been a failure to make disclosure of the existence of the substantial shareholding.

The Bill is somewhat lengthy, and I refer honorable members to the provisions of the proposed new section 69N as contained in clause 7. It is unnecessary for me to read it in detail. Provision is given for the court in certain circumstances, on the application of the Minister, to make certain orders relating to shares. It is believed that these powers which will enable the court to restrain dealings in the shares or to require the shares to be disposed of will ensure that shareholders comply with the requirements of the Bill.

So that foreign investors will know of their obligations, nominee companies and trustees are required to inform persons for whom they hold shares of the requirements of the legislation.

DUTIES AND LIABILITIES OF OFFICERS AND DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTORS SHAREHOLDINGS.—Part II. of the Bill re-enacts the principal statutory provisions in respect of the duties of directors, introduces a new provision designed to control insider trading by officers including directors, and extends the range of disclosure that directors must make with respect to their dealings in the company's shares.

The Bill gives effect to the recommendation of the Eggleston committee's fourth report. The substance of that committee's recommendations are set out in paragraph 24 of that report. It is important to note that the committee strongly recommended that the legislation should be limited to the case of an outsider who pays more than the true value in ignorance of unfavourable information. The legislation does not extend to provide compensation for a person who sells securities at a price which is perhaps less than he might have been able to obtain if he had had all the information available to him.

The third main group of amendments relates to account and audit. The existing provisions are re-enacted with substantial amendments, which give effect to the recommendations contained in the first Eggleston report, and I would commend that report to honorable members who desire to study the detailed reasoning behind the amendments. The amendments are set out in clauses 10 to 26 of the Bill.

Clause 10 repeals two transitional provisions of section 4, which provisions are spent and no longer required. By amending section 5, clause 10 introduces several new interpretations. There is an interpretation of " books " to cover every form of record, whether in writing or maintained on microfilm or by electronic process. This recognizes the great developments that have taken place in the recording of commercial and accounting information. For the first time, a definition is provided of a " current liability ", which is defined as being a liability which would in the ordinary course of events be payable within twelve months. Other liabilities are defined as " non-current ". A new interpretation of " emoluments " is provided. This is used in relation to the disclosure of directors' emoluments, and it is made clear that reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses is not included. An interpretation of " the profit or loss " is included largely for convenience in the drafting of the new provisions, and the existing interpretation of " profit and loss account " is extended to cover operations accounts and development accounts which are commonly used in relation to mining operations. A definition of " related corporation " is also provided, again to simplify the drafting of these complex provisions.

Clause 12 repeals the provisions of section 9 in so far as they relate to the appointment and qualifications of auditors. These provisions are re-enacted with considerable amendments in the new Division 3 of Part VI., and I will explain the new provisions later. Clause 13 contains consequential amendments to section

74F, which requires borrowing corporations to file half-yearly accounts. Clause 14 amends the existing provisions in section 131 which enable 10 per cent of the shareholders to demand the disclosure of the emoluments paid to the directors or to a director. The effect of the amendments is to extend the requirements to cover not only emoluments but other benefits paid to or received by the directors and each of them.

By an amendment to section 136, clause 15 extends the powers of the Registrar of Companies in relation to applications for the extension of time for the holding of the annual general meeting. Clause 16, which inserts a new section 159A in the principal Act, introduces a new provision which will require an exempt proprietary company to include in its annual report a statement by the auditor of the company whether the company has kept proper books and accounts, whether those accounts have been duly audited, and whether he has referred to any defect or irregularity in his report. This is an important provision, as experience has shown that many small companies do not keep proper books of account. Subject to significant exceptions, which I will refer to later, the Act will now require all companies to appoint auditors and the auditor to give a certificate of the type to which I referred. However, the exemption from filing the actual accounts is maintained for exempt proprietary companies.

Clause 17 re-enacts Divisions 1 and 2 of Part VI. of the uniform Act. The provisions have been substantially redrafted and the obligations in relation to the type of accounting records that must be kept and the preparation of the group accounts have been greatly extended. The obligations of the directors in relation to the accounts are made more specific, particularly in regard to bad and doubtful debts, the realization of current assets, and the value of non-current assets. The actual directors' report must contain a great amount of information which is set out in the proposed new section 162A, and the directors must report on the group accounts, as well as upon the individual accounts, but the directors of a holding company are required to make only one report covering the whole of the group's operations. Extensive information relating to options granted by a company must be disclosed in the directors' report. Special contracts made by a company with a director must also be disclosed.

The proposed new section 162 gives an important power to the Registrar of Companies to relieve the directors of a particular company from any requirements of the Act relating to the form and content of accounts or to the form and content of directors' reports. This power is considerable, especially having regard to the great extension in the amount of information that must be disclosed. It would not be appropriate in every case for the information to be disclosed, or to be disclosed in the way required by the Act. The registrar will be able to substitute different requirements for the basic requirements of the Act where such a course appears appropriate. It is proposed that the registrars of all States and territories will continue to meet frequently so that they will develop a consistent system of administering these discretions. It is most important that these discretions are exercised uniformly throughout Australia.

In general, these changes conform with the recommendations contained in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Eggleston committee's report on accounts and audit in which the committee endorses the general proposal that directors' obligations should be extended and that the legislation should be redrawn so as to differentiate clearly between the functions of the annual accounts and the directors' reports to ensure that the figures for a financial year are complete in themselves, to define expressly what the obligations of

directors should be, and to permit as much flexibility as possible in the presentation of annual accounts to enable companies to present them in the most convenient way without sacrificing any disclosure.

I think it would be appropriate for me to quote from the Eggleston committee's report to the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General on accounts and audits. The relevant portions of paragraphs 8 and 9 are the foundation of the portion of the legislation to which I am now referring. Paragraph 8 reads—

> Annual Accounts and the Directors' Report—
>
> The proposals embodied in the General Revision Bill would greatly expand the information which directors are required to give to shareholders in the accounts and in their annual report. In general, we agree with this extension of the directors' obligations, although in Appendix A we have recommended some deletions and some additions, for reasons there stated.

The general revision Bill referred to in that statement is not the Bill which is now before the House, but a draft measure which was prepared some considerable time ago and which was the subject of discussion by the Eggleston committee. Paragraph 9 reads—

> Our study of the provisions relating to annual accounts and the directors' report persuaded us that something more was needed than mere verbal changes to individual clauses or paragraphs. In particular, we felt that the following considerations needed to be kept firmly in mind:—
>
> (*a*) the different functions performed by the annual accounts and the directors' reports;
>
> (*b*) the need to ensure that, so far as the figures for the financial year are concerned, the accounts (including the notes thereto) are complete in themselves;
>
> (*c*) the need to determine what the obligations of directors should be, and to define those obligations in express terms and not by implication;
>
> (*d*) the desirability of flexibility in the annual accounts, to enable companies to present them in the most convenient way without sacrificing any requirement of disclosure.

The paragraph proceeds to elaborate on these various considerations in more detail, but it is not necessary for me to quote further from it.

There are two important matters referred to in the Eggleston committee's report on accounts and audit which have not been adopted by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. The first relates to the disclosure of turnover. The committee did not find this matter to be one of great significance in relation to the protection of investors, but said that no great harm had come from requiring its disclosure in other jurisdictions. The committee, however, adverted to problems of making the disclosure meaningful and not misleading, and suggested that the power to dispense with the requirement would be necessary. The standing committee believes that at the present time there is no justification for requiring disclosure of turnover, but the matter will be kept under review in the light of developments in accounting practices both here and overseas.

The second of the two matters which have not been adopted by the Standing Committee of Attorney-General relates to the suggestion made for the establishment of a companies commission. This proposal has been carefully considered by the standing committee, which believes that at this stage there is no justification for establishing such a complex statutory body, which would require intricate provisions to enable it to be adequately staffed and financed. Whilst the standing committee is most sympathetic to the idea that uniformity in administration in the different States and territories should be maintained, it believes that this can be achieved by maintaining and, if necessary, expanding the present frequent conferences between registrars of companies. The standing committee is also unanimously of the view that the office of the registrar must be upgraded to recognize the large expansion in the functions of the registrar

and the different nature of the work that he will be required to undertake under the amended law as well as under the securities industry legislation which was passed by this House last year.

The degree of flexibility in the accounts recommended by the Eggleston committee has been provided for by allowing registrars to exercise discretions in relation to disclosure of information. Already, I have given one example of such discretion being conferred. I might add that since this Bill was first presented to Parliament a large expansion in the qualified staff of the registrar's office has been effected. It is proposed later in this session to present legislation in relation to the establishment of an office similar to the office of Commissioner of Corporate Affairs established in New South Wales. It must always be remembered that the best legislation will be of little use unless it is adequately administered. The Government intends to do everything in its power to ensure that the companies administration is kept at an adequate strength to enable it to cope with the many new duties placed upon it by this legislation and by the securities industry legislation.

It would be appropriate at this stage to clear up some misunderstanding which has existed in relation to recommendations of the Eggleston committee concerning the establishment of a companies commission. It is clear from the report, and from many meetings of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General—meetings have been held usually at intervals of about every four months—that there has been no recommendation in favour of setting up a securities exchange commission on the model of the central body in the United States of America. It has been suggested that a recommendation for such a body emanated from the Eggleston committee. I say unhesitatingly that the committee made no such recommendation.

What the committee had in mind was a companies commission which would exercise certain discretionary powers, and thus relieve companies from the rigidity of some of the provisions of the Companies Act. This object is being achieved under the arrangements by the consent of Attorneys-General to develop the existing machinery in the administration of registrars of companies of each State and by improving the status and increasing the powers of the Registrar of Companies in each State, at the same time providing that there should be frequent consultation between the registrars to ensure that the exercise of their discretion would be kept upon a substantially uniform basis.

The proposed new Division 3 of Part VI. deals with the powers, duties and responsibilities of auditors. Provisions have been substantially redrawn with a view to giving additional independence to auditors, giving them express protection in carrying out their duties as auditors from actions for libel, and requiring them to disclose to the registrar any breaches of the Act as soon as they become aware of them. The independence of auditors has been increased by making provision for an auditor to remain the auditor of a company without annual re-appointment.

Although there has been little reaction in other States and territories to the proposal for all proprietary companies to appoint auditors, there has been some objection in Victoria not only from companies but also from accountants who specialize in keeping the books of small companies. In the view of the Government the object of requiring all proprietary companies to have an auditor is to ensure that they keep proper books of account and to enable fraudulent practices to be punished. Members will recall that a special provision was made to enable exempt proprietary companies that have unlimited liability to dispense with the services of an auditor where all members agree

and provided all members are private persons or other exempt unlimited companies.

In order to enable any exempt proprietary company that is prepared to accept responsibility through its directors for the accounts and to lodge copies with the registrar, provision is made in proposed section 165B to enable those companies to dispense with the services of an auditor. This provision has been introduced only by Victoria, but it is not thought to be an especially significant departure from uniformity as it will be availed of only by small local companies.

However, a company can remove any auditor by appointing a new auditor, but such an appointment can be made only if the nomination of the auditor has been given to the company not less than 21 days before the meeting. Notice of the nomination of a new auditor must be given to all members at least seven days before the meeting.

Furthermore, the position of an auditor in relation to retirement is now closely regulated. He may now resign only with the consent of the Companies Auditors Board after giving notice of his intention to the company. This provision is intended to ensure that an auditor does not resign to avoid becoming involved in the disclosure of breaches of the Act.

The Bill also proposes that reasonable fees and expenses of an auditor shall be payable by the company. This will enable the fees to be fixed by the company on a realistic basis from time to time, and avoid the general meeting from becoming involved in the question of auditors' remuneration.

In proposed new section 167, powers and duties of an auditor are set out in considerable detail and in particular his functions in relation to group accounts are dealt with for the first time. By sub-section (8) of the proposed new section, the auditor is to be under a statutory duty to inform the registrar of any default by the company or the directors. The new section 167B sets out a statutory protection for auditors from libel actions. Auditors have always enjoyed a qualified privilege, but it is believed that the express statement of this privilege in the Companies Act will encourage auditors to speak freely.

Clauses 18 and 19 contain consequential amendments, and clause 20 contains a most important amendment in relation to the making of false and misleading statements in any document required for the purpose of this Act. This extends the existing provision which relates only to statements false in a material particular. Substantial penalties are provided.

Clause 21 contains an even more important provision in that it provides for the first time a specific offence for an officer of a corporation to make any false or misleading statement or report to a director, auditor, member, debenture holder or trustee for debenture holders, or to an auditor of the holding company, or to a prescribed stock exchange. In the past the obligations under the Companies Act have been largely confined to obligations in relation to documents filed with the registrar or to be laid before the company in general meeting. This new provision takes account of the position of different office holders and stock exchanges who have a real interest in not being deceived as to the position of the company. I think that that provision has particular relevance in view of happenings at the present time.

Clause 22 provides an appropriate fee for applications lodged with the registrar to vary the requirements of the Act in relation to the form and content of the accounts. Clause 23 makes consequential amendments to the form of the annual return. Clause 24 re-enacts the Ninth Schedule which contains the detailed requirements of the matters to be dealt with in the accounts of the company. The information required to be disclosed is set out in much greater detail. The nature of the changes made in the Ninth Schedule and the reasons for them are discussed in Appendix A of

the first Eggleston report, and I think honorable members will find a perusal of that appendix most helpful in understanding the nature of the changes made in that schedule.

Clauses 25 and 26 contain provisions to deal with the change from the old system of accounting to the new requirements. To enable companies to vary their accounting practice to comply with the new requirements, the new legislation will apply only to a company in respect of the first financial year of the company after the commencement of this Act. Clause 26—on page 69—with the obligation now imposed on all exempt proprietary companies to appoint auditors, will give existing exempt proprietary companies a period of three months' grace. I have concluded my remarks on the second topic dealt with in the various Eggleston reports.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS.—Clause 27—at pages 70 to 81 of the Bill—contains a re-enactment of the existing provisions relating to company investigations. The existing two divisions dealing with inspections and special investigations have been integrated and all company investigations will now have to be authorized by the Governor in Council. The re-enactment proposed by the Bill follows the recommendations contained in the third interim report of the Eggleston committee except in relation to two recommendations. The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General unanimously agreed that the recommendations contained in paragraphs (*d*) and (*i*) of section 33 of the report should not be followed.

For the purpose of the record, I shall quote these two recommendations which both appear at page 14 of the report. Recommendation (*d*) reads—

> There should be power to publish the whole or part of a report, but before doing so the responsible Minister should certify that he has considered the probable effect of publication on the interests of the company, its shareholders and creditors, and any other persons mentioned or referred to in the report, and is satisfied that the public interest requires that the report or that part of it should be published.

Recommendation (*i*) reads—

> The expenses of all investigations should be borne out of public funds, except in the case of investigations into the ownership of shares and related questions, in which cases a power to require security for expenses from those requesting the investigation should be available, but the liability of such persons should be limited to the amount of the security.

The first of these recommendations was to the effect that there should be power to publish the whole or part of a report but before doing so a responsible Minister should certify that he had considered the probable effect of publication on the interests of the company, its shareholders and creditors, and any other persons referred to and mentioned in the report and was satisfied that the public interest required that the report or that part of it should be published. Whilst the Bill authorizes the report to be published, in whole or in part, it does not require the certificate of the Minister. The Government believes that under the ordinary doctrine of Ministerial responsibility the Minister would have to have regard to all these matters and to many others and that it is undesirable to attempt to prescribe the extent of his responsibility.

The second recommendation related to the expense of all investigations being borne out of public funds. The Government believes that in appropriate cases the costs of investigations, which could be very substantial, should be paid for out of the company's assets. In many cases the expense will ultimately be borne by the Crown, but it was not agreed that the general rule should be that the costs should be borne out of public funds. In all other respects, the Bill gives effect to the recommendations of the committee and the best explanation of the changes is to be found in the report of the committee. I have dealt now with the third topic which is covered by the legislation and which arises out of the recommendations of the Eggleston committee.

TAKEOVERS.—Clauses 30 to 34—at pages 83 to 116 of the Bill—contain the new provisions to regulate take-overs. Section C of the second Eggleston report contains a most valuable survey of the basis upon which control of take-over offers should be undertaken, and the Bill follows the recommendation of the committee in all respects. Changes made are very extensive but there are really no new principles involved. The changes are primarily directed to extending the coverage of the provisions to meet the developments of new techniques for achieving take-overs which avoided the existing legislation, but in one major respect the coverage of the law is extended in accordance with the Eggleston committee's recommendations. A take-over offer for the purposes of the legislation is, by the Bill, being constituted by the acquisition of 15 per cent of the voting shares whereas at present the acquisition of one-third of the voting shares is required to constitute a take-over offer.

The legislation is designed not to discourage take-over offers but to ensure that a shareholder will know the identity of the bidder, that the shareholders and directors will have a reasonable time to consider the proposal, that the bidder will supply the information necessary to enable a proper judgment of the merits of the bid to be made, and that all shareholders will be dealt with in a fair and equal way.

Clause 32, which is at page 109 of the Bill, provides for the transition from the existing law to the new law, and the scheme proposed is for the existing law to continue in force in relation to take-overs in respect of which a notice has been given before the commencement of the new legislation. Clause 33—page 109—contains a redraft of section 185 of the uniform companies legislation. That section is the provision which enables a company which has acquired 90 per cent of the shares in a class to compulsorily acquire the remainder. This is a provision which has been in the companies legislation of the United Kingdom and Australia for many years and the redraft does not alter the general principles of the existing legislation but does deal with various technical difficulties that have cropped up over the years. Clause 34—at page 113—contains a re-enactment of the Tenth Schedule which sets out the detailed information that must be included in the statement given by the bidding company and by the company in respect of which the offer is made. Clause 35—page 116—contains a validity provision to put beyound doubt the right of the directors of a company to be reimbursed for expenses reasonably incurred in respect of a take-over scheme.

Part VII. of the Bill—pages 116 to the end—contains several miscellaneous provisions that give effect to a number of amendments that have been recommended in the course of the review of the uniform Companies Act that has been carried on during the past four or five years. Many of the provisions are minor matters relating to clarification, uniformity or enlargement of existing provisions, to which I need not, at this stage, refer in detail. I shall, however, draw the attention of honorable members to certain important matters contained in this part of the Bill.

Clause 36—pages 116–119—contains a number of amendments to section 9 of the Act relating to the registration of auditors. The amendments give the Companies Auditors Board a discretion not to register an auditor who is not resident in the Commonwealth. Similar powers are given in respect of liquidators. The amendment is necessary as, at present, it is theoretically possible for a person to be an auditor of a company although he spends only a few days within the jurisdiction in the course of the financial year of the company.

Clause 39—page 127—amends section 76 of the Act. Section 76 contains a definition of "interest" to which Division 5 of Part IV. relates. That is the division concerned mainly with unit trusts and other interests

in companies. The present Act excludes from the definition of " interest " all interests in partnership agreements. The Bill amends the exemption to provide that only prescribed interests in partnership agreements will be excluded. The amendment will ensure the protection of the public in investing in partnerships in the same way as they are protected in investing in unit trusts, and will also ensure that certain partnerships not intended to be covered by Division 5 of Part IV. will not be included within the definition.

Clause 40—page 128—contains a re-enactment of section 95 of the Act; that section concerns the transfer of company securities. Although the re-enactment does not make substantial amendments there are several small amendments, and it has been far more satisfactory to re-enact the section than amend it paragraph by paragraph. The section as re-enacted will relate to all types of securities issued by companies, and makes certain administrative improvements to the method by which personal representatives of deceased members prove the transmission of securities.

Clause 41 of the Bill amends section 114 of the Act and provides that in future all companies must have at least two directors. In the light of present conditions it is considered necessary and desirable that all companies, however small they may appear to be, must have more than one director. Clause 53—page 156—increases company office fees payable under the Second Schedule to the Act. The increases are in line with a scale agreed by the standing committee.

For the assistance of honorable members, in addition to the notes which I have used in this second-reading speech, I have had prepared notes on the clauses of the Bill. As these are lengthy and detailed, I do not propose to read them, but I have copies available for any honorable members who desire them at this stage. I propose to circulate more copies if they are required.

Mr. LOVEGROVE.—Will you seek their incorporation in *Hansard*?

Mr. REID.—I inquired about that matter, and I understand that the incorporation of these notes in *Hansard* is not favoured. However, I shall arrange to do the next best and have copies circulated generally.

Mr. LOVEGROVE.—Why cannot they be incorporated?

Mr. REID.—That is a matter for Mr. Speaker. As this is a long and complicated Bill, I have arranged with Mr. Waldron, the Registrar of Companies and Miss Armstrong, Parliamentary Counsel, that they be available to assist honorable members in studying the Bill and explaining in more detail the effect of the various provisions.

At this stage I should like to pay a tribute to the work of Mr. John Finemore, Chief Parliamentary Counsel and his staff, particularly Miss Armstrong, and also the Registrar of Companies, Mr. Waldron, and his staff for the work they have done in the preparation of this Bill in conjunction with officers of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General throughout the States of the Commonwealth. I acknowledge the help I received from members of my party in this House—the honorable member for Balwyn and the honorable member for Bennettswood—and the researches they made together with Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Hider of another place. I also acknowledge the work done by members of the Opposition, particularly the honorable member for Melbourne, when the Bill was presented last session but was not proceeded with owing to the complexity of the clauses.

I trust that this House will pass the Bill with as little delay as possible so that Victoria may take its place with the other States and the Territories which have already enacted or are in the process of enacting the legislation and may proclaim the legislation to come into

operation on a date in the near future agreed with them. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. LOVEGROVE (Sunshine), the debate was adjourned.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 26.

I give the usual undertaking that, if honorable members desire further time, I shall certainly arrange that with them. As I indicated earlier, a more detailed explanation of the clauses will be made available to honorable members and I shall make available to them the services of the officers whom I mentioned.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Before putting the motion, I recommend to the Attorney-General that, in accordance with the usual practice, explanatory notes might well be presented to the Clerk of the Papers so that they may be handed out with copies of the Bills.

The motion was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Tuesday, October 26.

LOTTERIES GAMING AND BETTING (PRE-POST BETTING) BILL.

The Order of the Day for the resumption on the debate on the motion for the second reading of this Bill was read.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I have examined this Bill, and am of the opinion that it is a private Bill.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I move, by leave—

That all the Private Bill Standing Orders be dispensed with, and that this Bill be treated as a public Bill.

The provisions contained in this Bill have been recommended to the Government by the Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee constituted under the Racing Act 1958 and, in the opinion of the Government, they will not produce any benefit to the Victorian Club, but they certainly will in revenue to the Government, to the tune of 2 per cent of the turnover of bets lodged under the provisions of the measure.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—It is agreed that this is really a private Bill relating to the Victorian Club, which will benefit from its enactment. Members of the Labor Party are opposed to the Government's attitude that the Victorian Club should not be liable to the payment of fees. Despite the submissions made by the Minister, we believe the Bill must be for the financial benefit of the members of that club. It cannot be denied that its provisions will give the Victorian Club a privilege which no other licensed club will possess—that is, the exclusive right legally to conduct pre-post betting on the Melbourne Cup. Opposition members contend that surely this privilege should be paid for by the Victorian Club.

Members of my party are in no way opposed to the Victorian Club, and admire the service it has given to its members for just over 100 years. Sub-clause (4) of clause 2, provides, *inter alia*—

Any betting conducted on the licensed premises of the Club subject to and in accordance with a Club betting permit—

(*a*) shall not constitute an offence (whether by common law or by any statute);

(*b*) shall not be a ground for the premises of the Club or any part thereof being deemed or declared (whether by common law or by any statute) to be or to be used as a common gaming house or place or to be a common nuisance.

It is therefore proposed to give the Victorian Club a special advantage on a particular occasion. Members of the club and their friends will be allowed to participate in pre-post betting on the Melbourne Cup. All these people will enjoy the club on a gala occasion on Cup eve; doubtless they will be in a carnival and extravagant mood, and the club must

benefit from sales of liquor, cigarettes, and other items. A club which can legally provide this privilege will not only encourage older members to remain in the club, but also encourage new members to join. At present with 10 o'clock closing many licensed clubs throughout Victoria are struggling to retain their existing membership. I therefore move the following amendment to the motion:—

That, after the word "with", the words "except those relating to the payment of fees" be inserted.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I support the comments made by the honorable member for Geelong North, who has pointed out to the House that if the Bill is passed the Victorian Club will enjoy a unique position in our society in regard to the gaming laws. Mr. Speaker, you have indicated to the House that this is a private Bill, and there is possibly an argument that the Standing Orders relating to private Bills should be adhered to, but the Victorian Club should substantiate its case before a committee of examiners. That would be the proper way for this Bill to be handled. If the Government considers that the club's case—which I assume has already been presented to the Government—is sound, it should not have any fear, nor should the club, about the matter being submitted to a committee of examiners, to enable the club to establish why it should be treated in a way that no other club is to be treated.

The Opposition is prepared to cooperate with the Government by allowing Standing Orders to be suspended, but it takes the view that the fees applicable to private Bills should be paid, and that is why the honorable member for Geelong North has moved the amendment. The Opposition has serious thoughts on the practice of the Government in introducing Bills of this type and then proposing the suspension of the Private Bill Standing Orders. Since I have become a member of this Parliament, this procedure has been followed many times. The Government should be careful when deciding to take this course. This could well be a classic case in which the Standing Orders should be adhered to.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—It seems that the proposals embodied in this Bill are designed to meet a special occasion, but if they are given effect they may have a far-reaching impact in the community. Although the Country Party has no deep-seated objection to the Bill, it is aware that its provisions will give the Victorian Club a special privilege which it will doubtless endeavour to retain for its advantages. At some time in the future other clubs may seek the same privilege.

If the Bill has been introduced for the purpose of creating a level of betting which is not created by other means, especially in connection with the Melbourne Cup——

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member should concentrate upon the payment of fees and not the Bill itself.

Mr. TREWIN.—The Country Party considers that if the club is to have rights conferred on it, it should also have a commitment. It is felt that this is the issue.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—Honorable members have strayed a little. The Government rejects the amendment put forward by the honorable member for Geelong North, although it takes note of the points raised by him and by the honorable member for Broadmeadows. However, I point out that the Bill was not sought by the Victorian Club.

Mr. WILKES.—Was it requested by the Government?

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—It was pushed on to the Victorian Club by the Government, and the club was very reluctant to receive it. This puts a rather different note on the matter. It is primarily a taxing measure by the

Government and has not been introduced as a result of a request by the club. Therefore, in the club's view the Government is justified in waiving any fee which might otherwise have been charged to it.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—In view of the position stated by the Minister, the Government is not entitled to waive any fee which normally would be charged for a Bill of this nature. The Government is hiding behind the Victorian Club. The Minister's second-reading speech did not state that the Bill was sought by the Government. To read that speech one would think that the club had been on the doorstep of the Government. Now honorable members are told by the Minister that this was not the case and that the Victorian Club was prevailed upon by the Government—but why the Victorian Club? Tattersalls Club is another club in the metropolis that provides facilities for bookmakers similar to those provided for its members by the Victorian Club. The Government has seen fit to discriminate between clubs, but that is not the Opposition's argument.

Our argument is simply that, if the Government is not going to send this Bill to a committee of examiners to determine who should pay the fee, the public should not pay. Why should the public be saddled with the expense of this Bill? If it is a product of the Government, the Government should pay the fee. If it is not the product of the Government, the club should pay. It should not be a charge against the Consolidated Fund or the public of Victoria because it provides facilities for a select few. The public does not benefit one iota. As usual, the Minister is kidding himself. How can the public benefit?

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—From the tax.

Mr. WILKES.—The Government has such a rotten record on gambling and betting that it now wishes, through its Minister for Social Welfare, to get 2 per cent out of the miserable transactions that may take place at the Victorian Club.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Big transactions!

Mr. WILKES.—According to the Minister, they are big, but whether they are big or small it makes no difference to the principle, which is that the Government should be responsible and that the Victorian Club should make the necessary payments to the Government. If that is not the case—the Government has led the Opposition to believe that the Victorian Club is responsible for the Bill—the measure should be referred to a committe of inquiry to determine who is responsible. Members of the Opposition would readily accept the view of the committee of examiners. This is a disgraceful attempt by the Government, and the Opposition does not agree with it.

Mr. FLOYD (Williamstown).—I do not think that it is a disgraceful attempt at all; it is part of the routine that has gone on for the past fifteen years. Before you were in the chair, Mr. Speaker, other Speakers went along with the statement that, "I have examined this Bill and I think it is a private Bill". The usual procedure is that the Government moves that the private Bill becomes a public Bill. It allows the companies and everyone around the place to come along and get a "few quid" out of the Government. Before you were in the chair, Mr. Speaker, other Speakers went along with the business of saying that they had examined the Bill. They never examined the Bill; they went along with the Government.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order!

Mr. FLOYD.—All right, I knew it would be on.

The SPEAKER.—Order! I think the honorable member for Williamstown may not be wishing to do so, but he seems to be casting a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. FLOYD.—I am.

The SPEAKER.—The honorable member shall withdraw.

Mr. FLOYD.—Not you.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The Chair of this House is not the Speaker of the day, it is the Chair of the Legislative Assembly of Victoria. The honorable member should withdraw and apologize for his statement.

Mr. FLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, I cannot work out why I have got to apologize.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member will withdraw and apologize.

Mr. FLOYD.—Mr. Speaker, will you tell me what I have to withdraw?

The SPEAKER.—The honorable member for Williamstown said that Speakers had made the statement, " This Bill is a private Bill ", that they did not read it and that they went along with the Government.

Mr. FLOYD.—That is right.

The SPEAKER.—That shall be withdrawn and apologized for.

Mr. FLOYD.—But in the past?

The SPEAKER.—The honorable member is being called on to withdraw and apologize.

Mr. FLOYD.—I say that the Speakers in the past did not read the Bills.

The SPEAKER.—Order! There shall be no argument or debate on my call, and the honorable member for Williamstown will withdraw and apologize.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I rise to a point of order. Could I put it to you this way, Mr. Speaker, that the honorable member for Williamstown was not attempting to cast that reflection on previous Speakers or the Chair of this Assembly; he was merely trying to illustrate that the system in use at that time has been changed. Indeed, during your reign as Speaker of this Assembly, I submit that the system has been changed wisely because it conforms more with the system that is used according to *May* and in other Parliaments.

The honorable member for Williamstown may have digressed in attempting to say that there has been a substantial change in the method of examining private and public Bills in the past twelve or eighteen months. I doubt very much, with due respect to you, Sir, that he was casting any aspersions on previous Speakers or the Chair. He was merely stating that there had been a change.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I thank the honorable member for Northcote. There is no point of order. The honorable member for Northcote has been trying to help the honorable member for Williamstown. I called on the honorable member to withdraw and apologize, which I suggest he does, and get on with the debate.

Mr. FLOYD (Williamstown).—If I do not withdraw and apologize is there a penalty?

The SPEAKER.—I think the honorable member should withdraw and not ask that question.

Mr. FLOYD.—I am in a terrible position because I want to carry on my speech in the same manner. I withdraw and apologize. In the past there has been some misapprehension in the Chair about this change.

The SPEAKER.—I suggest that the matter has been adequately dealt with.

Mr. FLOYD.—I wish to continue my speech, but I could not do so without going against your ruling, Mr. Speaker, so I shall resume my seat.

The House divided on Mr. Trezise's amendment (the Hon. Vernon Christie in the chair)—

Ayes	..	26
Noes	..	33
Majority against the amendment	..	7

AYES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. McDonald (*Rodney*)
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Doube	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Shilton
Mr. Floyd	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Lewis (*Dundas*)	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Lewis (*Portland*)	Mr. Wilton.
Mr. Lind	*Tellers:*
Mr. Lovegrove	Mr. Broad
	Mr. Fell.

NOES.

Mr. Balfour	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Billing	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Stokes
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hamer	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Taylor (*Balwyn*)
Mr. Jona	Mr. Taylor (*Gippsland South*)
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Templeton
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Thompson
Mr. McDonald (*Glen Iris*)	Mr. Trethewey
Mr. McLaren	Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. MacLellan	
Mr. Manson	*Tellers:*
Mr. Meagher	
Mr. Rafferty	Mr. Burgin
Mr. Reese	Mr. Crellin.
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Scanlan	

PAIRS.

Mr. Clarey	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Birrell
Mr. Holding	Sir Henry Bolte
Mr. Moss	Mr. Borthwick
Mr. Turnbull	Mr. Rossiter.

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. Vernon Christie in the chair)—

Ayes	..	33
Noes	..	26
Majority for the motion	..	7

AYES.

Mr. Balfour	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Billing	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Evans (*Ballarat North*)	Mr. Stephen
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Stokes
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Hayes	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mr. Jona	Mr. Taylor (*Balwyn*)
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Taylor (*Gippsland South*)
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Templeton
Mr. MacDonald (*Glen Iris*)	Mr. Thompson
Mr. McLaren	Mr. Trethewey
Mr. Maclellan	Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Manson	
Mr. Meagher	*Tellers:*
Mr. Rafferty	
Mr. Reese	Mr. Crellin
Mr. Reid	Mr. Burgin.

NOES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. McDonald (*Rodney*)
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Doube	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Mr. Shilton
Mr. Floyd	Mr. Simmonds
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Trewin
Mr. Ginifer	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Kirkwood	Mr. Whiting
Mr. Lewis (*Dundas*)	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Lewis (*Portland*)	Mr. Wilton.
Mr. Lind	*Tellers:*
Mr. Lovegrove	Mr. Broad
	Mr. Fell.

PAIRS.

Mr. Birrell	Mr. Curnow
Sir Henry Bolte	Mr. Holding
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Moss
Mr. Rossiter	Mr. Turnbull
Mr. Wilcox	Mr. Clarey.

The debate adjourned from September 1) on the motion of Mr. I. W. Smith (Minister for Social Welfare) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Members of the Opposition bow to the fact that they do not have the numbers. It has been demonstrated that the Government, like a team of carpetbaggers, is prepared to hawk its taxing powers from club to club to raise a few meagre dollars by any possible methods. The next step will be to tax mothers' clubs and similar organizations, which hold events such as card afternoons or bingo games to raise a few cents.

Opposition members have no axe to grind with the Victorian Club. We have always admired the record of this club since it was established in 1862 or 1863, and trust that the club and its members will have many more years of success. The club was established initially to provide bookmakers of the 19th century with a system of settling their debts on the Monday after the Saturday race-meeting. The first meeting of what is now known as the Victorian Club was held on the footpath at the top of Bourke Street. The bookmakers gathered on a Monday morning across the road from Parliament House to settle their debts from the previous Saturday's races. Later the Victorian Club graduated from a rented room near the old Tivoli Theatre to the comfortable building it occupies today.

Doubtless the betting occasions which will result from this legislation will also be enjoyed by the visitors who are privileged to attend the Victorian Club on a Melbourne Cup eve. The tradition of many old sporting clubs over the years is to hold what are called Calcutta nights and the calling of the card on a racing occasion. This has been fully explained by the Minister for Social Welfare in his second-reading speech. Of course, in common with the occasional blind double or raffle, many of these activities over the years have been in contravention of the law, and they have detracted from the atmosphere and tradition of clubs. I am sure the Victorian Club will welcome the move to legalize Calcutta betting, because today the club has approximately 1,200 members of whom just on 100 are bookmakers. During the Melbourne Cup racing season, bookmakers transact a large volume of financial business. The Government has admitted that it pursued the Victorian Club with the object of collecting the 2 per cent turnover tax. The Government will benefit to a certain extent, and the club will also benefit. It must not be forgotten that this will be an exclusive privilege for the Victorian Club. Many other clubs in Victoria have bookmakers as members. When this Bill becomes law, I hope that any other club in Victoria which wishes to conduct this form of betting on what is now a national occasion—the Melbourne Cup carnival—will not be excluded. If, as the Government has said, it is more concerned in collecting tax than in helping the Victorian Club, it has no reason to debar any other club which makes a similar application.

The Opposition and other sections of the Victorian public will be interested in the results of requests not only of licensed clubs or bookmakers' clubs, but also of other clubs throughout the State. Many of these clubs are less financial than licensed clubs including the Victorian Club. Junior amateur clubs throughout Victoria today are forced to break the law in order to raise finance to carry out an essential community service, whether it be the boy scouts, the girl guides, little athletics, tennis, football, or cricket clubs. This is done by the running of a weekly raffle. It is not only important to keep such clubs functioning; it is in the interests of the State to protect the welfare of the junior citizens of Victoria. If the Government showed as much interest in its junior citizens as it does in the racing sports, and now in the Victorian Club, it would be taking a more progressive overall community line than it does under the restrictive measures of the Bill.

The ambit of the Bill can be widely interpreted. The wording of the clauses gives the Victorian Club a good deal of scope to dodge the true purpose of the Bill, which, as the Minister says, is to legalize Calcutta betting. Sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A, as contained in clause 2, of the Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act sets out the conditions under which the Government is prepared to grant a betting permit. It provides, *inter alia*, that a club betting permit is conditional upon—

(*a*) betting being conducted only on the Melbourne Cup;

" Betting " does not necessarily mean the Calcutta sweepstakes. Betting can mean straightout, concession betting, each-way betting, or a sweep. Concession betting relates solely to backing the winner. Place bettors may receive only their stake back. The clause contains no reference to Calcutta betting. Under this Bill there is nothing to prevent the Victorian Club from conducting a miniature betting ring on Cup eve with betting boards on the wall for straight-out betting as at Flemington on Cup Day. The Bill does not restrict betting to Calcutta wagering. The measure leaves the club with too many avenues of interpretation.

It must be borne in mind that this measure relates to the Victorian Club and not to a Sunday school or church picnic. Sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A provides also that a betting permit is conditional upon—

> (*d*) no intoxicating liquor being supplied or consumed in the room specified in the permit during the period specified in the permit;

Honorable members who belong to licensed clubs will realize that club members will not relish being told that on Cup eve they can enter the premises but must not have a beer for three or four hours while many members would not be interested in the Calcutta betting activity. This measure prohibits the other 1,100 members of the club from having a drink during the three or four hours that the Calcutta sweepstakes takes place in a particular room. Most bookmakers on Melbourne Cup eve lay off bets to a substantial amount and surely will not drink enough liquor to cause their minds to be affected.

As I have said, paragraph (*d*) of sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A imposes a restriction on members of the Victorian Club, and I imagine that the Government will give an explanation for that. The Opposition considers this measure to be a most immature one, and one which does not cover the Government's intentions. The Opposition also objects to the way in which concession after concession is given to the racing industry while the pleas from other sporting interests for legislation to assist them are ignored.

The Opposition does not oppose this Bill, and it does not detract from the efforts of members of the Victorian Club; in fact, it admires them, but it does criticize the Government for introducing this proposed legislation solely for the benefit of the racing industry while ignoring other sports. It is to be hoped that the Government will consider this question.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—In one way this measure is rather restrictive, but in another it gives great latitude. It is to be regretted that so much assistance is given to the racing industry while other sports are forgotten. Physically, many other sports make a greater contribution to the welfare of the community than racing, and the Country Party feels that, financially, they deserve consideration.

This Bill will legalize betting on the Melbourne Cup at the Victorian Club in that a Calcutta sweepstake will be permitted. In the past, the Government has been unable to collect taxes on betting which has taken place in clubs, but the measure now before the House will enable it to tax betting at the Victorian Club. No one will object to that, provided that the proceeds are used in a certain way. Both the bettor and the bookmaker will contribute revenue which will be of benefit to the State.

I remind honorable members that many people who will take part in the Calcutta sweepstake never go to a racecourse, and that people who attend the Victorian Club, either as guests or as members, will contribute to the revenue which the Government will receive. The Country Party supports this measure, but is concerned that it is a tax-collecting Bill and that it extends privileges to one section of the community.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—If the introduction of this measure has done nothing else, it has indicated the shabby intentions of the Government. The Government has been going to licensed clubs and begging them to implement some form of pre-post betting so that it may collect the 2 per cent tax which is imposed.

Although the Minister did not say so in his second-reading speech, the purpose of this Bill is to legalize something which is now illegal. In addition, the House was not told that this Bill was introduced as a result of requests by members of the Victorian Club; in fact, it has been introduced at the behest of the Government.

How many other clubs does the Government intend to approach to ensure that gambling activities will contribute to the revenue of the State? In taxing pre-post betting at this club, the Government has sunk to the bottom of the barrel. There is no form of gambling that the Government has not touched; and, in order to gain a miserable amount, it is now legalizing a practice which is at present illegal.

The Government must realize that the Totalizator Agency Board now distributes $2 million to racing clubs —a sum which should be going to the Consolidated Fund. There are other methods of increasing the Consolidated Fund without approaching the Victorian Club, Tattersalls Club or any other club. Does the Government intend to approach all other clubs to see if they will participate in pre-post betting and make a contribution to the Consolidated Fund? This is a shabby method of raising revenue. Surely there is some more refined way in which to do it. If the Government is serious about this measure, why does it not advertise in the press that all clubs can participate?

The Opposition does not object to pre-post betting, but it points out that there are many ways in which it can be done legitimately. The Totalizator Agency Board runs doubles on the Caulfield and Melbourne cups, and the Government receives revenue from that source.

This Bill bestows benefits on an exclusive group of privileged persons; it does nothing for the general public. When this legislation is enacted those privileged persons will be able to bet to their heart's content.

The public should recognize that by this measure the Government is asking licensed clubs to act as tax collectors. The time surely must have come when the Government does not continually have to alter financial arrangements to suit the pressures and demands on its Budget. Why must the Government have to resort to measures such as this? Racing clubs are very well catered for by the Government, and the Government has never impeded licensed clubs. There are better ways in which to raise revenue than to ask clubs to be tax gatherers.

The sitting was suspended at 6.27 *p.m. until* 8.5 *p.m.*

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I should like to raise one or two matters with the Minister for Social Welfare. When the House was dealing with the motion that all the Private Bill Standing Orders be dispensed with, the Minister stated that the Bill had been brought forward at the instigation of the Government and not at the instigation of the Victorian Club. During his second-reading speech the Minister informed the House that it was the Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee which made the recommendation. To ensure that I do not mislead the House, I shall quote the Minister's exact words. He said—

> However, as this practice was contrary to the provisions of the then Police Offences Act 1958, it was terminated.

The Minister was referring to the practice of pre-post betting within the precincts of the Victorian Club. He continued—

> The Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee constituted under the Racing Act 1958 has recommended that the practice of calling of the card be reintroduced and legalized.

The Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee consists of seven members, representative of the Bookmakers Association, the Victorian Racing Club, the Dog Racing Control Board, the Trotting Control Board and the Victoria Police. It is reasonable to assume that those members of the Victorian Club who are registered bookmakers would have discussed this matter with their association's representative on the committee. It could be reasonably said that the attitude of the members of the club would have had some influence, or these submissions would not have been made to the committee preceding the recommendation to the Government.

The Minister seems to be in a quandary and is not able to make up his mind whether the recommendation came from the committee or the Government. However, I am concerned because an illegal practice has been carried on in a club. In the eyes of the Government it was desirable to legalize this practice by the introduction of this Bill and, in the process, increase the Government's revenue. I ask the Minister to explain to the House why the Government has singled out the Victorian Club. Does the honorable gentleman want the House to believe that this is the only club in Victoria in which this form of illegal gambling takes place? Does he want the House to believe that the practice does not apply to other major racing events in this State, such as the Caulfield Cup?

It seems extraordinary that the Government will bring forward a Bill which singles out one club and then attempt to justify its actions on the basis that it is seeking revenue. It is not greatly concerned about the betting that goes on. It is prepared to legalize an illegal practice to increase its revenue. If that is the basis of the Government's case, why does it restrict the provisions of the Bill to the Victorian Club? Why not gather up all the other clubs in which this practice takes place?

One may well ask the Minister: Why is it that members of the Victorian Club, as has already been mentioned by the honorable member for Geelong North and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, are singled out for treatment which in effect means that members of the Victorian Club can indulge in this form of gambling with complete immunity whilst members of other clubs must take the risk of being caught?

Mr. WILKES.—The Government asked the club to do it.

Mr. WILTON.—The Minister does not seem to be able to make up his mind on that point. In his second-reading speech the honorable gentleman informed the House that the Government was acting on a recommendation of the Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee. Later, when the House was discussing another aspect of the Bill, off the cuff the Minister informed honorable members that the Bill had been brought in at the instigation of the Government. I invite the honorable gentleman to clarify the situation. I should also like him to inform the House why he considers that all the pre-post betting facilities available through the Totalizator Agency Board are not sufficient to cater for the gambling habits of the citizens of this State. Why is the Victorian Club singled out for this treatment and all other clubs are to be left off the hook? Does the Minister desire that the Victorian Club shall receive the protection of this Parliament whilst other clubs must run the risk of being prosecuted for contravening the law?

Another question for consideration is the type of betting to be allowed. As the honorable member for Geelong North pointed out, the Bill does not

limit betting to a particular type. Will the Minister submit amendments during the Committee stage? Are honorable members to see a repetition of performances witnessed in this Parliament of the Government writing its legislation as it proceeds.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2, providing, *inter alia*—

(b) At the end of Division 7 of Part IV. of the Principal Act there shall be inserted the following Division:—

DIVISION 8.—MELBOURNE CUP PRE-POST BETTING.

66A (1) The Chief Secretary on application in writing made to him by the Secretary of the Victorian Club may issue to the Victorian Club a Club betting permit.

. . . . .

(3) A Club betting permit is conditional upon—

. . . . .

(c) bets being laid only with persons who are the holders of current certificates of registration as bookmakers under Part IV. of the Racing Act 1958 and who are entitled to field in the grandstand enclosure at the Flemington Racecourse;

(*d*) no intoxicating liquor being supplied or consumed in the room specified in the permit during the period specified in the permit; and

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I have carefully noted all the comments that have been made by members of the Country Party and of the Opposition on this measure. I remind honorable members that the Government is not opening the field of pre-post betting but is legalizing the calling of the card—a specific, traditional and very narrow form of gambling that is carried out, to the Government's knowledge, by only one organization in Victoria, namely, the Victorian Club.

Mr. WILKES.—That is a ridiculous statement; the Government knows that it is carried on at many clubs.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—The calling of the card has been confined to the Victorian Club, and as a result of the Big Philou inquiry it became obvious to the Government that large sums of money were changing hands on the eve of the Melbourne Cup. Although the Bill refers to pre-post betting, the aspect being dealt with is a particular facet of pre-post betting which is explained in the second-reading notes. Most of the bookmakers who are licensed to operate at Flemington on Melbourne Cup day attend the Victorian Club on Melbourne Cup eve and not only lay off their bets, but also provide a service to their clients. The amount of money wagered has been sufficiently large to attract the Government's interest, particularly in view of the fact that it is an illegal operation and that a significant amount of revenue is being lost. That is why the Government has examined this practice and found it desirable to legalize and control it.

There is no demand from other clubs to licence the calling of the card because the other clubs do not have among their members bookmakers who are licensed to operate on the Melbourne Cup in the paddock at Flemington.

Mr. TREZISE.—The other clubs do not have the same number of members, but they would have some.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Bookmakers would belong to a number of clubs, but as a rule they would not attend those other clubs on the night prior to the Melbourne Cup. The Government is narrowing down the system of the calling of the card, but during the debate the points raised by some honorable members directed my attention to an additional need; that is, that other licensed clubs and organizations may go beyond the permitted Calcutta sweepstakes that they now run. If that is so they should apply to the Government through the Chief Secretary for consideration of whatever facilities they require. The Government will then

consider those requests as a separate item. The Bill deals with the simple calling of the card operation.

Mr. WILKES.—That is illegal and the Government intends to make it legal.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—And to obtain the revenue which should be gathered from it, and which would be obtained if this operation were conducted on Melbourne Cup day. I have clarified the Government's position.

Another aspect was drawn to the Government's attention. It concerns paragraph (*d*) of sub-section (3) of proposed section 66A, as contained in clause 2, which provides that a betting permit is conditional upon—

> no intoxicating liquor being supplied or consumed in the room specified in the permit during the period specified in the permit;

It seems to the Government that people who would be calling the card in a licensed club are experienced at this task and during the period in which the card is being called it is unreasonable that they should not be able to enjoy the normal facilities of the club and have a drink. I concede that the provision in the Bill is perhaps fringing on the unnecessary and therefore I foreshadow an amendment to remove this proposed paragraph so that the permit of the club will not specify that no alcohol is to be consumed during the calling of the card.

The second-reading notes which were circulated with the Bill set out the means by which the calling of the card will be undertaken. After the first year of operation of this measure there may be indications that there is a need for a change to be made in the permit and that is why the permit has not been spelt out in detail in the Bill. However, the principles are clearly set out and the method of operation is explained in the second-reading notes. Nevertheless, the points raised by members of the Opposition and members of the Country Party have been taken into account and the Government concedes them to some degree.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Although the Minister for Social Welfare has said that suggestions put forward by members of the Opposition and of the Country Party have been taken into account, as the debate unfolds it is becoming obvious that the decisions taken by the Government are wanting. The honorable gentleman has indicated that the Government's main concern is not what is happening at the Victorian Club but the Government's hawking its wares around the club and asking its members——

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Not asking them, telling them.

Mr. WILKES.—Very well, telling them that they are carrying out an illegal operation. Everyone knew what was happening at the Victorian Club. The Government was allowing pre-post betting to be undertaken at the club before the Melbourne Cup. Despite the fact that the Government knew that this was illegal, it turned a blind eye. However, it is now prepared to legalize the practice.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—The honorable member did not know it was illegal.

Mr. WILKES.—It is quite obvious that the Government did and I assume that the Gaming Squad has advised the Government that illegal betting was being conducted at the Victorian Club—that select edifice to which only privileged people are admitted. Members of the club were betting on the eve of the Melbourne Cup and the Government knew this. The Government's answer is to amend the Act to legalize this illegal betting and to obtain a turnover tax from the bookmakers when they are calling the card legally.

There are other methods by which the Government could raise revenue, but this is a gambling Government. The honorable member for Geelong North has pointed out that $2 million a year, which is collected by the

Totalizator Agency Board, is paid to racing clubs instead of to the Consolidated Fund. If this money were paid into the Consolidated Fund it would not be necessary for the Government to allow the Victorian Club to carry on illegal betting. The only answer that the Government has is to allow the privileged people who attend the Victorian Club to have a bet on the Melbourne Cup on the eve of the race if the bookmakers are prepared to take their money. The Government has given no consideration to the wishes of other Victorian clubs which want to conduct illegal betting prior to the running of the Melbourne Cup.

The Government has seen the possibility of raising revenue from the activities at the Victorian Club prior to the Melbourne Cup. This is the thin edge of the wedge and the Government ought to give serious consideration to its policy on gambling generally. If it wants pre-post betting it should allow the Totalizator Agency Board to conduct it.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—The Bill relates to the calling of the card.

Mr. WILKES.—I cannot distinguish between the calling of the card and pre-post betting.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—I bet you cannot.

Mr. WILKES.—The Minister and the Government are prepared to bet on anything and that is why the Government finds itself in this undesirable position. I would not expect the honorable member for Essendon to have a bet, but the Minister for Social Welfare is prepared to bet on anything.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Explain the calling of the card.

Mr. WILKES.—The Minister does not need me to explain the calling of the card to him because an explanation is set out in his second-reading speech. The Government adopted a politically dishonest approach to what appeared to be a reasonable request by a licensed club in the metropolitan area to conduct pre-post betting. The Minister knows that it did not turn out that way. The honorable gentleman said that the Government went along to the Victorian Club—it probably crawled on its stomach—and asked the club to reintroduce this practice so that the Government could increase its revenue by 2 per cent of the betting turnover at the club. In explaining the measure, the Minister said—

> More than twenty years ago it was the practice at the Victorian Club, on Melbourne Cup eve, to conduct what was colloquially known as the calling of the card, which is a system of auctioning betting odds on acceptors in the Melbourne Cup.

In other words, the club has been acting illegally for the past twenty years. In order to legalize the practice, the Government crawled on its stomach to the Victorian Club and asked if it would be prepared to make an approach to this lazy, incompetent Government, which is so beset with gambling, for this measure to be introduced and which the Minister has asked me to explain.

For the benefit of the Minister for Social Welfare and his backward back-benchers, I shall explain the calling of the card. On this point, the Minister said—

> The event took place in a part of the club premises set aside for the purpose and attendance was confined to members and special guests invited by the club.

Therefore, in my explanation to the Minister of his own second-reading speech, I point out that the calling of the card was for the privileged members of the club. The Minister has suggested that I might receive an invitation. Although I do not want to disappoint the Minister, on the grounds of common decency, I would be obliged to refuse any invitation that the honorable gentleman might arrange for me, on behalf of the Government, to attend anything that is illegal. I do not want to take part in that sort of activity. If the Government wants to acquiesce in some thing that has been illegal for the past twenty years, that is its business, but the Opposition will not associate itself with it. The Minister wants to know what the calling of the card means.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—You are reading it.

Mr. WILKES.—Of course I am reading the Minister's speech.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner) I ask the Minister not to interject further and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to ignore interjections.

Mr. WILKES.—I shall do that without any difficulty, Mr. Chairman. I am amazed that the Government could be so naïve as to introduce this measure and get the second most junior Minister in the Cabinet to explain that it was not the Victorian Club which wanted the practice legalized, but that it was the Government which desired to legalize something that was illegal so that it could obtain 2 per cent of the revenue from betting that is transacted at the club. I wonder where the Government will turn next to raise revenue.

As the honorable member for Geelong North rightly said, if a struggling cricket club or church football club wants to conduct a raffle or a blind double, the Government says that it is illegal and drags the organizers through the courts. If it were not for the efforts of the churches and various sporting clubs, the Government would have a greater problem of delinquency on its hands. These organizations receive no assistance from the Government, which prevails upon the Victorian Club—that exclusive domain where privileged members meet—to engage in an illegal betting transaction so that the Government may legalize it and raise revenue. If the Government were sincere, it would extend the same facilities to people who want to further the interests of sport in this State. The one sport in this State which has received complete and privileged assistance from the Government is that of racing, and other sports must take second place to it.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—What about basketball?

Mr. WILKES.—The Minister for Social Welfare knows the failures of the Government in that field; they are like the failure of his own department which has children sleeping on the floor at Allambie, for which the Minister cannot account. If the Government, which is warped in gambling habits and uses such uncouth methods to raise revenue, looked around for legal methods of raising revenue that did not encroach on the morality of the individual, it might get the support of the Opposition and of the Country Party. Up to date, the Government has made no suggestions along those lines.

Other important factors not confined to the narrowness of gambling ought to be considered by the Government. If this measure is the forerunner of proposed legislation to legalize betting at all licensed clubs, the Opposition will examine it. At present, the legislation is intended to apply only to the calling of the card at the Victorian Club and the Opposition opposes the way in which the Government went about doing this and the back-door methods which it employed to achieve what it considers to be a reasonable amount of revenue.

The Opposition has already pointed out that $2 million is paid by the Totalizator Agency Board into the racing clubs and that this money should not be for the clubs. It is not a matter of the racing clubs going broke. The Opposition rejects completely the Minister's justification for this revenue-earning source. Unless the Government can substantiate itself as being a responsible Government, without having to crawl to licensed clubs, the Opposition has no option other than to reject completely that sort of policy and philosophy.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—My remarks will be brief. I commend the honorable member for Geelong North on the manner in which he has handled the measure on behalf of the Opposition. Although the honorable member is the shadow

Minister for sport, he has not succeeded in imparting his wide knowledge of the subject to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Following that poor performance by the Minister of Water Supply, I want to comment on the remarks made by the Minister for Social Welfare. I support what has been put so aptly and correctly by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition concerning the preferential treatment given, in this case, to the Victorian Club, and not granted to other sections of the Victorian community.

In clarifying the Government's reasons for introducing the measure, the Minister said that the Government wanted to legalize something which the Victorian Club had been engaging in illegally. I presume that the officials of the Victorian Club should not have been dragged through the courts because their activities were illegal. By the same token, why should reputable people who are leaders in our community—councillors, justices of the peace and others who accept the presidency or patronage of a sporting club—be dragged through the courts by the Government because they run an illegal raffle in order to raise funds for their non-racing sporting club? It is no wonder that today so many reputable men decline office in sporting clubs.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—I ask the honorable member for Geelong North to return to clause 2.

Mr. TREZISE.—I will. I am pleased that the Minister has agreed that if any other club applies for this privilege, at least the application will be seriously considered. Despite the Minister's assertion, bookmakers do belong to many clubs throughout Melbourne and Victorian country centres. If these clubs want a betting permit, it should be granted because it is wrong that such permits should be restricted to one club.

In the 1970s it appears now that not only will Victoria have late-night shopping, but it will also experience late-night betting in licensed clubs. From an examination of the *Hansard* reports of some 50 years ago, it is obvious that the greatest alleged curse in Melbourne at that time was Friday night gambling at the old tote which operated in Johnston Street, Collingwood, and it took years of Government and police activity to eradicate the curse. What was fashionable in those days against the law will certainly become the pattern of the 1970s within the law.

Concerning the Government's revenue collecting through gambling, just on $2 million today is being paid perhaps wrongly into racing clubs. I am a supporter of racing, but in all fairness this money should be paid into the Consolidated Fund so that the Government can assist hospitals or any other causes for which it raises taxes. For the information of the honorable member for Ballaarat South, I emphasize that approximately $1 million a year is involved in unclaimed dividends. If a person puts $2 on the totalizator and his horse wins at 2 to 1, he wins $4. Surely that $6 belongs to him or alternatively consolidated revenue.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—I find some difficulty in relating the honorable member's remarks to clause 2.

Mr. TREZISE.—I shall sum up, briefly. At present, too much hero worship and emphasis is being placed on gambling houses and clubs. It is time the Government held an inquiry into all aspects of the Totalizator Agency Board proceeds.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! I ask the honorable member for Geelong North to return strictly to clause 2.

Mr. TREZISE.—I shall do so, Sir. Members of the Opposition are pleased that the Government and the Minister have seen fit to accept our

recommendations. The Bill was introduced hastily and is being rushed through to satisfy a certain club. The amendments which are now proposed should have been made before the Bill was introduced. It is more realistic to allow the consumption of alcohol in a licensed club such as the Victorian Club on an occasion such as that envisaged in the Bill. Members of the Opposition are pleased that the Government has seen fit to accept their proposals.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I move—

That, in paragraph (*c*) of sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A, the word "and" be added.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I move—

That paragraph (*d*) of sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A be omitted.

This follows the consideration which the Government has given to the recommendation put forward by the honorable member for Geelong North, which the Government believes is reasonable. People engaging in pre-post betting under the calling of the card system at the Victorian Club should have the normal facilities of the club available to them.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I am not completely satisfied with the Minister's explanation. The honorable gentleman made a passing reference to pre-post betting and touched briefly on Calcutta sweepstakes. One of the amendments agreed to by the Committee had the effect of removing paragraph (*d*) of sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A which provided that no intoxicating liquor could be consumed in the room where betting was being conducted. I should like the Minister to point out where this clause places any restriction on the type of betting that will take place in the club. Paragraph (*b*) of sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A states that a club betting permit is conditional upon betting being conducted only on the basis of which horse wins the Melbourne Cup. It may be that there will be no place betting and no each-way betting. If the Government desires that a particular type of betting should take place in the club, and only that type, it should be written into the Bill. That is the question I put to the Minister previously, and I do not believe he has answered it.

It seems to me the Government is concerning itself not with the moral aspect of illegal gambling but only with the revenue aspect. If this is so, where will it finish? Is the Government going to legalize two-up and impose a tax on that activity? Does it intend to legalize other illegal practices in the interests of earning revenue? Does it propose to legalize prostitution and to place a tax on that?

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the honorable member for Broadmeadows to return to clause 2, as amended.

Mr. WILTON.—From his remarks on behalf of the Government the Minister has given me the impression that the Government is not concerned with the moral aspect of this question. Clause 2 will legalize an illegal practice. The Minister has informed the Committee that this action is being taken solely in the interests of increasing the Government's revenue. Obviously, the Government is concerned not about the moral aspects of gambling but only about the revenue point of view.

The Minister said that if other clubs desired to be treated in a similar manner they should apply. I assume that further legislation would be necessary if the Government acceded to such requests because no provision in this clause would enable any other club in Victoria to be treated in the same manner as the Victorian Club is being treated. The only club mentioned in the clause is the Victorian Club.

Regardless of what any Minister says in his second-reading speech, only what is contained in the Bill becomes the law. Is the Government asking the Committee to remove any obstacles that may exist for the Government to alter permits and to change its mind in the future? From what the Minister said, there is a real possibility that, once this measure is passed, it will never be brought before Parliament again and that all the fiddling about in regard to the issuing of permits will be done at the Executive Council or Ministerial level. I should like the Minister to point out for my benefit what restrictions he claims will be placed on the type of betting that will be allowed in this club. I cannot see any such provision in the Bill. Betting can be conducted almost as though it were being done on the racecourse. If that is what the Government is prepared to allow, why does not the Minister say so, instead of attempting to hoodwink the Committee into believing that there will be some restricted form of betting?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—Mr. Chairman, you have allowed honorable members a fair licence on the discussion of the amendment that I moved.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I take a point of order. I did not discuss the amendments; I discussed the clause as amended.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—The Bill spells out that this provision is to pertain to the Victorian Club. As I said previously, it is not possible to specify in the Bill every detail of the permit, but clearly the second-reading notes and the Government's undertakings during the debate have outlined what sort of betting will be permitted and where it will be carried out. Clearly, it will be held at the Victorian Club and clearly it will be only by calling of the card as one single pre-post betting measure. The Government has no intention of allowing any extension of that particular aspect of pre-post betting, and there will not be any under this Bill. Separate legislation would be required to permit that in any other type of circumstance.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The Minister has referred persistently to the second-reading notes, which are a disgrace to him and his Government; they were written by a public servant at the behest of the Government. They do not indicate the Government's specific intentions in regard to this Bill. Sub-section (1) of proposed section 66A provides—

> The Chief Secretary on application in writing made to him by the Secretary of the Victorian Club may issue to the Victorian Club a club betting permit.

The Minister has stated that the Government approached the Victorian Club—not that the Victorian Club approached the Government—and asked it to apply to the Government for a permit to make legal what has been deemed to be illegal. It is of no use the Minister adverting to specific matters in his second-reading speech. By custom, Ministers read their second-reading speeches in this House. Excluding the Minister of Education, if Ministers did not read their second-reading speeches they would not be able to produce a speech containing any detail of a Bill.

The honorable members for Geelong North and Broadmeadows and I have been through the Minister's second-reading speech and cannot find that it contains any safeguards. Are members of the Committee entitled to assume, in the absence of any safeguards suggested by the Minister in his speech and in the Bill, that illegal betting in this form can continue anywhere else in Victoria other than in the Victorian Club? Possibly, the Gaming Squad has brought to the Government's notice that this betting was going on in the Victorian Club—that is, if the Gaming Squad could get into the club, which I doubt.

The Minister must know that it is going on in a host of other clubs. Whether the honorable gentleman likes it or not, he should not be so testy and churlish about this matter.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Where is it going on?

Mr. WILKES.—Anywhere. Would the Minister like the Opposition publicly to name the clubs in which it is going on? It is the responsibility of the Government to grant the same concessions to other clubs as it is prepared to grant to the Victorian Club. When will members of the Government get that into their thick heads? If this practice is all right for the Victorian Club today, it must be all right for the other clubs in Victoria. If any prosecutions stem from the activities of other licenced clubs for calling the card, this Government must stand indicted, or, alternatively, it must condone or give licences to other clubs in the same way that it is prepared to do for the Victorian Club. The Minister is aware that other licenced clubs in Victoria will be carrying out the calling of the card illegally on Melbourne Cup eve. I shall not name them because that is the job of the Minister and the Government.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—That is not right.

Mr. WILKES.—The Minister says that it is not right, but he knows it is right. Plenty of golf clubs, athletic clubs, and the like, will be doing this on Cup eve, and these clubs are entitled to the same protection that the Government is prepared to afford the Victorian Club. The Opposition will be interested to learn of any prosecutions that stem from this illegal practice, which is proposed to be made legal for one privileged section of the community —the members of the Victorian Club. We shall watch with great interest the actions of this gambling Government in respect of other clubs.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—Earlier I stated that if any other licensed club, in which the calling of a card takes place on the Melbourne Cup, wishes to continue the practice legally, the Government is in duty bound to examine the position in relation to that club. However, our experience is that the position does not exist in other clubs.

Mr. WILKES.—The Government has known it for twenty years.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—The Bill is confined to the Victorian Club and to make it successful it is necessary to have the bookmakers operating in such a club. I would be much surprised if this practice existed in other clubs.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—I should like clarification of the Minister's remarks. He stated that if clubs were prepared to approach the Government on the basis of the calling of the card they would receive consideration. I point out to the Minister that the calling of the card occurs at different clubs not only on the Melbourne Cup, but on other sporting events. Also there are other illegal activities, such as sweepstakes, on the night before an event. It may be a " tote " based on the contribution of club members on horses running in the Melbourne Cup and, whilst this is not technically the calling of the card, it is illegal betting. I ask the Minister whether the Bill is restricted to the calling of the card. If so, what is the difference between the calling of the card by one club and the conduct of a sweepstakes or a club " tote " by another club? Why is the Government concerned to legalize one form of gambling and not another?

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—I wish to discuss this matter briefly because I am concerned at the principles which are being enunciated. I am not interested in the inane interjections of the Minister of Labour and Industry, who, as usual, is pontificating about nothing. The performance of the Minister for Social Welfare on this clause has been

one of continual back-pedalling in the face of the well-founded and proper case put forward by the honorable member for Geelong North and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Opposition has pointed out the ludicrous nature of paragraph (*d*) of sub-section (3) of proposed new section 66A, as contained in clause 2 of the Bill, and the Government has back-pedalled and agreed to delete this paragraph. The honorable member for Geelong North emphasized that this provision would have been discriminatory in its nature and effect. The Bill does not provide for a properly-constituted licensed club to advance its own case. By selecting only one club, the Bill is discriminatory. Why was not provision made in the Bill to allow other clubs the same privileges proposed to be extended to the Victorian Club? The real reason is, as has been aptly demonstrated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that the Government sees the Victorian Club as the place where the money is. This is where the " silver tails " are to be found. This Government is concerned not with allowing the community to expand and legalize its activities but with raising a small amount of finance from one club.

It is a shame that the Government has taken what is openly a despicable attitude, and the honorable member for Geelong North is to be congratulated for bringing the matter forward. The Government has shown discrimination in favour of the Victorian Club for its own self-interest. It has no concern for clubs generally throughout the community, and, despite the assurances of the Minister in his vague second-reading speech and his subsequent vague comments, no consideration will be shown for other clubs which can demonstrate their ability to provide the same facilities for their members. Until the Government is prepared to amend the Bill to provide the same facilities to other clubs which can give their members a legitimate service, the legislation will clearly demonstrate the Government's lack of thinking and proper public concern.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).— I feel that I must pursue the point that I made previously. The Minister has made reference to the calling of the card, but clause 2 contains no reference to the type of betting which is to take place. The clause, which provides that a betting permit authorizes betting subject to and in accordance with section 66A of the principal Act, states that a club betting permit is conditional upon—

(*a*) betting being conducted only on the Melbourne Cup;

(*b*) betting being conducted only on the basis of which horse wins the Melbourne Cup;

(*c*) bets being laid only with persons who are the holders of current certificates of registration as bookmakers under Part IV. of the Racing Act 1958 and who are entitled to field in the grandstand enclosure at the Flemington Racecourse;

In the conditions under which the permit will be issued, there is no reference to the calling of the card. The Minister has made repeated reference to the procedure of the calling of the card, and I should like the honorable gentleman to explain to the Committee the difference between the calling of the card, Calcutta betting, concession betting, straight-out betting, or each-way betting, Are any of these types of betting involved in the calling of the card?

The Minister claims that his second-reading notes clearly set out the types of permits to be issued. However, the law, the courts, and the law enforcement authorities of this State can be guided not by what is in the Minister's second-reading speech, but only by what is in the statute-book. Again I invite the Minister to explain to the Committee what is the difference between the

calling of the card, Calcutta betting, concession betting, straight-out betting, or each-way betting. Are any of these types of betting involved in the calling of the card?

The clause, as amended, was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and the amendments were adopted.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—During the Committee stage I raised a specific question with the Minister in regard to the matter of the calling of the card. The honorable gentleman, who placed great emphasis on this point, has repeatedly informed honorable members that the type of betting to be engaged in at the Victorian Club will be the calling of the card. I asked the Minister if he would explain what was meant by the calling of the card, as against Calcutta betting, concession betting, straight-out betting, or each-way betting. Are any of those forms of betting the calling of the card?

As the Minister has seen fit to remain silent, I can only assume that the honorable gentleman knows nothing about it and has based his case on a second-reading speech which was prepared by some public servant. He knows nothing about the betting procedure in the Victorian Club.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I clearly indicated in my second-reading speech and later referred to the matter several times what pre-post betting and the calling of the card actually is.

Mr. WILKES.—What is it?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order!

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—For the benefit of those honorable members who are too stupid to read the notes of the second-reading speech, I shall comment very briefly. The permit will specify certain means of calling the card at the Victorian Club under the Act. A certain room will be set aside and a person will be appointed by the club to run an auction system on each horse as the saddle-cloth number is called. When the saddle-cloth number is called, bookmakers who are prepared to accept certain odds will call the odds. The master of ceremonies will announce those odds and any bookmaker who can better them will be brought forward and he will accept whatever wagers are offered unless of course, someone else can better the odds in question. In other words, it is a type of auction on the odds offered for each horse for a win only. Book entries will be made by the master of ceremonies and recorded for the scrutiny of Government officials. What is meant by the calling of the card under this Act is spelt out in my second-reading speech; it will also be specified in the permit.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—It was stupid of the Minister for Social Welfare to say that honorable members were too stupid to read because obviously the explanation that he supplied has nothing to do with calling of the card. His comments related to a combination of the Calcutta sweepstakes and the calling of the card. If the Minister examined his inadequate second-reading speech, he would understand exactly what is meant by the calling of the card. For the benefit of the stupid Minister and other honorable members I shall read the relevant portion which refers to this aspect. It reads—

More than twenty years ago it was the practice of the Victorian Club, on Melbourne Cup eve, to conduct what was colloquially known as the calling of the card, which is a system of auctioning betting odds on acceptors in the Melbourne Cup. The event took place in a part of the club premises set aside for the purpose and attendance was confined to members and special guests invited by the club.

Obviously, the Minister did not read his speech properly, because he does not know what the calling of the card means.

Mr. DIXON.—Can you tell the House what is meant by the calling of the card without reading from the Minister's second-reading speech?

Mr. WILKES.—Neither the Minister nor his stupid colleague from St. Kilda knows anything about this matter. The Minister's second-reading speech continued—

The practice was for a master of ceremonies, who was experienced in betting and appointed by the club for the occasion—

illegally, of course—

to begin by calling the name of the horse with the lowest saddle-cloth number and asking bookmakers present what odds they were prepared to lay. Bookmakers would indicate the odds available and a better or bettors would then state the amount for which they wished to back the horse.

Bookmakers would then state their willingness to accept bets up to a stated amount at the specified odds.

If the amount for which bettors wished to back horses was greater than the amount which bookmakers wished to lay, bettors would be invited to accept lower odds.

In his explanation to the House, the Minister made no reference to this information.

If the odds offered were not acceptable to bettors, bookmakers would be invited to offer longer odds.

It appears that the "silver tails" at the Victorian Club could stand the bookmakers up on a platform and say, "We are not satisfied with the odds you are offering; we want greater odds". If the "silver tails" wanted to lodge a larger amount than the bookmaker was prepared to accept, the bookmaker need not accept it. The Minister continued—

When the wagering on the horse was complete, the master of ceremonies would read out the bets made. These bets would then be confirmed by both bookmakers and bettors.

For the benefit of the Minister for Social Welfare, the part of his second-reading speech that I have read describes what is meant by the calling of the card.

The Opposition believes that if members of the Victorian Club are to be allowed to bet in this way, the privilege should be extended to other licensed clubs. The Opposition is unable to obtain from the Government or the Minister information concerning the action that the Government will take to enable other licensed clubs, which wish to conduct a calling of the card on Melbourne Cup eve or on a day prior to the Melbourne Cup, to enjoy this privilege. The Minister knows that this Bill will grant a special privilege to the Victorian Club. The Government will not extend the same privilege to other licensed clubs because the amounts invested at those clubs would be considerably less than in the case at the Victorian Club, with the result that the Government's rake-off would be correspondingly less. The Government is not interested in extending the privilege to other licensed clubs unless the rake-off it will receive will be at the same high level as that which will apply to the Victorian Club. The privilege should be extended to other Victorian sporting organizations which promote those forms of sport that are far more beneficial to the State than racing, which is promoted by the Victorian Club. If this were done, money could be ploughed back into the sport for promotion purposes.

Notwithstanding the remarks of the Minister for Social Welfare in reply to questions asked by the Opposition and the Country Party, the Government ought to pay more attention to areas of sport other than racing. The fact that the Premier is interested in racing does not mean that racing is the premier sport in this State and that it ought to be subsidized to the extent of millions of dollars at the expense of hospitals and other public services. If the Government intends to legalize this practice for the Victorian Club, it should seriously consider the plight of other sporting bodies in Victoria.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read a third time.

STATE FORESTS WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Forests) presented a message from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of a Bill to authorize expenditure on works and services and other purposes relating to State forests.

A resolution in accordance with the recommendation was passed in Committee and adopted by the House.

On the motion of Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Forests), the Bill was brought in and read a first time.

NEWHAVEN LAND BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands) presented a message from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor recommending that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of a Bill to authorize the granting of leases of certain land in the township of Newhaven, Parish of Phillip Island.

The House went into Committee to consider the message.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—I move—

That it be expedient that an appropriation be made from the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of a Bill to authorize the granting of leases of certain land in the township of Newhaven, Parish of Phillip Island.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I invite the Minister of Lands briefly to inform the Committee what leases of land are involved before honorable members are asked to vote on this motion. The Committee is entitled to know what leases the Government proposes to authorize. I do not expect a second-reading speech, but a brief explanation would be appreciated.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The purpose of the Bill is simple; it is to allow the Government to grant a 21-year lease to the Newhaven Yacht Club, which is already in existence on the foreshore of Phillip Island. The existing fenced area is the area covered by the schedule.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I thank the Minister for his brief explanation, but that in no way commits the Opposition in its attitude to the Bill.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The Minister seems to think that this is the least serious proposition of the Government in relation to the message.

Mr. DUNSTAN.—You do not expect us to take you seriously!

Mr. WILKES.—I should be surprised if anyone took the Minister of Water Supply seriously. This is one of the few Parliaments in Australia in which Ministers do not give any description of a Bill on the first reading. The honorable member for Broadmeadows has raised an interesting point in inquiring what the Bill is about. It is all very well for Parliament to agree to an appropriation for a specific purpose, but what is it for? It is heartening to hear the Minister explain reasons for the Bill before the motion for the second reading is moved. This is a practice which should be encouraged by the Parliament and by the Ministers because it gives Parliament an indication of what the Bill is about. Unfortunately, it can relate only to Bills for which a message is necessary. In any event, the Opposition is interested in this procedure and it will continue to pursue the Government for an explanation at this level on all occasions.

Mr. SCANLAN (Oakleigh).—The honorable member for Northcote raised a point on the explanatory note and statement to be given on the first reading. I should like to correct the impression that he gave about precedents established by Australian

Parliaments in relation to the first reading of Bills. My understanding of the position is that the only Parliament that adopts this procedure on the first reading is the Queensland Parliament, which operates under the unicameral system. Because there is no Legislative Council in Queensland, it is necessary to have an explanation at the first reading.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I rise to a point of order. The Committee is dealing with the question of an appropriation to be made on behalf of Her Majesty; it is not dealing with Parliamentary procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! The point of order is not upheld.

The motion was agreed to, and the resolution was reported to the House and adopted.

On the motion of Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands), the Bill was brought in and read a first time.

LAND TAX BILL.

The House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I move the resolution now in the hands of honorable members—

That subject to the Land Tax Act 1958 as proposed to be amended by the Land Tax Bill there shall in the case of each owner of land be charged levied collected and paid for the use of Her Majesty for the year commencing on the 1st day of January, 1972 and ending on the 31st day of December, 1972 the duty of land tax upon land as provided in the table appended hereto:

Provided that the minimum amount of tax payable for the said year by any taxpayer assessed under the Land Tax Act 1958 as so proposed to be amended shall be $1.

Where the Amount of the Taxable Value of Land or Lands as Assessed under the Land Tax Act 1958:—	The Duty of Land Tax shall be:—
Does not exceed $17,500	0·42 cents for each $1 of the taxable value
Exceeds $17,500 but does not exceed $20,000	$73.50 plus 0·62 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $17,500
Exceeds $20,000 but does not exceed $25,000	$89.00 plus 0·83 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $20,000
Exceeds $25,000 but does not exceed $30,000	$130.50 plus 1·05 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $25,000
Exceeds $30,000 but does not exceed $40,000	$183.00 plus 1·10 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $30,000
Exceeds $40,000 but does not exceed $50,000	$293.00 plus 1·14 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $40,000
Exceeds $50,000 but does not exceed $60,000	$407.00 plus 1·38 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $50,000
Exceeds $60,000 but does not exceed $70,000	$545.00 plus 1·60 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $60,000
Exceeds $70,000 but does not exceed $80,000	$705.00 plus 1·72 cents for each $1 of the taxale value in excess of $70,000
Exceeds $80,000 but does not exceed $90,000	$877.00 plus 1·83 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $80,000
Exceeds $90,000 but does not exceed $100,000	$1.060.00 plus 2·06 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in exces of $90,000
Exceeds $100,000 but does not exceed $110,000	$1,266.00 plus 2·18 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $100,000
Exceeds $110,000 but does not exceed $120,000	$1,484.00 plus 2·29 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $110,000
Exceeds $120,000 but does not exceed $130,000	$1.713.00 plus 2·52 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $120,000
Exceeds $130,000 but does not exceed $140,000	$1,965.00 plus 2·75 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $130,000
Exceeds $140,000 but does not exceed $150,000	$2,240.00 plus 2·86 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $140,000
Exceeds $150,000 but does not exceed $160,000	$2,526.00 plus 2·98 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $150,000
Exceeds $160,000 but does not exceed $170,000	$2,824.00 plus 3·09 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $160,000
Exceeds $170,000	$3,133.00 plus 3·21 cents for each $1 of the taxable value in excess of $170,000

Where the owner of land not being land used for industrial purposes is an absentee the duty of land tax provided in the foregoing provisions of the Table shall be increased by twenty per centum and for purposes of this Table—

(*a*) "Absentee" means a person who does not reside in Australia and includes a person who has been absent from Australia for at least twelve months immediately prior to the time when the ownership of his land for the purposes of the Principal Act is determined unless he satisfied the Commissioner that he resides in Australia, but does not include a public officer of the Commonwealth or the State who is absent in the performance of his duties;

(*b*) If at least three-fifths of the entire beneficial interest in any land is owned by absentees or if (where the land is owned by a body corporate) at least three-fifths of the issued share capital of that body corporate is held by absentees, that land shall be deemed to be wholly owned by absentees.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—This is an extraordinary situation. The Minister has stood before the Committee and said that he moves "the resolution in the hands of honorable members". Is the Committee not to be given any explanation by the Minister or the Government? Does the Government now demand from its supporters complete and absolute subservience to Cabinet and insist that whatever a Minister says goes? Apparently no members of the Liberal Party are the slightest bit interested in what the Government is doing to their constituents. It is extraordinary that the honorable member for Heatherton, who had so much to say last week, is prepared to sit in his place like a bag of mud and take no interest in the proceedings. I note that the heading of the motion circulated to honorable members is, "Land Tax Bill". Ever since I have been a member of this House I have heard members of the Country Party talking about land tax in rather heated terms.

Mr. BIRRELL.—Not now.

Mr. WILTON.—It is extraordinary. The Committee is entitled to an explanation.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! It is normal practice for taxing Bills to be founded on a resolution initiated by a Minister. The motion is self-explanatory. I hope that I do not see any unseemly Parliamentary behaviour while I am on my feet.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The motion is not self-explanatory by any means to the Opposition or to the Parliament. To use his own words, the Minister of Labour and Industry moved, "the resolution in the hands of honorable members".

If it is the common practice of this Government to propose a motion without explaining it, it is not the common practice of the Opposition to accept that treatment. The circulated document setting out the motion to be proposed in the Committee of Ways and Means suggests that the Premier and Treasurer is to move it. However, it has been moved by the first emergency, the Minister of Labour and Industry. I should like the Minister of Labour and Industry or the Premier and Treasurer to explain what it is all about. The motion states, *inter alia*—

That subject to the Land Tax Act 1958 as proposed to be amended by the Land Tax Bill there shall in the case of each owner of land be charged levied collected and paid for the use of Her Majesty for the year commencing on the 1st day of January, 1972 and ending on the 31st day of December, 1972 the duty of land tax upon land as provided in the Table appended hereto:

Provided that the minimum amount of tax payable for the said year by any taxpayer assessed under the Land Tax Act 1958 as so proposed to be amended shall be $1.

That does not mean anything to this Parliament unless it is fully explained by the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! This Bill will be founded on a resolution which merely sets out the details incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—That is so, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Opposition

are entitled to have it explained to them. Victoria has come to a sorry pass if the Minister lumps a taxing Bill on the table and says, "There it is; the resolution now in the hands of honorable members". With respect, the Clerk of the House must explain the procedure to the Minister.

Mr. BILLING.—We have missed you all day.

Mr. HOLDING.—If the House had missed the honorable member for Heatherton, it would be a mark of singular achievement for this Parliament. Parliament is not going to be made a joke of by the Minister or by the Government. Mr. Chairman, you have a duty to have this motion explained to you. One could suggest that the Minister should extend even that minimal courtesy to the Chairman. I do not agree with my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who said that the Bill should be explained by the first emergency, the Minister of Labour and Industry. He is the third emergency. It is not good enough; the Opposition is not going to be treated in this way. After all, this is the Government that introduces a taxation measure one day and removes it the next. We have no guarantee that the Government will proceed with the measure or that this Minister even understands it. Until the honorable gentleman explains it, the Opposition will take the Bill a piece at a time and go through it.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The motion that I have moved in Committee is in line with the practice that has been adopted on former occasions. The measure will be explained in detail at the second-reading stage which is the normal practice.

Mr. WILKES.—Members of the Opposition do not accept that practice; we have rights in this Parliament.

Mr. RAFFERTY.—The practice that has been adopted in the Committee tonight has been adopted for many years in Parliament, and it is the practice which the Government proposes to continue on this occasion.

Mr. WILKES.—We do not accept that practice.

Mr. RAFFERTY.—If the honorable member will read the motion he will see that it proposes certain tax rates for land tax. These rates are clearly set out in the table, which in itself is not a Bill. At the second-reading stage the Bill, which will incorporate the provisions in the motion, will be explained to the House in the normal way. That is the view of the Government and the view I am putting to the Committee.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Parliament should not be treated in a cavalier way by the Minister or the Government.

It is of no interest to the Opposition that the Minister states that he has adopted the usual practice. The fact remains that if the Opposition were prepared to acquiesce in the past, it is not prepared to acquiesce in the future unless a measure such as this is fully explained. The Minister did not read the motion which states, *inter alia*—

> Where the owner of land not being used for industrial purposes is an absentee the duty of land tax provided in the foregoing provisions of the Table shall be increased by twenty per centum and for purposes of this Table—

The Opposition wants that statement explained. What does it mean? What is the Government's intention in respect of an absentee owner? Surely, the Opposition is entitled to some explanation. The motion proceeds—

> (*a*) "Absentee" means a person who does not reside in Australia and includes a person who has been absent from Australia for at least twelve months immediately prior to the time when the ownership of his land for the purposes of the Principal Act is determined unless he satisfied the Commissioner that he resides in Australia, but does not include a public officer of the Commonwealth or the State who is absent in the performance of his duties;

If that is not a complicated statement, what is it? And the Minister says that the Opposition is not entitled to an explanation of the proposed resolution.

A measure that proposes definite amendments to the Land Tax Act and to impose penalties should be explained. It could be a penalty on the former member for Gisborne, who hopes to be a trade commissioner, if he has land, but the Minister is not prepared to explain it.

Finally, the proposed resolution states—

> (*b*) If at least three-fifths of the entire beneficial interest in any land is owned by absentees or if (where the land is owned by a body corporate) at least three-fifths of the issued share capital of that body corporate is held by absentees, that land shall be deemed to be wholly owned by absentees.

Apparently this does not appear in the Act. In spite of that, the Minister is not prepared to explain why it is included in the proposed resolution. Members of the Opposition demand an explanation. If we do not receive an explanation, we shall have to extract one from the Government word by word.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! The Minister has moved the motion in the hands of honorable members, and I quote from *May's Parliamentary Practice*—

> A ways and means resolution is a necessary preliminary to the imposition of a new tax, the continuation of an expiring tax, an increase in the rate of an existing tax, or an extension of the incidence of a tax so as to include persons not already payers.

Honorable members have a right to debate the motion which has been moved by the Minister.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—Mr. Chairman, thank you for your ruling and assistance on this matter. I very much appreciate that this is a necessary preliminary motion. By the same token, surely as members of this Parliament we have a responsibility to determine exactly on what we are voting. It may be that as a new member of Parliament I voice concern, but we have the absurd situation where a piece of paper is distributed amongst us. It is entitled "Land Tax Bill" and contains complicated figures which set out the exemptions the Government has established for absentee landholders. It also refers to certain beneficial interests. Honorable members are asked to vote on this immediately without any consideration of the principles involved and the details set forth in this paper.

As a member of the Committee, I am not prepared to vote on it without an explanation from the Minister. It is reasonably evident that the honorable gentleman knows nothing about it. He is not a third emergency —the Leader of the Opposition overrated him—he is the last emergency. No other Minister was present in the Chamber at the time. I hope the Attorney-General will extend the courtesy which is due to you, Mr. Chairman, to members of the Opposition, and even to the few members of the Government party present who have not deserted the sinking ship, by giving an explanation of what in fact is intended by the motion before the Committee.

It has been described in a cavalier fashion by certain back-bench members as a proposed resolution, and hence it should be supported. Members of the Opposition, who were elected by a larger proportion of electors than members of the Government, do not accept this principle under any circumstances. We have a responsibility to ensure that public moneys are spent and received on a proper and reasonable basis. I hope the Minister will not ignore the reasonable points put forward by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and that he will give a proper explanation of what is proposed and the proper process to be followed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I join with the other members of the Opposition in this Committee of Ways and Means in requesting an explanation from the Minister handling this matter on behalf of the Government. I draw attention to the piece of paper that has been circulated which says

it is a Land Tax Bill. It is a resolution to be proposed in the Committee of Ways and Means by the Premier and Treasurer. There has been no explanation of it by the Minister in charge of it. The Government produces to honorable members at the snap of a finger a detailed table of the rates of land tax. The table includes a complicated scale but no explanation of it has been given.

On the other side of the page—members of the Opposition turned it over but the Minister evidently did not—reference is made to an entirely different aspect of land tax—absentee owners.

Obviously it is a complicated motion, and it is evident to members of the Opposition, who have had it presented to them so bluntly, that the Minister has not given details. It may be simply a machinery procedure of the Parliament, but it is a complicated motion. No member of the Opposition or the Government party should be expected to decide such a complicated issue in Committee of Ways and Means without an explanation. It is obvious that progress should be reported and that the Government should consider the matter further. The Attorney-General has probably given the Minister of Labour and Industry some instructions. I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry again to consult the Attorney-General to see if the honorable gentleman can explain the motion to the satisfaction of honorable members to ensure that this complicated motion is not forced through Parliament, through the sheer weight of the numbers that the Government has.

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong).—The Committee is not dealing with detailed legislation. Am I right in suggesting that the proposed resolution has to be agreed to by the Committee of Ways and Means, and if the Treasurer introduced a Bill dealing with the land tax of Victoria, and put nothing in it, it would still be sufficient for the purposes of the resolution? In actual fact what happens is that the Treasurer historically gives a little more information than is necessary for the elucidation of honorable members, but if no rates were included the resolution would still go through the Committee of Ways and Means as similar resolutions have on other occasions. The members of the Opposition are aware of this and they are wasting the time of the Committee.

Mr. FLOYD (Williamstown).—The Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested that the Government will force this matter through by weight of numbers; I suggest the Government will force it through by weight of ignorance. Ways and Means is a procedure that comes from many years of tradition. No one in this Chamber knows what Ways and Means actually means. One would not send the junior Minister with a message because the kids would take the money off him, but the honorable gentleman is entrusted with the formidable task of pushing this motion through the Committee.

Over the years Ways and Means, a message from the Governor, and all these terms, have embellished the Government with something that flattens the Opposition. Tonight the Opposition does not intend to be flattened. Members of the Opposition want to know what Ways and Means actually means. Over the years when the kings of England wanted to find extra money to fight their wars on the continent they sent emissaries along to the House of Commons to find ways and means. We have fallen for this trick because we love tradition. I love tradition. I love the bands playing in the street and the Governor in his new clothes opening Parliament, but there is a limit, especially when junior Ministers who know nothing about the subject are put in charge. The Government talks about Ways and Means but invariably it is at the bottom of the Notice Paper.

It would be wonderful if the Minister sometimes explained what Ways and Means actually means. Of course, a money Bill cannot be passed unless a message concerning it is received from the Governor. This is the tradition that the Victorian Parliament is putting up with in 1971. I would not mind if the Premier introduced the motion, but when the "boys" are sent along to handle it and they know nothing about it, the Opposition has a perfect right to object.

At present honorable members are considering Ways and Means; later they will be dealing with Supply, and then Supplementary Estimates. All of these measures inform honorable members what the Government intends to spend, but none of them tells us what the Government has overspent. The Parliament is just drifting along. Apart from opening or shutting something, the Premier and Treasurer does nothing. The honorable gentleman knows what Ways and Means are, but he does not tell anybody. Despite the views of my colleagues, I thought the proposed accommodation tax was a good idea, but that view was not shared by backbench members on the Government side of the House. That has been thrust aside, as were the proposals concerning the Little Desert and the Royal Botanic Gardens.

The Committee is entitled to know what it is talking about, and the motion which is now before the Committee should be explained by the Minister of Labour and Industry. If the honorable gentleman does not know anything about it, the Government should send for someone who does.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—Honorable members on the Government side of the Chamber wonder why the Opposition objects to this measure and why it dares to ask for an explanation.

During the second-reading debate on the Land Tax Bill in December of last year, which is reported at page 2837 of *Hansard* of 5th December, 1970, the honorable member for Melbourne stated that when the Premier and Treasurer explained this Bill he said—

> For some obscure reasons which I have been unable to ascertain, it has always been necessary to introduce a land tax Bill annually to fix the land rates for that year.

In other words, the Treasurer has not the slightest idea why this Bill should be introduced each year. The measure now before the House consists of nothing but a table of figures. I presume the exemptions are the same, so it is quite obvious that as valuations increase from year to year so does land tax. This motion conveys nothing to the Committee. There is no explanation accompanying this measure, and honorable members are at a loss to understand it. This is absolutely wrong. I have seen no similar measure introduced into the House since I have been a member of Parliament. I agree with the Treasurer that the reason for this Bill being presented to Parliament every year is obscure, particularly as it is not an amending Bill. The Bill should be withdrawn.

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong).—All Bills which have anything to do with the Budget are presented every twelve months.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—It is extraordinary that a motion should be moved, and the Minister cannot give an explanation. The procedures of the House enable a motion such as this to be debated but, as a general rule, it is not. On this occasion, however, the Opposition joins issue because it has received no adequate explanation of the proposed legislation. The fact is that a Bill which imposes substantial increases in taxation is to be brought into the Parliament by way of resolution. No explanation has been given. If the Minister for Lands knew anything about Parliamentary procedures, he would know that any honorable member is entitled to ask for an

explanation of a motion which is being considered. That is how this matter started; and, indeed, if an explanation which was only half reasonable had been profferred by the Minister of Labour and Industry, the Opposition would not have objected. The Opposition does not expect too much from the Minister, because it realizes his limitations. If the Minister had indicated that he understood something about what was involved, the Opposition would have proceeded in the normal manner.

The Committee has received no explanation. It has been presented with the proposed schedule of taxes and there seem to be important matters of principle and policy involved, but the Government has not the courtesy to say anything about the Bill. It may be good enough every time an incompetent Minister rises for back bench members of the Liberal Party to genuflect and say, " Isn't he marvellous ", but it is not good enough for the Opposition.

In order to further record the Opposition's protest against the incompetence and incapacity of the Government and its Ministers, and its presumption that the Parliament can be treated in this manner, I move—

That all expressions after the expression " duty of land tax upon land " be omitted.

When the Minister is prepared to explain the words which have been deleted, the Opposition will consider the matter. The Minister can bring this matter back. We are entitled to protest, and this is the vehicle by which we are doing so.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I join with other members of the Opposition in criticizing the insulting fashion in which this matter of land tax has been brought before the Committee. The Minister has not explained the motion, because he does not know anything about it. He has made no attempt to ascertain its ramifications, and following this discussion I very much doubt whether he will attempt to give an explanation of the measure.

The newer members of Parliament have had little help from the Government in understanding completely what is meant by Ways and Means. They have had to discover that for themselves. I think the Minister, in not giving an explanation, has acted in a most objectionable fashion. It is all very well for honorable members who have been in this Chamber for years to sit back and pass judgment on newer members who have spoken and contributed to debates on many measures, but they are the least fitted to criticize those who have been members of the Parliament for only fifteen months or so. The newer members of Parliament have made it their business to find out what is happening, what are the procedures, how to actively participate in the business of the Committee and thus to faithfully represent their electorates. Many older members have not done that. They sit in their places and take everything while giving nothing.

I support the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. It demands an explanation of this motion by the Minister, because it proposes to increase taxes which are paid by members of the community. In passing, I remind the Committee that the cost of living has risen by 10 per cent in the past twelve months. It is also noteworthy that land valuations have increased and it is nothing more than realistic to expect revenue from the land tax to also increase. In spite of that, no explanation has been given by the Government. I have no doubt that my constituents would violently oppose this measure and would commend the action of the Opposition.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Although I have been in Parliament for a long time, I have never seen such a shambles nor witnessed such a display of incompetence. It seems that no Minister can explain this motion. The Minister of Lands is sitting at the table with a very gloomy look on his face. The Attorney-General is also at

the table, but I do not expect the honorable gentleman to explain the measure, for it is not within his jurisdiction. All we have heard is a paltry explanation from the back bench of the Liberal Party which was given in an attempt to obscure the inadequacies of this Government. The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is a sound one. It is designed to force the Government into explaining its own proposal. There is nothing shattering about this request or about the amendment. Up to now, no honorable member on the Government side of the Chamber, not even a Minister, has been prepared to explain the purposes of this proposed ways and means resolution. The Minister of Water Supply could easily emerge as leader of his party if he explained it. No honorable member on the Government benches is prepared to tell the Committee anything about the purpose of the motion or its effect. I have mentioned almost every front-bench member of the Government party, but I can obtain no indication that any of them is prepared to get the Government out of the mess, the shambles, into which it has got itself this evening.

Mr. BIRRELL.—That is your action.

Mr. WILKES.—Is it not incredible that the honorable member for Geelong, the only supporter of the Minister of Labour and Industry, says that it is because of the action of the Opposition that the Government is in a shambles? The Opposition is attempting to preserve the rights of the Parliament and the Government is in a shambles because it cannot even conduct the business of the House properly. Since 4 p.m., this House has passed one miserable little Bill to suit the " silver tails " at the Victorian Club. Now, the Government has the temerity to introduce, as its second effort, this proposed resolution in the Commitee of Ways and Means. The process adopted was for the Minister of Labour and Industry to move " the resolution in the hands of honorable members." There is no explanation of what the proposed resolution means, or its effect on the community and, apparently, it does not matter whether Parliament knows anything about it.

The Opposition puts the Government on notice now that this is the finish of this sort of action. The Government must be prepared to stand by its own convictions and introduce measures in a respectable way and be prepared to explain them fully, not only to the satisfaction of the miserable, backward, back-benchers on the Government side of the Chamber, but also to the satisfaction of the Country Party and the Opposition. We will not accept shoddy short-cut methods as instanced by the introduction of this proposed resolution by a lazy and incompetent Government.

It is unknown to the Committee whether the effects of this motion would be to create great hardship. It could exclude people who, to all intents and purposes, need not be excluded from the payment of land tax. It could fail to exclude people who should be excluded. The Committee is entitled to this information. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether in your experience in this Parliament you have ever seen such a shambles in what purports to be the Government of the State of Victoria? This is a simple, one-page, measure, yet the Govenment does not have the ability or intestinal fortitude to explain it to the Parliament. In the absence of any explanation from the Government, the Opposition is prepared to pursue its amendment to a logical and satisfactory conclusion in the interests of the Parliament and the people of Victoria.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—It has become clear from the observations made by the Opposition that its members are endeavouring to frustrate the will of the Parliament, as they have been doing to a considerable degree during the whole of the Parliamentary session. The Committee has just heard the Deputy Leader of

the Opposition say that he has no idea what is in the schedule which has been submitted to the Committee, and that he does not know what effect it will have on the community. As I said a short time ago, the practice adopted in this Committee tonight is the practice which has been adopted by the Committees of this Parliament for a number of years. The proposed resolution—it is not a Bill—is in the same form as other motions which have been presented to the Committee.

Apparently, some honorable members on the Opposition side of the Committee have read the motion and some have not. The schedule which has been submitted to the Committee by me is identical with the schedule which was passed by a Committee of the House last year. Therefore, it is utterly hypocritical for members of the Opposition to take the attitude they have taken. They were given their heads in dealing with this matter, and they have shown how inadequate they are. Many of them have attempted to show up the Government, but all they have done is to show up themselves. They have challenged the Government by saying that it does not know what is in the schedule, although it is precisely the same as that which was passed last year. A schedule of this type is presented annually, as all honorable members well know, and an identical schedule was agreed to last year by Opposition members. Now, they have the temerity to say that they do not know and the public does not know what is contained in the schedule.

All that the members of the Opposition have been doing for the past hour and a half is frustrating the will of the Committee. It is part of the image which they are attempting to create under the Leader of the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party. As has been demonstrated over many years, the Opposition does not have the ability to win sufficient votes to form a Government in its own right. Now, in frustration, it has devised a plan to destruct the Government and to delay its legislative programme as much as it possibly can.

Members of the Opposition have given a warning to the Government of the attitude they will adopt during the remainder of the session. In the past, the Government has always given them every possible consideration, and of course the rights of the Opposition in this Chamber will continue to be observed. But, if the Opposition aims at frustrating the will of the Parliament and delaying the passage of Bills, the Government will have to take what measures are open to it to ensure that the will of the Parliament is not frustrated.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Members of the Opposition are unaffected by the words of the fanatical windbag——

Mr. SUGGETT (Bentleigh).—On a point of order, I believe it is unparliamentary for the Leader of the Opposition to refer to a Minister as a windbag.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that unparliamentary remark.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I certainly withdraw.

Mr. SUGGETT (Bentleigh).—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you have not ruled on my previous point of order. I submitted that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition was unparliamentary and he should be asked to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The Leader of the Opposition is in the process of withdrawing it.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I certainly withdraw and apologize. I used an unparliamentary term and I withdraw it. The erudition shown by the Minister of Labour and Industry in abusing the Opposition was not equalled by his

erudition in explaining the motion. Throughout this unhappy episode all that members of the Opposition have sought from the Minister is an adequate explanation. This matter could have been finished an hour ago if the Minister had been prepared to give any sort of elementary explanation. However, one was not forthcoming. I want to make this clear to the Minister, who has a tendency to bluster and make threats like a pocket-handkerchief Premier——

Mr. GINIFER.—A mini-Premier.

Mr. HOLDING. — A mini - mini-Premier. I assure the Minister and his Ministerial colleagues that the rights of the Opposition are not determined by the Government; they are determined by this Parliament. He can threaten and bluster as much as he likes, and the day he or one of his colleagues wants to declare it on, we will be only too delighted to accommodate him. The honorable gentleman should make no mistake about that.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition nailed the Minister. For the past half hour the honorable gentleman has been getting assistance and advice from any quarter possible trying to find out what the motion was about. He has been trying to get some sort of explanation of the motion that he introduced. I have seen some pitiful and sorry performances in this Parliament but nothing more pitiful than the Minister calling for assistance from the honorable member for Balwyn and the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet. The Minister knows so much about the amendment that the Committee has witnessed the spectacle over the past half hour of back-bench members of the Government party wandering in the vicinity of the front bench, doubtless trying out the seats, being seized upon by the Minister of Labour and Industry in his efforts to obtain an explanation of the motion. The honorable member for Balwyn and the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet were tick-tacking in the Parliament as if they were at the Melbourne Cup and had found out five minutes before the start of the race that the favourite had been doped. That is no way in which to conduct the business of Parliament.

There was no need for this sorry episode to have occurred. If the Minister in charge of the Bill had been prepared to give a simple explanation of the proposition in the motion, it would not have occurred. It is of no use the Minister simply saying that the procedure he adopted has been followed for years. The procedure that is involved in Ways and Means is clearly set out in *May's Parliamentary Practice*. A motion of this kind can be debated at any time. It normally is not, because an explanation, no matter how minimal, is given when the motion is introduced. Honorable members are given a basic outline of the motion and they understand that under the normal processes of Parliament a substantive Bill will subsequently be introduced. Honorable members are entitled to an explanation of the basic principles of the motion and if one had been given the motion would have been agreed to in five minutes, as it ought to have been.

It is not as if the Minister was not asked for an explanation; he was asked for one by three members of the Opposition. When no explanation was forthcoming, members of the Opposition registered their protest by moving an amendment to the motion. The Government may treat the back-bench members of its party as if they are clowns in a circus, but it cannot treat Parliament in this way. The Opposition has always co-operated with the Government to enable legislation to be dealt with expeditiously.

Mr. BIRRELL.—I gave an explanation of the motion.

Mr. HOLDING.—I adopt the statement made by the honorable member for Geelong. As a back-bench member of the Government party he did his best to give the explanation that the Minister could not give, or failed to give. It was as valiant an interpretive effort as I have ever heard the

honorable member for Geelong make, but it was thoroughly inadequate. It was a meritorious and courageous attempt by a loyal back-bench member of the Government party. If the Minister had been prepared to make the same sort of valiant and commendable gesture when he was invited to do so, this debate need not have arisen. However, the honorable gentleman did not know what was in the motion. He made an earnest endeavour to read the motion quickly but it appears that his perception is not as good as that of some of the back-bench members of his party. He called upon the Minister of Lands for assistance and the honorable gentleman did his best. The Parliamentry Secretary of the Cabinet got into the act but retired to the corner biding his time. The Minister for Social Welfare retired with smug complacency; he has too many problems with social welfare. The Minister of Water Supply decided that he was not going to take part in this exercise; the honorable gentleman already has a lean and hungry look.

Members of the Opposition are starting to feel sorry for the second eleven in the Cabinet. Last week we thought the Chief Secretary was in dire jeopardy but his chances have been improved by the performance of the Minister of Labour and Industry tonight. Surely the problem is that the Minister of Labour and Industry has never been prepared to elucidate in two minutes the principles involved in the motion. Members of the Opposition have been left, like the honorable member for Geelong, to do their best. I hope that this sorry episode will not be repeated because it does the Government no credit. Members of the Opposition will not have Parliament treated in this way. The amendment has been moved to record their protest at this cavalier treatment.

Mr. SCANLAN (Oakleigh).—I had not intended to participate in the debate but I rise to make a number of brief points. Firstly, this amendment has considerably protracted the procedural stage leading to the introduction of the Land Tax Bill. Although members of the Opposition say that they seek to protect the public, it should be pointed out that this unnecessary delay in debate is costing the public thousands of dollars. The Minister of Labour and Industry has explained that the schedule to the Bill is identical with the schedule to the previous Land Tax Bill. I am prepared to table these schedules if members of the Opposition wish me to do so. They could then be easily checked.

Secondly, the amendment which seeks to omit the words after "tax upon land" from the motion, does not seek to exempt any landholder in Victoria from land tax but would have the effect of immediately removing the whole table from the schedule. The table includes exemptions that apply throughout Victoria. Yet members of the Opposition, by an ill-thought-out, shoddy amendment to the motion, seek to impose land tax on everyone in Victoria. That is indicative of a lazy, inept Opposition that has fallen into most incompetent practices in Parliament.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—I wonder what facts the honorable member for Oakleigh could put before the Committee on the amount in dollars that this measure would cost Victorians. As I look around the Committee I assume that Government supporters are like myself, paid whether they are here or not. I challenge the Government to meet regularly and more often instead of pushing Bills through at this hour of night.

The Minister of Labour and Industry has said that members of the Opposition voted for a similar Bill last year. That is not true; an amendment was moved by the honorable member for Melbourne to subclause (2) of clause 9 of that Bill.

If the Minister of Labour and Industry had understood the Bill that was debated last year, he would never have made that statement. A perusal of *Hansard* would indicate that members of the Opposition were not in complete agreement with the measure. The Treasurer then said that he did not know why a measure such as this had to be debated every year. That argument is still valid.

It appears that the Treasurer is at variance with the Minister of Labour and Industry. It was suggested that there is no difference between this Bill and the previous measure. That may be so, but the statement does not take into account that circumstances have completely altered. As the honorable member for Greensborough said, the valuation of land and the cost of living have increased. The motion does not provide for an increased exemption for the battler. It is still $9,000. If the members of the Opposition are not given the opportunity of adequately debating this motion they will not have the opportunity of voicing their opinions and exacting a promise from the Government that it will consider increasing the exemption. The Government should look at the altered conditions. After all, land tax is an impost based on valuations and ability to pay.

Mr. McLAREN (Bennettswood).—I refer to the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure of the Consolidated Fund for the year ending 30th June, 1972, and particularly to page 2, which clearly shows the estimates of receipts. This sets out not only the receipts but the payments which Victoria has to bear in the succeeding year. The document states that for the year ending 30th June, 1972, Victoria will receive $29 million from land tax. Against this is the actual receipts for the year ended 30th June, 1971, of $28,442,372. Honorable members have already had the opportunity, by reference to the Budget Papers, of understanding that the estimated receipts from land tax for the current year are exactly the same as the revenue obtained during the previous year. As the honorable member for Preston has queried this statement, it is obvious that he has not referred to the basic document upon which the finances of this State are founded. Apparently the Opposition is either without any information or background knowledge of the financial processes of this State and is in some way attempting to delay the operations of this Committee.

Several honorable members have already indicated that the motion which is before the Committee, and to which the Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment, is in exactly the same form as that for the previous year. The Land Tax Bill 1970, which operates until 31st December, 1971, was passed by the Legislative Assembly on 3rd December, 1970. I have carefully checked each of the items in the table of that Bill with the table contained in the motion now before the Committee and the items are exactly the same. Therefore, the amendment that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, as has been indicated by several honorable members, is pure humbug.

I refer honorable members to page 807 of May's *Parliamentary Practice*, seventeenth edition, where there is an explanation of the procedures under which this Parliament operates. Chapter XXX gives an account of the procedure in considering ways and means—in other words, the provision of revenue to meet national expenditure. Therefore, each of the Bills relating to the items of taxation listed on page 2 of the Estimates of the Receipts and Payments of the Consolidated Fund for the year ended 30th June, 1972, indicates a need for a consideration of this matter. One would think that honorable members who have been in Parliament for years would have accepted the motion before the Committee as a normal

process. If the Opposition objects to it, its members are going against the procedures to which they have agreed in previous years. As a member of the Government party, I object to the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition and I regard it as absolute humbug.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—It is ludicrous for the honorable member for Bennettswood to talk about humbug when he has just engaged in the greatest example of political humbug that honorable members have ever heard. When moving the motion, if the Minister of Labour and Industry had had enough common decency to inform honorable members of what the honorable member for Bennettswood has referred to, the motion would have been agreed to long ago. The honorable member for Bennettswood has deliberately attempted to cover up the inefficiency of the Minister by implying that the Opposition opposes the measure. The Leader of the Opposition made it clear that, to preserve the decency of this Parliament, it was necessary to move the amendment so that the Opposition could demonstrate to Parliament, and to every citizen who has any regard for democracy, its attitude concerning the Minister's disrespect.

Back-bench members of the Liberal Party and junior Ministers have attempted to extricate the Cabinet from a ridiculous situation. Then the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet decided to get into the act and, as usual, because of his own stupidity and ignorance, he made a complete mess of it. The honorable member had the audacity to imply that the Opposition was deliberately attempting to prevent landowners from receiving exemptions from land tax. Obviously, the honorable member knows nothing about the Land Tax Act, because section 6 provides—

> Subject to this Act there shall in the case of each owner of land be charged levied and collected by the Commissioner and paid for the use of Her Majesty in aid of the Consolidated Revenue for each and every year a duty of land tax upon land for every dollar of the unimproved value thereof as assessed under this Act at such rate as for each year is declared by an Act of Parliament.

The stupid-looking honorable member for Oakleigh——

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! Those remarks are unparliamentary and I ask the honorable member to withdraw them.

Mr. WILTON.—But he is stupid, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILTSHIRE.—Withdraw.

Mr. WILTON.—Out of respect to you, Sir, and the high office that you hold, I certainly withdraw the word " stupid ", although I think he is.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable member will, without reservation, withdraw the remarks.

Mr. WILTON.—Sir, the honorable member——

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! I ask the honorable member to withdraw, without reservation, the expression he used.

Mr. WILTON.—I will withdraw it in any way you like, without reservation or otherwise. In his attempt to imply that the Opposition was deliberately setting out to deprive people of land tax exemptions, the honorable member for Oakleigh made some remarks concerning the amendment. His comments indicated, at least to honorable members on this side of the Chamber, that he knows nothing about the principal Act or about the procedure which is now before the Committee. If the amendment is agreed to, it will have the reverse effect to that suggested by the honorable member in that no land tax will be paid by anybody. Members of the Government party should take this genius, who is at the moment occupying the position of Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet, away and show him in the principal Act where the principle is clearly laid down.

The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will have the reverse effect, because if it is agreed

to the Government will be denied the right to levy land tax as there will be no table setting out the basis of land tax payments. This is the purpose of the amendment, and even the honorable member for Bennettswood can understand that.

To clarify the situation further, I refer honorable members to *May's Parliamentary Practice*, seventeenth edition, at page 809 where, under the sub-heading "Taxation" it is stated, *inter alia*—

> A ways and means resolution is a necessary preliminary to the imposition of a new tax, the continuation of an expiring tax.

Mr. Chairman, you have already drawn the Committee's attention to that aspect. The Opposition's amendment, if carried, will have the result that no one will pay land tax, because the table is required to become a part of the legislation. The honorable member for Oakleigh did not know what he was talking about; as usual, he was speaking from the top of his head. All that the Opposition has been asking for is some brief explanation on the matter. Was it too much for the Minister to say to the Committee that the Government, as usual, was submitting the motion to the Committee for certain specified purposes? Surely that was not expecting too much!

The Minister of Labour and Industry did not even have the decency to apologize for the absence of the Premier and Treasurer. The circulated document setting out the motion bears the words, "Sir Henry Bolte: To move—". As land tax is within the responsibility of the Treasurer, one would expect the honorable gentleman to grace the Committee long enough to introduce the measure. I am sure the honorable gentleman would not have treated the Committee in such a cavalier fashion as did the Minister of Labour and Industry. How would the other party Leaders feel if one of their members did not have the decency to tender an apology if their Leader were absent on another matter? Does the Government now take the attitude that it is "kick where you see a head," and "make every post a winner?" Is its attitude, "jump in first, boots and all," and "never mind any of the niceties of propriety, make the most of opportunity" I have the greatest sympathy for the Premier. Honorable members are aware of the difficult task facing him. He must repeatedly absent himself from the House to carry out affairs of State, and the least he could expect from his own Cabinet is the common decency of an apology when he is not present.

I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. If the Government has no regard for the democratic processes of Parliament, the Opposition has, and it is prepared to do something about it. However, we know what will happen. When the vote is taken every member on the Government back-benches will sell his democratic principles down the river. The only back-bench member on the Government side of the Chamber who showed any courage was the former member for Gisborne. The claims by the Minister that the Opposition was deliberately frustrating the processes of Parliament were absolutely ridiculous. His action demonstrated how bereft the Cabinet is of any capacity. Apparently this measure was not even discussed in Cabinet.

MR. FLOYD.—Or even in the party room.

Mr. WILTON.—That is right. The honorable member for Geelong let the cat out of the bag and the Secretary of the Cabinet put the lid right on it. Obviously the Treasurer has said, "Fix that up; I'll be back tomorrow". The Minister has blown in like something out of a Walt Disney spectacular and gone through this rigmarole of moving a motion. Then the honorable gentleman

waffled on about the Opposition deliberately frustrating the Committee. His statement was absolutely stupid.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East).—The debate which has occupied a considerable part of the evening must cause a great deal of disquiet to any honorable member with any real concern for the government and the management of the State, because of the Government's complete inability to handle the situation that developed. It has been contended by Government supporters that the Minister of Labour and Industry has followed the normal procedure which has been followed over the years. In fact, that is not the case. If the normal procedure had been followed, as in 1968, this situation would not have arisen. It has been drawn to my attention by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party that, at page 1656 of volume 292 of *Hansard*, the following report appears:—

LAND TAX BILL.

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Land Tax Act 1958 to declare the rates of land tax for the year ending the 31st day of December, 1969, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

In the next volume, at page 2402, the *Hansard* report reads—

LAND TAX BILL.

The debate (adjourned from November 19) on the motion of Sir Henry Bolte (Premier and Treasurer) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The report of the second-reading debate then follows. Page 2498 of *Hansard* records—

The Bill was read a second time, and committed, *pro forma*.

The House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

At that stage, after the second-reading debate on the land tax measure, the motion fixing the rates of tax was moved in the Committee of Ways and Means. Therefore, today's procedure is not parallel to the procedure that has been followed in past years. If that previous procedure had been followed, this debate would have been completely unnecessary. This demonstrates the total inability of the Government to run the affairs of the State. However, in fairness to the public of Victoria and to those members of the Government who display some degree of competence, and apparently are absent from the Committee tonight, the Country Party is not prepared to support the amendment because obviously the Government requires the funds raised from the land tax which is proposed to be levied. However, the members of the Country Party would certainly like to register their protest at the incompetence of the Government, firstly, because of its inability to handle the situation that developed tonight: and secondly, for allowing the situation to develop in the first place, because if the normal procedure had been followed it could not have arisen.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The Committee is indebted to the honorable member for Gippsland East for his correction of the stupid assertion of the Government that this was normal practice. The honorable member pointed out how the Committee has been misadvised by the Government. Honorable members have seen a display of ignorance, and also some inconsistency, by members of the Government party. First, the Minister of Labour and Industry stated that the motion provided for a particular purpose. The Secretary of the Cabinet disagreed and gave an opposite interpretation. The only member on the Government side who realized what the motion did was the honorable member for Bennettswood. I suggest to the Minister and the Government that they should pay more attention to the diligence of back-bench members who ascertain what motions mean.

The Government should not give a further disgraceful exhibition of incompetence. Government members did not know what a simple

motion entailed—whether it related to exemption from land tax or a further imposition of that tax; whether it meant an exemption under certain conditions or a further imposition under certain conditions. Not one member of the Government, other than the honorable member for Bennettswood, was able to give the explanation. What members of the Opposition wanted was a simple, accurate, succinct explanation of the motion and we could not get it. Three different interpretations of what it meant were offered after a debate which lasted more than an hour. That is a shameful performance by a Government. Members of the Opposition believe the Government should be better informed in regard to its legislation. We tender no apology for serving notice on the Government that while it continues to present legislation in a shabby, shoddy way we will use every means at our disposal to bring the Government back to where it should be.

Whether the amendment is proceeded with or not is immaterial. It was necessary for the amendment to be moved so that the Government's attention could be directed to its failure to provide Parliament with a proper explanation of the motion. What happens to the amendment is a question for the Opposition, not for the Government. The Government should take warning from this exercise. In future, it should provide honorable members with proper explanations, as was the custom as pointed out by the honorable member for Gippsland East.

The Government has been found wanting tonight. In the mire of its stupidity it should take warning from the exercise and the debate which has taken place. If it does so, it will not have been in vain. I hope that in the future the Government will present legislation with which it is fully conversant so that it will not be necessary for honorable members to carry on a debate for four hours to inform the Government on its contents.

Mr. A. W. TAYLOR (Balwyn).—The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the honorable member for Gippsland East have both shown some ignorance of the procedures of this House. The honorable member for Gippsland East pointed out some facts, but he overlooked that in 1968 additional matter in the Bill meant that it had to be introduced in a different way. This occurred also in 1970. In answer to an interjection, I point out that I have been assured today that this is the normal practice, as it was in 1969 and in many previous years. *May* points out that in modern practice the only form of proceeding by which ways and means may be initiated is a motion moved in Committee. That is exactly the procedure that has been followed tonight. There is no extraneous matter in the Bill. In 1970, some special rates of land tax were introduced. In 1968, the year to which the honorable member for Gippsland East referred, the Bill contained some extraneous detail with which I am not familiar, but I know it contained some additional matter.

I point out that the schedule actually expires on 31st December. That is the reason why there must be a reintroduction of the schedule by motion each year, unless there is some extraneous matter in the Bill which necessitates a slight variation from the procedure. Furthermore, taxes apply for a year or for a number of years. Land tax is imposed from year to year: that is why the rates are set out in a schedule.

Another point is that, when criticizing the proceedings tonight, members of the Opposition overlooked the fact that they are just as responsible as the Government and that this procedure is followed purely for the purpose of maintaining Parliamentary control. This ques-

tion has been discussed previously by members of the Government and of the Opposition.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—If this debate has done nothing else, it has cleared the air and has shown the inability of the Government and the Minister to explain this minor measure. Never has the Committee seen such a flurry of supporters and clerks assisting the Minister to explain the situation. Taxation measures are the Achilles heel of the Government. It was announced today that the Government does not intend to persist with the proposed accommodation tax. This shows how the Government can be caught off-balance if it does not understand all the ramifications of a particular measure.

In one of the weakest arguments I have heard the Minister of Labour and Industry attempted to put forward the Government's case. The Opposition is not prepared to accept any motion that comes forward without adequate explanation and will use the forms of the House as occasion warrants. It is not a question whether the Government wishes to push through legislation; it has the remedy in its hands. The Government should be prepared to listen to informative debate and the requests of honorable members for explanations. It must take warning from tonight's argument that it is necessary to go through the exercise to ensure that honorable members on all sides are aware of what they are voting on or what they are asked to decide. Again, I point out that taxation measures are the Achilles heel of the Government and will be its downfall if it continues not to explain measures satisfactorily to Parliament.

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda).—The Committee has been treated to a semantic, hypocritical and unnecessary exercise. The real intention of members of the Opposition has been made clear by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds, that is, to prevent and delay by all possible means any taxing or budgetary device proposed by the Government. The Opposition wants to ensure that there is a running down of services such as education, social welfare, housing, transport, the provision of police, and law and order, and all of those things which honorable members and the citizens of Victoria realize can only be provided through taxing measures.

The points of procedure which have been raised by the Opposition are clearly irrelevant. They are made all the more irrelevant by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition admitting to the Committee that the amendment which has been moved by the Opposition is immaterial; in fact, if honorable members cared for a moment to pursue the amendment to its conclusion, they would find that although the Opposition's intention is not to have a land tax Bill, the amendment will bring about the opposite result.

I say that because the Opposition has moved that all words after the words " duty of land tax upon land " be omitted. The motion states, *inter alia*—

> That subject to the *Land Tax Act* 1958 as proposed to be amended by the Land Tax Bill there shall in the case of each owner of land be charged levied collected and paid for the use of Her Majesty for the year commencing on the 1st day of January, 1972 and ending on the 31st day of December, 1972 the duty of land tax upon land . . . .

In other words, the Opposition is prepared to impose land tax upon every owner of land in this State. That is precisely what the amendment means. The Opposition, which has been so keen to criticize the Minister in charge of this Bill, to complain that he has offered no explanation and to accuse him of misinterpretation, should look to itself. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has played down the amendment, because it demonstrates that the Opposition supports land tax upon every landowner.

Let it be made clear that that is not the intention of the Opposition. The Opposition's intention is to

delay the imposition of land tax to prevent services being provided throughout the State. The moving of the amendment has been a hypocritical and completely unnecessary exercise, and it has clearly illustrated that the only desire of the Opposition is to frustrate desirable legislation.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—If this debate has done nothing else, it has clearly demonstrated that the Parliament absolutely and quite clearly refuses to be treated as a rubber stamp by the Executive. I must say how pleased I am that back-bench members on the Government side of the Chamber have seen fit to present their points of view. It shows that the members have some concern about and knowledge of this matter. The same cannot be said for the Minister of Labour and Industry. By his extremely weak performance, the honorable gentleman has shown that he has no knowledge or understanding of the motion. The honorable members for Bennettswood, Balwyn, St. Kilda and Oakleigh have also shown that they know nothing about the motion. The Government is in disarray.

The Bill that will be introduced if the resolution is agreed to will impose a tax and it is a disgrace to the Opposition and the Government that the Committee should be in its present position. Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee has been discussing this motion for many hours, the Minister absolutely refuses to clarify its provisions. The Leader of the Opposition requested an indication of the Government's intentions, but this was refused. The Opposition is expected to be nothing more than a rubber stamp, but it will not. Members of the Opposition demand to know exactly what the Committee is now debating. This motion was no sooner put into our hands than the Minister asked us to vote on it. It did not matter that the Opposition had not received an explanation of the motion. The Opposition should be allowed to consider proposed legislation in a reasonable manner.

The Leader of the Opposition made it perfectly clear in his amendment that his purpose was to delay the consideration of the motion until the Opposition was given an explanation of it. This matter should be reconsidered by the Parliament. If the Government is not sure what is involved, the Opposition cannot be expected to understand it. The honorable member for Oakleigh, who is heir apparent to a Cabinet post, spoke on the motion and was as inept as the Minister. He said that this was merely a procedural stage. That is a disgrace surely, Parliamentary procedure allows members to rise and to ask what is involved in proposed legislation. The honorable member for Oakleigh dealt with the matter in a most cavalier fashion and indulged in nothing but cant and humbug. The Opposition hopes that the Government will reconsider its attitude on the motion and that in future the Opposition will not be treated as a mere rubber stamp. The Opposition is determined to fight for the people of Victoria and it will ensure that when it is debating motions in Parliament it knows exactly what it is doing.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I support the amendment. In his second-reading explanatory speech on the Land Tax Bill on 19th November, 1970, which is reported at page 2403 of *Hansard*, the Treasurer said that there were inequalities and inconsistencies between the commissioner's valuations and municipal valuations, and that it was desirable to eliminate them.

The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition highlights the fact that, because of increased costs over the past year and consequent increased tax payments, the Government should reconsider this motion. If the amendment is agreed to, people

who were previously exempt may be required to pay this tax because the exemption ceiling is only $9,000. Each person at present paying this tax could very well come into a higher category of tax. That fact alone warrants approval of the amendment.

The amendment was negatived.

The motion was agreed to, and the resolution was reported to the House and adopted.

Leave was given to Sir Henry Bolte (Premier and Treasurer) and Mr. Rafferty (Minister of Labour and Industry) to bring in a Bill to carry out the resolution.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry) brought in a Bill to declare the rates of land tax for the year ending 31st December, 1972, and for other purposes and moved that it be read a first time.

The motion was agreed to; and the Bill was read a first time.

CHIROPODISTS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply), was read a first time.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands), was read a first time.

LATROBE VALLEY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply), was read a first time.

HIRE-PURCHASE (FORM) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr. REID (Attorney-General), was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: DYSLEXIC CHILDREN—ROAD SAFETY AND TRAFFIC AUTHORITY: TRAFFIC LIGHTS FOR ESSENDON INTERSECTION.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until tomorrow, at half-past Three o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—I desire to bring to the attention of the Minister of Education the problem of dyslexic children in Victoria and their teaching. Recently Mrs. Sandall, of 36 Hoyle Street, Morwell, informed me that she is having great difficulty in getting the Education Department to teach her son, Paul. This boy of nine years is suffering from the condition known as dyslexia. The difficulties are similar to problems at present handled by the Psychology and Guidance Branch of the Education Department, particularly in the Latrobe Valley at the department's remedial centre at Traralgon.

Unfortunately, the problems of children suffering from dyslexia are such that even the remedial centres which the Education Department now operates in Victoria are unable to cope with the children. Recently the psychiatrist stationed at the Hobson Park Psychiatric Hospital in Traralgon estimated that as many as 600 of these children were in the Latrobe Valley alone. Of course, this causes great concern to those parents who are finding it difficult to educate their children. I also point out that in the *Age* of 26th April, 1971, an article under the heading " Slow Learners " referred to the problems of these children throughout the State.

I earnestly request the Minister of Education to take urgent steps to ensure that the type of tutor necessary to teach these children, and who I am led to believe has been perfected in

Sweden and in the United States of America, is introduced into Victoria as soon as possible.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I wish to ask the Minister acting on behalf of the Minister for Local Government in this House whether he will urgently discuss with his colleague whether the request of the City of Essendon to the Road Safety and Traffic Authority for the supply of the design for traffic lights within that city can be expedited. Recently, with the aid of Country Roads Board funds the City of Essendon carried out improvements at the intersection of Mount Alexander, Maribyrnong and Ormond roads. It involved a realignment of the roadways creating almost a right-angled crossing over Mount Alexander Road. The new design has completely changed the traffic flow which is absolutely unregulated at this right-angled crossing. The City of Essendon has done everything within its power to expedite the installation of signals, and has temporarily erected "stop" signs, but these measures are not enough for the traffic which uses this intersection. I am greatly concerned that there could be a fatal accident because there is a great volume of traffic at certain times of the day.

As I understand the position, the plans are simple. I ask the Minister to take up this matter as one of urgency. The City of Essendon is prepared to go ahead with its part of the job to complete the whole intersection. I therefore ask the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government——

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I think this is a matter for the Chief Secretary.

Mr. EDMUNDS.—I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I redirect my urgent request to the Chief Secretary and ask that he take this matter up with the Road Safety and Traffic Authority so that the installation of signals at this intersection can be expedited. There is certainly a high risk of accidents because of the lack of signals.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—In recent years, the Education Department has placed considerable emphasis on giving special assistance to slow learners and slow readers by making use of the findings of modern medical and educational research. I shall not bore the House by giving all the details, but I shall be happy to investigate the case raised by the honorable member for Morwell.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I shall be glad to take up with the Road Safety and Traffic Authority the matter raised by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.38 *p.m.*

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, October 13, 1971.

The PRESIDENT **(the Hon. R. W. Garrett)** took the chair at 3.28 p.m., and read the prayer.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME.

APPLICATIONS.

The Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

(*a*) How many applications for farm build-up and farm reconstruction, under the rural reconstruction scheme, has the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission received to date?

(*b*) What is the current position regarding the processing of and action taken regarding these applications?

(*c*) What is the percentage of requests for assistance for farm build-up of total requests in terms of numbers and the amount of money involved?

(*d*) Does this percentage make the Commonwealth requirements for lending impossible to meet; if so, what action has been taken to rectify the situation?

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The answers are—

(*a*) Applications have been received as follows:—

(i) Farm build-up	170
(ii) Debt reconstruction ..	1,851

(*b*) 1,430 applications have received initial processing, of which 580 have been declined, 152 have received offers of assistance, and the remainder are in various stages of finalization.

(*c*) Eight per cent of applications are for farm build-up. Statistics have not been kept to show the respective totals of amounts applied for.

(*d*) The Commonwealth legislation sets a general objective of one-half of the funds being applied to farm build-up over a four-year period. It also provides for a review of this objective from time to time. The Government has consistently brought before the Commonwealth Government its opinion that the objective of 50 per cent of the funds being applied to farm build-up cannot be obtained in the present rural situation. On 10th June last the Victorian Minister of Lands requested the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry to initiate discussions on an immediate review of the whole scheme, particularly regarding more flexibility of operation. There has been no response to this request from the Minister for Primary Industry.

MELBOURNE HARBOR TRUST.

RECLAMATION OF LAND IN FOOTSCRAY.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) What proposals are there to reclaim or clean up that area of tidal land bounded by Hyde Street to the west, Stoney Creek to the south and the Yarra River to the east?

(*b*) What authority is responsible for the area's control?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answers are—

(*a*) Arising out of a conference convened by the Minister for Local Government on 5th July, 1971, and attended by representatives of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, the Melbourne Harbor Trust, the Williamstown and Footscray city councils, the Lower Yarra Crossing Authority, the Lands Department and the Local Government Department, an estimate of cost is being sought for the reclamation and improvement of the area of the Stoney Creek estuary east of the Williamstown railway to the Yarra River.

(*b*) The area east of Hyde Street is under the control of the Melbourne Harbor Trust but, subject to a satisfactory arrangement being made as outlined in (*a*) above, the area may be transferred to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works.

LANDS DEPARTMENT.

FOOTSCRAY LAND.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) Under what departmental control is that area of land east of the Melbourne-Williamstown railway line and bounded by Hyde Street?

(*b*) What plans are there for its beautification and use?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answers are—

(*a*) The area of land adjoining Stoney Creek between the Melbourne-Williamstown railway line and Hyde Street is under the control of the Department of Crown Lands and Survey.

(*b*) When the problems of drainage in this area are attended to (see answer to previous question on this subject), it is proposed that the areas be placed under the Williamstown and Footscray city councils (for the areas south and north of the Stoney Creek respectively) for development for recreational purposes.

SHIRE OF WOORAYL.

GRANT FOR AMENITIES.

The Hon. R. W. MAY (Gippsland Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

Has the Local Government Department received from the Shire of Woorayl an application for a grant for toilet and other facilities to serve the basketball courts at Leongatha; if so—(i) on what date was the application received; (ii) was consideration given to granting a priority to the application; and (iii) when is it anticipated that a grant will be available for such works?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer is—

(i) An application was received on 13th July, 1970, from the Shire of Woorayl for a special subsidy of $12,000 from the Municipalities Assistance Fund (over and above the normal upper limit available to each municipality) for construction of a pavilion to serve the basketball courts at Leongatha.

(ii) and (iii) Subsidies of this special nature can be allocated only after all of the normal demands on the Municipalities Assistance Fund have been met.

Because of the increases recently made in these normal allocations, it will not be possible to make a special allocation to the Shire of Wooryl for this purpose during 1971-72, nor can there be any guarantee of this in future years.

SPASTIC CHILDREN'S SOCIETY OF VICTORIA INC.

GOVERNMENT GRANT.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

Is the Minister aware that the Spastic Children's Society of Victoria Inc. anticipates a deficit of $300,000 in addition to a bank overdraft of $300,000 for the current year; if so, why has the Government endangered the carrying on of the magnificent work of the society by lowering the 1970-71 grant from $100,000 to $50,000?

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The answer is—

The society has requested the Government to give special consideration to its financial position for 1971-72 and it has undertaken to supply details of its budget estimates for the year together with a detailed statement of the particular matters which it desires to raise with the Government on the welfare of spastic children and adults in Victoria generally. This information has not yet been supplied by the society.

The grants referred to by the honorable member are not the only grants made available to the society by the Government. They were special emergency grants of assistance to supplement the maintenance grants made available by the Hospitals and Charities Commission.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

SECONDARY SCHOOL LIBRARIES: STAFFING.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province) asked the Minister of Public Works—

Following the provision of the Commonwealth library block to State secondary schools, what arrangements are normally made to adequately staff them where no library facilities existed previously?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—The answer is—

The staffing officer will provide teacher-librarians where such are available; it is not possible to provide library aides.

DOG-RACING.

REPRESENTATION ON TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL (Melbourne Province) asked the Minister for State Development—

Has the Melbourne Greyhound Racing Association, the Sandown Racing Company, or the Association of Victorian Country Greyhound Racing Clubs made any request to the Chief Secretary for representation on the Totalizator Agency Board; if so, has he given any consideration to a member representing each body, as racing clubs are represented?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—I am advised by the Chief Secretary that he has received representations from each of these bodies, and that these representations are being considered.

AUSTRALIAN MARINAS (AUSTRALASIA) PTY. LTD.

DIRECTORS AND SHAREHOLDERS: HOTEL-MOTEL AT ST. KILDA.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province) asked the Minister of Agriculture—

(*a*) Who are the directors and shareholders of Australian Marinas (Australasia) Pty. Ltd?

(*b*) What arrangements have been entered into between Australian Marinas (Australasia) Pty. Ltd. and the St. Kilda City Council?

(*c*) At what stage are discussions between the council and the Minister of Lands concerning the building of a hotel-motel on the marina foreshore between Brooks Jetty and Point Ormond, St. Kilda?

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—The Minister of Lands has supplied the following answers:—

(*a*) Directors registered by the Registrar of Companies:

Archibald Wilberforce Spooner of Ballamore Park, Ferntree Gully Road, Scoresby, company director.

Norman Harold Spooner of 337 Glen Eira Road, Caulfield, company director.

John Barry Spooner of Ferntree Gully Road, Scoresby, director.

Rodney Brian Spooner of Ferntree Gully Road, Scoresby, director.

Shareholders registered by the Registrar of Companies:

A. W. Spooner
N. H. Spooner
John-San Enterprises Pty. Ltd.

(*b*) Pursuant to the St. Kilda Land Act 1965, No. 7348, the corporation of the City of St. Kilda has entered into a lease with Australian Marinas (Australasia) Pty. Ltd. for a term of 50 years from 1st May, 1969, for the purposes of a marina.

(*c*) Representations have been made by Australian Marinas (Australasia) Proprietary Limited for permission to build a hotel-motel and the extension of the maximum term of the lease provided in the Act from 50 years to 75 years. The company and the St. Kilda City Council were both advised that, as this request would require amendments to the St. Kilda Land Act 1965, the Minister was not prepared to give consideration to the submission unless and until a specific request was made by the council, at whose request the initial legislation was introduced.

A letter dated 12th October, 1971, from the St. Kilda City Council to the Minister formally requests that the St. Kilda Land Act 1965 be amended to provide for the company's proposals.

The matter is now under consideration.

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION.

RIVER MURRAY: PRIVATE DIVERSIONS OF WATER.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) asked the Minister for State Development—

(*a*) What volumes of water have been reserved for private diversion from various sections of the River Murray?

(*b*) What volumes of water have been taken up by private diverters in each case?

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—The answers are—

(*a*) Between Lake Hume and the Nyah pumping station—20,000 acre-feet.

Between Nyah pumping station and the South Australian border—60,000 acre-feet.

(*b*) Between Lake Hume and Nyah pumping station approximately 12,500 acre-feet has been allocated under licence.

Between Nyah pumping station and the South Australian border approximately 29,000 acre-feet has been allocated under licence.

MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN BOARD OF WORKS.

GREEN WEDGE AREAS.

The Hon. W. G. FRY (Higinbotham Province) asked the Minister for Local Government—

(*a*) Has he any information concerning the proposed green wedge areas in the metropolitan area?

(*b*) Has he any information as to when the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works amendment to the Melbourne metropolitan planning scheme concerning these areas, and other matters, will go on exhibition?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answers are—

(*a*) Yes. Following reports from the Town and Country Planning Board and Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in 1967 respectively entitled "Organization for Strategic Planning" and "The Future Growth of Melbourne" the Government adopted the policy of controlled outward corridor growth for Melbourne, with retention of substantial wedges of open country between growth corridors. Details of that policy were announced to this House by my predecessor on 21st February, 1968.

(*b*) The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works amending planning scheme will implement that policy, and is expected to be placed on public exhibition next month.

ACQUISITIONS OF PROPERTY IN COLLINGWOOD.

For **The Hon. R. J. EDDY** (Doutta Galla Province), the Hon. A. W. Knight asked the Minister for Local Government—

How many properties have been acquired by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works in the area between Vere and Gipps Streets, Collingwood, for the purpose of constructing a road?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—The answer is—

For the purpose of widening Hoddle Street the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has currently acquired fifteen properties reserved in the planning scheme.

Within the area currently reserved in the Metropolitan planning scheme for proposed secondary road purposes between Vere and Gipps Streets, Collingwood, the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has acquired, at the request of owners, a total of six properties.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

LEVEL CROSSINGS IN KYABRAM.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province) asked the Minister of Public Works—

Has the decision announced in March this year by the Railway Department that finance had been allocated for the installation of flashing lights at the Allan Street and Albion Street crossings in Kyabram been reviewed; if so, what is the current situation?

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works).—The answer is—

The Borough of Kyabram was advised by the Railways Commissioners in March, 1971, that "in view of current works and priorities, it is anticipated that the installations will not commence before October, 1971."

This timing has been affected as the programme for installation of flashing lights at level crossings has been cut to accord with the finance available from the Level Crossings Fund.

The installations at the two level crossings mentioned are not now expected to be carried out this financial year. If additional revenue were made available to the Level Crossings Fund, the programme could be reviewed.

PRIVACY (CONTROL OF PERSONAL INFORMATION) BILL.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL (Monash Province).—I move—

That the following Order of the Day be read and discharged:—

Privacy (Control of Personal Information) Bill—Second reading.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was withdrawn.

CRIMES (INHUMANE PUNISHMENTS ABOLITION) BILL.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I dislike all forms of physical violence to man, woman or child. I dislike cruelty to animals, rodeos, seeing elephants forced to stand on one foot, lions jumping through hoops of fire, huge bears riding small bikes and bullfighting.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—What about league football?

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Any risks attendant to league football are voluntarily incurred, but why should animals be made to look ridiculous? Why should animals have to do the things humans ordinarily do, and humans not have to do the things animals do? Would the honorable member like to have a flank rope tied around his thigh? One knows what to expect when playing league football, but does the bull who enters the arena know what is ahead of him?

I say that by way of explanation, because the House may wonder why I oppose the flogging of a thug. Briefly, the answer is because it does no good, only evil. Therefore, why does the State flog the thug? It is because the State is fettered to a superstition that it does good. Flogging is a debauchery of mind and body. It is a cruel, inhuman and degrading torture. It is totally ineffective and leads to harmful results. Its justification is primitive and sadistic and finds common expression in the words, "The thug commits violence to the person of another. Why should not the State retaliate by committing violence to the thug?" I should hate to live in a community which did not believe itself to be above the level of a thug.

As with capital punishment, a wealth of informed opinion is available on this subject. Briefly, this material establishes that the infliction of corporal punishment has no effect on the crime rate. In common with capital punishment, from the dawn of history corporal punishment has had a pretty fair trial. This torture takes its place with mutilation, the rack, the stocks and the pillory, which also had no effect on the crime rate and were dropped. The only effect these punishments had was to degrade the offender further without deterring others.

This also applies to flogging, which is a vicious, cruel, senseless act on the part of society, and once

inflicted makes the task of reformation uncertain and perhaps impossible. In Victoria this form of punishment is still on the statute-book but is used so sparingly as to have become obsolete. The last whipping took place in 1958. Certainly there have been no other floggings since the war and probably there have not been more than half a dozen in the past 40 years. I can remember some of them, but I do not think my recollections would assist the House. However, it may surprise honorable members to learn that corporal punishment was, generally speaking, abolished in Britain as long ago as 1861—not 1961.

In view of recent debates on the vagrancy laws, the House will not be surprised that corporal punishment remained for males convicted of being incorrigible rogues under the Vagrancy Act. I understand that the expression "incorrigible rogue" means a person who does not wish to work. Any person declared to be an incorrigible rogue was liable to be flogged. The shooting of the sovereign, an ambassador or his servants and the irregular slaughtering of cattle and horses, curiously enough, attracted the penalty of flogging which, as I have said, has been abolished. Since then, some sporadic attempts have been made to revive it in Britain, but they have all been rejected.

In Britain, in fact everywhere in the world, the most revolting forms of punishment were available to deal with the incidence of crime but they accomplished nothing. Historically, the most revolting forms of punishment were reserved for the "lower orders". Under the ancient criminal law in Britain, most of which we inherited, although not these provisions, a person's rank in society would determine not only what court dealt with him but also the range of punishment that could be inflicted upon him.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—Some of them had their heads taken off, too.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—That is so, of course.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—The upper strata—not the boys round the town.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Mostly they lost their heads, not for crimes in the sense that we speak of crimes against the criminal law, but because in the opinion of the sovereign they had become too ambitious.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—Some of the sovereigns lost their heads, too.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—That was a political struggle, but it must not be confused with what was done to the lower orders. Being a political struggle, it found its way into the administration of the law, and provision was made for Lords and persons of wealth and power to be excluded from the range of punishment that was so lavishly available to the populace.

Flogging has done no good, but if it is to continue on the statute-book—His Honour Mr. Justice Gillard pointed this out recently—as would seem likely in Victoria, which on present indications would seem to be the last State in the world to contemplate the abolition of either hanging or flogging, is it not time that some examination was made of the criminal activities which should attract the penalty of flogging today?

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Mr. Galbally is now coming round to my way of thinking.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—It has taken Mr. Swinburne quite a long time, but he must get some comfort and solace from the fact that at last he is making some progress. Indeed, as Mr. Swinburne would know, this matter has been carefully examined from time to time by committees in Great Britain. I shall not refer to them, as no doubt the House is familiar with them, but they came up with the answer, "No flogging." In Victoria no examination into this subject has been conducted. It seems

that on penal reform and flogging the Government knows more and more the less research and inquiry it does. Eventually the Government can be expected to know everything that is to be known upon the subject by reason of the fact that it has done nothing whatever to find out about anything at all on the subject-matter!

Most people would naturally associate flogging with crimes of personal violence. Is it to be reserved for those offenders, in the light of modern conditions? After all, flogging probably belonged to a rural community. For what forms of violence should we reserve flogging today in the light of the activities of the motorist? If it is to be reserved for crimes of violence, it must be remembered that many such crimes are committed today by persons using motor cars. They are safe in the car, but, recklessly or drunkenly, they run through a safety zone and cripple and kill. This is a crime of violence to which some consideration should be given having regard to the depredation every day on the roads.

Again, many of the crimes committed are against the community and not against the individual. How should these offenders be dealt with? The predatory fraudulent activities in this financial arcanum of the modern Babylon rob the country and tarnish our reputation. What about those people? Is it not time that the Government said that if it was not going to abolish flogging it should at least examine its implications and its effect, and determine whether it aids the reformation of the wrongdoer? I believe that most people today consider reformation is an essential if not the better part of the punishment. We derived many good things from the Roman law; but flogging was not one of them.

It was the fashion in Imperial Rome to scourge offenders on the Colosseum and then force them to engage in mortal combat. In 410 A.D. a monk named Telemachus was so overcome that he jumped into the blood-soaked arena to stop this dreadful exhibition. The contestants were providing entertainment for the blood-hungry mob. Telemachus lost his life; his gesture was useless. Imperial Rome was not impressed; the scourging and the blood went on unabated. An earthquake—not the government of Imperial Rome—put an end to this frenzy of cruelty. The Colosseum was rendered unsafe in an earthquake half a century later. Sometimes I think only an earthquake will move the Government to consider penal reform.

Before I conclude, I shall refer briefly to the provisions of the Bill relating to solitary confinement, which attracted some unfavourable comments when a similar measure was previously debated in this House. To me, solitary confinement is an inhumane form of punishment. If this House feels that it could accept my Bill without the provision relating to solitary confinement, I shall be prepared to move for the deletion of the relevant provision during the Committee stage. Although I do not believe in solitary confinement, I would be willing to sacrifice that part of the Bill in order to remove the stain of flogging from our society.

On the motion of the Hon. W. M. Campbell, for the Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 20.

VAGRANCY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 15) on the motion of the Hon. J. W. Galbally (Melbourne North Province) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—This Bill contains two separate and distinct proposals: Firstly, the repeal of the insufficient means provisions of section 5 of the principal Act; and, secondly, the repeal of the consorting

provisions of section 6 of the principal Act. Because the principles involved in each proposal are different, I shall deal with them separately.

Honorable members will recall that the first of the two provisions incorporated in the Bill was the subject of what I think was—and I am sure members in general agree with me—a most fruitful debate in this House during last session. Honorable members were impressed by the information and case histories produced after most detailed research by Mr. Clarke. I do not propose to cover in detail the ground which I traversed during that debate. It may be recalled that I indicated in my second-reading speech that if it were shown that the law had no purpose and acted harshly, the section in question should clearly be repealed, but if that were not shown, the section should remain in the Act. I further stated that if it were shown that there were possibilities of abuse or misuse of the section, Parliament should consider appropriate amendments.

The combined arguments of Mr. Galbally and Mr. Clarke convinced the House—this was shown by the vote on the second-reading motion—that the provision was, on occasion, open to abuse and that there were better ways of dealing with many persons who were the subject of a certain charge. As a result, I then gave the House three undertakings to which, I think, I should now refer to refresh the memories of honorable members. Dealing with the claim by Mr. Clarke that many persons who were proceeded against under this provision would be more appropriately dealt with by medical means or by care and attention of some kind, I pointed out that many magistrates in such circumstances did not enforce the law, and in fact, referred the persons in question to institutions, to social workers or to doctors. I said that it would be better if the law specifically required considerations such as these to be taken into account and specifically authorized a magistrate to discharge a person who had been charged to the care of an institution or to refer him for medical or psychiatric examination. I then stated—

> My first assurance is that appropriate amendments to the law to achieve these results will be considered before the spring session with a view to making the law more specific.

For the information of the House, I shall deal firstly with what has been done in pursuance of that undertaking. A number of conferences, which I considered to be very fruitful, have so far taken place between representatives of the Department of Health, the Social Welfare Department, the Law Department and the Chief Secretary's Department. These conferences have produced a scheme which, I believe, is infinitely better than the one which I proposed to the House during the Committee stage of the debate on the previous measure. The conferences came to the conclusion that it would be inappropriate in the first instance to charge a person who appears to be in need of care and protection with an offence under section 5. It further decided that there ought instead be a new section 5A which would result in a departure from the old procedure of criminal proceedings against persons who are in need of care and protection because of indigence, alcoholism or some acute condition, and enable a respondent—not a defendant—who appears to be in need of care and protection to be brought before a magistrate for reference to an appropriate medical or social welfare institution. A provision of this type would go a long way towards meeting the criticism that people in this category should not be regarded as defendants or treated as criminals.

The officers at the departmental conferences also concluded that section 5 should be amended to enable a magistrate, if he thought that a defendant ought to be more appropriately dealt with under the proposed new section 5A, to strike out the charge and instead treat it as an

application for the protection of a defendant under the proposed new provision. I have a draft of the new provisions which are much more detailed than I have outlined. I believe that in the interests of producing the best possible amendments, we should give further consideration to the draft proposals with which I am not entirely satisfied at this stage. Certainly, the agreements in principle, which I have indicated to the House, represent a vast improvement on the present law and an advance on the proposals that were considered during the last session of Parliament. Furthermore, they are more in accord with the principles which all honorable members wanted to see embodied in the legislation.

It will be noted that for good reasons, which I outlined in the House during the last session, the proposals I have foreshadowed do not envisage that the existing offence contained in section 5 will entirely disappear from the legislation. What is needed is a supplementary provision which will ensure that persons who are without means, perhaps because of some unforeseen difficulty, or suffering from some medical or psychiatric condition, should not be treated as criminals. Assistant Police Commissioner Crowley was recently requested by the Chief Secretary's Department to make a detailed investigation of cases handled over a recent period under section 5 of the Act. Whilst he does not purport to claim that his investigation gave him completely accurate figures—not all information was available in respect of the cases investigated — Assistant Commissioner Crowley indicated that his investigation appeared to show that approximately 55 per cent of those charged in recent times with the offence of insufficient lawful means of support were, in fact, persons more properly regarded as persons in need of care and protection. I feel that the investigation conducted by Assistant Commissioner Crowley warrants the raising of this matter in the House.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The investigation shows that more than one half of the persons charged were in need of care and protection.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—That is so; it emphasizes the importance of the proposed new section. Consequently, I believe the debate during last session has rendered an enormous service to the State and made a great contribution towards improvement of the law. Assistant Commissioner Crowley estimated that approximately 25 per cent of the total prosecutions under section 5 represented petty thieves, beggars and minor lawbreakers, whilst some 20 per cent represented professional lawbreakers. The existing section would, of course, be needed with respect to both those categories. I might add that the charge to which section 5 refers has, in fact, been used from time to time against known professional lawbreakers who are living in a state of affluence but against whom specific crimes might be rather difficult to prove.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—Are you referring to certain financial transactions in the news at the present time?

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—Mr. Galbally will recall the case of the late notorious Frederick William Harrison, a gunman and stand-over man of some notoriety. Mr. Harrison, being well represented, had a habit of getting off on many charges, but he was ultimately convicted and sent to prison for six months on the charge of insufficient lawful means of support, the magistrate being then the man who is now our present Crown Solicitor, Mr. John Downey.

During the debate on the previous Bill, I cited cases in which the use of the provision could be justified in many different ways, and of cases in which the proposed new section 5A would be useful. Therefore, I invite the House to withhold precipitate action on section 5 to enable completion of the studies which have been progressing on the proposed new pro-

visions. These will require certain administrative arrangements, including the availability of centres to which to refer persons in need of care and protection. The conferences to which I have referred have been heavily engaged in administrative preparation towards this end.

I turn to the second principle contained in the Bill which deals with the proposal to abolish the charge of consorting. Both this principle and the one with which I have previously dealt were the subject of a report by the Statute Law Revision Committee in 1963. That committee heard evidence from a variety of sources and its members unanimously affirmed the need to retain both the insufficient means principle in some form and the consorting provision. On the question of the onus of proof, the committee reported that whilst it upheld in general the principle of innocence until proved guilty, the provisions in the Summary Offences Act where the onus of proof was otherwise were expressed in such a way that until strong necessity had been shown for a departure from the principle, the committee was reluctant to interfere.

Dealing specifically with the consorting provision, the Statute Law Revision Committee considered evidence which suggested that the provision was sometimes abused by police to harass people. That was the case made by Mr. Galbally in his second-reading speech. The committee further indicated that it agreed that those comments were pertinent and that the original intent of the provision was to break up gangs and undesirable people who consistently met and planned crimes and the committee agreed that, as a weapon, the provision still had its place on the statute book. The committee said that the situation of harassment had been criticized by the courts but was fortified by taking the view that the provision will not work unreasonably under scrutiny by the courts.

No witness who appeared before the Statute Law Revision Committee, whether speaking on behalf of the Law Institute, the Bar Council, or any other source, suggested abandonment of the consorting provision. Various witnesses suggested modification of one kind or another.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—The committee may not have heard the right witnesses.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—The witness on behalf of the Law Institute was Mr. Galbally's brother, an expert in the field whose competence I would not challenge. Mr. Frank Galbally suggested the possibility of amending this provision so that it would apply only between the hours of sunset and sunrise. The committee rejected that suggestion. Quite clearly a dangerous situation would develop if large groups of known criminals were to consort freely together whenever they thought fit and for whatever purposes they thought fit. Such a situation would assist in the planning of criminal activities and would be likely to increase the range of criminal activities. Therefore, the consorting provision is a weapon in the armoury against organized crime.

I agree with Mr. Galbally that the provisions of this law could be abused unduly to harass a person who had formerly engaged in criminal activities and who sought to go straight. When the law has been so abused it has rightly criticized in the courts, and honorable members who read this morning's newspapers can recall one such criticism. This is the first reported criticism of this kind for a considerable period, although criticisms were made with monotonous regularity some years ago. I shall outline to the House the way in which the section operates and the guidelines adopted by the police.

Firstly, the mere association or an occasional meeting between a citizen with no criminal record and a person who has a criminal record does not and cannot constitute an offence. For

a charge under section 6 of the principal Act to succeed, it must be proved that a person habitually consorted with thieves, known prostitutes and persons convicted under section 5. Secondly, it must be proved that a person so charged has failed to give an account of his means of support. Thirdly, it must be proved that a person has failed to give the court a good account of his consorting. The laws thus restrict the activities and association of criminals and are a major weapon in crime prevention. Bookings and warnings by police operate to deter many young offenders who might be likely to drift into a life of crime through association with professional criminals.

I indicated that I would outline to the House the normal police procedure. The practice of the Consorting Squad is to require at least nine and frequently up to fourteen bookings over a period of not less than one month and not more than four months. Where a member of the squad sees a number of known criminals together with others, he may approach the party and question the individuals about the reasons for the association. If no excuse is given, the persons in the group are normally warned of the effect of the consorting section and their names are taken. In that event, a report is filed with the Information Bureau at police headquarters. If the bookings reach a figure of between nine and fourteen the case is examined to see whether the case constitutes habitual consorting, and if so proceedings are taken and the accused is supplied with a copy of the bookings alleged against him.

Last year there were 544 bookings for consorting but no charges were laid. The warnings had their effect and the law achieved its purpose without anyone being taken to court. This year there have been a little over 1,400 consorting bookings which have resulted in eight charges, three of which have been the subject of convictions whilst five cases are still pending.

The Hon. R. J. EDDY.—There were a couple of savage sentences.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I have the record of the accused involved in a case mentioned by Mr. Eddy which consists of four sheets of criminal offences going back to 1961. There have been consistent offences every year including a number of offences for dishonesty. He has been charged, as Mr. Eddy knows, with consorting and has received a sentence. It is to deal with these individuals that the consorting provisions exist to provide a protection to society and to young people who might associate with criminals and be led into a life of crime. The Government is convinced that this provision serves a useful purpose and could not support its repeal.

At this stage I do not ask the House for an adverse vote on the measure as a whole and I have no desire to inhibit the debate. I suggest that the debate on both aspects should proceed for so long as honorable members desire to speak upon them and that then the debate should be adjourned. I hope that, over the next month and in any event before the House rises, I shall be in a better position to inform honorable members of the more satisfactory proposals arrived at by the Attorney-General, the Chief Secretary and myself about paragraph (*a*) of section 5 of the principal Act. They could be dealt with in conjunction with this measure. Alternatively, if the measure is pressed to a vote, the Government would have no alternative but to vote against it and introduce its proposed measures for cure and protection as a separate Bill. I leave it to the House to decide the method to be adopted.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY (Melbourne North Province) (*By leave*).—I suggest to the Minister for Local Government that the debate on the measure be adjourned and that it continue when honorable members have had the opportunity of studying the amendments he foreshadows.

Otherwise, on one aspect of vagrancy we are in the Minister's hands as to what he now proposes. If it suits the convenience of the House, the better course might be to adjourn the debate at this stage. The Minister could indicate when the amendments were ready, and the debate could then be resumed.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—Any member may move the adjournment, Mr. Galbally.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I thought the Minister might indicate his proposal.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province).—I move—

That the debate be now adjourned.

In the circumstances, I suggest that the debate be adjourned until the next day of meeting.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—I have before me the rough draft of these provisions; actually, I think this is about the fifth draft. I am prepared to supply a copy of it to both Mr. Galbally and Mr. Clarke. This is not a political matter. We are endeavouring to get a change, an improvement in the law, which is acceptable to all honorable members. I would welcome any constructive criticism that honorable members may have for the improvement of the draft. I have indicated that, although I am delighted at the progress made by the officers who have taken part in this conference, I am at this stage not happy with the state of the draft. It may be that Mr. Galbally and his party and Mr. Clarke and his party can be of assistance, and we would welcome assistance from whatever source it came. In those circumstances, I think the debate should proceed next week, although I do not undertake to have a draft amendment in a form satisfactory to everybody by that stage.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE (Northern Province).—By leave, members of the Country Party are most anxious to proceed with the debate on this important Bill. We would definitely like it to go ahead next week and I ask the Minister to let us have this information as soon as possible.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT.—I will provide the draft forthwith.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to, and it was ordered that the debate be adjourned until the next day of meeting.

LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (EQUAL PAY) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 6) on the motion of the Hon. J. W. Galbally (Melbourne North Province) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL (East Yarra Province).—It was pleasing to me to read Mr. Galbally's second-reading speech on this Bill because I felt that for the first time in many such speeches he had made some progress. On all previous occasions he referred to the days of Caesar or Ulysses or someone like that. Mr. Galbally has progressed to the Bantus of South Africa of some 150 or 200 years ago, which is a tremendous step forward.

Secondly, when Mr. Galbally spoke about the members of the judiciary he took another step forward—the second in one speech, which I think is tremendous. Prior to last Wednesday, Mr. Galbally always referred to what Sir Leo Cussen said in 1912. Last week, he referred to what Mr. Justice McCardie had to say in 1939 on the dressing habits of ladies. I do not know what that subject or what the Bantus of South Africa have to do with equal pay for equal work, but some progress has been made.

In March of last year when the debate on a similar measure was resumed, the Government suggested to the Opposition that there was no need to enact legislation of this type because equal pay for equal work

was a reality. It was clearly explained to the House why that was so. We outlined the decision of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in June, 1969, and referred to approximately 80 determinations which prior to that judgment had been amended to grant equal pay. We outlined the various avenues in the Public Service—about 54 in all—and the additional 20-odd wages board decisions which since June, 1969, granted equal pay for equal work. This is a clear indication to members of the Government that the principle of equal pay for equal work has been accepted on a Federal level because of the findings of the Arbitration Commission.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—It has not been accepted on a Federal level.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It has also been accepted at the Victorian level.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—It has not been accepted at a Federal level; do not mislead the House.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—If it had not been accepted at the Victorian level, so many awards and determinations would not have been altered to provide equal pay for equal work. On this score I should have thought Mr. Galbally would have come forward and said, "That is not quite true. We feel that we would like to see the passage of this Bill because group A, group B or group C in the community are in fact being prejudiced because this Bill has not been passed."

One might feel that there is more in this Bill of Mr. Galbally's than there is in the Arbitration Commission's findings on equal pay. When one examines the criteria laid down in clause 2 of the Bill and those laid down by the Arbitration Commission, one finds that there is not much difference. Each provides for equal pay for equal work. Before this can be granted there must be a job situation wherein a female is doing the same job as a male counterpart. This must be the position before either the provisions of this Bill or those of the judgment of the Arbitration Commission can apply.

The Hon. J. W. GALBALLY.—I tried to explain that to Mr. Campbell years ago.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—I can conclude only by emphasizing that if there is a reason why this Bill is necessary the Opposition has not told the Government. As the Government feels that equal pay for equal work is an accepted reality within the community, it has no alternative but to oppose this Bill.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE (North-Eastern Province).—Once again, the House is debating a Bill to amend the Labour and Industry Act to grant equal pay for the sexes. I do not intend to go over the history of Mr. Galbally's measures or to debate what Mr. Campbell has said. Members of the Country Party see no useful purpose in the measure. This is a subject for the courts to consider following applications. As has been said, many applications for equal pay have been granted and many more will be granted when it is proved before the courts that work done by the sexes is of an equal nature. I do not believe the passing of this measure would give any blanket approval for the granting of equal pay or advance that objective one step. The matter must go before the courts and cases must be proved. I see no useful purpose in the Bill, and therefore members of our party do not intend to support it.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—This Bill has received scant courtesy from the Government. More than one year ago the Liberal Party held a conference and discussed the question of equal pay for work of equal value. It decided that women should receive equal pay for work of equal value. At the following election this was part of the Government's

platform. However, when submissions are made to the Government for the granting of equal pay, it replies, "Go to the courts". Unfortunately, our farmer friends in the Country Party who have not been interested in wages, also say, "Go to the courts."

I repeat what I have said many times previously when debating similar Bills that the passing of this measure would not enable one woman to obtain one extra cent. It merely asks the Government to express an opinion that women doing equal work or work of equal value should receive equal pay.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—What good would that do?

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—I always thought that a Bill should have a purpose behind it, that it was going to do some good in the community. Tell us what this Bill will do.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—If Mr. Campbell will listen, I will explain the position to him. This is a conservative government and in the history of conservative Governments in Victoria women have not achieved any wage increases from wages board determinations at the instigation of those Governments.

Mr. Campbell or those for whom he used to work always appeared in opposition to the unions in cases seeking equal pay. Nevertheless, as a result of union representations, 21 wages boards prescribe equal pay for female workers. These statistics are contained in the March issue of the *Industrial Information Bulletin*, volume 26, No. 3, at page 799. In 87 determinations only one set of wage rates has been fixed for adults, so that there is no distinction in wage rates paid to employees of the tramways and the railways. Twenty-eight other determinations provide for at least one classification. That has been achieved in spite of Mr. Campbell and his conservative friends who, at every point, have opposed the view that women should receive justice in relation to wage rates.

I propose to show Mr. Campbell why this matter has received prominence resulting from the growth of technology in industry. Following the second world war and in particular during the late 1950s Australia was suffering from a serious shortage of labour which the Federal Government endeavoured to cure by giving a great impetus to migration. In search of staff for its members' factories, the Victorian Employers Federation found that there was a surplus labour pool despite the influx of migrants. This pool comprised married women aged between 35 years—which was deemed to be the end of the family bearing age—and approximately 60 years. At that stage this group provided a large workforce of approximately 411,000 women who the employers said were then remaining at home, and could be gainfully employed. Employers' organizations sponsored certain publicity pointing out that many of these women were suffering from neuroses because they did not have sufficient work to occupy them during the day.

I now quote from the summing up of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission after its inquiry into equal pay, published in 1969—

> The evidence submitted before the court by Mr. Hawke on this issue showed that between 1961 and 1966 the percentage increases in the workforce were as follows:—
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Males .. .. | 8·1 per cent |
> | Not married females | 14·5 „ „ |
> | Married females .. | 69·2 „ „ |

This indicated that overall females showed an increase in the workforce of 35·4 per cent. Quoting statistics from memory, nearly 50 per cent of the female workforce is now comprised of married women. If married women were to be withdrawn from industry tomorrow, Australian secondary industry would be adversely affected. Women are playing an important part in the community and the wages paid to them provide a

large amount of the purchasing power in the economy. No export market is returning more money to be enjoyed in this country than is being paid to the women's workforce.

The submissions of the trade union movement on this matter have achieved great progress. The unions wanted all Governments merely to express as a socially desirable opinion that women doing the same work as men, and of equal value, should receive the same rate of pay. Until 1967, the industrial movement was not prepared to risk its successes in female wage negotiations by an application to the commission. I have explained this to Mr. Campbell both privately and publicly in the House. The industrial movement was not prepared to risk having a decision made by the commission on the consent agreements it had negotiated on the payment of the same rate of pay for work of equal value. If at a time when 21 cases existed the unions had made one application to the commission and the application had been rejected by the commission, it would have prejudiced the whole of the 21 cases in which a decision had been obtained by agreement.

Taking cognizance of the large part being played in industry by women as the result of the need for labour, in the 1967 national wage case the Arbitration Commission granted an equal increase in the base wage for women and men, despite its rejection of equal pay for women, but at the time the commission said—

> We invite the unions, the employers and the Commonwealth to give careful study to these questions . . .

I do not wish to restate the questions enumerated by the commission in regard to the desirability of equal pay. The statement continued—

> with the knowledge that the Commission is available to assist by conciliation or arbitration in the resolution of the problems.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—The first time the honorable member knew that was when we told him in 1967.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I have not heard such an infantile statement from a member who has this day raised no argument and presented no case. All he did was to abuse my Leader and refer to Bantus. The honorable member has to make some extraordinary statement to get through.

The industrial movement made certain submissions in the national wage case in 1967, which cost it between $40,000 and $50,000. That money had to be spent to fight men like Mr. Campbell and those who represented his point of view in court so that the industrial movement could obtain wage justice.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Why pick on me?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—For a number of years Mr. Campbell was an advocate for employers. In the national wage case of 1967 the commission invited the unions and employers to take their case to arbitration. The decision handed down by the commission stated that it was desirable that the parties take cognizance of State legislation. In its decision the commission drew attention to the complexities associated with the granting of equal pay to women for work of equal value, and cited a number of instances. The decision embraced nine points, and stated that the Arbitration Commission would accept the principle of equal pay, but that due to these complexities it would be based on women actually doing work of equal value, in the same volume, under similar conditions involving only work done by men and women. Therefore, nurses, typists, stenographers, many shop assistants, and a whole host of other people were predominantly excluded from any decision that should be made by the commission. The commission pointed out that the needs case was never investigated because, after all, the basis of the female wage was never related to the fixation of the family wage of a man, his wife and three children, which was the male base wage.

The establishment of the female wage was sought over 60 years ago. Since then times have altered. Today many women maintain homes and have the same needs as a married man. They may even maintain a mother, and possibly children of widowed brothers and sisters. Therefore, there is a needs content in relation to the modern concept of family life. With all the qualifications stipulated by the commission very few women qualified for equal pay, but the commission took notice of those States which had made a social declaration in relation to equal pay for work of equal value. Of course, Victoria, together with Queensland, was conspicuous because it did not support this declaration. I quote the following passage from the commission's statement of the case before they gave their decision—

> Four States, namely, New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania had passed virtually identical legislation on equal pay . . . there is a belief in this community that the concept of equal pay for equal work is a socially proper one.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—What does that mean?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—With great respect I am trying to penetrate Mr. Campbell's thick skull and the conservative attitude of his party that there is a need for the Government to make a social decision on this desirable idea.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Who would benefit?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—The great dill blurts out again! One cannot sum it up in any other way. Mr. Campbell asks: Who would benefit? At least Victoria's name would have appeared among those other States which have passed virtually identical legislation on equal pay, but that would not impress Mr. Campbell.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—I am asking which ladies in the community would benefit if this Bill was passed?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—If this Government stated a socially progressive policy and did not merely mouth the policy of equal pay for equal work during election campaigns, and indeed firmly believed in this policy, it would be a guide to the State wages tribunals. The industrial movement would not have to fight for its life every time it took this issue to court.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—The honorable member knows that the industrial movement does not fight it.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—How many times have tribunals sat in deliberation on this matter to be confronted by people like Mr. Campbell and his cohorts in the Liberal Party? Of course, the industrial movement has done something about it many times.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—The honorable member is speaking of 50 years ago.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I am referring to the applications that were submitted to the 1967 national wage case. Mr. Campbell's mob were there and the Liberal Federal Government paid counsel to appear and oppose the applications of the unions. The Liberal State Government intervened and used taxpayers' money to ensure that the women did not receive justice.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Why does the honorable member not answer the question: Who will benefit?

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Perhaps I can answer the question in this way. Certain work can be performed by women much more proficiently than by men. Therefore, in January, 1970, the Ice Cream Wages Board made a determination whereby equal pay, to be introduced in annual stages, was awarded to the classification "Cake Decorator (female), i.e., a person who is competent to decorate to standards required," there being a similarly defined male classification. The employers were not satisfied with the decision and appealed to the Industrial Appeals Court on the ground that men did not do this

work and that only women were employed. The employers claimed that they should not have to pay the women the equivalent of the male rate, and they won their appeal. What the employers were saying in essence was that although women could decorate cakes more beautifully and better commercially than men, they must be employed at a reduced rate of pay simply because they were women.

All I want the Government to do is to make a statement of its policy on the principle of the employment of women and their entitlement to receive equal pay for work of equal value. By interjection earlier Mr. Campbell asked who would benefit. If the Victorian and Queensland Governments had made a statement on this principle perhaps the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission may have excluded that part of its judgment which stated that the work must be that done by men and women. As a typical example I refer to the manufacture of light globes and transistor radios. In a progressive technological age men cannot do this fine manipulative work as well as women can. The only men employed in this industry are supervisors. The work is done by girls between the ages of 16 and 20 years and they have to be phased out because their eyesight deteriorates by the time they are 22 years of age. Yet, these women are paid only 75 per cent of the male rate because the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has decided that women are not entitled to receive equal pay unless the work they are doing is also done by men.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—That condition is laid down in the Bill being debated.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—It is, but Mr. Swinburne will not accept it. All I want is for the Government to make a statement on the principle of equal pay for women.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—It is in the Bill, but Mr. Tripovich is moaning about it.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I am entitled to moan about it because members of the Labor Party spend about 60 per cent of their time trying to get the Government away from its eighteenth century thinking. The trade union movement has little respect for the type of treatment it receives from the Government and the stage has almost been reached when it can do without the Government and the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The advantages that the trade union movement has gained over the years in wage justice for women have been achieved despite the actions of Conservative Governments and the people whom they represent. The trade union movement has been successful in latter years not because of the need for wage justice but because employers cannot get people to work for them unless they pay good wages.

The Bill was introduced in the hope that the Government would make a statement on the principle of equal pay for women, but Mr. Campbell was prepared to proceed with the debate without studying developments that have occurred since last year. The honorable member was prepared to say, " I oppose equal pay for women." In fact, Mr. Campbell had to be induced to agree to an adjournment of the debate. When the debate was resumed he said something about the Bantus, got a bit of a laugh and sat down.

I make an appeal to the Government to rid itself of its eighteenth century thinking. It should realize that today employers have to pay women a reasonable wage to get them to work.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—Women are getting equal pay today.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Yes, because that is the only way in which the employers can get them to do the work. There is not one girl in the press gallery taking notes of the

debates who does not receive consideration from her employer as a human being; she does not receive this consideration because she is a woman and therefore of less value than a man, as Mr. Campbell suggests. The Liberal Party has survived because it was always prepared to put forward suggestions that would save the employers a dollar and that principle will enable the Liberal Party to survive until such time as society ends.

Unfortunately, it appears that I cannot drag the Government away from its eighteenth century thinking. This does not matter industrially, but I am disappointed that the Government will not make a statement on equal pay for women similar to the statements made by the Governments of Western Australia, New South Wales, South Australia and Tasmania. Those Governments stated that they believe women should receive equal pay for work of equal value.

Years ago members of the Labor Party used to take cognizance of the fact that it was defeated in its attempts to introduce progressive reforms and we used to feel sorry for the women in the community who were denied their rights. Today it does not matter if we are defeated, but every defeat shows up the Government for what it is—a Conservative Government totally opposed to social reform. The Government will not give wage justice to females.

The House divided on the motion (the Hon. R. W. Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	9
Noes	26
Majority against the motion	17

AYES.

Mr. Eddy	Mr. Tripovich
Mr. Elliot	Mr. Walton.
Mr. Galbally	*Tellers:*
Mr. Kent	Mr. O'Connell
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Knight.

NOES.

Mr. Bradbury	Mr. Houghton
Mr. Byrne	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Campbell	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Chandler	Mr. Mansell
Mr. Clarke	Mr. May
Mr. Dickie	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Fry	Mr. Nicol
Mr. Gleeson	Mr. Storey
Mr. Gross	Mr. Swinburne
Mr. Grimwade	Mr. Ward.
Mr. Hamilton	
Mr. Hauser	*Tellers:*
Mr. Hider	Mr. Granter
Mr. Hunt	Mr. Dunn.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

The debate (adjourned from September, 29) on the motion of the Hon. Haddon Storey (East Yarra Province) for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech was resumed.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON (Templestowe Province).—I join with previous speakers in paying my respects and affirming my oath of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I congratulate the Queen's representatives, Sir Rohan and Lady Delacombe, upon their outstanding work during their term of office.

I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on their excellent speeches. One was a maiden speech and the other had some fine virtues. In moving the motion, Mr. Storey dealt mainly with the liberty of the individual and environmental control. I shall have something to say about environmental control and, although I agree with what Mr. Storey said on the subject, I shall approach it in a slightly different way. In seconding the motion, Mr. Hider dealt mainly with social welfare and penal reform. Penal reform is a matter which should and does interest almost every member of Parliament, especially honorable members in this place.

One of the State's foremost disciples of penal reform postulates that associations of guilt and punishment are a result of the human environment in which we live and not a genetically predetermined factor in

our make-up. This person also contends that we should dissociate guilt and punishment; that we ought rather to treat social wrong-doers as persons who have something akin, but not the same, to a mental deficiency. Until misbehaviour and unacceptable social conduct can possibly be treated in much the same way, he does not dismiss the possibility that electro-convulsive treatment, which in layman's terms is shock treatment, could be used in the psychological treatment of those who are habitually criminally minded.

I find it difficult to accept that punishment is not the proper reward for social misbehaviour, but I hope I am able to maintain an open mind and be open to the conviction that there are other ways of protecting victims of social misbehaviour who are selected at random. I feel that punishment is the proper reward for social misbehaviour although some people have gone further along the road and postulated that this is not so.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Would not punishment be a deterrent?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Punishment is a deterrent to wrongdoing in the community and should be regarded as such. I find it difficult to refer to punishment as anything else because I believe punishment is a deterrent factor and therefore safeguards those who are victims of social and criminal misbehaviour.

Urban planning is a most important matter with which provincial Governments will have to deal. In this context, I refer to municipal councils and State Governments. Both urban planning and environmental control will have to be handled by these authorities over the next 30 or 40 years. The problems with which we have had to deal concerning social reform may be said to be a part of the problem of environmental control because obviously the socially disadvantaged are living in an environmental atmosphere which most of us would consider to be substandard and undesirable. I would not rule out social welfare as a facet of environmental control.

Urban planning will involve the State Government in enormous expenditure and it will be difficult to obtain the finance. In a recent speech, the Minister for Local Government said that the possibilities of a betterment tax on land development raised the hope that it may be possible for such a tax to provide the funds necessary for the development of trunk sewers, water supply, electric mains, highways and roads of all descriptions, public transport, and for the provision of open space recreational areas. The difficulty that I envisage in this proposal is that the present system of financing such projects is with money borrowed at a reasonably low rate of interest. To finance the schemes by a betterment tax would mean that the money would be borrowed on a developmental rate at anything up to 15 or 17 per cent, which I understand is the current interest on money being expended on urban development. The interest on this money would become a component in the final cost of a block of land. Therefore, the object which some see of decreasing the cost of land to the suburban dweller would not be achieved because costs would increase rather than decrease.

The Government is tackling the matter from the point of view of planning policies. During the debate, Mr. Jenkins drew attention to the planning policies relating to the overall principles which should be adopted in planning various areas of the near metropolis. Honorable members are familiar with the statements of planning policy which have been enunciated and I shall not go through them except perhaps to comment upon the statement relating to the Yarra Valley. The House will recognize that, naturally, I have a special interest in this particular statement of planning policy.

The policy proposed for the Yarra Valley follows along the lines of the other planning policies because it seeks to ensure that what His Excellency describes as the beautiful Yarra Valley—there is no doubt about that—is reserved for the recreation of the future population of Melbourne so that the people will have somewhere in the almost immediate environs of the city to relax, enjoy the fresh air and participate in active and passive recreation. The Yarra Valley is the nearest, most accessible and most beautiful area to the metropolis because a greater part of the valley is within the area which will be subject to planning by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. This area extends along the valley as far as the boundary of the Shire of Lilydale in the vicinity of Healesville.

Unless people are permitted to live within sight of or near such an area, they will not be able to enjoy the amenities which are available. Planning for this area should provide for the possibility and probability, in fact the necessity, for urban development because many people will be prepared to work hard and to devote the results of their labour to the privilege of living in an area which is so open and beautiful, so that they may enjoy their leisure hours there. Admittedly, some people will prefer to be near a hotel, golf links, football ground, race track or some other facility. These people do not look for the type of recreation which will be possible in the Yarra Valley.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—Thousands of people have no choice.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—I agree and for those thousands who have no choice it is necessary to provide them with the ability to visit such a beautiful area and enjoy its amenities.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—How much would a five-acre lot cost there? The cost could have something to do with the ability of people to live in the area.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Undoubtedly it would be a factor, but I do not wish to argue about the price of land at the moment. I think some ratepayers in the Yarra Valley will be adversely affected, because in paying their rates they will be expected to provide amenities for those who wish to visit the area to enjoy its beauty. I think this is a matter which should be examined by the Minister for Local Government.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—What is the minimum holding in your shire?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—A quarter of an acre. The provision of transport facilities is an important part of urban planning. The honorable member who moved the motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply referred to this matter. It has become more fashionable now than it was in the past to promote public transport as the best method of moving people from one place to another. Previous opinions on the merit of freeways have changed.

It is proposed to build the Eastern Freeway which will serve large areas of Doncaster, Templestowe and Balwyn—in fact, all of the north-eastern suburbs—and it is claimed that it will alleviate traffic congestion in inner metropolitan areas and enable amenities in those areas to be improved, but I doubt whether it will have that effect.

Modern experience in America shows that freeways tend to become filled with traffic and do not relieve traffic congestion in other areas. They generate their own traffic. In view of that, the construction of the Eastern Freeway could merely result in increasing numbers of cars pouring into Melbourne and, eventually, completely clogging the city. All honorable members will agree that such a situation is most undesirable.

I ask the authorities who are responsible for planning to investigate carefully whether the railway which it is proposed to run along the centre of the Eastern Freeway should

not be built first, to ascertain whether the reaction in this State will be the same as that in America, where motorists drive quite long distances to a place which is eight or nine miles away from the metropolis, park their cars and then board a fast, comfortable train which travels non-stop, or with very few stops, to the city. I think this is an opportunity for such an experiment to be conducted.

Box Hill station, which is within my province—although I do not refer to it because of that—is the busiest station on the suburban network. An area of 9 acres of land is being used there for the handling of briquettes. I think the demand for briquettes is lessening, and that natural gas is taking over; but, in any case, areas in other districts could be used for briquette handling and the area of 9 acres which is close to the busy Box Hill station could be developed. I have no doubt that plans are being made to do this because it is considered to be a most important point of "modal interchange", as the planners call it; that is, a centre at which buses and cars stop after travelling to it for many miles to allow people to board trains for the city. The lines are being triplicated, and it should be possible quickly and comfortably to convey people to the city and avoid choking city roads. The cost of establishing these interchange centres would not exceed the cost involved in establishing an ever-increasing number of car parks in the city area.

People such as doctors, commercial travellers and others will always need to use motor cars in the city and, although surveys and the transportation studies have revealed that commercial traffic will increase at a faster rate than public traffic, the use of public transport will increase to a very considerable extent.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—If it is planned in the right way.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Yes. There is a positive and negative approach to the problem. The positive approach is to make public transport faster, more comfortable and more convenient. The negative approach is to allow highways and other roads leading into the city to become so choked with traffic that drivers find it too uncomfortable to have to proceed in a stop and go fashion—for example, in a motor car travelling in first gear which has to stop every 20 yards, and which takes 40 minutes to reach the city from Richmond. Even the negative approach would force people to use public transport, but I prefer the positive approach.

There is a problem in directing funds to the improvement of public transport. Most of the finance provided for highways is collected from motorists, and it will be difficult to convince them that it is in their interests that public transport should be encouraged. Twelve months ago, the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria admitted in its journal that it was desirable that public transport should be improved; and, if such an important motorists' association holds this view, it is possible that drivers can be convinced.

As honorable members are aware, finance for roads is derived, principally, from petrol taxation. The taxes are paid into the Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue, and money out of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Fund is paid to the States. It will be difficult to divert this finance to the improvement of public transport. In any case, I am of the opinion that funds which are used in connection with all matters of transport—road transport, rail transport, road building and so on—should be under the control of a single Ministry, so that priorities can be determined and the most important tasks can be carried out first.

In his Speech, the Governor mentioned many important environment protection steps which have and will be taken in this State over a short period. His Excellency referred to the establishment of the Environment Protection Council and the

Land Conservation Council. The Governor also referred to the magnificent work which is being carried out by the Ports and Harbors Branch in combating the problem of pollution. The House is aware of the work which has been done by the Minister of Public Works to ensure that oil will not be spilt into the bay or into the ocean, and I think the honorable gentleman is to be congratulated. Victoria is leading the other States in introducing this very important environmental control measure.

Pollution of our streams, pollution of our air, pollution by noise and by smoke and rubbish are matters which are only on the fringe of the real problem. There is no doubt that the real problem is the vast increase in population which has taken place all over the world. Many authorities of world stature can be relied upon to explain the ramifications of this problem. The most recent authority on the Australian scene was the American, Professor Ehrlich, who captured the imagination of the people of this country in a way in which few others have been able to emulate.

Some people believe that the Roman Catholic Church does not believe in population control, but that is not so. In a statement in 1967 and in a Papal Encyclical in 1968, Pope Paul VI. clearly indicated that the great church which he heads is not opposed to population planning but is opposed to some of the methods used.

The question of population control is extremely important. At the dawn of the Christian era, and after human occupation of approximately 1 million years, the population of the world was 200 million; in 1975 the population of the United States of America will be the same. I should like to be accurate about this; the actual population of the world today is 3,500 million. Demography is a comparatively new science and it is not easy to calculate what populations were at different times. The census-taker is a modern innovation and we now have reasonably accurate estimates of population, although they are not infallible.

The Hon. M. A. CLARKE.—The Romans took a pretty accurate estimate of the population.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—The Romans took that estimate for taxation purposes, particularly in Britain where taxes were levied on households. By estimating that there were so many people to each house, an estimate of the population was arrived at. By the dawn of the Christian era, there were about 200 million people in the world. This was after human occupation of about 1 million years. Sixteen centuries later, at the time of the colonization of the new world, that number had doubled. Between 1800 and 1920, a period of only 120 years, the population doubled again. It is estimated that by the end of this century the total population will be about 7,000 million, approximately twice the number it is today. It is expected that the rate of increase is likely to be tenfold each century. By the year 2,100 which, in geological terms, is a mere second away, there will be 70,000 million people in the world, Another hundred years later, in the year 2200, when our grandsons' grandsons will be alive, the population will be 700,000 million people. We begin to get into the field of what Sir Macfarlane Burnet calls the exponential impossibility. He believes that population increases of this kind cannot be maintained, that the earth cannot support them. It is doubtful whether the world can, on a continuing basis, support the population which occupies the world now.

There are two sides of this exponential impossibility. One is the possibility that the earth will not be able to feed the number of people expected to inhabit it. I know that I am resurrecting a doctrine which was first stated in the year 1728 by the Reverend Malthus. Although

this well known Malthusian doctrine was discredited, Malthus could well be right. The turn of events over the next 200 years indicated that the potential of the earth for producing food was very much greater than anyone at that time thought it was. We have experienced the green revolution, advances in science, and the use of fertilizers which have made it possible for the population to increase enormously.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—We are only scratching the surface yet.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—I understand that one of my collegues will take up that point in this debate, and I shall not enlarge upon it. Australia must be regarded as one of the foremost food producing and food exporting countries in the world. We export about two thirds of our wheat, one of our major food products, about half of our meat, and about one third of our dairy produce.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—What about our minerals?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Unfortunately, we cannot eat minerals, but I shall come to them later. This great food producing country exports about half of the food it grows, but this is a country of only 12 million people. Half the food produced here is consumed by 12 million people. How many people are fed by the other half of the food produced in Australia? We do not know, but I think we could say that the Australian consumes far more food than he needs. It can be assumed that the other half of the food produced here would feed three times the number of the people fed by the half consumed in Australia; in other words, it would feed about 36 million people.

It could be said that the Australian people could decrease their consumption of food quite considerably, and they would probably be even more healthy if they did so. On this basis, it can be calculated that food produced in Australia could feed another 24 million people. Even then, the total number which could be fed by Australian food would be only 70 million or 80 million which is an absolutely insignificant number of people when compared with the numbers of people I have mentioned including 70,000 million in the year 2100. How many more food producing countries will have to increase their production and how many technical advances will be needed before even a small part of the expected increased population can be fed?

It is said that the oceans of the world are an untouched source of protein, but they are not. Furthermore, they are not as abundant a source of protein as some people would have us think.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—That is only a matter of opinion.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—There is already a lot of international fishing. The Japanese fish in seas all over the world, including the Mediterranean. They fish on the banks of the North Sea, on the coastal shelf of South America, and in our own waters. The total catch has a protein content that is equivalent to the protein from the meat eaten by the Americans each year.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—What about the cultivation of growth in the sea, or living food?

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—There must be some possibilities in that direction. I have dealt to some degree with the problem of feeding the population of the earth. Another exponential impossibility dealt with by Sir Macfarlane Burnet relates to the possibility of running out of natural resources, the minerals and fossil fuels on which we depend so much for our existence, and particularly for the production of power to run the economic world in which we live. Sir Macfarlane Burnet said that we will run down these minerals and fossil fuel resources of the world

and that, if nuclear power is used for the production of economic wealth, we will run into all sorts of pollution dangers which, according to this great scientist, are just unacceptable.

There are also other dangers, Up to date, we have been lucky to escape the effects of a dangerous chemical which could be of the nature of DDT. All honorable members are familiar with the fact that DDT has been found in the eggs of penguins of the Antarctic. Originally, it must have been used on land, and then washed down rivers into the ocean. The dangers which the chemical industries pose to the health of the world are considerable. Mr. Elliot made a point about resources of the ocean. There is a possibility that chemicals could destroy the organisms in the oceans which produce the bulk of the nitrogen which we breathe. These organisms could be destroyed by a chemical similar to DDT. In fact, the use of DDT itself could have resulted in their destruction.

Other chemicals have had serious effects on people. The use of the drug thalidomide resulted in the birth of deformed babies. Even one dangerous drug or chemical could have the potential of destroying the organisms which produce the nitrogen which we breathe. As honorable members know, the oxygen we breathe is largely generated by the forest vegetation of the world. Yet we continue to destroy our forests and replace them with concrete and asphalt jungles. About 500,000 acres of land in the world goes under concrete and bitumen each year. Therefore, policies for reforestation are needed, not only to supply the timber which has so many uses, but also to supply oxygen. It has been estimated that an acre of pine forest produces 1,000 times as much oxygen as the average acre of vegetation. The people of the world face the possibility of destroying the very elements on which they depend for life.

The answer seems to be that all nations should be planning for the future problems of unacceptable growths of population and that all decisions should fit into a plan which should be adopted either on a world-wide basis or, in this country in particular, on a national basis. Australia might be the last country of the world able to save itself from the problems to which I have referred.

As I said earlier, Professor Ehrlich has made Australia aware of these problems, and our most prominent scientists have been pointing them out for many years. Professor Gus Nossal, one of our most brilliant younger scientists, says it pleasantly, with a smile on his face, as if he were not worried. It could be said that we should not worry because, after our destruction, there will be no one to worry. Sir Macfarlane Burnet is another scientist who has been telling us of these problems. Other prominent Australian scientists have been warning us for years of the problems of over-populating the world and, in particular, over-populating this country, and of the problems involved in using up our natural resources such as minerals on which we depend for our modern economic, social, and political organizations. It is a difficult subject to encompass and understand and I tackled this problem with a great deal of trepidation. I hope I have understood it. I have read a great deal about it, and listened to our scientists. I hope other people will also do so.

A new look should be taken at the problems of tertiary education. We have tended to develop an educational system which places an emphasis on the universities, which may or may not be properly placed. We have detracted from the great value of the technical institutions. Perhaps a review should be made of this form of education. Education in universities should be directed more towards teaching, research and pure learning, and less towards fitting people for a job. I deplore the tendency of the universities to turn themselves into job factories. I look

to the tertiary colleges to provide this need. Ten years ago, the Martin report provided a blueprint for education. I wonder whether this is not becoming out-dated and whether a new look should be taken at the field of tertiary education to determine its direction in the years ahead.

If my colleague, Mr. Garrett of the Templestowe Province, were present, he would wish to join with me in this expression of loyalty. He does not get the opportunity of speaking much in this House. The constituents of Templestowe Province have a high regard for him.

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL (Melbourne Province).—I apologize to you, Mr. President, and to the House for my non-attendance on the resumption of this debate. All honorable members agree that His Excellency and Lady Delacombe have endeared themselves to Victorians over many years not only by their courtesy and charm but also by attention to their civic duties. No matter how small or large the function is, this wonderful couple will always attend. We should be proud to have a Governor and his lady of such fine calibre.

I congratulate Mr. Storey on his maiden speech and Mr. Hider on his contribution to this debate, particularly in relation to social welfare as it affects people being released from prison. His Excellency's advisers mentioned the Environment Protection Authority and the Environment Protection Council. I was amazed to see an article in the *Age* newspaper of 28th September of this year under the headline "Dickie Rejects Clean Air Man", which stated—

> The State Government has rejected Mr. Colin Willman as the Trades Hall Council representative on the Environment Protection Council.
>
> Mr. Willman, a member of the Clean Air Committee, has been a constant critic of the Government on pollution matters.
>
> He was the THC nominee to fill one of the three lay positions on the 17-man Environment Protection Council.
>
> State Cabinet has told the THC that legislation on the council requires the THC to submit five names, from which the Government will choose a representative.
>
> "We do not want an expert," the Minister for State Development (Mr. Dickie) said last night. "We want someone devoid of preconceived ideas.
>
> "We want someone like the president, or the two vice-presidents or the secretary or the assistant secretary of the THC on the committee. We'd like their names on the list to choose from."

I should have thought the Minister for State Development would want advice from an expert. The best man should be appointed irrespective of who or what he is. I do not know Mr. Willman, but if he is the man for the job he ought to get the tap on the head, as the saying goes.

The Hon. G. J. NICOL.—He has got it.

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL.—The Government gives the tap on the head on the recommendation of the Minister. The best man for the job should be appointed. The problem of pollution should be tackled. Honorable members would be amazed at the smog conditions in Los Angeles. Unfortunately, I was in hospital there for six days. When I looked out of the window I saw what I thought was fog descending, but it was smog. This could happen here. No matter how much is spent on prevention, control and the enactment of legislation and its policing, the human element is always involved. We cause the pollution of the streams, roadways, footpaths and the air we breathe, and we must take the blame. Protection must come from the legislators. If an expert can enforce legislation by his knowledge, it should be done.

At present, one of the greatest problems is the disposal of household and commercial waste, especially in the city, because to a large extent this problem does not exist in the provincial towns. The co-operation of municipal councils is necessary to combat the emanation of smoke into the atmosphere. The Minister for Local Government should get the

municipalities together and arrange a satisfactory means for the disposal of household garbage and commercial waste.

I wish to be fair and compliment the Minister of Public Works who is doing an excellent job in preventing pollution of the foreshores from shipping, particularly from the discharge of oil. I applaud the stand he has taken on this matter. The Government has established a new Ministry of Social Welfare. I hope it will have a little more bite than has been shown in the field of decentralization. I shall not read it, but I refer honorable members to an article in a publication issued by the Brotherhood of St. Laurence under the heading, "Families must Beg and Borrow". That is the situation in Melbourne at present. Another article refers to 3,000 homeless men. These men who roam the streets of Melbourne must go to various institutions for bed and food. If it were not for these charitable organizations, I do not know where these people would go. An article in the *Northern Advertiser* asks what is being done for these people and what can be done. It points out several remedies and the necessity for subsidies from the Government.

I hope the Government will carry out a vigorous programme of social welfare to combine the concepts of prevention and rehabilitation. Mr. Hider made an excellent speech on rehabilitation. Preventive services can reduce hardship and social suffering. The Ministry of Social Welfare must be geared to the modern way of life and the problems associated with it. Municipal councils should be encouraged to provide social welfare officers in all districts and the people should work in close liaison with the Ministry. For many years councils have been doing an excellent job in the field of social welfare, but they cannot carry the whole burden. Their only revenue is from rates. Because he is paying rates, and State and Federal taxation, the ratepayer is facing a treble burden. It is time that the municipalities were given larger subsidies to carry out the welfare work which they have been doing for years in place of the Government.

Adverting now to housing, I agree with Mr. Swinburne's remarks relating to the provision of homes for people in the low-income group, particularly pensioners. In the past 32 years, the Housing Commission has built 70,246 units, comprising 56,067 houses and 14,209 flats. A total of 31,859 units have been sold. Since 1956, the Government building programme has been approximately 2,300 units a year. The present waiting list for home units is 13,774 and for lone-person units, 1,993. As honorable members are aware, if municipalities do not provide the land, the Housing Commission will not build lone-person units or pensioner flats in their areas.

The Government is as far behind with housing as ever. Because of the natural increase in population augmented by immigration, people do not have much hope of obtaining Housing Commission homes. The Government must examine this matter. After all, a man's home is his castle. Members of the Opposition believe in home ownership just as much as the members supporting the Government, but also believe that provision should be made to assist people who cannot provide their own homes. This has been the Opposition's policy for many years and it still is. I hope the Government will heed my remarks and endeavour to assist home building. Instead of building high-rise flats, the Government should consider returning to the villa units and single units for pensioners like those which were provided in 1956. They afford a decent way of living. High-rise flats may be adequate for couples, but they are not satisfactory for families. In all high-rise flat areas a certain amount of junior delinquency occurs as people cannot control their children if they are out of sight half the time. This stagnant Government should

have been out of office years ago. At each election it seems to come up with a willy-willy and by a fluke remains in office. I hope it will not get back in 1973.

I say without fear of contradiction that a hospital cannot have a rebuilding programme unless it conducts a public appeal. Despite the money that hospitals and charities are receiving from gambling this is still the position. This financial year the hospitals have received just on $6 million from Tattersalls and $11.5 million from the Totalizator Agency Board, and yet they are farther behind than Harold Pronto who used to race at Richmond. Without an annual appeal a hospital has insufficient finance. For many years I have advocated that the Government should examine the dividends of the Totalizator Agency Board. This year fractions and unclaimed dividends amounted to $2 million. Instead of being distributed to the clubs that revenue should be going to the hospitals and charities. For years I have also advocated that instead of the distribution being on the basis of 5 per cent to the Government and 8 per cent to the racing clubs, it should be reversed. The racing clubs are all in a fine financial state.

If honorable members examine the Totalizator Agency Board's report for this year and see what has been distributed to the racing clubs, they will get the shock of their lives. Last night Mr. Eddy asked a question relating to the payments which have been made to the country racing clubs from the Racecourses Development Fund. In 1969–70 the amount was $272,451; this year it was $645,557.65, which is an increase of $373,106. This amount goes into the improvement of country racecourses. At present the racing industry is flourishing.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—What about football?

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL.—If the Government wishes to bring in football pools it must submit legislation to Parliament. Whether it will be rejected or adopted is another matter. The Government should appoint a person to conduct an inquiry into the racing industry, and discover whether more money should be derived from the Totalizator Agency Board and from the racing industry to be distributed to the hospitals and charities. The hospitals are no better off than they ever were. A fair amount of money has been given to them but not sufficient. This source of revenue should be explored.

I was amazed at an article that appeared in a North Carlton weekly paper the *Northern Advertiser*, on 30th September, which stated—

> Unsewered West is "Primitive".
>
> Factories in an area of West Melbourne were finding it increasingly difficult to attract staff because of the stench of sewage, Councillor Joe Wilson told *The Advertiser* yesterday.
>
> Councillor Wilson is a partner in a wholesale business at the West Melbourne Market.
>
> The unsewered area, 1½ miles from Melbourne's G.P.O., includes the heart of the city's transport industry, and the market.
>
> Although the market itself is sewered, about 2,500 employees of factories on the northern side of Footscray Road have only septic tanks.
>
> Councillor Wilson, a member of the Melbourne Council health committee, said the ground in the area was "absolutely supersaturated" from the tanks, which were installed in 1963.

It is disgraceful that an area only 1½ miles from the Melbourne General Post Office where food is handled has septic tanks. The Board of Works should take some action. In my opinion the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works should be engaged only on the function for which it was first established, namely, to supply adequate water and sewerage systems. At present the Board of Works is planning highways and freeways and does not know where it is. The Minister for Local Government will agree with me, because he knows that the board is altering its plans every five minutes, so to speak. It is time the Government examined the functions of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works.

The Hon. A. K. BRADBURY.—What about abolishing the board?

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL.—We shall put Mr. Bradbury on it. I also wish to advert to the railways and the development of public transport, which is receiving high priority in the over-all transportation plan. Doubtless, the railways could be one of the State's greatest assets, in both the metropolitan and country areas. The bug-bear with the citizens of Melbourne are the railway stations which are unmanned at night. This situation has obtained since 1962. Despite protests from various quarters, such as women's guilds and church organizations, the Government turns a deaf ear. I hope the Government will provide a return to the conditions which obtained before 1962 when every railway station was manned at night. At present some stations are manned until 8 p.m. and others until 6 p.m. and some are not manned at all on Sundays. People are afraid to travel at night, especially elderly people, women and teenage girls, who are afraid of being molested by thugs, and their parents are worried while they are away from home.

I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. President, and I hope the Government will take cognizance of the facts that I have submitted.

The sitting was suspended at 6.26 *p.m. until* 8.2 *p.m.*

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province).—In taking part in this Address-in-Reply debate I wish to express my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and also that of the electors of the Northern Province which, with Mr. Clarke, I have the honour to represent. I express my loyalty to the Queen's representative, His Excellency Sir Rohan Delacombe, and commend the Governor and his wife, Lady Delacombe, for the exemplary manner in which they execute their duties in this State. I also commend the two newer members, Mr. Storey and Mr. Hider, on their moving and seconding of this motion for the adoption of an Address-in-Reply. Many other honorable members have made worth-while contributions to this debate, but I doubt whether any other member has criticized the Government with such feeling and sincerity as Mr. O'Connell, who preceded me prior to the dinner break.

In his address to Parliament, His Excellency referred to a number of matters, including the rather topical subject of pollution and the control or conservation of the environment. I do not wish to go deeply into that field but desire only to comment that I believe any decision or policy arrived at by the Government or any authority should be based on scientific fact, logic and common sense and not on emotion or near-hysteria which often occurs when conservation projects are discussed. In other States, I suppose to a greater extent than Victoria, there appears to be a conflict of interests between the mining industry and persons who wish to conserve the environment. The situation is best summed up in an article, by Mr. Eugene Bajkowski, in the *Bulletin* of 5th June this year, in which he said—

> The rabid fringe of the conservationists—and "health and nature cranks" who have jumped on the anti-pollution bandwagon—virtually demand that industrial progress be stopped and that everybody should "stop interfering with nature" and go back to the wooden plough.
>
> The more balanced representatives of the conservationist camp sensibly limit their campaigning to demands that where nature must be disturbed every reasonable effort should be made to ensure that interference with the environment should be reduced to the absolute minimum—and that every effort should be made to restore it to its natural state wherever possible and as soon as possible.

That certainly sums up my view on this somewhat controversial subject. I repeat what I said earlier, that at present when a large number of organizations, no doubt all well-intentioned, are getting on the pollution and environmental bandwagon, any policies or decisions made by any Government or any authority should be based on common sense, logic and scientific fact.

Possibly, in no other field of conservation is more emotion aroused than when one considers the vexed question of the killing of kangaroos in other States of Australia. I appreciate that this is not really a Victorian matter because the kangaroo is completely protected in Victoria except under special circumstances. However, I am pleased to say that in New South Wales recently the National Parks and Wildlife Foundation was established. This is a private organization which has been funding the purchase of areas of land which are added to the reserves administered by the Government's National Parks and Wildlife Service. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Bulletin* of 18th September, 1971. Recently this foundation purchased a 107,000-acre property, known as Yathong, 400 miles west of Sydney. The article states—

> The principal scientific interest of Yathong will be a research project into the interaction between wildlife and commercial land use. The service expects to study the way in which the kangaroo population of the area rebuilds under controlled conditions. The object is to make recommendations on the commercial management of kangaroo.

I realize that some of the persons and organizations supporting the conservation of kangaroos would treat the suggestion of the commercial farming of kangaroos as unthinkable. However, I believe this is a step in the right direction because the subject will be properly investigated. Having examined the kangaroo problem in other States, particularly New South Wales, I should not be surprised if eventually a recommendation is made that it is possible to conserve kangaroos and at the same time to make use of them commercially.

I cite that example of controversy over the conservation of kangaroos as an illustration of what I referred to earlier when I said that a good deal of emotion and hysteria is evident with some conservation and pollution problems.

The next matter relating to pollution to which I refer is one which will undoubtedly raise the ire of some members of this House. I refer to an aspect of pollution which affects our so-called quality of life. I want to say something about the garbage which emanates from television sets in the form of commercial advertisements. I do not suggest for a moment that all television advertisements fall into this category. Undoubtedly, many commercials are well-produced; they are artistic and in good taste. On the other hand, some advertisements for soap powders, detergents and to a lesser extent pet foods, are an insult to the intelligence of the viewer. They are certainly produced in an endeavour to increase or promote the sale of these products, but the claims made for soap powders and detergents have absolutely no scientific foundation and could well come under the heading of misleading advertising. It is extremely doubtful whether the rather attractive and impressive results seen in the advertisements extolling the virtues of particular pet foods could be substantiated and whether the products shown in the advertisements actually end up in the tin.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Especially that marrow bone jelly!

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—That may be a first-class example. Two aspects must be considered. The first is the aspect of consumer protection, and I seriously suggest that the authorities charged with this responsibility in Victoria could well take a long and critical look at whether or not some advertisements shown on television do not mislead the viewer. The other aspect is that the Australian Broadcasting Control Board could also examine the question whether some code of ethics or standards should be promulgated for television commercial advertisers to follow.

In his Speech the Governor referred also to some matters relating to hospitals and health in Victoria. I refer

briefly to one aspect of hospital administration and in particular to hospitals in country areas although my comments could well apply to large metropolitan hospitals. I wish to compare the operating costs and the efficiency of two pairs of country hospitals to substantiate my opinion that the hospitals which operate most efficiently receive the least incentive to increase their efficiency, in that they receive the least assistance from the Government by way of grants from the Hospitals and Charities Commission.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—It is the same with well-organized charities.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—That is quite so. First, I shall compare the operations of hospitals at Kyabram and Kyneton. I obtained these statistics from the annual report of the Hospitals and Charities Commission. In these two cases, Kyabram and Kyneton, the daily bed averages were 39·5 and 38·2, so they are roughly comparable in size. The total expenditure was $215,000 and $247,000, respectively — again, roughly comparable figures. However, the Government grant paid through the Hospitals and Charities Commission to Kyabram was $32,700 and to Kyneton, $81,300. I realize that these grants may be influenced to some extent by the facilities at the individual hospitals, although these two hospitals are comparatively the same age, and they could also be influenced by the services available. However, I doubt whether this would account for the great difference between $32,700 and $81,300.

In the case of the Rochester and Seymour hospitals the comparison is even more startling. The daily bed average at Rochester was 22·9 and at Seymour 22·2. The operating expenditure at Rochester was $144,300 compared with $146,400 at Seymour —again comparable in size and total expenditure. However, the Government grant to the Rochester hospital was $7,600 compared with a grant of $34,800 to the Seymour hospital. I doubt whether this large difference in the Government grants to the two hospitals can be explained other than by saying that one hospital is more efficiently run than the other. The existing system of administration, of audit and the payment of Government grants does not give sufficient incentive to these hospitals to operate efficiently.

The Hon. I. A. SWINBURNE.—Has Mr. McDonald the figures of local contributions?

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—I do not have them with me, but I know from what I have read in the annual report of the Hospitals and Charities Commission that the efficiently run hospital has a higher local support. The president of the Kyabram and District Memorial Community Hospital, Mr. T. J. Tehan, has corresponded with me on this subject and summed up the situation well when he said—

> The main purpose of this letter however is to underline the position which exists whereby a hospital, which is run efficiently at comparatively low costs, is penalized in the amount of Government grant received as compared with a hospital run at higher costs. There does not appear to be any attempt at any stage to conduct a costing investigation on a comparative basis to ascertain why certain hospitals in the State require much higher Government grants than others.

The suggestion I put to the Minister of Health is that there should be a survey or investigation into this field and consultative and management advisory services should be made available to the committees of management of hospitals. This could possibly rectify the situation to which I have referred.

In his Speech to Parliament, His Excellency referred to the investigation into the Victoria Police Force carried out by Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston. I am sure that every member of the House agrees that the report and investigation were well worth while and already the Government has taken action on a number of the important recommendations contained in the report. However, there is one recommendation which may not appear to be important to

most citizens. In paragraph 137, at page 33 of his report, Sir Eric discussed the proposed reorganization of country police districts and recommended the closure of six one-man police stations. Unfortunately, one of those stations is in my province and another is on the border of my province and the Bendigo Province. I refer to the police stations at Goornong and Bridgewater. I have no doubt that Sir Eric, the Chief Secretary and the Chief Commissioner of Police could substantiate these recommended closures on the grounds of economy, but when a Government department is assessing the value of a service to the community it cannot and must not measure this value in terms of money alone.

I suggest that the provision of a police station, a school, a medical practice or a hospital in a small country town is essential to the survival of that community and if one of these facilities is taken away, one of the props which keeps this community in existence is removed. I repeat that when these decisions are being made the department or the Minister must take into account factors other than the amount of money that will be saved.

I was interested to note that in the small township of Axedale, which is in the Bendigo Province, a new police station and residence will be constructed and I hope similar treatment will be extended to Bridgewater and Goornong, which are in my province.

I refer now to a noticeable deficiency in His Excellency's Speech. I was surprised, as were other honorable members, to learn that there was no reference in the Speech to any additional action to bring about decentralization in Victoria. I do not propose to embark on a full-scale debate on decentralization but I want to refer in particular to a matter which is inhibiting, restricting and preventing the establishment of secondary industries in Bendigo. I refer to the availability of Crown land for industry in that city. In the House last week I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture concerning the areas of Crown land in Bendigo alienated for secondary industry and I was advised, to my surprise, that in 1970, only two areas were alienated and in 1971 one area was approved and three applications are proceeding.

I also asked the Minister what was the average time lapse between the receipt of an application and the approval of the alienation. The answer I received was that in one case the time lapse was eight months, and in the other it was fourteen months. The Minister stated that in the second case the land was available before the fourteen months had expired.

I was in Bendigo on 6th October of this year with the Leader of the Country Party, Mr. Ross-Edwards, and we had discussions with a number of people who are interested in decentralization, including representatives of the Bendigo Development Committee. I was concerned that many secondary industries which are interested in establishing in this city become frustrated and are frightened by this long delay and the clumsy procedure which has to be followed in acquiring Crown land. There are areas of Crown land in Bendigo that could be subdivided and handed over to the council so that they could be sold quickly to anyone who is interested in acquiring them for the establishment of an industry. One area in particular of 16 acres has already been reclaimed by the Bendigo City Council.

If my suggestion were adopted and if the operations of the Department of State Development were altered to enable the department to give an applicant for industrial land a package deal rather than his having to go the Local Government Department, the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, and the State Electricity Commission, some of the red tape and administrative time-wasting could be avoided. The

person who wished to acquire the land could go to the Department of State Development and the deal could be quickly transacted.

I understand that the Minister of Lands is going to Bendigo in the near future to examine this problem to find a solution. I have no doubt that representatives of the Bendigo Development Committee, the Bendigo City Council and other organizations in Bendigo will be pleased if the Minister can overcome this delay in the alienation of Crown land.

I repeat, on behalf of myself and the people of the Northern Province whom I represent, my expressions of our loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and to her representative in Victoria, Sir Rohan Delacombe.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT (Melbourne West Province).—In his Speech, His Excellency stated that special attention was being given to the provision of facilities for the care of old people and particularly the frail and the infirm. Action has been taken by a group of local citizens to form the Yulunga Elderly Citizens Centre at North Footscray where people in the eventide of their lives can be looked after properly. It is the belief of those supporting the Yulunga centre that it will supply an urgently needed additional service because the accent will be on encouraging old folk to live hopefully, rather than passively waiting to die without hope. To an old person independence is the most precious possession. Yulunga will help them to retain this independence.

I emphasize that the planned centre is angled towards a needy section of the community who are not at present covered by any existing service. It will assist those elderly folk who are without family or friends to take responsibility for their care during a temporary disability or need. On 1st March of this year I wrote to the Minister for Social Welfare seeking a subsidy for this centre and the negative answer that I received from the Minister leaves a lot to be desired.

The aged and infirm persons who will be cared for at the centre have worked hard and have helped to develop Victoria. In his letter the Minister stated that no funds were available to enable a subsidy to be made to the centre. A former Mayor of Footscray and a willing band of local residents raised a considerable sum of money to provide facilities for elderly people at this centre and it is important that a subsidy should be made available to enable further work to be undertaken because there are many old people in the western suburbs. They include those who through temporary disability are unable to prepare adequate meals for themselves or undertake necessary personal care. There are also those who, after leaving hospital, need a further period of convalescence with, if necessary, re-education in self-care before returning home. Others need the psychological uplift of contact with people in their own age group. It is accepted that loneliness is a completely destructive force which influences the physical reaction to even minor illnesses and inevitably robs the individual of the will to live. I urge the Government to give a subsidy to the Yulunga centre which is to be established in Footscray.

At the turn of the century, the Melbourne Harbor Trust proposes to build a dock for container vessels on an area of land situated south of North Road, Newport. The district was recognized as one of the best residential areas in Melbourne. The Strand runs through this portion of the municipality and, under a licence from the Melbourne Harbor Trust, the City of Williamstown has developed wonderful recreational facilities. The Minister of Public Works has relatives living in the area and probably he passed along the Strand during his courting days and also more recently. The residents of Williamstown will be up in arms if the proposed port development takes place in vicinity of the Strand.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—Are you referring to the proposal for a dry dock?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—No, where it is proposed to build a container dock at the turn of the century. The harbor trust has adequate land available on the east side of the river where the docks could be constructed and thus leave the beautiful Strand to the residents of Williamstown.

The Hon. MURRAY BYRNE.—You are supporting the Government on the dry dock proposal?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—The Minister knows my position as I was present at a deputation to him on that project, when he explained the stand taken by the local members of Parliament. My colleague in another place, the honorable member for Williamstown, has been expounding this project since he was elected to Parliament more than eighteen years ago. It is preferable to establish a dry dock in Victoria rather than to have vessels sail to Singapore and so deprive the Australian seamen of employment on coastal ships. I am prepared to debate this matter anywhere at any time.

Yesterday, in reply to a question concerning the future use of the State Electricity Commission's Paisley briquette depot, the Minister for Local Government revealed that 15 acres of land has been provided for a high school site. The local members of Parliament are quite happy with this arrangement. In fact next year the high school will begin its first year of operation. Another part of the area is required for an electrical sub-station. I am particularly concerned about the remaining 105 acres in the depot area. The Housing Commission has been asked whether it is interested in developing the site and I urge the Minister of Housing to accept the offer immediately because this is a suitable area for Housing Commission homes and a few three or four storey flats. I am not suggesting that high-rise flats or concrete jungles should be erected, but homes of the type which have been built in Bradley Street, Newport, and at Laverton and Sunshine would be suitable. Sewerage and shopping facilities are available, the area is close to bus services, and a station could be constructed on the Altona line. I implore the Minister of Housing to seize the opportunity of developing the area as a housing estate.

When legislation to establish the Lower Yarra Crossing Authority was before Parliament, I referred to an area of land east of Hyde Street which has now been completely filled in and needs beautification. In reply to a question today, the Minister for Local Government stated that the land was under the control of the Lands Department and that when the problems of drainage are attended to, it is proposed that the area shall be placed under the control of the Williamstown and Footscray city councils for development for recreational purposes. This proposal coincides with the wishes of the local members of Parliament. In fact, one of my colleagues who has retired from another place referred to this matter on a previous occasion, as did our former colleague, the Hon. Archibald Todd. Now is the time for the development to be proceeded with.

It may be necessary for officers of the Soil Conservation Authority to be consulted about the treatment of the banks of the Stony Creek to prevent erosion to enable development of the area for recreation. The Westgate Golf Club has a nine-hole golf course in this locality. Michael Cahill, who is the present Victorian amateur golf champion, used to train on this course. The club proposes to extend the course to eighteen holes. Previously I have suggested that if a subway were constructed under the railway line, the second nine holes could be developed on the other side of the line from the existing course.

The time has arrived when the area should be developed to provide recreational facilities for the local residents.

I now relate my remarks to the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. On 28th September I asked the Minister for Local Government the following question:—

In respect of the special allocations of $18 million approved from the Works and Services Account of the Budget for the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, at what locations will these moneys be spent and for what purposes will they be used?

The Minister replied—

	$
(*a*) Continuation of the construction of the effluent outfall sewer which will extend from the south-eastern purification plant at Carrum along the Mornington Peninsula to Bass Strait	15,800,000
(*b*) Part of the cost of providing a sewerage service to the eastern suburbs in the foothills of Mount Dandenong which drain into the Brushy and Dandenong creeks	1,300,000
(*c*) Continuation of the construction of a water supply at Kalorama, Tremont, Kallista and The Patch on the Mount Dandenong ridge	900,000

I urge the Government to consider the needs of the western suburbs because the residents of that area are in the same plight as those in the eastern suburbs and it is unfair that their needs should be neglected in favour of works to benefit eastern suburban residents. In the Werribee and Melton areas, but particularly in Werribee, development is being retarded by the lack of an adequate water supply. I trust that the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission will speedily complete its survey of the water supply needs of the Werribee area. The soil in the western suburbs prevents the use of septic tanks and many properties are waiting for sewerage to be provided.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Where would a water supply for Werribee emanate?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—At the moment, the town supply for Werribee is tapped from a Board of Works pipeline which supplies the board's farm at Werribee.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—Are there any water catchments in the area?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—It is proposed to build a catchment on Cowie's Hill and the Greenvale reservoir could also supply water to the area. An additional source of supply will be the proposed reservoir in the Melton-Sunbury district. I urge the Government to ensure that portion of the board's funds are spent in the western suburbs so that the residents of that area may receive some of the benefits to which they are entitled.

The Hon. W. V. HOUGHTON.—If they move to the eastern suburbs, they will be looked after.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—Many of the managers of factories in the western suburbs live in the eastern suburbs because they will not live in the area which their factories pollute. This pollution occurs even during the night. If the Board of Works does not spend some of its rate revenue in the western suburbs, the time will come when local landowners will refuse to pay the improvement rate and force the board to take them to court. Ratepayers are entitled to have some of the rate revenue spent in their area. One of my colleagues has mentioned that he would like Mr. Bradbury to be a commissioner on the Board of Works.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—You were once a commissioner.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—When I was a member of the board, I argued that the board should be reconstituted into a five-man commission. My colleague Mr. Walton also made similar statements when he was a commissioner on the board. The Premier promised to reconstitute the Board of Works but in the face of opposition from members of the Liberal Party,

who comprised the majority of commissioners of the board, the honorable gentleman was not game to proceed with the proposal. On Tuesday, 7th September, this year I asked the Minister for Local Government the following questions:—

How much Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works revenue has been spent on special road projects since its inception?

At what locations have these moneys been spent?

What is the order of priorities for future projects?

The reply revealed that nothing has been spent in the western suburbs. It is high time that money was spent in that area. In those suburbs funds for road maintenance and other purposes are needed just as urgently as in the eastern suburbs. During the Supply debate I mentioned a problem which exists at Ashley-street, Tottenham, and I suggest that the Board of Works should spend some of the revenue it collects from ratepayers in the western suburbs on overcoming that problem. If the board collects rates for the maintenance of roads and for the construction of freeways, some of it should be expended in the western suburbs. The people living there pay their rates and they expect something to be done.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Mr. Knight wants some bitumen for the battlers.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—That is so; and I also point out that nothing has been spent in Port Melbourne.

The Hon. W. M. CAMPBELL.—What about the Cowderoy Street drain?

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—That is a matter which Mr. Todd and I once took up with the Government, but nothing was done. All this Government does is make promises.

I should now like to discuss the problems which confront professional fishermen at Mallacoota. I congratulate the Fisheries and Wildlife Branch on the fine work that it carries out, but it is obvious that, unless it is supplied with an enforcement vessel, the branch is powerless to stop the activities of abalone poachers at Mallacoota. I have mentioned this requirement to the Government on several occasions, but it has not seen fit to take any steps to put an end to this illegal practice.

On Tuesday, 7th September, I asked the following questions of the Minister of Public Works:—

What amount of revenue has been collected in registration and licensing fees from professional fishermen in the past two years?

What amount of this money has been spent in enforcing regulations and in providing equipment for such enforcement during the past two years?

In reply, the honorable gentleman said—

	1969-70	1970-71
	$	$
Boat registration fees ..	3,905	4,227
Licence fees	84,184	85,438
	88,089	89,665

Boat registration fees are paid to Consolidated Revenue and licence fees are credited to the Fisheries Research Fund. Thus, the bulk of the funds raised from these sources is applied to research, to the management and development of commercial fisheries, and towards the cost of providing extension services and education for fishermen.

Under section 19 (4) of the Fisheries Act 1958, 10 per cent of the amount collected for payment into the Fisheries Research Fund is paid into Consolidated Revenue. In accordance with the Act, these moneys are used to meet the cost of administering the Fund, and the cost of enforcing the commercial fishing licence provisions of the Act.

Expenditure on commercial fishing enforcement is, of course, substantially higher than this.

Fishermen believed that the registration and licence fees would be used to provide the Fisheries and Wildlife Branch with an enforcement vessel.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—The moneys are paid to the Fisheries Research Fund, and they are used for research.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—Mr. Hamilton should talk to fishermen in the area. They will not agree with

him. The Government could not even frame legislation in this matter. Mr. Hamilton knows nothing of the situation. On behalf of the fishermen in the area, I ask that an enforcement vessel be provided at Mallacoota. It would appear that Mr. Hamilton is not in favour of law and order, and that the Government is not prepared to enforce the law against abalone poachers.

Now I wish to discuss road safety, and in doing so I pay tribute to the work which has been done by the Road Safety Committee in an attempt to solve this very serious problem. Road safety has been discussed many times in this Chamber, and there is no doubt that Victoria's road toll is a matter of great concern to all honorable members.

I believe that driving licences should be graded in accordance with the type of vehicle which is to be driven, and that the scheme should be implemented immediately. It is tragic that more people are being killed on Victorian roads than were killed at the height of the Vietnam war.

A very short time after a person obtains a driving licence, he can have it endorsed to permit him to drive an articulated vehicle. The waiting period is so brief that a driver could not possibly be qualified to change from a motor car to an articulated vehicle.

In the dock area, and in industrial suburbs big vehicles carry large billets of steel and wood which are not tied down and which frequently drop onto the road and constitute a hazard for other motorists. Vehicles carting scrap to the docks, and trucks which are leaving the wharf loaded with massive bars of iron and other materials present the same danger.

There appears to be no co-ordination between Government departments. When Footscray Road was widened and construction of the new market in Footscray Road was commenced, the entrance was constructed on the eastern side of Footscray Road. This has led to a great deal of congestion in that area. The railways were not satisfied with that, however; they constructed another entrance and now permit heavy steel-carrying trucks and brewery wagons to pass through this entrance. When passing through the area last Monday, I saw an incident in which only the sheer skill of a driver prevented him from being impaled by iron which could have pierced his windshield. I believe the Victorian Railways act in these matters without consulting anybody. It is high time that the Transport Regulation Board intervened and declared the south side of Dynon Road and the north side of Footscray Road to be one-way traffic areas. Vehicles should not be allowed to cross. This would reduce the number of accidents that occur. As I have said, I believe that driving licences should be carefully graded to ensure that motorists are properly qualified to drive specific types of vehicles.

The Government does not care about the road toll. Honorable members on the Government side of the House smirk and smile when fatalities on the road are referred to. They are not sincere. This is a very serious problem which should be treated in a serious manner. This incompetent Government will do nothing to overcome the problem of road safety in Victoria.

I now refer to the staffing of police stations in the western suburbs. A large number of police from western suburban police stations are rostered for duty at the showgrounds during Show Week, at the racing at Moonee Valley, at the trotting at the showgrounds and at the soccer at Maribyrnong. On the occasion of the Springbok tour, 40 police officers were drawn from the Sunshine area alone.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—They must be a law-abiding people there.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—I will back the people in the western suburbs as law abiding; there are more law-abiding people in the western suburbs than there are in the province represented by Mr. Hamilton. The incidence of delinquency in the honorable member's province is much greater than it is in the western suburbs. I suggest that the honorable member should not throw stones because if he does they will be quickly thrown back at him.

There is a shortage of police in the western suburbs and I plead with the Minister to ask the Chief Secretary to appoint more police to stations in this area. The Government looks after those who indulge in gambling.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—The honorable member is offending his colleague, Mr. O'Connell.

The Hon. A. W. KNIGHT.—I am not. I want the police to look after those areas to which they are allocated and not have to spend so much time on behalf of the racing people. One day when I was at the Flemington Bowling Club about this time of the year—it was Derby Day, just prior to the running of the Melbourne Cup—I noticed that ten policemen on motor cycles were occupied in escorting the Governor to the Flemington racecourse and back to Government House. In addition, a number of other police were engaged on point duty to cover the Governor's journey. These policemen could have been used for ensuring road safety, because the Governor is quite able to look after himself. I want the people to be protected, but the Government is using the Police Force in a way which is contrary to the recommendations contained in the St. Johnston report. The best way in which the law can be enforced is to have policemen on the spot all the time.

Police from the Sunshine police station—as my colleague, Mr. Thomas, will confirm—are frequently sent to suburbs on the other side of the city, in spite of the fact that the station at Sunshine is short-staffed. This is regrettable because in former times it was the practice that when a young policeman left the training depot in St. Kilda Road he was employed on a six months' training beat in the metropolitan area from the Russell Street police station. Unfortunately, today these young policemen are being transferred to stations after spending only a couple of days at the Russell Street station. An experienced policeman must then accompany these young men all the time until they are familiar with the routine of the area to which they have been posted. This creates an extra burden on the force and efficiency tends to be reduced.

I plead with the Minister for assistance to be given to the Sunshine police station, where at present four men are engaged in office work. The station is two men down on its establishment strength—one is on National Service training and the other is absent on special duties. On the patrol wagon at night, under recent instructions, a senior policeman must accompany a junior on divisional patrol. This leaves much to be desired in overcoming the problems that are encountered, particularly as there has been a spate of car thefts in the western suburbs, as well as in other areas. People leave their cars outside railway stations and other places and this causes considerable trouble for the police.

I make a plea for additional police to be added to the strength at the Footscray police station, which is the major station in the western suburbs. Especially do I make a plea for a subsidy to be granted to the Yulunga Elderly Citizens Centre, for which an appeal has received such a generous response. This will assist elderly people in their twilight years.

On the motion of the Hon. F. J. Granter, for the Hon. F. S. GRIMWADE (Bendigo Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

VEGETATION AND VINE DISEASES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 6) on the motion of the Hon. G. L. Chandler (Minister of Agriculture) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province).—The purpose of this Bill is to enable modern methods to be used to cope with a locust plague which is likely to be a serious threat to Victoria if it moves from its base in New South Wales. Honorable members who have experienced a locust plague know the tremendous damage that it can cause. Millions of dollars' worth of produce can be destroyed. Therefore, the Labor Party supports the measure which will enable the Government to take appropriate action to prevent this plague from reaching a stage which could prove disastrous to many people in Victoria.

The Bill makes provision for a wider definition of the word " parasite " so that there will be no doubt that the grasshopper is covered by the definition. Doubtless honorable members may believe that many other species of insects could be classed as parasites.

The Hon. H. M. HAMILTON.—I hope the honorable member is not looking at the Government side of the House.

The Hon. D. E. KENT.—Mr. President, I was looking ahead! The Bill applies particularly to the grasshopper plague that is threatening this State. Clause 3 proposes the insertion of a new section 5A in the principal Act. This will allow for special provisions to deal with plagues when the Governor in Council is of opinion that there is danger of a plague of any parasite, such as the locust.

The Bill is acceptable to the Labor Party, but I draw attention to subsection (3) of proposed new section 5A, by which responsibility is placed on the occupier or owner of land to take at his own expense whatever action is required by the Department of Agriculture. In a plague for which the landholder has no responsibility, because it has not been caused by any action on his part and there is no precaution he could have taken to prevent the beds of grasshoppers from getting on to his property, the responsibility should be accepted by the community. The burden should not be imposed on the individual landowner.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—This provision is contained in the principal Act. In this particular case it would apply only to the grasshoppers in the hopper stage. The landowner has a responsibility there.

The Hon. D. E. KENT.—The community should accept responsibility for a situation which is not the result of any negligence by any individual. I am taking the opportunity of expressing that point of view, but, as I have pointed out, my party does not intend to obstruct the passage of the Bill. Sub-section (5) of proposed new section 5A states—

> An inspector may recover from the occupier or owner of any land in any court of competent jurisdiction the costs and expenses of taking any action he is authorized to take under sub-section (4).

In the circumstances in which some farmers may find themselves, this may impose a heavy burden. Therefore, I am justified in making the point that the responsibility should be accepted by the community.

As the Minister stated in his second-reading speech, in the past the Government has provided material to enable landholders to carry out the necessary work, and the honorable gentleman indicated that the Government would probably view favourably such a course of action if the circumstances warranted. That action is to be commended.

Sub-section (6) of proposed new section 5A enables the Government to take action, particularly when the grasshoppers reach the flying stage and travel rapidly over great distances. Action must then

be taken promptly and it would not be practical to give notice to individual landholders that the Department of Agriculture intended to enter on a property to take control measures. It has been said that every effort will be made to inform landholders of the intention to take action, but the proclamation will give Government officers the right to enter upon properties to spray the flying grasshoppers or to take whatever other action is necessary. This is only right and proper. Except for what I have suggested, that a lighter burden should be placed upon the unfortunate landholders who have grasshoppers on their properties, the Labor Party supports the Bill.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL (North-Western Province).—The Country Party supports this small Bill which amends the Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act 1958 because it understands the advantages which will result for Victoria, and also for New South Wales. The definition in clause 2 of the Bill states that "parasite" means any organism. The Act states that "parasite" means any parasite. That seems a little ridiculous and, with the help of the officers of the Papers Room, I found the original Act. It consists of only one page and it was published on the 16th September, 1873. I do not know whether the introduction of that Act had anything to do with the Chandler family, but at that time the family went to Boronia. I wonder what the connection was and whether they were parasites or organisms.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—I was not there.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL.—The legislation was enacted as a result of something which occurred to the west of Melbourne, at a place now being joined to the metropolitan area by the Melbourne City Council and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. I am referring to Geelong, where wine grapes were grown at the time. The original Act provided—

1. The Governor in Council may by order from time to time prohibit or restrict the importation into Victoria of grape-vines or grape-vine cuttings generally or from any place or places to be named in such order, and every such order may alter or revoke; and while any such order shall be in force the importation of grape-vines or grape-vine cuttings or such importation contrary to the tenor of such order shall be deemed to be prohibited or restricted as the case may be within the meaning of any law now or hereafter to be in force relating to customs; and if any such grape-vines or grape-vine cuttings be imported or brought into Victoria then and in every such case such grape-vines or grape-vine cuttings shall be forfeited and shall be destroyed or otherwise disposed of as the Commissioner of Customs may direct.

2. Nothing in this Act shall operate to restrict the importation of raisins currants or any other form of dried grapes.

The purpose of the Act was to combat the disease *phylloxera* in vine root stock. As a boy, I attended the agricultural college at Mildura where I was supposed to learn agricultural science. A great part of the lessons consisted of pruning *phylloxera*-resistant vines. The vines were pretty tough; they were like box-thorn and they had such vigorous growth that they could be cut back three or four times a year.

Amendments to the original Act were enacted, and there were some consolidations. In 1896, for the first time, there was a definition of the word "insect" as well as a definition of "disease". But there was still no mention of parasites. An insect was defined as a small invertebrate segmented animal having head, thorax, three pairs of legs and usually with one or two pairs of wings.

The Hon. O. G. JENKINS.—That sounds like a member of Parliament.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL.—I do not think it referred to a member of Parliament because nothing is said about its having two heads or two tongues. However, it fits the description of the locust. A locust is a kind of African or Asian winged edible insect, which collects in swarms. I do not know what they are like in Africa or Asia, but I have some experience of Australian locusts, or grasshoppers, as we call them.

After walking over them and seeing the mess they make, I could not imagine anybody, even the children of Israel, suffering them. They are a pest and parasite, and they are also insects.

The main purpose of the Bill is to give the Government the necessary power to define more precisely what action can be taken to combat these grasshoppers. Clause 3 sets out what can be done to combat the parasite, but it does not actually mention the insects. The Country Party knows what the Government has done. We congratulate the Minister and his department, particularly the officers of one section. Several groups have worked over a number of years to devise ways and means of controlling this pest.

People who live in the north-western corner of Victoria know what a plague of grasshoppers is like. It is only to the north of the River Murray that the great breeding grounds exist. One of the biggest problems in the 1950s was to locate the breeding areas which are spread over thousands of square miles. Many parts might be visited only once in twelve months or two years. As a result of checking on grasshoppers and much investigation, the New South Wales department and the Victorian department have located most of the breeding areas.

I have seen small swarms on two or three occasions. They were not much bigger than three or four swarms of bees, but they could be seen on the ground where they were worked up with implements. That had some effect in controlling them before they reached the flying stage. I once saw six acres of lettuce growing in New South Wales but, overnight, a plague of grasshoppers attacked the lettuce and all that was left were the stalks in the ground. The grasshoppers could be heard eating the lettuce with a brisk, brittle, chopping sound. They certainly hopped into that lettuce.

The only thing I have heard anything like the sound—except for a pig eating—were wood-ducks or geese. I remember one man shooting at geese in the middle of an 8-acre paddock but they were ignoring the shooting. They could be heard eating in the same way as the grasshoppers. The sound is different from that of mice eating a paddock of wheat, when the stalks can be heard falling; there is not the same munching or crunching.

The Department of Agriculture has done a particularly good job in combating these plagues, and this Bill will give its officers a greater sense of security. The owner of a property has to meet, more or less, the expenses of controlling grasshoppers on his land, but nobody will know what is happening in the Crown lands and the western leases of New South Wales. When the grasshoppers swarm they can be checked by aircraft and the breeding grounds can be located. Until the Minister informed me earlier today, I did not know that grasshoppers were located in Victoria in the Sunset country. I do not expect them to be there because of the sandy soil. Grasshoppers seem to prefer a firm soil in which they can bury their eggs so that they can be hatched out under particular conditions.

People on the land are troubled by all sorts of pests and diseases. I have had experience with grasshoppers, black spot, and downy mildew. I remember that in 1921 my grandfather's grapes had already been sold in England but, within four or five days, downy mildew wiped them right out. The leaves wilted on the vine and just dropped off and a valuable market was lost. Now, as a result of work by the Department of Agriculture, something is known about this and ways and means are being found to counteract it before trouble actually occurs. The same thing is happening with grasshoppers.

Many other things happen on the land and the Act covers them. However, I know from experience that the

South Australian Act deals with red scale which affects citrus trees. South Australia uses the Act as a means of protecting the South Australian market from growers in other States. Everything is blocked from the Adelaide market. No fruit can be taken over the South Australian border unless it bears a certificate issued by the Victorian Department of Agriculture. I have known members of Parliament object to the fact that when they have come from Queensland or parts of New South Wales they have had to dump fruit at road blocks. They only object because they do not understand the trouble that can be caused by fruit-fly. But South Australia takes it a bit further. Even if there is a certificate from the Victorian Department of Agriculture, the fruit must go to Mile End, and several cases are opened. If even one red scale is found, there is a complete inspection of all the fruit. When this happens the market for the day is lost. This tends to prevent Victorian growers from selling their produce there.

Victoria has not used its Act in that way, although it has the power to do the same thing. The Department of Agriculture should be congratulated for acting justly, fairly, and honestly, but the other States are taking advantage of their legislation and, unless Victoria retaliates, the position may get out of hand. South Australian fruit is sold under the price charged in Victoria. Admittedly, it is clean fruit, but it is no better than ours. The South Australian growers supply their good quality fruit at the lower grade price and swamp the market in Victoria. They sell their own people the lower grades at standard price. Juggling of the market in this way is profitable for the South Australian growers, but Victoria does not do this.

The Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act is very old. It has been amended only six times in 98 years. This amendment to the Act is wise, because when grasshoppers start to swarm action must be taken immediately. It would be no use serving 21 days notice on land-holders that they must do something about the grasshoppers, because the swarms could be on their way, and the officers who go on to land to inspect and advise must be protected. It authorizes the officers to carry out the inspections and the department to ensure that the grower plays his part, whether the disease be black spot, red spot or fruit fly. The grower realizes that he has a responsibility to take action. Irrespective of whether infestation comes from places interstate or intra-state, when it occurs in plague proportions prompt action must be taken. Victorian prevention methods have been most effective.

The Hon. S. E. GLEESON (South-Western Province).—Seldom have I seen so biased a piece of legislation. I wish to speak for the locust, that relatively inoffensive creature which has been so misnamed and maligned. I shall use an allegorical argument which may teach a lesson. The only offence that this creature has committed is perhaps to have an obsession for breeding and eating. He in this House who has not those same appetites, let him cast the first canister of lindane.

All that this creature does by breeding and eating to the extent it does is to bring a state to this world which mankind will do himself if given sufficient time. It is only a relative time scale before he arrives at this state. Before attacking the locust in this way and before he arrives at that stage, we should move into the area and give him a lesson with pamphlets and advice on family planning.

The locust is free of many of the bad habits of mankind. When *canabis*, opium poppies and other drugs are presented to him, he shows no signs of addiction—he eats the lot. Other creatures mentioned in this Bill are in the sap-sucking group. I refer to them in the human race as bloodsuckers. Our approach is to

license them and so long as they put in a satisfactory tax return, we allow them to live peacefully.

I rose to make a qualified defence of the locusts' habits, with which I have some sympathy and I refer to the fact that this species are called parasites in the Bill. I consider the term "parasite" is not applicable to this organism. To use the term "parasite" is like the logic of Humpty Dumpty. Lewis Carroll's Humpty Dumpty claimed he could make a word mean anything and so long as his audience knew what he meant, he thought that was all right. I am reminded of the apocryphal student—I do not mean a student of the *Apocrypha*—who is no doubt related to Macaulay's schoolboy who, when asked to conjugate the verb "to sing" said, "I sing in the swamp, I sang in the mud and I sung to the bottom." I suggest that if the student had been in Mr. Fry's English class, he would have sunk to the bottom of that too. While one can understand what he meant, one must deplore his choice of words.

I wish to refer to the *Proceedings of the First International Congress fo Parasitology*, in which a "parasite" is defined as—

> an organism which being devoid, on the given stage of his evolution, of some physiological functions, essential for his existence as an individual as well as a species, counterbalances this deficiency through the integration of his own functions (and in some cases even of his structures) with the functions of an organism of another species (the host) to which the parasite becomes attached for life or only during a given stage (or stages) of his life-cycle and for which the co-existence (co-operation) with the parasite is of no necessity.

I suggest that the Parliamentary Counsel and those people who have to draft the Bills should simplify as much as possible the English used in them and not use words which confuse many of those people who like to see a distinct meaning to a distinct term. In my opinion the approach to this insect problem is one of instilling in the average person, particularly the country person, throughout Victoria and the other States, a requirement that he should watch nature closely and report the first incidence of these creatures so that early action can be taken to obviate the need to use the methods suggested in this Bill, and the use of insecticides to excess.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province).—It is with some trepidation that I follow Mr. Gleeson. I fully support the provisions of the Bill, which will amend the Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act. I refer to recent criticisms and press comment concerning the use of insecticides in programmes to control the locust problem.

The Minister of Agriculture is undoubtedly aware of the situation in New South Wales where the relevant Minister has incurred criticism because the New South Wales Department of Agriculture intends to use the chemical lindane as a control measure. The New South Wales Minister, Mr. Crawford, has successfully answered the criticism and has explained that this chemical will be used for ground control by the farmers under the direction of officers of his department. When aerial spraying is involved, a less dangerous chemical such as maldison should be used.

The effects of these chemical sprays should be examined to ascertain whether they are suitable and to what extent the base chemicals in the spray decomposes when they are on the soil or in the water. In 1966, the Premier established a Pesticides Review Committee. I have confidence in that committee in its review of the use of pesticides in this State. The committee's work can give the users of these chemicals every confidence.

I am concerned at criticism by Mr. Peter Bennett which appeared in the *Shepparton News* of Wednesday, 15th September. Mr. Bennett, who is well known in the agricultural field, specializes in putting forward views on the use of natural and organic fertilizers. He claims that the chemicals used in sprays in the Goulburn

Valley could kill the area. He referred to the struggle to prevent the use of insecticides and weedicides, and to the tremendous opposition of vested interests in the Department of Agriculture. That opinion was unjust to the Minister of Agriculture, his officers and the department.

I do not believe that this criticism is justified. In its work on pollution and conservation, the department does its best based on scientific fact and logic. If reliance is placed on the ill-informed and unsubstantiated criticisms by Mr. Bennett and others, there will be far more trouble than exists at present.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Everyone thought that DDT was a panacea.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—That is so. We should measure the worth to the community of that substance in terms of the control of malaria over large areas in post-war years. Evidence has been put forward that the use of DDT far outweighed its disadvantages. The various committees, such as the Pesticides Review Committee in Victoria, now advise that DDT should be used more cautiously. This criticism of the spraying campaign proposed by both departments embraces the suggestion that such a programme should not be used and that we should rely on ecological means of controlling the locust problem. In pre-Biblical times people were concerned with locust plagues, and in the 2,500 years that have elapsed since then, no ecological means of controlling such a plague has been developed. Therefore, it does not look as if it is possible for a locust plague to be ecologically controlled.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—It is easy to be ecological when the locusts are not eating your crops.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD.—Mr. Elliot's interjection reminds me that it is easy for persons and organizations to be critical of the programme that has been investigated by the Minister of Agriculture and his department. I am certain that, if the livelihood and sources of income of these persons were threatened, as is the case in northern Victoria at the moment, their attitude to the problem would be different. I have heard it said by responsible people in the community that possibly the best thing that could happen would be for a high-flying swarm of locusts to descend on the metropolitan area. Doubtless, if this occurred, the thinking of some of the critics would be different.

The Minister of Agriculture and the Government should be commended for taking this action to ensure that the campaign is carried out in a completely legal manner. I have no doubt that the campaign will enjoy the support of every landowner not only in northern Victoria, but throughout the State. After all, the locusts may not be selective concerning where they go.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS (Western Province).—I join with the other speakers in supporting the measure. Mr. Mansell referred to the few times that the original Act has been amended. When this measure was first prepared, I took the opportunity of discussing with the Parliamentary Counsel the possibility of having the Act rewritten in modern language. In view of the fact that some of the provisions contained in this amending Bill could have far-reaching effects, I suggested that the whole of the Act should be reviewed in approximately six months' time. In his second-reading speech the Minister gave an assurance to this effect.

I should also like to support Mr. McDonald's remarks regarding the criticism voiced by people and organizations of the use of chemical sprays in controlling the possible plague of locusts. If these people experienced a grasshopper or locust plague, they would change their minds overnight. I have vivid memories of a locust plague which occurred in 1935 during my youth. It was a frightening experience to see a black cloud of locusts rolling across the countryside. In only a matter of hours after the

locusts landed, tremendous damage was done. The only two plants that grasshoppers will not touch are oleanders and chrysanthemums. If a person fills his garden with oleander bushes and chrysanthemum plants, he will be reasonably safe and retain some greenery around his house, but all other green vegetation will be completely denuded by these parasites, insects, organisms, or whatever they are called.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Do they go for the gums too?

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—They will eat anything. Recently, I read a report in which Mr. Grassby complained of these plague insects entering his office in the Riverina. The thought crossed my mind that he was lucky that he was not wearing a green suit at the time because the insects may have attacked that too!

Under the heading "Threat of death if locust spray used," the following article appeared in the *Age* of 12th October:—

The insecticide lindane could destroy much of Australia's wildlife—and might kill people who came into contact with it, a member of Victoria's Clean Air Committee said yesterday.

Mr. Colin Willman, Trades Hall Council representative on the committee, has asked the Federal Minister for the Environment (Mr. Howson) to intervene in the proposed spraying of lindane on locust beds in the Riverina.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Mr. Willman is the gentleman whom the Minister for State Development scrapped. He is a capable man.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—I am not worrying about that. The article continued—

He said the spraying would almost certainly mean a gross and dangerous contamination of the Australian environment and could have a highly dangerous effect on humans, their food and on various wildlife in Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia.

"Lindane is a chlorinate hydro-carbon of a persistent type capable of being fatal to humans if swallowed and likely to cause serious illness if absorbed through the skin," Mr. Willman said.

It is perfectly true that any poison of this type that is swallowed is highly dangerous.

"The area to be sprayed in New South Wales has low rainfall and there is, therefore, a higher danger to wildlife through the foodchain because of the higher persistence of lindane in a dry area."

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—Does lindane dissipate with moisture or rain?

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—That does help to dissipate it.

Mr. Willman said less persistent and less dangerous sprays should be found to put down the locust plague.

Possibly, less dangerous sprays could be used, but it may take some time to find them, and by that time, the plague would be well under way and could clean up the Riverina, Victoria, and possibly even Tasmania.

Victorian wildlife officials last week warned that vast numbers of Australia's wildlife could be wiped out if lindane was used to combat the plague.

They have appealed to the New South Wales Government to reconsider its decision to use the chemical.

The State president of the Victorian Field and Game Association (Mr. P. G. Brown) said the New South Wales authorities should "carefully reconsider their decision to use this dangerous chemical".

Mr. Brown said lindane was an extremely dangerous chemical which could cause more long-term damage than the locusts.

The people to whom the article refers are ill-informed concerning the damage that can be caused by a plague of grasshoppers or locusts. If they owned properties in the path of the plague and were dependent on the properties for their income for the next twelve months they would adopt a vastly different view.

Whilst I appreciate that some wildlife must certainly be destroyed in an eradication campaign, it is a small price to pay to save millions of dollars worth of produce in the State and in the Riverina.

The Hon. S. R. MCDONALD.—Some livestock may die if there is a serious lack of fodder.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—The situation envisaged by Mr. McDonald is more than a possibility; it is a certainty. A locust plague has no respect for any herbage other than the oleander or the chrysanthemum, and cattle or sheep will not eat oleanders or chrysanthemums. Therefore, any rural reconstruction problems that exist at present would be magnified a hundred or a thousand-fold if the plague is not stopped.

I believe the Department of Agriculture, in collaboration with its counterparts in New South Wales and South Australia, should be commended for the action it is taking and on the fact that it is highly organized to begin spraying to kill the parasites before they get on the move. It was stated by a previous speaker that locusts can travel from 40 to 50 miles a day. This has been proven.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—In a day?

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—Yes, in a day. By catching a jet stream of air, locusts can rise to a height of 3,000 or 4,000 feet, and have even been known to travel up to 1,000 miles a day.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—That means they could easily reach Tasmania.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—That is correct. The fears expressed by conservationists and their supporters are ill-founded. The Department of Agriculture should be commended for its interest in seeking to preserve the farming community and primary produce of the State.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH (Doutta Galla Province).—Knowing Mr. Willman, to whom Mr. Gross referred, I can understand his concern on this issue. Probably, Mr. Willman has never encountered a locust plague. I recall the locust plague which occurred in 1935. It was at the time when the Eucharistic Congress was first held in Victoria. In 1935, I was a railwayman, and I was relieving at Rushworth when the grasshopper plague occurred. After a plague of this type, no vegetation for animals to eat exists for some weeks. Mr. Willman, with his expertise, if I may use a modern term, would view this question from an environmental aspect, but without direct knowledge of the effects of such a plague, he can see only that an eradication campaign poses a threat to the people and the environment. I can understand Mr. Willman's attitude. Frequently, people who have some industrial expertise and some experience of industrial matters, but who have never actually worked in industry, make statements concerning industrial conditions. Those who are familiar with the conditions laugh at statements of this type.

The Hon. K. S. GROSS.—I was not criticizing Mr. Willman's statement.

The Hon. J. M. TRIPOVICH.—I am aware of that. Each person speaks from his own viewpoint, and the importance attached to various matters depends upon the view of the beholder. No person has contributed more to the continuing fight for clean air than Colin Willman.

No person has been more sincere in his beliefs and in his dissemination of propaganda over a period of many years. Whatever comments Mr. Willman made were probably made in ignorance of what a grasshopper plague is like. I regret very much that the Minister did not see fit to re-appoint Mr. Willman to the Clean Air Committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6407 section 3).

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—Mr. Kent referred to sub-section (3) of new section 5A which provides—

> Every occupier or owner of land who fails to give any notice or take any action as required by any proclamation made under this section shall be guilty of an offence against this Division.

He also referred to sub-section (5) under which an inspector may recover from the occupier or owner the costs of taking any action. As Mr. Mansell indicated, these provisions are not new; they have been in the Act over the years. Honorable members should remember that, if this plague develops, urgent action will be required and that the best method of dealing with locusts is in the hopper stage when they are on a property. It will not be disputed that a landowner should have some obligation to deal with them on his property in the hopper stage, in the same way as he deals with diseases. If the plague were on a vast front, I suppose the Government of the day would have to make available spray and so forth to help landowners. Such provisions are not new, and when one has in mind the other provisions in the Act which have existed for years I do not think honorable members should be critical.

Mr. Mansell made a number of points. He has lived in an area where such plagues have been a problem over the years. Crops to the value of possibly $100 million are in existence along the Murray Valley and the Goulburn Valley. The Government and the Department of Agriculture have a tremendous responsibility to protect them from this menace. No one would doubt that the relationship which exists between the Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales and myself and the departmental officers in New South Wales and those in Victoria is of the highest order. Since 1955, Victoria has paid part of the cost of having one or two officers carrying out a survey in New South Wales to ascertain where the egg beds are, in the belief that with the build-up which has taken place year after year the day must come when the plague would break out and locusts would come south or south-east.

I take second place to nobody in my interest in conservation and wildlife, but I do not think one can go to the extreme of saying that one will not do this or that regardless. The Government will work under the advice of the Pesticides Review Committee which is comprised of representatives of the Department of Health, the Fisheries and Wildlife Branch, the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission, the Lands Department and the Department of Agriculture under the chairmanship of Mr. Downes of the Soil Conservation Authority. The Government will seek this committee's advice and guidance.

I have here a statement made by Mr. Crawford, the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture in which he stressed that lindane was being used only in those areas where the stock carrying rate was light and that this was another factor in reducing any possible danger from the use of this chemical. Mr. Crawford stated that on irrigated pastures and other land where the stock carrying capacity is high maldison will be used. This chemical is also recommended for crop protection. In Victoria we would never think of using lindane from the air. It has been used in every other outbreak in Victoria over a number of years and has been used in New South Wales for over twenty years. So far as I am aware there has never been any criticism of its use.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT.—It saved farmers in the north-west last year, at Narrabri, Moree and west of there.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER.—A person who writes a letter to a newspaper and claims that a farmer is likely to tip into a stream spray which he does not use is going to extremes.

Mr. Gleeson made some interesting remarks in his enlightened speech. I do not know whether they were relevant, but I assure him that his views on birth control will be passed on to the leaders of the locust movement in New South Wales for their consideration!

This legislation is necessary. The position in New South Wales is that the dry and cold weather has had a dampening effect on the development

of locusts, but that does not mean that the danger is passed. We must not be lulled into a false sense of security. The campaign that is being planned by the two departments concerned has been carefully thought out. I hope it will not be necessary to put it fully into action. However, the longer the build-up continues the greater the danger is that when the plague does break out it could be of a greater magnitude than this country has previously seen. All the Bill does is bring up to date certain sections of the Act. The Government has not used aerial spraying to any extent in troubles of this kind since 1955, and then it was carried out substantially by the Air Force. The Government has a responsibility to protect landowners against damage and also to ensure that the Act is brought up to date.

The Hon. D. E. KENT (Gippsland Province).—I neglected earlier to congratulate the Department of Agriculture on the work it has carried out on this occasion and previously. No criticism was intended of the activities of the department or the Minister who I believe have acted in an effective manner. I realize that some sacrifices of wildlife may be necessary on occasions in order to safeguard crops.

The Hon. A. R. MANSELL (North-Western Province).—It has been suggested that the wording of the Act could be brought up to date, but I do not subscribe to that idea. When I read through the Act it struck me that it was worded in such a simple manner that it contained no ambiguities or legal jargon; it is written plainly in such a way that any farmer or other person can understand it. I commend the persons who were responsible for the wording of the Act as contained in the 1958 consolidation. The interpretation of "insect" or "parasite" might have changed, but the wording is straight forward and is easily understood.

The clause was agreed to, as were the remaining clauses.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

LOTTERIES GAMING AND BETTING (PRE-POST BETTING) BILL.

The Order of the Day for the second reading of this Bill was read.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I have examined this Bill, and in my opinion it is a private Bill.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—In another place, this Bill was also ruled to be a private Bill but was treated as a public Bill. I propose that the same procedure should be followed in this House. Therefore, I move—

That this Bill be dealt with as a public Bill.

The Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL (Melbourne Province).—I move the following amendment to the motion:—

That the words "except in relation to the payment of fees" be added.

My reason for moving this amendment is that the Bill relates to a private club, namely the Victorian Club, with which all honorable members will be familiar. I have no doubt that in view of the quality and calibre of members of that club they would have no objection to paying the costs of enacting this legislation. The Bill relates to the calling of the card and the Government will receive 2 per cent of every bet laid.

The House divided on the amendment (the Hon. R. W. Garrett in the chair)—

Ayes	..	7
Noes	..	22
Majority against the amendment	..	15

AYES.

Mr. Elliot	Mr. Tripovich.
Mr. Kent	*Tellers:*
Mr. Knight	Mr. Eddy
Mr. O'Connell	Mr. Thomas.

NOES.

Mr. Byrne	Mr. Jenkins
Mr. Campbell	Mr. Mansell
Mr. Clarke	Mr. May
Mr. Dickie	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Fry	Mr. Nicol
Mr. Gleeson	Mr. Storey
Mr. Granter	Mr. Swinburne
Mr. Gross	Mr. Ward.
Mr. Hamilton	
Mr. Hider	*Tellers:*
Mr. Houghton	Mr. Hauser
Mr. Hunt	Mr. McDonald.

PAIRS.

Mr. Galbally	Mr. Chandler
Mr. Walton	Mr. Grimwade.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

More than twenty years ago it was the practice at the Victorian Club on Melbourne Cup eve to conduct what was colloquially known as the calling of the card which is a system of auctioning betting odds on acceptors in the Melbourne Cup. The event took place in a part of the club premises set aside for the purpose and attendance was confined to members and special guests invited by the club.

The practice was for a master of ceremonies who was experienced in betting and appointed for the occasion by the club to begin by calling the name of the horse with the lowest saddle-cloth number and asking bookmakers present what odds they were prepared to lay. Bookmakers would indicate the odds available and a bettor or bettors would then state the amount for which they wished to back the horse. Bookmakers would then state their willingness to accept bets up to a stated amount at the specified odds.

If the amount for which bettors wished to back horses was greater than the amount which bookmakers wished to lay, bettors would be invited to accept lower odds. If the odds offered were not acceptable to bettors bookmakers would be invited to offer longer odds. When the wagering on the horse was complete the master of ceremonies would read out the bets made. These bets would then be confirmed by both bookmakers and bettors. The same procedure was then followed for each acceptor in the Melbourne Cup.

However as this practice was contrary to the provisions of the then Police Offences Act 1958 it was terminated. The Bookmakers and Bookmakers Clerks Registration Committee constituted under the Racing Act 1958 has recommended that the practice of calling of the card be re-introduced and legalized. In the view of the committee pre-post betting on the Melbourne Cup by doubles bookmakers financing their books and by bettors does take place on a large scale prior to Cup Day and it is desirable to devise a suitable method of ensuring that this pre-post betting is properly recorded and subject to the statutory turnover tax.

I am advised that many wagers are made in circumstances which result in the Government being deprived of turnover tax which would be payable if those wagers were made on a Government licensed racecourse. The amount of revenue being lost to the Government in this way is substantial and since there is no doubt that the betting takes place it is considered proper to legalize it and to obtain the lost revenue.

It is not considered necessary to legislate for pre-post betting on any event other than the Melbourne Cup because this is the one event which attracts pre-post betting on a large scale. The Bill inserts a new section 66A into the Lotteries Gaming and Betting Act 1966. This section empowers the Chief Secretary to issue a club betting permit to the Secretary of the Victorian Club authorizing pre-post betting on the Melbourne Cup to take place on a specified part of the premises of the club during such period and on such day as is stated in the permit. This betting must be conducted in accordance with the conditions set down in sub-section (3) of the new section 66A. Betting

conducted on the specified part of the licensed premises subject to and in accordance with the permit will have the same status and effect as if the betting had been made on a racecourse during the holding of a race-meeting for horse-races. This means that the amount of any bet made or of any money won as a result of a bet may be enforced in any court of law.

In addition it will not constitute a contravention of the Liquor Control Act 1966 in regard to betting on licensed premises. Likewise, such betting will not constitute an offence whether by common law or by statute and will not be grounds for the premises of the club or any part thereof to be deemed or declared to be a common gaming house or place or to be a common nuisance. Pursuant to sub-section (5) of the new section 66A bookmakers concerned will be required to furnish to the Comptroller of Stamps a bookmaker's statement and to pay stamp duty as if the bets had been made on the Flemington racecourse on Melbourne Cup Day. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of the Hon. G. J. O'CONNELL (Melbourne Province), the debate was adjourned.

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

WATER AUTHORITIES ACCIDENT INSURANCE BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development), was read a first time.

MERCY PRIVATE HOSPITAL (GUARANTEE) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I have examined this Bill, and am of the opinion that it is a private Bill.

The Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development).—In another place this Bill was also ruled to be a private Bill, but was treated as a public Bill. I propose that the same procedure be followed in this House. Therefore, I move—

That this Bill be dealt with as a public Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

On the motion of the Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development), the Bill was read a first time.

BUILDING SOCIETIES (SPECIAL ADVANCES) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

SPASTIC CHILDREN'S SOCIETY OF VICTORIA INCORPORATED: GOVERNMENT GRANT—VICTORIAN RAILWAYS: LEVEL CROSSINGS AT KYABRAM—LANDS DEPARTMENT: LAND AT SIMPSON FOR MURRAY GOULBURN CO-OPERATIVE COMPANY LIMITED.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—By leave, I move—

That the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

The Hon. D. G. ELLIOT (Melbourne Province).—Today I received a reply from the Leader of the House in response to a question concerning the Spastic Children's Society of Victoria. In the answer, which is highly unsatisfactory, as I will demonstrate to the House, the Minister said, *inter alia*—

The society has requested the Government to give special consideration to its financial position for 1971-72 and it has undertaken to supply details of its budget estimates for the year together with a detailed statement

of the particular matters which it desires to raise with the Government on the welfare of spastic children and adults in Victoria generally. This information has not yet been supplied by the society.

In a letter dated 11th June last, the Premier and Treasurer wrote to the Spastic Children's Society of Victoria stating, *inter alia*—

As you will be aware, at that time—

I understand the Premier was referring to a request for a deputation which was made last January and has not yet been acknowledged or arranged—

I arranged for a detailed examination to be made of the society's position and I now have the opportunity of considering the result of that examination.

The result of the examination was that the special Government grant was lowered from $100,000 for the previous year to $50,000 for this year. The position is so scandalous that I believe some figures relating to the society should be reported to the House with an earnest entreaty for the position to be rectified.

The annual cost of services rendered by the society is $990,000, towards which the society has received a grant of $55,000 from the Hospitals and Charities Commission plus a special Government grant of $50,000, which is exactly half the special grant allocated in 1970, so that the total Government allocation is $105,000. Thank God we have people such as those who support the Spastic Children's Society of Victoria! I do not know of any passing-the-buck classic that could supersede this effort. The Government stands absolutely condemned for being prepared to hide behind the fund-raising ability of such a worthy organization.

The society is currently catering for 610 cerebral palsied children and adults attending its schools and centres for daily treatment, education and training, some of whom are country children and adults residing in the society's two hostels. The waiting list for additional services is as long as every honorable member's arm. The weekly cost of treatment and training is $20 per person, and if a child or adult is accommodated at one of the society's two hostels, the cost is $65 a week.

The society runs a fleet of 43 buses which cover 700,000 miles per annum, providing transport from home to the centres. This involves the society in transport costs of $6 per week per student. Grants currently received from the Hospitals and Charities Commission total $55,000 per annum and then there is the now-generous special allocation of $50,000 which the Premier and Treasurer has halved from the previous year. A grand total of $105,000 is provided by the Government.

Because of the constant increases in awards affecting staff salaries, the society anticipates a deficit of $300,000 for the current year in just maintaining existing activities. This is without providing any relief or service for families with children on a long waiting list. It is impossible to get a more classic example of man's inhumanity to man and the Government stands condemned for its attitude. It is not possible to gloss over this matter because it is a shocking indictment of the Government's irresponsibility. The anticipated deficit is in addition to the present bank overdraft of $300,000, on which the society has to meet interest payments of $70 a day.

The society operates some wonderful centres such as Marathon school, the Dame Mary Herring day centre for children and sheltered workshop for adults, the Northern Districts Spastic Centre for children and sheltered workshop for adults, the Chis-Lon Spastic Centre for children and sheltered workshop for adults, the Chelsea and Peninsula Districts Spastic Centre for children and sheltered workshop for adults, at Geelong a school for children and sheltered workshop for adults, Shannon Park, and the Bendigo Spastic Centre for children and adults. In addition, the society operates the Dame Mary Herring Hostel for children and

Rattray-Wood House for adults. I do not know of any organization in Australia which can better the activity, the dedication and the fund-raising ability of this organization and the people behind it. I do not want to mention the names of these people, but they are famous throughout the length and breadth of the land and they should not be used by the Government as an excuse to hide behind the fund-raising ability of the organization and thereby halve its special grant to the society, especially when conclusive evidence is available that the society needs more money this year than it has ever needed throughout its history.

As long ago as last January, the organization requested the Premier and Treasurer, as a matter of urgency, to receive a deputation to discuss the society's financial position. No deputation has yet been organized and I ask the Leader of the House to expedite the deputation so that the matter can be taken up urgently with the Premier, and so that this wonderful charity, which is operating almost solely on its own ability, with only about one-tenth of its funds being provided by the Government, can function properly in the interests of the needy—and are they needy—children and adults in this State.

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I have listened with interest to the aggresive manner in which Mr. Elliot has presented his case. Naturally, I could not be expected to be familiar with the history of the matter, but as soon as the information which Mr. Elliot has presented is available, I shall bring it to the attention of the Premier.

The Hon. S. R. McDONALD (Northern Province).—I raise a matter concerning the allocation of finance to the Level Crossings Fund which provides finance for the installation of flashing lights and other warning devices at level crossings. Earlier this week, I received correspondence from the Borough of Kyabram and the local ratepayers' association pointing out that they had received verbal advice that, due to a reduction in the funds allocated to the Level Crossings Fund this year, the installation of flashing lights at two level crossings in Kyabram had been postponed.

The reply to a question which I asked the Minister of Public Works today indicates that the earlier advice that the installation would be carried out this financial year has been changed because the programme for such installations has been cut to accord with the finance available from the Level Crossings Fund. The Minister went on to say that flashing lights will not be installed at the two level crossings in the current financial year but that the position may be reviewed if more finance is made available. It is regrettable that, as a means of effecting economies in the State finances, a reduction has been made in the allocation for this type of work. The two crossings concerned are situated at Allan Street and Albion Street, Kyabram. During the past three months, one fatal accident and one serious accident have occurred.

I ask the Minister for Local Government to take up with the Minister of Transport the question of undertaking a review to ascertain whether the finance available to the Level Crossings Fund can be increased to the same level as last year. From a road safety point of view, it is a retrograde step to reduce allocations merely as an economy measure.

The Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government).—I am certainly aware of the problem. In December last, for clearly good reasons, the proportion of funds payable by the Victorian Railways towards the abolition of level crossings was reduced from 15 per cent to 5 per cent. This was occasioned by the financial difficulty in which the Railways Commissioners found themselves and because of the need to channel the available funds to the improvement of public transport, which is an aim that all honorable members will support.

As the change in December last was made retrospective to the 1st July, 1970, some dislocation was occasioned to projects planned for the current financial year and for subsequent years upon the basis of old formula. It will be realized that with such a reduction in the proportion payable by one party, the share borne by the Country Roads Board and the Level Crossings Fund, the other two participants in the scheme, is increased. This means that unfortunately the fund has run short of money.

For some time discussions have been going on between myself, the Minister of Transport and the Treasurer, with a view to rectifying the situation and finding a satisfactory formula to increase the moneys available from the Level Crossings Fund. Some agreement has been reached on the means of achieving this, but agreement has not yet been reached on the method by which current projects can be undertaken. At officer level, officers of the Treasury, the railways and the Country Roads Board have been working out the details of applying a new formula to current works. Of course, the object is to ensure that as much work as possible is undertaken on the abolition of level crossings and all honorable members will recognize the importance of this work. The objective is to obtain the additional funds without unduly affecting other essential services which must be provided, and to do so on a basis which is equitable to all the authorities concerned.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province).—Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government will make land at Simpson available to the Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited to erect a store and depot and if not, why. In a debate on another matter, I referred to the tremendous quantity of paper that is being used in order to achieve certain objectives. The size of the file of correspondence on this matter indicates the amount of paper involved in a simple request to purchase an area of land.

The Hon. S. R. MCDONALD.—It is like Peyton Place, a continuing story!

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL.—I agree and I am certain that there is more behind the matter than appears on the face of the correspondence. It seems to me that there are certain vested interests in the Liberal Party who are having a great deal to say in what is happening. The answer I received from the Minister does nothing to improve the situation.

I should explain to the House what is desired. All the Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited wants is a depot where its trucks can unload from smaller to larger transports to carry goods to other places. The company is not interested in a joint store with other firms. I belong to many co-operatives, and I can understand any of them taking this view. Why should they be tied to vested interests? Why should they not be able to build a store of their own and operate it themselves?

In his reply to my question, the Minister referred to dairy expansion in the area, but I point out that this proposal has absolutely nothing to do with the expansion of the dairy industry. The co-operative wants a store to use for supplying goods within the area and a depot for its trucks. It is as simple as that.

Can the Minister explain why the Government will not permit these people to go into Simpson which, as I have previously pointed out, is probably one of very few places in the State that the Government can prevent the co-operative from entering?

The Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture).—I did not prepare the answer to the question asked by Mr. Mitchell, and I am not completely familiar with the negotiations in which the Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited and the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission have been engaged.

It is my impression that of the three organizations concerned, two are co-operatives and one is a proprietary company. As I understand the position from the reply which Mr. Mitchell has received and from my own knowledge of the situation, an endeavour was being made to get the Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited to unite with the other companies at Simpson so that a complex could be developed. If Mr. Mitchell is saying that he does not agree with the developments that have been brought about by the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission and that he does not agree that this combined operation should take place, it is a matter for him. I am not entering into that aspect of the matter.

I did not prepare the answer, but I know of the circumstances. My belief is that the three organizations were getting together to do something worth while. If the Murray Goulburn Co-operative Company Limited wishes to stay out of that arrangement, it is a matter for the company; but, apparently, another effort has been made to get it to join the scheme. I do not know if Mr. Mitchell has been in touch with the company since he received the answer, but additional information may be available. I shall draw the Minister's attention to Mr. Mitchell's remarks.

The Hon. C. A. MITCHELL (Western Province).—Mr. President, by leave,——

The PRESIDENT (the Hon. R. W. Garrett).—I remind the honorable member that matters that have been raised on the adjournment cannot be debated. I suggest that the honorable member should contact the Minister at another time.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.50 p.m., until Tuesday, October 19.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, October 13, 1971.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. Vernon Christie)** took the chair at 4.4 p.m., and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated:—

ARTS.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES: FINANCE.

(Question No. 300)

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong) asked the Treasurer—

1. What Government funds have been expended in Victoria on cultural activities in each of the past five financial years?

2. What is the current basis of the various categories of grants or subsidies available to cultural organizations?

3. Whether Government funds, from either cultural allocations or other sources, are made available to claimants for new cultural buildings throughout Victoria, as distinct from grants to performing organizations and art galleries; if so, what individual grants have been made in each of the past five financial years and to which organizations in each case?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—The answers are—

1.

——	1966–67	1967–68	1968–69	1969–70	1970–71
	$	$	$	$	$
Cultural grants	379,750	385,965	425,134	510,895	742,349
National Art Gallery and Cultural Centre	3,111,304	3,727,672	2,685,335	2,805,731	847,212

2. *Country art galleries.*

Recurrent grants: These are made on the following basis:—

$1,000 per annum to galleries in formative stages for the maintenance of collections—for example, where there is a large art collection but no gallery.

$4,000 per annum to galleries with proper exhibitions, open full time, but without a professional director.

$5,700 per annum to galleries with a full-time professional director, open full time to the public and properly maintained, with proper programmes of art exhibitions.

Capital grants: These are made to municipalities in country centres with substantial art collections worthy of adequate housing, towards approved art gallery projects involving new buildings or the renovation or alteration of existing buildings. There is no fixed basis of assistance, the amount of each grant being determined by the Treasurer according to the circumstances in each case.

Other cultural grants: Grants are made from time to time to various cultural organizations, other than country art galleries, to assist them to meet either recurrent or capital expenditure. There is no fixed basis of assistance, the amount of each grant being determined by the Treasurer according to the circumstances in each case.

3. Yes.

		$
1966–67	None	
1967–68	City of Horsam — Mibus Art Gallery and Cultural Centre	31,309
1968–69	City of Horsham — Mibus Art Gallery and Cultural Centre	68,691
1969–70	Shire of Wodonga — Wodonga Art Gallery and Cultural Centre ..	35,703
1970–71	Shire of Wodonga — Wodonga Art Gallery and Cultural Centre	64,297
1971–72	Shire of Morwell—Latrobe Valley Arts Centre ..	73,994

WORKERS COMPENSATION.

CASES INVOLVING STATE COAL MINE.

(Question No. 379)

Mr. LOVEGROVE (Sunshine) asked the Chief Secretary—

1. How many cases involving the State Coal Mine were fixed for hearing before the Workers Compensation Board since the board's sittings commenced in February of this year?

2. How many of these cases actually proceeded to a court hearing as distinct from being settled?

3. Whether the State Accident Insurance Office on each occasion arranged for the Court Recording Service Pty. Ltd., or some similar organization to be present for the purpose of taking a transcript of the proceedings?

4. What was the cost involved in obtaining the services of the court reporters, and on how many occasions their services were used?

5. What was the cost incurred in the attendance at these cases of medical witnesses from Wonthaggi?

6. What was the amount of counsel's fees paid on each such case?

7. As the great majority of cases are settled at the door of the board, why the Insurance Commissioner or his legal advisers cannot settle the cases before the court hearing date?

8. Whether the Chief Secretary can assure the House that all reasonable steps are being taken to prevent a gross waste of money in legal and other unnecessary expenses?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The answers are—

1. Thirty-four.

2. Three.

3 and 4. No, although provision was made for the possible use of a transcription service where this was considered necessary by the legal advisers to the Insurance Commissioner. A total of 25 such bookings were made and the charge in 22 instances was limited to the booking fee of $18. The cost in connection with the three contested cases was $262.40.

5. $2,225. These medical witnesses were all called by the applicants' solicitors.

6. The average cost per case was about $150. The total counsel's fees were—

	$
State Accident Insurance Office	2,733
Applicant	2,383
	5,116

7. Every reasonable endeavour is made by the Insurance Commissioner and his legal advisers to settle out of court and in fact more than half of the cases finalized since January, 1971, have been settled before being fixed for hearing. In the large majority of those cases fixed for hearing, the efforts of the Insurance Commissioner were hampered by the decision of the applicant not to submit a counter-offer or propose a settlement figure. Consequently, serious discussions in relation to settlement could not take place until the morning of the hearing.

8. Yes.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

REFRIGERATED FARM BULK MILK TANKS.

(Question No. 386)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister for Fuel and Power, for the Minister of Agriculture—

Whether the Department of Agriculture has any plans to raise the standards for refrigerated farm bulk milk tanks; if so, what alterations are contemplated and what has caused these steps to be taken?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The answer supplied by the Minister of Agriculture is—

The Department of Agriculture is discussing with Victorian dairy farmers and dairy factory organizations proposals to raise the minimum standards for refrigerated farm bulk milk tanks.

Since Australian standard N46 was first published in 1963, the department has required that all refrigerated farm bulk milk tanks comply fully with the design, materials and construction aspects of the standard which affect the sanitation of tanks, contamination of milk by metals, and proper mixing of milk for sampling.

The alteration contemplated is to require that, from a date yet to be determined, all new refrigerated bulk milk tanks should also comply fully with the refrigeration performance aspects of the standard.

The alteration contemplated arises from the need to ensure the maintenance and improvement of the quality of milk and dairy products.

The following deficiencies have been detected in tanks which do not comply with the refrigeration performance aspects of the standard:—

1. At high air temperatures the motors cut out on overload and refrigeration of the milk ceases until the overloads are reset.

2. Excessively prolonged cooling times entails either an undue restriction of milk collection schedules or the collection of milk which has not been properly cooled.

3. Excessive fluctuation of the temperature of milk particularly in combination with agitation of the milk promotes the development of rancid flavours and other defects.

The department considers that these deficiencies should be corrected, and procedures are being worked out in consultation with the industry.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN BRUNSWICK EAST ELECTORATE.

(Question No. 388)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Education—

In respect of Brunswick Girls, Princes Hill, Fitzroy, Brunswick and Moreland high schools, and Brunswick and Coburg technical schools, respectively—

1. What was the total enrolment at each school in 1970 and in this year, respectively?

2. How many pupils at each school received maintenance and requisite allowances in each such year and what proportion of the total enrolment at each school these recipients represented?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1 and 2.

School	Total enrolment		Maintenance requisites		Percentage	
	1970	1971	1970	1971	1970	1971
Brunswick High School	783	886	46	55	5·8	6·2
Brunswick Girls High School	395	443	59	56	14·9	12·6
Brunswick Technical School	712	716	53	68	7·4	9·5
Coburg Technical School	691	694	25	32	3·6	4·6
Fitzroy High School	942	1,026	46	65	4·8	6·3
Moreland High School	857	947	31	28	3·6	3·0
Princes Hill High School	882	954	76	107	8·6	11·2

SCHOOLS IN CASTERTON AREA: TELEVISION PROGRAMMES.

(Question No. 389)

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether, in view of the inability of schools in the Casterton area to receive television programmes which form part of the school curriculum, he will take this matter up with the Postmaster-General to have this situation remedied?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answer is—

Yes.

HERNE HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL.

(Question No. 393)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether approaches have been made to improve staff accommodation facilities for teachers at the Herne Hill Primary School, Church Street, North Geelong; if so, what are the alleged shortcomings of the present facilities, and when it is expected that the requested facilities will be provided?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answer is—

Yes, approaches have been made regarding insufficient internal staff toilets and accommodation.

No precise indication can be given as to when the work will commence. However, it is expected to commence during 1972.

SUBSIDIES FOR HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY HALLS.

(Question No. 396)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many high schools have not received subsidies for the construction of assembly halls?

2. How many subsidies are expected to be made available next financial year, and what high schools will receive these subsidies?

3. What is the priority of Buckley Park High School to receive a subsidy for the construction of an assembly hall?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1. A total of 170 high schools have not received special grants for assembly halls. However, included in this figure are a number of high schools at which halls have been erected by the department and also a number at which grants will be approved in the relatively near future.

2. As the allocation for assembly halls for next financial year is not known at this stage, it is not possible to indicate which schools will receive subsidies in that year.

3. As outlined in the answer to question 2, it is not possible to indicate precisely when Buckley Park High School will receive its subsidy. However, it is possible that it may become available next financial year.

COLLECTION OF SCHOOL COMPOSITE FEES.

(Question No. 404)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Education—

Whether any principals have refused to collect composite fees because of their non-compulsory nature; if so, which principals and schools, when each such refusal occurred and what was the resultant action taken by the Education Department?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answer is—

No such refusal has been brought to the notice of the Education Department.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

DUPLICATION OF GEELONG-MELBOURNE LINE.

(Question No. 391)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. What length of rail duplication has been completed on the Geelong–Melbourne rail link in each of the past ten years?

2. When it is expected the duplication works will be finally completed?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answers are—

1. In 1965—2½ miles between Rock Loop and Laverton.
   In 1967—3¼ miles between Newport South and Rock Loop.
   In 1968—6¾ miles between Laverton and Werribee.
   In 1970—9¾ miles between Werribee and Little River.

No duplication work on the Geelong line was completed and brought into service during the other years mentioned.

2. Further extension of the duplication work beyond Little River will give little operational advantage until the section between South Kensington and Footscray is duplicated, but owing to the reduction in the purchasing power of the loan funds made available to the railways, neither project can be undertaken this year.

However, it is anticipated that funds will be available to carry out the work of providing a long crossing loop at Lara and crossovers at Little River; also power signalling at Werribee with remote control of Little River during the current financial year.

These works will facilitate the operation of trains, particularly over the remaining single track sections between Little River-Lara and Lara–Corio, and form a necessary part of the ultimate complete duplication of the line.

GEELONG WEST LOCOMOTIVE DEPOT: ACCOMMODATION FOR EMPLOYEES.

(Question No. 392)

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North) asked the Minister of Transport—

Whether complaints have been received on the state of accommodation provided for railway employees attached to the locomotive depot at Geelong West; if so, what are the details of the complaints, and what action is proposed to improve facilities for the employees concerned?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The answer is—

Yes, complaints have been made about the poor condition of office accommodation and furniture. Some new furniture has been provided, and draft plans for new office accommodation have been prepared and a copy has been left with the staff for comment.

HOUSING COMMISSION.

BROOKES CRESCENT, NORTH FITZROY, RECLAMATION AREA.

(Question No. 398)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Housing—

1. How many householders were resident in the Brookes Crescent area of North Fitzroy at the time the Housing Commission decided to recommend to the Governor in Council that the area be proclaimed a slum reclamation area?

2. How many householders are resident in the area at the present date?

3. How many of the householders who moved out of the area in the intervening period—(*a*) sold their house to the commission; or (*b*) had been renting houses which were sold to the commission?

4. How many of the owners and tenants, respectively, who moved out of the area were—(*a*) offered commission accommodation; and (*b*) accepted commission accommodation?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answers are—

1. 176.

2. The commission is not in possession of this information.

3. The commission has no record of the total number of householders who have moved out of the area in the intervening period but it has, within that period, purchased by free negotiation 56 properties which have subsequently become vacant and of these:

(1) 10 were occupied by tenants.

(2) 46 were occupied by owners.

4. (*a*) Where the property was sold to the commission, commission accommodation was made available to all owners and tenants who required it.

(*b*) Eight householders availed themselves of the commission's offer.

(Question No. 400)

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East) asked the Minister of Housing—

Whether his answer to a question without notice asked in this House on 30th September, 1971, means that the Housing Commission's resolution of 9th February, 1970, has been set aside and that the commission does not intend to recommend to the Governor in Council the proclamation of the area known as the Brookes Crescent area, North Fitzroy, a slum reclamation area under section 67 (1) of the Housing Act 1958; if so, whether he will take steps to notify the residents of the Brookes Crescent area that the commission does not intend to proceed with its recommendation to the Governor in Council?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answer is—

No.

COUNTRY ROADS BOARD.

DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND SUPERVISION OF LOWER YARRA CROSSING.

(Question No. 405)

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds) asked the Minister of Housing, for the Minister for Local Government—

If the Minister will lay on the table of the Library all files, documents and memoranda in possession of the Country Roads Board relating to the design, construction and supervision of the Lower Yarra Crossing?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The answer supplied by the Minister for Local Government is—

Yes. The files and documents (which will comprise approximately nine large crates) will be made available in the south room of the Library from Friday, 15th instant, to Tuesday, 19th instant, inclusive. Granting of the request will occasion upwards of 70 hours' work, and considerable disruption, for officers of the Country Roads Board. If the honorable member avails himself of the offer of consultation already made to him, he may in any future requests be in a position to assist in minimizing difficulties and expense by more precisely specifying files and information which he desires.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

PRIVATE SCHOOL FINANCES.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Is the Minister of Education aware of a recent decision of the Federal Government to allocate certain finances to private schools purely on a needs basis; if so, in view of the limited finance available in this State what objection, if any, has the Minister to allocate finance to private schools in the State on a needs basis?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—A report appeared in the daily press to this effect, but I noticed that on the following day it was corrected by the Federal Minister for Education and Science. The Minister pointed out that in the capital field a needs basis, in a sense, had always operated. An expert committee advises the Commonwealth Government on priority needs of private schools for grants for the construction of libraries and science blocks. This system has operated since the introduction of the grants for science blocks and libraries, but it is far more difficult to operate a needs system in the recurrent expenditure field.

An assessment at this level involves not only the pupil–teacher ratio in the school but also the fees charged, the capacity of parents in the district to pay increased fees and, perhaps, a detailed financial investigation of the organization conducting the school. In other words, it is far more difficult to use this method in the recurrent expenditure field than it is in the capital field.

ALLAMBIE RECEPTION CENTRE.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—In view of the fact that children at the Allambie Reception Centre are privileged to sleep on beds without legs, does the Minister for Social Welfare regard these beds as a standard item of equipment in the Social Welfare Department; if so, will the honorable gentleman give consideration to having all beds without legs made a standard item in this department?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I do not regard beds without legs as a standard item of equipment for every institution within the department, but Allambie is an emergency care centre in which children have an average stay of three months. As I indicated yesterday, the figures fluctuate violently. In June they were down to 200; at present the number of children at Allambie is 260. However, violent fluctuations in admissions occur, and emergency situations must be coped with by using emergency methods. Whilst the Government has long-term plans to overcome the causes of over-crowding at Allambie, it is not possible in the very short term to overcome the necessity from time to time to have children sleeping on beds without legs.

CONTEMPT OF COURT HEARING.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—I wish to direct a question to the Attorney-General, and refer to a letter which appeared in the *Age* of 6th October, 1971, written by Mr. Peter Brett, who I understand is Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Melbourne, concerning a matter of contempt of court by Mrs. Langer. Does the Attorney-General consider that the matter was correctly handled by Judge Gray?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! For obvious reasons I must rule the question out of order. It asks for an opinion on the decision of the court.

ALLAMBIE RECEPTION CENTRE.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Can the Minister for Social Welfare inform the House whether there are beds without legs at any institution, other than Allambie, under his control? In view of the anti-inflationary programme of the Government, has the Minister given any consideration to having chairs and tables without legs at Allambie?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—There are no gnomes at Allambie. It is not necessary to have tables and chairs without legs; this is a ridiculous suggestion. However, at Baltara, which is another emergency centre, the same provisions are made for the same types of circumstances.

HOUSE OF COMPASSION, FITZROY.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Will the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government inform the House whether the Minister or the Government intends to intercede in the dispute between the House of Compassion, Fitzroy, which is conducted by Indian nuns to help homeless men, and the Fitzroy City Council?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I am unable to answer the question on behalf of the Minister for Local Government, but I will be only too happy to refer it to him for investigation.

EMERGENCY HOUSING.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—Is the Minister of Housing aware that, yesterday, the Minister for Social Welfare stated, in reply to a question, that his department and the Housing Commission had established lines of communication for providing emergency housing for people in necessitous circumstances? If so, what action has the Housing Commission taken on this matter? Further, are there any plans to establish emergency housing? If not, are any plans envisaged for the future?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The lines of communication to which the Minister for Social Welfare referred were created as a result of discussions between us some months ago. The arrangement was made that, in any case in which a family occupying a Housing Commission dwelling appeared to be having social problems, it would immediately refer that family to the Social Welfare Department for investigation of its problems, and that the commission would co-operate to the best of its ability in solving the problems, whether they related to the family's housing situation or to other matters which were more appropriately within the realm of the Minister for Social Welfare.

This arrangement cannot be reduced to a formula. It is an arrangement under which the two departments agree to co-operate. That co-operation will be complete so far as it is possible to achieve completeness.

The establishment of emergency housing has been tried on a number of occasions and it has been found that it tends to become not emergency housing but rather a sub-standard continuing process. It is preferred not to create emergency housing but to solve the problems as they occur with permanent housing.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda).—I direct a question to the Minister of Education. Following announcements by the Office of Catholic Education from which it appears that Catholic education will be concentrated on primary schools rather than secondary schools, has the Minister taken any action to determine the possible effects that this may have on the State education system?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—A detailed analysis of the rather voluminous report issued by the Catholic Office of Education is necessary but, in the meantime, I have spoken to Father Martin, the Director of Catholic Education, asking him to inform me as soon as possible of any changes which may be contemplated for next year so that remedial measures may be taken immediately.

ALLAMBIE RECEPTION CENTRE.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Will the Minister for Social Welfare inform the House what it costs the Government to keep a child at Allambie, and what it costs the Government to keep a child in a foster home?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—Without capital repayments and interest, it costs approximately $58 to keep a child for a week at Allambie. With foster care, it costs the Government $7.50 a week for a child plus hospital, medical, dental and some clothing expenses.

NEW TRAINS.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—Can the Minister of Transport inform the House how many types of Harris trains were ordered by the Railways Commissioners and who were the constructing authorities?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I shall have to ask the honorable member for Coburg for some elucidation. The Harris trains are those that are generally known as the blue trains and I am not sure whether the honorable member means the trains which have been operating for some years or trains which have been ordered recently.

Mr. MUTTON.—I mean the new trains.

Mr. WILCOX.—They are new suburban trains and they are distinguishable in a number of ways from the Harris trains to which the honorable member referred. The order is for 30 trains to be delivered over a period of six years, which will be five new trains a year. I emphasize that they are new trains and not new cars. There is a provision in the contract that if funds are available the Victorian Railways can increase the order to a total of 50 trains and I certainly hope that that happens. As honorable members are aware, public transport is coming into its own and I expect that in due course the order will be increased to 50 trains.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—The Minister of Transport did not answer the last part of my question in which I asked who were the constructing authorities for this project.

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—The order and the contracts are complicated because a number of firms are involved. The principal contractors are Martin and King, a Victorian company. A number of other companies are involved, including the Japanese Hitachi company. This is for the order which has been placed outside the Victorian Railways. A number of carriages will be made at the Newport railway workshops. The prototypes which are running on the suburban system at present were made at the workshops. The workshops will also play a part in the final putting together of the carriages. This is a complex procedure and if the honorable member wants more detail I shall get it for him.

DAM AT TRARALGON SOUTH.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—Is the Minister for Fuel and Power aware that certain councillors of the Traralgon Shire Council have called for a public inquiry into the plan of the State Electricity Commission to construct a dam at Traralgon South, and if so, will the honorable gentleman give consideration to granting that request for an inquiry?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—I am aware that the City of Traralgon asked the Government to undertake an inquiry into this matter. The request was considered by the Government, which took into

account a number of things that are happening throughout Victoria and decided that an inquiry was not necessary.

CONTEMPT OF COURT HEARING.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—Has a letter which appeared in the *Age* of 6th October of this year, in which certain criticisms of a contempt of court hearing were made, been brought to the attention of the Attorney-General, and if so has the honorable gentleman had the opportunity of investigating these complaints? If the honorable gentleman has done this, what was the result of the investigation?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—The letter referred to by the Leader of the Country Party appeared recently under the signature of Peter Brett, who I understand is the Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Melbourne. The letter criticized the way in which Judge Gray conducted certain proceedings for contempt of court against Mrs. Kerry Langer. I have called for a transcript of the proceedings, but my investigations indicate that Judge Gray acted quite properly in the matter.

I desire to make some comment upon the letter written by Professor Brett. Firstly, he wrote the letter on the basis of an incomplete press report of the proceedings which two newspapers have subsequently taken the trouble to correct and to reveal the facts of what occurred. Secondly, Professor Brett stated that it was open for His Honour to refer the matter to another judge. This is not so under the statute relating to contempt proceedings in the County Court, which legislation was passed recently by this House.

The investigations that I have made indicate that Judge Gray acted quite properly and correctly and it seems deplorable that a gentleman holding the office of Professor of Jurisprudence, and responsible for teaching law students, should, firstly, write a letter based on an incomplete report and, secondly, make an error of law.

SHOP TRADING HOURS.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—What action has the Minister of Labour and Industry taken to reorganize the services within his department to meet the problems which will emanate from the Government's recently announced proposal to extend shop trading hours? Is the current move being called "Rafferty's rules" in shop trading circles?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I will allow the first question.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—Working hours in the community are arranged by employers and employees, not by the Department of Labour and Industry.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—Can the Minister of Lands inform the House how many applications have been approved under the rural reconstruction scheme, what amount of money is involved, and whether it is the Minister's intention to meet Ministers from other States to discuss the future of the scheme because of the difficulties that the honorable gentleman considers were apparent in the early formation of the scheme?

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The Government has made 152 offers amounting to $2·756 million and to date has received 123 acceptances involving $1·912 million. Those figures applied as at noon last Monday.

Earlier this month, I issued invitations to Ministers from all other States to attend a conference in Victoria to discuss problems arising out of the administration of the Commonwealth rural reconstruction scheme. To date, I have received acceptances

from Ministers of all States other than Queensland. The Ministerial conference will be held on Friday, 29th October, and will be preceded by an officers' conference on the previous day.

Figures I have obtained from other States indicate that, with the exception of Tasmania—which at this stage has made no offers of assistance—the States as a whole have sufficient experience critically to analyse the scheme in fine detail. That is the purpose of the conference which I have called.

SHOP TRADING HOURS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Can the Minister of Labour and Industry inform the House what organizations made representations to him for changes in shopping hours, and how many Victorian citizens were represented by those organizations?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The simple answer to the question is: The general public. The number of people in Victoria is approximately 3·4 million.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Can the Minister of Labour and Industry inform the House of the names of those citizens who represented the general public, and the nature of the representations, or was the honorable gentleman merely speaking of the ladies of the Liberal Party?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The honorable member will find the information he seeks in the electoral rolls of Victoria.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—Did the Minister of Labour and Industry make an analysis of the cost structure of the retail industry prior to his announcement on trading hours, and did the honorable gentleman study the submissions of the Retail Traders Association, which estimated a 20 per cent increase in costs as a result of his decision?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The answer to the first question is, "No", and the answer to the second question is, "Yes".

SCHOOL INSURANCE.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—In view of the fact that State school advisory councils have to bear the full cost of insuring against burglary in schools, and that these costs are increasing rapidly, has the Minister of Education any plans to remove the burden of this cost from the advisory councils and place it with the department?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The aim of the Government has been progressively to lighten the burden placed on the advisory councils and school committees by the introduction of such features as the construction of new libraries and new multi-purpose rooms in primary schools with more than ten rooms, by providing an additional $1 million for the direct grant system. This policy of gradually lightening the burden of school committees and advisory councils will be continued.

SHOP TRADING HOURS.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Apart from employee organizations, can the Minister of Labour and Industry name those organizations which have made representations to him opposing the proposed extension of shopping hours?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I am unable to supply that information at present as I do not recall it sufficiently. I have records in the department which I will make available if the honorable member places the question on the Notice Paper.

WATER STORAGES.

Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas).—In view of the large quantity of water held in the Fyans and Bellfield reservoirs, will the Minister of Water Supply run water into both Lake Hindmarsh and Lake Natimuk?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—I will ask the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission to consider this matter.

FOSTER CARE OF CHILDREN.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Can the Minister for Social Welfare tell the House how many children in State reception centres are waiting to be placed in foster homes?

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I am not able to state the number, but very few are waiting to be placed in foster care. The Family Welfare Advisory Council is now examining ways in which the placement of children in foster care can be accelerated; but there are very few children in reception centres at present who are classified as ready and waiting for foster care.

SHOP TRADING HOURS.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—Has the Minister of Labour and Industry investigated claims made by retail organizations that the extension of shop trading hours will favour large supermarkets at the expense of small trading organizations which have a high labour content in their business operations?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I have heard of no such claims.

SCHOOL COMPOSITE FEES.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Has truancy action been taken against any parent in this State who keeps his children at home because he cannot or refuses to pay composite fees?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—I think the honorable member for Geelong North is referring to an article which appeared in this morning's press which said that a parent had kept his children at home because pressure had been exerted on the children to take along a composite fee. I would have been most alarmed if that had taken place. I asked that the matter be investigated, and I received an assurance from the principal that no such action had taken place, that no pressure had been exerted on the children, and that they had been treated in exactly the same way as other class members.

SHOP TRADING HOURS.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—In view of the announcement by the Minister of Labour and Industry of the Government's intention to lift restrictions on trading hours in a wide range of businesses, will the honorable gentleman inform the House why the inspectors in his department made so many raids on nurserymen last Sunday?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The officers of the department have always been conscious of their responsibility to uphold the law, and I hope they will continue to be. I believe they carry out their duties very effectively.

SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT.

Regional Development.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I wish to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Minister for Social Welfare to involve municipalities and local communities in the establishment of effective criteria for co-ordinated regional development in his department.

Approval of the proposed discussion was indicated by the required number of members rising in their places, as specified in Standing Order No. 8B.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—There are two aspects of this matter. The first is the failure of the Minister for Social Welfare to

involve municipalities and local communities in the establishment of criteria, and the second is the clear failure of the honorable gentleman to establish any effective criteria.

The motion revolves around the decision of the Minister for Social Welfare to embark upon the experimental establishment of regional welfare offices at Preston and Geelong. The Opposition believes that the scheme which has been announced by the Minister, and the way in which he has established the regional scheme, are contrary to the principles of the Social Welfare Act, and that it is a policy matter which has been totally unplanned and has no goals. The Opposition also is of the view that the manner in which regionalization of social welfare is being handled will be detrimental rather than beneficial to the State.

In his Budget speech, the Treasurer said—

> Approval has been given for the first steps in the regionalization of the full range of the department's services, and for the co-ordination of these services with the activities of other departments, and with local government and voluntary services. The first of these regional offices will be at Geelong and Preston.

Following the Treasurer's announcement of the scheme, several members of the Opposition, including the honorable member for Geelong North and myself, asked a series of questions of the Minister for Social Welfare with the object of establishing what was involved in the regional plan of the Social Welfare Department. In a question without notice, and later in a question on notice, I asked the Minister for Social Welfare whether his department had taken steps to co-ordinate its regional boundaries with those of any other Government departments, and the Minister, in an answer which amazed me, said that it was not planned to set deliberate boundaries at that time.

I am sure all honorable members agree that a region is an area with definite boundaries, but the so-called regions which have been established at Preston and Geelong do not have boundaries. I challenge the Minister to name any other Government instrumentality in Victoria—or, for that matter, in the Commonwealth—which boasts of regional offices or sections which do not have boundaries.

I contrast the rather simple concept of regionalism which is entertained by the Minister for Social Welfare with the much more admirable regional scheme which was drawn up by the Education Department. Apparently, the Minister for Social Welfare has little or no inkling of that scheme.

On the day that the Minister informed me that the regional scheme of his department did not involve boundaries, the secretary of the Education Department wrote a letter to all members of Parliament in which he pointed out that the department had decided to establish three experimental regions from the beginning of next year. With the letter he enclosed a handsome booklet which clearly sets out the regions and their boundaries. They are at Ballarat, Bendigo, and Gippsland. The Minister is apparently quite happy that his regionalization involves no boundaries and that there is no indication of what the functions of the regional offices at Preston and Geelong are. By contrast, the Education Department's plan includes firm boundaries.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Is the honorable member debating the Education Department or the Social Welfare Department?

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—I am contrasting the approach to regionalization of the Social Welfare Department with that which has been adopted by the Education Department. I am pointing out that the Social Welfare Department has established regionalism in the same way as a magician pulls a rabbit from a hat; in other words, there is no explanation of the department's scheme.

Mr. DIXON.—Those departments are completely different.

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—Indeed, they are, and I shall develop that point later. The Education Department's regions have firm boundaries, and there are firm criteria for their establishment. I now quote from an article entitled "Regional Directorates" by Lyle Cullen which appeared in the *Educational Magazine,* volume 28, No. 6, of July, 1971—

> Factors determining the drawing of the regional boundaries included:—
>
> 1. Existing local government boundaries;
> 2. Central planning authority regions;
> 3. Community affinities;
> 4. Educational viability.

The regionalization scheme of the Education Department contains a comprehensive outline of the functions of regions and there is a clear relationship of the regions to the whole educational structure. It is obvious that extensive planning was undertaken before the Minister of Education decided to beat his chest and announce that regions were to be established.

In another place on 7th September of this year, Mr. Clarke asked the Minister of Public Works, for the Minister of Education, this question—

> When was a decision announced to establish a decentralized or regional office of the Education Department in Bendigo?

The reply given to Mr. Clarke was—

> The decision to establish a regional office of the Education Department in Bendigo was announced in the Premier's policy speech delivered in May, 1970.

The scheme was announced in September. That clearly indicates that the proposal which had been announced by the Premier was the subject of extensive planning, as it should have been. The Opposition contends that the same planning has not been carried out with the regionalization scheme of the Social Welfare Department. It is a half-baked, so-called regional scheme which is destined for failure. This is unfortunate, considering the pathetic way in which social welfare is provided in Victoria today. Clearly, there is a lack of liaison between the Minister for Social Welfare and other Ministers, particularly the Minister of Education. Certainly, there is a lack of liaison with the Minister for Tourism. This is indicated by an article in *Travel News,* No. 6, of June, 1971, published by the Ministry of Tourism, which sets out the regions in which its regional tourist councils are being fostered.

These regions are based on development regions created by the Central Planning Authority and clearly define the regional boundaries and some of the criteria of regionalism. The article states—

> Victoria is vigorously fostering the creation and promotion of regional tourist councils, based on development regions created by the central planning authority.
>
> In the planning and co-ordination of tourism, the old concept of individual resort promotion must give way. In its place comes regional promotion.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The regional concept goes even further. It provides a wonderful opportunity for adjoining resorts and regions to support one another. Joint advertising is one way. Liaison to present a continuous programme of festivals, seasonal attractions, sporting events and other activities, is another.

The emphasis placed on regionalism by the Education Department and by the Ministry of Tourism is clear. The principles upon which regionalism has been established have been clearly thought out, and much planning has gone into the development of these regions, into the delineation of their boundaries, and into the activities which occur within them—the creation of staff, and the setting out of the basic principles which underlie the creation of the regions. All this has been lacking in the Social Welfare Department. There has merely been a bald statement that regions will be created.

Section 5 of the Social Welfare Act is an important section which sets

out the constitution of the department. It states that one of the main purposes of the department is—

> co-ordinating the activities of Government municipal and voluntary organizations engaged in social work in the community and planning the effective use of their resources.

The very principle of co-ordination is spelled out in the Act. The thought behind that principle is that welfare services are at present distributed at various levels, including those of the Federal Government, the State Government, municipal councils, and voluntary agencies. As many honorable members have stated in this House, there is no systematic organization for providing social welfare services, and co-ordination is a major aspect needed in any over-all social welfare system. In the creation of regionalism which one would assume is designed to streamline the social welfare programme of the State, to improve the range of services, and to provide better facilities for the community in Victoria, the Minister, one would presume, would act upon the principles of co-ordination. One would expect him to consult representatives of the Federal Government, other State departments—to which he has easy access—municipalities and the local communities involved, including voluntary organizations.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Are you saying that that has not happened?

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—Yes, I am saying that it has not happened. The Geelong municipality has had no formal notification from the Social Welfare Department of its intention to create an experimental region in Geelong. The honorable member for Preston informs me that the Preston municipality has received no such notification. Irrespective of whether these municipalities and the voluntary agencies and the local community have received formal notification from the department of its intention to create experimental regions, there has been no co-operation between the department and these authorities or organizations in drawing up a regional scheme. This is the crux of the Opposition's criticism of the Minister. The Minister has merely made his bald announcement that experimental regions will be established. He has made no attempt to present the reasoning behind that announcement.

Mr. DIXON.—Why do you not define the word "experiment"?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I ask the honorable member for St. Kilda to listen to the debate and to stop interjecting.

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—If the Government is committed to the concept of regionalism, it must spell out the underlying principles in the same way as the principles were briefly spelled out in the Ministry of Tourism booklet I have mentioned. However, to this date, no principles have been enunciated, despite frequent questions on the subject from the honorable member for Geelong North and myself.

When the Ministry of Social Welfare has established whether or not it is committed to regionalism, then it should be able to draw up a draft proposal on exactly what regionalism means so that it can be discussed with the Federal Government authorities concerned with welfare. These will include the Commonwealth Employment Service and branches of the Commonwealth Social Services Department and the Federal Department of Health. In the opinion of the Opposition, the scheme should also be co-ordinated and discussed with other Victorian Government departments which are already operating on a regional basis. Obviously, it must be the subject of discussion with the municipalities concerned and with the voluntary agencies and the general community of the area.

The Minister would not deny that unless community co-operation can be obtained and there is involvement in social services at a local level, any services provided by either the Federal Government or his department would not be successful and

would not be provided in the most effective way. The need to provide co-ordinated services—that is, the provision of services by the various levels of Government and co-operating community organizations—has been recognized by the Government as it is set out in section 5 of the Social Welfare Act. During the debate on the Social Welfare Bill on 9th December, 1970, Mr. Julian Doyle, then the honorable member for Gisborne, told this House—

> This co-ordination is of vital importance if the programme of social welfare is to make any sense. There is far too little co-ordination at present and far too much fragmentation of services.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The co-ordination of social welfare means utilizing, to the greatest possible degree, those services which are currently available, whether they are provided by Federal, State, or local Government authorities or by private organizations. Without this co-ordination, there will be fragmentation and a hopeless disparity between one community and the next. No upgrading of social welfare can be properly implemented whilst there is a lack of co-ordination.

The former honorable member for Gisborne was the major Government party speaker in that debate. One would assume that his views on social welfare had some influence on the Government. Certainly, they had some influence when the Bill was drawn up but it is obvious, from the recent action of the former honorable member for Gisborne, that the paths followed by the Government and, in particular, by the Minister for Social Welfare, were such that he became so discouraged with the minimal efforts of the Government in the field of social welfare that he was compelled to take the most unusual step of resigning from Parliament at the early age of 36.

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda).—Mr. Speaker, I take a point of order that it is unethical and unparliamentary for an honorable member to interpret the intentions of another honorable member which can in no way be related to any fact which can be assessed by the House.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I do not uphold the point of order. The honorable member for Brunswick East is giving his opinion of an event, and I think he is in order.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition believes that the Minister has acted precipitately by announcing his so-called experimental regional scheme without any definition of what it involved, and without explanation of the activities and areas it would encompass. The Minister has provided no definition of regionalism and no plans; and the Minister's department has failed to confer with the municipal councils concerned and with the communities affected by the scheme. The Minister's actions show a great ignorance of the concept of regionalism. The Opposition believes that the Minister, in stark contrast to the Minister of Education, has displayed irresponsibility in the way in which he has presented his scheme to Parliament.

The concept of regionalism as outlined by the Minister for Social Welfare has no valid criteria and no underlying philosophy. Yet it has been announced that a steering committee has, for some time, been engaged on necessarily extensive examinations of administrative and mechanical procedures required to be involved in such a system of regionalization. That information was contained in part of an answer to a question on notice asked by me on 14th December, 1970. Surely, one would expect that before such a steering committee were created to examine administrative and mechanical problems of regionalism, the Ministry would establish the criteria by which it would create regions. They would include the extent of the boundaries, the nature of the activities that would be conducted, and the form of administration in those regions.

The Education Department intends to appoint regional directors. This is proper in any system of regionalization. The Minister for Social Welfare

has not mentioned that a Director of Regional Services will be appointed or a regional division established such as was advocated by members of the Opposition during the debate on the Social Welfare Bill. It is ludicrous that staff has been earmarked for appointment to these regions without boundaries before any effective consultation and involvement has taken place. I do not mean that the Minister for Social Welfare should address meetings and say what the department has foisted on them. I refer to conferences around the table to reach agreement.

The Minister for Social Welfare has acted precipitately and irresponsibly because he has not communicated with the sectors in the community that are providing social welfare services. He stands condemned for presenting to the House a half-baked concept—if one can grace it with the term " concept "—of regional welfare programmes.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I am amazed; I was hoping to hear something to which I could reply, but I must now start from the beginning and explain to the honorable member for Brunswick East what the Social Welfare Department is all about. It may be of interest to members of the Opposition, including their Leader, to know what goes on. They do not realize that the Ministry of Social Welfare is under way. They are ignorant of the responsibility of the Ministry.

The motion moved by the honorable member for Brunswick East is not in order because it is not a matter of urgent public importance. It is certainly a matter of public importance, and I welcome the opportunity of explaining to the House the plans that are in hand. The honorable member has given me little to which I have to reply. It is interesting that I have spoken to meetings all over Victoria on an average of three occasions a week and most of the people present have been members of the Liberal Party. Most of the people who act in a voluntary capacity are supporters of the Liberal Party. Only twice have I seen any person present representing Opposition views.

Mr. HOLDING.—We do not think you are worth listening to.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—Yet the Dandenong branch of the Australian Labor Party asked me to be their guest speaker. I was delighted to attend. I noted that the honorable member for Dandenong was not present, although a former member of another place was there. If the honorable member for Brunswick East would confine his interest to the progress of the department instead of pedalling the " Fairlea Five " to my office, he would understand exactly what was going on.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I rise to a point of order. The Minister is engaging in improper behaviour.

Mr. BILLING.—Come on, Disraeli, you can do better than that!

Mr. BORNSTEIN.—Shut up, you little twit.

Mr. HOLDING.—Listen to the anti-Semite from Heatherton.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the honorable member for Heatherton to withdraw his remark, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his unparliamentary remark.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—If my remark is offensive, I withdraw it. I did not appreciate the remark of the honorable member for Brunswick East that I was a little twit. I ask him to withdraw, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I withdraw. Having heard what he said, I still refer to the honorable member as an anti-Semite.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—I ask for a complete withdrawal of the last remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that offensive remark.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—It is not an offensive remark, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! It is offensive to the honorable member.

Mr. HOLDING.—I said that the honorable member was an anti-Semite. The word "anti-Semite" has a well-known meaning in English usage. The honorable member for Brunswick East was addressing the House, and without provocation the honorable member for Heatherton called him Disraeli in a way that was clearly directed to his religious beliefs and origin. I believe the statement of the honorable member for Heatherton was anti-Semitic. There has been no Parliamentary ruling to suggest that the expression "anti-Semite" is unparliamentary, unless you rule that way, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition knows the spirit in which he made that remark and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. HOLDING.—In deference to your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I shall withdraw, but in my opinion I can still maintain my beliefs.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—I again rise to ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition if he will withdraw.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I rise to a point of order. How can the Leader of the Opposition withdraw an opinion? He said, "In my opinion."

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! I again ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw. He knows the spirit in which the statement was made, in the same way that the honorable member for Heatherton knew and the honorable member for Brunswick East knew. The honorable member for Heatherton withdrew, and I ask the other honorable members to withdraw their remarks.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I withdraw, but I maintain my beliefs.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—I rise again to ask that the honorable member for Brunswick East withdraw his remark that I was a little twit.

Mr. WILKES.— You are a big twit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member for Brunswick East has been asked to withdraw that remark and he is about to do so.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I made the remark because I found that the honorable member for Heatherton was offensive. However, in deference to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—I again rise, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This is not good enough.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will again hear the honorable member for Heatherton, but before he speaks I am satisfied that the withdrawal has been made.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I was rising to a point of order and reflecting on the conduct of the Minister for Social Welfare in impugning my integrity in relation to a deputation that I had taken to his office. That deputation took place with his complete approval. I find his reflection on me most offensive and I ask him for a withdrawal.

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I certainly withdraw anything that is offensive to the honorable member for Brunswick East. I should like to continue to outline to the honorable member and to the other members of the Opposition, who apparently know very little about social welfare, exactly what the Social Welfare Department

is, what it has done, and what it proposes to do about regionalization. It is amazing to me that the honorable member for Brunswick East has demonstrated such a lack of knowledge. In the past few months it has been the honorable member for Northcote who has asked questions without notice on social welfare matters. Am I to believe that the shadow Minister for Social Welfare, the honorable member for Brunswick East, is not interested?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the Minister for Social Welfare to use some other expression. Shadow Ministers are not known in this House.

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—I should like to call on you for assistance, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Does one refer to the honorable member as the phantom Minister or the honorable member for Brunswick East? It is clear that his role has been completely usurped by the honorable member for Northcote. Is the member going to support his colleague? Is the honorable member for Geelong North going to tell us how wrong are the policies on regionalization? Will the honorable member for Moonee Ponds tell us what he knows about social welfare? The honorable member for Preston, who benefits so much, is not in the Chamber. Will he say that the people in the electorate of Preston are up in arms against regional services?

A number of difficulties have been encountered regarding regional services and it is not possible immediately to create staff at the top level. The greatest difficulty is that the staff at the top level have been fully occupied in carrying out the day-to-day functions. Nevertheless, they have been formed into a special planning committee, particularly to plan for the regionalization of the facilities of the department. What has been achieved? As a result of the department's investigations, it became obvious that if social services were to be supplied in an economic and beneficial way to the community it would be necessary to decentralize the department's services from its office in 1 Macarthur Street, Melbourne, and use the voluntary assistance that is available. We plan co-operation with volunteers and the other two levels of government. This policy has been clearly enunciated in dozens of meetings at which I have been guest speaker.

Mr. WILKES.—To the ladies of the Liberal Party!

Mr. I. W. SMITH.—I have also been guest speaker at a branch meeting of the Labor Party at Dandenong. Because the Social Welfare Department had little background or traditions in regional services—social welfare legislation in this State is only ten years old—the department's experience was insufficient to set firm regional boundaries, as suggested by the honorable member for Brunswick East. Unlike the Education Department, which has functioned for many years, the Social Welfare Department has been in business for only a relatively short time.

The key to regional centres is that they are experimental, and, in this respect, the Government does not intend to force on the community the rigid guidelines which the Opposition would like to lay down. The department will provide the specific welfare needs that each area requires. The new staff, for which provision has been made in the Budget, will be employed in the last half of the financial year. The staff will be requested as a special duty to co-operate with the municipalities and the local people in the community to provide the required services.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—By leave, I move—

That Standing Order No. 8B be suspended to enable the Minister for Social Welfare to continue his speech for fifteen minutes.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Leave is refused. The Government was warned last week when it wanted to use the guillotine during a debate in

this House that it will receive no consideration from the Opposition. None of the churlish statements of the Minister for Social Welfare have enlightened members of the Opposition because he said nothing about social welfare. The Social Welfare Department is no different now from what it was before it had a Ministerial head. Since the inception of the department, the honorable gentleman who is the titular head, has achieved nothing.

The Minister omitted to tell the House of the inadequacies that exist still in the field of social welfare. The honorable gentleman simply said that he had addressed Liberal Party meetings and a Labor Party meeting at Dandenong, telling them of his social welfare achievements in Victoria. I should be delighted to know whether the Minister would be game enough to explain the beds without legs at Allambie.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the terms of the motion. The remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition are wide of the mark, having regard to the drafting of the motion before the Chair.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to confine himself to the terms of the motion.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I will take no more liberties than did the Minister for Social Welfare. In the regionalization of social welfare services, all that has been achieved by this Minister and his department is the establishment of centres at Preston and Geelong. I invite honorable members to examine the problems associated with that great step forward. The Government, the Treasurer and the Minister for Social Welfare have refused the Commonwealth Government's offers of domiciliary care whereby social workers could have been provided in every elderly citizens' centre and in every municipality in the metropolitan area. This is what is meant by regionalization. Has the Minister ever told the Treasurer that his department wants to participate in the regionalization scheme so that social workers could be utilized by local councils, which in most cases provide health facilities, home-help services and meals on wheels? The Government has refused to accept the Commonwealth Government's offer to regionalize welfare services in Victoria. Its only attempt at regionalization has been to establish offices at Preston and Geelong.

I shall examine what occurs when a person applies for assistance from the Social Welfare Department. People who require assistance must trudge along to the department where they are assessed on a means test basis and, if they qualify for assistance, the department doles out a miserable pittance. When asked a question in the House a fortnight ago, the Minister knew little about the conditions under which people qualify for this assistance. Whether the meagre dole-out from the Social Welfare Department, together with the Commonwealth assistance, is enough for a family to subsist on at the time is not considered.

In the Preston area, where one of the Minister's regional centres is supposed to function, many families require assistance. One family in this category consists of a man on an invalid pension, his wife and seven children. By the time the family has met its regular financial commitments from the miserable pittance it receives from the State and the Commonwealth, it has $3 a week left on which to live. The Minister of Education wants to extract school composite fees from this family. The family I have cited is illustrative of hundreds of families who receive only a dole-out of money from the Social Welfare Department. No human understanding is shown for their problems.

If regional social welfare services are to function satisfactorily, much more must be done by the Minister for Social Welfare and the Treasurer.

Ample evidence exists that the Treasurer dislikes social welfare. From an examination of the honorable gentleman's Budget proposals, it will be noted that a very low priority has been given to social welfare. The Treasurer may have a good reason for that; I do not query it. However, he cannot have his cake and eat it too.

If regional welfare services are to be provided to cope with the problems that confront families throughout the State, including the inner metropolitan areas, the first step by the Minister and the Government should be the provision of social workers at a municipal level. The Minister does not want to employ anyone; he wants the ratepayers to employ people to carry out the social welfare work of the Government. It is the Government's responsibility to subsidize the wages of social workers. If the State Government cannot do this, the responsibility then devolves upon the Federal Government. However, the voluntary agencies are responsible for at least 47 per cent of social welfare work in Victoria. In the United States of America the voluntary agencies are compensated by the State and Federal Governments which recognize the value of such agencies and pay them accordingly. How much does the Government give voluntary agencies, which carry out the bulk of social welfare activity in Victoria? It gives them nothing!

Mr. SMITH.—That is how much you know!

Mr. WILKES.—If the voluntary agencies were forced to rely on the miserable dole-out they receive from the Government they could not exist. By comparison with the United States of America, the Victorian Government gives nothing to voluntary agencies, which are propping up his broken-down department.

The Government is not regional-minded; it is stultified. Social welfare in Victoria wants a good push, and the best push it could get is to remove the present Minister for Social Welfare and encourage the Treasury to be more sympathetic to the needs of the people who, from time to time, are forced to apply for assistance. A shortage of social workers exists in the Social Welfare Department. As a result, the case loads of 103 persons in the department must be almost doubled. The Premier, who is laughing, knows nothing about the case loads on social workers. Owing to the failure of the Minister and the Government to recruit social workers, the Social Welfare Department is faced with an acute shortage in this sphere. A shortage of social workers has always existed because they do not want to work for the Social Welfare Department owing to the inadequacy of the salaries the Government is prepared to pay. I recognize that the Public Service Board fixes the rates of pay. A need exists for streamlining the activities of the Social Welfare Department of this State.

In any regionalization of social welfare work, many local councils would be prepared to co-operate with the Minister and the Government. Unfortunately, because of the actions of the Treasurer, the Minister has turned his back on the councils. Why have the offers of domiciliary help from the Commonwealth not been accepted? Similar offers were accepted by the Minister of Health, but the Minister for Social Welfare is not allowed to accept them. These offers are just as important to the Social Welfare Department as they are to the Department of Health. With Commonwealth aid, dozens of families could be provided with assistance through municipal councils.

When a husband is on a pension and his wife is receiving child endowment, it is of no use their seeking assistance from the Social Welfare Department as the means test will eliminate them. Various benevolent societies, such as the Rotary Club and local services clubs, often assist these people. If the Minister is not aware of this, he should visit some of the northern areas and examine the cases handled, not by

registered voluntary organizations, but by other voluntary organizations such as the Rotary Club, Lions Club, and Apex Club, and also by municipal councils. They are disgusted with this Government and with the assistance the Government has given them. I could cite many cases in which councils have paid to have the electric light reconnected to a house when it has been cut off. Many councils have given food to such families because they have not had any although by the standard set by the department and the means test applied these families were not entitled to any further assistance.

Of course, the State is prepared to take their children and shove them in to Allambie, in beds without legs, but some mothers want to keep their children; they do not want to let them go to the State's reception centres because they know their background and in any case they do not want to lose their children. The Minister said that it cost $58 a week to keep a child in a reception centre and only $7.50 a week to keep it in a foster home. The honorable gentleman said that nobody was waiting to get into foster homes. That is because there are no foster homes to accommodate children. The Government stands indicted. I support the motion capably moved by the honorable member for Brunswick East. The Minister did not answer the charges made because he could not answer them.

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda).—Unfortunately, this House has been treated to an adjournment motion which is not an adjournment motion. The honorable member for Brunswick East commenced by admitting that the policy which is being followed by the Government is experimental. The honorable member made no effort to define the word "experimental". Instead he indicated how the Education Department and the Ministry of Tourism define regions. The Education Department has a budget of well over $400 million, and I fail to understand what that has to do with the Social Welfare Department, which has a budget approaching $20 million. The problems of education are completely different from those of social welfare. Because a policy commends itself to a department such as the Education Department, that is no necessary reason for it to commend itself as being a policy for social welfare.

There is nothing in the papers which have been written on the problem of regionalization or decentralization or localization which would support the motion moved by the honorable member for Brunswick East. Before I refer to these papers, I contrast the speech of the honorable member for Brunswick East with that of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What the honorable member for Brunswick East had in logic the Deputy Leader of the Opposition lacked, but he tried to make up for it by ranting and raving to disguise the task he had in attempting to support this adjournment motion, which was stupid from the beginning. I do not know why members of the Opposition lent themselves to the moving of an adjournment motion which could be wiped out with the one word "experimental".

The Victorian Council of Social Service has, through Mr. Hayden Raysmith, referred to decentralization and localization of welfare in these words—

> One hopes these important policies will be determined only after careful evaluation of existing local welfare developments and the difference between localization and decentralization is fully appreciated.

The point I wish to emphasize is the difference between decentralization and localization. It has been assumed by the honorable member for Brunswick East that the Social Welfare Department is in the process of decentralizing, that it is simply in the process of moving the department into other areas of the State. However, the problem is much more complicated; it is a problem of the localization of welfare. This means that the department has carefully to find out what exists in each different local area throughout the State. One does not define boundaries as being

the geographical boundaries which should apply to Preston, or to Geelong, or to St. Kilda, because they do not. Each area is different, as is each locality. Each has its peculiar problems of social welfare defined in the broadest sense.

Until members of the Opposition realize that experiments and pilot studies in this field must be carried out, the Opposition will get nowhere in its attempts to think about social welfare. This point is made by Mr. Hayden Raysmith when he refers to the difficulty that many people —including members of the Opposition—have in discerning between decentralization and localization. It should be obvious to all honorable members that it is necessary to discern the local committees which exist from area to area. Where there is a combination of voluntary agencies, the municipality, the State Government and the Commonwealth Government, the difficulties will be different from place to place. In some areas a substantial amount to start with is required from the Social Welfare Department, whereas in other areas that start will be provided by the voluntary agencies and in other areas by the Commonwealth. The way in which these complexities are to be integrated is not by putting out some sort of regional scheme to cover the whole of Victoria in one hit. The complexities of this field are not appreciated by the Opposition.

I wish to quote from an address given by the honorable member for Bennettswood at the Municipal Youth Services Conference, held at the Springvale city hall on Sunday, 7th February, 1971. The honorable member for Bennettswood made the point—wrongly in my view—in support of Mr. Fagan, Secretary of the Municipal Association of Victoria, that it is not necessarily desirable for municipalities to be involved to a great extent in social welfare and that it could well be that the Social Welfare Department should be the prime body responsible for the localization of welfare. I disagree with that point. Nevertheless, it is a valid argument, because it was put forward by Mr. Fagan who also said—

> I am quite sure that local government will be the richer in its moral fibre if it paid for the things it wants to give the community. Apart from the responsibility involved in raising funds and their proper expenditure, State aid tends to rob local government of its independence, its virility and its ability to stand on its own feet.

Mr. Fagan was making a case that local government should not in fact enter into the field of social welfare to any great extent. Of course, this will vary from municipality to municipality, from region to region, from community to community and from locality to locality. So it is right and proper that the Social Welfare Department should undertake pilot studies. The two pilot studies, one at Preston and one at Geelong, are not really off the drawing board yet, but this motion moved by the Opposition criticizes the fact that there exists no effective criteria. The reason that this sort of effective criteria has not yet been developed is that it would be unwise to develop criteria at this point. It is important that the information which can be derived from these pilot studies should be incorporated into welfare concepts. If these pilot studies are not made, drastic mistakes in development could occur. Therefore, it is important that the information obtained from the development which will occur in Preston and Geelong should be fed back slowly so that it may be decided how particular developments in particular areas should proceed.

I wish to praise the Minister's involvement with municipalities. In St. Kilda, an important development is taking place which is being aided substantially by the Minister. With the support of the honorable gentleman, there has been developed a steering committee in St. Kilda to produce a community welfare centre. This centre will involve the co-operation of voluntary agencies, the St. Kilda City Council, the State Government and the Commonwealth Government. The steering committee has drawn up aims for the City of St. Kilda.

Mr. HOLDING.—Who are the members of the steering committee?

Mr. DIXON.—Dr. Harbison, who is on the Committee for Social and Preventive Medicine at Monash University, councillors of St. Kilda, a social worker at St. Kilda, numerous voluntary agencies' representatives, and, incidentally, the member for St. Kilda, who initiated the project.

We believe that in St. Kilda it is important to provide a central primary location where all of those persons in need of assistance may come and where all types of welfare service will be represented. The centre will enable people in St. Kilda to become aware of all the services and facilities available. We believe that by localizing the welfare activities we will be able to co-ordinate at a local level the welfare activities of Commonwealth, State and local government with a maximum interchange of ideas. We believe co-ordinating the activities of the St. Kilda voluntary welfare groups will assist them to develop maximum efficiency, mutual awarness, co-operation and the exchange of ideas. In addition, the centre will allow each of the governmental and private agencies represented to operate autonomously in its own field without interference while being able to take full advantage of participation in a group framework. It will also serve as a source of statistical and practical research information which will ensure that proper facilities are made available for the precise needs of the people in the St. Kilda area.

We, at the local level, are unable to define the area because it is difficult to say which citizens, in the municipalities of St. Kilda, Prahran or Brighton, are those who ought to be able to come to the community welfare centre in St. Kilda. If one finds difficulties in the narrow parochial welfare field in defining the boundaries for community welfare, honorable members can imagine the difficulties inherent in any policy which seeks to define areas throughout the State. Of course, because the Minister can see the inherent difficulties in such a proposal he refrains from being a party to it. Members of the Opposition, in putting forward some glorified plan, have merely displayed their utter incompetence and lack of understanding of social welfare.

I turn now to the Victorian Council of Social Service, which has been closely associated with the Government in ensuring the co-operation and co-ordination of welfare agencies. The Government enabled the Social Welfare Department to help the Victorian Council of Social Service to initiate an in-depth survey of what was required in the City of Geelong. The result is that Geelong will benefit substantially from this survey and also from the fact that an office will be set up there by the Social Welfare Department. This was done with the co-operation of the Minister, the Social Welfare Department, the Victorian Council of Social Service and all of the organizations which are involved in social welfare in Geelong. I could turn to many examples of this having been done. In fact, so numerous are the examples that Mr. Hayden Raysmith was prompted to say that municipal welfare personnel—

> gives Victoria the most advanced pattern of municipal welfare services of this type in Australia. And one which presents many opportunities for evaluation and deveopment.

The incompetent Opposition has moved a motion, which should not have been moved, when the Government is providing in this State, to quote Mr. Hayden Raysmith, "the most advanced pattern of municipal welfare services of this type in Australia."

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! The honorable member has one more minute.

Mr. DIXON.—This motion is ill-conceived. The two members who have spoken for the Opposition have been diametrically opposed in the cases presented to the House by them. Both cases have been presented incompetently and, for these reasons, the motion should fail.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—The case put forward in support of the motion has been led by two members of the House, of whom one has had a long record of experience in social welfare work in this State, whilst the other is a comparative apprentice. However, the case has been well covered and so far it has not been answered.

The honorable member for St. Kilda took the House on a parish pump journey through St. Kilda, and the incompetence of his submissions can be judged from his statement that boundaries for the Social Welfare Department could not be defined simply because the proposal was at an experimental stage. Yet the Education Department has already brought out a booklet defining boundaries, and they are not experimental. I shall quote from a book written by Mr. Lyle Cullen, a senior officer of the Education Department, and I assume the booklet is supported and verified by the Minister. On future development Mr. Cullen states—

> It is emphasized that the initial phase of the decentralization plan is experimental.

Therefore, the contention of the honorable member for St. Kilda that the argument of the Opposition is incompetent fails. Many comments and interjections have been made about Geelong and Preston. The Minister takes pride in the fact the Geelong has a record to be proud of in social welfare work. I shall examine that record, which later may be verified by the honorable members for Geelong and Bellarine.

The work of the Social Welfare Department in Geelong may be described as disgraceful. One woman social worker is required to cover half of the Western District, thus leaving families in the Geelong area for several days on end without any assistance. This is a disgrace to the present Minister and to former Ministers. This woman is required to cover Camperdown, Colac, and even the Minister's own city, Warrnambool, and in doing so she may leave families in Geelong in a serious plight for many days. This state of affairs needs urgent reform.

I welcome any long overdue move to assist the Geelong area. But what has gone on in Geelong during the past few months? The Minister claims that he has been invited to various Liberal Party dinners and dinners given by other community bodies. Admittedly, the honorable gentleman has attended two dinners, and I am one member of the Opposition who was present at the Geelong Community Chest dinner. The only person in the room at that function who knew nothing about Geelong was the guest speaker, who told everyone present what they wanted to know about Geelong. Everyone who attended wore a bow tie and a smart suit. Little evidence of poverty was visible, but those present knew a great deal about it. The people in Geelong do not know what is wanted in Geelong—they must listen to the Minister making a speech in his Geelong Grammar School tones! The honorable gentleman spoke well.

I claim to speak on behalf of Geelong and I assume that the Leader of the Country Party will speak on behalf of the people of Shepparton. Poverty exists in Geelong and no matter how people may try to sweep it under the carpet it cannot be denied. The *Geelong Advertiser* today published a news item concerning a former policewoman, Elaine Brown, who is now a social worker for the Catholic Family Welfare Bureau. Recently, she returned from a trip overseas, and she was reported to have said that the poverty and squalor she saw in Hong Kong was little different from the poverty that existed in Victoria at present.

If action is to be taken on this matter it must not be as a public relations gimmick. The Minister has announced a plan that has no foundation. To build a foundation for such a plan, whether it be in Geelong, Shepparton or any other community, it is necessary to get down to the

grass roots level and speak to individuals in those areas who know the problems far better than the Minister.

Mr. BIRRELL.—These people have all been to Melbourne on deputations.

Mr. TREZISE.—That may be so. Today the Minister claimed that there had been no criticism of social welfare from any community organization in Geelong, but he does not know Geelong. Two hours ago I telephoned two municipalities in Geelong. One was the Geelong West City Council, which conducts a meals on wheels service, a home help service and a pensioners' association and extends assistance to people in necessitous circumstances who have difficulty in paying their rates. It is a council which has its finger on the pulse of the community. I inquired whether the council had heard from the Minister for Social Welfare about the needs of the City of Geelong West, but the reply was critical.

Mr. DIXON.—Has the council heard from the Victorian Council of Social Service?

Mr. TREZISE.—Indeed. The first response I received was that of criticism. The Minister had disappointed the council, which was frustrated because it had been ignored in every way. For many years the Shire of Corio has endeavoured, through the Housing Commission and the Social Welfare Department, to have a social worker stationed in the shire, but because of the Minister's lack of co-operation the council, in frustration, some two months ago appointed its own social worker, who will be paid from the ratepayers' funds. Now the Minister says that he is going to do something about it. If the honorable gentleman had acted earlier, the Shire of Corio would not have had to appoint a social worker.

Mr. DIXON.—Why not?

Mr. TREZISE.—Because the council said it should be the responsibility of the Social Welfare Department.

For many years I have repeatedly asked questions of the Minister of Housing about the co-operation between the Housing Commission and the Social Welfare Department and what social workers operate in Housing Commission areas. The Minister has always replied that no assistance has been received in this regard, and practically no co-operation. If the Social Welfare Department is not prepared to liaise with the Housing Commission in areas in which there are people who need help, the Minister has fallen down on his job. In Geelong there are 2,600 rented commission homes, of which 25 per cent are occupied by women living alone—deserted wives, widows, or unemployed persons. To my knowledge, these are areas in which the Social Welfare Department and the Minister have made no contact.

In this House three members represent areas in Geelong, and I imagine we all handle many cases of people who need assistance from the Social Welfare Department. I would not be bragging if I said that I have more contact with the needy people of Geelong than the others. Yet we, as local members, have never been asked what we think of the needs of Geelong and of people in Housing Commission areas. I am prepared to swear on the Bible that every Friday between 5 and 10 deserted wives come to me in tears because they are ignored by the Social Welfare Department. It is not my duty to tell them that it is not the job of the Housing Commission, or of the council, to assist them but that it is the job of the Minister for Social Welfare. The only way in which the honorable gentleman can act properly in these circumstances is to ascertain the position from people who are aware of the situation.

Has the Minister consulted the honorable member for Polwarth regarding the "hell" which has been created at Winchelsea, where 40 deserted wives live in Housing Commission homes because of lack of co-operation or assistance from the Social Welfare Department? Has the

Minister contacted the Shire of Winchelsea about this matter? I shall refer to two cases in the Polwarth electorate, and I presume the local member will also tell the story to the House. Deserted wives in Geelong who need assistance are bundled off to Winchelsea to live in homes which lack proper community facilities. I shall quote from a letter I have received from Mrs. Christy, of 13 Warner Street, Winchelsea.

Mr. DIXON.—Why name her?

Mr. TREZISE.—She is a personal friend.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I take it that the honorable member is addressing the Chair?

Mr. TREZISE.—I have nothing to hide as spokesman for these people, and neither have they. If the Government does not wish to bring the matter into the open, that is its responsibility. Mrs. Christy states in her letter—

> I feel if I can't get my children out of Winchelsea very soon I'm going to end up with two, in particular, lads who feel they never had a chance, as the eldest is 15 in March and says, "What's the use of going on in school?" The second says the same. They are victimized in the school ground with words such as, "What's it like living in Chinatown?" I feel I must get them away from Winchelsea. I had a very good friend who couldn't live here any longer. It was ruining her children's life and her health with worry. The difference since she left in herself and children is truly unbelievable. Maybe you think I am not right in this feeling.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christe).—Order! The main point of the motion is that the Minister has failed to establish effective criteria. The remarks of the honorable member for Geelong North are not relevant to this point.

Mr. TREZISE.—I am pointing out that the Minister should liaise more with the Winchelsea Shire Council and the local member of Parliament. The letter continued—

> I feel the situation is very desperate now and it is beginning to get me down.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The time allotted to the honorable member will expire in one minute.

Mr. TREZISE.—The pie in the sky policy statement made by the Minister has not been well received by the people of Victoria. The honorable gentleman has not tried to solve the problem by consulting the people who know something about them. He has gone to Geelong and made statements on what he believes are the problems, but he has not real knowledge of the problems that exists in that area and as a result he has made immature statements about regional boundaries. I support the argument put forward by the honorable member for Brunswick East and I believe it to be unanswerable by the Government.

Mr. McLAREN (Bennettswood).—My first comment is that the motion moved by the honorable member for Brunswick East is almost incomprehensible and its incomprehensibility has been confounded by the remarks of the three members of the Opposition who have spoken during the debate—the honorable member for Brunswick East, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the honorable member for Geelong North.

The honorable member for Geelong North tried to outline some needs in Housing Commission areas, but it could be described as almost being reverse snobbery. I object to the suggestion that people who live in Housing Commission areas should receive special consideration. I represent an electorate in which there are three substantial Housing Commission estates and I suggest that those areas should be considered as part of the local district. For the honorable member for Geelong North to emphasize that these areas need special assistance is, I repeat, a form of reverse snobbery.

I suggest that honorable members should re-read that part of the Treasurer's Budget speech in which the honorable gentleman set out the

Government's objectives for social welfare. In that speech the honorable gentleman said—

> The Ministry is currently giving consideration to the working out of its long-term objectives, but it is appropriate that I should mention here one or two aspects of the action which has already been taken. Approval has been given for the first steps in the regionalization of the full range of the department's services—

That is what the present motion is directed against—

> and for the co-ordination of these services with the activities of other departments, and with local government and voluntary services.

In view of the fact that the Ministry of Social Welfare has only recently been established, I consider that the Minister for Social Welfare has given considerable time and thought to the planning of the department. He has given consideration not only to planning within the department but to meeting groups in the community who are associated with social welfare and asking them to come to his office to discuss these aspects. Regional areas have already been established in Geelong and Preston and that is an indication of the way in which the department is undertaking experiments in these areas.

The honorable member for Brunswick East, in suggesting that there should be a map on which regional areas are indicated, is looking to the form of socialistic planning that is behind his thoughts rather than saying that there should be experiments in areas which could be expanded or retracted if necessary. Much of the criticism which has been made of the Allambie Reception Centre falls back on to the young children who reside in this and other institutions. Sometimes my heart bleeds for these young children when I hear this criticism. Are honorable members playing politics when they attack these institutions? Do honorable members fully understand the role of these institutions? We should be stressing more the need for putting these children back into the community and fostering their development.

If the Opposition were honest in its criticism of the Social Welfare Department it would put forward constructive suggestions on how these children could be moved out into the community. Our endeavours should be directed towards ensuring that these young children are put into foster homes, rather than have them remain in these institutions which, as the Minister has explained on a number of occasions, are places where young children are taken in emergency. This means that at times the number of children in these institutions is in excess of the number they are capable of accommodating, but in time the number will be reduced. It must be expected that at times these institutions will be overcrowded.

Honorable members should realize that in planning social welfare services for the future more attention must be given to local or regional groups, irrespective of whether this is within a municipality or within a region, as was explained by the Minister for Social Welfare and referred to by the honorable member for St. Kilda. However, there should be further discussion on it.

I believe the suggestions that have been made about both the Geelong and the Preston regions should be further examined, and the reference that the honorable member for St. Kilda made to the paper I gave to the Municipal Youth Services Conference on 7th February, 1971, has indicated plainly that this consideration ought to be given to local regional areas but in conjunction with the municipalities.

In planning social welfare services for the future there is a need for close co-operation between the Commonwealth Government, which has the most power and finance, the State Government, the municipalities and the many voluntary organizations which are undertaking social work in the community. The recent decision to increase the Budget allocation for wards of the State to

$20 a week for each child will help to reduce the number of children at the Allambie Reception Centre.

I believe the motion has been moved half-heartedly by the Opposition and is only confusing the situation. In my opinion the Ministry of Social Welfare is being capably administered by the Minister for Social Welfare.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—I support the comments of the honorable member for Brunswick East and the other members of the Opposition who have spoken during the debate and I refute the suggestion that the subject of the motion is not a proper one on which to move for the adjournment of the House. In fact, I think that suggestion is a reflection on the Chair and if it were properly held it should have been put forward and substantiated when the motion was moved. Therefore, the suggestion has little in its favour. The motion states that the failure of the Minister for Social Welfare to do certain things is of urgent public importance and I agree with that contention. I am sure that the majority of residents of the metropolitan area hold a similar opinion.

The Minister for Social Welfare has had no official contact with the cities of Preston and Northcote concerning social welfare. When social welfare facilities are envisaged, planning should be started but when the Social Welfare Department was established the Government adopted an incorrect procedure by appointing staff and then starting to look for something for them to do. The normal procedure is to carry out the planning and then to appoint the staff.

An example of the incompetence in the department at the moment is that no member of the staff in head office or in the branches knows anything about the department's proposal for establishing regions. In addition, the department has been lax in not acting conjointly with the municipalities in providing social welfare facilities. The municipalities and the department have been operating as single units and there has been no co-operation. The Minister has not attempted to find out what the City of Preston is doing in the way of social welfare.

The Preston City Council and the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital are co-operating in providing social welfare facilities but they have received no indication from the Social Welfare Department of its plans for the area. It has been stated that the department is co-operating with the local hospitals and the local municipalities but there is no evidence of this co-operation in Preston. A social worker from the Preston and Northcote Community Hospital brought a boy to the council's home needs section, which is the only one of its kind in Australia. The boy needed swimming lessons and I can assure the House that he will get them. If a person is found dead there are two lines of action which can be followed. The first is to notify the relatives, and if no relatives can be found, the second is to notify the police. The employees of the Preston City Council do this sort of thing and they are all paid employees.

When a child from a deprived family in Preston needs a holiday, the services of voluntary organizations, such as Lions and Rotary, are used to ensure that the child has a holiday. The council's social welfare agencies are also used for this service. Is a similar scheme envisaged in the plans of the Social Welfare Department? Perhaps the Minister feels that this type of planning at the grass roots level is unworthy. I refute the suggestion by honorable members opposite that people who are crying out in desperation should do more for themselves because I believe the community which has placed them in this position owes them something.

Mr. WILTSHIRE.—That is stupid.

Mr. KIRKWOOD.—The honorable member for Syndal has made an intelligent interjection! The opinions

expressed by members of the Government party by way of interjection make me wonder how every three years they gain pre-selection. When I hear that it is planned to regionalize the Social Welfare Department, I look for other things. I think of deserted wives and husbands with families and the organizations that are available to assist them. I then wonder if anything for these families is on the planning board.

I am concerned that the Social Welfare Department will spend approximately $20 million in the next twelve months and that no indication has been given that the problem mentioned by the honorable member for Brunswick East will be attacked in any way. The Opposition would like to see the problem attacked. Members of the Opposition do not know what the proposed procedure will be and they are concerned because they believe that people who find themselves in an unfortunate situation are entitled to some sort of helping hand. The helping hand could come from many avenues. It could be a direct channel to the marriage guidance organizations, the Parents Without Partners Association, the local municipal council, or any other community organization which is prepared to help. The Minister did not inform honorable members what his department proposes to do.

Some hospitals will be affected by the proposed regionalization of the department's services. I suggest that four private hospitals in the Preston and Geelong areas, and at least one public hospital in each will be involved. It is essential that avenues for assistance should be available. Again the Minister has been devoid of thinking that a need exists for this assistance. The only home-making service in Australia has been established in the City of Preston and I am surprised that the Minister has not taken the trouble to examine the scheme and to discuss with the local supervisors what happens in the field. The honorable gentleman could possibly work in with this particular service and the community would be only too pleased to be associated with the department in this field.

The honorable member for St. Kilda said that the Opposition lacked a true knowledge of this subject. I refute his contention that the only honorable member with a true knowledge of this subject is himself. If the honorable member had believed that a need existed for the project which is being planned in the St. Kilda area, he would have done more about it when he first entered this House. The honorable member's public relations will be magnificent this week because he will be able to say that the project is being planned. The honorable member's concern for the community will be restricted to planning. The concept of decentralization or localization suggested by the honorable member for St. Kilda was in opposition to what the Minister proposes for the Social Welfare Department in the next six months. Quite often the honorable member for St. Kilda is in hot water in his own political party and on various matters is to the side of his colleagues.

Mr. BIRRELL.—Get on with it.

Mr. KIRKWOOD.—I believe the Government should get on with it and should have acted in this matter decades ago. Candidly, I think the Minister realizes that an urgent need exists. The Government should proceed with the planning now and make it obvious to the staff who are employed and the people who are concerned in the homes that it is prepared to do something before next Christmas.

Mr. J. A. TAYLOR (Gippsland South).—Today the Opposition, led by the honorable member for Brunswick East, delivered a cream-puff attack on the Minister for Social Welfare. The honorable member said nothing that members of the Government party did not expect to hear and provided an excellent run-down on the regionalization of

the Education Department. I remind the honorable member for Brunswick East that the Education Department has been in existence for many years and has regionalized its administration at least to the extent of having district inspectors. On the other hand, the Social Welfare Department was established only twelve or thirteen months ago and undoubtedly will eventually introduce a similar regionalization system.

To be successful, regionalization must be flexible and an individual approach must be adopted to each area. To cite an example, some months ago at Morwell I attended a meeting of social welfare workers from the Gippsland area. Statements that they made left no doubt that each area they represented experienced a different problem. The basis of regionalization in the Social Welfare Department is that each area should be treated as a separate entity.

It is necessary to examine the areas which the Social Welfare Department will cover and to define the responsibilities of the departmental officers and voluntary workers who give freely of their time and offer help to people in need. The training of social welfare workers is undertaken by the Social Welfare Department. Under regional administration, the farming out of the work will be undertaken by people familiar with the area; this is important. The views expressed by members of the Opposition would lead one to think that the Opposition would force social welfare upon the municipalities and impose upon them the will of the department. This could not work under any circumstances. A municipality must accept the ideas of the Social Welfare Department and must help in the same way as the voluntary workers who give freely of their time within the areas, and who are in direct contact with those people who are in need because of unnecessary burdens which have been placed upon them.

Whilst the honorable member for Brunswick East was stewing over this so-called attack on the Minister for Social Welfare, the Minister was speaking to two different organizations and discussing with them their ideas on how the administration of the department should be regionalized. The honorable member for Geelong North said that the local people should be consulted, and this was being done by the Minister. Investigations are being carried out. The Social Welfare Department will have sixteen officers stationed in the Geelong area, and part of their job will be to gather the information required to establish the greatest needs in the area to decide what the priorities should be, and to set up the basis of individual contacts between voluntary workers and the people in need.

Therefore, the groundwork which the Opposition contended was not being done is being undertaken at the moment. Their most important function will be to foster the co-operation of the service clubs, volunteer agencies and the municipalities in tackling the problems facing people in the community who need help. I was disappointed by the fact that, in levelling charges against the Minister for Social Welfare, the honorable member for Brunswick East had to be pulled out of the mire by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who, in his normal way, strove to salvage something from the wreckage. I fully support the Minister in defending himself against this attack upon himself and his department.

Honorable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. J. A. TAYLOR.—I cannot agree in any way with the arguments which have been advanced by the Opposition. In my view, the arguments that have been adduced carry no weight at all.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—In the short time at my disposal, I indict the Minister for Social Welfare.

Mr. WILCOX.—See if you can say something worth while for once.

The SPEAKER.—Order! I invite the Minister not to continually interject.

Mr. WILKES.—It is a disgrace.

The SPEAKER.—Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. FELL.—I indict the Minister because, by his own admission, no liaison exists between the State and the Commonwealth, nor has there been liaison between municipalities and the Social Welfare Department. In addition, no contact has been made with the two municipalities which are most vitally affected by the proposed regionalization of the Social Welfare Department.

The honorable member for St. Kilda said that the regionalization proposal was in the nature of an experiment. The Government has had seventeen years in which to experiment. When will honorable members see the results of this experiment? Municipalities have demonstrated that localization is not the answer to the problems which exist in the social welfare field. It is of no use the honorable member for St. Kilda now attempting to hop onto the band wagon. Municipalities will not wait any longer; they have had enough of the Government.

Honorable members interjecting.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! There are far too many interjections. Members are interjecting out of their places. The House must hear the conclusion of this debate in silence.

Mr. FELL.—The honorable member for St. Kilda spoke of the need for local organization, but I suggest that one cannot localize in social welfare activities.

The SPEAKER.—The honorable member has 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. FELL.—That will probably be insufficient to allow me to list all of the inadequacies for which the Government is responsible and which can be laid at its doorstep. If I had the opportunity of listing the deficiences which exist in the Minister's department, I am certain that the honorable gentleman would have great difficulty in supplying a satisfactory answer. Social problems cannot wait seventeen years to be resolved. The Opposition wants action instead of further experiments.

The SPEAKER.—The time allowed for this debate has expired.

The House divided on the motion for the adjournment of the House (the Hon. Vernon Christie in the chair)—

Ayes	19
Noes	46
Majority against the motion	27

AYES.

Mr. Amos	Mr. Lewis (*Portland*)
Mr. Bornstein	Mr. Lind
Mr. Curnow	Mr. Mutton
Mr. Doube	Mr. Simmonds.
Mr. Edmunds	Mr. Trezise
Mr. Floyd	Mr. Wilkes
Mr. Fordham	Mr. Wilton.
Mr. Ginifer	*Tellers:*
Mr. Holding	Mr. Fell
Mr. Lewis (*Dundas*)	Mr. Kirkwood.

NOES.

Mr. Balfour	Mr. Rafferty
Mr. Billing	Mr. Reese
Mr. Birrell	Mr. Reid
Sir Henry Bolte	Mr. Ross-Edwards
Mr. Borthwick	Mr. Scanlan
Mr. Broad	Mr. Smith (*Bellarine*)
Mr. Burgin	Mr. Smith (*Warrnambool*)
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Stephen
Mr. Dunstan	Mr. Stokes
Mr. Evans (*Ballaarat North*)	Mr. Suggett
Mr. Evans (*Gippsland East*)	Sir Edgar Tanner
Mrs. Goble	Mr. Taylor (*Balwyn*)
Mr. Hamer	Mr. Templeton
Mr. Hayes	Mr. Thompson
Mr. Jona	Mr. Trethewey
Mr. Loxton	Mr. Trewin
Mr. McCabe	Mr. Wheeler
Mr. MacDonald (*Glen Iris*)	Mr. Whiting
Mr. McDonald (*Rodney*)	Mr. Wilcox
Mr. McLaren	Mr. Wiltshire.
Mr. MacLellan	*Tellers:*
Mr. Manson	Mr. Crellin
Mr. Meagher	Mr. Taylor. (*Gippsland South*)
Mr. Mitchell	

PAIRS.

Mr. Clarey	Mr. Moss
Mr. Turnbull	Mr. Rossiter.

The sitting was suspended at 6.35 *p.m. until* 8.7 *p.m.*

MOTOR CAR (BREATH TESTS) BILL.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend Division 2. of Part VI. of the Motor Car Act 1958 with respect to preliminary breath tests and breath tests.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

STATE FORESTS WORKS AND SERVICES BILL.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Forests).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides authority for the expenditure of $5·15 million on works and services. An amount of $3·622 million has been approved for expenditure on proposed works for the financial year ending June, 1972. The additional amount authorized by the Bill is to provide Parliamentary authority to continue works until the passing of further legislation relative to the works programme to be approved for the financial year 1972–73.

Clause 1 of the Bill comprises the short title and citation. Clause 2 provides for the expenditure of moneys for the purposes set out in the table in this clause of the Bill. Clause 3 provides that no moneys shall be expended except under this measure and has the effect of cancelling unexpended authorities remaining under the State Forests Works and Services Act 1970.

ITEM 1: Fire protection, $850,000—The Forests Commission is responsible for prevention and suppression of fires in State forests and national parks and within one mile of these lands, which represents in total about one third of the State's area. As it is an established fact that in south-eastern Australia the combination of climate and inflammable eucalypt fuel gives rise to severe bush fires practically every summer, there is a very real need to maintain expenditure on forest fire protection, particularly the prevention aspects, at a high level. Accordingly provision has been made for the following new works:—Construction of 1 lookout cabin; 260 miles of fire access tracks; 52 helicopter landing pads; 92 miles of dozed firelines; and 1 airstrip. Eleven new dams will be constructed in areas where permanent water supplies are not normally available in summer.

The commission will again retain a helicopter on immediate call in the summer for transport of fire crews and for plotting the spread of major fires. Funds are again provided for employment of mobile self-contained crews including some university students, during January and February, to augment the commission's basic force of fire fighters in forest districts. Similar crews have proved very valuable in the past five fire seasons. With the completion of the fire-bombing base at St. Clair, near Matlock, there will now be five bases in operation and equipped with facilities for mixing and loading phoschek fire retardant into aircraft for attack on fires in mountain forests. The other bases are at Benambra, Snowy Plains, Victoria Valley and Bonang.

The Government has made special provision for further expenditure on fire protection works in the State forests in the Dandenong Ranges as a continuing step in implementing the fire protection plan for that area. The major work to be undertaken is removal of hazardous material from the buffer zone on the north-western and western slopes above the Basin.

Fire Fighting Equipment.—Funds are provided for the replacement of ten 600 gallon four-wheel drive tankers which have reached the end of their economic life.

A further six weather stations will be set up in strategic location principally in the mountain forest areas to improve accuracy in assessing fire danger.

Five base stations in the radio network will be furnished with new equipment and converted to remote control to overcome interference problems. Testing is proceeding with a range of V.H.F. communications equipment with a view to conversion to this mode of communication within the next two or three years.

Further developmental work will be undertaken in design of ancillary V.H.F. radio equipment for aircraft to facilitate control of the increasing range of aerial operations involving air to ground communication in fire protection and also in aerial seeding, insect and pest control, and spraying with trace elements and plant nutrients.

Fire Research.—Work continues on projects designed to give basic data on forest fire behaviour and its effect on flora and fauna. Experiments are being conducted with new techniques to attempt to improve fire suppression efficiency in the field and if successful they will be incorporated as standard field procedures. These include quick methods of determining fuel moisture contents in the field, and the evaluation of other fire retardants which may be cheaper and perhaps more efficient under our forest condition than the chemicals currently being used.

ITEM 2: Indigenous State forests, $550,000—Funds under this item provide for the continuation of silvicultural treatments in native forests. The objective of these operations will be the maintenance and improvement of forest productivity by the regeneration of recently logged areas, the reforestation of unproductive areas resulting from past fires and early uncontrolled utilization, and the upgrading of the growing stock in immature and overstocked young stands.

To the maximum extent possible, departmental staff will direct and supervise the operations of forest licensees to achieve silvicultural benefit to State forests. This item finances the additional works necessary to complement the activity of licensees in attaining silvicultural objectives.

Where licensee operations are not feasible due to insufficient merchantable produce, departmental operations are necessary to achieve the silvicultural objectives. Activities will be conducted in a variety of forest types throughout the State, including the river red gum and the box and ironbark forests, but the more important activities will be in areas of first class timber potential which lie in the higher rainfall areas of the State. In these areas, the major project will be the replacement of overmature, defective and understocked stands with vigorous new crops. Harvesting and regeneration of the young mountain ash and alpine ash stands, resulting from the tragic forest fires of 1939, will begin on a small scale. Management plans have been prepared for the use of this large and most valuable resource.

The full sunlight technique involving maximum utilization, seed bed preparation and direct seeding will continue to be the prime method of regeneration for ash-type mountain forests. Agricultural aircraft, with minor modifications to facilitate the accurate aerial sowing of the eucalypt seed, will be used to sow approximately 5,000 acres. The fine eucalypt seed is clay-coated to make it larger and heavier for the purpose of aerial seeding.

Collection of adequate quantities of seed for regeneration purposes is a perennial problem due to the variability of the natural seed production cycle in our native species. With the aid of recently developed artificial seed extraction systems, it is planned to establish a reserve of

seed from the current good capsule crop, to offset the difficulties of poor seed crop years.

The mixed species eucalypt forests of the foothill country will continue to receive regeneration and improvement treatments. Improvement operations, a major activity in this forest type, aim at upgrading the desirable growing stock trees by removal of the damaging influences of defective and over-mature stems.

The thinning of established young stands, the elimination of cull trees and unwanted coppice growth and the regeneration of unproductive areas is planned for the red gum and box ironbark forests of the drier regions. These areas produce most of the State's railway sleepers, and thinning practices are oriented to improve the supply of this product.

An inter-departmental project to rehabilitate portion of the sandhill country in the far north-west of the State by planting with the native Murray pine is being continued. Projects also funded by this item include erosion control works in native forests and construction works such as new dams and fencing which are essential to the proper control of grazing in forest areas. Provision is also made in this item for works in forest parks, alpine reserves, scenic reserves and various types of special purpose reserves set aside by the commission.

Public interest in outdoor recreation and environmental conservation has increased and will continue to expand. The commission, aware of this development and in anticipation of its expansion, has established a programme of reserving significant areas of State forest for scenic and scientific purposes and to provide facilities for recreational use of the forest. Ninety-three such parks and reserves have been established, totalling just under 65,000 acres of reserved forest which are set aside specifically for public recreational and similar uses.

Works in these reserves will be carried out to provide the visiting public with comfortable access in the form of roads, car parking areas and graded walking tracks. In addition, funds will be used to provide adequate picnic areas complete with all the facilities expected by the person who visits the forests for recreation purposes.

ITEM 3: Extraction roads, $450,000 —Finance under this item provides for new road construction which is required, as well as for improvements to existing forest roads and bridges.

The continual extension of timber harvesting activities into the more remote regions of the State requires a corresponding extension of the commission's roading system. Some plantation areas established before the start of the plantation expansion programme require more roading to enable the efficient harvesting of the areas now approaching maturity. The efficient management and protection from fire of the State's forests depends to a large degree on the provision of access by means of minor roads and 4-wheel-drive tracks into otherwise inaccessible regions.

The various agreements between the commission and some of the larger wood-using companies which involve the production of large volumes of pulpwood will require in some areas considerable additions to roads in both hardwood and softwood forests.

The extensive stands of mountain ash regeneration which followed the 1939 fires are rapidly reaching utilizable size and utilization will soon commence on a considerably larger scale than formerly. These stands are dense with high volumes per acre and will require an intensive roading network for thinning and harvesting. As well, they are situated in mountainous and high rainfall areas where roading is costly, and requires to be well advanced prior to harvesting.

The need for more economic transport has led, over the years, to the development of larger and heavier

haulage vehicles. Many of the commission's roads built in earlier days are now inadequate to cope safely with these larger transport units and must be improved.

The increase in usage of forest roads by the general public for tourism and recreation has meant that many roads built twenty or even only ten years ago, though then adequate for use for timber extraction only, can no longer be so described when used as well as increasingly heavy tourist traffic and must be improved for the safety of all who use them.

The commission's normal road construction and improvement programme was considerably delayed last financial year in the eastern parts of the State by the heavy floods in Gippsland. These caused widespread damage and required the reconstruction or replacement of many bridges and culverts and the reconstruction of many sections of road.

ITEM 4: Plantations establishment —softwoods and hardwoods—including softwood planting undertaken in accordance with agreements between the Commonwealth and the State, $2.75 million—It is expected that the annual planting of softwoods under the proposed second five year agreement between the State and the Commonwealth will be 11,500 acres per annum.

The 1971-72 programme will be carried out in 25 forest districts. Major plantings will be carried out as follows:—

Marysville–Taggerty	1,450 acres
Rennick	1,300 acres
Mirboo–Yarram ..	1,300 acres
Benalla	1,000 acres
Tallangatta ..	1,000 acres
Myrtleford ..	700 acres

Major expenditure items included in the softwood planting programme this year are—

	$
Land purchase, clearing and site preparation ..	496,000
Raising nursery stock ..	134,000
Planting	223,000
Tending planted areas ..	157,000
Roading	184,000

The clearing programme associated with this planting will use both departmental and contractor resources and is designed to enable, where possible, areas in advance of immediate planting requirements to be cleared.

Cleared areas in advance of actual areas required for planting enable necessary site preparation works to be carried out in the summer prior to planting. It has been found that ploughing during the summer preceding planting both improves the site and lowers later costs by reducing subsequent competition from regenerating scrub and weed species. Cleaning operations amongst the young trees to remove competing scrub is a labour intensive activity, and, as such, is increasing rapidly in cost. It is planned to plough 6,200 acres of the area to be planted this year.

Approximately 12 million seedlings will be required to plant the 11,500 acres and these will be raised at nurseries located at Benalla, Trentham, Rennick, Koetong and Narbethong. *Pinus radiata* will be raised at the first four named nurseries whilst, at Narbethong, sufficient of the other softwood species, largely Douglas fir, will be raised to permit at least 1,000 acres to be planted in species other than pinus radiata.

Sixteen hundred pounds of seed will be required to raise the necessary nursery stock. This quantity of seed will not be available from existing mature plantations in this State and purchase from interstate sources will be necessary to make up the deficiency. This purchase of seed from interstate sources is a temporary measure as this year will see the Forests Commission's seed orchard programme approaching completion. This project of 300 acres of specially grafted elite seed trees will produce genetically superior seed to provide trees of improved growth and form.

The cone crop from the orchards will provide 10 per cent of seed requirements this year and will be supplying all requirements within eight years.

An amount of $157,000 will be expended on tending 25,000 acres of plantation. This includes cleaning of lately planted areas to reduce competition to the young plants from scrub species, firming of plants after planting and spraying of areas where necessary to overcome mineral trace element deficiencies.

Reforestation will continue in the South Gippsland hills where approximately 1,000 acres of scrub-covered country now regarded as uneconomic for farming, which has been purchased for placing back under forest, will be planted. The main species to be used is mountain ash which is native to the area and which will be raised at the Olsen's Bridge nursery, south of Boolarra. Prison labour, provided by the Social Welfare Department and supervised by Forests Commission staff is used in the nursery and at all stages of planting. Clearing and other site preparation for this reforestation programme is carried out largely by the Forests department.

Other hardwood plantings will be made to plant up blank areas in the forest and to reclaim worked out gravel pits in various parts of the State.

An amount of $184,000 will be expended to construct sixteen miles of primary roads and 108 miles of secondary roads in various plantation areas. This roading is necessary to enable planting to be carried out and will permit future plantation maintenance and protection as well as providing the skeletal framework for later timber extraction roads.

As areas of matured plantations are clearfelled, the sites will be prepared for new plantings of suitable species. Approximately 500 acres will be treated in this manner during 1971-72.

ITEM 5: Forest officers' quarters, workshops and other buildings, $180,000—There is considerable variation between forest districts—geographically, in forest types and in the class of forest operations carried on. To enable its professional officers to obtain experience in all types of district work, it is necessary that they periodically transfer between districts. These transfers are facilitated by the policy of providing official residences for professional forestry officers and several additional residences will be provided this financial year.

New district offices currently being built will be provided at Stawell, and at Daylesford where officers are at present occupying totally inadequate office space in the court-house. In addition, extensions will be added to some offices where these have become necessary.

The policy of replacing outmoded sheds and garages will be continued. Some of the buildings to be replaced were provided in the days of horse transport and are completely inadequate for current requirements.

ITEM 6: Purchase of land, $70,000—The purchase of properties in the Dandenong Ranges for the preservation of beauty and for fire protection purposes is continuing, and properties are also being purchased for the extension of the fire protection zone north of the Ferntree Gully National Park.

Suitable private property adjoining existing reserved forest will be purchased, when offered, in continuation of the commission's programme of forest management. Other land purchases will be necessary to provide access to fire protection and timber extraction. This item does not include land acquisition for softwood plantation purposes which is provided for in item 4.

ITEM 7: Purchase of plant, other than under items 1–5 inclusive, $230,000—Provision has been made for the purchase, fabrication or replacement of items not financed from the Plant and Machinery Replacement Fund. Such items include small plant,

tools and equipment required by the central workshop at Newport and the various field repair centres. In addition, chain saws, motor mowers and similar equipment for general field use will be provided. Provision is also made in this year's Bill for the acquisition of additional large tractors required in connection with the reforestation programme.

ITEM 8: Farm forestry, $70,000—The farm forestry loan scheme offers a landowner a loan up to $5,000 for the planting of pine trees on his property; the loan is interest free for the first twelve years after planting on the basis that the thinnings from the plantation will, after this period, pay the interest on the loan.

At 30th June, 1971, $163,000 had been committed under 66 agreements of which $99,190 had been actually paid to agreement holders as reimbursement of establishments costs incurred. This scheme is of increasing interest and attraction to land owners and negotiations for further agreements are in various stages. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 27.

NEWHAVEN LAND BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Newhaven Yacht Squadron was constituted in 1962 to promote and encourage the sport of yachting in Westernport. It is established in a club house on a site of 34 perches being part of the permanent reserve for public purposes along the foreshore in the township of Newhaven on Phillip Island. Permission to occupy the site was given by the corporation of the Shire of Phillip Island in its capacity as committee of management of the reserve.

The squadron wishes to undertake the development of a boat harbor in front of the club house and it has sought a lease of about 9 to 10 acres of the bed of Westernport. The Fisheries and Wildlife Branch, the Town and Country Planning Board, the municipality of the Shire of Phillip Island and the Ports and Harbors Branch of the Public Works Department are all in favor of the proposed boat harbor.

The bed of Westernport is unreserved Crown land and the leasing provisions of the Land Act permit the granting of a lease of the sea bed below high-water mark. However, the power to lease does not extend to the site of the club house situated on the permanent reserve and, in the over-all development, it is desirable that the proposed lease include the site of the club house. This is the purpose of the Bill.

For the information of honorable members, I point out that the proposed development of a boat harbour would be subject to conditions specified by the Ports and Harbors Branch. One of these conditions requires a qualified professional engineer to be responsible for the preparation of plans and specifications and the general supervision of the works. Another provides that detailed plans of all sections of the scheme be submitted for the approval of the branch before the commencement of any work. The municipality of the Shire of Phillip Island will require a public access path with a minimum width of 12 feet between the club house site and the proposed boat harbour.

Clause 1 cites the short title. Clause 2 provides that the Governor in Council may grant leases of that part of the reserve shown in the schedule. This will enable the site of the club house to be included in a Crown lease of the boat harbor. The schedule contains a plan of the land presently occupied by the Newhaven Yacht Squadron which is to be leased by the Crown. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 27.

INSTRUMENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend certain of the provisions of Part VI. of the Instruments Act 1958, which deals with bills of sale of personal goods, whether given absolutely or by way of security. It also regulates agreements for the sale of personal goods, where, under a further agreement for letting or hiring, the vendor retains or retakes possession of the goods. The Act requires these instruments to be filed in the Registrar-General's office, and if not so filed they are of no effect.

As honorable members may be aware, any person proposing to lend money on the security of goods or to purchase goods can, by searching in the Registrar-General's office, ascertain whether or not the proposed borrower or vendor transferred the goods to a third person, either absolutely or by way of security, thus giving to that person a right to seize the goods. Since 1964, there has been an enormous growth in the number of bills of sale lodged with the Registrar-General. In that year, 6,794 bills of sale were lodged, whereas in 1970 the number of bills of sale lodged was 27,668. The cost and complexity of operating the existing system of recording and filing has correspondingly increased, and the possibility of error in indexing and in searching has also increased. It is essential in the public interest that the situation be remedied, and the amendments proposed by the Bill have the following aims:—

1. To do away with the statutory requirement of a "book" containing elaborate particulars and to substitute an index of grantors' names.

2. To streamline the process of lodging and filing instruments, thus reducing the cost and expense presently involved both for the public and the Registrar-General's office.

3. To overcome difficulties presently being experienced in supplying to the public accurate and speedy information as the existence of instruments lodged under Part VI. of the Instruments Act.

4. To remove the present limit of $2.00 imposed by sub-section (3) of section 139 of the Instruments Act in respect of fees.

5. To correct certain anomalies in the existing legislation.

Clause 1 is the usual citation and commencement provision. Clause 2 contains a drafting amendment to avoid the repetition of a lengthy expression in a later clause. Clause 3 effects a number of amendments of section 35 of the principal Act. Paragraph (*a*) of this clause amends paragraph (*a*) of sub-section (2) of section 35 to make it clear that the details required to be set out in a bill of sale may be contained either in the bill of sale itself or in a schedule or inventory next to or referred to in the Bill. This amendment is intended to remove any doubt as to the effect of the existing provision where the property is described in a schedule.

Paragraph (*b*) amends paragraph (b) of sub-section (2) of section 35. This amendment is related to the proposal for automatic filing contained in clause 9 of the Bill. In practice, when a bill of sale or a copy bill of sale is lodged under section 35, it is accompanied by any schedule or inventory, or a copy thereof, and the necessary affidavit of execution. However, as the Act stands, it is not essential that these documents be lodged at the outset, and they could be produced at the time of filing. With the introduction of automatic filing, it is essential that they be produced at the time of lodging the bill.

Paragraph (c) repeals sub-section (4) of section 35. This provision deals with two matters. First it provides that, notwithstanding the provisions enabling a Court to avoid the invalidating effect of sub-section (2) of section 35 when satisfied that failure to comply with sub-section (2) is accidental or inadvertent and not misleading, no bill of sale is to be filed unless, on its face, it sets out the particulars required by sub-section (2). Secondly, sub-section (4) provides that a bill of sale is not to be filed unless it has been lodged in accordance with paragraph (*b*) of sub-section (2) of section 35. The introduction by clause 9 of automatice filing raises certain difficulties in regard to sub-section (4). The proposed section 48 introduced by clause 9 requires a bill of sale to have been lodged in accordance with section 35 before it can be filed. This removes the necessity for the second requirement of sub-section (4). The first requirement of sub-section (4)—namely that a bill shall not be filed unless on its face it sets forth the required particulars—is inconstistent with the concept of automatic filing. At present, before a Bill of Sale can be effective, it must—

(*a*) be filed within 35 days; and

(*b*) subject to the power of the court to relax the stringency of those requirements, comply with the requirements of sub-section (2) of section 35.

If sub-section (4) of section 35 remains as it is, then, notwithstanding that a Court might well conclude that the complete omission of one or more of the particulars required by sub-section (2) of that section should not invalidate the bill, it could not be filed; and therefore, although it is a bill which the legislation obviously intends should be effective, it could never in fact operate or have any validity. The repeal of sub-section (4) of section 35 and the enactment of the provisions contained in clause 9 which introduce automatic filing will mean that all bills lodged within the stipulated time will, in the absence of a caveat, unless withdrawn, automatically be filed. The effect of an omission or inaccuracy in complying with sub-section (2) of section 35 will be left, in the event of a dispute, with the Court and not, as at present, with the Registrar-General. This would appear to have been the intention of the amendments effected to section 35 by the Instruments (Bills of Sale) Act 1958, No. 6438.

Clause 4 substitutes a new section 36 for the existing section. The existing provision requires the Registrar-General to keep a book and to enter therein certain lengthy particulars in respect of each bill of sale. Other provisions—sections 45, 48 and 55—require further particulars to be entered in this book. The intention of the present amendments is that these further entries should be made on the instrument. The new section 36 introduced by clause 4 provides for an index of grantors' names showing only the number and date of lodgment of any bills of sale given by a particular grantor. It will make the index compact, manageable and easier to search.

Clause 5 amends section 40, which relates to caveats against the filing of bills of sale. Presently there is no requirement that the existence of a caveat should be shown either on the bill of sale or in the book kept pursuant to section 36. This amendment, which requires a memorial of any caveat to be endorsed on the relevant bill of sale, will thus ensure that a person searching a bill of sale will become aware of the existence of a caveat.

Clause 6 inserts a new section 43A and is consequential upon the amendment made by clause 5. When a caveat, noted on a bill of sale pursuant to section 40, as amended by clause 5 of the Bill, is withdrawn or removed by the court, a memorandum of that fact will be made on the bill of sale. Clause 7, which inserts a new sub-section (4) in

section 44 of the Act, authorizes the inclusion in the one renewal notice of any number of bills given to the one grantee. This will reduce administrative costs both for the public and for the Registrar-General.

Clause 8 substitutes a new section 45. The present provision requires particulars of renewal notices to be entered in the book presently kept under section 36. The new provision will require a memorandum of the renewal to be made on the bill. This is in line with other proposals that the bill rather than the index should reflect the current position.

Clause 9, which repeals and replaces the present section 48, provides for the automatic filing of a bill of sale on the first day on which it might properly be filed. It is rather curious that in the legislation as it stands, sections 48 and 49 are the only provisions which deal with the process of filing a bill of sale. Sections 33, 34 and 35 require filing and set out the results of failure to file. Sections 37 and 38 impose restrictions on filing so as to allow for caveats. In practice a bill of sale is regarded as being filed when the prescribed filing fee is paid; but even this is doubtful. At one time, in the 1915 Instruments Act, it was not necessary to lodge the bill prior to filing and the process of filing consisted of the physical production of the actual bill to the Registrar-General. However at that time it was necessary to give prior notice of "intention to file" a bill of sale. This notice had to comply with a scheduled form and had to show particulars of the kind presently set out in section 35. In fact, the then forerunners of section 35 related not to the bill, but to the notice of intention to file, and imposed a prohibition on filing a bill of sale unless the notice had been filed as required by the then legislation. When the requirement of the notice was abolished and the lodgment of the bill itself was substituted for that notice, no consequential amendment was made to the filing provisions.

Proposed new section 48 clarifies this situation by providing for automatic filing on the first day on which the bill may properly be filed. The expression "might properly have been filed" ensures that the provisions of section 37, which prohibit filing before the expiration of the time in which a caveat may be lodged, and section 38, which prohibits filing where a caveat is in operation, will not be affected. Automatic filing will avoid the necessity for a lodging party to attend the Registrar-General's office on two separate occasions and will reduce both cost and administrative effort.

Clause 10 repeals section 49 of the Act. This is consequential upon the provision for automatic filing contained in clause 9. Clause 11 amends sub-section (1) of section 50 of the Act to ensure that where there has been automatic filing of a bill of sale given by way of security, but if no moneys have in fact been advanced or there are no moneys due or secured by the bill, then the grantor can obtain and file a satisfaction piece.

Clause 12 substitutes a new section for the existing section 53. This deals with the filing of assignments of bills of sale and, in line with the general provisions of the Bill, requires a memorandum of the assignment to be endorsed on the bill itself. The new provision also provides that the time of payment of the filing fee as shown by cash register imprint is to be taken as the time of filing of the assignment. The present requirement that assignments should be entered in a separate book is retained, so that searchers wishing to know whether a person has disposed of bills of sale of which he is the grantee can ascertain that fact without first having to ascertain particulars of all bills of which he is the grantee. This is necessary, since the index to be

maintained under section 36, as amended by this bill, will not show the names of grantees.

Clause 13 amends section 54 of the principal Act. Although the present section 55 refers to the filing of copies of contracts of sale and contracts for the letting or hiring of the goods sold, section 54, which avoids such contracts unless in writing and filed, does not presently contemplate the filing of copies. This amendment overcomes this difficulty.

Section 55 of the present Act provides for the filing of contracts of sale of personal chattels and contracts for the letting or hiring of those chattels back to the vendor. The new section 55 proposed in clause 14, in line with the other provisions of this bill, provides for a memorandum of the date of filing to be endorsed on the contracts and for the names of the vendor and purchaser to be entered in the index to be kept pursuant to section 36. This amendment is consequential upon the earlier amendments relating to bills of sale, since the same index is used for searching in respect of both transactions.

Sub-clause (1) of clause 15 introduces three new sections—sections 55A, 55B and 55C. The proposed section 55A and the amendments made by sub-clause (2) of clause 15 are to overcome existing anomalies in the present legislation relating to the filing of copy documents. The legislation as it stands permits the filing of copy bills of sale, copy assignments and copy contracts of sale and contracts for letting or hiring. Scattered throughout the existing Part VI. are various references to copies. The proposed amendment is designed to rationalize these references. In each case there is, or will be after the enactment of this bill, a single provision permitting the filing of a copy or copies. Subsequent references to the filing of copies are deleted by sub-clause (2) of clause 15. The proposed section 55A makes it clear that where the Instruments Act as amended by this Bill refers to the lodging or filing of, or the entry of a memorandum on an instrument in respect of which a copy is permitted to be lodged or filed under Part VI., then that is to be read as a reference to the lodging or filing of either the instrument or a true copy thereof, or to the entry of a memorandum on the instrument or on a true copy thereof.

The proposed section 55B requires memoranda entered on instruments to be signed or initialled by the officer authorized to do so, and permits the Registrar-General to add additional information on any such memoranda. The proposed section 55C is necessary because many bills of sale, when lodged, have very little blank space upon them, and it may be necessary to add sheets for the purpose of making the endorsements required by this Bill.

Clause 16 repeals the existing provision in sub-section (3) of section 139 of the principal Act which imposes an upper limit of $2 on any one fee. This limit has remained since 1956 and the provision for automatic filing will, unless the revenue is to suffer, involve the payment of a higher fee upon lodgment of a bill of sale. Clause 17 is a transitory provision to preserve bills of sale given before the new provisions come into operation. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 27.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the consideration of Order of the Day, Government Business, No. 4 be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Can the Minister of Water Supply explain why the Government finds it necessary to postpone the consideration of this Order of the Day? Last night, I got the impression that the Government placed great emphasis on the Land Tax Bill. In fact, the honorable member for Oakleigh seemed very concerned about it. I assume that the item was placed high on the Notice Paper so that the Government could proceed with the Treasurer's second-reading explanatory speech today. Without any explanation, the Government is now asking the House to agree to an alteration in the order of precedence of Bills listed on the Notice Paper.

Mr. FLOYD.—The Government forgot to get the Bill printed.

Mr. WILTON.—I do not know whether the Government forgot to get the Bill printed or whether the responsible Minister is not ready to proceed. The Minister should give some indication to the House of the necessity for the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—The Government's reason for deferring the second reading of the Land Tax Bill until tomorrow is that the Premier and Treasurer is otherwise urgently engaged. As I discovered last year when I was Secretary of the Cabinet, the Government from time to time extends courtesy to the Opposition when the member who is handling a Bill for the Opposition is unable to be present. In fact, I gave an assurance tonight to the honorable member for Midlands in this regard. The courtesy is frequently extended to the Leader of the Opposition when he is unable to be present, which is understandable because his electorate is the whole of Victoria. I ask the honorable member for Broadmeadows to support the motion as a gesture of courtesy to the Premier who, as Treasurer, personally wishes to explain the measure to the House.

I thank the House and the honorable member for Broadmeadows for the indulgence which I am sure would have been extended if the Premier and Treasurer had not arrived. In view of fact that my Leader is now present, the motion can be withdrawn.

By leave, the motion was withdrawn.

LAND TAX BILL.

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In the past, for some obscure reason, Parliament has insisted that the Bill fixing the rates of land tax must be presented annually. If some variation was proposed in the rates of land tax naturally one would expect a Bill to be presented to Parliament, but in this instance no change is proposed from the rates to which Parliament agreed in its wisdom last year. I am merely asking for the measure to be re-enacted. There is no mystery about it.

Mr. WILKES.—The Treasurer would not have thought so last night!

Sir HENRY BOLTE.—I was not present then ; there must have been a mystery writer in the House who found something in it that was not there. I invite honorable members to peruse the Bill. It is precisely the same as the measure which was passed last year but which Parliament has decreed must be re-enacted. I believe it would be proper to pass this measure on a permanent basis—although I do not wish to provoke a debate on that score—so that only when amendments were proposed would the measure come before Parliament. I have nothing to add.

On the motion of Mr. FLOYD (Williamstown), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 20.

CHIROPODISTS (REGISTRATION) BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is introduced to enable certain persons who have been working as chiropodists, many for a number of years, to be registered and to continue to practise their profession. Three years ago, the Chiropodists Act 1968 was passed by Parliament to set up a registration board to control the practice of chiropody in Victoria. A board was established and the Act came into operation on 10th February, 1970. The Bill, *inter alia*, makes it an offence for any unregistered person to practise chiropody for fee or reward.

By sub-section (1) of section 10 of that Act, any person engaged in the practice of chiropody could, within twelve months of the commencement of the Chiropodists Act 1968—that is, before 10th February, 1970—apply to the Chiropodists Registration Board of Victoria for registration as a chiropodist on the ground of long experience, although that person's initial training in chiropody may not have been equal to the standard that would be gained today. Most chiropodists applied for registration during the twelve months, although 34 applications were submitted after the expiry of that period. There may be some others who have not yet applied.

The board does not wish arbitrarily to deprive any people of their livelihood and has therefore sought the Government's assistance to reopen the Act for a further period of twelve months. The amendment contained in this Bill will enable the Chiropodists Registration Board to "process" the 34 late applications it now holds and to receive further applications from persons eligible to apply up to 10th February, 1972. The board will publicize the further opportunity to apply and the need after that date to be registered if a person is to practise chiropody for fee or reward. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. LIND (Dandenong), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 20.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for two amendments to the Agricultural Colleges Act 1958 as set out in clauses 2 and 3. Clause 2 is a machinery measure to amend section 5A of the principal Act and relates to Crown lands which under the principal Act come under the control of the Minister of Lands and are not part of the lands comprising the permanent reservations in respect of the agricultural colleges established at Longerenong and Dookie. The leases referred to were taken over from the trustees holding office under the Agricultural Colleges Act 1928 by the enactment of the Agricultural Colleges Act 1944.

The clause provides for the transfer of an encumbrance such as a mortgage from a purchase lease to a Crown grant of the same land. In 1950, the principal Act was amended to allow the holder of a lease for a term of years to apply for a purchase lease. Such leases are registered under the Transfer of Land Act and it was probably taken for granted at the time that an encumbrance would be automatically transferred from a purchase lease to Crown grant when a lease matured into freehold. The amendment is sought by the Department of Crown Lands and Survey on the advice of the Registrar of Titles.

Clause 3 amends the provisions contained in section 9A of the principal Act relating to the stock trading accounts at the agricultural colleges established at Longerenong and Dookie by widening the costs which may be charged against each such

account. Currently, only the payment for all sheep and cattle purchased for those colleges—other than those purchased expressly for rations and those purchased for research purposes from special funds—is charged to the account. However, it is considered that all reasonable costs associated with the purchase, transport, running and sale of sheep and cattle should be a charge against the account as is currently applicable with the stock trading accounts directly under Treasury control and operating at departmental research stations and at the Glenormiston Agricultural College.

Whilst the Bill provides that payments shall be made out of the appropriate stock trading account for the purchase of sheep and cattle, and for associated transport costs, other than sheep and cattle expressly for rations or from special funds for research purposes, provision has been made for the appropriate stock trading account to be charged with the cost of contract services, veterinary services, stock medicines, stock registrations, wool packs and such other items as are approved in writing by the Treasurer of Victoria which are associated with all sheep and cattle. This action has been taken because it would be administratively unworkable to apportion such costs between sheep and cattle purchased from a stock trading account and their progeny as against those purchased from other sources.

The Bill also provides for the Stock Trading Account to meet the transport costs of sheep and cattle consigned for sale or transferred and of sheep and cattle products consigned for sale or transferred where the proceeds of sale are to be paid into an appropriate stock transfer account. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. E. W. LEWIS (Dundas), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 20.

LATROBE VALLEY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains two measures to assist the Latrobe Valley Water and Sewerage Board in its administration. The first, contained in clause 2, specifies the avenues available to the board for investment of its surplus funds and extends to the board the benefits of being able to invest surplus funds in the short-term money market.

Other local authorities can now do this under the provisions of the Water Act, the Geelong Waterworks and Sewerage Act and the Sewerage Districts Act. The clause as drafted is similar to the amendments made to those Acts in 1963 following provision for such investments by municipal councils made in the Local Government Act in 1962.

The second is a machinery measure, contained in clause 3, which will simplify the annual statements of accounts which the board is required to prepare. The present provision requires the board to prepare each year a revenue account, a statement of receipts and payments, and a balance sheet.

However, most of the figures in the revenue account are duplicated in the statement of receipts and payments. Under the proposed amendment, these two statements will be replaced by one statement of revenue and expenditure which will show more clearly the board's financial position for the relevant year. The proposed amendment will bring this section of the Act into conformity with the Water Act and the Sewerage Districts Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. AMOS (Morwell), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 20.

HIRE-PURCHASE (FORM) BILL.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As honorable members will be aware, section 131D of the Stamps Act 1958 prohibited a vendor or other person from adding duty payable by the vendor to the amount payable by the purchaser of any goods. This provision was repealed by sub-section (2) of section 8 of the Stamps Act 1970.

Honorable members will also be aware that section 3 of the Hire-Purchase Act 1959 contains very detailed requirements for the contents and form of hire-purchase agreements. In particular, paragraph (*e*) of sub-section (2) of section 3 requires that every hire-purchase agreement shall set out in tabular form precise details of the various components of the price of the goods, but no provision is made for stamp duty, which is not of the same nature as any of the items specified in paragraph (*e*).

In light of the repeal of section 131D of the Stamps Act, clause 2 of the Bill proposes machinery amendments of section 3 of the Hire-Purchase Act 1959. The amendments follow similar legislation in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory.

The proposed amendments in clause 2 are as follows: Paragraph (*a*) replaces sub-paragraphs (viii) to (xi) of paragraph (*e*) of sub-section (2) of section 3 by new sub-paragraphs (viii) to (xii). The new sub-paragraph (viii) makes provision for stamp duty included in the total amount payable to be shown separately. The remaining new sub-paragraphs re-enact the existing sub-paragraphs (viii) to (xi), with amendments consequential upon the new provision as to stamp duty. Paragraph (*b*) inserts a new sub-section (2A) to make it clear that the order in which the matters specified in paragraph (*e*) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Act are set out in a hire-purchase agreement is immaterial. Paragraph (*c*) makes a consequential amendment of the First Schedule to the Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

On the motion of Mr. FELL (Greensborough), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Wednesday, October 20.

WATER AUTHORITIES ACCIDENT INSURANCE BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 14) on the motion of Mr. Dunstan (Minister of Water Supply) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—The Opposition does not oppose this minor measure. The honorable member for Midlands was to handle it on behalf of the Opposition but because of circumstances he has had to entrust it to me. However, I do not intend to speak at length on it.

The Bill extends to members of water trusts, sewerage authorities and similar organizations the insurance cover which is available to municipal councillors as the result of amendments made to the Local Government Act. As these members work in an honorary capacity the Government is acting sensibly in ensuring that they are covered by insurance when they are travelling between their homes and the places at which they conduct business on behalf of the organizations they represent.

The Bill contains nine clauses and amends eight Acts. The purpose of the measure is to ensure that members of water trusts and similar organizations are not disadvantaged if they are injured when conducting business on behalf of their organizations. The Oposition wishes the Bill a speedy passage.

Mr. BROAD (Swan Hill).—The Country Party also supports this small Bill. Several months ago Parliament passed legislation widening the

insurance cover available to municipal councillors. This insurance cover protects a councillor during the time he is travelling on council business. The insurance policy costs a municipality approximately $9 a year for each councillor.

The purpose of the Bill is to extend a similar insurance cover to members of water trusts, sewerage authorities, river improvement trusts and similar organizations. Few claims are made against these policies. As the members of these organizations do their work voluntarily it is only right and proper that they should not be disadvantaged if they become involved in an accident whilst conducting business for the organizations, they represent. The only members of these organizations who receive any payment are the chairmen, who are entitled to a small allowance for expenses. The Country Party approves of this excellent piece of legislation.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

MERCY PRIVATE HOSPITAL (GUARANTEE) BILL.

The Order of the Day for the resumption of the debate on the motion for the second reading of this Bill was read.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I have examined this Bill and am of the opinion that it is a private Bill.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I move—

That all the Private Bill Standing Orders be dispensed with, and that this Bill be treated as a public Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The debate (adjourned from September 15) on the motion of Mr. Rafferty (Minister of Labour and Industry) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. LIND (Dandenong).—In his second-reading speech, the Minister likened this Bill to several other measures which have been passed by this House inasmuch as it guarantees to a certain limit loans raised by a church organization in an endeavour to support, maintain and conduct a private hospital. On 28th September, the honorable member for Melbourne asked the Treasurer a question about loans arranged by the Sisters of Mercy Property Association for the proposed renovations and additions referred to in the Bill. The Treasurer's reply indicates that the association has arranged three loans totalling $800,000, two for a period of ten years and one for a period of fifteen years. The interest rate for the first two loans is 7·5 per cent and for the third 8 per cent. In these days, nobody could quibble with those interest rates.

The Mercy Hospital is one of the leading hospitals of our metropolis and is used extensively by prominent surgeons. The passing of the Bill will help this band of wonderful religious sisters to conduct the hospital and the Opposition fully approves the measure.

Mr. MITCHELL (Benambra).—The Country Party offers no objection to the Bill, which accords with legislation passed by the House on two previous occasions concerning St. Vincent's and Cabrini private hospitals. The measure will provide appropriate assistance to the Mercy Hospital.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

BUILDING SOCIETIES (SPECIAL ADVANCES) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 14) on the motion of Mr. Meagher (Minister of Housing) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—This relatively small measure seeks to amend the Building Societies Act to enable a building society to increase from $20,000 to $30,000 the maximum advance that it may make without being subject to the restrictions imposed by the Act on "special advances". Other States have already lifted the limit on advances that building societies may offer to their members without going through the rigours of the provisions relating to special advances.

It is interesting to note that this type of loan is not available from banks and co-operative housing societies because usually it is granted to persons in the community who have a far greater ability to repay loans than the average person who seeks a housing loan. Permanent building society loans usually attract a rate of interest of 8 per cent or 9 per cent and the type of person who obtains such a loan has the ability to service it.

The reason for the increase in the maximum advance is the higher costs of land, materials and labour. The measure will enable the various building societies to assist their members without going through the provisions relating to special advances. The Victorian Building Societies Association has submitted that there is a need to increase the current limit on advances, and the Register of Building Societies, to whom this submission was made, has recommended the proposal to the Government.

It is also interesting to note that capital and deposits of the permanent building societies in Victoria currently amount to about $122 million, and this measure will enable the societies to offer more funds to persons who use building societies to obtain loans for home building. Few special advances are made by building societies, and the purpose of the measure is to update the amount of money which will be available to those who wish to encumber themselves with a debt of up to $30,000 to build a home. The Opposition does not offer any criticism but endorses this machinery Bill, which will assist permanent building societies.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

POLICE REGULATION (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 14) on the motion of Mr. Hamer (Chief Secretary) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The main purpose of the Bill is to make amendments to the Police Regulation Act 1958 to enable the implementation of certain recommendations made in the report on the Victoria Police Force by Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston following his examination of the activities and administration of the force.

In his second-reading explanatory speech, the Chief Secretary adverted to a number of the recommendations and indicated the effect that they would have on the administration of the force. The honorable gentleman said that 186 recommendations had been made and that although some of them were of great importance, others were minor.

This report on one of the most detailed examinations of the Victoria Police Force ever to be undertaken, made certain specific recommendations which are complementary to each other. The Opposition's view is that because the Government chose to implement certain recommendations and not others which I think are complementary, maximum benefit will not be derived from the recommendations.

It is true that the Government has accepted a majority of the recommendations that were made and has attempted to implement them.

Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston recommended that the Chief Commissioner of Police should be known as "Commissioner of Police" but the Government decided not to accept that recommendation. The Opposition congratulates the new Chief Commissioner on his appointment. We believe that the Government made an excellent and wise choice. The Chief Commissioner has had 37 years of experience in the Police Force, and there is no doubt that he knows what is required to raise the standard of the force in the eyes of the public and what administrative changes are necessary in the interests of the force. The Opposition also congratulates the Government on its appointment of Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Miller as deputy commissioners. My party offers its full support to those gentlemen in their perhaps unenviable task of reconstructing the Victoria Police Force in line with the recommendations contained in the report of Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston. The Chief Commissioner has already made a plea for public support. I do not refer to that officer's remarks concerning capital punishment, because, as the Chief Secretary explained, it was purely a personal view.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I do not think that is a subject that should be canvassed in a debate on this measure.

Mr. WILKES.—I agree, Mr. Speaker. The Chief Commissioner realizes that it is important that the Victoria Police Force should have the full co-operation of the Victorian public. In asking for moral support for the force, it is obvious that the Chief Commissioner realizes that the Police Force must demonstrate to the public that it will maintain law and order in an acceptable way. The Chief Commissioner understands what is required to overcome the problems with which the force is faced, and I have no doubt that he will receive the fullest support of members of the community. When he does so, I have not doubt that the Victoria Police Force will be second to none in the Commonwealth.

There are many dedicated officers in the Police Force who have served in it for many years. As is the case in all organizations, if a member of the Police Force strays in some way or commits a misdemeanour, it is prominently featured in the press and on radio. At times, this is unfortunate.

Recommendations of Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston which were unacceptable to the Government were—

That the rank of sergeant should be replaced by that of "section officer".

That a policeman should be automatically transferred from a country station after eight years service there.

That the Accident Appreciation Squad should be abolished.

That the City Traffic Police should be disbanded.

The Opposition believes that the Government might have been unwise in not accepting what Sir Eric said about policemen on traffic duty. There are approximately 90 policemen on traffic duty in the inner city area. If their duties could be taken over by traffic officers, as they are in New Zealand and other countries, 90 more police officers would be immediately available for other duties.

I suggest that the duties of those police officers could be taken over by traffic officers. They may not be able to deal with mobile traffic offences, but they would be in a position to deal with non-moving traffic offences, with the direction of traffic, the routing of traffic in city areas and with the control of pedestrians. The Opposition is of the opinion that the Government could well have considered Sir Eric St. Johnston's recommendations more widely.

In his second-reading speech the Chief Secretary described the organization of the Police Force, including officer supervision and establishment,

and many other facets of police administration. It must be emphasized that there is a need for an increased number of clerical staff in the Police Force and, generally, for a larger civilian ingredient; but care must be taken that an imbalance is not created between civilian employees and the trained members of the force. Such an imbalance could easily arise.

The strength of the Victoria Police Force at present is more than 5,000 and this is indicative of the fact that recruiting has improved following the recent general increase in police salaries. The force has now become more attractive to a larger number of young men who are satisfied to join it for a career. Although the Government has consistently opposed salary increases in the past, on this occasion it agreed, and this has had a marked effect. I should like to sound a note of warning to the Government. Although there are more than 5,000 police officers, the force is still 1,000 men short of the strength suggested by Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston, the former Chief Commissioner, Mr. Wilby, and his predecessors, Mr. Arnold and Mr. Porter. In 1956 Mr. Porter said that the force was badly under strength. In addition, the Premier, on occasions, and the former Chief Secretary, Sir Arthur Rylah, have stated that it was impossible to recruit men for the force. On one occasion the Premier said that no matter what salary was offered, men would not join the force.

The Opposition disagreed with the Premier's assertion, and now that the Government has decided that it does not oppose salary increases in the Police Force more men are applying for a career in the force. The good type of young men now offering augurs well for the future of the force.

The Chief Secretary commented on Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston's recommendation that the establishment of the force should be increased to 6,700. When the Minister explained the Bill he stated that the authorized strength of the force would be increased this year to 5,373. The actual strength is much lower than that figure, but there has been an increase of 550 since the tabling of the St. Johnston report. I have suggested to the Minister a means by which the effective figure can be increased still further. The use of traffic wardens in place of policemen at certain city intersections would achieve this result. This move has been successful in other countries, where it is used to a far greater extent than in Australia. Doubtless the Government has a policy on this. It may not believe that traffic wardens can adequately carry out this job. Certainly, it is a matter for the Government to decide.

The Minister adverted to the number of policewomen and their importance in the force. Some policewomen are to be appointed as members of the Criminal Investigation Branch, of Special Criminal Investigation Branch squads, of the Vice Squad and of the Mobile Traffic Section. The Opposition agrees that there is a place for women in the Police Force, just as there is a place for women in any other Government department or in industry. I could not understand why the Minister, in making his second reading-speech from an eighteen-page document, devoted sixteen pages to the administration of the force, and only the last two pages to the provisions of the Bill.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! Every speech in this House should be relevant to the question before it.

Mr. WILKES.—On no occasion have I disagreed with that suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I am merely using the Minister's second-reading notes to illustrate the opinion of the Opposition on the measure. We do not claim to agree——

Mr. BIRRELL.—It is a little bit of verbal diarrhoea.

Mr. WILKES.—I beg your pardon!

The SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member for Northcote.

Mr. WILKES.—Words fail me, Mr. Speaker. I shall not bother to answer the stupid interjection. What I am concerned about, and the honorable member for Geelong is not, is whether by the actions of the Government, and in the normal course of events, this State has a Police Force which is properly equipped and of proper proportions to meet the demands of the community. If this Bill does anything to achieve that end, the Opposition will not oppose it.

I wish to draw attention to those parts of the Minister's speech that refer specifically to the Bill rather than to the packing that the honorable gentleman applied to it, telling honorable members what they already know about the administration of the Police Force. Principally, the Bill deals with existing rank structures in the force and changes that were recommended. Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston recommended them because it was not uncommon for a senior constable to wait fourteen years before he became eligible to be elevated to the rank of sergeant, or for a first constable to wait a similar period before he became eligible for promotion to the rank of senior constable.

These delays in promotion led to dissatisfaction among members of the Police Force. It also created a sense of hopelessness in a policeman's mind, in that he knew that if he stayed on for another ten years he might become a senior constable, and in a further five years he might become a sergeant. Many members resigned from the force to take jobs in private industry because of these promotion difficulties under the existing rank structures. It did not take Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston long to realize the situation and he made recommendations basically in line with the rank structures operating in the British Police Force and the London Police Force. I am grateful to the Government for making it possible for me to visit Scotland Yard, where I was able to examine the rank structures existing there. They are much in line with the Government's proposals.

In future, promotions in the Police Force will be on merit. If a member of the force has a special attribute or ability, it will be taken into consideration, as well as seniority, when promotion is being considered. This principle should always have applied but unfortunately the Public Service has not agreed with it. It is good to see the Government departing from the old staid principle of the Public Service that nothing mattered but seniority. In the past if a bright policeman stationed at Benalla should have been promoted to Russell Street, he could not get to Melbourne if he did not have seniority, irrespective of his ability. The Bill will go some of the way towards correcting this disability.

In his second-reading speech the Chief Secretary stated that the provisions of the Bill which were necessary to bring about changes in the rank structure fell broadly into three categories, namely—

(*a*) those which are required to change the designation of members of the force from the old to the new ranks;

(*b*) those which make the various determinations of the Police Service Board in terms of the old ranks applicable to members of the force of the new ranks; and

(*c*) those which make consequential amendments to the Police Regulation Act 1958 and, where various ranks of members of the force are referred to in other Acts, amend those Acts.

No one expects the change to work smoothly from the outset, but in the long term there is no doubt in the minds of members of the Opposition that the new rank structure will do much to correct many of the dissatisfactions that were responsible for the loss to private industry of a number of very skilled and dedicated men in the Police Force.

Of course, lack of promotion was not the only reason for members leaving the force. Low remuneration played a big part. Although men were trained in specialized divisions in the force—for instance, in the Company Squad members were trained as accountants, and in the Forensic Science Section men were trained in ballistics and other sophisticated activities—they were not compensated as well as employees doing similar work in private enterprise. As a result many good men were lost to the force. However, it is heartening to know that some of them are reapplying for membership.

The Chief Secretary has a different approach to the problems of the force from that adopted by his predecessors, and the new Chief Commissioner, Mr. Reg. Jackson, will doubtless agree with the restructuring of the force. By using all the methods at his disposal, the Minister will be able to achieve what should have been achieved long ago.

Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston made specific reference to complaints made against members of the Police Force. At page 172 of his report, he dealt specifically with corruption.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I missed that point. Is the honorable member referring to the report of Colonel St. Johnston?

Mr. WILKES.—Yes, Mr. Speaker. The matter was adverted to by the Chief Secretary a number of times in his second-reading speech. I shall not refer to it further except to point out that the Government proposed to appoint a former stipendiary magistrate to hear complaints made against members of the Victoria Police Force. The press has referred to this as the appointment of an ombudsman. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. HAMER.—That is not my title.

Mr. WILKES.—It is not the Chief Secretary's title, nor is it mine. It was the title bandied about freely in the press. The appointment of a former stipendiary magistrate to such a position is a step in the right direction, but I point out to the Chief Secretary, and to the Government, that under the provisions of the Bill it does not appear to members of the Opposition that this person will be able to achieve much in this capacity.

If a person has a complaint against a member of the Victoria Police Force he will not immediately go to this former stipendiary magistrate. He must ventilate his complaint through the normal channels, and it may end there. If the complainant is not satisfied with the way in which his complaint has been handled, he will be able to go to the former stipendiary magistrate and lodge his complaint. This is a step in the right direction. However, if the former stipendiary magistrate is only to examine complaints against members of the Police Force, in our view his job will be superfluous. If a complainant has had cause to be dissatisfied with the manner in which his complaint has been investigated in the normal channels in the force he may apply to the former stipendiary magistrate to have the matter reviewed. At least it will be another avenue of appeal against a decision which, in this case, would be made by the superintendent who investigated the complaint in the first place.

Policemen as well as the general public are entitled to a right of appeal. If policemen have complaints arising from dealings with members of the public or with their superior officers, they should have the same recourse that the Government intends to give to the general public. After all, a policeman is a public servant who must perform his job according to the terms of his employment. He is entitled to some protection. The Government has gone some of the way to providing the necessary protection in cases

where judgments have been given against members of the Police Force for specific amounts.

If all that the former stipendiary magistrate is to do is to review reports considered unsatisfactory by complainants, perhaps that will relieve courts and responsible people in the community from taking other steps to investigate these complaints. However, from time to time, the Government should thoroughly examine the reports of the former stipendiary magistrate to see whether his activities are satisfactory. If they are, it may well be that the Government will next decide to appoint an ombudsman to examine complaints not only against members of the Victoria Police Force but also against all members of the Public Service or Government decisions.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—The honorable member for Northcote is getting away from the subject of the Bill.

Mr. WILKES.—I was attempting to point out the relevance of that policy to the principles of the Bill. I think the Government should give my suggestion some consideration, because the responsibility given to the former stipendiary magistrate is very restricted. From time to time, the Opposition has expressed its concern about the Victoria Police Force, about the increasing crime rate, about the number of deaths and injuries on the roads, and about the stupid way in which the Government handles the Mobile Traffic Section of the Police Force. The Opposition is dissatisfied with the way in which traffic blitzes are conducted in Victoria; they do nothing to cut the road toll. From time to time, the Opposition has made suggestions about these blitzes to the Government.

When considering any restructuring of the Police Force, the Chief Secretary would be well advised to visit South Australia and see how Brigadier McKenna briefs the mobile traffic men there before they go out on the highways. Because of this briefing, they do a far more effective job than is done in Victoria. This is because of the stupidity of the Government which should realize that the responsibility for the toll on the road does not lie with the man who exceeds the speed limit by 3, 4 or 5 miles an hour, and who is a very easy victim. It is easy to place an amphometer at the bottom of a hill to trap motorists. This was done in Plenty Road at the bottom of a hill near La Trobe University. Obviously, in these circumstances motorists exceeding the 35 miles per hour speed limit will be caught.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I cannot see that this is relevant to the Bill. I point out that, unfortunately, the explanatory second-reading speech had a lot of irrelevant sections. It would be unfortunate to extend the debate on the Bill even wider, and to deal with items which were not mentioned in the explanatory second-reading speech would be out of order.

Mr. WILKES.—I completely agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker; in fact, I rarely disagree with you. I suggest to the Chief Secretary that when he is considering restructuring within the Victoria Police Force he should take these matters into account. It is one thing to change ranks from first constable to senior constable, senior constable to sergeant, or sergeant to senior sergeant, but it is another to obtain value from these changes. Value will be obtained if attention is given to the results to see that the Government gets value for its money. As a rule, the Government achieves this, but I am not making the suggestion in that sense. The Premier has reminded me that I have made the statement. Most legislation relating to motor vehicles, whether it is the Motor Car Act, the Crimes Act or other Acts, is designed to raise revenue.

The SPEAKER.—The honorable member is on another subject.

Mr. WILKES.—I am reminding the Chief Secretary that if the restructuring of the Police Force, as was recommended by an expert, is to be successful, he should take into consideration some of the suggestions I have made. Unfortunately, I am unable to make other suggestions and keep within the terms of the honorable gentleman's second-reading speech and the Bill itself, but I would be delighted to advise him privately, or during other debates in this House, how members of the Opposition believe that in the long term the Victoria Police Force can be improved, and the road toll can be reduced.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—For obvious reasons, the Country Party is grateful to the Government for presenting this Bill. Last year, Victoria was privileged to have its Police Force examined by an outside expert. I pay tribute to the work of the former Chief Secretary, Sir Arthur Rylah, and to his keenness in relation to anything connected with the Police Force. Irrespective of where Sir Arthur went in the State, he called upon the officers of the Police Force to acquaint himself with their conditions and to make himself available to discuss anything of note or interest. Although many officers did not agree with some of his points of view, they always acknowledged his interest in them and held him in high esteem for that.

Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston was given wide powers to examine the Police Force throughout Victoria to see how it operated, to find out if its practices were good, to decide whether the officers were well paid and whether their conditions were acceptable, and, in general, to see whether these men who are at the beck and call of everyone in the State received proper acknowledgment as a responsible body of men and were treated as they should be both as policemen and as human beings. Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston made 186 recommendations which were of great interest to all who read them. The Government is to be commended for accepting many of the recommendations without question. It is endeavouring to resolve others or accept them with modifications. At this stage, 107 of the 186 recommendations have either been put into operation or are being dealt with to the benefit of the Police Force.

The Bill gives an opportunity for a restructuring of the ranks of the Police Force which my party believes to be necessary. It also provides, by making amendments to the schedule to the Act, an opportunity to consider pensions paid to widows of deceased policemen. Great concern has been expressed by some members of the force about the pensions which are available to men of certain ranks. Men who had been members of the force for long periods were concerned that, if anything happened to them before they retired, their widows might not be adequately cared for.

Although some amounts are laid down, I do not know whether the superannuation or retirement payments are adequate. The sums mentioned do not seem to be great but, no doubt, they are worked out in relation to other benefits which are available and, consequently, they may be sufficient for the widows of deceased officers in the future.

We must not be so naïve as to believe there has been no discontent in the Police Force in the past. I believe it was brought about because of the salary range and lack of opportunity for promotion. The St. Johnston report suggested that both these matters should be rectified and the recommendations have been accepted by the Government. In addition, the Police Association brought to the notice of the Government the need for higher salaries for certain ranks and also the need for opportunities for quicker promotion as means of relieving discontent.

Policemen throughout the State were concerned about their conditions of employment and their pay as measured against what was available in employment in private industry, and it is well known that discontent on this point led to resignations in greater numbers than were desirable. This operated against keeping the Police Force well manned and adequately serviced.

The Country Party congratulates Chief Commissioner Jackson on his appointment and wishes him well in his term of office which has been set at five years by the Bill. The fixing of a five-year term of office is a result of another St. Johnston recommendation. The Police Force has about 5,000 members. The Government has always acknowledged that the numbers could be greater, but I would accept that at present recruiting is satisfactory. We can look forward to many of the young men now being recruited playing a big part in the future of the Police Force. Education standards are rising and, while the enrolment qualifications in some instances are not as high as they could be, they are much improved. I believe that capable officers are being recruited.

The public should appreciate the way in which the members of the Police Force carry out their duties. Parliament must ensure that these men are adequately paid and have adequate opportunities for promotion. The Country Party believes that this Bill is at least the first step towards enabling men to have a satisfactory career in the Police Force and towards an acknowledgment and acceptance by the public of the worth of the force.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2, providing for the ranks of certain members of the force to be changed.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I thank the honorable member for Northcote and the honorable member for Benalla for their comments on the new appointments. The three men appointed on Monday carried a great deal of confidence from within and outside the force. It is gratifying that, although applications were invited from all over Australia for the top position, by virtue of their outstanding service these men were appointed from within the force. It is a great credit to the Victoria Police Force and should be an encouragement to these appointees and their subordinates.

The honorable member for Northcote referred to the decision not to disband the city traffic police as recommended by Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston. Colonel St. Johnston was firmly of the opinion that traffic control was a police function. He did not hold with other forces exercising traffic control and the Government agreed with him. He recommended, however, that the city police should be disbanded and incorporated in other branches of the force in "A" district covering the city area and used for all sorts of other purposes. This recommendation was not supported within the force on the basis that the men concerned were trained in special duties in the city area and for sporting venues. They have a special uniforms allowance, are smartly dressed and impressive, and to disperse them indiscriminately would be a waste of special training. That is why they have been retained as a separate group.

It is not the intention to supplant trained policemen generally with clerks or female typists. However, it is intended to relieve trained members of the force from the painful duties of typing with one finger the various summonses and reports so that they may go out on the beat and deal with the public. It is proposed to make full use of their specialized training. That process has been going on for some time and I hope

that it will be intensified further so that they will be relieved of those extraneous duties.

In dealing with complaints about the force, Colonel Sir Eric St. Johnston recommended that the Police Force, as always, should have an investigating officer within its ranks to investigate complaints, but that the investigation should be checked by an independent person. He recommended that this person should be the Chairman of the Police Discipline Board. The Government has departed from that recommendation in two ways. Firstly, it was thought not to be proper that the head of the Police Discipline Board should investigate complaints because if he felt further action should be taken, it would be possible that the matter would come before his own board for decision. That is why the services of a former stipendiary magistrate were made available for this purpose. Secondly, and this is most significant, the former stipendiary magistrate would be available to a disgruntled person who was not satisfied with the investigation of his complaint within the force. The matter could be taken on review so that a second independent opinion could be obtained. He is not an ombudsman but a reviewing officer for the force. I am glad that the Committee has seen fit to welcome the Bill. As the honorable member for Benalla stated, this is a step towards a better organization of the force, and with more manpower and equipment available, we hope it will serve the State in future as it has done in the past.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 3, providing for amendments to the principal Act.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East).—Reference is made in clause 2 to the deletion of the rank of first constable. However, this rank appears at the end of this clause.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The references are to the old ranks for pension purposes. I shall check the matter and if an amendment is necessary, I shall arrange for a suitable amendment to be prepared before the Bill reaches another place.

The clause was verbally amended, and, as amended, was adopted, as was the remaining clause.

Schedule, providing, *inter alia*—

SCHEDULE

Number of Act	Title of Act	Extent of Amendment
.	.	.
6386	*Superannuation Act* 1958	In section 29A before the word "sergeant" there shall be inserted the word "senior".

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I move—

That, after the item relating to the Superannuation Act 1958, the following item be inserted :—

6809	*Sheep Owners Protection Act* 1961	In sub-section (1) of section 6 before the word "sergeant" there shall be inserted the word "senior".

The amendment will bring the rank into line with the new ranks, under the Sheep Owners Protection Act.

The amendment was agreed to, and the schedule, as amended, was adopted.

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and passed through its remaining stages.

APPRENTICESHIP (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 7) on the motion of Mr. Rafferty (Minister of Labour and Industry) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—The Opposition regards this Bill as important because it deals with the

training of young people for apprenticeship and the provision for supervision of that training. It also provides requirements for the facilities for training at technical schools and workshops.

The original Act was introduced by the former honorable member for Williamstown, Mr. John Lemmon. At that time apprenticeship conditions were largely related to wages board determinations. Since that time the apprenticeship provisions have been divorced from wages board matters. This Bill makes it clear that the Apprenticeship Commission is responsible for the training of apprentices. The measure reviews the constitution and function of the commission. The provisions of the clauses will be discussed in detail during the Committee stage.

Clause 2 provides for binding the Crown and includes trade technicians as apprentices. Clause 3 specifies employer representation. It is significant to note that changes have been made in this direction as the result of a division that has occurred within the employer ranks with the establishment of the Metal Trades Industry Association.

Clause 4 deals with the meetings of the commission and clause 5 with the annual report of the Apprenticeship Commission. At this stage I indicate that the contents of the report in past years and this year should be the subject of discussion in the Committee stage. I believe that the House must make a decision on whether the report should be presented to Parliament rather than to the Minister. The 1971 report has been made available only in the past two or three days. Clause 6 makes provision for the appointment of officers and supervisors.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I do appreciate that the honorable member has done a great deal of research on this matter, but to discuss the clauses individually now might not be as good as doing it in Committee, and I commend that suggestion to the honorable member for Reservoir.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I indicated that I had hoped to discuss these matters in some detail in the Committee stage, but I give notice of why I regard this as an important measure. It is important because there are deficiencies in the training of apprentices in Victoria. Until I made some inspections I was not aware of the extent of the deficiencies. I was surprised to learn of the difficulties confronting apprentices in country areas. These apprentices have not received the benefit of the provisions of past legislation which allows subsidies to be paid to students in country areas who are travelling long distances on day release. It is true that provisions are made for subsidies to block release students seeking accommodation in the metropolitan area. These subsidies have not been increased in conformity with rising costs. The conditions in which these students are expected to live in the metropolitan area are not conducive to adequate training. It is important that students should have comfortable accommodation so that they can be trained in an atmosphere which will permit them to absorb their training.

Amongst the organizations which have made submissions on this measure is the Victorian Trades Hall Council. On 16th September, 1971, the council carried a resolution in the following terms:—

> Council stresses the importance of apprenticeship and apprenticeship training in our education system and views with concern that no reference was made in the State Budget to allocation of funds for the purpose of apprenticeship and apprenticeship training. This is despite the recent amendments that were made to the Apprenticeship Act to provide more finance for this purpose.
>
> We note that the Commonwealth Government has allocated additional funds in the Commonwealth education programme for 1970-71 as related to universities, colleges of advanced education, technical education and secondary education.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I invite the Premier not to interject continually. I have invited the Premier once, and I will do it again, to cease interjecting. I presume the honorable member for Reservoir is quoting.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I am quoting from a resolution carried by the Victorian Trades Hall Council on 16th September, 1971. It was an important resolution because it was the subject-matter of a press release by the Minister today. The resolution continues—

> However, the allocation for such funds to technical education has been proportionately low.
>
> Council, therefore, calls upon the State Government to reappraise its education priorities to allow more funds to be directed to technical education in this State.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I have invited the Premier twice not to interject, and I ask him now to cease his interjecting.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—The Minister of Labour and Industry used figures that were published in the report in a press statement in the *Age* today. I will not read the statement because the Minister knows what he said, but I make the point that the honorable gentleman indicated that the Commonwealth Government did not provide sufficient funds for technical training of apprentices in Victoria. What the Minister did not say was that the Victorian Government allotted funds on the following basis: —Universities $1,100 per student; colleges of advanced education, $1,000 per student.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I will not mention to the Premier again that he is interjecting and I warn him now not to interject.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I am quoting figures from the annual report of the Apprenticeship Commission of Victoria. Secondary education institutions were allocated $610 per student, but technical education institutions, which are training the future tradesmen of the State, received the miserable amount of $150 per student. It is no wonder that 10 to 15 per cent of graduates of universities are finding it impossible to obtain employment in the categories for which they have been trained. The situation is no better for apprentices. Recently it was reported that there were ten applicants for every vacancy for apprenticeship as a motor mechanic, and fourteen applicants for every vacancy as an apprentice panel beater. Yet there is a shortage in Victoria of skilled tradesmen in both these categories. Employers are not apprenticing young people in these trades and the Government is not providing the funds to train apprentices. The consequence is a shortage of skilled tradesmen, despite the abundance of people seeking training as apprentices.

I had the opportunity of speaking to some country apprentices. Any honorable member who is interested in the training of apprentices from the country should visit the Melbourne School of Hairdressing, which has the second largest enrolment of apprentices in Victoria. It is second only to the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. At the Melbourne School of Hairdressing some 600 students attend daily and are being trained in an old gaol, an old paper factory, and an old ball bearing factory. The grounds at the school can only be described as a mud heap. The canteen is less than half the size of a milk bar counter. These are the conditions under which country students are being brought to Melbourne on block release for three weeks and are expected to be trained and return to the country to practise their trade.

In this building I saw apprentices doing the business principles section of the course being taught in a room which had a bare concrete floor, no electric light or power

and a galvanized iron roof. I visited the supervisor of the girls from the country, the person responsible for their well-being while they are being trained, and talked to her in her office. It consists of a small room with an open section about 4 feet down from the ceiling covered by a piece of cloth material to prevent the draught from blowing in from outside. This is the type of facility offered to Victorian apprentices from the country in 1971.

It is not unique, because one does not have to go far to the Melbourne School of Printing and Graphic Arts. I am told by the people responsible for the training of these apprentices that it is important that the climate and the atmosphere of the rooms in which this art is practised should be controlled. However, the most appalling conditions exist in the science classes in this building. The Minister of Education might inform the House at some future stage in this discussion what his intentions are in respect of these schools.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I assume these students are apprentices.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—They are apprentices—block release apprentices and day release apprentices in the metropolitan area. They are taught 37 trades at the Melbourne School of Printing and Graphic Arts. This is not a small school and it is important. It teaches apprentices in essential crafts. One of the problems of the school is to assess the needs of the industry so that apprentices are not trained in skills which will be redundant and so that the equipment in the school is in accordance with the equipment required in industry. I saw $24,000 worth of modern equipment in a store room because there was nowhere to accommodate it. This is not a unique instance. There is much valuable equipment at the school, including some of the finest printing equipment in the State, but the school does not have the facility to operate the equipment adequately to train the apprentices who are seeking to practise this particular skill and to learn a trade at this establishment.

Because of the short period of the adjournment of the debate on this Bill I did not have the opportunity of visiting all the schools which are training apprentices, but if the conditions in the two schools I have mentioned are an indication of the standard available to apprentices and if the others are no better, it is an indictment of the Government to bring forward a measure such as this which contains good provisions but does not provide the funds to implement those provisions. It is a useless exercise for the Government to say that it is doing something for apprentices and to present a Bill such as this which contains many fine words and attitudes; that does not train apprentices. Apprentices need facilities to undertake their training.

Persons who are employing apprentices need encouragement so that something will be done to train more apprentices. The Government might investigate what is happening in its departments. I hesitate to read the answer supplied by the Minister of Health in the light of the Premier's comments, but I think the honorable gentleman will appreciate the point. On 29th September I asked the Minister of Health whether the Mental Health Authority employs apprentices.

I recall the Minister's answer because he said that the Department of Health did encourage the employment of apprentices, which I was pleased to hear. The honorable gentleman made the comment that if there were no apprentices, this was part of the syndrome of modern permissive society. The result of the encouragement of the Minister of Health is the total of one apprentice cook employed by the Mental Health Authority out of a total of 477 tradesmen.

In case the Minister of Health feels isolated, I asked a similar question of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission and was informed that the commission employed 10 apprentices to 192 tradesmen—a ratio of 1:19.2. The ratio of the Department of Agriculture is even worse; it does not employ any apprentices although it has a total of 47 tradesmen. The Victorian Railways historically have a fine record for the employment of apprentices. It is well recognized by private industry that railway apprentices are well-trained, because these apprentices are sought by private industry. The railways, which have an average of about 3 tradesmen to 1 apprentice, employ 2,878 tradesmen and 826 apprentices. The railways set an example to other Government departments in this respect. The Lands Department employs 2 apprentices and 64 tradesmen, and the Country Fire Authority 42 tradesmen and 1 apprentice. There must be something in Government policy which is prejudicial to the employment of apprentices. It is useless for the Government to assert that it is concerned about apprentices and apprenticeship and to tell employers that they should employ apprentices when it sets such a bad example in this respect in its own administration.

I now wish to say something about specific accommodation problems of girls undertaking the hairdressing course at the Melbourne School of Hairdressing. It may be of some concern to the Minister to know the standard of accommodation for girl students who are between the ages of fifteen and eighteen years and who are undertaking apprenticeship training in hairdressing. The majority have to stay at the Travellers Aid Society. The conditions they describe are entirely unsatisfactory; they are cold, are unable to obtain adequate facilities for showers and cannot receive phone messages. Obviously, their families are concerned that they are unable to get messages to them to ascertain whether they are all right in the big city. After all, girls from the country are a bit lost in the metropolitan area, and one of the problems of the course is that they tend to be isolated from the metropolitan students. They are not isolated on the basis of skill, because they are found to be most diligent students who are at least comparable and perhaps a little better than metropolitan students.

The subsidy provided for students varies from $9 to $3 according to the year of apprenticeship, and these girls are expected to pay $18 to the Travellers Aid Society. So far as I can ascertain no responsibility is accepted by the Apprenticeship Commission for their accommodation. I understand that this is not the case with students on block releases from country areas in respect to printing trades. I believe the Apprenticeship Commission does accept some responsibility in this area. I ask the Minister to investigate and consult with the Minister of Education with a view to seeing what can be done in this regard. These girls are expected by their employers to return to country areas to work on Saturday mornings to make up the 40-hour week although in some instances they rise at 5.30 a.m. to get to the school and spend the day in the conditions that I have described. In one-third of the cases I discussed they are then expected by the employer to work on Saturday morning to make up the 40-hour week. This raises the question of job opportunities in the country for apprentices. It is important that if country apprentices are to be trained they must be provided with employment.

Last week honorable members heard the honorable member for Ballaarat South refer to industries in the Ballarat area. It is important to understand that industries in country areas are declining, and a company such as Ronaldson, Tippett Ltd., which employed 150 people,

many of them skilled tradesmen, has closed and its property is now for sale.

Mr. RAFFERTY.—The Government cannot be blamed for that.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—That is so, but the honorable member for Ballaarat South supplied misleading information to the House on industry in the Ballarat area. On 30th September, 1971, he informed the House that there were in the Ballarat urban area 294 factories of which 204 had fewer than ten employees. He failed to say that 95 of these factories employed under four people, including working proprietors. In fact, the total number of people employed by these 95 factories was 178—fewer than two employees to each factory.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Is the honorable member referring to apprentices or to the number of employees?

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I am referring to industries and job opportunities in the country. It is important to understand the type of factories that exist in country areas.

The SPEAKER.—I think that subject is going wide of the general question of apprenticeship, which the honorable member has been very well adhering to.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I am coming to the point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker. At present in the Ballarat area, approximately 302 junior persons are unemployed. I do not wish to canvass the issue of exemption from taxation, but some kind of incentive should be offered to country industries to provide employment, not only for apprentices, but for all types of employees. However, the House is now considering the position of apprentices. The 204 factories referred to by the honorable member for Ballaarat South as being important employ 846 persons. The remaining 90 factories employ 6,683 people. I have checked the figures quoted by the honorable member with the statistics provided by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for 1967-68, and I found that the member for Ballaarat South used these 1967-68 figures.

I now wish to take a little further the matter of assistance to apprentices in country areas on day release. Earlier this year the relevant Act was amended to enable country apprentices travelling on day release to receive technical training to be paid a subsidy towards the cost of their travel to and from their homes or places of employment to school. I have had drawn to my attention that apprentices in the Mortlake area must travel to Warrnambool to attend school, and that apprentices in Robinvale must travel to Mildura. This is a hardship for these apprentices not only in terms of finance but also in terms of the time spent at school and in travel. Often they must leave home early in the morning and return late at night. Some apprentices are subjected to more hardship than is generally realized. These young people are at an age when they need adequate rest, and it is not fair to expect apprentices to put in these long hours, which are extended because of the distances they may have to travel in country areas.

Another problem relates to those apprentices who have to find board and lodgings adjacent to their place of employment. I am referring not to those apprentices who come to live in Melbourne, but to those who are forced to leave their homes and live near their place of employment in country areas. Perhaps honorable members who represent country areas could give illustrations of this problem in their own electorates. Other provisions of the Bill provide for significant changes which will cover the supervision of apprentices by the Apprenticeship Commission, and the repeal of certain sections of the Employers and Employés Act 1958.

The Opposition does not oppose the Bill, but is aware of many deficiences in the Apprenticeship Act in this State. It is to be hoped that the fine words contained in the Bill will be matched by action in the future.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—I congratulate the honorable member for Reservoir on his excellent contribution to the debate. My colleague, who has spent a great deal of time on the detail of the Bill, understands the requirements and needs both of apprentices and of the State.

The youth of today rightly carries a heavy responsibility in the community. Young people are striving to improve their standard of living by an increase in their leisure time. Swift changes have occurred as a result of technological developments and improvements, and young people are just as entitled as industry or the skilled tradesmen to the benefits gained in this way.

The trade union movement has been in the forefront in the demand for improved working conditions. It has also been in the forefront in demanding better educational facilities through technical schools and tertiary institutions. It should be realized that today apprenticeship should receive a closer study by the community at large. For the past 25 years a serious shortage of skilled tradesmen has existed in this State. I concede that many apprentices are employed in the metal and electrical trades but, unfortunately, there is a general shortage of apprentices which, to my mind, is not being tackled in a planned way. It is important that industry, in co-operation with the trade unions, should assess the needs of both the apprentices and the future skilled tradesmen. Members of Parliament should be able to discern this need more clearly than other people.

It has already been said that one of the main problems in industry today is the lack of vacancies for apprentices. This cannot be blamed on the apprentices or on the trade union movement; it can be blamed on the State and those who control industry. If the State is to progress, these problems must be recognized and overcome. Plans must be developed to produce skilled tradesmen and this must be done through the apprenticeship system. Up to the present, no attempt has been made to overcome the lack of skilled tradesmen and industry will probably regret this in years to come. Unless there are skilled tradesmen now, there will be none in the future because without the skilled tradesmen the apprentice can learn only part of his trade or calling and this is not enough. An article in a trade union publication *The Age of Youth and Unions* states—

> Trade unions also are concerned with the proper training of apprentices. Too often employers do not train apprentices in every aspect of their trade.

When responsible people in the community accept this as a fact, Parliament must show concern. Industry must also show concern because if no action is taken to meet the problems of a shortage of skilled tradesmen and apprentices in 1971, our future will be in jeopardy. The article in the journal also states—

> To overcome these, the ACTU demands regular shop and job inspection to see that apprentices are being rotated to different machines and taught to use different skills in their trade. These checks would ensure that apprentices are trained in all aspects of equipment and technical skills.

The skills and knowledge of a tradesman take many years to acquire. It also takes many years to pass on this know-how to those who will become the tradesmen of the future. Honorable members may wonder why apprentices are not apprenticed to the Apprenticeship Commission or at least to the industry with which they are associated. I suggest that the commission would be the better body as it would be more readily available

to the trade union movement and to employers' organizations which want to push forward with speed, because speed is needed today in apprenticeship training.

The honorable member for Reservoir mentioned the expenditure by the Government on all types of education and the report of the Apprenticeship Commission clearly shows the difference in spending on technical education and spending on advanced education. The disparity exists in both State and Federal spheres. Insufficient provision is made for technical training. The honorable member for Reservoir justifiably criticized Government departments, some of which are lax about the employment of apprentices. For instance, in the Mental Health Authority the proportion of skilled men to apprentices was 400 to 1. The State Electricity Commission and the Victorian Railways are to be commended. Their contribution to producing skilled craftsmen and properly trained apprentices is much appreciated by those who have worked in various workshops or who possess tradesmen's skills.

Any Bill introduced into this House, particularly by the Government of the day, should be carefully studied. The Opposition is always prepared to devote considerable time to any Bill dealing with apprentices. There should be an organized plan, to meet not only the needs of today but also those of a decade from now for tradesmen and apprentices. Particular consideration should be given to the availability of young people to become apprenticed to the various industries which are expanding so quickly. The facilities associated with the training of apprentices must be considered in the light of future needs. If the problems are not tackled in this way, tradesmen's skills will be lost in this State and also in other States. I hope these skills will not be lost within the next decade. Ten years from now will be too late to do anything about the problem because there may be no craftsman to pass on the skills which take years to accrue.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Clause 3, providing for the constitution of the commission.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—I direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that the provision contained in sub-clause (2) will mean that in future the employers' representative on the commission will consist of two members appointed on the nomination of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, one on the nomination of the Victorian Employers Federation and one on the nomination of the Victorian Branch of the Metal Trades Industry Association. I commend the philosophy behind the appointment of nominees of the various organizations. It is a pity that the Government did not agree to this principle in the appointments to the Environment Protection Council.

Some interesting changes are taking place within the employer organizations and this sub-clause reflects those changes. The emergence of the Metal Trades Industry Association is causing some concern to employer organizations and is seen as a fragmentation of the employers' front. It will be interesting to note whether any conflict will arise within the commission from this development. The Metal Trades Industry Association, which is interested in metal trades apprentices, may have a different attitude from that of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures and the Victorian Employers Federation because the association has adopted a different relationship with the trade union movement. It has adopted a realistic approach to the role of unions in industry and has an attitude to industrial agreements which, no doubt, will

cause some friction between the employer representatives on the commission. I endorse the provisions that bodies should appoint their own representatives to boards and commissions such as the Apprenticeship Commission and I hope that principle will be adopted in other fields.

Mr. BIRRELL (Geelong).—The trades coming under the control of the Metal Trades Industry Association employ approximately one-third of the apprentices in training and two-thirds are from other groups. The new basis of representation has a relationship to that statistical proportion of apprentices in the metal trades.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—I support the remarks of the honorable member for Reservoir. As honorable members are aware, I am probably the only honorable member in this House who has served an apprenticeship and I am capable of speaking on the subject. Clause 3 is indicative of a change occurring in the Apprenticeship Commission. In his second-reading speech, the Minister of Labour and Industry said that, in the commission's view, the change is more appropriate and relevant to today's conditions.

The chairman of the commission will be appointed not on experience in industry but on having a sound knowledge of industrial training. A vast difference exists between the two expressions. Apart from the appointment of a permanent head, in recent years very little change has taken place in the functions of the commission. The honorable gentleman said that the changes are desirable because of changed social and industrial conditions. I should like to know the reason for the omission of the words, "experience in industry" and the insertion in place thereof the expression "sound knowledge of industrial training". It would seem that, in future, the Government will be able to appoint an absolute academic to the commission. This should not be a criterion for an appointment to this important post in the sphere of apprenticeship.

As I understand the meaning of the expressions, "experience" is the actual observation of facts and events brought about by a person being a participant in what has occurred in industry, and "knowledge" is a more theoretical aspect. Instead of having a practical experience, a person would have a theoretical understanding of a series of events. This has deep significance for industry and apprenticeship training. Can the Minister inform me why this amendment was necessary? I am not concerned with the brief references he made in his second-reading speech.

Honorable members now have the opportunity of asking the Minister questions and I want to know why it is necessary to omit the words "experience in industry" from paragraph (*a*) of sub-section (4) of section 7 and insert the words "a sound knowledge of industrial training". The amendment can only mean that a teacher will be appointed as chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission which, to my mind, is not a good thing. I should prefer the chairman to have had practical experience in industry.

Proposed new paragraph (*c*) of sub-section (4) of section 7 provides that one of the members representing employers shall be appointed on the nomination of the Victorian Branch of the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia. Such a person would have a wide knowledge of industry generally. If on the one hand it is necessary to bring in a person who has a wide industrial experience as a member of the commission why, on the other hand, is it necessary to delete the words "experience in industry" from the qualifications of the chairman? The amendment can only mean that the person appointed will

have an academic approach to a delicate area of industrial relations, because anybody who has been through an apprenticeship—I commenced an apprenticeship at fourteen years of age—knows that during an apprenticeship a lad gains a basic understanding of employee and employer relationships. I want to know whether the Minister is prepared to tell the Committee why the proposed alteration in the qualifications of the chairman is necessary.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—I should like the Minister to indicate whether the Government has changed its policy concerning the appointment of members of commissions. When the Environment Protection Bill was before Parliament, the Government would not accept an amendment to provide for the appointment to the Environment Protection Council of a trade union representative who had been selected by the Trades Hall Council. In this measure the Government provides for various employer organizations to nominate their own representative instead of the Government selecting one from four names submitted. The Government should be consistent in its aproach.

I support the remarks of the honorable member for Reservoir concerning the Metal Trades Industry Association of Australia. The *Sunday Review* of 5th October carries the headline "Employer Unity Crumbles Away". I agree with the honorable member for Reservoir that undoubtedly a split has occurred in the employer ranks not only in Victoria but also throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—The honorable member for Moonee Ponds asked a question concerning the qualifications for the future appointment of the chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission. I remind the honorable member that the present chairman of the commission, who has frequently been applauded by honorable members for his work, was a teacher. This is a first-class example of the fears expressed by the honorable member for Moonee Ponds not being fulfilled.

The Apprenticeship Commission comprises representatives of the trade union movement—we hear about them frequently—and representatives of industry. The recommendation for this amendment came from these gentlemen and I personally support it. Today, great emphasis is placed on a sound knowledge of training but the amendment will not mean that the person will not have had some practical experience. The recommendation by the Apprenticeship Commission is worthy of the Government's support and that is why it has been included in the measure.

In reply to the honorable member for Preston, I simply say that the honorable member was dealing with two specific Acts. Proposed paragraph (c) of sub-section (4) of section 7, as contained in sub-clause (2) is in line with the construction of the principal Act. The other matter referred to by the honorable member related to a different Act altogether.

The clause was agreed to, as was clause 4.

Clause 5, relating to the annual report of the commission.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—This clause provides that the annual report of the Apprenticeship Commission shall be presented to Parliament. The 1970 and 1971 annual reports of the commission contain a damning indictment of the state of apprenticeship in Victoria. The reports deal with the matters that I raised earlier relating to education priorities and the fact that the miserable pittance of $150 is allowed for the technical education of each student whilst $1,100 is allowed for each university student. This a a glaring example of the priorities attached by the Government to education of apprentices. For too long, apprentices have been considered by some people as the

drop-outs of society but apprentices who become tradesmen are the people who build societies.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—The honorable member is speaking about the contents of the report and not the clause before the Committee.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I simply commend to honorable members a study of the 1970 and 1971 reports of the commission because they will then understand the deficiences in apprenticeship education. The matters which were raised in the 1970 report have been repeated in the 1971 report and relate to administration rather than expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member is getting away from the clause under consideration.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Mr. Chairman——

Sir HENRY BOLTE.—Oh!

Mr. WILTON.—Why don't you go home if you are dissatisfied with the running of the Committee. We will get on much better without you.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable member will address the Chair. I suggest that his remarks could be taken to be offensive.

Mr. WILTON.—I submit——

The CHAIRMAN.—Is the member raising a point of order?

Mr. WILTON.—Yes, Sir. On a point of order, I submit that, in referring to the report, the honorable member for Reservoir is attempting to emphasize the need for a report of this nature to be tabled in Parliament as provided in the clause. The honorable member is highlighting certain facts of the report to indicate to the Committee why the Opposition completely agrees with the clause.

The CHAIRMAN.—Order! The honorable member for Reservoir knows what I meant.

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My final point is that in future, reports of the commission will be presented to Parliament. In the past the reports have been presented to the Minister. This provision is a good one and I recommend to honorable members that when the report is presented to Parliament they should study and absorb its contents.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—I agree with the clause. This report should be presented to Parliament, because only then will Parliament understand that thousands of apprentices have been lost to the trade. From 1957 to 1967 approximately 7 per cent of apprentices drifted from the industry. The number of applications made during those years is not available. Honorable members should study the report.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 6 (Amendment of No. 6199 s. 10).

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—On 6th October, 1971, I asked the Minister some questions about supervisors. This clause deals with the appointment of supervisors to oversee the training of apprentices, and makes a significant change in the principal Act. It spells out the role of supervisors in the training of apprentices, not only in the workshop but also in technical colleges and other institutions.

As I indicated, I asked the Minister of Labour and Industry the current position to discover whether adequate supervisors were being provided to ensure that apprentices were trained correctly. On 6th October, 1971, I was informed by the Minister that there were 1 senior supervisor, 3 assistant senior supervisors and 22 supervisors. On 16th September, 1970, I asked a similar question and was informed that there were 1 senior supervisor, 3 assistant senior supervisors and 23 other supervisors. Since that time

there has been a net loss of one supervisor. When the last Bill amending this Act was debated the Minister apologised for the fact that insufficient supervisors were available, when I stated that the overseas standard of 200 apprentices to one supervisor compared unfavourably with the situation in Victoria where there were 1,300 apprentices to one supervisor. Since then the position in Victoria has worsened.

There are two supervisors to cope with more than 2,000 apprentices in the hair-dressing and beauty salons. There are literally thousands of establishments at which hairdressing apprentices are trained. The apprentice is not seen often enough to ensure correct training in this industry, which is rife with employers who exploit junior labour to the extent that 33 per cent of the probationary apprentices each year have left the industry by the time they have completed their probationary training. In many instances they have left not of their own free will but because the employer was using the probationary period to exploit cheap labour, thus filling up the trade, which is so saturated with staff that it is uneconomic. Apprentices from country towns are finding it difficult to find employment in their home towns and are forced to go to the city where they have to compete for employment in an over-staffed industry.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Edgar Tanner).—Order! I ask the honorable member to return to clause 6.

Mr. SIMMONDS.—I am pointing out to the Committee that there are two supervisors to deal with this trade, and unless they advise the commission of the circumstances in the trade neither the commission nor anyone else will be conscious of the problem. It is important that people should be trained for their job. What qualifications do the supervisors possess? Are they qualified to the standard of teachers in the trade? If they are not, why is this so? Are the supervisors specialists in their trade? In country areas one supervisor will cover almost every trade within the ambit of the commission. The more inadequate is the supervision the less job opportunities there are.

While the deficiencies are bad enough in the technical schools, many employers do not train apprentices adequately or teach them the necessary skills. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure that sufficient supervisors are employed to investigate the training problems. In many trades the supervisors do not see the apprentices, and many employers do not care. I believe a later clause refers to a log book. I shall not discuss that on this clause. A practical proposition has been advanced by the Minister that the qualification required of applicants for appointment as president of the commission should be a sound knowledge of industrial training. This should apply also to the appointment of supervisors.

The clause was agreed to.

Clause 7 was adopted with a verbal amendment, as was clause 8.

Clauses 9 and 10 were agreed to.

Clause 11 (Repeal of section 25 of the principal Act).

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—This clause provides for awards to determine conditions of employment and for the commission to be responsible for the training of apprentices. The Opposition agrees with this philosophy, and draws attention to the fact that there is a growing need for apprentices to join appropriate trade unions so that they will be in a position to take action if the Government does not provide suitable training facilities or make adequate provision for job training and does not take up the question of apprenticeship to a trade rather than to an employer. There should be no restriction on opportunities for apprentices. Grave difficulties have been raised—particularly in the printing industry—over the intensity

of training which results from compression of courses from, say, five to four years. These are problems which need constant attention, and if the Government does not provide these conditions, apprentices will be able to take action through unions.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 12 and 13.

Clause 14 was adopted with a verbal amendment.

Clause 15 (Relating to apprentice journals or log books).

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir).—I understand that this proposal is supported by the Apprenticeship Commission and others who are concerned with apprenticeships. The Opposition is anxious that future employers should not be permitted to peruse the contents of an apprentice's log book. When he has finished his period of training and is seeking employment, an apprentice should not be placed in a position in which an employer can ask for his log book, which will contain a good deal of confidential information. Safeguards should be included in this measure to provide that a log book is the property of the apprentice and need not be produced.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—The point raised by the honorable member for Reservoir is valid. An apprentice's log book will contain a good deal of confidential information, and it is essential that it should remain his personal property. I know of no reason why the Government should refuse this approach.

The clause was agreed to, as were the remaining clauses.

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and passed through its remaining stages.

VEGETATION AND VINE DISEASES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Council and, on the motion of Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands) was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: APPOINTMENT OF TEACHERS: BRUNSWICK GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL — MELBOURNE AND METROPOLITAN TRAMWAYS BOARD: TURN INDICATORS FOR TRAMS.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the House at its rising, adjourn until this day, at Ten o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara).—I direct the attention of the Minister of Education to problems which exist at schools in my electorate and in the north-western part of the State. I have received a letter from the North-West Advisory Councils Association about this matter. That association is comprised of representatives of high schools at Boort, Donald, Merbein, Ouyen, Robinvale, Wedderburn, Birchip, Hopetoun, Mildura, Rainbow, Sea Lake, Charlton, Kerang, Murrayville, Red Cliffs, and Swan Hill. I have been advised that a number of senior teaching appointments at some of the schools have been advertised but not filled; in fact, there are still ten vacancies, and the North-West Advisory Councils Association desires the Minister to readvertise those positions. In its letter the association states—

Further the association maintains that the tribunal has adequate powers, after consultation with the classifiers, to fill readvertised positions with applicants who have had less than the required time in the previous class.

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—I rise to a point of order. The honorable member has raised an issue which is of importance to his electorate, but he should not read or quote from a letter.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—There is substance in this point of order. Honorable members should not read speeches. On the adjournment motion, the honor-

able member should not make a set speech. He has five minutes during which he can speak on one subject, and it should concern a matter of Government administration.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, would you please tell me which Standing Order provides that an honorable member has a fixed period during which he can speak on an adjournment motion? You mentioned a period of five minutes.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I do not know whether it is a Standing Order; I think it is a precedent, which is well established. I would be glad to turn up the precedents for the honorable member's study. I call on the honorable member for Kara Kara not to make a set speech, and to be brief.

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara).—The association maintains that under clause 1 of regulation 4 under the Act the tribunal can appoint teachers to these positions although they have not had the required time in previous classes. The same situation applies also to senior assistants within the schools I have mentioned which have 30 vacancies at present for positions which have already been advertised and not filled. I ask the Minister to take up this matter with the classifiers to see if something can be sorted out and to have teachers appointed to these positions as soon as possible.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I raise an urgent matter with the Minister of Transport. It relates to a question of road safety as it affects his administration. I refer to traffic control items on trams and also at one particular depot. Turning movements are not indicated on trams. I should like to be informed why trams are not required under the Road Traffic Act to carry turn indicators as a clear indication for motorists.

The Tramways Board has a special set of warning signals installed at tram depots for turning movements. It has been reported to the board previously with little avail that the lights in Plenty Road, Preston, are not functioning. The board has been requested to take action but nothing has been done. I am impelled to raise this matter with the Minister so that emergency action may be taken in the interests of road safety.

Mr. BORNSTEIN (Brunswick East).—I direct the attention of the Minister of Education to the serious staffing position at Brunswick Girls High School and more particularly to the likely crisis in the staff provision at the school next year. The enrolment at the school is such that it has been granted 7 new teaching positions —2 senior teachers and 5 senior assistants. However, through advertisements the school has been able to fill only 3 of the senior assistant positions so that 4 of those positions are unfilled. I do not think I need to impress on the Minister the serious problems which exist at this school —that 79 per cent of the 460 pupils are now migrants; that reading difficulties at the school are enormous and that the proportion of temporary teachers is very high. More disturbingly, it is apparently the policy of the department that positions such as these which are not filled are not readvertised. I strongly urge the Minister to look at that aspect of his department's policy with a view to readvertising these positions.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The matters raised by the honorable members for Kara Kara and Brunswick East will be brought to the attention of the Committee of Classifiers, which is a statutory body set up under the Teaching Service Act.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The remarks of the honorable member for Greensborough will be directed to the Minister of Transport for such action as seems to him to be appropriate.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.10 *a.m.* (*Thursday*).

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, October 14, 1971.

The SPEAKER **(the Hon. Vernon Christie)** took the chair at 10.34 a.m., and read the prayer.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

The following answers to questions on notice were circulated:—

STATE RIVERS AND WATER SUPPLY COMMISSION.

EXTRACT OF GRAVEL FROM WOOLSHED SWAMP RESERVE.

(Question No. 415)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Water Supply—

Whether the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission has now agreed to allow the Gordon Shire Council to extract gravel from a portion of the gravel reserve at Woolshed Swamp?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—The answer is—

Yes, but at this stage only from mutually agreed-upon areas.

FILLING OF LAKE WOOROONOOKE.

(Question No. 417)

Mr. CURNOW (Kara Kara) asked the Minister of Water Supply—

Whether the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission intends filling Lake Wooroonooke this year; if so, when this will be done and what amount of water will be required to be put into the lake?

Mr. DUNSTAN (Minister of Water Supply).—The answer is—

Consequent on the dramatic improvement in Grampians storages in the last three weeks it is the intention of the commission to fill Lake Wooroonooke this year. This will commence within the next fortnight. It is estimated that 200 acre-feet of water will be supplied, i.e. about ten days run of the channel.

EDUCATION.

COMMONWEALTH SECONDARY AND TERTIARY SCHOLARSHIPS.

(Question No. 418)

Mr. SIMMONDS (Reservoir) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many Commonwealth scholarships were provided for—(*a*) secondary education; and (*b*) tertiary education during the past five years for students of State schools, Catholic schools, and other private schools, respectively?

2. How many of each type of scholarship were allotted to schools situated north and south, respectively, of the Yarra River?

3. What proportion of the number of secondary scholarships were allotted to University High School?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1, 2 and 3. The allocation of Commonwealth scholarships is a matter for the Commonwealth. We have written to the Department of Education and Science asking for the required information. The honorable member will be advised by letter as soon as a reply from that department comes to hand.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

MAFFRA HIGH SCHOOL.

(Question No. 422)

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East) asked the Minister of Education—

1. At what stage are plans for the building of a library at Maffra High School?

2. When it is expected that tenders will be called?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1. In a letter dated 29th September, 1971, the Education Department authorized the school committee to call tenders for the building of a library.

2. This is a decision for the school committee.

TEACHERS RECRUITED FROM OVERSEAS.

(Question No. 429)

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray) asked the Minister of Education—

1. How many teachers have been recruited from overseas by the Education Department in each of the past five years, indicating from which countries?

2. How many of these teachers left the service of the department in each of the past five years?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The answers are—

1 and 2. The information sought is not readily available. However, the Assistant Director-General of Education, Dr. Shears, would be happy to discuss this subject with the honorable member.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

DECISIONS BY MAGISTRATE.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—I ask the Attorney-General whether his attention has been directed to what appear to be inconsistent decisions by a magistrate who placed a youth, who had been charged with breaking and entering a chemist's shop and stealing drugs, on a bond and who, in the same court, dealt with a woman with a small child for larceny of a pair of slacks by fining her $200, in default twelve months' imprisonment?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I am grateful to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for directing my attention to this matter. This is the first I have heard of it. I will obtain a report on the decisions in the two cases and the reasons for them. It is essential to obtain a report, because one cannot act on the basis of a press report which may be incomplete.

HORSHAM–KYOSAN ENGINEERING COMPANY LIMITED.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—I direct a question to the Treasurer. Some weeks ago I asked the honorable gentleman why the Government had not accepted an offer from shareholders of Horsham-Kyosan Engineering Company Ltd., to buy debentures held by the Government. At that stage, the Treasurer indicated that he was not in a position to make a statement to the House. I now ask whether he can inform the House of the reasons for the Government's attitude?

Sir HENRY BOLTE (Premier and Treasurer).—I am still not in a position to make a statement in the House on this subject. However, if the Leader of the Opposition would like to see the file, I shall be delighted to show it to him.

D.24 RADIO SYSTEM.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—Has the Chief Secretary noted various reports that the D.24 radio system would break down in an emergency and could not handle the expected volume of traffic under the State Disaster Plan? If the honorable gentleman is aware of the inadequacies of the system, has he investigated the need to modernize it and, if so, what are his findings?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I take it that the honorable member for Moonee Ponds is referring to a press report of some weeks ago which was said to be based on a statement by a senior constable stationed at police headquarters, Russell Street. The report was very much exaggerated as I found when I had some investigations made. A perusal of the report would indicate that the situation posed as a possible threat was, to say the least, a highly unlikely set of circumstances which would place an immense strain on any communication system.

However, the D. 24 system is under review. The Government is anxious to improve communications within the Police Force, particularly as the Chief Commissioner, under certain circumstances, becomes responsible for coping with major disasters in Victoria, and in such an event the police system would be used for communications over a wide area. The whole of the communications system is being revised with a view to its improvement. Funds are being made available in the Budget this year for this purpose. I hope that before long Victoria will have a first-class system emanating from D24.

ST. KILDA FORESHORE.

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda).—Is the Minister of Lands aware that the palm trees to which I referred last week have now been removed and

that the lawn in front of the St. Kilda baths has been bulldozed and pushed inside the baths? Have permits been obtained for these works and if they have not been obtained, why not? Will the Minister ensure that if the necessary permits have not been obtained, the work will cease forthwith?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I take it that these are permits from the Lands Department?

Mr. DIXON.—From the Lands Department and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—As I explained to the House last week, the lease to Sequarium Pty. Ltd. has been in existence for fourteen years. Under the terms of the lease Sequarium had the right to develop an area in front of the existing baths. It is true that Sequarium, like any other owner of land, is required to have a permit for the work it might carry out.

As a result of the question asked last week by the honorable member for St. Kilda, I endeavoured to establish whether permits had been granted or whether the people concerned had any documents which would prove that they had permits. The first difficulty I faced was that there had been share transactions within the company and it was difficult to establish whom I could contact to obtain this information. Subsequently, I contacted people who were domiciled in Sydney and they assured me verbally that they had the permits, but as yet they have not been able to provide me with written proof. I am endeavouring through the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works to ascertain whether permits have been issued, and I shall pursue that point.

OUTBREAK OF HEPATITIS.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Is the Minister of Education aware that outbreaks of hepatitis in certain schools have or could reach epidemic proportions and, if so, what preventive action does the Education Department intend to take in relation to certain schools?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The practice is immediately to notify the Department of Health, firstly, to verify whether it is an outbreak of hepatitis and, secondly, to decide whether any action needs to be taken to segregate children, to close the school, or to treat the building.

ST. KILDA CITY COUNCIL.

Mr. DIXON (St. Kilda).—Is the Minister of Lands aware that, in reference to the proposed hotel-motel on the St. Kilda marina, Councillor Brian Zouch, on the front page of the *Southern Cross,* objected to the Minister of Lands asking the St. Kilda City Council for a request to amend the St. Kilda Land Act, and that the councillor further said that he believed that the Minister was looking for a scapegoat? I wish to clarify whether the honorable gentleman asked the council for a letter or not.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—The St. Kilda Land Act was authorized by this Parliament initially at the request of the St. Kilda City Council to the Minister of Lands at the time. That Act gives the St. Kilda City Council the right to enter into certain leases for the development of the marina at St. Kilda. As the Act arose from representations by the council, when approaches were made to me on the question of an amendment, I gave an unequivocal answer that under no circumstances would I consider an amendment unless a specific proposal was put before me by the St. Kilda City Council.

The legislation was enacted for the benefit of this council and, in my view, the Government should not consider an amendment to it unless it is requested by the council. I wrote to the St. Kilda City Council in those terms. I received a reply in ambiguous terms. I wrote again and said that unless the amendment was

requested I would not be prepared to give the matter any consideration. Yesterday, I received a request.

"SOUTHERN AURORA" ACCIDENT.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—Can the Minister of Transport inform the House whether all claims arising from the *Southern Aurora* crash have been dealt with; if so, can he give the approximate cost to the Government?

Mr. WILCOX (Minister of Transport).—I have the information in my office, and therefore I ask the honorable member to place the question on the Notice Paper.

PIN-BALL MACHINES.

Mr. KIRKWOOD (Preston).—Can the Chief Secretary state whether it is a fact that pin-ball machines are being operated without permits in this State, and will the honorable gentleman undertake to investigate the system of permits and the operation of the machines by persons who control them?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—It is certainly not true that pin-ball machines generally are being operated in this State without permits. On the contrary, permits for pin-ball machines are being issued and reissued every week. It has been claimed that some premises are operating pin-ball machines without a permit. In fact, the honorable member has given me a report on the subject which I have asked the Chief Commissioner of Police to investigate. When I receive a report from the Chief Commissioner, I will communicate with the honorable member and advise him whether there are any such premises.

UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—Can the Minister of Education advise whether the proposed meeting of the principals of University, Princes Hill and Flemington high schools to discuss the needs of students in the surrounding areas has been held? If the meeting has taken place, was a satisfactory conclusion reached between the principals and the Minister to satisfy the needs of children in the local area?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—It has been decided to admit 100 or so form I. pupils to University High School next year in order to relieve the pressure on surrounding high schools. This decision follows the presentation of a plan by the principals of the University, Princes Hill and Flemington high schools. I pay tribute to the principals of the schools for the amount of work they have done in analysing the position and the positive and constructive proposals that they submitted to solve what would otherwise have been a difficult problem for next year.

ROAD SAFETY.

Mrs. GOBLE (Mitcham).—In view of a report from the United States of America that a system of road grooving has proved very effective in reducing the accident rate in some States, will the Chief Secretary investigate the possibility of introducing this system in Victoria?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I have heard a little about this development in the United States of America, where it is claimed that grooving of roads on curves has prevented skidding and overturning. The honorable member can be assured that the Government is anxious to investigate anything which might prove of value in combating the road toll. I will be pleased to have the report investigated.

DRUNK DRIVING CASES.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Can the Chief Secretary inform the House how many cases are pending against motorists who have been charged under the .05 law and cannot be proceeded with because of the omission of a provision in the legislation when the relevant section of the Crimes Act was transferred to the Motor Car Act?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not being factual. I think the honorable member is referring to a decision last week by a magistrate concerning some procedural difficulties in dealing with cases under the previous .05 legislation owing to the introduction of the new Act from 1st August this year. I can only say that the decision has been disagreed with and departed from in a number of subsequent cases in at least three other courts. The result is some difference of opinion between the magistrates as to the true position.

The Government is taking steps to have the first decision reviewed so that the position can be clear. In the meantime, all other cases are being proceeded with until a similar difficulty occurs. At that time those cases will proceed. No delay is expected. I am unable to inform the honorable member off-hand of how many cases are involved, but the number would be large.

ROLL BARS ON TRACTORS.

Mr. B. J. EVANS (Gippsland East).—Can the Minister of Labour and Industry inform the House what stage has been reached with the preparation of regulations governing the fitting of roll bars on tractors, and whether interested people will be given an opportunity to examine these regulations before they are proclaimed?

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—Originally, an indication was sent to interested parties of what we had in mind as a broad outline and we requested a reply by the end of July. As it was not convenient for many organizations to send a reply, the time was extended. We believe that we have now received most representations, either in writing or by deputation. The proposals that have come in are currently being examined in this State, in collaboration with New South Wales in particular. We are not yet in a position to finalize the matter as some more information is required. I have indicated to a number of organizations that before we finalize the regulations in detail those who have particularly requested to do so will have a further opportunity of discussing them.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

Mr. TREZISE (Geelong North).—Can the Chief Secretary inform the House what action is being taken to overcome the controversy taking place at present between trotting officials and greyhound officials on the likelihood of Totalizator Agency Board trotting and greyhound racing meetings operating on the same night?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—The responsibility for deciding whether there will be Totalizator Agency Board operations on any of these sports rests with the board, on which the various interests are represented. At present a discussion is taking place on whether Totalizator Agency Board facilities should be extended to dog races outside the metropolitan area. I assure the honorable member that the interests of the trotting associations and clubs will be fully considered. As yet no decision has been made, but the matter is under consideration.

PIPELINE UNDER PORT PHILLIP BAY.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—In view of the widespread fear that bay beaches will be polluted by the excavation of the trench for the pipeline from Mordialloc to Altona, can the Minister for Fuel and Power inform the House whether his department has laid down any conditions on the type of excavation that must take place there and the amount of sand that may be removed each day, or whether any special conditions have been laid down about weather and tide conditions on the days on which the excavation of sand takes place?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—All those conditions are laid down under the licences which were granted for the laying of this pipeline some time ago. These conditions are in conformity with the requirements of the experts of the Ports and Harbors Branch and of the Melbourne Harbor Trust.

Mr. DOUBE (Albert Park).—Will the Minister for Fuel and Power lay on the table of the Library the file relating to the matter the honorable gentleman has just discussed?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—No, the licence is a private document and belongs to the people to whom it has been granted. If the honorable member is interested, he should come to my office and I shall arrange for officers of the Mines Department to explain what the conditions are.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. EDMUNDS (Moonee Ponds).—Can the Minister of Housing inform the House of the current position concerning the Commonwealth Government's much vaunted housing financial arrangements which are to take the place of the Commonwealth–State Housing Agreement?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The proposal is that the financial arrangements will be the subject of a Commonwealth Act of Parliament. My latest information, which I received yesterday, is that the draftsman has not yet been instructed on what is to be included in the Bill. It will be necessary for this Parliament to enact legislation to cover Victoria's part of the deal, but I am having some difficulty in preparing a Bill because I am completely in the dark about the Commonwealth's intentions.

PIPELINE UNDER PORT PHILLIP BAY.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—Can the Minister for Fuel and Power inform the House why he and the officers of his department regard a legal document and a licence to install a pipeline under Port Phillip Bay as private, especially having regard to public interest? There is no doubt that the bay itself is regarded by the people of this State as public property.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—Applications were advertised in the press initially, and anyone who wishes to look at the terms is under no disability. People often call on us—some called as late as yesterday — to examine the document. It has been made available to them readily. The licence, however, is an engineering document and, although the Mines Department would be happy to explain it to honorable members, it belongs to the firm concerned. A great deal of engineering work was carried out when the application for a licence was prepared. The conditions are not private, but if the licence were to be made freely available, details of the firm's engineering planning would be revealed, and the firm may not want people to see it; however, I am quite happy to ask the firm concerned about it. I do not think the conditions stipulate how much excavation is to take place each day, but I shall be happy to inform the honorable member of the requirements which have been laid down by the Ports and Harbors Branch.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Will the Minister for Fuel and Power advise the House whether the licence to which he has adverted contains specifications and plans in connection with the laying of the pipeline under Port Phillip Bay; if so, what is the difference between those specifications and plans and any other specifications and plans which have been submitted to public departments in documents which have been made public?

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—The difference is that these plans have been prepared by a private company. They concern engineering details, and the permit is the property of the company.

Mr. WILKES.—You have said that they are plans and specifications.

Mr. BALFOUR.—They are more than that. They are engineering working drawings.

HOUSES IN COUNTRY AREAS.

Mr. TREWIN (Benalla).—When calling tenders for the construction of Housing Commission homes in country areas, is the Minister of Housing prepared to give a percentage cost advantage to local tenderers who use a proportion of local material?

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—The object of the Housing Commission is to provide housing as cheaply as possible to the people who need it. I should imagine that a local tenderer for a commission project would have an inbuilt advantage in that he is local and uses local materials. Therefore, I do not think there is any real need for a loading in favour of local tenderers as against others.

SCHOOL ASSEMBLY HALLS.

Mr. BILLING (Heatherton).—Can the Minister of Education inform the House of the number of assembly halls which are being built each year? If a priority has been set, can he give any information concerning an assembly hall for Parkdale High School?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—The sum of approximately $1·2 million is spent each year on the erection of assembly halls on a subsidy basis of three to one and a maximum amount of $90,000 for the construction of any one hall. From memory, Parkdale High School is down the list, but I should imagine it would be a prospect for the 1972-73 financial year.

FISHERIES INSPECTOR FOR BENDIGO.

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—Following a deputation which I took to the Chief Secretary some weeks ago from the Bendigo Legion Angling Club, could the honorable gentleman advise whether he has considered the appointment of a fisheries and wildlife inspector at Bendigo, and if so, what was the result of that consideration?

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I have discussed this matter with the Director of Fisheries and Wildlife. He recognizes that there is a need for greater coverage by inspectors in this area. On the other hand, he has pointed out that there are shortages elsewhere as well. I am unable to assure the honorable member for Midlands that there is an immediate prospect of the appointment of an additional inspector, but it will be done as soon as possible.

PERMANENT SECONDARY TEACHERS.

Mr. SCANLAN (Oakleigh).—Could the Minister of Education tell me the number of permanent secondary teachers who were recruited to the secondary service last year?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—A special attempt has been made in recent years to increase the number of permanent teachers in the secondary service because of the relatively high percentage of temporary teachers whom the department was forced to recruit through the boom years of expansion. One of the problems with temporary teachers is that there is a resignation rate of approximately 30 per cent per annum —because most temporary teachers do not intend to serve for a long period—whereas amongst the permanent teachers the resignation rate is between 7 per cent and 10 per cent per annum. Last year a record number of permanent teachers—approximately 550—was recruited, and I am pleased to say that the number of temporary teachers was actually reduced by approximately 60.

HOUSING COMMISSION POLICY.

Mr. FELL (Greensborough).—I direct a question to the Minister of Housing. Is it the normal operation of the Housing Commission to promote the commercial use, for the

establishment of hotels on residential land, of land owned by the commission at Watsonia, which is under-size and which entails the use of public open space and the alienation of parklands?

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member should ask a question, not make a speech.

Mr. MEAGHER (Minister of Housing).—I ask the honorable member to put that question on the Notice Paper and to put it into intelligible English. I do not know what he means.

VICTORIAN SECONDARY TEACHERS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. JONA (Hawthorn).—In respect of the number of permanent teachers currently employed in the Secondary Division of the Teaching Service, could the Minister indicate what percentage of those teachers are currently members of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association and what percentage were members of the association twelve months ago?

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—Until March of this year association fees were deducted for members of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association by the Accounts Branch of the Education Department and paid direct to the association. Therefore, there are no departmental records at this stage which indicate the exact membership of the Victorian Secondary Teachers Association. However, from press reports I understand that, according to the president of the association, membership has declined by approximately 2,500 members since March of this year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

ANSWER TO QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—I desire to make a personal explanation, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday during questions without notice, the honorable member for Morwell asked me a question and I regret that I misinterpreted what he meant and gave an incorrect answer.

Some time ago the Shire of Traralgon wrote to the Premier asking the Government to conduct an independent inquiry into land valuations in Traralgon South. The matter was considered and the Government's answer was that it did not think an inquiry was necessary.

Later in the day in conversation with the honorable member for Morwell I gathered from him that there was a suggestion from the Traralgon Shire Council that an inquiry should be held into the advisability of the State Electricity Commission building a dam on the Traralgon Creek. I had not heard of this, nor had I been asked about it. That is why I answered the question in the way I did. However, to put the matter in order my answer to the honorable member for Morwell is that I have not heard of the proposition, nor have I received a request about it. If a request should come forward it will receive due consideration.

STATE DEVELOPMENT.

CLOSING OF COUNTRY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—I wish to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Minister for State Development to take positive action to prevent the closing of certain country industries.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I should like to ask the honorable member for Morwell in what sense does he use the word "prevent"? What is the meaning of it? The honorable member said, "to prevent the closing of certain country industries."

Mr. AMOS.—The word is used in the sense of the sort of assistance that the Government embarks upon by its decentralization policy.

The SPEAKER.—Order! There must be a simple meaning of the word. Is it used in the modern sense of stopping, closing, or that sort of thing? What does the word mean?

Mr. AMOS.—Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does mean the stopping of certain country industries.

The SPEAKER.—I have examined this. The Leader of the Opposition was good enough, in accordance with normal practice, to give me adequate notice of this and I find that to stop the closing of certain country industries is beyond the function of the Minister for State Development and beyond the function of his department. Under his Act the Minister is charged to be responsible for promoting and co-ordinating the development of primary, secondary and tertiary industries throughout the State. To assist in the thinking about this matter and the function of the department, I point out that there is in the Trust Fund an account called the Industrial Development Fund. The purpose of this fund is to assist in the establishment and expansion of secondary industry. On examining this I find that it is beyond the scope of the Minister to stop the closing of industries. That is at the will of the owner or owners; or it may be at the direction of a court; probably a liquidator; or it may be on the advice of a receiver.

To say that the Minister has failed to take action to stop the closing of certain country industries, in my view, would be out of order. Because of the interesting nature of this, I am prepared to hear brief argument before I give my final ruling.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the motion moved by the honorable member for Morwell is in order and, with respect, you have taken a somewhat short view of the responsibility of the Government in this matter. Only today I had occasion to question the Premier at question time about the closing of a particular industry in Horsham. That industry had received certain direct grants of money from the Government by way of debenture. It is perfectly true that under Acts of this Parliament there is a responsibility upon a certain Minister to provide incentives and assistance for what could be broadly described as decentralized industries. Pursuant to that power and the exercise of that power, the Treasurer through various departments advances sums of money in all sorts of ways. In the particular case I specifically mentioned today, it was by way of debentures.

Perhaps by way of elaboration I might canvas the issue in order to assist you, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister feels that, as a result of the powers conferred on him by this Parliament, he is enabled to advance, say, $15,000, or $150,000, secured by debentures to assist the development of an industry, and that industry finds itself in an economic situation which threatens its existence, surely it is the responsibility of the Minister to take prudent and proper steps, not merely to keep the industry going but to preserve and protect the investment of the State. At no point would a question along these lines be regarded as an improper question to be directed to the Minister or the Treasurer.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to any view of the Minister exercising his rights under the Act. The duty to assist and develop is a positive concept, but the other side of that proposition is that the Minister can be assisting the development of an industry by taking steps to prevent it from closing. If a decentralized industry is operating in a country town the Minister is entitled to take action under the Act to advance a sum of money to keep the industry going. It is an exercise of the powers of the Minister under that interpretation of the Act to advance a sum of money or to do whatever he feels proper in order to keep the

industry going. The proposed adjournment motion involves that proposition. It contemplates the sort of functions which are within the power of the Minister. It is particularly argued that it would be within the power of the Minister to advance a sum of money to an industry. Some time ago, the Treasurer saw fit to advance a considerable sum of money to the Shepparton Preserving Company in order to enable that company to continue operating.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS.—That is not correct.

Mr. HOLDING.—That is a proper exercise of power under the Act passed by this Parliament. If that is a proper exercise of power, it would certainly have been open to any honorable member to argue that, if funds were not advanced, the failure to do so, in itself, would involve a failure of proper judgment by the Minister under the Act and that could therefore quite properly be the subject of an adjournment motion.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to elaborate on the terms of the preliminary ruling you have given on this matter but I am not convinced by the arguments put by the Leader of the Opposition. It seems to me that to entertain this motion would involve an understanding that the Minister had an extent of power which is far beyond that entrusted to him by any statute. Industries in the country may be closed for various reasons, in the same way as industries in the metropolitan area may be closed. A proprietary company may close because the principal carrying on the business may die and it is not convenient for the beneficiaries to continue the industry. But, apart from this question which I do not propose to elaborate, if you, Sir, rule in favour of the motion, I reserve my right to take further points of order on other grounds.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—Mr. Speaker, I believe a good case has been put to you supporting the view that the Minister is directly involved in the functioning of certain industries in country areas. He is involved under the Act. You, Sir, took time to ascertain the meaning of the word "prevent" which is used in the motion. The word "prevent" can also mean "to deal with", and the Minister has power to deal with industries in country areas in certain circumstances. This is the reason for the fund which is controlled by the Minister and his department. If an industry in a certain area needs a subsidy, the Minister is acting within his power under the Act in granting that subsidy.

If the subsidy is a means of preventing an industry from closing down, surely it is within that power, and it is the Minister's responsibility to assess whether the granting of a subsidy will boost an industry to maintain it at a certain level or let it go to the rocks. I believe the Minister specifically has that function within the terms of the Act and that, indeed, he has used the powers the Act has given him on a number of occasions. One case which readily comes to mind is that of the Shepparton abattoirs where the Minister moved in because he had power to do so under the Act. Because of this power, which I believe the Minister may exercise at his discretion, I suggest that the motion as submitted is in order.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—I suggest that the motion is wrongly drawn. As it has been ascertained that the word "prevent" means "stopping", where the motion refers to the closing down of certain industries, those industries should be enumerated.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that he had asked a question about a particular industry. The Premier advised the honorable member that he could not make his answer public yet but offered to show him the file. I am certain that when the Leader of the Opposition sees that file he will understand that the situation is one on which a public an-

nouncement could not be made but that the matter is very well in hand. The motion should be ruled out of order. If the Opposition wants to debate the subject, a different motion should be submitted to the House.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the motion as worded is in order. The key words of the motion, of course, are " to prevent the closing of ". The *Concise Oxford Dictionary* makes it quite clear that the meaning of the word " prevent " includes to meet or to deal with. In the sense in which it is used in the motion it means to take positive action or to deal with the closing, continuance, or maintenance of certain country industries. It has been made clear in relation to the department that this is what is intended, and that is the question that is before the House. The fact that an industry closes down because of the death of a proprietor or for some other reason, as put by the Attorney-General, is quite irrelevant to the powers of the Minister and his department and therefore has no relevance to the motion.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—What was said by the Attorney-General in making a point about an industry closing down as a result of managerial action may well apply to individual industries. But, if the debate is allowed, the Opposition proposes to submit to the House evidence to show that, as a result of his own or Government inactivity, the Minister has failed to discharge his responsibilities in preventing the closing down of certain industries. You, Mr. Speaker, will appreciate that it would be impossible for the Opposition to list in the motion the industries which it considers have suffered as a result of Government inaction and particularly as a result of the Minister's inaction. I therefore submit that the debate should be allowed to proceed so that the Opposition can present to the Parliament a case to show that, in some instances, industries have closed down as the result of the lack of any action by the Minister or the Government.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—I thank honorable member for their part in the discussion on the point of order. I think what is important is that the mover of the motion indicated that the word " prevent " was used in the sense of stopping. There are other meanings of " prevent ". The " stop " meaning is a more modern one. I do suggest that the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is a little too concise to give the full meaning of the word.

There is a middle-English meaning which is used a good deal in the James I. version of the Bible, and even in the Old Testament, which has another connotation. But the mover of the motion did say " stop ". I found the argument on this interesting and helpful. To say that the offering or withholding of loans by the Minister would have an effect on whether an industry continued or not is a very valid point but, on the basis that the honorable gentleman cannot stop industry, that in fact he might lead the industry to water but he cannot make it drink, the decision to stop an industry is in the hands of the owners or others involved, as I mentioned before. I believe it is without the province of the Minister to be able to stop the closing of certain country industries and I rule the motion out of order. I suggest to the honorable member for Morwell that the Clerk of the House is, as usual, available to discuss with him the possibility of moving a motion on another day closely, adequately and in order portraying what he wants to bring before the House.

Mr. AMOS (Morwell).—I rise to a point of order. In view of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and with respect to your advice concerning the Clerks at the table in regard to the proper wording of a motion for the adjournment of the House, I point out that the Clerks at the table in fact advised me on the correct wording of the motion. In view of your ruling, Sir, I move—

That the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure

of the Minister for State Development to provide such assistance under Act No. 8081 as would enable certain country industries to remain in operation.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! This could create a precedent. There is a usage laid down that the Speaker should have adequate notice of an adjournment motion so that he can give a ruling on it, which I have done. This is rational and obvious in its sense. I cannot give a snap judgment on whether a motion is in order or out of order. I will not accept the motion because of lack of notice. I recommend to the honorable member that that is an appropriate decision for the good of the House. I again recommend to the honorable member that at the first opportunity, which is the next day of meeting, he should proceed again in the way he wants in this matter.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—With respect to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order and I am bound to join issue with you. As you are well aware, the Standing Orders do not require an honorable member to give notice either to yourself, the Minister concerned or to the Government of his desire or intention to move a motion for the adjournment of the House. That is done properly as a matter of courtesy. I have moved an adjournment motion without giving you, or the Minister concerned, any notice. At the time, I gave my reasons, which were important for the House. On that occasion you were moved to rebuke me for failing to give you the courtesy, but you upheld my right under the Standing Orders to depart from that course if I chose to do so.

The effect of your ruling would be to transform what has been a practice in this House, a matter essentially of courtesy between honorable members, yourself and the Minister, into a substantive ruling on this important subject. I do not believe that within the Standing Orders you should create that precedent. If I may address you on another aspect, I suggest that it would be dangerous at this stage for you to rule in the way in which you have done because it would in fact be outside the scope of the Standing Orders. I agree that those orders have to be literally interpreted, but where a Standing Order is clear and confers certain clear rights, it is dangerous for any Speaker to read a matter of usage into it in a way which subjugates the rights of honorable members. It is clearly open to the honorable member for Morwell, if he so desires, under the Standing Orders, without giving notice to you and to the Minister, to move a motion for the adjournment of the House. You have accepted that in the past.

On the question of what you describe, Mr. Speaker, as the good conduct of the House, I have always believed—and members of the Opposition will agree—that as a matter of good usage it is not desirable to use the forms of the House to open up new precedents without giving you, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity of being able to consult the substantial body of precedent to which you might want to refer to give a correct ruling.

What the honorable member for Morwell proposes is within the Standing Orders and his motion should not be ruled out of order on the question of notice. With respect, Mr. Speaker, you have had the benefit of considering the substance of the first motion and you have ruled that it is out of order. The honorable member for Morwell has had the wit to adopt your ruling and he has rephrased his motion in a way which I believe is clearly within the ruling you have given. If that creates a precedent which you would like to consider in terms of the rights of honorable members, so be it, but I submit that you, Sir, and the House would be at no disadvantage if the honorable member for Morwell were now to continue with his motion. I submit that it is in order; it is not out of order because of the usages and practices of this House. I also submit that you, as Speaker, are under no disadvantage

because courtesies were extended to you in this matter by giving you notice of the substance of the motion.

The honorable member for Morwell has relied upon your advice and guidance and has rephrased his motion in a way which makes it clearly within the Standing Orders.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. With respect, I maintain that your previous remarks, Mr. Speaker, were correct; the appropriate procedure was for the honorable member to redraft his motion and submit it at a later date. The giving of notice in these matters is most desirable to ensure proper debate. If that principle were departed from it would be possible for an honorable member to raise at any time any matter by way of an adjournment motion without notice to the Government so that the necessary material could not be produced. You, Mr. Speaker, would believe in the desirability of notice being given and it is something about which you may have some discretion. It is a discretion which may wisely be exercised in favour of insisting on notice, and that being so, you would be following the precedent of three of your predecessors. I have been a member of this House under three Speakers before you. Your ruling that this motion may be submitted at some later stage is proper and wise.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! I feel that this matter has been adequately canvassed. I appreciate the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and of the Attorney-General. There is a good deal of precedent for the Speaker being informed well in advance of a motion for the adjournment of the House. I know that at times notice has not been given and an apology has always been tendered. If notice is not given the Chair is put in a difficult position, but it is not incumbent on the mover to notify the Government, although that courtesy is usually extended.

On the face of it, I am still not prepared to give a snap judgment on the new motion which has been presented and I will not accept it for the reasons I have given. I ask the honorable member to take my advice and bring the motion forward on the next day of sitting.

Mr. HOLDING (Leader of the Opposition).—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the reasons that you have given, that at this stage you might feel disadvantaged in considering whether or not the motion is in order, would be acceptable if you want to have the benefit of considering that aspect. However, quite frankly, and with respect, it would not be acceptable on the basis of notice of the motion not having been given. If the Opposition were to concede that basis, it would in fact be conceding that you, Mr. Speaker, have created a precedent in this House which is clearly contrary to the Standing Orders. With respect, the Opposition could not be a party to that.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! It is not creating a precedent to rule that on the next day of meeting the honorable member can take such action as he thinks fit.

MELBOURNE HARBOR TRUST (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Melbourne Harbor Trust Act 1958 and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was brought in and read a first time.

VEGETATION AND VINE DISEASES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. BORTHWICK (Minister of Lands).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The need for this measure has been precipitated by the very real danger of swarms of the Australian plague

locust invading Victoria from the north in November and December of this year. Present indications are that the potential for invasion by the locust is greater than ever before, and that widespread control activities on a community basis will be necessary. Although this is the immediate need, the Bill has been drawn in general terms so that the provisions could be used against any pest or disease of plants that assumes plague proportions.

The main purposes of the new provisions are to enable speedier action to be taken when a plague is developing and to provide power for Government action, such as aerial spraying, when it becomes the only means of dealing with the outbreak. Aerial spraying has been used to combat plagues in Victoria since the 1945-46 season, when Mr. T. W. Hogan, now principal entomologist in the Department of Agriculture, used specially equipped Royal Australian Air Force planes to save the fruit crops of the Goulburn and Murray Valley districts from a plague of the Rutherglen bug. Some spraying against the bug was also done at East Burwood, which was then a major orchard district. The same equipment was used by Mr. Hogan against a locust plague in the Mallee late in 1946, and this is believed to be the first time in the world that aerial spraying was used against locusts.

Other locust plagues followed soon after—a minor one in the Swan Hill district in 1950; a larger one over a much bigger area in 1953, when Victorian spray planes went as far north as Hay to meet advancing swarms; and a very big one in 1955, when the battle was fought first in the border areas of New South Wales and then in Victoria. Aerial spraying was used in all these campaigns, but there has been no occasion to use it against a plague since. It was done then without any specific legislative backing, and no legal objections were raised, doubtless because farmers were happy to see the Government stepping in to save their crops and pastures from certain and sudden destruction.

Developments in agricultural aviation mean that aircraft equipped for spraying are nowadays commonplace and it is no longer necessary to invoke the aid of the Air Force when aerial spraying is required. Consequently aerial spraying, because of its speed, efficiency and economy, is certain to play a major part in controlling plagues in the future. The Government believes that under present-day circumstances it is essential to provide full legislative backing for the urgent actions which must be taken when a plague is threatening or comes suddenly upon the State, and this is what the Bill seeks to achieve.

I should like to illustrate some of the situations which face the Department of Agriculture and the Government in a plague situation by reference to the Australian plague locust and its habits. This locust is a species of grasshopper exclusive to Australia; it differs from other grasshoppers in that it can multiply with great rapidity under favorable conditions, form into enormous swarms and migrate over distances up to several hundred miles. This happens at unpredictable intervals, sometimes long, sometimes short, apparently depending on seasonal conditions. The large African migrating locust appears in Queensland and another locust, the spur-throated variety, is at present causing concern in the Emerald district of Queensland, but neither is likely to spread to Victoria.

The Australian plague locust normally lives at low density in the outback areas of Queensland, northern New South Wales and South Australia. When good summer rains fall in those areas, as has happened in the past year or two, the locusts build up rapidly and some of the larger swarms move generally in a southerly and easterly direction. These swarms reach central and south-western New South Wales in

autumn, and despite control activity by that State usually succeed in laying their eggs over large areas. The egg beds threatening Victoria this year are spread through 20,000 square miles of country, but are not continuous over that area. The densest beds are in the Hay-Griffith-Hillston area, and other dense beds occur around Deniliquin. East and west of both these areas are other beds less dense but still dangerous.

The locust lays its eggs by boring a hole in compact soil in open country and inserting 20 to 50 eggs in a pod of tough waterproof material which can stand up to most weather conditions. It can repeat this procedure two or three times before it dies, so numbers can increase a hundredfold in one generation. Many hundreds of hoppers can hatch out of one square foot of an egg bed. There are usually two generations each year. Eggs laid in the autumn hatch in September and early October. The tiny wingless hoppers gather into groups called bands and move about in search of food. Over a period of four to six weeks they moult five times and reach the adult winged stage. One acre of grown hoppers can spread out into 5 acres of winged locusts.

Swarms vary in size, but might be tens of square miles in area. If not too dense, they "roll" or "drift" along up to 30 miles a day moving generally southwards and feeding as they go. A large swarm can eat 80 to 100 tons of vegetation a day and goes on eating for several weeks. Grass is the primary food, but vegetables and cereals are also favourites. Hungry swarms will attack practically any type of agricultural or horticultural crop.

Locusts in a big dense swarm undergo a change which turns them into a migratory phase. A migrating swarm can rise thousands of feet into the air under favourable weather conditions and travel hundreds of miles before settling down. One huge swarm which reached Victoria in 1955 was not sighted anywhere in New South Wales and is believed to have come direct from Queensland. Recent research by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization has used radar tracking to show that night flights may be quite important in migration.

For almost twenty years a research programme on the Australian locust has been financed jointly by the Commonwealth and mainland States and present-day control methods are based on this research. In the same way, a special patrol officer is jointly financed to keep watch on the breeding areas in New South Wales and Queensland and give advance warning of plagues.

Because of the immense areas involved, it has not proved economic to attack the locust in its outback breeding areas and prevent the initiation of plagues. Nor is it practicable to treat the egg beds to prevent hatching. The most practical and economic approach is for the landholders to attack the hopper bands by ground spraying to reduce the number of large swarms forming, then for the community to attack the surviving swarms by aerial spraying as they reach the winged stage. This phase of the campaign against the present outbreak will take place in New South Wales, with Victoria providing a survey helicopter and eight officers to assist at a cost of $22,000.

The areas concerned are so vast and the available time so short—particularly as spraying can only be done in relatively calm weather—that some swarms are quite likely to evade all these measures and either drift long distances or take to the air and migrate. These are the swarms which can invade Victoria and must be dealt with by a separate campaign in which Victoria must supply all the aircraft, insecticides and staff. The greater the success in New South Wales, the lower the cost of any Victorian campaign. The 1955 campaign cost the State $400,000.

My purpose in relating all this is to show that in the case of the plague locust we have to deal with a voracious insect which can occur in huge numbers over vast areas and despite early attacks may reach a highly mobile stage which allows it to invade distant areas with little or no warning. It is obvious that the ordinary processes of the Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act are not the slightest use in these circumstances, and reliance on them would leave a hundred million dollars worth of crops and pastures along the Murray in jeopardy.

Other plague insects like Rutherglen bug, thrips and cutworms have different life histories, but all have the common attribute that quick and widespread action is necessary to deal with them. Only the future knows what kind of plagues might be ahead of us, but it is certain that we will have them and must be prepared to fight them with modern methods.

I shall now deal with the provisions of the Bill. The term "parasite" is used in a general sense throughout the Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act to cover the multiplicity of forms of life which destroy or damage plants. Clause 2 of the Bill amends the old definition of "parasite" to ensure that it can in fact include chewing insects like grasshoppers which might not be called parasites in everyday language. In fact, grasshoppers and many other species of chewing insects have been proclaimed under the Act for many years, so clause 2 would not extend the scope of the Act but merely make certain that a key provision is valid.

Clause 3 proposes the insertion of a new section to be numbered 5A, and this contains the special provisions to deal with plagues. It has some features in common with Division 2 of Part I. of the Act which provides special powers to deal with fruit fly outbreaks, but unlike that division it is supported by existing provisions in Division 1 of Part I.

Action under the new section could only be taken when the Governor in Council has made a proclamation because of the danger of a plague of a particular parasite. As in the case of fruit fly proclamations, it is envisaged that the proclamation would be revoked when the danger had passed, and then the other provisions of the section would again become inoperative.

The Bill proposes that the danger could be declared for any part or the whole of the State. Within the proclaimed area, landholders would be required to give notice when the parasite reached a certain level so that departmental officers could plot the main danger areas and initiate any Government action necessary.

Landholders in the proclaimed area or some specified part of it would also be required to take the type of action that they are normally required to take against pests and diseases on their land. This is a basic principle of the whole Act, and action of this kind can be required under present provisions of the Act, but only by inspectors serving a notice on each landholder, and this of course would be quite impracticable in plague conditions. The proclamation in effect takes the place of the notice.

In the case of a locust plague hatching from egg beds in Victoria, the action required would probably be ground spraying of the hopper bands. It is not intended that landholders would be required to take action against flying swarms, as these are more appropriately dealt with by Government action. In some past cases of hatchings in Victoria, the Government has supplied control materials to landholders free of charge, but this is a decision which must be taken on the merits of each plague and is not something which should be written into the legislation.

Sub-section (4) of the proposed new section provides for the Minister to authorize an inspector to carry out control measures at the expense of the landholder if the landholder is not

doing what the proclamation requires him to do. Under existing provisions of the Act, an inspector would have to wait 21 days after serving a notice then take the landholder to court to get an order authorizing him to carry out control measures at the landholder's expense. This again is clearly impracticable in the face of a plague.

Up to this stage, all that the new provisions propose is the giving of notice by the landholder and a speeding up of existing procedures to get action against the plague, with the exception that the Minister instead of a court would authorize an inspector to act where a landholder had failed in his duty.

Sub-section 6, however, introduces a concept new to the Act. This is to allow Government intervention when it becomes clear that the action which can reasonably be required of landholders is not sufficient to prevent the plague spreading or to cope with some particularly mobile stage of the parasite. Under these circumstances, especially when aerial spraying is involved, there is no time to get the written permission of each landholder to enter his land or spray over it or to serve him with a notice that such action is to be taken by the Government. Naturally landholders would be made aware of what could happen by every possible means, but individual approaches would be impossible.

So sub-section (6) proposes a procedure authorized by the Governor in Council by which necessary government action could be taken in the interests of the community without waste of vital time and without cost to the landholder.

This is a wide power, and I give an assurance on behalf of the Government that operations under this subsection would be carried out only under the close control of responsible officers of the Department of Agriculture and every effort would be made to work in full co-operation with landholders and the community at large. The department has a long history of experience in this field and its officers are familiar with the many aspects which have to be considered in such campaigns.

Not the least of these are the risks associated with the use of modern pesticides, and again I give an assurance that these campaigns will be conducted in accordance with conditions approved by the Pesticides Review Committee, a body which the Premier established in 1966 to watch over the use of agricultural chemicals in Victoria and their effects. The committee comprises representatives of authorities concerned with health, fisheries and wildlife, water supply, lands and agriculture under the chairmanship of Mr. R. G. Downes of the Soil Conservation Authority. Mr. R. G. Downes is a member of the recently-appointed Pesticides Review Committee and in his private capacity is vice-president of the Australian Conservation Foundation. With these safeguards, there is no reason to fear any abuse of the proposed powers, and I hope honorable members will see the necessity for them.

Clause 4 of the Bill is a consequential amendment which would extend to actions under the new section the legal protection which section 22 already gives to actions under existing provisions.

In conclusion, I wish to say that, while the amendment has been prepared so that it can become a permanent part of the Vegetation and Vine Diseases Act, the Government proposes to review the new provisions after they have been tested in action for one or two campaigns. If it is found that they are too harsh or too widely drawn, suitable further amendments will be introduced or in the extreme case the amendments will be revoked. However, I believe that all these powers are urgently needed in the situation now facing Victorian farmers and I commend the Bill to the House with the request that it be dealt with expeditiously.

On the motion of Mr. WILKES (Northcote), the debate was adjourned.

It was ordered that the debate be adjourned until Thursday, October 21.

SUNDAY ENTERTAINMENT (CINEMATOGRAPH FILMS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 30) on the motion of Mr. Hamer (Chief Secretary) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—Although this measure could be considered a simple one because it merely alters the time at which films may be screened in Victoria on Sundays from 8.30 p.m. to 1.30 p.m., I suggest that it has some significance for it indicates a change of attitude on the part of the Government to society at large and to the general question of what is to be permitted to take place on Sundays. It is a Bill which is worthy of consideration.

In explaining this measure, the Chief Secretary stated that the Government wished to cater for visitors and strangers in Melbourne. In his second-reading explanatory speech, which is reported at page 857 of *Hansard*, the honorable gentleman stated—

> The Government has been considering an extension of these hours to cover Sunday afternoons, principally for the benefit of visitors and strangers in a town or city, or others who for various reasons have no resources or opportunity for diversions of other kinds.

That conjures up rather interesting possibilities; but it is assumed that the Government intends the provisions of the Bill to provide a resource which people will be able to use—although the price of admission to theatres is now so high that many people will be unable to afford this entertainment.

Equity is put forward as being the main ground on which this measure has been introduced, in that there are other forms of admission-paid entertainment on Sunday afternoons and, therefore, the screening of films should not be excepted. Examples of admission-paid entertainment on Sundays are association football, soccer, cultural activities and motor racing. Because those entertainments have been permitted on Sundays, the alteration of the time of screening Sunday films which is provided for in this measure is justified. Another justification is the attitude which has been adopted to Sunday entertainment by the other States. In the Australian Capital Territory, Queensland, New South Wales and South Australia films are permitted to be shown on Sunday afternoons, and in Tasmania they may be shown at any time on Sundays. Western Australia and Victoria are the only States of the Commonwealth which do not provide for entertainment of this kind on Sundays, and the Opposition is pleased that the Government has had a change of heart.

It has been suggested that the reason for Victoria's negative attitude in the past was that the community was not prepared for Sunday entertainment, but one must ask what the community has to do with it in the sense of being able to restrict the rights of individuals who wish to see films or some other form of entertainment. It is the old Victorian concept of the restriction of the rights of individuals by what in many cases is a mythical community attitude.

Traditionally, the churches have spoken for the community concerning what should happen on a Sunday. I find that hard to understand. I know of no reason for the churches to exercise control over Sundays and not to be concerned about other days. It does not say much for religion if it is only a one-day operation. Perhaps the churches felt that entertainment on Sundays would provide some form of competition, but I cannot accept that that is a logical attitude.

The Opposition is pleased that there has been a change of attitude on the part of churches and a change

of heart on the part of the Government. I was heartened to receive a letter from the Victorian Council of Churches in which the secretary of the council explained the attitudes of the Anglican and Protestant churches to Sunday entertainment.

Mr. SUGGETT.—What is the difference?

Mr. FORDHAM.—I pardon the honorable member for Bentleigh's ignorance. Anyone who knows anything about the subject would realize that Anglicans are not Protestants. The Victorian Council of Churches stated—

> We emphasize that we have no desire to impose restrictions on the community in regard to Sunday observance other than such as might be necessary to protect personal rights. Furthermore we can see positive value in having picture theatres open earlier on Sunday, particularly for those who may be at a loose end at that time.

The Opposition commends churches for their change of attitude to Sunday entertainment and the Government for meeting this need of the community. As the Minister indicated in his second-reading speech, the Roman Catholic Church has indicated that, in general, it agrees with this proposal.

Although the Minister stated that the Government has an undertaking from the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association that no attempt will be made to stage special shows of "horror" or objectionable films on Sunday, I point out that cinema operators are not required to have a permit. Under section 5 of the principal Act they have an automatic right to show films on Sundays and, as no permit is required, the Chief Secretary will have no means of ensuring that objectionable films are not shown. Perhaps the Minister could explain how this will be done. I suggest that the Government would be wise to be hesitant in trying to control the sorts of films which may be shown. I should think it is the responsibility of individuals to choose whether they wish to see them or not; there is no compulsion on anybody to see such films.

One other aspect about which members of the Opposition are most perturbed and which is the most disappointing feature of this measure is the attitude of the Government to the employees involved. Two sorts of people are involved in this measure. Firstly, people are interested in going to see films on Sunday afternoons in Melbourne if they are given the opportunity. Secondly, employees are also involved, and I suggest that they have been badly neglected by the Government in framing this measure. I refer to ticket sellers, ushers, managers and projectionists. I have been advised by the relevant union—the Theatrical Employees Association—that in fact it was not contacted by the Government before this Bill was introduced. It is not just a matter of courtesy but a matter of industrial relations because this measure will affect the way of life and the time and conditions of work of members of this union. One would have thought they would be contacted and consulted even shortly prior to the Bill's introduction to let them know in advance. I am assured by the association that the first they heard of it was when they read a press release by the Minister some time ago.

It is to be regretted that the Government does not discuss legislation such as this with the relevant people involved. This association does not have a history of being belligerent or difficult to get on with; in fact, it is most co-operative in its attitude. I hope this attitude is not a reflection of the Government's general attitude towards employees and industrial relations in this State. The Opposition hopes there will not be a repetition of this situation.

Members of the Opposition support the principle of the measure. We believe the people of Victoria as a whole, not just visitors and strangers, have a right to this sort of entertainment on Sunday afternoon. There is a world-wide trend for Sunday entertainment and we believe it is a

good trend so long as the same rights and privileges that apply during the week are maintained on Sundays.

Mr. R. S. L. McDONALD (Rodney).—Members of the Country Party support this small Bill, which amends section 5 of the Sunday Entertainment Act. We have the assurance of the Chief Secretary that he has contacted church leaders through the Victorian Council of Churches and the spokesman for the Roman Catholic Church to ensure that the rights of the churches are protected. Members of our party appreciate that in a growing city like Melbourne people desire entertainment on Sunday afternoon. The showing of films is one form of entertainment. Members of the Country Party support the change of hours to 1.30 p.m. instead of 8.30 p.m. as at present. I wonder what the Minister of Labour and Industry will propose as a result of this change. Will the employees be paid extra for Sunday work? Will charges be increased for this Sunday entertainment? Will costs be increased? If projectionists and other staff are paid triple time for Sunday work, will an additional charge be made?

The Chief Secretary's second-reading speech is recorded at page 857 of *Hansard*. The honorable gentleman has stated that the Government has an undertaking from the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association that no attempt will be made to stage special shows of "horror" or objectionable films on Sunday and that this amendment is proposed on that express understanding. Members of our party want to know what assurance the Government has received on the showing of horror or objectionable films. Will exhibitors be able to advertise in local papers that such films will be shown on Sunday night? This is the only point on which members of the Country Party seek enlightenment. Generally we support the measure.

Mr. MUTTON (Coburg).—The purpose of this small measure is to amend section 5 of the Sunday Entertainment Act. It advances the time from which films may be shown on Sunday, and this is in keeping with modern tendencies. People have the opportunity of engaging in other forms of entertainment on Sunday and I see no harm in this measure. However, I do not think the Chief Secretary or any member who has contributed to the debate has stated whether or not the Government will permit the showing of "R" classification films on Sundays. This fact should be made known to honorable members, and I invite the Chief Secretary to comment on this aspect.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2, relating to Sunday films.

Mr. HAMER (Chief Secretary).—I have been invited to comment on one or two matters raised in the second-reading debate, and I will do so briefly. The first matter concerns the possible screening of films of horror or what are broadly described as objectionable films on Sundays. This arose out of an attitude expressed by the Vicar-General of the Roman Catholic Church that although that church did not oppose the change of hours it was hoped that the opportunity would not be taken, because of the change, of putting on special shows of this nature. I do not think it would be proper to interrupt the run of a film whether it was an "R" certificate or any other film just for the Sunday.

It will be known to most honorable members that some exhibitors at times put on "special" midnight horror shows which are obviously designed to attract a certain element in the community who find a great deal of stimulation in such shows. I think it is right to attempt to ensure that on Sundays no "special" shows are put on. Despite what many people say Sunday is different from the other days of the week. I asked the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association to give me an assurance on that point and I have a letter from the association giving that assurance. I stress

the word " special ". I do not suggest that the ordinary run of a film should be interrupted on Sunday in order to show something milder, just for Sunday. So long as the exhibitors do not seize the opportunity to put on shows of a special character for a special group in the community, they will be observing their assurance.

The second question related to the control of this assurance. The Government cannot control it by way of revocation of licence. I believe that the association, having given this assurance, will abide by it. I have stressed that this change in the law is being sought on this basis. Therefore, it is a matter of faith and confidence, and I am quite happy to extend this to the association.

The honorable member for Rodney referred to the conditions under which films might be screened and the effect that they might have on admission charges. This is a matter for the industry to decide. The conditions under which projectionists, box office attendants and usherettes will be employed will be decided by the industry, which will also make its own decision on admission charges. I think I am right in saying that admission charges to theatres on Sunday nights are the same as on week days, so apparently satisfactory arrangements can be made. It is not the intention of the Government to interfere in any industrial arrangements —they will come about, or not, as the case may be. All that the Government proposes to do is to remove the existing time limitation.

On the subject of consultation with the union, I should point out that I did not consult individual exhibitors. In retrospect, it may be that it would have been desirable to ask the union if it objected to the proposal, but on two bases it was not necessary. Firstly, it will make its own arrangements, anyway; and, secondly, as I understand it, it was in favour of the extension of hours. In any case, I received no approach from the union although notice of the Government's intention had received some prominence in the press. The union did not make any objection to me, so it can be assumed that, generally speaking, the union is not objecting to this extension of hours and that it will find satisfactory ways and means of working the additional time with consequent adjustments to wages and salaries.

In reply to the honorable member for Coburg, I would not be inclined to try to make special arrangements about " R " certificate films to be shown on Sunday. The " R " certificate has a special significance. Its purpose, of course, is to prevent children between the ages of six and eighteen years from seeing certain films. Having provided for that, the Government should not restrict the freedom of adults to see these films on any day of the week, including Sunday, and I know of no reason to interrupt the running of a film with an " R " certificate. I am unable to predict how many " R " certificate films will be shown, but there could be a large number. The censor is showing an increasing freedom and desire to allow mature and adult films to circulate in the community. No doubt the censor will use the " R " certificate fairly freely to allow these films to be seen by adult audiences, who will make their own free choice. I know of no reason to make special provision for " R " certificate films on Sundays.

Mr. FORDHAM (Footscray).—I assure the Minister that theatrical employees are not in favour of the measure now before the Committee. On a number of occasions officers of the union have seen me on the matter and doubtless they will find ways and means of negotiating with the exhibitors to try to work out appropriate arrangements between the union and the exhibitors.

The Minister has evaded an obvious inequality. The honorable gentleman consulted the exhibitors, who comprise one of the parties involved, and one suspects that this could be a *quid pro quo* for the introduction of the " R " film certificate system, but I do not question the Minister's motives. However, I reiterate the attitude of

the Opposition that it would have been fair and desirable to confer with the employees on this matter, and we respect the Minister's acknowledgment that this also may have been desirable.

The clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

COAL MINES (PENSIONS INCREASE) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from October 6) on the motion of Mr. Balfour (Minister of Mines) for the second-reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—As indicated by the Minister in his second-reading speech, the purpose of this Bill is to increase the rates of coal mine pensions because of the latest increase in Commonwealth social service pensions, and thus retain the relativity that previously existed between pensions paid to the retired Wonthaggi coal miners and pensions paid by the Commonwealth Government.

Honorable members will recall that this measure was introduced into the House on a message from His Excellency the Governor and that the Committee of the House dealt with that message. I now take the opportunity of drawing to the attention of the Minister certain anomalies that I, and the retired coal miners also, consider exist in the payment of the scale of pensions. I regret that the Minister has not taken action to remove these anomalies but has merely produced a Bill to increase the amount paid to retired or disabled miners and the widows of miners, and to increase the allowance for a miner's wife. Nothing is being done to deal with the other allowances payable under the principal Act. This is causing considerable concern to the many people in receipt of these pensions.

Some mines were operated by private industry in the Wonthaggi district, but the main mine was operated by the Victorian Railways. In the early stage of the life of the mine, the Government of the day wanted Victoria to be independent of outside supplies of black coal for the railways. That was why miners were recruited and the mine was established. The mine operated for many years, and many miners living today at Wonthaggi spent up to 35 years of their working life in that mine.

The superannuation scheme came into existence in 1942. At that time, principles were laid down on payments to retired or disabled miners and the widows of miners, and allowances for dependent children. The relativity between social service pensions paid by the Commonwealth Government and the amounts payable under the superannuation scheme at that time was vastly different from what it is today. In fact, a reverse situation applies. The pension to be paid under the superannuation scheme would have been about 85 per cent higher than a Commonwealth social service pension. The allowance for a dependent child was set in 1942 at 85 cents a week and it has remained unchanged ever since.

All those concerned, the Parliament, the Government of the day, and the organization which represented the miners which consulted the mine owners, agreed that 85 cents was a reasonable payment for a dependent child, but in the light of current costs that sum is grossly inadequate. An indication of its inadequacy is the fact that the Commonwealth social service allowance for a child is set at $4.30. The relativity between the superannuation payments and Commonwealth social service payments in this area has become grossly out of proportion. This is one matter which needs urgent attention and I ask the Minister to give it earnest consideration.

It is noticeable that, with the passing of the years, a growing number of miners are receiving Commonwealth social service pensions for which the principal Act obliges

them to apply. This reduces the demands on the fund. The principal Act requires a periodical review by the actuary to determine the state of the fund and its capacity to meet pension payments and other expenses. However, it appears that the Government is attempting to make the fund support itself entirely. That is wrong; it creates injustice to miners, miners' widows and miners' children.

These miners served the State in an industry which was vital to the State's public transport system, before the introduction of the diesel-electric locomotive, when most of the railway system depended upon uninterrupted supplies of coal. Governments of the past considered that these miners played a vital role in a vital industry. The miners demonstrated their loyalty to the State. For many years the principal Act obliged miners to retire at the age of 60 years. But, because of the unusual circumstances which developed during the second world war, an approach was made to them, on patriotic grounds, to forgo their rights to retire at 60 and to continue in employment until they reached 65 years of age. The approach was made because of the serious shortage of skilled mine workers at the time. The miners agreed to that proposal, not only in the interest of the State but in the interest of the country as a whole.

One result was that, when many miners who had forgone their right to retire at 60 did retire, they immediately became eligible for Commonwealth social service payments which the principal Act required them to apply for. Yet these men had contributed to the superannuation fund from the time of its inception in 1942.

The situation is far from satisfactory. The miners can reasonably expect to be treated in a similar manner to retired miners in other States. I know that the Minister has said that, in other States, coal mining is still a viable industry and that the superannuation funds in those States attract contributions from miners still employed in the industry while the coal mining industry has ceased to exist in Victoria. That is not a reasonable attitute for the honorable gentleman to adopt. The Government should consider the services that these people have rendered to Victoria in an industry in which it was difficult to recruit people. It could have been termed a savage industry, and the conditions under which the men had to work were harsh.

Under the Commonwealth social services legislation, a class A widow with two dependent children receives a total income of $30.25 a week, whilst a miner's widow with two dependent children receives the sum of $20.20. The Government is not reasonable in persisting with its attitude of refusing to increase the payments to the retired miners to a sum equal to that paid to their counterparts in New South Wales. Seventy-five per cent of the people concerned are receiving Commonwealth social service benefits. Therefore, the fund is continually being relieved of its liabilities to the extent of those payments and because the elderly recipients die.

It is distressing to note that, in Victoria, dependent children over the age of sixteen years receive no benefit from the fund, but in the Commonwealth sphere a full-time student between the ages of sixteen years and 21 years receives a benefit. If that concession were allowed to the recipients under this fund, the number would be infinitesimal and the proposal would be reasonable. The Opposition cannot move an amendment because it would involve an adjustment of rates. The miner serves an important industry and it is equitable that he should receive reasonable payments so that he can support his family and adequately provide for his old age. That is not the case at present.

When the Government decided to close the State Coal Mine, some miners were permitted to retire at the age of 55 years. For this purpose,

an agreement was reached with the Treasury. However, this agreement will be concluded in 1974 because it relates to the period only until those people reach the age of 60 years. The Minister can argue that the fund is being continually depleted. The total invested to June, 1971, was $795,000, which is a considerable sum of money. The receipts for the year totalled $115,559. This involved the sale of certain securities and the contributions of the Treasury under section 5 of the State Coal Mine (Winding Up) Act (No. 1175). That section relates to the matter to which I earlier referred, of permitting miners to retire at the age of 55 years.

In accordance with the provisions of section 121 of the Coal Mines Act 1958, that the Treasury could make certain contributions under certain circumstances, no payments were made into the fund in 1970. The Government is endeavouring to make the fund self-supporting. If that policy is to continue, retired miners will be placed at a disadvantage and will suffer an injustice. Although for obvious reasons the Opposition does not oppose the Bill —it brings a small measure of assistance to the recipients of pensions—its advantages are only meagre. The weekly payment to a retired miner will be increased from $18.25 to $19.50. Other dependants such as widows and wives will receive similar small increases of only 75 cents. A retired miner carrying out his obligations under the principal Act and applying for social service payments, will receive a total of $19.25 a week. Therefore, a payment of only $2.25 is required to be made from the superannuation fund. The fund is relieved of the payment of $17.25 because this is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. The same situation applies to a disabled miner because, when he reaches the age of 65, the fund provides only $2.25. For a retired miner who is still supporting his wife, if they are both eligible for Commonwealth social service pensions, the combined income from the Commonwealth will be $30.50 a week, so only $3.50 is provided from the fund. Widows receive $17.25 from Commonwealth sources, so only $1.25 has to be provided by the fund.

I submit to the Minister, firstly, that the child allowance should be increased to the equivalent payable under the Commonwealth legislation, namely, $4.30; and, secondly, that the miner's pension should be brought up to the amount that is being paid to retired miners in New South Wales. If this means that at some future time the fund will be depleted and it will necessitate the Treasury making a contribution, then, as a gesture to these people who have served the State in what was a very difficult industry, the Government should accept that financial responsibility. The Minister has an opportunity of demonstrating to these retired miners and the community at large that both he and the Government genuinely intend to look after those who have served the State and so ensure that they will not find themselves in necessitous circumstances. Not a large number of persons or a vast amount of money will be involved, especially when one compares this expenditure with the total State Budget and the commitments that the Government is undertaking in other directions.

In the past, the Government has been prepared to make financial contributions to citizens on the principle that they have suffered through Government action. The best example that I can cite is that in which the Government, of its own volition—it had no legal obligation to do so—decided to make a contribution of $5,000 to the gentleman who had been the successful tenderer to operate the proposed restaurant in the Royal Botanic Gardens. Despite the absence of a legal obligation, the Government decided that this gentleman had suffered financial loss as a result of the Government's not proceeding with the project, for reasons which I shall not mention because they are painful to the Government. There have been other examples.

I appeal to the Minister and the Government to adopt the same attitude towards the people who are affected by this measure. The pensioners do not use the State for any business enterprise; they have made their contribution to the development of the State in the form of its public transport system and in many instances to the establishment of certain industries.

In the hey-day of the Victorian coal-mining industry, more than 2,000 miners were employed. The Minister has the opportunity of showing himself as a true statesman and of carving his name in the annals of this Parliament by extending to these pensioners what I consider is their just right.

Mr. MACLELLAN (Gippsland West).—I welcome this measure in that it provides for an increase in the pensions payable to retired coal miners from the State Coal Mine. The honorable member for Broadmeadows has taken me by surprise by changing his tactics slightly. When the Leader of the Opposition visited Wonthaggi, both he and I interviewed a deputation from the retired miners and we agreed with them that the Coal Mine Workers Pensions Fund should stand on its own. The former miners made it clear that they were seeking the additional payments from the fund and not from the Treasury. They expected that the pensions fund would be able to support the additional payments and the Leader of the Opposition and I agreed that we should seek a thorough actuarial investigation of the fund in order to prove whether the expectation was well-founded.

I presume that the honorable member for Broadmeadows has changed those tactics. I do not know whether the honorable member hopes that the Government will be more generous with its own money than it can be with money from the pensions fund, or whether he feels that the fund could not possibly support the payments which he suggests should be made. If the honorable member has concluded that the fund does not have the assets to support the payments, then he has abandoned hope of an actuarial report justifying those payments. If the honorable member is seeking a State subsidy for the fund, then he has already reached some conclusions about the ability of the fund to meet the payments, which previously both he and I have asked the Minister to authorize.

I have not abandoned that hope because it is my wish that, on the death of the last pensioner or pensioner's dependant, the last dollar in the fund will have been spent; and that it has been spent according to an actuarial distribution for the benefit of those persons who subscribed to the fund. I have never heard from any retired coal mine worker in Wonthaggi a suggestion that the fund is so near bankruptcy that it could not support the payments or increase them. The position has been the reverse. The suggestion is that the fund, if it is properly managed and properly investigated by an actuary, who will give a firm opinion instead of a generalization, could well support increased payments. I expected that the honorable member for Broadmeadows would reflect the thinking of the Leader of the Opposition when he interviewed the deputation at Wonthaggi. Admittedly, the deputation had to be squeezed in during the middle of a civic reception, and it did not take long. However, this was the line of thinking at that meeting —not a Maverick line—that a subsidy was necessary. It was not a matter of attempting to win two battles at once, but perhaps as a matter of tactics with the Minister, of winning one battle first and leaving the second battle until the first was won.

If the honorable member for Broadmeadows considers that the whole battle can be won at the one bite, I shall be delighted and so will the pensioners, but as a matter of tactics he would have been better advised to leave it as agreed at Wonthaggi when the Leader of the Opposition was there.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

The sitting was suspended at 12.58 *p.m. until* 2.2 *p.m.*

Clause 2 (Relating to increases in pensions).

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Apparently the Minister has not been impressed by any of the points that I raised during the second-reading debate on this proposed legislation, because the honorable gentleman did not even bother to observe the customary practice of mentioning points which have been raised in debate when clause 2 of a Bill is being considered in Committee. The honorable gentleman has remained completely unmoved about what I consider to be the clear injustices which are being suffered by people who receive the pensions which are the subject of this Bill.

The honorable member for Gippsland West finds himself in a very embarrassing position. The honorable member has been placed at a disadvantage by the hard-hearted, skinflint attitude of the Government towards his constituents. The honorable member has demonstrated that he does not understand this measure. In an effort to cover his acute embarrassment he deliberately attempted to confuse the House by saying that the Opposition is in two minds about the Bill.

The honorable member has misinterpreted my remarks concerning the capacity of the fund to meet increased pensions. The rates set out in the Bill for retiring pensions, incapacity pensions, additional payments for dependants and pensions payable to dependants could be increased irrespective of the capacity of the fund. In my view, it is immaterial whether the fund can meet the increases. I believe it can, and I have been assured of that by miners' representatives—even those who are on the tribunal—who have had a long association with the fund. It is clear that the fund can meet increased payments, but if at some time in the future it cannot, the Government should provide funds to enable it to do so.

The honorable member for Gippsland West cannot receive information about the fund from the Minister of Mines. Although he asked the honorable gentleman to have a complete and detailed analysis made by the actuary of the fund and its capabilities, it is obvious that the Minister ignored the honorable member's question.

I point out to the honorable member for Gippsland West that, irrespective of any comments which were made by the Leader of the Opposition on his visit to Wonthaggi, where he conferred with representatives of the Wonthaggi Retired Mine Workers Pensioners Association the pertinent point is that these people are not receiving justice. The Opposition's view is that the Minister of Mines should amend this proposed legislation to provide for across-the-board pension increases. I do not believe it is beyond the capacity of the fund to finance those increases. Even if it is, that is not important. Even if the Treasury had to make a contribution—I do not say that would be necessary—no large sum of money would be involved. As I have said on many previous occasions, the Government has made contributions of this sort to other sections of the community.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—I have listened with interest to the honorable member for Broadmeadows and the honorable member for Gippsland West. My primary objective at this stage is to have this Bill passed by Parliament so that the additional pensions may be paid to the persons concerned. The date from which they are payable is 8th October, so the sooner Parliament passes the measure the better.

Similar legislation was passed in April last. No representations have since been made to me by pensioners or representatives of the coal miners for any adjustment to either pensions or allowances. Following the

introduction of the Bill, the honorable member for Broadmeadows suggested that allowances should be granted for children who are dependent on their parents because they are continuing their studies. I examined the situation and found that 400-odd miners receive allowances for their children from the fund and that some 9 families in which there are 13 children under the age of 16 years receive payments. Further, an additional 9 families have possibly 14 children under the age of 20 years. I do not know, and have not had time to ascertain, how many of those 14 children are still dependent on their parents. Nor do I know the number of coal mine pensioners, or more correctly miners, who are paid this superannuation—as the honorable member for Broadmeadows pointed out—and who receive other benefits for their children from the Commonwealth or some other source.

I am prepared to consider whether the allowances for children should be increased or whether some allowance should be made for student children over the age of sixteen years who are still dependent on their parents. When it is ascertained how many are involved I shall be willing, provided that the Government approves, either to introduce special legislation or to include a provision along these lines when the next Bill is presented to Parliament. I shall certainly undertake that investigation. I realize that some time has passed since the allowance for children was initially fixed, and I agree with the honorable member that it has never been altered over the years. Up to date nobody has suggested that it should be altered.

Before I propose any alterations I must ascertain exactly what is involved. If none of the children over sixteen years of age are still dependent on their parents, it is not of much use amending the Act to make an additional allowance for children. Personally, I should prefer to help children under sixteen years of age. The honorable member for Broadmeadows will recall that some years ago the Act provided that an allowance was payable for only three children per family. This restriction was removed, and only one child benefited. Nevertheless, the Government is willing to examine anomalies from time to time and I shall be prepared to examine the position of dependent children whether they are under sixteen years of age or older, provided that they are continuing their studies. The main purpose of the Bill is to honour the Government's promise to the coal mine pensioners that whenever Commonwealth pensions are increased this Act will be amended so that payments may be made as soon as possible. That is why I hope the Bill will be accorded a speedy passage.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—I thank the Minister for his undertaking to examine the allowance for dependent children. I am sure the miners will also appreciate the honorable gentleman's gesture. The Minister said that no representations had been made to him since last April when the previous measure was dealt with by Parliament. In view of the fact that representations have been made to me by two representatives of the retired miners' association, I ask the Minister to meet a representative group from the association to discuss other aspects of pension payments, namely, the amounts paid to retired miners, disabled miners and miners' widows. These people would be most appreciative of the opportunity of discussing these matters with the Minister.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—I have met representatives of miners on several occasions and am always happy to meet anyone who wishes to put a proposition to me. The honorable member appreciates that there are limitations on the amount of money which can be paid from the fund. I shall be prepared to see the honorable member or any representatives of the miners who wish to see me.

The clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and the report was adopted.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—I move—

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—During the Committee stage, the Minister made brief mention of the limitations of the fund. I wish to draw to the honorable gentleman's attention the fact that as the result of questions I recently directed to his colleague, the Minister of Transport, concerning the amount of money realized from the sale of certain equipment and property which was formerly used by the Wonthaggi coal mine, the Minister of Transport indicated that a sum of $79,600 resulted from this sale—that the plant realized $35,470, equipment $23,780, and buildings $20,350. The honorable gentleman also stated that the money had been credited to the Coal Mines Depreciation Fund in the Treasury, in accordance with the provisions of the State Coal Mines (Winding Up) Act 1968.

As I understand the situation, once all expenses of the sale have been met the Treasurer may pay the residue into the Consolidated Fund. I ask the Minister to confer with the Treasurer with a view to ascertaining whether the honorable gentleman would be prepared to use this sum of money as a Government contribution, so to speak, towards increasing the amount available to meet increased commitments from the fund administered by the tribunal.

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister of Mines).—I shall be happy to discuss this matter with the Treasurer and my colleague, the Minister of Transport, who may also have an interest in it. There is no doubt that over the years the State Coal Mine at Wonthaggi incurred considerable losses which were borne by either the State or the Victorian Railways. The Minister of Transport would also have to be brought into any discussions concerning the fund, as suggested by the honorable member for Broadmeadows.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read a third time.

JURIES (COMPENSATION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from August 31) on the motion of Mr. Reid (Attorney-General) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—The purpose of this small Bill is to increase the rate of payment to jurors who serve six days or less on a jury and, as pointed out by the Attorney-General in his second-reading speech, clause 3 of the Bill contains consequential amendments of sections 15 and 16 of the principal Act in relation to fees paid by a civil litigant who desires an action to be tried by a judge and jury.

Although the Bill is small, I point out that it is important that persons sitting on juries should have a clear mind, listen only to the evidence, and judge the case on that basis. It is pertinent that honorable members be reminded of the year 1215 when juries were first introduced following the disbandment of trial by ordeal which existed in those days. Henry II., as well as Pope Innocent II., will at least be remembered for having introduced the jury system. It was not until 1352, in the reign of Henry III., when the jury system which we closely follow today was introduced.

At that time jurors were selected in a similar fashion to the way in which certain people had the privilege of electing members to Houses of Parliament. Since then we have made progress and our laws are patterned in principle on the laws which govern the functioning of courts in the jurisdiction of Great Britain. These procedures have been adopted with certain improvements and the result is the jury system which exists today. Now every person on trial has the right to be tried before a jury of twelve people who are his peers—that is, his equals.

At this point I ask: Why should this miserable Government deal with jurors this way? When explaining the Bill, the Attorney-General stated that the juror's fee was to be increased by 25 per cent of the previous fee of $6 a day, fixed in December, 1967. The honorable gentleman went on to say—

> The proportional increase is slightly greater than the 23·6 per cent increase in the minimum wage rate between December, 1967, and June, 1971.

Honorable members are aware that from time to time the Liberal Party both in this State and in the Commonwealth sphere makes an issue of the fact that the average wage per person is $83.50 a week. Why should this Parliament accept a principle designed to make jurors exist on $37.50 a week?

Mr. DUNSTAN.—Most employers make up the difference.

Mr. SHILTON.—I know that many employers do not make up the difference. It is important that a juror should have no other considerations than those relating to the case which is before him. If a man is taken off the street to serve on a jury he may lose money and a true verdict cannot be expected. However, as it is not competent for the Opposition to move an amendment to the Bill, which does provide a minimal, miserable increase in the payment to jurors, the Opposition must support it.

Mr. WHITING (Mildura).—I congratulate the honorable member for Midlands on the research carried out by him on the Bill which, as he pointed out, is important. He presented his case in an efficient manner and I also congratulate him on that score.

Compensation for jurors will always be a contentious issue because service on a jury is an unenviable job for most people. If, as the honorable member for Midlands stated, people have financial worries during their period of jury service they certainly cannot give of their best. This must, in itself, detract from the benefits of the jury system. I strongly urge the Attorney-General to examine closely the proposals for compensation for jurors put forward by the honorable member for Midlands.

The Country Party is perturbed at a trend which has appeared in certain sections of the community which have indicated a desire to do away with the jury system. This system has been proved over the years and from generation to generation. It is to be hoped that the jury system will continue to be improved and there should be no deterioration of it in any way. If the system is to be maintained fully and in as fine a condition as we would hope to see it operate, one necessary element must be adequate compensation to those people who are required to to serve on juries.

Apart from increasing fees for jurors who sit for five days or less by 25 per cent, the Bill adjusts charges to persons who require juries, which may consist of 4, 6, or 12 jurors in civil cases. In one case the fees are raised from $48 to $60 and, in another, from $72 to $90, or part thereof. From the Government's point of view, this is a revenue earning provision, but the compensation to be paid to jurors is the barest minimum which could reasonably be suggested. Unfortunately, this reflects on the jury system itself. The Country Party is disappointed that the Government did not see fit to give more thought to an averaging of the income level or even averaging the incomes of those who are normally required to perform jury service. If this were done, people who serve on juries would feel easier in their minds and would not be troubled when required to perform this valuable service.

Mr. WHEELER (Essendon).—A good case has been put forward by the honorable member for Midlands and the Deputy Leader of the Country Party on the fees paid to jurors. The jury system is one

with which we have lived for many years. It is one of the outstanding rights and duties within our society for a person to sit on a jury and stand in judgment of his fellow man. To do so may involve a sacrifice. Members of the Opposition, the Country Party and the Liberal Party, alike, believe that the jury system is as good a system as is possible. Until somebody suggests something better some sacrifices must be made to preserve the jury system which, in itself, is a compensation for those sacrifices.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Rate of compensation of jurors).

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—I again urge the Attorney-General to consider bringing payments to jurors into line with the fees paid to witnesses. At present, if a Crown witness loses salary by presenting himself to give evidence and the amount paid as a witness fee does not fully compensate him for that loss, he can apply to the Law Department for the payment of an increased fee. If the Government cannot set jury fees which have parity with average weekly earnings, it should seriously consider making similar arrangements for jurors so that, if a man loses money because of serving on a jury, he can apply to have the jury fee increased to compensate him fully.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I shall examine the suggestion made by the honorable member for Midlands, but I direct attention to what was said during the second-reading debate by the honorable member for Essendon. People are apt to forget that one of the duties of a citizen is to serve as a juror. We should not over-emphasize the payment for that service.

The clause was agreed to, as was the remaining clause.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I propose the following new clause to follow clause 3:—

AA.(1) A party who before the date of commencement of this Act enters a civil case for trial by a jury in the Supreme Court or requires a civil case to be tried by a jury in the County Court and pays to the prothonotary or to the registrar or assistant registrar of the County Court the fees payable under section 15 of the principal Act and the case is not tried before the date, shall before commencement of the trial to the prothonotary or to the registrar or assistant registrar as the case may be an amount equal to the difference between the amount paid upon entering the case for trial or requiring the case to be tried by a jury and the amount that would be payable if the case were entered for trial or required to be tried after that date.

(2) A party who under section 16 of the principal Act procures before the date of commencement of this Act a trial to be had by a jury of twelve and the trial is not had before that date, shall before the commencement of the trial pay to the prothonotary an amount equal to the difference between the amount paid to the prothonotary to procure the trial to be had by a jury of twelve and the amount that would be payable if the party procured the trial to be so had after that date.

(3) If the amount referred to in sub-section (1) or (2) payable in respect of a trial is not paid in accordance with sub-section (1) or (2) before the commencement of the trial the court shall proceed to conduct the hearing of the trial and determine it without a jury.

This new clause is necessary because the Act does not come into operation until 1st January, 1972, and it is desired to provide that, on and after that date, the new fees shall be payable. The proposed new clause will meet the conditions relating to civil files because in those cases the plaintiff pays the jury fees to the Crown and, in due course, the Crown pays the fees to the jurors. As the provisions of the measure will not come into operation until 1st January, 1972, the solicitors for the plaintiff may pay fees at the present rate. This is to ensure that jurymen and jurywomen serving after the date on which the Act comes into operation will be paid at the relevant rates and that the appropriate amount will be reimbursed to the Crown.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—Can the Attorney-General tell me what will be the effect if the trial does not take place but is set down for a later date? Will there be additional amounts payable?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—The honorable member for Broadmeadows is referring to an adjourned hearing. It applies only to the date of coming into operation.

The new clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House with an amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

MAGISTRATES' COURTS BILL.

The debate (adjourned from August 31) on the motion of Mr. Reid (Attorney-General) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. LOVEGROVE (Sunshine).—The Opposition does not oppose this Bill, the Minister's second-reading speech on which is reported at page 52 of *Hansard* at 31st August of this year. It has for its purpose the consolidation of legislation dealing specifically with Magistrates Courts, and proposes to amend the Justices Act. The measure contains 49 clauses and 2 schedules; 11 of the clauses provide for no changes in the present Justices Act, 30 have no substantive changes and the remainder provide 11 changes and a schedule.

The proposed amendments arose from an investigation of the administration of justice in the courts under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Smith, who recommended that the Act be redrafted in modern terms. Reference to this matter is made in three annual reports of the Public Service Board. At page 9 of the 1968 report, the board stated, *inter alia*—

> 1.2.2. Recently the O. & M. Inspectors have been involved in a series of preliminary studies concerning two other proposed engagements at—
>
> the Law Department—Several firms of private management consultants have been invited to submit proposals concerning the possible application of operations research, and other management techniques, to the Courts Branch in the administration of circuits for magistrates and clerks of courts.

The report of the board for the year ended 30th June, 1969 contains the following statement at page 16:—

> 5.2.1. In addition the O. & M. Inspectors have been involved in a series of preliminary studies concerning proposed engagement of private management consultants—
>
> At the Law Department—
>
> following consideration of the preliminary studies at the Courts Branch, the Board approved the engagement of private management consultants to undertake an operations research review of the administration of circuits for Magistrates and Clerks of Courts. In this instance, the Board did not provide O. & M. Inspectors for the Review Team or Steering Committee.

Again, at page 16 of the report of the Public Service Board for the year ended 30th June, 1970, under the heading "Electronic Data Processing" the following statement appears:—

> At the time the computer became available, several systems were being designed by consultants engaged to assist departments with specific problems. To reduce the cost of these projects the facilities of the Centre were used to test these programs and bring them into operation. The following projects fall into this category:
>
> Law Department—Review of the Court of Petty Sessions circuits to achieve greater effectiveness.

This illustrates the approach of the Government concerning the administrative reform of the Magistrates Courts. Currently, 214 courts are operating in Victoria, one in Melbourne, and 38 as headquarters of 13 circuits which comprise 175 courts. Thirteen stipendiary magistrates sit in Melbourne and 38 work on the circuits, making a total of 51 magistrates. Moreover 5,124 justices of the peace work on the circuit.

When the courts were originally established they were known as justices courts and in the main were presided over by justices of the peace. From what I have seen with other honorable members engaged on

committee inquiries, the trend today in Victoria and throughout Australia is for the stipendiary magistrates gradually to take over the important work of the courts. I say this without any reflection upon the good work performed by justices of the peace. I mention this matter in conclusion because the measure is not purely an administrative one; it contains certain overtones of law of which all honorable members are aware. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—The Country Party supports the measure which, as has been pointed out, is of an administrative nature and perhaps could be better discussed in Committee. With the changing times, it is obvious that Parliament must pay more attention to the administration of our courts because every day people in all walks of life waste a tremendous amount of time under the existing court procedures. If this measure can result in alleviating some of the delays that occur, it will achieve a worth-while objective.

When the Bill is considered in Committee, I should like the Attorney-General to comment on clause 5. As the honorable member for Sunshine has pointed out, the great majority of courts, numerically, are situated in country areas and clause 5 will empower the Governor in Council to close certain courts. Admittedly, this power must vest in some authority. In this day and age of trying to achieve more efficiency, it is necessary to remember that persons should not be forced to travel lengthy distances to attend Magistrates Courts. I ask the Minister to comment on this aspect of the measure.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clauses 1 to 4 were agreed to.

Clause 5 (Governor in Council may revoke appointment of places for Magistrates' Courts).

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I acknowledge the co-operation of the Opposition and of the Country Party in supporting this measure which, in principle, will achieve considerable reforms in the procedures of the Magistrates Courts. I was particularly interested in the invitation by the Leader of the Country Party for me to speak on the power of the Governor in Council to close courts from time to time.

As the honorable member for Sunshine pointed out, reports of the Public Service Board have included references to a report which was made to me by a firm of management consultants concerning the closing of certain courts. Where comparatively few cases were heard each year, it was recommended that the business of those courts should be transferred to neighbouring courts. I appreciate the work undertaken by the consultants but I take the view that a report of this nature must be applied with a good deal of reservation. The motives which prompt management consultants, of which there are many in the community, relate to economies in Government administration. I certainly support economy in Government administration but sometimes it can be bought at too great a price.

I believe the recommendations should be applied somewhat gradually and not holus-bolus. After all, local justice is as important to a community as local government. Although courts in country districts may be doing only a moderate amount of business, it is a good investment in the interests of the community because courts should have a symbol of justice. As the Minister of Transport reminds me, the same situation should apply in suburban areas.

I am giving attention to the reports but I acknowledge freely that, on my own initiative, I am applying the recommendations with a certain amount of conservatism. I have also taken account of reports made to me from the stipendiary magistrates, who

have a practical knowledge of the matter. I inform the Leader of the Country Party, as well as the Minister of Transport, who has a special interest in the suburban area, that, whilst I am Attorney-General, these recommendations for a reduction in the number of courts will be applied with a good deal of discretion.

My recent announcement on the use of certain courts for traffic business was made only after much consideration of the stipendiary magistrates' reports to which I have referred, and the general necessity to deal with traffic more promptly than it is dealt with at present.

Mr. ROSS-EDWARDS (Leader of the Country Party).—I thank the Attorney-General for the assurances he has given the Committee about using his discretionary powers before any country courts are closed. I ask the honorable gentleman to consider conferring with local members before making these decisions, because—as he has put it so ably—if only the aspect of saving money was considered and taken to its logical conclusion no civil servants would be employed outside the metropolitan area. When one considers a typical brief involved in a Magistrates Court case and the people involved — the accused, the witnesses, and the solicitors—it seems that the only person who must travel a distance is the magistrate. Usually, the court is held in a country hall, which is rented by the Law Department for the magnificent fee of approximately $4! From an economic point of view, the closure of certain country courts could save the State some money, but at the same time it would add a considerable burden to the people concerned.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The Government's decision to institute traffic courts is good. It is true that over the years the Opposition has made several attempts to encourage the Government in its administration of the law courts. Indeed, the honorable member for Sunshine, who was handling the Bill for the Opposition, stated in this House many years ago that owing to the increasing volume of traffic offences the then Courts of Petty Sessions—they are now Magistrates Courts—were being cluttered up and that it would certainly relieve the pressure from the magistrates if traffic offences were heard in a special court.

I ask the Attorney-General whether the establishment of two special courts for traffic offences means that special magistrates will hear these offences continually, or whether the circuit system will still operate whereby the magistrate who happens to be on duty at the time will hear the traffic offences. If special magistrates deal with traffic offences, they will become specialists in that field. I do not disagree with the policy of a magistrate serving in a special jurisdiction, just as I do not disagree with a judge serving in a special jurisdiction, because I believe they become very accomplished and expert in deciding cases in their specialist jurisdictions. I refer in this regard to workers compensation, divorce, and other jurisdictions. The view that I have expressed is not held by all members of my party. I invite the Attorney-General to indicate whether it is proposed that magistrates in the traffic courts which will be established will specialize in traffic offences.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—Two matters have been raised during the debate in Committee. I shall answer first the matter raised by the Leader of the Country Party, who requested me to ensure that the local members of Parliament are notified of any intended closure of courts in their electorates. This practice has always been adopted by me, and I believe by my predecessors, and I propose to continue it, because it is essential that the people who are most closely associated with the representation of the district should be given ample notice before any court is closed.

The second point, which was raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, referred to the establishment of traffic courts. I made a statement on this subject indicating that the courts at Kew, Flemington, and Sandringham, would be used exclusively to deal with matters arising from what is known as the alternative procedure. Under this procedure, if a defendant has not indicated his intention to defend certain traffic offences, the stipendiary magistrate in chambers can pronounce an order against him. I explain to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that what I have stated, and what I am proceeding to carry into effect, is not the ultimate establishment of a traffic court but a lead-in to it. As a starting point, a certain range of offences will be dealt with under the alternative procedure. The offences in question will be dealt with in the specified courts, but of course a range of graver offences lie outside that area. Before graver offences could be brought specifically into the range of specified courts, a further amendment to the Justices Act would be required, particularly relating to the venue of courts. At present, this question is under consideration by the Statute Law Revision Committee.

In answer to the honorable member for Northcote, who asked whether magistrates will remain specially designated as traffic magistrates, I point out that at present the magistrates' circuits are changed every two years, and magistrates are moved from one court to another. I believe it would be a mistake to leave a magistrate in a traffic court all his working life because he may become a little stereotyped. The honorable member's question reminds me of a debate in this Chamber shortly after I was first elected to Parliament. The then honorable member for Midlands, Mr. Clive Stoneham, was advocating this policy and I was in opposition to him. I pointed out that it could be a weakness because a magistrate or a judge can sometimes become too highly specialized. The magistrates in these courts will be subject to the same rotation as that which applies to stipendiary magistrates at present by reason of location. In other words, changes will occur from time to time in the personnel of the courts.

The clause was agreed to, as were clauses 6 to 45.

Clause 46 (Punishment for contempt).

Mr. SHILTON (Midlands).—Paragraph (*b*) of sub-clause (1) provides, *inter alia*, that if any person—

> being summonded or examined as a witness in any Court or criminal proceeding, appeal, action or matter or being present in Court and required to give evidence refuses to be sworn or to answer any lawful question;

This paragraph replaces section 211 of the Justices Act and is much wider. I ask the Attorney-General whether the provision is so drafted that a person would have the privilege of refusing to answer a question as is provided in certain sections of the Evidence Act. What is the position of a person who refuses to answer questions on the ground that, in doing so, he may incriminate himself? Can the Attorney-General state whether a person is obliged under the new provision to answer questions, or can he rely on the old plea?

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I appreciate the points which have been raised by the honorable member. I shall examine them and if there is a deficiency in the Bill I shall see whether an appropriate amendment can be made.

The clause was agreed to, as were the remaining clauses.

Schedule One was verbally amended, and, as amended, was adopted, as was Schedule Two.

The Bill was reported to the House with amendments, and passed through its remaining stages.

STATUTORY SALARIES BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 28) on the motion of Mr. Rafferty (Minister of Labour and Industry) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. WILKES (Northcote).—The adjournment of this debate was sought by the honorable member for Melbourne who, as the House knows, is now in hospital. The honorable member has recommended that this measure should not be opposed. When Parliament considered a similar Bill in December of last year, it was thought that it embraced all officers in the Public Service whose salaries were fixed by order of the Governor in Council, but that was not so, because two categories of offices were involved in that Bill—firstly, those for which previously the legislation provided for salaries and/or allowances to be fixed before appointment; and secondly, those cases where the relevant Acts prescribed the actual salaries or a maximum salary payable in respect of the offices concerned. In each case, legislation was necessary before salary or allowance adjusments could be made.

The purpose of the Bill was to standardize the legislative provisions so that when a general salary review took place it would not be necessary to introduce legislation to give effect to the new rates. Parliament had adopted this course in a large number of cases, but it was acknowledged that the simplified form of legislation was desirable in all instances.

Opportunity was also taken in the Bill of referring uniformly to " salary and allowances;" previously some Acts provided for salary only. However, in submitting the 1970 Bill, some offices were inadvertently omitted, and the Bill now presented is designed to bring these offices into line with the others.

This Bill amends the Country Fire Authority Act, the Geelong Harbor Trust Act, the Housing Act, the Labour and Industry Act, the Melbourne Harbor Trust Act, the Mental Health Act, the Ministry of Transport Act, the Public Service Act, the Supreme Court Act, the Teaching Service Act, the Vermin and Noxious Weeds Act, the Workers Compensation Act and the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission Act.

In 1970, the salaries of the Chairman of the Public Service Board and the Chairman of the Teachers Tribunal were deliberately held aside to be adjusted by a legislative amendment on each occasion. Further consideration has been given to those appointments, and it has been decided that the salaries applicable to them should be adjusted in the same way as are the salaries for other statutory positions—that is, by the Governor in Council. When the previous Bill was being considered it was decided that adjustment of the salary of the Auditor-General was to remain the prerogative of the Parliament, but I should not be surprised if the Government now takes a different view and intends to include provision to fix the Auditor-General's salary in this proposed legislation.

The Opposition's view is that salary adjustments for senior members of the Public Service should be no different from the adjustments of salary of people in industry, commerce or trade. When courts determine new salary rates—for example, under the Metal Trades Award—the increases flow throughout all sections of the community, with the exception of senior officers of the Public Service. Whenever it became desirable for their salaries to be adjusted, it was necessary for the Parliament to enact legislation. Consequently, many senior public servants found that, if there was a steady increase in the cost of living or a general increase in costs in the community, their salaries were very much behind the measuring rod that would normally have been used. The recent 6 per cent increase in the national wage would, under this Bill, flow on to the officers concerned. Members of the Opposition agree with that principle. We agree that the salaries of these

officers should be adjusted. In fact, the policy of our party is that quarterly cost-of-living adjustments should be made, if possible. This Bill deals with the matter in a broader sense so that adjustments will be made according to the index and the demand in the community.

I should imagine that, in the same way as the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission reviews salaries on the application of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and other bodies representing unions, in future the Government will review from time to time the salaries of the public officers referred to in the Bill and any adjustments considered necessary will be made automatically without recourse to an Act of Parliament. Members of the Opposition agree with this principle of adjusting salaries of public servants, and we hope the Government will see fit to include provision for the Auditor-General in this Bill because, if its purpose is to establish a principle or a method by which these salaries will be fixed in the future, it should be all-embracing. This system will obviate the work of preparing separate Acts and will remove the hardship of a waiting period for adjustment when Public Service salaries fall behind from time to time. Furthermore, the Government will be able to determine more accurately its economic policies if it knows what its salary commitments are. Therefore, members of the Opposition support the Bill.

Mr. R. S. L. McDONALD (Rodney).—Members of the Country Party support this measure which relates to the salaries, allowances and fees of certain public officers. It is introduced to take into account the inflationary trend. It is useless for anyone to assert that there has been no inflation; it is still evident. Essentially, this is a Committee Bill. The clauses contain provisions relating to the salaries of various public officers and I see no need to discuss them in Committee. The proposal is to make provision for a flow-on of salary increases to the persons concerned because of the inflationary trend that exists. Members of the Country Party support the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of Act No. 6228).

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I thank members of the Opposition and of the Country Party for their support of this Bill which the Government considers to be an important measure.

The clause was agreed to, as were the remaining clauses.

Mr. RAFFERTY (Minister of Labour and Industry).—I propose the following new clause to follow clause 1:—

AA. In sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Audit Act 1958 for the expression "a salary at the rate of $17,750 per annum" there shall be inserted the words "such salary and allowances as are determined by the Governor in Council".

In his second-reading speech the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned the desirability of including the Auditor-General under the provisions of the Bill. That view was shared by the honorable member who handled the Bill for the Country Party. The Government also recognizes the importance of such a provision and the proposed new clause will have that effect.

The new clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House with an amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

EXHIBITION (BORROWING POWERS) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 1) on the motion of Mr. I. W. Smith (Minister for Social Welfare) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—The purpose of the Bill is to increase from $700,000 to $800,000 the maximum permissible liability of the trustees of the Exhibition. The Exhibition has a rather interesting history and has a direct link with responsible Government, both State and Federal. In 1901 the opening of the first Commonwealth Parliament took place there. For a period of some twenty years the Victorian Parliament met in that building while this building was used by the Federal Parliament. The history of the Exhibition is interesting reading and I commend it to honorable members. Some interesting characters lived in that era of the early years of responsible Government in Victoria.

In his second-reading speech, among other things, the Minister referred to the trustees' plans for extensions, modifications and alterations to be made at the Exhibition if Parliament approves this Bill. One area of the building to be affected is that portion which was formerly known as the White Ensign Club. The Minister indicated that the trustees propose to remove this building and convert the area into a car park, which it is expected will be needed when the other works are completed. It is then intended to use the remodelled building as a substantial convention centre.

In passing, I make the point that in these days everyone is being caught up in the demand for the provision of additional parking space. It is affecting every section of governmental responsibility, including municipal government and all Government departments. Frequently public bodies find themselves in the situation of being required to spend considerable sums of money to provide parking space for motor cars, and I wonder where it is going to end.

The proposition contained in the Minister's second-reading speech is reasonable and my party offers no objection to the Bill. It would seem that the trustees of the Exhibition are alive to the potential of the building if it is brought up to date and modernized to meet the demands of present-day society. The attitude of the trustees is businesslike and members of the Opposition wish them well in their efforts. It would appear that at present the trustees are enjoying a certain amount of prosperity and hope to become completely solvent by good management of the financial aspects of this new undertaking. We do not oppose the Bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of No. 6120 s. 14).

Mr. I. W. SMITH (Minister for Social Welfare).—I thank the honorable member for Broadmeadows for his help and consideration of this measure and I shall certainly convey his good wishes to the trustees of the Exhibition. If the Bill is passed I am sure that Parliament will wish the trustees well in the conduct of their future developments.

The clause was agreed to.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION (NEWPORT POWER STATION) BILL.

The debate (adjourned from September 7) on the motion of Mr. Balfour (Minister for Fuel and Power) for the second reading of this Bill was resumed.

Mr. WILTON (Broadmeadows).—The purpose of this Bill is to approve as an undertaking within the meaning of section (1) of section 3 of the State Electricity Commission Act the construction of a steam power station at the site of the existing Newport power station adjacent to the mouth of the Yarra River. The present Newport power station is one of the

earliest power stations to be constructed in Melbourne. Originally the station was owned and operated by the Victorian Railways.

In its over-all planning the State Electricity Commission considers that it is desirable to have a new power station erected, and to that end it prepared a detailed report which was submitted to the Minister and recently tabled in this Parliament. A perusal of the report will enable honorable members who are interested in the project to assess the important part that the station will play in the future over-all operations of the commission in regard to base load power stations operating on the brown coal fields on the Latrobe Valley; the State's entitlement from the hydro-electric project in the Snowy Mountains area; and the existing availability of power from the hydro-electric plants operated by the commission in Victoria.

The report is interesting in that it indicates that the commission has gone to some trouble to explain the detailed operations of a power house on the over-all grid system. The report points out the necessity of having base load stations and intermediate to peak load stations which will meet the wide variable demand for power. The commission's report also reaffirms a long-established principle that hydro-electric generating stations are ideal to handle peak load power demands. Of course, we in Victoria are not as fortunate as people in some other parts of the world in that we do not have large water resources available to continually expand our hydro-electric operations. The Snowy Mountains scheme is almost completed and the commission can fairly accurately forecast its future entitlements from that source. The commission has decided that it is necessary to have what is termed an intermediate to peak load station at Newport.

A large sum of money—something like $145 million on current 1971 prices—is involved for the erection of a 1,000 megawatt station. I understand from the report of the commission and from the Minister's second-reading speech that that is the target at which the commission aims. Whether the power station will be extended to produce more than 1,000 megawatts is a matter for future planning. At this point, it is sufficient to take it that there will be a 1,000 megawatt power station comprising two units, each having a capacity of 500 megawatts.

It is interesting that the power station will be fired by natural gas. The commission, in its report, and the Minister, in his second-reading speech, placed great emphasis on the fact that natural gas is a non-pollutant fuel. I do not dispute that for one moment because it has been clearly established in other States and other parts of the world that natural gas is a non-pollutant fuel inasmuch as there are no residual unburnt fractions which can be exhausted into the atmosphere. Pollution has always posed major problems when other forms of fuel have been used for power generation, particularly solid fuels, and the Newport power station has a bad history in this regard. I do not say that in a derogatory way but, in the days when the Newport power station had a far more important role in the over-all power generating system than it has now, the only types of fuel available to the commission were solid fuels such as brown coal briquettes or black coal or, to a lesser degree, oil.

The station was always a source of annoyance to the many residents who lived close to it. In the late 1940s and early 1950s I spent some seven years at that station as an employee of the commission, and I well recall several instances when members of the public became involved in animated and heated arguments with the commission about pollution from the station.

When I read the report of the commission and studied the map at the back of the report, I wondered why the commission had not taken the opportunity of shifting the power

station to the other side of the Yarra River. There may be some engineering reason why this could not be done. There is open land on the opposite side of the river and a site there would be quite some distance from developed areas. The relocation of the power station on the other side of the river would have had two effects. Firstly, it would have increased the area of open space between the power station and the residential areas of Newport, because the river itself would have been part of the open space. Secondly, there would have been some reduction in the area of land in Williamstown on which rates cannot be levied. This is a major problem for the City of Williamstown, as the honorable member for Williamstown has told the House on many occasions. Large areas of land within that city do not attract rates, and the power station land is an extensive area of that type.

If the new power station had been erected on the other side of the river and the land at present occupied by the power station had been disposed of by the commission, the price received for it would have been considerable. It is possible that the commission would have suffered no monetary loss. The report of the commission indicates that it gave serious consideration to several sites when determining where the power station should be erected and, on economic grounds, it finally settled on Newport.

I am a little concerned that this will be the first occasion on which the commission will rely on a source of fuel outside its control. Up to now, all the major generating stations built and operated by the commission have used fuel from sources under the control of the commission. The brown coal fields in the Latrobe Valley have been under the control of the commission since its inception. The early history of the commission is set out in some detail in a publication of the commission, *Brown Power*, which I commend it to all honorable members. *Brown Power* gives a good picture of the early development of the commission, the problems it encountered, and the way in which it overcame them. In the early days of the commission it was believed that an authority charged with the responsibility of generating the power needs of the State should control the sources of its fuel. To this end, the Latrobe Valley brown coal fields were explored, the extent of the deposits was determined, and the commission was given control over those fields and charged with the task of developing them in conjunction with the development of electricity generation.

The commission has tackled these tasks successfully and the State can look with pride at its achievements over the years. The commission has acquired great expertise in the use of what is a low grade fuel when compared with other solid fuels, natural gas, and oil. In overcoming the difficulties, the commission devised a system by which brown coal could be used satisfactorily, and the State benefited materially.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—The honorable member for Broadmeadows is discussing the State Electricity Commission widely; this Bill relates to the Newport power house.

Mr. WILTON.—In any power project, the source and cost of the fuel is a key factor, firstly, in justifying the establishment of the powerhouse and, secondly, in its future economics. The point I was coming to is that it is generally conceded that, unless natural gas can be purchased by the commission at a price substantially below that charged for this fuel in other markets, there could be some doubt about the economic viability of this section of the commission's operations. I am rather surprised to find that, repeatedly, the Minister and the Government draw a shroud of secrecy around any sort of agreement between any State authority and the gas and oil industry in this State.

It seems extraordinary that when I visited the chairman of the Electricity Trust of South Australia and asked him how much he was charged for natural gas to be used in his power stations, he told me; but when a similar request was made to this Government, I was met with a wall of secrecy. I have not been able to ascertain what the commission would pay. The Minister for Fuel and Power has spoken about variables and continuity of supply. I can only compare the remarks of Dr. Hetherington with the situation in other parts of the world relating to the use of this fuel in the electricity generating system. The South Australian Government pays 2·3 cents a therm, and the fuel must be transported 480 miles.

Natural gas comes to Melbourne from Longford via the pipeline around the Gas and Fuel Corporation's ring main. Discussions have taken place between the State Electricity Commission and the Colonial Gas Association. I do not know whether the details have yet been ironed out. The commission may find itself in the position of being ready to start and then discover that the price is too high. It is putting itself into a corner. There should be a clear understanding between the producers, the transporters and the Colonial Gas Association. The power station is located within the franchise area of the company. Perhaps the association may forgo its rights.

I regret that the Opposition has found it difficult to get a clear-cut answer from the Government. The Minister for Fuel and Power was good enough to arrange for me to confer with the senior officers of the State Electricity Commission on the planning of the power station. I had a frank discussion on procedures and the role to be played by the commission. When the question of cost was raised, I was referred to the Minister. That is fair enough because it is the Minister's responsibility to answer for his instrumentalities. I hope the Government has agreed on a price and that Parliament is not being asked to approve a project for which there is no permanency of price or supply. This is the first occasion on which the commission has entered into a large project for which fuel outside its own control is to be supplied.

I cannot understand why the Government continues with this wall of secrecy around the negotiations between the producers and the Government instrumentalities concerned. Members of the Opposition do not oppose the Bill because they believe it is the responsibility of the commission to plan for the building of these stations and have them operational when they are needed. The commission has always aimed at this target and it is trying to discharge its responsibilities to the State. One of the major difficulties of the day-to-day operations of the commission concerns its peak-load operations. Demand can rise from normal to peak load in a short time. The hydro-electric supply from the Snowy Mountains and the other Victorian supplies are now at their maximum, and other fields must be examined. I accept the commission's argument that natural gas is the ideal fuel because it has a high British thermal unit content, which is important from an operational cost point of view, and also because it is a non-pollutant.

Parliament must accept the commission's proposals because honorable members are unable to ascertain what the fuel will cost. The Government has got itself into a situation where many authorities which may desire to use this fuel will find that because of the Government's interference during the negotiations between the Gas and Fuel Corporation and the producers on the price of natural gas they have to pay more than that paid by similar authorities in other States. The Government played politics then, and it now finds that the Victorian producers have almost been priced out of the rest of the Australian market.

The SPEAKER (the Hon. Vernon Christie).—Order! The honorable member is now discussing the marketing of natural gas whereas the Bill relates to the construction of a power house at Newport.

Mr. WILTON.—I was coming to the point that this may well be the reason why the Government has consistently shrouded all aspects of its operations in secrecy.

The SPEAKER.—Order! The honorable member has already canvassed that particular argument. I direct the honorable member's attention to Standing Order 78B, which he knows very well.

Mr. WILTON.—This may well be why the Government has refused to reveal to the Opposition or to the public the price that the State Electricity Commission will pay for natural gas. I invite the Minister for Fuel and Power to assure the House that I am wrong and to inform honorable members of the facts. If the Minister fails to do that, honorable members are entitled to assume that my description of the situation is accurate.

Mr. BROAD (Swan Hill).—The Country Party approves the plans of the State Electricity Commission to build a new power station at Newport to burn natural gas. The project will benefit the whole State, both country and metropolitan areas. Although it may be thought that the output of the station will serve particularly the metropolitan area, the power generated by the station will flow into the State system and will service a kitchen in Melbourne or a shearing shed in Swan Hill. The consumption of electricity in Victoria is increasing at approximately 8 per cent per annum and obviously provision must be made at this stage to increase the production of this valuable product.

When there is a feeling of apprehension and uncertainty in the community, it is good for a Government to proceed with a normal plan of State development because it acts as a quiet gesture of encouragement to all industry to do the same. The development of this project will increase the confidence of the people and help them over this temporary period of difficulty.

I am pleased that the commission proposes that oil can be used in the furnaces if the need arises. I appreciate the commission's action to avoid pollution of the atmosphere and disfigurement of the surrounding area. The most attractive feature of the commission's administration for country residents is the operation of uniform tariffs. I often wish that the Federal Government would apply the same principle to telephone charges. The Country Party supports the Bill.

Mr. FLOYD (Williamstown).—As the Parliamentary representative for the area, I think that I should say something about the proposed new power station. I congratulate the Minister for introducing this measure because, according to his second-reading speech, the honorable gentleman was under no obligation to do so. I do not remember legislation being brought before Parliament concerning the erection of the Yallourn W station, which has a generating capacity of 750 megawatts. Apparently, when it is proposed to build a station to produce 1,000 megawatts, it is worth consideration by Parliament. It is a good idea to allow Parliament to discuss projects which involve such a large expenditure. It also allows those people who object to this sort of activity to take the opportunity of appearing on television to discuss the matter. Therefore, I congratulate the Minister on introducing the measure and also for making available to members of the Opposition the facilities of the State Electricity Commission in order to discuss any problems which are not explained by the Minister,

I am sure that the honorable member for Broadmeadows will agree that Mr. Frank Chipperfield

and Mr. Glynn were most helpful in their advice on a number of matters which, if I attempted to discuss them, you, Mr. Speaker, probably would rule out of order. They concern honorable members who have to put up with the somewhat misplaced criticism of the project.

Everybody wants to use an electric razor, switch on the electric light and ride on escalators and in lifts, but nobody wants to see transmission lines, a power station or even a purification plant. I welcome this proposed station to the Williamstown electorate, and I am pleased that it is being built at Newport because, with due respect to the newcomers to Williamstown who are more concerned about the balance of nature, conservation and so on, Williamstown is still an industrial suburb and relies to a certain extent on the Newport railway workshops and other industries to allow local businessmen to make a living.

When the existing power station at Newport became redundant and men were being retrenched, the effects were felt throughout the municipality. Although many used to complain about the power house, they did not want it closed down. Williamstown needs a power station to absorb those people who have been put off from the existing power station.

I welcome the new project with reservations. During his second-reading speech, the Minister dwelt on the aspect that the power house would not be objectionable to the ratepayers and residents of Williamstown. Whilst I trust the State Electricity Commission, I am concerned that it has not always kept its promises. The Minister said that for many years the commission had been concerned with public relations, and that it had taken all sorts of steps to be good friends with the public. This is not correct. The commission had to be brought into step many years ago at the expense of the Williamstown municipality.

In the days before I was a member of Parliament, the then Attorney-General, the Honorable Thomas Mitchell, in a moment of weakness, generosity, or love for Williamstown, granted the council, of which I was a member, a fiat to prosecute the State Electricity Commission through the Government for allowing Williamstown to become covered with grit. Great play has been made in the Minister's second-reading speech of what the Government will do throughout the State Electricity Commission's undertakings with electrostatic precipitators. It took many years to have these put on the chimneys at Newport, and before they were fitted the district was showered with so much grit that cricket could not be played on the adjoining reserve. The council asked the Government for permission to prosecute the commission. It is difficult for a municipality to attack a Government instrumentality, even though it receives permission. The Government instrumentality can install containers around the area to collect fall-out and have it chemically analysed. It is possible that other industries in Williamstown were as much at fault as the State Electricity Commission. Safeguards must be provided for the future.

The members of the Opposition welcome the power house and the foresight of the State Electricity Commission. We welcome also the planning that the commission intends to undertake to ensure that power generation is doubled about every eight years. The commission appears to be doing the right thing. It is necessary for research to be undertaken, and if we seek to safeguard the future, we must search the past. Safeguards should be provided for the future of the power house. My colleagues ask why the State Electricity Commission does not construct the power house on the other side of the river. The simple answer is that the commission bought the land for practically nothing. Not long ago the area where the power house is situated today was farm land. It is also part of a

reclamation of an old bay called Greenwich Bay. I have the details. The farm was subdivided into 5-acre or 10-acre blocks and the commission bought it for a small sum. When the commission decided to go in for power generation, that was the logical place to put the power house and I am glad that it will be there.

A name is now being sought for the site. These days everything has to have a name. It is no longer called the Newport power house; that is too prosaic. I suggest that it be called Greenwich, which was the name of the original estate. A study of the history of Williamstown reveals that the settlement was to be called Greenwich.

Mr. WHEELER.—It could be called Floyd's Village.

Mr. FLOYD.—Or Floyd's Folly. If this monumental power house with 600-ft. chimneys is to be called anything, I suggest it should be named after the former chairman of the State Electricity Commission who did a magnificent job, but if something glamorous is required it can be called Greenwich Bay power house.

The State Electricity Commission has informed me that the area will be landscaped. In that way the Williamstown City Council will receive some of the benefits to which it is entitled, as it will not receive rates. The Greenwich station existed on this site two years before the Geelong railway line was extended to Melbourne. The station was called Greenwich. For two years people who came from Geelong went up the Yarra River on a boat called *The Citizen*.

On the television programme "Dateline" recently the subject of decentralization was raised and it was stated that the power station should be located somewhere in the bush. If it were, the power would have to be brought down by ugly transmission lines. When the station is built, the gas will be transported underground. My colleagues are perturbed about the cost of the gas, but Yallourn will not continue for ever. The Yallourn power house is a thermal station. It has a base load, but it has its limitations. As the years go by and atomic power and natural gas are used, Yallourn could become redundant. The State Electricity Commission was formed because assured supplies of coal could not be obtained from New South Wales. One door closes and another door opens. The New South Wales coal mine owners were difficult to negotiate with, and Yallourn was opened, but in time it will become redundant. Natural gas or nuclear power will be used. For years Williamstown has been searching for a clean power station, and this is the opportunity of getting it.

Safeguards are needed to ensure that the errors of the past are not repeated in the future. Tons of grit have been taken from roofs of certain buildings at Williamstown, such as the Strand Hotel. When electrostatic precipitators were installed, part of the foreshore was reclaimed and it made a fine football and rugby ground. Electrostatic precipitators collect the grit, but it has to be disposed of. It is easy to do so in Yallourn because there are many holes there. The quarries in Melbourne are being rapidly filled up and the councils have nowhere to put rubbish. The new gas-fuelled power station will not produce any grit. If gas is not used, oil must be used, and electrostatic precipitators cannot be used for oil-fired furnaces. When oil has been used at the old power station at Newport in the past, there has been as much trouble with the old machinery as when coal was burnt. The oil gets on household washing that is left out all night. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization was unable to provide a solution to eradicate the problem associated with the damage that was done to clothing.

Finally, as natural gas will be used to generate power, briquettes will not have to be brought all the way from Yallourn to Newport. This will eliminate a number of dangerous crossings where the railway line

crossed roads and boom gates have not been provided. It will also dispose of the fuel dump that was originally located at Williamstown and later at Altona and Paisley. That area can be used for housing, as school sites, or for some other purpose. Furthermore, the cartage of briquettes around the Williamstown area will be minimized. As my colleague in another place recently stated, the briquette carriers put "hungry boards" on the sides of their trucks. The boards were used to enable bigger loads to be carried, but frequently a load was so big that the briquettes fell off onto the roads and created a menace to residents.

I congratulate the State Electricity Commission for its forward planning, and I thank the Minister for Fuel and Power for his courtesy in allowing Opposition members to discuss the matter with the commission. The State Electricity Commission has taken a lead in public relations. A liaison committee has been created to discuss any problem that occurs with the Williamstown City Council. As a member of the council, I was instrumental in assisting the committee to get started after the fuss and bother that had arisen over the fiat and the prosecutions.

It is to the credit of the State Electricity Commission that when the troubles had disappeared three-monthly conferences were held and the commission sent its senior men—even the chairman—to confer with the Williamstown council. I hope this state of affairs will continue, and that the fears I have expressed about a recurrence of events of the past are groundless. I am delighted that Williamstown municipality was selected as the location of this wonderful power station, which will serve the people of this State for many years. It will be a very valuable asset to the city. Fears have been expressed that because Williamstown is sited on an area of basalt which was an overflow of lava from Mount Macedon, the sounds of the power station will reverberate throughout the city. I think the people who express such fears would be better off directing their energies to something which is more worth while.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a second time and committed.

Clause 1 was agreed to.

Clause 2 (Approval of scheme for establishment of power station).

Mr. BALFOUR (Minister for Fuel and Power).—I am sure that this power station will be of great benefit to the people of Victoria, and I express my appreciation of the way in which the honorable member for Williamstown and other members who have participated in the debate have handled the matter. I trust that the good relations which exist between the State Electricity Commission and the Williamstown City Council will continue.

The clause was agreed to, as was the remaining clause.

The Bill was reported to the House without amendment, and passed through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT: TEACHERS' RESIDENCES FOR PORTLAND.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next, at half-past Three o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. REID (Attorney-General).—I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. W. J. LEWIS (Portland).—I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Education to a shortage of houses for high school teachers at Portland. The Portland High School has been established for 25 years, and the advisory council of the school has advised me that there are only three teachers' residences, one of which is allocated to the

principal. Its distance from Melbourne makes the Portland High School a difficult school to staff, and teachers are usually appointed in the holiday season when it is most difficult to obtain accommodation. This is a matter of concern to the advisory council, and I have been requested to ask the Minister to take steps to provide residences for two senior teachers who must be housed in 1972.

Mr. THOMPSON (Minister of Education).—As the honorable member for Portland probably knows, the Teacher Housing Authority works on a budget of $1·6 million and as a statutory authority it is authorized to borrow $300,000. The department looks forward to a steady, if unspectacular, increase in the number of houses being provided for teachers. I shall be happy to consider a special investigation of Portland's need for two residences to be provided in 1972.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.27 p.m., until Tuesday, October 19.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, October 19, 1971.

The PRESIDENT **(the Hon. R. W. Garrett)** took the chair at 4.46 p.m., and read the prayer.

POLICE REGULATION (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

APPRENTICESHIP (AMENDMENT) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. Murray Byrne (Minister of Public Works), for the Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development), was read a first time.

SUNDAY ENTERTAINMENT (CINEMATOGRAPH FILMS) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

COAL MINES (PENSIONS INCREASE) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. G. L. Chandler (Minister of Agriculture), for the Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development), was read a first time.

JURIES (COMPENSATION) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government), was read a first time.

MAGISTRATES' COURTS BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. A. J. HUNT (Minister for Local Government), was read a first time.

STATUTORY SALARIES BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. G. L. CHANDLER (Minister of Agriculture), was read a first time.

EXHIBITION (BORROWING POWERS) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. MURRAY BYRNE (Minister of Public Works), was read a first time.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION (NEWPORT POWER STATION) BILL.

This Bill was received from the Assembly and, on the motion of the Hon. Murray Byrne (Minister of Public Works), for the Hon. V. O. DICKIE (Minister for State Development), was read a first time.